

Legislative  
Assembly  
of Ontario



Assemblée  
législative  
de l'Ontario

---

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

No. 116

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

N° 116

1<sup>st</sup> Session  
42<sup>nd</sup> Parliament

Wednesday  
5 June 2019

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

Mercredi  
5 juin 2019

---

Speaker: Honourable Ted Arnott  
Clerk: Todd Decker

Président : L'honorable Ted Arnott  
Greffier : Todd Decker

### **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.

---

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



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

ISSN 1180-2987

# CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Wednesday 5 June 2019 / Mercredi 5 juin 2019

## ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

### **More Homes, More Choice Act, 2019, Bill 108, Mr. Clark / Loi de 2019 pour plus de logements et plus de choix, projet de loi 108, M. Clark**

Mr. Mike Schreiner .....	5539
Mr. Ian Arthur .....	5540
Ms. Marit Stiles .....	5542
Ms. Jessica Bell .....	5545
Ms. Bhutla Karpoche .....	5547
Third reading debate deemed adjourned .....	5549

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS

The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott) .....	5549
Mr. Guy Bourgouin .....	5549
Mr. Jeremy Roberts .....	5549
Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens .....	5549
Mr. Rudy Cuzzetto .....	5549
Miss Monique Taylor .....	5549
Mr. Mike Schreiner .....	5549
Ms. Jane McKenna .....	5549
Mr. Michael Mantha .....	5549
Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde .....	5549
Hon. Monte McNaughton .....	5549
Mr. Taras Natyshak .....	5549
Ms. Jill Dunlop .....	5549
Ms. Bhutla Karpoche .....	5549
Ms. Christine Hogarth .....	5549
Hon. Caroline Mulroney .....	5549
Ms. Doly Begum .....	5549
Mr. Robert Bailey .....	5549
Mr. Stephen Crawford .....	5550
Ms. Doly Begum .....	5550
Ms. Andrea Khanjin .....	5550
Hon. Lisa M. Thompson .....	5550
Mrs. Daisy Wai .....	5550
Mr. Paul Calandra .....	5550

### **Correction of record**

Mr. Michael Mantha .....	5550
--------------------------	------

## ORAL QUESTIONS / QUESTIONS ORALES

### **Government contract**

Ms. Andrea Horwath .....	5550
Hon. Victor Fedeli .....	5550

### **Health care funding**

Ms. Andrea Horwath .....	5551
Hon. Christine Elliott .....	5551

### **Climate change**

Ms. Andrea Horwath .....	5552
Hon. Rod Phillips .....	5552

### **Interprovincial trade**

Ms. Goldie Ghamari .....	5553
Hon. Todd Smith .....	5553

### **Public transit**

Ms. Jessica Bell .....	5553
Hon. Jeff Yurek .....	5553

### **Government's record**

Ms. Mitzie Hunter .....	5554
Hon. Victor Fedeli .....	5554

### **Skilled trades**

Mr. Paul Calandra .....	5555
Hon. Merrilee Fullerton .....	5555

### **Workplace safety**

Mr. Jamie West .....	5556
Hon. Laurie Scott .....	5556

### **Broadband infrastructure**

Mr. Toby Barrett .....	5556
Hon. Monte McNaughton .....	5557
Hon. Ernie Hardeman .....	5557

### **Municipal government**

Ms. Suze Morrison .....	5557
Hon. Steve Clark .....	5557

### **Public transit**

Mr. Billy Pang .....	5558
Hon. Monte McNaughton .....	5558
Hon. Jeff Yurek .....	5558

### **Water quality**

Mr. Taras Natyshak .....	5558
Hon. Monte McNaughton .....	5559

### **Charitable gaming**

Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria .....	5559
Hon. Caroline Mulroney .....	5559

### **Environmental protection**

Ms. Sandy Shaw .....	5560
Hon. Rod Phillips .....	5560

### **Official members' photograph**

The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott) .....	5560
-------------------------------------	------

### **Notice of dissatisfaction**

The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott) .....	5560
-------------------------------------	------

## DEFERRED VOTES / VOTES DIFFÉRÉS

<b>Bringing Choice and Fairness to the People Act (Beverage Alcohol Retail Sales), 2019, Bill 115, Mr. Fedeli / Loi de 2019 visant à offrir à la population plus de choix et un accès équitable en matière de vente au détail de boissons alcooliques, projet de loi 115, M. Fedeli</b>	
Second reading agreed to .....	5561

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS

Ms. Natalia Kusendova .....	5561
Mr. Mike Schreiner .....	5561
Ms. Jill Dunlop .....	5561

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS / DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS

### Legal aid

Ms. Jessica Bell .....	5561
------------------------	------

### Autism treatment

Mr. Billy Pang .....	5562
----------------------	------

### Climate change

Mr. Ian Arthur .....	5562
----------------------	------

### Transportation infrastructure

Mr. Amarjot Sandhu .....	5562
--------------------------	------

### Health care

Mr. Terence Kernaghan .....	5562
-----------------------------	------

### Guelph and District Multicultural Festival

Mr. Mike Schreiner .....	5563
--------------------------	------

### Teeyan Da Mela

Mr. Deepak Anand .....	5563
------------------------	------

### Eddy Lefrançois

Mr. Michael Mantha .....	5563
--------------------------	------

### Ontario's Best Butter Tart Festival

Ms. Jill Dunlop .....	5563
-----------------------	------

### Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis

Ms. Natalia Kusendova .....	5564
-----------------------------	------

### Visitors

Mr. Deepak Anand .....	5564
Mrs. Nina Tangri .....	5564

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS / DÉPÔT DES PROJETS DE LOI

<b>Protecting a Sustainable Public Sector for Future Generations Act, 2019, Bill 124, Mr. Bethlenfalvy / Loi de 2019 visant à préserver la viabilité du secteur public pour les générations futures, projet de loi 124, M. Bethlenfalvy</b>	
First reading agreed to .....	5564
Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy .....	5565

<b>Making Northern Ontario Highways Safer Act, 2019, Bill 125, Mr. Bourgouin / Loi de 2019 visant à accroître la sécurité des voies publiques dans le nord de l'Ontario, projet de loi 125, M. Bourgouin</b>	
First reading agreed to .....	5565
Mr. Guy Bourgouin .....	5565

<b>La Francophonie Act, 2019, Bill 126, Mme des Rosiers, Mrs. Lalonde / Loi de 2019 sur la Francophonie, projet de loi 126, Mme des Rosiers, Mme Lalonde</b>	
First reading agreed to .....	5565
Mme Nathalie Des Rosiers .....	5565

<b>Ontario Food Terminal Protection Act, 2019, Bill 127, Ms. Karpoche / Loi de 2019 sur la protection du Marché des produits alimentaires de l'Ontario, projet de loi 127, Mme Karpoche</b>	
First reading agreed to .....	5565
Ms. Bhutila Karpoche .....	5565

<b>Ontario Water Resources Amendment Act, 2019, Bill 128, Ms. Dunlop / Loi de 2019 modifiant la Loi sur les ressources en eau de l'Ontario, projet de loi 128, Mme Dunlop</b>	
First reading agreed to .....	5566
Ms. Jill Dunlop .....	5566

<b>Safe and Healthy Communities Act (Addressing Gun Violence), 2019, Bill 129, Ms. Hunter / Loi de 2019 pour des collectivités saines et sécuritaires (traitant de la violence armée), projet de loi 129, Mme Hunter</b>	
First reading agreed to .....	5566
Ms. Mitzie Hunter .....	5566

<b>Combatting Litter for the Environment and Nature Act, 2019, Bill 130, Ms. Khanjin / Loi de 2019 visant à lutter contre les détritiques afin de protéger l'environnement et la nature, projet de loi 130, Mme Khanjin</b>	
First reading agreed to .....	5566
Ms. Andrea Khanjin .....	5566

## MOTIONS

### House sittings

Mr. Stephen Lecce .....	5566
Motion agreed to .....	5566

## PETITIONS / PÉTITIONS

### Curriculum

Ms. Marit Stiles .....	5566
------------------------	------

### Government's record

Mrs. Amy Fee .....	5567
--------------------	------

### Curriculum

Ms. Sara Singh .....	5567
----------------------	------

<b>Curriculum</b>	
Mr. Terence Kernaghan .....	5567
<b>Waste reduction</b>	
Mme Nathalie Des Rosiers.....	5568
<b>Library services</b>	
Mr. John Vanthof.....	5568
<b>Child care</b>	
Ms. Doly Begum.....	5568
<b>Municipal planning</b>	
Mr. Tom Rakocevic .....	5569
<b>Tenant protection</b>	
Ms. Bhutila Karpoche .....	5569
<b>Campus radio stations</b>	
Mr. Mike Schreiner.....	5569
<b>Climate change</b>	
Mr. Ian Arthur.....	5569

#### **ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR**

<b>Bringing Choice and Fairness to the People Act (Beverage Alcohol Retail Sales), 2019, Bill 115, Mr. Fedeli / Loi de 2019 visant à offrir à la population plus de choix et un accès équitable en matière de vente au détail de boissons alcooliques, projet de loi 115, M. Fedeli</b>	
Hon. Victor Fedeli.....	5570
Ms. Sandy Shaw.....	5571

Mr. Doug Downey .....	5572
Mr. John Vanthof.....	5573
Mr. John Fraser .....	5574
Mr. Mike Schreiner.....	5575
Third reading vote deferred.....	5577
<b>More Homes, More Choice Act, 2019, Bill 108, Mr. Clark / Loi de 2019 pour plus de logements et plus de choix, projet de loi 108, M. Clark</b>	
Mr. Gilles Bisson .....	5577
Third reading vote deferred.....	5577
<b>Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Amendment Act (Interim Period), 2019, Bill 117, Ms. Jones / Loi de 2019 modifiant la Loi sur la Société de protection des animaux de l'Ontario (période intermédiaire), projet de loi 117, Mme Jones</b>	
Hon. Sylvia Jones.....	5578
Mr. Kevin Yarde .....	5578
Mr. Mike Schreiner .....	5579
Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria .....	5580
Third reading agreed to .....	5581
<b>Private members' public business</b>	
Mr. Doug Downey .....	5581
Motion agreed to .....	5581
<b>Adjournment debate</b>	
Mr. Doug Downey .....	5582
Motion agreed to .....	5582



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 5 June 2019

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE  
DE L'ONTARIO

Mercredi 5 juin 2019

*The House met at 0900.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Let us pray.  
*Prayers.*

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MORE HOMES, MORE CHOICE  
ACT, 2019

LOI DE 2019 POUR PLUS DE LOGEMENTS  
ET PLUS DE CHOIX

Resuming the debate adjourned on June 4, 2019, on the motion for third reading of the following bill:

Bill 108, An Act to amend various statutes with respect to housing, other development and various other matters / *Projet de loi 108, Loi modifiant diverses lois en ce qui concerne le logement, les autres aménagements et d'autres questions.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Further debate.

**Mr. Mike Schreiner:** Good morning, everyone. I rise to contribute to the debate on Bill 108. I'm asking MPPs from all parties to listen to municipal leaders, citizen groups, heritage and environmental groups who are speaking out against Bill 108.

Over 80 municipal governments, housing advocates and environmental leaders wrote an open letter to the minister requesting that the government provide additional time to consider Bill 108. I want to quote from their letter:

"The provisions in Bill 108 would limit the ability of municipal governments to plan for, and provide amenities for the people we all serve. Our residents expect their neighbourhoods consist of more than just a grouping of homes. Parks, daycares, and recreation centres are not nice-to-haves but necessary building blocks of a thriving community.

"Residents are also concerned about losing Ontario's natural heritage if schedules 2, 5, and 6 of the act is passed. Bill 108 threatens conservation areas, wetlands, and the plants and animals that call them home, particularly endangered species. Ontarians value and cherish their natural areas, and will not accept losing them to sprawling subdivisions when better options are available."

Yet the government is ramming this bill through with only one day of hearings.

I had mayors reach out to me who wanted to speak on Bill 108 to express their concerns, but because there was only one day of hearings—it actually happened while the Federation of Canadian Municipalities meetings were taking place—they were unable to contribute to the debate.

I believe it's wrong for the government to silence their voices.

Speaker, I want to challenge the government's assertion that this bill is somehow good for hopeful homeowners or people struggling to pay rent.

The chief architect of the greenbelt and highly respected urban planner Victor Doyle had this to say about Bill 108: "Despite its title, the province's Housing Supply Action Plan and Bill 108 do very little to support an increased supply of affordable housing ... and in certain instances are directly contrary to that goal, such as restricting the use of inclusionary zoning only to major transit stations."

The mayor of Mississauga, Bonnie Crombie, said, "We have not seen any evidence that reducing fees and timelines for developers will result in the creation of more affordable housing or that savings will be passed along to consumers. The long-held principle that 'growth pays for growth' would no longer apply, resulting in existing rate-payers and residents footing a larger share of the bill for new growth."

So by reviving the old OMB rules and reducing development charges, the government is essentially handing over the keys to the province to big developers. This will leave municipalities cash-strapped and unable to ensure healthy, livable communities with recreation centres, daycares, parkland and other essential amenities. Reviving the old OMB will drag municipalities back into multi-million-dollar squabbles in front of a quasi-judicial tribunal of unelected adjudicators.

It was a good day for democracy and for citizens when the OMB was killed. As a matter of fact, members opposite, when they were in opposition, voted to get rid of the OMB, so I wonder what has changed. It's disappointing to see that democratic power is being wrenched back away from citizens and municipalities, who won't even have the same appeal rights as big developers under the government's proposed new system.

The growth of our communities should be driven by the people who live in these communities, not by private interests. The government's housing plan is straight out of the 1950s, when the best idea we had going was building more sprawling suburbs, and we now know the cost of that kind of development. We've evolved since then, and there are better solutions.

Worsening sprawl will not solve the GTA's skyrocketing housing prices, but it will line the pockets of big developers and speculators. To quote the recently sacked Environmental Commissioner, "It's fast and easy to turn a wetland to a suburb. It's almost impossible to turn it back."

If we were serious as a province about tackling the cause of out-of-control housing prices in 2019, then we'd be looking at the activities of land speculators and private equity firms and vacation rental companies.

Yesterday, MPPs from all opposition parties joined environmentalists and developers to speak out against Bill 108. We were joined by a developer from Windmill Development Group, which is committed to a triple bottom line: people, planet and prosperity. He spoke about ways that we can respond to development pressures without encroaching on prime farmland and sensitive wetlands or wildlife habitat. He talked about the need for intensification around transit hubs, about the missing middle, about developing urban brownfield sites. We also could add to that list tiny homes, laneway housing, secondary suites and co-housing, to make better use of existing housing stock and urban land.

Bill 108 embraces some of those ideas, and that's a good thing, but why put them forward in the context of an omnibus bill that does so much other damage?

It's wrong to put endangered species at risk of extinction, and it's wrong that endangered species don't have a voice in this government. They can't vote; they can't write campaign cheques. So today, on World Environment Day, I would like to give them a bit of a voice, because I don't want to be a part of the generation that sees so many species go extinct, and tell my kids that they can't enjoy the wildlife that I've been able to enjoy.

**0910**

I want to ask the members opposite—for instance, the member from Parry Sound–Muskoka, whose riding includes habitat for the threatened Algonquin wolf—will he stand up and vote against Bill 108? Or the member from Kenora–Rainy River, whose riding includes one of only two subpopulations of the grey fox, which is threatened in Ontario but not in other jurisdictions—and the minister suggests we can get rid of anyway—will he stand against Bill 108?

To the member from Lambton–Kent–Middlesex, whose riding includes significant wetlands around Lake St. Clair, where the king rail lives, and is an endangered water bird: Will he stand up against Bill 108?

To the member from Niagara West, whose riding includes a few of the remaining cherry birch trees, of which the minister says, “We can cut down and pay into some pay-to-slay fund”: Will he vote against Bill 108?

Speaker, I ask because I want to echo the comments of Anne Bell from Ontario Nature yesterday, who said that if this bill passes, the proposed changes are so profound that the Endangered Species Act would be rendered into a “hollow shell of its former self. It will be pretty much useless in addressing the ongoing decline of endangered species.”

I remind members of this House that globally, one million species are at risk of becoming extinct.

I was at an event last night with the Honourable Tom McMillan, who was the environment minister in Brian Mulroney's government. He spoke about the responsibil-

ity of all legislators in this country to address the biodiversity and climate crisis. Bill 108 does exactly the opposite.

So it would be impossible, I believe, for any MPP to read this bill and claim that it will actually improve the life of endangered species. I ask my colleagues: Do you want to be complicit in that? I hope not. I ask you not to be, and I ask everyone in this House to vote no on Bill 108.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Further debate?

**Mr. Ian Arthur:** It's a pleasure today to contribute to the debate on Bill 108, which is something like the “more, better, good homes act,” or something like that. The panache this government has for naming bills is just extraordinary.

I think that there are very few bills where the true intent of this government is so clearly laid out as in Bill 108. When you break down the different components of the bill and the acts that it amends, you really begin to have a deep understanding of where the priorities of this government lie.

This bill is a gift to sprawl developers. It endangers the last few wetlands and protected forested areas that we have, particularly in southwestern and southern Ontario, where we only have 3% coverage. Speaker, 18% coverage is what is considered safe, and we have 3%. I know that in your riding, Speaker, there were actually flood warnings from the rising water levels in Lake Ontario.

**Hon. Jeff Yurek:** Lake Erie.

**Mr. Ian Arthur:** Lake Erie—sorry. Yes, Lake Erie. Thank you for the correction, Minister.

A large part of that is that we no longer have the resiliency to deal with these extreme weather conditions, which are happening more and more often. And one of the best ways we can create that resiliency is by protecting these wetlands and forested areas, because they act like a sponge. When we have forested areas, when we have wetlands and there are these extreme weather events and large rainfalls in the spring, the province has the capacity to deal with that. When we pave over them, when we hand out these areas to sprawl developers to create subdivisions, we lose that resiliency.

It's also incredibly expensive to do. The suburbs that are breaking up our farmland or forests or paving over wetlands—they're some of the most expensive ones to run down the road. But they're very profitable right up front at the very beginning because a lot of the money is made when you actually take those pieces of farmland and you chop them up, not in the actual building of the houses or anything like that. So lining up Ontario to embrace that kind of development on a massive scale is going to have dramatic repercussions for a very long time, and I think a lot of them are going to be negative. I don't think it's going to deal with the affordability crisis in housing. I don't think it's actually going to deal with the supply crisis that we have and, I think, environmentally, it's going to be a huge mistake.

I'd like to read a statement here from Environmental Defence. It was their submission on this:

The “government is putting Ontario’s environment up for sale at bargain basement prices. We’re concerned this move gives sprawl developers a free pass to pave over farmland, forests and endangered species, putting our clean air, drinking water, local food supply and vulnerable habitats at risk. At a time where parts of Ontario are flooded and feeling the devastating effects of climate change, allowing development in our natural protection areas like forests and wetlands is irresponsible and dangerous.

“What’s equally concerning is that this plan is short on details on how it will actually address housing affordability. We know that opening up distant farmland for low-density housing isn’t going to provide affordable housing, but it will make commutes longer, taxes higher ... provisions and delaying habitat protections, these changes represent a gutting of” the act.

So, environmental groups are against Bill 108—probably to be expected, to be honest with you—but what’s more remarkable is the number of municipalities that are actually against Bill 108. Right here, I have a stack of submissions from municipalities all across Ontario, and this is only a small portion of them. The municipalities, almost in their entirety, have spoken out in their dislike of this bill. They’re focused a little bit less on the environmental protections, although they do talk about that extensively.

They sent a submission in—many of them are the same; many of them sent in the same submission. I’m going to start by reading from the city of Toronto: “Whereas the legislation that abolished the Ontario Municipal Board and replaced it with the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal received unanimous—all-party support”—this is the first line. I’m reading from the city of Toronto submission.

I’m going to move on to the Halton region and read the second line: “Whereas all parties recognized that local governments should have the authority to uphold their provincially approved official plans; to uphold their community driven planning; and”—that was from Halton.

Now we’re in Aurora: “Whereas Bill 108 ... once again” allows “an unelected, unaccountable body to make decisions on how” their “communities evolve and grow.”

On to Markham: “Whereas the city of Markham”—and that would have been substituted for any of the other municipalities—“requests that the proposed changes to the Planning Act provide greater deference than that previously afforded to local, municipal decisions on development applications, by restoring the test under the Planning Act that appeals must be on the basis that the municipal decision is not consistent with the provincial policy statement, fails to conform with a provincial plan, or fails to conform with the local and regional official plan(s)”—from Markham.

Now on to Oliver Paipoonge municipality: “Whereas this MOU is ‘enshrined in law as part of the Municipal Act’. And recognizes that as ‘public policy issues are complex and thus require coordinated responses ... the province endorses the principle of regular consultation between Ontario and municipalities in relation to matters of mutual interest’; and

“Whereas by signing this agreement, the province made ‘a commitment to co-operating with its municipal governments in’” accordance to “‘new legislation or regulations

that will have a municipal impact’”—that’s from Grey county. I know the member from Grey county talks to his constituents a lot.

Now on to Niagara-on-the-Lake: “Whereas Bill 108 will impact 15 different acts—Cannabis Control Act, 2017, Conservation Authorities Act, Development Charges Act, Education Act, Endangered Species Act, 2007, Environmental Assessment Act, Environmental Protection Act, Labour Relations Act, 1995, Local Planning Appeal Tribunal Act, 2017, Municipal Act, 2001, Occupational Health and Safety Act, Ontario Heritage Act, Ontario Water Resources Act, Planning Act, Workplace Safety and Insurance Act....” That’s from Niagara-on-the-Lake.

#### 0920

We’re going to go a little bit closer to my home and the township of Frontenac. “Be it further resolved that the township of South Frontenac”—and we can substitute, again, any of the municipalities that dislike this tremendously—“call upon the government of Ontario to halt the legislative advancement of Bill 108 to enable fulsome consultation with municipalities to ensure that its objectives for sound decision-making for housing growth that meets local needs will be reasonably achieved; and

“Be it further resolved that a copy of this motion be sent to the Honourable Doug Ford”—sorry; the Premier—“Premier of Ontario, the Honourable Christine Elliott, Deputy Premier, the Honourable Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Honourable Andrea Horwath, leader of the New Democratic Party, and all MPPs in the province of Ontario.”

I read from a number of them, but there’s still a stack here. We have Ajax; we have the city of Hamilton; we have the entire Durham region. We have Georgina, Brampton, Newmarket, Halton Hills, Southwest Middlesex, Grimsby, the York region, Aurora, which I already said, and Oakville. This isn’t even all of them. These are just the ones I had printed copies of in my office.

The mass opposition to this—the municipalities are saying, “Stop. Give us time to have some input on that.” That’s what they’re asking. They’re saying that they should have a right to determine their own governance and their own ability to effect development in their ridings. It’s hard to believe that this government wants, in this frankly bull-headed manner, to push forward with these changes when there is that much opposition to them.

That was a petition sent to the government, but many of the councillors and mayors across Ontario have also spoken out in other ways, apart from the formal petition. I’m going to read a couple of their quotes.

Chris Murray from the city of Toronto said there was “limited evidence” the legislation would make it easier or faster to build housing. “There are no tools in Bill 108 that address head-on our affordable housing challenge.” That’s one.

From Mississauga: “The province’s new housing legislation is a plan made by people who don’t have a clue how municipalities work....”

In Halton Hills, regional chair Gary Carr said, “Quite frankly, this bill has been written by the developers,” which is indicative of what I’ve been saying this whole

time. There's no consultation with municipalities. They're almost entirely opposed to this bill.

It is a gift to a very specific type of developer. Let's be very clear that this is a boon to sprawl developers. There are some excellent developers out there, doing gentle densification, working on brownfield development, and we need to support them and they should continue what they're doing. But the breaking up of wetlands, forested areas and farmlands is not the solution for housing anywhere in Ontario.

From the region of Peel: "Bill 108 will once again allow an unelected, unaccountable body to make decisions on how our communities evolve and grow."

Oakville mayor Rob Burton told the National Observer that Bill 108 indicated that Ontario is under "a centralized authoritarian regime." He's using some strongly worded language. He says, in relation to schedule 5, "The damage is going to be immense." The damage "to the environment is going to be immense...."

"I am alarmed at this unconsultative, one-sided, un-informed set of sweeping, draconian measures that will only harm communities and the environment, and will not achieve their stated goals.... It's a joke. It's a travesty."

That's a few of the comments that you're getting from municipalities across Ontario. Many of them I wouldn't really say are bastions of progressive ideals, but they really do have a fundamental problem with that.

My critic area is the environment, so I do want to spend some time on schedule 5 and the changes to the Endangered Species Act.

I want to say that Bill 108 is a massive step backwards for endangered species in Ontario. It does provide an avenue for sprawl developers to pave, or pay to pave, over wetlands and protected areas, and it undermines the scientific integrity of COSSARO and the scientific intent of the Endangered Species Act. It allows the minister to overrule protections, and it is being rammed through the Legislature with little debate or stakeholder input, which I just made abundantly clear by reading all those submissions.

Gutting the Endangered Species Act at a time in history when we are facing human-caused mass extinction is—I don't have the words; it's audacious, maybe, but cruel and irresponsible and shirking our responsibilities as leaders and legislators. We are moving in the opposite direction. We are facing a crisis, Speaker. And it is a crisis. The entire scientific community is united in it being a crisis. Yet, our move, as a province, is to remove what few protections we actually have for endangered species in the name of development. It's the wrong way to go, Speaker. It is absolutely the wrong way to go.

I'm going to quote the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, and they did not mince their words: "Nature is declining globally at rates unprecedented in human history—and the rate of species extinctions is accelerating, with grave impacts on people around the world now likely.... We are eroding the very foundations of our economies, livelihoods, food security, health and quality of life worldwide."

Now, the only good thing about the report is that it says it's not too late to make a difference, but that we need to

take action on every level, from local to global, and that would actually include provincially. We would have to actually do something provincially, and that would mean expanding protections, taking a more aggressive stance on protecting endangered species. We have to do that, Speaker. We will never get back what we lose if this legislation is passed. We will never get it back.

We live in a time where we must turn the mechanism of government to do everything in its power to deal with this crisis, be it for endangered species, be it for the air quality and our own health, be it for our food security—the ability to feed ourselves is going to be tremendously affected in years to come. We, and this government, are focusing on the wrong thing. It's hard to be able to see where that path leads and, frankly, not to be able to do anything about it, because there's incredible damage coming. It's going to hurt people across this province, regardless of their income level, regardless of where they live. The effects are going to be detrimental. It's hard to see that coming and not be able to do anything.

I pray that this government listens to municipalities, listens to environmental groups and pauses Bill 108 to do some meaningful consultations with people across Ontario.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Further debate?

**Ms. Marit Stiles:** Good morning. Speaker, as always, I'm pleased to join the debate today on behalf of my community, the great riding of Davenport, where, I have to say, the housing crisis is being felt acutely. And it is a crisis, Mr. Speaker, of affordability; I would say less of availability, more really of affordability. I hear it every single day when I'm on the doorsteps talking to my constituents.

Under the previous Liberal government, we did see housing become increasingly unaffordable in Toronto, pushing more people into the shelter system or out onto the streets, and certainly more and more people barely making ends meet because so much of their income has to go to housing. The former government talked about affordable housing—I will give them that—but when push came to shove, their agenda always put landlords and, again, big developers before people in need of housing.

This government is taking that agenda to new heights, handing developers really extraordinary powers over our communities, under the guise of addressing a housing crisis.

**0930**

In Toronto, the average market rent—for those who may not reside in the city—is about \$1,492 for a two-bedroom, not including utilities. Honestly, in my community, there is no way you're going to find a unit for that price. I doubt that, actually. In Davenport, we've seen rents increase—and this is going to shock a few people out there—by 35% since 2012, in just seven years.

Of course, we know that under both of these governments, we haven't seen wages increase accordingly. It's something, again, that comes up at the doorstep every time I'm out canvassing. I meet people in their thirties—often a young couple in their thirties starting out. Maybe they both even have full-time jobs. That's pretty awesome.

They're terrified that they will be forced to leave their apartment because they won't be able to afford a new one in the same neighbourhood. Also, as they start their family they're really not sure whether they're going to find a place that's close to a school or anywhere near a school, or if they have children that they'll be able to find a space in a school nearby, in the same neighbourhood.

The idea of home ownership: When we talk about that at the doorstep, people laugh. It's incomprehensible that home ownership would be an option. It's something that simply can't even be entertained by young people in my riding.

For people who are precariously employed—and that number is also growing in Toronto—even a legal rent increase can mean that they're going to be forced to move, and we see that happening increasingly.

Mr. Speaker, think of minimum wage earners and how much of their income goes to rent each month. It doesn't leave, really, anything left over for groceries or other necessities of life, and we see that increasingly. Those are the people in our food banks. Those are the kids who rely on the student nutrition programs that this government may end. These folks are worse off after this government's decision to roll back the minimum wage that was supposed to come into effect, let's remember, on January 1. Now that we're in June, those minimum wage earners have about \$600 less in their pockets, thanks to this government. It's something to keep in mind as we weigh this legislation and, frankly, all legislation. We should be asking ourselves, "Will this make life better for working people or worse?"

Mr. Speaker, one thing is for sure: This bill will do nothing to ensure that new affordable housing is built or that existing affordable housing remains that way. It won't stop landlords from jacking up rents—you had an opportunity; you didn't take it—and it won't protect tenants from renovations, which is a big issue in my community. In fact, some of my constituents right now at 394 Dovercourt Road are facing renovation. I know it's happening across the province, actually. It's quite terrifying.

So what does this bill do? There are a whole lot of goodies in here served up to make wealthy developers even wealthier. That's pretty much what this bill is about.

For one, it brings back the hated Ontario Municipal Board in schedule 11. Let's remember that this is a completely unaccountable body stacked with developers, which has the power to override municipalities completely. And let's remember that for years municipalities pleaded with the previous government, the Liberal government, to address this structure, until finally, when they were facing an election, they agreed to shift the balance. Now this bill restores the power of the OMB to be the final say on planning decisions—a very poor decision and one that I think we will suffer for as a province.

In my community, what that means is that when it comes to major developments like those that are happening along Dufferin Street—oh, I could talk for hours and hours about the developments happening on Dufferin Street.

I think what you'll find when you go to communities like mine is that people aren't objecting to development.

They understand the need for intensification. But they want truly affordable units. They want something for that height that's going to be achieved. They want investment in parks and community recreation centres. Sometimes—sometimes—the city gets it right and we get some of those things.

In the case of what's happening along Dufferin Street, there will no longer be any incentive for developers to work with the community and the local councillors before construction. They can simply wait it out, the developers; appeal to the OMB, which is now the LPAT and I guess will be the OMB again—it's hard to keep track—and most likely they're going to have their plans rubber-stamped. It will just be approved. So all the work that communities do to try to extract some community benefit will be gone.

This tilting of the scales back toward developers runs absolutely roughshod over municipalities, city planners, school boards, and most importantly, those local community members. It takes away any incentive, any carrot and, frankly, any stick that municipalities have to negotiate those community benefits.

To make matters worse, this bill would restrict what development charges can be levied from new developments. This is very shameful. Right now, those development charges help all community members benefit when new buildings are constructed. They pay for things, again, like parks, green space, streetscape improvement, libraries, child care spaces—all of which ultimately are great news for communities. They make sure that when that development happens, it happens within a neighbourhood where people, when they move into those buildings, can know that there is going to be a space in a school nearby, child care, community recreation services, that kind of thing—green space, my goodness.

The details of that new system are going to be left to regulation, but the act specifies that these charges will be capped based on a prescribed percentage of the appraised value of the land, and not the number of new residential units.

The bill also frees developers from the prospect of paying education development charges, an issue near and dear to my heart as the education critic for the official opposition. Once again, what we see happening is power transferred away from local boards and centralized in the hands of the minister to decide what is best for growing schools and growing communities. Mr. Speaker, in the past, I know myself, personally, and our party have advocated for more use of education development charges so that we could invest not just in schools in growing areas, but also in the \$16-billion repair backlog that we have in our schools, schools that any minute now are going to get so hot—if the weather warms up like it usually does at this time of year—that our kids are going to be literally getting sick in class because of lack of air conditioning, let alone leaky roofs and freezing classrooms in the winter.

**Interjection:** And the education workers who work there.

**Ms. Marit Stiles:** And the education workers who work there, who have to deal with those poor working conditions, as do the children.

Speaker, in Davenport and other parts of Toronto, density is increasing. This bill hampers the ability of the city to ensure that amenities and public services will be there to support that increasing density. By giving developers a free hand to do as they please, a few people stand to make a lot of money, a great deal of money, at the expense of smart, urban development and what we call “complete communities.”

I’m not going to read from the city council manager’s report, as I had intended to, because there have been some new developments I want to make sure I have time to get to.

But, Speaker, the question is, how did we get here? We know that some of Ontario’s wealthiest developers were quietly funding a massive third-party advertising campaign, Ontario Proud—some across the way will be familiar with that—that was really dedicated solely to electing this government. Achieved. I know that my constituents and people across Ontario have many questions about the influence of those powerful lobbyists on government policy.

I will add, it wasn’t just this government, because I recently had the experience of sitting on a panel with a former member from Beaches–East York, I believe, Arthur Potts. He says he was a lobbyist with the city for developers, for construction companies, and many of the same people that, unfortunately, he pointed out ironically, defeated his government and helped elect the members opposite. But he gave me some really interesting insight into what this government is doing. He actually agrees, ironically, with some of what the government is doing because he supported those companies.

**0940**

But anyway, Speaker, like many members in this House, my inbox has been deluged with emails opposing this bill and opposing the undemocratic way it has been rammed through the Legislature, leaving only—let’s remember—one day to hear from the public about such sweeping changes. It’s a complete slap in the face to the people who sent us here. I feel like a broken record sometimes, because unfortunately, we have to talk about that all the time, whether it’s a committee or here—

**Interjection:** It’s happening.

**Ms. Marit Stiles:** It’s happening all the time.

I don’t care what the bill is or how right the government thinks they are; the people of Ontario have a right to take part in the legislative process. This is their House, and they have a right to be heard. These are their laws.

Despite these attempts to limit participation by regular people in this process, people have certainly been making their voices heard. We have heard about many, many municipalities that have objected to this bill, from places large and small.

We’ve also had a groundswell of opposition from ordinary citizens to this bill. Amendments to the Endangered Species Act—and I know my colleague just spoke very eloquently about that. I want to revisit that issue. As many will know, Ontario currently has over 230 species at risk, including Blanding’s turtles, lake sturgeon and the boreal caribou. Bill 108 essentially allows developers to pay to break the law, buying their way out of the Endangered

Species Act. This has been, I think, quite a concern for so many Ontarians. I can’t tell you how many people have emailed me about this. The bill completely ignores environmental and animal science. It sells out our natural heritage in these backroom deals, hidden away from public oversight or any scrutiny. That is, I have to say, chilling.

This is an emotional subject, Mr. Speaker, and one that I do believe transcends party politics, because no matter what part of Ontario you live in and no matter how you vote, Ontarians know that our natural environment and biodiversity are part of what makes this province one of the most beautiful, livable places on the planet. We are so fortunate, and we are at such risk. The idea that we, as humans, somehow exist outside of these ecosystems is fundamentally flawed, yet it seems to be pervasive in this government’s approach to the environment. And that is truly disappointing to me, personally, to the people I represent and, I think, increasingly to many, many Ontarians, and also, I would say, especially to the next generation, to the young people who are out there every Friday, pleading with us to do the right thing.

Speaker, our very survival as a species is intricately linked to the environment in which we live. If this bill is allowed to pass, we will only be accelerating the species loss that science has already told us is headed for catastrophic levels. I, for one, do not want to pass that burden onto my daughters or their daughters, and I expect some members opposite feel the same. I hope you will find the courage to join us in opposing this deeply flawed legislation.

Just before I close, Mr. Speaker—I have a few more minutes—I want to talk about some news that has emerged today in an interview with the *Globe and Mail* where the municipal affairs minister has said that he intends to send two proposed official plan amendments, one for the development of Toronto’s midtown and the other for the development of the downtown, back to Toronto officials on Wednesday—that’s today—with major revisions meant to address what he calls “the city’s housing affordability crisis.”

To comply with this directive, the city is going to have to go back to the drawing board, I guess. I want to say how deeply disturbing this is to many of us living in this city—once again, no consultation, no discussion even with people who were elected to represent our city, city councillors—nothing.

I want to quote the minister here, Mr. Speaker, in this article. He says, “As a politician, it’s very difficult, because I am looking out for those people who don’t live in those neighbourhoods right now, who don’t have that voice.” Huh? What? What does that even mean? This minister should be concerned about what’s going to happen to people already living in that neighbourhood, as well as the people who are going to move in, because those people aren’t going to have community centres or daycares.

Already, there are notices up on the fences around developments happening in these areas of the city—if you haven’t, I urge you to go out and check it out yourself, because there are signs on those fences that say, “We

cannot guarantee that your child will have a space at this school,” which really means they won’t, and then they will have to be bused to another school.

I just want to point out that the cost of that, the cost of busing, as this government should know, is astronomical. It’s an enormous part of our education budget. It will continue to grow. What we need are more community schools. If you’re building high-rises and you’re going to go higher and higher and not think about those investments, we will all literally be paying that price in the future. I think that’s just one example of where this can go so badly wrong.

The minister talks about needing to allow for more development and building higher buildings in these areas near transit stations and transit growth. But the problem is, we have people literally standing on crowded platforms, kids on crowded platforms—I’ve talked about this before in this House. Kids on crowded platforms getting to school by subway, at risk of getting pushed into the—I mean, this is my nightmare as a parent. I really urge the government to understand the implications of this.

I know what this is about. This is about giving a gift, frankly, back to those who have supported you, big-time developers, and the Liberals previously did exactly the same thing. But Ontarians have had enough of this and Torontonians have had enough of this. We are going to pay the price, and all those people, those families who you say you want to support, are going to literally pay the price. It is terrifying and it is really, deeply undemocratic, so I have to say shame on the government for this.

In closing, I want to thank everyone who has taken the time to write in and share their views on this deeply flawed legislation. Whether you are someone who has been waiting on the affordable housing waiting list for 10 years and you know this bill will only put housing further out of reach, whether you’re a concerned neighbour who wants smart, responsible growth in your community and not a return to the bad old days of the OMB, or whether you’re someone who knows that we’re already up against the extinction clock for too many species, I want you to know that we hear you and that we will be opposing this bill every step of the way.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Further debate?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** It’s an honour to stand up to speak to Bill 108, the More Homes, More Choice Act, on behalf of the residents of University–Rosedale. Now, there’s no doubt that we have an affordable housing crisis in Ontario. We certainly have an affordable housing crisis in University–Rosedale. It’s the number one issue that my constituents face. When I go door-to-door, this is the issue people bring up most frequently.

We also just did a community meeting in Kensington to discuss and talk about ways that we can individually help people who are facing an affordable housing problem—maybe they’re facing eviction—and also look at some of the political reasons why we are facing an affordable housing crisis. Some of the stories that came up in that community meeting are really indicative of the ways that our affordable housing crisis affects people on so many

different income levels and in so many different ways—people that allegedly would be helped by this bill, the More Homes, More Choice Act.

Those people include the individuals who live at 54-56 Kensington. Almost all of them are men who are struggling to get by—it’s a rooming house, like many places in Kensington—and they are being threatened with illegal eviction by a new landlord who wants to jack up the rent and turn some of the apartments into Airbnbs. These people are terrified because if these people are evicted, some of them will end up homeless, which is terrible. And for one of those people who lives very close to them, an individual called Kwame, who the Kensington-Bellwoods community legal clinic has been working with, actually had that fate when, once again, a new landlord bought his apartment and illegally evicted all of the tenants, including Kwame.

#### 0950

They called the police, the police came and actually charged the landlord for hurting the tenants and illegally evicting them, but the police did not have the ability to return Kwame to the apartment. The Landlord and Tenant Board, even though they ruled in Kwame’s favour—because the landlord is appealing, Kwame and his former roommates are not able to access that apartment and Kwame is living in a shelter on Bathurst Street right now.

Then there are other people in the more middle-income bracket, such as a resident of University–Rosedale whose kid goes to the local school. He and his partner are both earning a decent income and want to stay in the riding and want to keep their kid in their school, because their child has friends, their child likes the teacher and, quite frankly, it’s really very difficult for a child to move them to a different school. His landlord evicted him, and now he’s paying \$3,500 a month rent for a two-bedroom apartment because that’s all he could find in the riding. This is very typical of the kinds of situations that people in University–Rosedale find themselves in because of the affordable housing crisis.

It’s unethical that we have this situation, because there are ways to solve it. The problem is that this bill, Bill 108, is not going to address the very real affordable housing realities that people all across Ontario face at all those different levels that I was talking about.

What Bill 108 really is is a piece of legislation that was designed for, and caters to, donors of the Conservative Party. That’s what it is. It’s developers, by and large—there are good developers out there, but by and large, there are also many developers who want to capitalize on our very hot housing market and make a quick buck, and that is being done at the expense of people who already live here.

Bill 108 is a bill that gives developers free rein to trample on the environment by paying a fee, and it is putting our endangered species at risk—species that already are endangered, and then it’s putting them further at risk.

Bill 108 is a bill that overrides municipalities’—including Toronto, which is the sixth-largest government in Canada, and this bill essentially takes away Toronto’s right to make its own decisions—city councillors’ and residents’

own decisions about how we want to develop in a way that makes sense for people here. That's not right. This bill is not going to do much at all to address the affordable housing crisis, and it's going to do a lot of things that will make things worse.

I want to summarize a little bit more about some of the issues that I see in this bill in more detail. A lot of these issues have been brought up by residents' associations in my riding who follow the issue of development very closely. They include the Annex Residents' Association, the Greater Yorkville Residents' Association, the Harbord Village Residents' Association and the Ossington residents' association. They really care. They're the kind of people who care about the kind of neighbourhoods they live in and they get involved. They've approached me, and some of them spoke at committee, and these are some of the issues they brought up.

One is that they're very concerned about how municipalities are being robbed of the power to provide important services, like parks, daycare centres and community infrastructure, because the amount of development charges that can be placed on a new development have been reduced, and that's a huge problem.

Just to clarify, municipalities use development charges essentially to make developers contribute to the services that people need in an area. This makes a lot of sense, because when you have 1,000 or 2,000 people move into an area, which is what happens if you build a big condo, those people need parks to go to—many of them have little pets or kids—they need daycare centres, they need community centres. They need all these critical services to make the quality of living in a highly urbanized environment good. That's what's part of it. What happens when developers don't pay their fair share is that everyone else has to pay their fair share, or it's not done and people's lives are a little bit more miserable. So that's a big win for developers and it's a big loss for communities.

On a personal level, we just had a development, an Honest Ed's development, at Bathurst and Bloor. The developer responsibly worked very closely with the residents' associations, the local community and the local city councillors to try and do what was right. There's going to be some affordable housing. There's going to be a new park. They've provided some subsidies to local businesses so some small businesses can stay in the area and survive on Bloor Street and on Markham Street. That kind of negotiating power that city councillors have to get what the community needs is lost with this bill, because this bill basically significantly reduces the power municipalities have to get those kinds of things that developers sometimes are a little reluctant to give.

Another big concern that Bill 108 raises is the proposed changes to the Planning Act, the Ontario Heritage Act and the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal Act. Quite frankly, these changes are a big windfall for private developers, because we're reverting back to the old OMB rules, which means that local residents, neighbours and community groups have much less say over the kind of development that happens in their community. Quite frankly, that's a huge problem, because residents' associations deserve to

have a say over what happens and local elected officials deserve to have a say too. This bill takes that away.

Bill 108 also robs cities of the power to address local needs and promote affordable housing. The reason why it does that is because it takes away something called inclusionary zoning. Inclusionary zoning essentially means that if a developer comes into your community, a certain percentage of units are set aside to be affordable. Maybe it's at 80% of market rent for 50 years' time and 20% of units are defined as affordable. All those things are variables that municipalities work with the developer to work out. That's essentially now gone. What's so frustrating about that is that the city has been fighting for so long to have that inclusionary zoning power, because they know that inclusionary zoning means that affordable housing units are built.

There's this thing called the "crane index." It's a real thing, and it measures how many cranes in a given area are building condos or developments. It's one of the measures of how successful a city is or how many residential units are being built. Toronto, actually, is number one in North America on the crane index. We are building more condos and more residential units than any other city in North America. The challenge is that the units that are being built are not affordable. There was a recent study done by the city of Toronto. It looked at the—I don't know what it was; I think it was about 40,000 units had been built. One in 40 of them was defined as "affordable," meaning a person on an average income in Toronto could afford them.

It's not just about supply. It's also about addressing this issue of affordability. The way of doing that, through inclusionary zoning, is disturbingly absent in Bill 108. It should be included; it should be returned back in there so we can actually tackle the affordable housing crisis.

Another issue that people have raised again and again is the fact that Bill 108 hands over environmental protections and conservation rules to private developers. This issue, for the residents of University–Rosedale, has been one of the biggest—the highest number of emails that I've received in the last few weeks has been on this issue. I've received over 600 letters and emails from constituents in University–Rosedale who are very concerned about the idea of allowing developers to pay a fee to get out of environmental protections. In the words of one of my constituents, Catherine, "This is entirely short-sighted thinking. 'Open for business' does not have to occur at the expense of our natural environment." I couldn't agree with Catherine more.

I know none of this comes as a big surprise to this government. This government has, unfortunately—this is just the latest step in a whole series of moves this government has made to make affordable housing less affordable in Toronto. You've gutted rent control on new rental units, even though the Liberal government tried that experiment for 25 years and it was a spectacular failure—a spectacular failure. Nothing affordable has been built. Purpose-built rentals have essentially not been built. It doesn't work.

#### 1000

You've cut 25% of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing budget, you've cut \$40 million from the affordable rent support program and you've cut \$11 million from

the ending homelessness program. So this is the latest step in a whole series of moves to not make housing affordable in Toronto. It's unconscionable that that is happening given how many people are really struggling to even survive in Toronto right now.

I want to spend the final few minutes just talking about the huge amount of research and evidence that is out there that identifies policies that we in this House can move forward on to make affordable housing a reality—not just in Toronto, but all across Ontario. That includes making developers pay their fair share. So, instead of reducing development charges, we increase development charges, so we can use that money to build more affordable housing units, as well as daycares and community centres. It means building more rental housing. And maybe that means the government has to play a role in getting that started up. It means investing in co-ops, such as the ones like Kawartha co-ops and Sultan co-ops in Yorkville.

Sultan co-ops: It's a beautiful building. It's now self-sustaining. It doesn't need any government intervention. A lot of seniors live there who are struggling to make ends meet but have this oasis they can live in that's affordable. And it's next to \$1.5-million condos, right next door, that are completely unaffordable. That kind of model—and Sultan co-ops can be replicated elsewhere, but it's not, and it should be.

We should be moving forward on inclusionary zoning. We should be fixing social housing so that people who are really struggling and who need a lot of government help have a safe place to live so they can actually build their lives. We need to make laws that protect renters and make it possible to stay in their homes so that we can challenge the sharp rise in illegal evictions and renovations. We should engage with local residents and give them a say in what happens in their neighbourhood by not going back to the OMB process, which we know doesn't work.

I will continue to fight with the residents of University–Rosedale to stand up for affordable housing, and to stand up for meaningful and responsible development so that we can move forward with intensification, but that it's done in a respectful and responsible way so that Toronto could be the great, world-class city that it deserves to be—not just for international investors, but for people who live here and call it our home.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Further debate?

**Ms. Bhutla Karpoché:** On behalf of my constituents, I rise to speak to Bill 108, the More Homes, More Choice Act. Now, despite its title, Bill 108 does nothing to address the affordable housing crisis. It does a whole lot of other things but does not address the affordable housing crisis. So I want to make sure that it's on the record that this bill is not going to address the affordable housing crisis.

So what does Bill 108 do? One of the key things it does is to bring back the OMB. Now, in Parkdale–High Park many of us have fought for OMB reform for years, over a decade—maybe longer. The OMB is an uneven playing field—we know that—because community groups have to fundraise. I've been to many of the fundraisers. It's bake sales. It's garage sales. Through tens of dollars, maybe

hundreds of dollars at a time, communities have to fundraise so that they're able to hire planners, they're able to hire lawyers, just in order to have a say in the planning decisions that impact and affect our own neighbourhoods, while big developers, we know, have entire law firms and planning firms as part of their development teams. And we know, historically, looking at OMB decisions, that time and time again they have favoured the developers over communities' needs.

Speaker, the city of Toronto voted to “Free Toronto from the OMB.” The NDP, over the last many years, tabled many bills to free Toronto from the OMB before the Liberal government finally acted—very last-minute, I would say; just before the election—based on the growing movement of people who felt very strongly that the OMB did not represent their needs.

This bill, Bill 108, basically takes away the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal, which has existed for less than a year, and brings back the old OMB. Basically, in doing so, it's bringing back the same rules that gave lobbyists and developers power over the city. That's right; the developers are now able to go around municipalities, around city councils, around communities, and put forward proposals before the OMB that the public, the city, hasn't even seen. How is that fair? So with Bill 108, the Ford government is essentially giving a gift to the developers, and it's bringing the unaccountable, unelected OMB back into Ontario.

Bill 108 has a huge impact on municipalities, a huge impact on our city here. It's certainly not a housing bill. In fact, it is what we call a “deregulation bill” because it amends 13 different pieces of legislation in order to give developers what they want. I won't read all 13 of them, but it affects legislation such as the Conservation Authorities Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Environmental Assessment Act, the Environmental Protection Act, the Occupational Health and Safety Act, the Ontario Heritage Act, the Ontario Water Resources Act, the Planning Act, the Workplace Safety and Insurance Act, and so on. As one of my constituents called it, this bill is essentially “green-lighting the developers' bill,” and I couldn't agree with my constituent more.

With Bill 108, the Ford Conservatives are doing their best to remove protections that are in place right now to prevent developers from running roughshod over much-needed environmental protections and existing provincial regulations. We have heard from mayors and councils and municipalities across Ontario that this bill will make it harder for municipalities to self-govern and will do nothing to address the affordable housing crisis that the municipalities have been left to deal with after decades of Liberal and Conservative government downloading.

Here in the city of Toronto, the chief city planner, Gregg Lintern, and city manager Chris Murray, said that there is “limited evidence” that this legislation would make it easier or faster to build, and that, “There are no tools in Bill 108 that address head-on our affordable housing challenge.”

The reports and recommendations that have been made by both the Toronto city manager and chief planner demonstrates a deep concern that the envisioned changes to

development charges actually threaten many of the city's projects that are part of the city's 10-year capital plan. Projects that include:

- a dozen child care centres that cumulatively adds to almost 600 spaces;
- more than 20 Toronto Public Library expansion and renovation projects;
- more than 100 new or expanded parks; and
- two dozen community recreation centres, five pools, four arenas and 200 playground improvement projects.

All of these projects are threatened here in the city of Toronto.

Another constituent of mine wrote, "These community projects are the spinal cord of an inclusive and cohesive society and provide invaluable service and spaces for taxpayers." I couldn't agree with this constituent more.

Again, another one writes:

"Currently, Bill 108 requires cities to choose between parkland dedication and instituting a community benefit charge. Both are necessary to create livable communities.

"Allowing cities to require on-site parkland dedication is a key tool for growing cities, especially as land prices rise. This makes acquiring land through purchase much more difficult.

"Parks are not simply places to relax and play, but critical pieces of infrastructure that help clean air, water, regulate temperature and mitigate the effects of extreme weather."

Again, here a constituent is highlighting the impact of climate change and why we need our parks more than ever.

Speaker, Bill 108 is basically forcing us to choose between soft services for the community, like child care, affordable housing and parkland dedications. We shouldn't have to make that choice between green space and community services. Both are required for sustainable communities. It limits parkland dedication to just 5% of the development site area, regardless of density.

#### 1010

They're also taking away development charges. That is \$924 million over 10 years from infrastructure for parks, libraries and other community benefits. Again, here we have this government bringing forward a deregulation bill that is taking away so much just in order to benefit their developer friends.

As was mentioned, it also amends the Endangered Species Act. Now, not only would the cities lose green space with the bill, but it's going to have a negative impact on Ontario's natural environment and our biodiversity. This bill exposes Ontario's farmland to urban sprawl and development and also severely reduces conservation authorities' role. It takes away protections for species at risk and also removes environmental assessments.

ProtectNatureTO and Lenka Holubec from my riding wrote to me to say, "As the world receives an urgent global assessment report from the United Nations on the imminent collapse of the natural world, Ontario is abandoning endangered species. Buried in" this bill "are 20 pages of amendments to the Endangered Species Act.

"On May 29, over 75 scientists across North America signed and sent a letter to environment minister Rod

Phillips, urging him to reconsider and maintain a species-at-risk recovery program that was 'independent and expert-based.'

"The scientists make strong reference to the first comprehensive UN biodiversity report that found that over one million species are at risk of extinction due to human activity.

"We are extremely concerned about losing Ontario's natural heritage if" the so-called schedules in this "act are passed. As all Ontarians, we value and cherish our natural areas, and we will not accept losing them to sprawling subdivisions."

I'd like to thank Lenka for her work in organizing against this bill. She had to work on very short notice very quickly because, like many other bills, again, this government is undemocratically rushing this bill through the legislative process.

Many constituents wrote to me about the shortened time for public consultation, that it would be almost impossible for the government to take into account all the public comments that they would be receiving, and I have to agree. I know that from Parkdale-High Park hundreds of submissions were sent. I wonder if members of the committee and members of the government have actually taken time to read them and consider them before rushing through this bill. I don't think so, because over the weekend they were too busy staging photo ops in convenience stores as opposed to listening to the concerns of the people of Ontario.

Because so many of the submissions that were made by the residents of Parkdale-High Park will not be considered by committee, I do want to spend some of my time bringing the voices of the people of Parkdale-High Park to the chamber here. I'd like to get it into the public record that I did not receive a single email or phone call from my constituents in support of this bill. In fact, I received hundreds and hundreds of emails and phone calls basically asking me to oppose the bill and registering their concerns. These are not just form letters. This is not just part of an email campaign; they were very detailed, personalized emails and letters. I know that the minister has received many as well because the minister was also copied on a lot of these submissions that were made.

In the first one I have here, the constituent writes, "I live in ward 4 in Toronto"—that's Parkdale-High Park—"and I do not support the reinstatement of the Ontario Municipal Board rules, putting more power in the hands of developers and lobbyists. We cannot allow an unaccountable and unelected body to determine local planning decisions. This is unconstitutional and undemocratic."

The other one writes—this is from constituent Dr. Erich Vogt: "I'm concerned about Bill 108 because my perspective comes from working for five decades in a range of development projects, both globally ... and locally as a member of community groups based here in Toronto. The one lesson I have learned the hard way over decades of undertaking complex infrastructure projects is that the successes and failures of projects are directly linked to the degree to which communities are meaningfully consulted and engaged in the planning and implementation processes.

“There is no shortcut, no quick and easy way to bring about consensus to successful, sustainable and inclusive projects.”

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** I thank the member very much.

*Third reading debate deemed adjourned.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Unfortunately, it is now 10:15. This House will now stand recessed until 10:30.

*The House recessed from 1015 to 1030.*

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** I would ask for the members' attention. I have an introduction I'd like to offer. We have with us in the Speaker's gallery today a student delegation from the Maggie L. Walker Governor's School for Government and International Studies, from Richmond, Virginia. These are the future political leaders of the United States. Please join me in warmly welcoming them to the Ontario Legislature.

*Applause.*

**Mr. Guy Bourgouin:** It's a pleasure to introduce to the House Sue Déry, safety manager of Grant's Transport Ltd., from New Liskeard—she is with her daughter Alisha Boskwick—Mario Villeneuve, président de Villeneuve Construction from Hearst; Dave Plourde, the mayor of Kapuskasing; and Mark Andrews, former OPP north east region traffic and marine unit commander from North Bay. Welcome to Queen's Park.

**Mr. Jeremy Roberts:** We have here the grandmother of our Ottawa West–Nepean page, Sophia, up in the gallery. Regina Stocki is with us today. Welcome.

**Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens:** Today I rise—it is a great honour—to announce that today, June 5, is a very special day for a good friend of mine, the member from Niagara Centre. Speaker, today MPP Jeff Burch is celebrating not only his 50th birthday but also his anniversary. Happy birthday, Jeff, and happy anniversary, Linda.

**Mr. Rudy Cuzzetto:** I'm thrilled to welcome Paul Vincent and his daughter, Katie. Last year, Katie was named Ontario athlete of the year. Over the last two weeks, she won six medals—two golds and four silvers—for Canada at the Canoe Sprint World Cup in Poland and Germany. Mr. Speaker, I know we're looking forward to cheering for her next year at Tokyo as women's canoe events are added to the Olympics for the first time. Go, Katie, go!

**Miss Monique Taylor:** It has given me great pride to introduce these same folks into the Legislature almost this entire session: our autism parents and advocates Amanda Mooyer, Michau van Speyk, Amy Moledzki, Angela Brandt and Faith Munoz. Welcome back to Queen's Park again.

**Mr. Mike Schreiner:** It's a real honour to welcome students and teachers from the environment club from the York School to Queen's Park today. I had the pleasure of meeting with them this morning and they're in the members' gallery here. Welcome.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** The member for Burlington.

**Ms. Jane McKenna:** Yay! Thank you, Speaker. I'm always usually last, so I'm grateful that I'm not today.

I look forward today to—Canadian Martyrs school is going to be here. I'm going to meet them on the grand staircase. I don't see them yet.

I also want to wish a happy birthday to my friend Gila, the MPP from Thornhill.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Introductions of visitors. The member for Algoma–Manitoulin.

**Mr. Michael Mantha:** Well, introduction of a special birthday today—the member from Oshawa. It's her birthday, as well, today. Happy birthday, Jennifer.

**Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde:** It's a pleasure for me to introduce in the House Theresa Osezua, the mother of our page captain Patrick Osezua, and his aunt Fidelia Ogoh. Let's please welcome them to the House. Thank you very much for being here.

**Hon. Monte McNaughton:** I'm pleased to welcome to Queen's Park today Helen Kearns, mother-in-law of James Northey, who works for the Ministry of Infrastructure. Helen is the CEO and president of Bell Kearns and Associates. Welcome to Queen's Park.

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** I'm pleased to welcome Matt Wilson, president of the Ontario Ground Water Association; Dr. Joel Gagnon, head of the heavy metals lab at the Great Lakes institute at the University of Windsor; Marc St. Pierre; Marilynn St. Pierre; Kevin Jakubec; and Natalina Aquino here today.

**Ms. Jill Dunlop:** I'd like to welcome teachers and students from École élémentaire catholique Samuel-de-Champlain. Welcome.

**Ms. Bhutla Karpoche:** I'd like to welcome constituents of mine: Anthonia Ayeni, with her two daughters Glory Ayeni and Greatness Ayeni, aged 9 and 6. They're here at Queen's Park to have lunch and experience the day with their MPP.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** It is my pleasure to introduce two constituents of mine and parents of Amelia, who is our page from Etobicoke–Lakeshore: Joseph Markson and Alicia Markson. Welcome to Queen's Park.

**Hon. Caroline Mulroney:** I have the great pleasure of welcoming members of my staff and team from York–Simcoe to Queen's Park today: Mary-Lynn Seeley Warr, Lucy Rose and Nicole Stefanick.

I'd also like to welcome Ariana Magliocco from Vaughan. Ariana has joined the Ministry of the Attorney General for the summer months. Welcome.

**Ms. Doly Begum:** I have the honour of introducing a group of young women here in the gallery, and some in the public gallery, who came for the child care conference this morning: Eva Lacson, Jane Deng, Fatima Pinheiro, Maryam Ahmadi, Tara Stafford-Regis, Lynda Zheng, Tracy Morris and baby Olivia, Rita More, Jane Mercer, Laurel Rothman, Laura Feltham, Erin Filby, Amy O'Neil, former councillor Janet Davis and Victoria Marshall.

**Mr. Robert Bailey:** It gives me great pleasure today to welcome here at Queen's Park Eric Rayson from my

riding of Sarnia–Lambton, accompanied by his daughter Annabelle, who was a page in the last session with us. Welcome to Queen’s Park.

**Mr. Stephen Crawford:** I’m pleased to introduce Yvonne Blaszczyk, vice-president, human resources and board director of BMG Group, and Nicole Crawford, proud mother of legislative page Monica Crawford and president of Navroc Investment Management. Welcome to Queen’s Park.

**Ms. Doly Begum:** I’d like to welcome Rachel MacDougall, who is here to watch question period this morning, from my riding of Scarborough Southwest.

**Ms. Andrea Khanjin:** It’s my great pleasure to introduce Myles Wilson, who is in the gallery today, from my constituency office. Welcome.

**Hon. Lisa M. Thompson:** I had a wonderful meeting today with two students, and I welcome them to the House sincerely: Meredith Scharlach, Emma Wesley—and her mom, Tammy. Welcome to Queen’s Park, and thank you so much for meeting with me earlier today.

**Mrs. Daisy Wai:** I have two introductions. I would like to welcome my husband, Albert Wai, joining me today at Queen’s Park in celebration of our 40th wedding anniversary. Thank you, Albert, for your support while I serve Ontarians and work hard for the people.

I would also like to introduce Mr. Bill Rowan, Mrs. Deanna Rowan, and their son and my executive assistant’s husband, Mr. Tim Rowan. Mrs. Rowan will soon be celebrating the first anniversary of her 79th birthday, which we celebrate. She doesn’t want to say that number. Happy birthday and welcome to the Ontario Legislature.

1040

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** I’m proud to rise today and recognize some of the families who are here to support and watch our page from Markham–Stouffville, Jack Lynch. His parents, Meagan and Paul Lynch, are here. His grandparents, Anne and Edward Lynch and Peter and Donna Loughlin, are here; aunt and cousins Denise Lynch, Ella Marsh, Jacob Marsh and Cameron Marsh. He’s doing an excellent job, and I know you’re very proud of him.

#### CORRECTION OF RECORD

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Two members have informed me they have points of order.

The member for Algoma–Manitoulin on a point of order.

**Mr. Michael Mantha:** I would like to correct my record. On Sunday night, during debate, I used the term “our First Nation,” which is a very colonial term. It’s wrong, and I apologize to First Nations. I should have said, “the First Nation.” When I’m wrong, I say I’m wrong.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Thank you very much.

The member for Ottawa South, I believe, has a point of order.

**Mr. John Fraser:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I’m asking for unanimous consent to ask a question on behalf of the member from Simcoe–Grey.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** The member for Ottawa South is seeking the unanimous consent of the House

to ask a question this morning on behalf of the member for Simcoe–Grey. Agreed? I heard some noes.

The member for Orléans on a point of order?

**Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde:** Yes. It gives me great pleasure—if I could just have a page, maybe Patrick, come and deliver. We had two successful round tables in my riding of Orléans, on our autism round table. I would like page Patrick to deliver this to Minister MacLeod this morning. Thank you very much.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** It’s not a point of order. *Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Do you have a point of order?

**M<sup>me</sup> Nathalie Des Rosiers:** Yes.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Okay. The member for Ottawa–Vanier appears to have a point of order.

**M<sup>me</sup> Nathalie Des Rosiers:** Yes. I’m seeking unanimous consent to ask a question on behalf of the MPP for Simcoe–Grey. It’s one of my last few days in this Legislature, and I ask for unanimous consent to be able to do that.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** The member for Ottawa–Vanier is seeking the unanimous consent of the House to ask a question this morning on behalf of the member for Simcoe–Grey. Agreed? I heard a no.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### GOVERNMENT CONTRACT

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My question is to the Minister of Finance. This morning, the Premier received a letter from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce urging the government not to proceed with their scheme to rip up the contract with the Beer Store. They’re joining the Ontario Chamber of Commerce and thousands and thousands of Ontarians who are raising serious concerns about this reckless scheme. Does the minister still believe it’s a good idea?

**Hon. Victor Fedeli:** Thank you for the question. It’s interesting to note that most people in the province of Ontario were the same as I was when I first got elected—they don’t know, we don’t realize that the Beer Store is not owned by the government of Ontario. Yes, we own the LCBO, but the Beer Store is owned by three global beer giants. They were given a sweetheart deal by the Liberal government, who put profits ahead of people.

The deal is terrible for the consumers. It is killing competition. It is keeping prices high, and it is stifling our craft brewers. There is no deal like this anywhere else in the world. It is a sweetheart deal that rewards only the Beer Store and their near monopoly. We would have to open 11,500 new outlets just to be at the same level per capita as the province of Quebec.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** The supplementary question.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Well, Speaker, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce certainly knows who owns the Beer Store. The minister and the Premier spent a lot of public

money jetting to New York and Washington, but evidently they never checked in with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Like the Ontario Chamber of Commerce, they are raising serious concerns about a government that rips up contracts on a whim.

We know the previous government did that, and now we have a government in place that's doing the exact same things. Ontario families are wondering why the government is ready to blow hundreds of millions of dollars on this Beer Store scheme—this Beer Store battle, in fact—when that money could be so much better invested in things like education and health care.

Why is the finance minister so committed to this reckless and senseless scheme?

**Hon. Victor Fedeli:** We campaigned on a promise to put people first, including by growing jobs and expanding choice and convenience for Ontario consumers. Our government is open for business and open for jobs, and that approach is working. Since coming to office, 170,000 net new jobs have been created across the province. Just last week we heard from Fitch bond rating agency, who gave us an upgrade, the first upgrade in eight years—eight years, Speaker—and they did this after we brought our legislation with the Beer Store.

The fact of the matter is, it's a bad deal for consumers and a bad deal for businesses. Special adviser Ken Hughes says the agreement with the Beer Store “stifles competition, keeps prices artificially high, and prevents new craft beer entrepreneurs from getting a strong foothold in the market.”

Speaker, we will always get the best deal possible for Ontario consumers and Ontario businesses.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** The final supplementary question.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** The people of Ontario have been pretty clear. They want a government that's focused on priorities like schools and hospitals. Instead, they have a government that's ready to blow billions of dollars, potentially, on a Beer Store battle, a scheme so reckless it's becoming an international incident now.

Will this minister back away from this reckless plan today?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Members please take their seats.

The minister to respond.

**Hon. Victor Fedeli:** Repeating Beer Store insider made-up numbers is not going to advance this cause. Nowhere else in the world does a government give the biggest beer store companies special privileges at the expense of consumers and the rest of the industry. The three global beer giants are for profits, not for the people.

You have to ask yourself, Speaker, why are these multi-national companies fighting the province so hard when all we want to do is put more of their product in more stores? The reason is because their deal was so lucrative. The sweetheart deal they made with the previous Liberal government is so lucrative, they will do anything, say anything to make sure they keep their turf. They're ignoring the economic opportunity that we know: Expanding beer and wine into corner stores, grocery stores and big box stores

will add 9,100 jobs to the province of Ontario and \$3.5 billion in our—

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Thank you.  
The next question.

## HEALTH CARE FUNDING

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My next question is for the Minister of Health. Yesterday, London Health Sciences announced that they would be cutting an equivalent of 165 full-time positions due to budget challenges. Can the minister explain how eliminating 165 front-line health care workers is going to eliminate hallway medicine?

**Hon. Christine Elliott:** London Health Sciences has experienced some difficulties in the past, but certainly our government is helping all hospitals across Ontario, with an additional \$1.3 billion into our health care system with this year's budget, \$384 million in new money for operational expenses and a \$1.2-million investment for London Health Sciences Centre last fall to help them get prepared for the flu season.

However, they make their own decisions. They have their own independent board of directors. But as part of this exercise, London Health Sciences Centre is exploring opportunities to not fill vacant, non-patient-facing roles and is also reviewing parameters to mitigate overtime hours. There are no job cuts or reductions being contemplated at this time.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** The supplementary question?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** The hospital CEO in London was pretty clear yesterday: “It's been very tough to operate in this environment.... [t]o operate ... where expenses are inflationary and revenue is flat.” And the Financial Accountability Office, of course, was clear that we are going to see more and more cuts as hospital funding falls behind inflation.

It was a recipe for hallway medicine under the Liberals, as they played the game the same way, and it's a recipe for hallway medicine now, as this government hasn't learned from the mistakes of the Liberal government.

1050

One hundred and sixty-five health professionals are losing jobs in London. Is the government prepared to acknowledge that their scheme to end hallway medicine is simply not working because it's fundamentally the same scheme that the Liberals had in place?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Stop the clock. The member for Don Valley East will come to order. The Minister of Finance will come to order. The member for Kitchener–Conestoga will come to order. The member for Mississauga–Streetsville will come to order.

Start the clock. The minister to reply.

**Hon. Christine Elliott:** Mr. Speaker, I will say to the leader of the official opposition, through you, that in actual fact we are increasing the amount of money that we are putting into health care: \$1.3 billion this year. We promised the people of Ontario during last year's election campaign that we would protect what matters most to them:

health care and education. We're increasing our education budget as well as health care—\$1.3 billion is a lot of money; \$384 million to increase the operational costs in hospitals is a lot of money.

We are working with London Health Sciences Centre. There has been an update from yesterday, I'm happy to say. We know that London Health Sciences Centre is taking steps to mitigate their budgetary challenges and is undertaking a review to generate cost savings. As I indicated in the previous response, they are also exploring active opportunities to not fill vacant non-patient-facing roles and are not contemplating any job cuts—

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Thank you. The final supplementary.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** For families that are worried about the state of Ontario's health care and the next trip to the emergency room, the Ford government cuts are deeply, deeply concerning—cuts to public health, cuts to ambulance services, cuts to cancer screening and now eliminating front-line health staff at hospitals. These are the things that matter most to the people of Ontario. Is this what the Ford government is planning on doing for the next three years to our health care system? We don't want to see what that's going to look like.

Is the minister ready to admit that her budget cuts are causing front-line staff to be laid off, impacting care for the patients of our province as a result, and will she leave more patients waiting for care in hospital hallways by continuing with this wrong-headed move?

**Hon. Christine Elliott:** I guess I need to say it again: We are increasing our investment into our health care budget by \$1.3 billion this year. In addition to that, what we're doing is modernizing our system. It's not responding to the needs of Ontarians. It's not fulfilling their requirements. It's not going to be sustainable for the future. The people of Ontario know that if we want to have a health care system and if we want to have an education system in the future, we need to make some changes and we need to make those changes right now. What we are doing is making sure that we will be responding to the needs of Ontarians now and into the future.

We want to make sure that they receive the connected care that they deserve, which they're not receiving right now. Right now, once people leave hospital and they need home care, they don't know what's going to happen. They don't know who's going to be coming, when they're coming or what care they're going to be providing. That is not excellent quality health care. That's what we are changing. That's what we're working on in hospitals and health facilities across this province so it will be sustainable for the future and it will provide—

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Thank you very much. The next question.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My question is for the Minister of the Environment.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** I didn't hear what was said, but I'm going to ask the member for Northumberland–Peterborough South to stand up and withdraw.

**Mr. David Piccini:** Withdraw.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** I recognize again the Leader of the Opposition. I'll give you a few seconds.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Thank you kindly, Speaker. I appreciate that.

As I said, my question is to the Minister of the Environment. While the Ford government spends millions of public dollars fearmongering about the dangers of fighting the climate crisis, a new study by Canadians for Clean Prosperity, a business-oriented environmental group, shows that the Ford government's inadequate carbon-reduction schemes will actually cost Ontario businesses far more than an effective one would and add as much as \$154 a year to household budgets.

Will the minister be revising his sticker campaign to warn households of the ineffectiveness of and the expense associated with the Ford government's carbon scheme?

**Hon. Rod Phillips:** Mr. Speaker, through you to the Leader of the Opposition: The fact that the carbon tax lobby group is saying that a carbon tax is a good thing shouldn't be a surprise even to the NDP. The FAO confirmed that \$648 is the amount that it will cost Ontario families in 2022. In fact, the report she's referencing actually agrees with those numbers. It suggests that the difference between our plan and the Liberal plan is \$550; pretty close to that \$648, wouldn't you say, Mr. Speaker?

I think the Leader of the Opposition would be more concerned about the effects of the carbon tax, for example, in Hamilton. So when I see that Hamilton Health Sciences and St. Joseph's Healthcare are going to, together, be paying close to \$3 million in additional tax to Justin Trudeau, I would think the Leader of the Opposition would be worried about what's happening at home in Hamilton.

Mr. Speaker, we will keep talking about our plan to reduce greenhouse gases—

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Thank you.

Supplementary question.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Well, Speaker, the simple fact is that when it comes to the climate emergency we are all facing, the cost of action is nothing compared to the cost of inaction, and Hamiltonians know that very, very well. In fact, the city of Hamilton has declared a climate crisis; perhaps, this government should do the same.

This spring, it's been more clear than ever that Ontario needs to act, yet the Ford government is moving absolutely in the wrong direction, cutting funding to tree planting and conservation efforts, even while they spend millions forcing every Ontario gas station to post partisan advertising.

Is the Ford government ready to concede that their scheme will not only cost families more but utterly fail to address the growing danger of the climate emergency that all of us are facing?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Members, please take their seats.

Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks to respond.

**Hon. Rod Phillips:** Mr. Speaker, through you to the member: Again, when we got rid of Kathleen Wynne's cap-and-trade program, a program that I know this opposition party supported, it was \$264 in the pockets of Ontarians. Justin Trudeau's program is going to take \$648 out of the pockets, and that doesn't even include the impacts on McMaster University, a very important institution, again, in the great, great city of Hamilton: \$1.3 million of impact in Hamilton, where the Leader of the Opposition is from.

We will keep telling Ontarians about these programs. We will keep telling Ontarians about the impacts on families. No, we're not going to step away from fighting the carbon tax and we're not going to step away from fighting climate change. You can fight climate change without a carbon tax, Mr. Speaker.

#### INTERPROVINCIAL TRADE

**Ms. Goldie Ghamari:** My question is for the Minister of Economic Development, Job Creation and Trade. Last week, the minister travelled to Halifax to promote our "open for business, open for jobs" mandate at the Committee on Internal Trade. As a former international trade lawyer, I understand the importance of interprovincial trade as a key economic driver in Ontario. Interprovincial trade supports agriculture, farmers, small businesses and good jobs in my riding of Carleton and across Ontario. In 2017 alone, Ontario exported approximately \$145 billion in goods and services to other Canadian jurisdictions.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, can the minister please outline how he has been working hard to reduce interprovincial trade barriers and promote the importance of free trade between provinces and territories?

**Hon. Todd Smith:** Thanks to the member from Carleton for the great question, and the great work that she's doing in her riding and here at the Legislature.

1100

I had a productive trip to Halifax last week, Mr. Speaker. It's always great to get back to the Maritimes. The Committee on Internal Trade was meeting there. That's the body that governs the CFTA, the Canadian Free Trade Agreement, which was meant to get rid of internal trade barriers. It's something that Ontario is a leader on. Despite the agreement being in force since 2017, progress is just too slow. Trade barriers between provinces and territories are holding back job creators in Ontario, and they're holding back job creators in Canada, quite honestly.

The Bank of Montreal estimates that eliminating these barriers would add \$15 billion to \$20 billion a year to Ontario's GDP. That's why this is such an important priority for Premier Ford and our government. We can create thousands of jobs by tearing down these barriers. That's why Ontario is going to continue to push for freer trade with Canada's provinces and territories.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** The supplementary question?

**Ms. Goldie Ghamari:** Through you, Mr. Speaker, thank you to the minister for his excellent response. Interprovincial trade is an important issue for the hard-working people of Carleton and across Ontario. I know that I speak on behalf of our side of the House when I say that I am relieved that reducing interprovincial trade barriers is one of the minister's key priorities in his portfolio.

We came into office on a commitment to protect what matters most, and that includes creating and protecting good jobs. That means we need to push the federal government and other provinces on this issue. The agreement Ontario signed with Saskatchewan in the fall is one example of how we've already taken steps to reduce trade barriers right here in Ontario.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, could the minister please expand on what other steps Ontario is taking to reduce interprovincial trade barriers?

**Hon. Todd Smith:** Since taking office in June of last year, we've been providing a lot of leadership on the interprovincial trade file. Back in October, as the member just mentioned, Premier Ford and Premier Moe of Saskatchewan signed an MOU to cut red tape and reduce trade barriers between the two provinces.

When I was in Halifax, I told my colleagues that we're committed to getting pipelines built that will add tremendous opportunity not just in Ontario but to our country.

In April, I wrote to my counterparts and told them that Ontario is giving up our veto of pipeline projects under the Canadian Free Trade Agreement. A report from the Fraser Institute shows Canadian oil producers lost almost \$21 billion last year because they can't get their oil to market. We don't want to get in the way of that in Ontario; we want to get out of the way so that we can see that kind of growth in our GDP and in our economy. That's thousands of good jobs that we're missing out on here in Ontario and in Canada. We're not going to sit idly by while that happens.

Premier Ford has been a leader on the Canadian front. We are going to strive for a Canadian Free Trade Agreement that works for all provinces and territories.

#### PUBLIC TRANSIT

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** My question is for the Minister of Transportation. Yesterday, Metrolinx quietly cut five GO bus routes altogether and significantly reduced service on two more. These cuts mean that commuters in Oakville, Milton, Bolton and North York will have to cram onto overcrowded GO buses and face even longer travel times.

Mr. Speaker, how can the minister expect Ontarians to believe he is committed to improving our commutes when he scraps bus routes and reduces service when no one is looking?

**Hon. Jeff Yurek:** Thanks very much for that question from the member opposite, and good morning.

This Friday, it will be a year since we were elected and sworn in at the end of June. We inherited a \$15-billion deficit, a record debt. What we've done over the last year is review, line by line, the spending within the Ministry of Transportation. What we've done is we have focused on

expanding GO rail throughout this province. We've increased service 25% to Kitchener. For the first time ever we have GO rail going out to Niagara Falls and St. Catharines, and the largest expansion of service on Lakeshore East and West.

Unfortunately, we've looked at what buses were running in this system that were empty—barely flowing. We've repositioned some of those bus routes to newer routes that have been brought forward. We look forward to continuing growing our regional transportation network in the GTHA.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** The supplementary question?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Back to the minister: The estimates came out last month. They show that the government slashed \$184 million from Metrolinx's budget.

It is now clear that the minister's cuts to Metrolinx means axing bus service that people rely on every day. These buses are not empty. Mr. Speaker, what additional service cuts and fare hikes does the minister have planned for our region's GO riders?

**Hon. Jeff Yurek:** Mr. Speaker, I think the member opposite needs to take a look at the successes that we've had over the last year on the GO Transit system. As I mentioned earlier, we have expanded service to Kitchener by 25%, we've created a new route to Niagara and St. Catharines, and expanded the Lakeshore East and West routes.

We are positioning ourselves to continue to grow the GO network across the entire GTHA. Just recently, we announced that kids under 12 get to ride GO Transit for free. That's a permanent structure.

We are going to continue to integrate our fares in the system. We're continuing to work with our partners at CN and CP to expand ridership. Just recently, with the Minister of Infrastructure, we released the RFP that's going to work toward expanding GO Transit across the entire network. In fact, Mr. Speaker, once this RFP is in place, GO rail will be self-sufficient by 2031. That's the record we want to have for this government.

#### GOVERNMENT'S RECORD

**Ms. Mitzie Hunter:** My question is to the Deputy Premier. The Premier continues to push a manufactured fiscal crisis in the name of finding efficiencies, yet this government seems perfectly happy to spend \$1 billion of taxpayers' dollars on booze—

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Stop the clock. The Minister of Children, Community and Social Services, please come to order.

Restart the clock. I apologize to the member for Scarborough–Guildwood.

**Ms. Mitzie Hunter:** Thank you, Speaker. The Premier continues to push a manufactured fiscal crisis in the name of finding efficiencies, yet this government seems perfectly happy to spend \$1 billion of taxpayers' dollars on booze

in damages to beer stores, while at the same time cutting \$1 billion in social services over the next three years.

The government's priorities are wrong-headed: forcing children with autism into oversized classrooms; spending more tax dollars on ineffective and regressive climate policies; axing the child advocate but hiring a special adviser for alcohol; and firing the non-partisan expert panel on ending violence against women.

Speaker, when will this government be open for children with autism, open to real climate crisis solutions and open to the general well-being of Ontarians rather than corner store—

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Thank you.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** The member for Kitchener–Conestoga must come to order.

The question is to the Deputy Premier. I recognize the Deputy Premier.

**Hon. Christine Elliott:** Minister of Finance.

**Hon. Victor Fedeli:** Where do you start with all of those pieces, of which, sadly, very little is even based on fact?

We passed a budget that is entitled Protecting What Matters Most, and that is exactly what it does. It protects health care, it protects education and it protects the services that we rely on every day.

You have to think, coming from this Liberal member, who sat by and watched their government spend \$40 million a day more than they took in—and that was fine then. That was fine for the Liberals to do—\$40 million a day more than they took in.

We have been making smart, long-term decisions. We're reinventing the way government delivers services. We're focusing our resources on the individuals and families in greatest need. That is how we're restoring trust, transparency and accountability, and balancing the budget—

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Thank you very much. The supplementary question.

**Ms. Mitzie Hunter:** Speaker, the reality is that this government is spending about \$5 billion more than the Liberal government's previous budget, and somehow we continue to see devastating cuts for the people, justified by sham consultations and little to no evidence-based decision-making.

Why is this government set on leaving the people of Ontario behind through countless broken promises and skewed priorities? This government can't continue to pull the wool over Ontarians' eyes. The evidence is right in front of us. We cannot be fooled. The people are not pawns in your political games. These are real lives that are at stake, with real consequences.

1110

The families and the children with autism have been here day after day after day, looking for answers from this government. When will this government finally put the people first, just like you claimed?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** And stop the clock again.

Interjections are out of order and so is yelling across the floor. The member for Kitchener–Conestoga must come to order. The member for Carleton must come to order.

Start the clock. The Minister of Finance to reply.

**Hon. Victor Fedeli:** Speaker, again, where do you start with that? Last question, we're not spending enough; this question, we're spending too much. Why don't we get the facts straight?

Let me tell you what that member and her party voted against, Speaker: They voted against bringing \$26 billion of tax relief to Ontario families, seniors, individuals, students and businesses. That's what that opposition voted against. They voted against \$2 billion in low-income individual and family tax credits. They voted against \$2 billion in bringing child care to 300,000 low- and middle-income families. And yes, they, too, voted against bringing \$90 million to help 100,000 low-income seniors have free dental.

We certainly know what they're against now, Speaker: They're against protecting what matters most. We will stay here, and we will protect what matters most for the people.

#### SKILLED TRADES

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** My question is for the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities. For 15 very long years, the previous Liberal government allowed the skilled trades to become complex and convoluted. In fact, their system kept people out of the skilled trades.

We know that by 2021 some one in five jobs will be in the skilled trades. These are very good jobs. These are important jobs to helping build a bigger, better, stronger province of Ontario, Mr. Speaker. I know that in my riding, tradespeople are very excited by the opportunities that this government is putting forward.

I know that last week the minister made an announcement on this. I wonder if she might help the House better understand the changes that she has brought forward and the announcement that she made last week.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Before I recognize the minister to respond, the member for Hamilton East–Stoney Creek has to come to order.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Yes, he did.

The Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities.

**Hon. Merrilee Fullerton:** Thank you, Speaker, and thank you to the member for his question and his great work on behalf of the people of Markham–Stouffville.

Speaker, I would like to thank the Premier as well as the member from Northumberland–Peterborough South and the MPP from Durham for joining me last Friday at the Darlington Energy Complex to announce our plan to modernize the skilled trades in Ontario.

Through budget 2019, we passed the Modernizing the Skilled Trades and Apprenticeship Act, which will reduce red tape for employers and apprentices, streamline service delivery and help promote the vibrant and tremendous op-

portunities in the skilled trades in Ontario. Our plan includes the implementation of a portable skills model, which will allow training and certification within and between the trades. This new flexible framework will allow our workforce to respond to the demands of the changing job market, ensuring that Ontario is open for business and open for jobs.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** The member for Hamilton East–Stoney Creek has to come to order.

Supplementary question?

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** How disappointing it is to see the NDP yet again voting against and working against our tradespeople. Whether it's craft brewers, whether it's small business people and now the tradespeople, the NDP will always vote against those people who want to work hard, make a difference for the province of Ontario and help build a bigger, better, stronger province of Ontario. It is clear they're upset that our changes are seeing more people come into the trades. They should be happy about that.

We know what 15 years of Liberal governments created. They created a system where people couldn't get in. When I meet with the tradespeople, they said it's partly responsible for the increasing house prices because there weren't enough tradespeople to do the jobs.

So I wonder, despite the opposition that we're getting from the NDP, who don't seem to care about hard-working people in the province of Ontario, if the minister could continue and provide us with more information on why this announcement is so good for the province of Ontario.

**Hon. Merrilee Fullerton:** Thank you again to the member for the question. The member is absolutely right that our government is taking decisive action to reduce the burden on Ontario's skilled tradespeople and develop a modern skilled-trades workforce.

As part of our plan to put our skilled tradespeople first, our government is investing \$18.1 million in pre-apprenticeship programs to help prepare hard-working Ontarians for careers in the skilled trades. We are also investing \$12.2 million to support the Ontario Youth Apprenticeship Program to help students in grades 11 and 12 gain the experience they need in the skilled trades while getting credits for school.

Speaker, by investing in the jobs of today and tomorrow, our government is delivering on our promise to get Ontarians working and make Ontario open for business and open for jobs.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** The next question: the member for Sudbury—

**Mr. Paul Miller:** How many trades have you got?

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** The member for Hamilton East–Stoney Creek has to come to order.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** The member for Hamilton East–Stoney Creek is warned.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** How do you know? How do you know? How do you know what I've done in my life? How do you know? How do you know?

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** The member for Markham–Stouffville will come to order.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** Maybe you should read before you talk. That might help you before you make mistakes—

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** The member for Markham–Stouffville is warned.

#### WORKPLACE SAFETY

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** The member for Sudbury can now ask his question.

**Mr. Jamie West:** Thank you very much, Speaker. The member from Stouffville actually talked about New Democrats not caring about workers. A good opportunity for the government to demonstrate that they do—

**Hon. Lisa MacLeod:** Who is it to?

**Mr. Jamie West:** The question is for the Minister of Labour.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Stop the clock. He's going to ask his question to the government. He's going to say who it is to. Don't start yelling at him just as he has got the floor.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Order.

Start the clock. The member for Sudbury.

**Mr. Jamie West:** Thank you, Speaker. I apologize for their behaviour.

My question is for the Minister of Labour. The member opposite said that New Democrats can't demonstrate that they care about workers. This question is about that. It's an opportunity for the minister to demonstrate her care as well.

Speaker, as reported by the Toronto Star, three temporary agency workers died working for Fiera Foods or its affiliated plants over a 17-year span. Only after pressure and damning media reports did the previous Liberal government launch an inspection of the industrial bakery. Following those inspections, another worker, a 52-year-old temp worker, died in a related Fiera business that was not part of the previous inspections.

It's clear there's a pattern of incidents leading to deaths at Fiera Foods and its affiliates, but the Ministry of Labour has failed to investigate them properly. Will the Minister of Labour commit today to ordering proactive workplace safety inspections of all Fiera Foods affiliates?

**Hon. Laurie Scott:** I thank the member opposite for the question. Workplace deaths are a tragedy. We, on this side and at the Ministry of Labour, are not willing to compromise on protecting workers through health and safety enforcement. We've actually increased the enforcement budget by half a million dollars.

We are helping more workers become safer by making health and safety training more accessible, more convenient and less expensive. We've made health and safety training courses available online as a way to supplement in-person training. We're modernizing government services across the board by making more information and services available online.

Mr. Speaker, with respect, we are actually increasing the number of health and safety inspectors throughout the province so that we can watch where workplace—

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Thank you very much. The supplementary question.

1120

**Mr. Jamie West:** I would argue, perhaps, that reducing the number of hours of workplace training from three full days of in-person class to six and a half hours online is not improving safety.

I asked the minister the question because since the fourth death of a temporary worker at a Fiera business, the government has signalled to large employers, such as Fiera, that health and safety conditions will largely be self-reported. It also signals to temp workers that they have it too good and they don't need specific protections.

In fact, since the death of the fourth temporary worker at a Fiera business, this government has cut at least \$16 million from programs meant to prevent workplace injuries and deaths.

I'll ask again: Will the Minister of Labour commit today to standing up for workers and ordering proactive workplace safety inspections at all Fiera Foods affiliates?

**Hon. Laurie Scott:** Mr. Speaker, the member opposite should know that I cannot comment directly on investigations that are occurring through the Ministry of Labour. But I can tell the member opposite that health and safety enforcement is not a nice-to-have; it's an essential for this government, and we are protecting health and safety.

We've increased the enforcement budget by half a million dollars. We're proud of the fact that we prioritize health and safety inspections and enforcements for our investigations that go on proactively and preventatively. I know that this side of the House and I, as Minister of Labour, are keeping workers safe. That's what we owe them, and that's what we're continuing to do, by modernizing the Ministry of Labour so that more people can get educated.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I will say for the third time in this question period: We've increased enforcement officers for health and safety.

#### BROADBAND INFRASTRUCTURE

**Mr. Toby Barrett:** The question is for the Minister of Infrastructure. We received news, a few weeks ago, when the minister and the Minister of Agriculture arrived in my riding to unveil a key piece of Ontario's budget commitment to improve people's broadband connections, no matter where they live.

For years, I've been hearing from people in my area complaining—I hear these complaints in my own home, actually—about poor Internet service. This is going to help. It's going to help families stay connected. It's going to help students with their homework. It's going to help both large and small businesses be part of Ontario's thriving economy.

Minister, could you let people in this House—give them an idea what the SWIFT program is about and what the next steps are for this program to see some progress down in Norfolk county?

**Hon. Monte McNaughton:** Thank you to the member from Haldimand–Norfolk for that excellent question.

Mr. Speaker, without a doubt, being disconnected means being disadvantaged. I was happy to join the member, along with my colleague the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, for this very exciting announcement. Our government is committing up to \$63.7 million to the SWIFT program. We've heard from our rural and northern communities and, unlike the previous Liberal government, we're taking action.

SWIFT offers reliable broadband access, allowing residents and businesses to stream high-speed Internet from their homes, farms and businesses. People will access digital services, get their work done and connect with their loved ones.

Affordable broadband connectivity is essential in rural and northern Ontario. With this commitment, we're proving that we're putting the people at the centre of everything we do and protecting what matters most.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** The supplementary question.

**Mr. Toby Barrett:** Thank you, Minister. I will add that the other half of my riding, Haldimand county, did not opt into the SWIFT program, and they also have some considerable issues with connection.

However, this is great news for farmers. Farmers can't remain compliant and competitive when they can't effectively do business online or file documents. Modern agriculture requires connectivity for a variety of jobs, checking the weather, checking the markets. Affordable broadband is essential across rural Ontario to access e-commerce, close deals, process payments, share information and connect with your customers and with your markets.

Speaker, could the minister reiterate why broadband is so important for the business of farming?

**Hon. Monte McNaughton:** I'll refer this to the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs.

**Hon. Ernie Hardeman:** Thanks to the member from Haldimand–Norfolk for that very great question. Our farmers know that access to reliable Internet is critical for their businesses to thrive. Agriculture is increasingly high tech with the rise of precision agriculture. As farming becomes increasingly highly land- and labour-intensive, technology also needs to be far more controlled and accurate in systems like GPS guidance, sensors, robotics, drones, autonomous vehicles like tractors and many more.

Farmers and those in rural parts of the province have access to even fewer resources due to the nature of their remote locations, so their need to access wider government resources such as health care and especially mental health care options online is even more urgent.

I'm proud of our government's investment to expand broadband in southwestern Ontario through SWIFT and in eastern Ontario through EORN. We look forward to continuing this important work to make sure those in rural Ontario have the same access—

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Thank you very much. The next question?

## MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT

**Ms. Suze Morrison:** My question is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Today the Globe and Mail uncovered the Premier's latest scheme to play mayor of Toronto. The Premier and his minister will be unilaterally making changes to the city of Toronto's official plan that would "loosen the rules it would have imposed on developers in order to increase flexibility and reduce red tape for businesses." The city will have no ability to appeal these decisions, and the people of Toronto will have no ability to make their voices heard on these changes.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier is once again making changes that will have a significant impact on the people of Toronto without any consultation. My question is simple: Why?

**Hon. Steve Clark:** Speaker, through you to the honourable member: I'll tell you why. Last June we had an election, and those two official plan amendments, 405 and 406, were presented to the ministry. Those didn't reflect our government's priorities. We've made it very clear, and we continue to make it clear, that we need to build more housing. So with all due respect to the member opposite, direct your comments not to the Premier but to me. The files were sent to me and it's my intention to provide modifications to OPA 405 and 406 to reflect government priorities.

In terms of consultation, we've had robust consultation. Speaker, through you to the honourable member: Our Housing Supply Action Plan, Bill 108, that's presently being debated at third reading, makes it very clear that we are going to increase the housing supply. A Place to Grow, the growth plan for the greater Golden Horseshoe, had extensive consultation last fall and this spring. Again, unanimously, we indicated that we would be intensifying around major transit station areas.

There's been lots of consultation. Now we're working on implementation, Speaker.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Supplementary question?

**Ms. Suze Morrison:** Back to the minister: This is hardly the first time that this Premier has made sweeping changes that affect the daily lives of the people of Toronto. The government has stolen the subway system away from the people of Toronto. They threw—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Order. I'm going to ask the member to withdraw.

**Ms. Suze Morrison:** Withdraw.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Complete your question.

**Ms. Suze Morrison:** Thank you, Speaker.

They threw Toronto's democracy into chaos with their unilateral changes to Toronto city council in the middle of an election, and their cuts to everything from public health to education will make the lives of people in the city of Toronto so much harder. How can the minister justify running roughshod over the people of Toronto once again?

**Hon. Steve Clark:** Speaker, through you to the honourable member: I can justify the why. We need to leverage the \$28.5 billion that our government is spending on transit.

You look at those two official plan amendments: 90% of the transit and the LRT is in that area. We have to intensify around major transit station areas.

Again, the member keeps talking about the Premier. It is my intention, as Minister of Municipal Affairs, to present those modifications later today to the city. Again, we are trying to move forward on things that I would think that this member would support. We are going to continue to work on inclusionary zoning so that we can have affordable housing near transit.

1130

But make no mistake: When we had those consultations on the Housing Supply Action Plan, when we had the consultations on A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, almost unanimously we talked about intensifying around major transit station areas. This is what we're going to do for the people, those people who are dreaming of realizing the dream of home ownership—

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Thank you.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Stop the clock. Order. Restart the clock. The next question.

#### PUBLIC TRANSIT

**Mr. Billy Pang:** My question is for the Minister of Infrastructure. This week, he joined the Minister of Transportation for an excellent announcement. Our government ran on a mandate to make Ontario open for business and to get the province moving. Commuters have spent years frustrated with overcrowding on the Yonge line, and they want more connections across the region. With the upload of the TTC to the province and the construction of new lines and subway extensions, our government is doing just that. Despite this, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau and his Liberal government have chosen to play politics with infrastructure that people desperately need.

Mr. Speaker, for the first time ever, the province is taking a true leadership role in building new transit. Could the minister tell us about what our government is doing to help commuters in this province?

**Hon. Monte McNaughton:** Thank you to the member for that excellent question this morning. Mr. Speaker, we're putting people at the centre of everything that we do. That means helping commuters and providing relief for people in the GTA through five great transit projects.

Prime Minister Trudeau claims that we haven't done our part to get infrastructure built. Well, Mr. Speaker, Justin Trudeau is dead wrong. We've nominated 54 road, bridge and transit projects to the federal government, and Justin Trudeau has yet to approve a single project. The prime minister is worried about election season; we're worried about the construction season.

Mr. Speaker, the federal government didn't waste any time approving transit projects in Vancouver. They approved Vancouver's projects before a business case was even submitted. Yet Justin Trudeau prefers to play politics. His government is not putting the people of Ontario

first. We've submitted these projects to the federal government. I'm calling on Justin Trudeau to put his money where his mouth is: Fund our projects.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Stop the clock. Order. Restart the clock. The supplementary question?

**Mr. Billy Pang:** Thank you to the Minister of Infrastructure for the great response. The Premier made a historic announcement just a couple of months ago. Our government for the people announced a \$28.5-billion subway plan that will get the commuters of this province moving. Those commuters who use Line 1 on a daily basis know the congestion that currently exists.

We have heard from people loud and clear that they're tired of overcrowding on subways, so we are building the new Ontario Line, both for Toronto residents and people coming into the city. However, as the minister has stated, we are calling on the federal government to give their supports to the historic subway plan. Can the Minister of Infrastructure share more about the funding commitment needed from the federal government?

**Hon. Monte McNaughton:** I'll refer this question to our amazing Minister of Transportation.

**Hon. Jeff Yurek:** Thanks for that question opposite. Let me inform the chamber that we have a plan. We have four projects that we need to get rolling. Mr. Speaker, we have been speaking with the federal government and now it's time for them to act. We are not asking for favours. We're not asking for special treatment. We are, in fact, asking for the same treatment that the federal government under Justin Trudeau has given other provinces. Right now, we are not being treated the same. That's why the Minister of Infrastructure and I called on Justin Trudeau to publicly stop campaigning and playing games with this funding.

We are ready to build transit, Mr. Speaker. We have money committed to building it. We have legislation that allows us to build it faster and cheaper. We have taken decisive action to get transit built for Ontarians. It's time for Justin Trudeau to do his job and fund and build transit.

#### WATER QUALITY

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** My question is to the Minister of Infrastructure. Since 2008, residents in north Chatham-Kent have been dealing with well water contaminated by black shale, a known carcinogen. This contamination is attributed to the piledriving of foundations through the bedrock of the North Kent Wind 1 turbine project.

During the campaign, the current Premier promised the people affected by this contamination that he would conduct a health hazard investigation immediately. Well, Speaker, "immediately" has come and gone. It's now more than a year later, and the people are still waiting. They're here in the gallery today. They have lost trust in this Premier and this government.

Will the minister stand up today and make good on his promise to ensure these Ontarians have clean and safe drinking water? I'm calling on the minister to put his

money where his mouth is and initiate this health hazard investigation today for these people who have been here and have been fighting for years for clean drinking water.

**Hon. John Yakabuski:** Who built the turbines?

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** The Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry will come to order.

The question is to the Minister of Infrastructure.

**Hon. Monte McNaughton:** I thank the member from Essex for the heads-up for this question here this morning. We welcome those members and even the former members from the community in Chatham-Kent who have fought for this issue. We've been working very, very hard on this issue. I've been working closely with the Minister of Health, and we're looking forward to having more to say.

But, you know, Mr. Speaker, this is quite ironic. This member, the party opposite, the opposition party, voted in favour of the Green Energy Act. They voted in favour of the Samsung agreement. They supported private power when they voted for that Green Energy Act. We were left with a mess. We are going to clean it up. They caused this problem. We'll take no advice from that member opposite—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Stop the clock. The House will come to order.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** The government side will come to order.

Start the clock.

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** The minister knows that he's dodging the question, I know that he's dodging the question and, more importantly, his own community knows that he's dodging the question. This is about priorities, and do you know what I find ironic? This is a government that prioritizes access to beer over access to clean drinking water for the member, for his own riding. It's unbelievable—you want to talk about irony.

In a letter to Kevin Jakubec of Water Wells First, the Premier wrote the following: "I commit myself and the PC Party of Ontario to stopping this travesty and commit that a full health hazard investigation is conducted in north Chatham-Kent...."

"As Premier, you have my word Kevin we will hold accountable every party that did this."

Premier and Minister, will you honour your word? Or should we just chalk this one up as another empty promise from the Premier and his ministers?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Members will please take their seats.

The question is to the Minister of Infrastructure.

**Hon. Monte McNaughton:** Well, Mr. Speaker, this member supported that—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Order. Stop the clock. The member from Essex will come to order. The Premier will come to order.

Restart the clock. The Minister of Infrastructure has the floor and can reply.

**Hon. Monte McNaughton:** We are going to honour our commitment. We've made all kinds of promises, and we're fulfilling every single promise that we made in that campaign. When we came to government, we immediately cancelled 758 wind and solar contracts. You opposed that, sir. We cancelled the Green Energy Act that that party opposite supported. You voted against that. I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, we are the—

*Interjections.*

1140

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Okay. The Minister of Infrastructure, take a seat. Stop the clock.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** The member for Essex will come to order. The member for Waterloo will come to order. The member for Northumberland–Peterborough South, come to order. Anybody else?

Start the clock. The next question.

#### CHARITABLE GAMING

**Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria:** Everyone knows that our government speaks the language of the people. Today, as all of Ontario awaits the tipoff of game 3 of the NBA finals, we are talking Raptors.

My question is to the Attorney General. Mr. Speaker, millions of Ontarians have tuned in to watch Kyle Lowry, Kawhi Leonard, Pascal Siakam and their teammates chase the championship for the north. From the comfort of their homes to our multiplying Jurassic Parks, Ontarians are taking note of the brand new chance to participate in the games' 50/50 draws online from anywhere in the province.

Mr. Speaker, could the Attorney General please tell this House about this government's support for charities and the important changes that have allowed charities like the MLSE Foundation to open up their 50/50 raffles online?

**Hon. Caroline Mulroney:** Let's go, Raptors!

Mr. Speaker, to make life easier for charities and the people who support them, my parliamentary assistant the member for Durham, on behalf of my ministry, announced changes earlier this year that have made it possible to fundraise through online 50/50 draws. Now you don't need to be in the building for the big game to grab a chance to win the big prize through a seamless online experience.

While we're all feeling confident about the Raptors' chances tonight in Oakland, we know that the charities and the people and the communities they support are already winning. I have had the chance to develop and grow a charity with my family and experience the profound impact we can each have when we come together as communities to create positive change.

Mr. Speaker, it's been incredible to see the funds raised this spring for charitable initiatives by organizations like the MLSE Foundation, Jays Care, the Ottawa Senators Foundation—

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Thank you. The supplementary question.

**Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria:** I thank the Attorney General for her response. Of course, we know that the

Ottawa Senators Foundation, Jays Care Foundation and other foundations and charities, like hospital foundations, are among so many important charities that will help so many people across this province. For example, the MLSE LaunchPad has helped 13,000 young people through free sports programming since it opened its doors in 2017. They have an additional 6,000 kids currently enrolled. We look forward to Jays Care's next Challenger Baseball National Jamboree and the Girls At Bat all-star game.

We all know that in baseball and basketball, the numbers tell their own story. Since the member from Durham made this announcement, we have noticed a significant increase in the impact these new changes have had to foundations. Could the Attorney General please share some of these numbers to illustrate the impact of allowing online e-raffles in Ontario across this province?

**Hon. Caroline Mulroney:** The power of the online platform for charitable 50/50 draws is truly remarkable. The member is right: Since the member from Durham made the announcement, the numbers that have been generated this spring are also truly remarkable.

For game 2 of the NBA final, more than \$490,000 in 50/50 dollars was raised in one game alone, Mr. Speaker. Some 87% of the sales, \$978,000 in sales, took place online. In total, the MLSE Foundation has raised over \$1.5 million for the MLSE Foundation initiatives at Maple Leafs and Raptors games.

Meanwhile, the Toronto Blue Jays Jays Care Foundation nearly doubled its 50/50 sales through its opening four-game series this season, compared to last year. In total, more than \$977,000 in total 50/50 tickets were sold over those four games to help fund initiatives like the Challenger program, which empowers children, youth and adults living with physical and cognitive disabilities with core life skills inherent to baseball.

Mr. Speaker—

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Thank you very much. Next question.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

**Ms. Sandy Shaw:** The question is for the Premier. Last week, the Hamilton Spectator had a front-page story about my private member's bill, the Nancy Rose Act. I'm grateful to have had all-party support in passing the bill. My sister Nancy died of leukemia as a child.

Directly next to that story about my bill was a report about leukemia rates in Hamilton. This study found that in some Hamilton neighbourhoods, the leukemia rates are double the national average. Sarnia, Thunder Bay, St. Catharines, Sault Ste. Marie and Hamilton are those five communities. Benzene exposure from industry is identified as having links to specific types of cancer, including acute myeloid leukemia.

Mr. Speaker, this government has repealed the toxic substances act. Facilities no longer need to prepare new toxic substance reduction plans or even to review existing plans.

Does this government think tracking and reducing toxic substances is important? And what do they have to say to

those residents who are being exposed to health risks with little to no government accountability or oversight?

**Hon. Doug Ford:** Minister of the Environment.

**Hon. Rod Phillips:** Mr. Speaker, through you to the member: Again, we all commend her on her private member's bill.

These are issues that this government is taking extremely seriously. That is why, after years and years of promises that communities like Sarnia would receive a health study—promises made by the previous government. This government, because of the hard work of our MPP from Sarnia, Bob Bailey—I know I'm not supposed to say their names, Mr. Speaker. He came to me, as the Minister of the Environment, on day one and said, "You need to come to Sarnia. You need to hear the promises that have been made about a health study that hasn't been kept."

That's why this government is investing in those kinds of studies. We are doing the work that previous governments didn't do. We take these studies very seriously. That's why we're focused on clean air, clean—

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Thank you very much.

#### OFFICIAL MEMBERS' PHOTOGRAPH

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Once again, I wish to remind members that after we conclude our business this morning, we're going to come together, in this 42nd Parliament, across party lines, and have our photograph taken—the official photograph of the 42nd Parliament. I'm hopeful that everyone is able to stay.

#### NOTICE OF DISSATISFACTION

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Pursuant to standing order 38(a), the member for Scarborough—Guildwood has given notice of her dissatisfaction with the answer to her question given by the Minister of Finance concerning government priorities. This matter will be debated today at 6 p.m.

#### DEFERRED VOTES

##### BRINGING CHOICE AND FAIRNESS TO THE PEOPLE ACT (BEVERAGE ALCOHOL RETAIL SALES), 2019

##### LOI DE 2019 VISANT À OFFRIR À LA POPULATION PLUS DE CHOIX ET UN ACCÈS ÉQUITABLE EN MATIÈRE DE VENTE AU DÉTAIL DE BOISSONS ALCOOLIQUES

Deferred vote on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 115, An Act to amend the Liquor Control Act with respect to the termination of a specified agreement / Projet

de loi 115, Loi modifiant la Loi sur les alcools en ce qui concerne la résiliation d'un accord particulier.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Call in the members. This will be a five-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1149 to 1154.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** I would ask the members to please take their seats.

On May 30, 2019, Mr. Fedeli moved second reading of Bill 115. All those in favour of the motion will please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

#### Ayes

Anand, Deepak	Hogarth, Christine	Phillips, Rod
Baber, Roman	Jones, Sylvia	Piccini, David
Babikian, Aris	Kanapathi, Logan	Rasheed, Kaleed
Bailey, Robert	Karahalios, Belinda C.	Roberts, Jeremy
Barrett, Toby	Ke, Vincent	Romano, Ross
Bethlenfalvy, Peter	Khanjin, Andrea	Sabawy, Sheref
Bouma, Will	Kramp, Daryl	Sandhu, Amarjot
Calandra, Paul	Kusendova, Natalia	Sarkaria, Prabmeet Singh
Cho, Raymond Sung Joon	Lecce, Stephen	Scott, Laurie
Cho, Stan	MacLeod, Lisa	Skelly, Donna
Clark, Steve	Martin, Robin	Smith, Dave
Coe, Lorne	Martow, Gila	Smith, Todd
Crawford, Stephen	McDonell, Jim	Surma, Kinga
Cuzzetto, Rudy	McKenna, Jane	Tangri, Nina
Downey, Doug	McNaughton, Monte	Thanigasalam, Vijay
Dunlop, Jill	Miller, Norman	Thompson, Lisa M.
Fedeli, Victor	Mitas, Christina Maria	Tibollo, Michael A.
Fee, Amy	Mulrone, Caroline	Triantafilopoulos, Effie J.
Ford, Doug	Nicholls, Rick	Wai, Daisy
Fullerton, Merrilee	Oosterhoff, Sam	Walker, Bill
Ghamari, Goldie	Pang, Billy	Yakabuski, John
Gill, Parm	Park, Lindsey	Yurek, Jeff
Hardeman, Ernie	Parsa, Michael	
Harris, Mike	Pettapiece, Randy	

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** All those opposed to the motion will please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

#### Nays

Andrew, Jill	Gravelle, Michael	Natyshak, Taras
Armstrong, Teresa J.	Gretzky, Lisa	Rakocevic, Tom
Arthur, Ian	Harden, Joel	Sattler, Peggy
Begum, Doly	Hassan, Faisal	Schreiner, Mike
Bell, Jessica	Hatfield, Percy	Shaw, Sandy
Berns-McGown, Rima	Horwath, Andrea	Simard, Amanda
Bisson, Gilles	Hunter, Mitzie	Singh, Gurratan
Bourgouin, Guy	Karpoche, Bhutula	Singh, Sara
Burch, Jeff	Kernaghan, Terence	Stevens, Jennifer (Jennie)
Coteau, Michael	Lalonde, Marie-France	Stiles, Marit
Des Rosiers, Nathalie	Lindo, Laura Mae	Tabuns, Peter
Fife, Catherine	Mamakwa, Sol	Taylor, Monique
Fraser, John	Mantha, Michael	Vanthof, John
French, Jennifer K.	Miller, Paul	West, Jamie
Gates, Wayne	Monteith-Farrell, Judith	Wynne, Kathleen O.
Glover, Chris	Morrison, Suze	Yarde, Kevin

**The Clerk of the Assembly (Mr. Todd Decker):** The ayes are 70; the nays are 48.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** I declare the motion carried.

*Second reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Pursuant to the order of the House dated June 4, 2019, the bill is ordered for third reading.

There being no further business this morning, other than the photograph, this House stands in recess until 3 p.m.

*The House recessed from 1158 to 1500.*

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**Ms. Natalia Kusendova:** I'd like to introduce this afternoon members of the ALS Society of Canada: Tammy Moore, the CEO; Lauren Poplak, manager, public affairs and communications; Ryan Fedurco, public affairs and communications coordinator; as well as Icille Pighin.

The ALS Society of Canada is dedicated to the fight against amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, also known as Lou Gehrig's disease, and to providing support for those living with ALS. Thank you for being here today.

**Mr. Mike Schreiner:** I'd like to welcome Sandra and James Hill to Queen's Park today. Their granddaughter, Catherine Walke, is one of our pages. Thanks for joining us today.

**Ms. Jill Dunlop:** I'm happy to introduce two constituents of mine and one who is actually working here with us at Queen's Park: Katy Mullins and Mark Sochaniwskyj, as well as my legislative assistant Will Dandie. Thank you for being here today.

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

### LEGAL AID

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Yesterday, I delivered a letter to the Attorney General from over 200 members of the legal community, demanding that the government reverse its devastating cuts to Legal Aid Ontario. Today, I want to share another example of this government's attacks on supports for our most vulnerable. Downtown Legal Services is a legal clinic at the University of Toronto in my riding that serves students as well as low-income households. At the same time, it provides law students with hands-on experience and training. But the clinic now faces an uncertain future because of this government's choices.

I want to read from a letter they sent me:

"For nearly 50 years, we have proudly offered free legal advice and representation. In the past several months, the government has put all three of our funding sources in serious peril.

"Student levies represent more than a third of our budget. The Conservatives' Student Choice Initiative could wipe out that funding completely.

"At the same time, Legal Aid Ontario faces a 30% funding cut, and mandatory tuition cuts have limited the ability of the faculty of law to replace any lost funding.

"Without Downtown Legal Services, countless students and households across Toronto would face convictions for crimes they didn't commit, preventable

evictions from their homes, unfair termination from their jobs, and deportation.”

Student legal clinics like Downtown Legal Services exist at every law school across Ontario. I join them in calling on the Premier and his colleagues to immediately reverse the cuts and to include legal clinics in the list of essential university services.

#### AUTISM TREATMENT

**Mr. Billy Pang:** Over the past month, I have met with many of my constituents and local stakeholders regarding the Ontario Autism Program and how services can be improved while still remaining fiscally responsible.

Our government and our Minister of Children, Community and Social Services, the Honourable Lisa MacLeod, have proven our commitment to support children with autism in our province with the creation of an expert panel on needs-based supports. This 20-member panel will collectively provide recommendations to our minister on the best way to implement and utilize the feedback that the ministry has received and will receive from further consultation over the coming months.

I'm proud to stand by the minister and would like to announce that I too will be hosting a round table in my riding to receive input and feedback from my constituents and local service providers on June 8 from 1 p.m. to 3 p.m. at the Angus Glen Community Centre.

We understand the importance of the OAP, and we will continue to work tirelessly on this file. I applaud our minister for her hard work on this file.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

**Mr. Ian Arthur:** On August 20, 2018, a 15-year-old high school student began striking from school, demanding that the Swedish government take action on the climate crisis. Since that fateful day, #FridaysForFuture has grown into a global movement that I believe has the momentum to change the world. That student, Greta Thunberg, has addressed the European Parliament, the British Parliament and the United Nations. She has graced the cover of Time magazine.

Her frank and honest testimony has captured the attention of the world. For the first time since the origins of the climate crisis some 40 years ago, we may see action that matches the scale of the emergency we face. Youth are striking for their future, for the right to have the opportunities of their parents and grandparents, and they are a growing cacophony. The May 24 strike had over 1.6 million participants in 125 countries, with 4,199 actual strikes.

In response to the movement, UN Secretary-General António Guterres said, “My generation has failed to respond properly to the dramatic challenge of climate change. This is deeply felt by young people. No wonder they are angry.”

To the youth across the world: Thank you. Do not stop ever. Don't accept it if they say, “We can't,” because what

they mean is, “We won't.” Demand action, now and always.

#### TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE

**Mr. Amarjot Sandhu:** Commuters in the GTA experience the worst commute times in North America. The cost of congestion to commuters and the economy in the GTA is expected to exceed \$15 billion annually by 2031. This is an outcome of the negligence on the part of the previous government to invest in new transportation infrastructure for the last 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I tabled a motion in the Legislature and called on the government to immediately resume the environmental assessment for the GTA west corridor to improve the region's transportation network, reduce travel times and help alleviate traffic congestion across the GTA. Should the motion pass, the environmental assessment should resume at the point it left off at in 2015. Completing the environmental assessment for the GTA west corridor would allow the government to build more transportation infrastructure in the future to meet the needs of commuters and businesses as our economy grows.

US President John F. Kennedy famously said, “American roads are not good because America is rich, but America is rich because American roads are good.”

People in the GTA and Ontario deserve a transportation network that benefits businesses, commuters and families, and shows the world that Ontario is open for business.

#### HEALTH CARE

**Mr. Terence Kernaghan:** Speaker, recently, I toured Health Zone, a nurse-practitioner-led clinic in London. I heard from patients and staff about their holistic approach to health: Rather than looking at singular diagnoses or problems, they consider the whole person, including mental health, in a multidisciplinary approach.

Nurse-practitioner-led clinics deserve a seat at the table within the Ontario health team model. I urge this government to recognize NPLCs as primary care providers and ensure that if a person decides to receive primary care at an NPLC, then they should come off the Health Care Connect list.

Thank you for your great work, Health Zone.

My good friend Marilyn Gibson passed away recently and was tremendously lucky to pass away in a compassionate and supportive home-like atmosphere at St. Joseph's Hospice in London. The building is thoughtfully designed, and through community programming staff provide tremendous support for those on their grief journey after their loved one passes.

Hospices currently receive only 50% of their operational funding despite saving the province \$661 per day when patients enter a hospice instead of a hospital.

Thank you to the amazing Sisters of St. Joseph and all the staff, volunteers and supporters of St. Joseph's Hospice.

We miss you, Marilyn.

### GUELPH AND DISTRICT MULTICULTURAL FESTIVAL

**Mr. Mike Schreiner:** The 33rd annual Guelph and District Multicultural Festival is happening this weekend, from June 7 to June 9, at Riverside Park. This is an amazing event held every year to celebrate diversity and inclusivity, and it's one of the reasons I love Guelph.

**1510**

This year's theme is One World Living Together, and the festival delivers on this theme. The vibrant and colourful traditional costumes of China, Puerto Rico and Africa; the infectious drumming of Carnival; and the food—let me tell you about the food: fresh Chilean salsa and burritos, Eritrean and Ethiopian stews, Indian samosas and tandoori, Caribbean roti, and the best Syrian shawarma you'll ever eat.

It was a privilege to be a part of the opening ceremonies last year as my first-ever event as a newly elected MPP, literally the day after the election.

I want to recognize the festival founder, Delfino Callegari, who ran the festival for 31 years as a volunteer. I want to thank Meher Parakh, who is the festival's new executive director, and all the volunteers, vendors and performers.

Unfortunately, provincial budget cuts are threatening the festival, and so I hope people in Guelph come together so we can enjoy this festival for the next 33 years.

### TEEYAN DA MELA

**Mr. Deepak Anand:** It's always a pleasure to rise. Empowerment in its simplest form can be understood as gestures both big and small that help elevate others to greater heights and an overall happier, productive and peaceful life. Empowerment is an unstoppable force for good.

Female empowerment is important in order to support women, young and old, in self-actualizing their inner power. The next generation of empowered women leaders and change-makers will transform our world.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to now recognize Sukhi Nijjar from Watno Dur Radio and TV Network, an organization that has been organizing Teeyan Da Mela, a festival, over the past 15 years. Thousands of women in the GTA, young and old, look forward to this event every year, and it has become a memorable community event.

This event provides a space for all women to mix and mingle, have great entertainment, watch the singers perform, sample delicious food, and learn and network. Overall, it's a lot of fun, and it is very important.

As a community servant, it gives me pride and great joy in knowing that organizations like Watno Dur are in my riding of Mississauga–Malton. They provide such a welcoming space to nearly 7,000 women.

I had the opportunity to attend this event along with the two most powerful women in my home: my wife, Aruna Anand, and my daughter, Suvidhi Anand, and we enjoyed it.

Thank you, Sukhi.

### EDDY LEFRANÇOIS

**Mr. Michael Mantha:** June is ALS Awareness Month. ALS is a terminal disease that gradually paralyzes people because the brain is no longer able to communicate with the muscles of the body that we are typically able to move at will. Despite advancements in research, the causes of ALS are unknown, and eight out of 10 people with ALS die within two to five years of being diagnosed.

But there is hope, Mr. Speaker, and that hope is in Eddy Lefrançois. Eddy exemplified that hope during his life on this earth. Eddy would always say, "I have ALS, but ALS does not have me."

I want to thank Lise and Ti-Guy Lefrançois from Dubreuilville.

Lise, merci beaucoup pour le col d'Eddy pour la SLA. Il était le grand ambassadeur du Canada pour la SLA.

Eddy raised over \$100,000, along with the community of Dubreuilville, for research and development. Why? Because Eddy believed that we were so close. Over the last five years, huge steps have been taken in order to get us closer towards treatment for people with ALS. He also donated his tissues towards research and development.

Some might say that Eddy lost his battle with ALS. I am so happy that Tammy Moore, the CEO of ALS Canada, is here with us today, because she's going to remember this conversation that I had with her at Eddy's celebration of life. I turned around, and we had a private chat, and I told her, "Eddy took on ALS head-on, and he kicked the hell out of ALS, is what he did."

As Eddy would always say: Let's roll!

### ONTARIO'S BEST BUTTER TART FESTIVAL

**Ms. Jill Dunlop:** There's only one thing more Ontarian than a trillium or a loon, and that is the butter tart. A summer barbecue table, farmers' market, or picnic in Ontario would be incomplete without these sweet and delicious treats. Since early pioneer times, people in our province have baked up these uniquely Canadian delicacies for their families to enjoy during the summer months.

Although I believe a House debate could be had for how gooey the filling ought to be, or if raisins have any place in a butter tart, I don't want to spark that divisive of a debate today. Instead, I want to welcome everyone in this House and all our constituents to Midland this Saturday for the aptly named Ontario's Best Butter Tart Festival.

On June 8, thousands of Ontarians will flock to the town of Midland in Simcoe North to enjoy tarts from over 170 vendors, and purchase tart-themed clothes, products and food, which this year will include tart-flavoured bacon strips. Last year, the festival attracted over 50,000 people to our town on Georgian Bay. This year's organizers expect that more than 180,000 butter tarts will flood the streets of Midland.

As a lifelong butter tart enthusiast, I will be helping judge the traditional tarts competition alongside local dignitaries; Food Network stars; the festival's founder, Barb Rowlandson; and other tart connoisseurs.

I invite everyone to partake in the sweetest day of the year and visit Ontario's Best Butter Tart Festival in Midland this June 8.

#### AMYOTROPHIC LATERAL SCLEROSIS

**Ms. Natalia Kusendova:** Every year in the month of June, we mark ALS Awareness Month in Canada. ALS is more commonly known as Lou Gehrig's disease, after the famous New York Yankees first baseman, who was diagnosed with the disease.

ALS gradually paralyzes those diagnosed with it, because the brain is no longer able to communicate with the muscles of the body. Over time, these muscles break down, and people with the disease slowly lose their ability to walk, talk, eat, swallow and, eventually, even breathe. ALS Awareness Month is an important opportunity to raise awareness of this cruel disease.

Our government is focused on building a more patient-centred health care system, one that will help people living with ALS to access the care they need in a faster, more integrated fashion. Their doctors will be able to get them the care they need and share their medical records more easily, as part of a larger team working to provide for their needs.

I want all Ontarians living with ALS to know that their government is working to provide them with the best care possible in their fight against this disease.

#### VISITORS

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** I understand that the member for Mississauga–Malton has a point of order.

**Mr. Deepak Anand:** I just want to take a moment and recognize and welcome Parveen Dalal and Rakhee Dalal, from my riding, and Dr. Amit Narwal, Mani Narwal, Aayush Narwal, Shreya Narwal and Shashwat Narwal for the first time to Queen's Park. Welcome to Queen's Park.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** I understand that the member for Mississauga–Streetsville might have a point of order.

**Mrs. Nina Tangri:** I'd also like to welcome today into the chamber Komal Paul Singh, Avtar Singh, Gurmit Singh and Sukhi Nijjar, all from the media. Thank you for joining us today.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### PROTECTING A SUSTAINABLE PUBLIC SECTOR FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS ACT, 2019

##### LOI DE 2019 VISANT À PRÉSERVER LA VIABILITÉ DU SECTEUR PUBLIC POUR LES GÉNÉRATIONS FUTURES

Mr. Bethlenfalvy moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 124, An Act to implement moderation measures in respect of compensation in Ontario's public sector / *Projet de loi 124, Loi visant à mettre en oeuvre des mesures de modération concernant la rémunération dans le secteur public de l'Ontario.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? I heard some noes.

All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Call in the members. This will be a five-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1520 to 1525.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** All members who are in favour of the motion will please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

#### Ayes

Anand, Deepak	Harris, Mike	Phillips, Rod
Baber, Roman	Hogarth, Christine	Piccini, David
Babikian, Aris	Jones, Sylvia	Rasheed, Kaleed
Bailey, Robert	Kanapathi, Logan	Roberts, Jeremy
Bethlenfalvy, Peter	Karahalios, Belinda C.	Romano, Ross
Bouma, Will	Ke, Vincent	Sabawy, Sheref
Calandra, Paul	Khanjin, Andrea	Sandhu, Amarjot
Cho, Raymond Sung Joon	Kramp, Daryl	Sarkaria, Prabmeet Singh
Cho, Stan	Lecce, Stephen	Scott, Laurie
Clark, Steve	MacLeod, Lisa	Skelly, Donna
Coe, Lorne	Martin, Robin	Smith, Dave
Crawford, Stephen	Martow, Gila	Smith, Todd
Cuzzetto, Rudy	McKenna, Jane	Surma, Kinga
Downey, Doug	McNaughton, Monte	Tangri, Nina
Dunlop, Jill	Miller, Norman	Thanigasalam, Vijay
Elliott, Christine	Mulroney, Caroline	Thompson, Lisa M.
Fedeli, Victor	Nicholls, Rick	Tibollo, Michael A.
Fee, Amy	Oosterhoff, Sam	Triantaflopoulos, Effie J.
Fullerton, Merrilee	Pang, Billy	Walker, Bill
Ghamari, Goldie	Park, Lindsey	Yurek, Jeff
Gill, Parm	Parsa, Michael	
Hardeman, Ernie	Pettapiece, Randy	

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** All those opposed to the motion will please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

#### Nays

Andrew, Jill	Harden, Joel	Sattler, Peggy
Armstrong, Teresa J.	Hassan, Faisal	Schreiner, Mike
Arthur, Ian	Hatfield, Percy	Shaw, Sandy
Begum, Doly	Horwath, Andrea	Simard, Amanda
Berns-McGown, Rima	Hunter, Mitzie	Singh, Sara
Bisson, Gilles	Karpoche, Bhutla	Stevens, Jennifer (Jennie)
Bourgouin, Guy	Kernaghan, Terence	Stiles, Marit
Burch, Jeff	Mamakwa, Sol	Tabuns, Peter
Coteau, Michael	Mantha, Michael	Taylor, Monique
Des Rosiers, Nathalie	Miller, Paul	Vanthof, John
Fraser, John	Monteith-Farrell, Judith	West, Jamie
French, Jennifer K.	Morrison, Suze	Yarde, Kevin
Glover, Chris	Natyshak, Taras	
Gretzky, Lisa	Rakocevic, Tom	

**The Clerk of the Assembly (Mr. Todd Decker):** The ayes are 64; the nays are 40.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** I declare the motion carried.

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** I would invite the President of the Treasury Board, if he wishes, to give a brief explanation of his bill.

**Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy:** The Protecting a Sustainable Public Sector for Future Generations Act, if passed, would ensure that increases in public sector compensation reflect the fiscal situation of the province and are consistent with the principles of responsible fiscal management and protect the sustainability of public services.

MAKING NORTHERN ONTARIO  
HIGHWAYS SAFER ACT, 2019  
LOI DE 2019 VISANT À ACCROÎTRE  
LA SÉCURITÉ DES VOIES PUBLIQUES  
DANS LE NORD DE L'ONTARIO

Mr. Bourgouin moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 125, An Act to amend the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act to make Northern Ontario Highways Safer / Projet de loi 125, Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'aménagement des voies publiques et des transports en commun pour accroître la sécurité des voies publiques dans le nord de l'Ontario.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

1530

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Would the member like to briefly explain his bill?

**Mr. Guy Bourgouin:** I am pleased to be here to introduce my first private member's bill, which is intended to make it safer for northern Ontarians to travel our highways during the winter months.

Briefly, this bill seeks to reduce the number of winter closures on Highways 11 and 17 that are oftentimes caused by poor road conditions and maintenance standards that are not at par with those on southern Ontario highways. The bill thus amends the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act in relation to standards for road maintenance in winter.

A new section 100 sets out a classification system for Ontario highways consisting of five classes of highways. The section classifies all 400-series highways, the QEW highway, and Highways 11 and 17 as class 1 highways.

The section also sets out the time within which snow must be removed from each class of highways after each snowfall. Class 1 highways have the strictest requirements for snow removal, requiring that the pavement be bare of snow within eight hours of the end of a snowfall.

LA FRANCOPHONIE ACT, 2019  
LOI DE 2019 SUR LA FRANCOPHONIE

Madame Des Rosiers moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 126, An Act to promote the maintenance and development of Ontario's Francophonie / Projet de loi 126, Loi visant à promouvoir le maintien et l'épanouissement de la Francophonie ontarienne.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** I would invite the member to give a brief explanation of her bill if she so wishes.

**M<sup>me</sup> Nathalie Des Rosiers:** Monsieur le Président, c'est mon dernier projet de loi, qui vise à remplacer la Loi sur les services en français, qui a maintenant 30 ans. Le projet de loi codifie certaines pratiques, clarifie le concept d'offre active, et propose et balise l'avenir de la francophonie ontarienne, des Métis de langue française et de cette francophonie très diversifiée qui continue de contribuer à l'Ontario.

Je veux remercier l'AJEFO, l'Association des juristes d'expression française de l'Ontario, pour son leadership dans ce dossier et ma comarraine, la députée Marie-France Lalonde d'Orléans, qui coparraine ce projet de loi également. Merci aussi à la députée de Glengarry–Prescott–Russell pour son appui.

ONTARIO FOOD TERMINAL  
PROTECTION ACT, 2019

LOI DE 2019 SUR LA PROTECTION  
DU MARCHÉ DES PRODUITS  
ALIMENTAIRES DE L'ONTARIO

Ms. Karpoche moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 127, An Act to amend the Planning Act to protect lands in relation to the Ontario Food Terminal / Projet de loi 127, Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'aménagement du territoire pour protéger des terrains en ce qui a trait au Marché des produits alimentaires de l'Ontario.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Would the member for Parkdale–High Park like to explain her bill?

**Ms. Bhutla Karpoche:** This bill amends the Planning Act. New section 47.1 of the Planning Act designates the lands on which the Ontario Food Terminal is situated and the prescribed surrounding lands as a provincially significant employment zone. This bill provides protections for these lands to prevent development or conflicting uses on the lands in the future.

ONTARIO WATER RESOURCES  
AMENDMENT ACT, 2019

LOI DE 2019 MODIFIANT  
LA LOI SUR LES RESSOURCES  
EN EAU DE L'ONTARIO

Ms. Dunlop moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 128, An Act to amend the Ontario Water Resources Act / Projet de loi 128, Loi modifiant la Loi sur les ressources en eau de l'Ontario.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** I would invite the member for Simcoe North to explain her bill.

**Ms. Jill Dunlop:** In recognition of Adam Beck's birthday and Waterpower Day on June 20, I would like to introduce my private member's bill, the Ontario Water Resources Amendment Act.

Water power production in Ontario is governed by two separate pieces of legislation, including the Ontario Water Resources Act, which has added unnecessary and duplicative regulatory burdens on producers.

This proposed bill adds an exception for the taking of water under this act for constructing, altering, improving or repairing a dam if a dam produces electricity and the activity is done in accordance with a minister's order under the Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act. By eliminating onerous barriers to growth and innovation, this bill allows water power operators to lead Ontario to a cleaner, more affordable and more sustainable energy future.

SAFE AND HEALTHY  
COMMUNITIES ACT (ADDRESSING  
GUN VIOLENCE), 2019

LOI DE 2019 POUR DES COLLECTIVITÉS  
SAINES ET SÉCURITAIRES (TRAITANT  
DE LA VIOLENCE ARMÉE)

Ms. Hunter moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 129, An Act to amend the Health Insurance Act and the Health Protection and Promotion Act in respect of addressing gun violence and its impacts / Projet de loi 129, Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'assurance-santé et la Loi sur la protection et la promotion de la santé en ce qui concerne la violence armée et ses répercussions.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Would the member for Scarborough–Guildwood care to explain her bill?

**Ms. Mitzie Hunter:** The bill amends the Health Insurance Act. Insured services shall include prescribed hospital-based violence intervention programs. They shall also include trauma-informed counselling for survivors and others affected by gun violence.

The bill also amends the Health Protection and Promotion Act. Boards of health shall have programs and services for reducing gun violence. They shall also have programs and services for increasing the capacity of the community to assist survivors and others affected by gun violence.

COMBATTING LITTER  
FOR THE ENVIRONMENT  
AND NATURE ACT, 2019  
LOI DE 2019 VISANT À LUTTER  
CONTRE LES DÉTRITUS  
AFIN DE PROTÉGER  
L'ENVIRONNEMENT ET LA NATURE

Ms. Khanjin moved first reading of the following bill:  
Bill 130, An Act to proclaim the Provincial Day of Action on Litter / Projet de loi 130, Loi proclamant la Journée provinciale d'action contre les détritrus.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Would the member for Barrie–Innisfil like to explain her bill?

**Ms. Andrea Khanjin:** As of 2019, Ontario generated nearly a tonne of waste per year per person every year, and the overall diversion rate in the province has been stalled below 30% since 2004. Ontario needs to reduce the amount of waste that is generated and divert more waste from landfills through proven methods including preventing and reducing litter in public places and waterways.

To raise awareness of the importance of a clean environment and not littering, it is appropriate to proclaim an annual Provincial Day of Action on Litter. Therefore, I'm introducing this private member's bill.

1540

MOTIONS

HOUSE SITTINGS

**Mr. Stephen Lecce:** I move that, pursuant to standing order 6(c)(i), the House shall meet from 6:45 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. on Wednesday, June 5, 2019, for the purpose of considering government business.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Mr. Lecce has moved that, pursuant to standing order 6(c)(i), the House shall meet from 6:45 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. on Wednesday, June 5, 2019, for the purpose of considering government business. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? I heard some noes.

All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** On division.

**The Speaker (Hon. Ted Arnott):** Carried on division.  
*Motion agreed to.*

PETITIONS

CURRICULUM

**Ms. Marit Stiles:** I actually have over 5,000 signatures here on these petitions. They've been provided to me by

parents from Bluewater District School Board, Halton, Hastings, Kawartha, Upper Canada, Simcoe and York region, and I'm very pleased to read them out here in the House.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the 2015 health and physical education curriculum was based on extensive province-wide consultation with parents, caregivers, educators, health and education experts;

"Whereas cancellation of the sexual health component of the 2015 health and physical education curriculum would place students at risk by withdrawing instructions on naming body parts and learning about responsible decision-making and consent, gender expression and gender identity, sexuality, sexual health, growth and development, LGBTQ issues and healthy views of body image;

"Whereas repealing the 2015 curriculum would not stop classroom issues arising for which students need factual, evidence-based and age-appropriate answers to support their understanding of healthy behaviour and healthy decision-making;

"Whereas the majority of parents support the 2015 health and physical education curriculum;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Minister of Education not repeal the sexual health component of the 2015 health and physical education curriculum."

I'm very pleased to join parents and educators in signing this petition, and I'll be handing it off to page Amelia to table with the Clerks.

#### GOVERNMENT'S RECORD

**Mrs. Amy Fee:** I have a petition here titled "The First Year of Premier Ford-led Government (Supporting and Promoting the Timeline of the Government for the People).

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas almost one year ago, Premier Ford's PC-led government was elected with an overwhelming majority; and

"Whereas the government was elected on a mandate of restoring Ontario's finances, as well as delivering responsible, accountable and transparent government; and

"Whereas since being elected, the Premier Ford government has passed a historic amount of legislation to get Ontario on the right track, including:

"Bill 2, Urgent Priorities Act, 2018;

"Bill 4, Cap and Trade Cancellation Act, 2018;

"Bill 5, Better Local Government Act, 2018;

"Bill 32, Access to Natural Gas Act, 2018;

"Bill 34, Green Energy Repeal Act, 2018;

"Bill 36, Cannabis Statute Law Amendment Act, 2018;

"Bill 47, Making Ontario Open for Business Act, 2018;

"Bill 48, Safe and Supportive Classrooms Act, 2019;

"Bill 57, Restoring Trust, Transparency and Accountability Act, 2018;

"Bill 66, Restoring Ontario's Competitiveness Act, 2019;

"Bill 67, Labour Relations Amendment Act (Protecting Ontario's Power Supply), 2018;

"Bill 68, Comprehensive Ontario Police Services Act, 2019;

"Bill 74, The People's Health Care Act, 2019;

"Bill 81, Supply Act, 2019;

"Bill 87, Fixing the Hydro Mess Act, 2019;

"Bill 100, Protecting What Matters Most Act (Budget Measures), 2019;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Continue to fulfill your mandate to protect what matters most to the people of Ontario while working to reduce immense debt and deficit shamefully left by the previous Kathleen Wynne Liberal government."

Mr. Speaker, I fully support this petition and will be affixing my name to it and giving it to page Patrick to bring to the table.

#### CURRICULUM

**Ms. Sara Singh:** I'm proud to present this petition.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the 2015 health and physical education curriculum was based on extensive province-wide consultation with parents, caregivers, educators, health and education experts;...

"Whereas repealing the 2015 curriculum would not stop classroom issues arising for which students need factual, evidence-based and age-appropriate answers to support their understanding of healthy behaviour and healthy decision-making;

"Whereas the majority of parents support the 2015 health and physical education curriculum;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Minister of Education not repeal the sexual health component of the 2015 health and physical education curriculum."

I want to thank members from across Peel region; we've got over 500 signatures here, Mr. Speaker. I'm really proud to sign my name and send this off with page Christopher.

#### CURRICULUM

**Mr. Terence Kernaghan:** It gives me great pleasure to present these petitions on behalf of some excellent educators and just great people from London, including Mark MacLeod, Mike Thomas, Craig Smith, Jennifer Hillner, Glenda Manzi and Alia Awaysheh. The petition reads:

"Save the Sexual Health Component of the 2015 Health and Physical Education Curriculum.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the 2015 health and physical education curriculum was based on extensive province-wide consultation with parents, caregivers, educators, health and education experts;

“Whereas cancellation of the sexual health component of the 2015 health and physical education curriculum would place students at risk by withdrawing instructions on naming body parts and learning about responsible decision-making and consent, gender expression and gender identity, sexuality, sexual health, growth and development, LGBTQ issues and healthy views of body image;

“Whereas repealing the 2015 curriculum would not stop classroom issues arising for which students need factual, evidence-based and age-appropriate answers to support their understanding of healthy behaviour and healthy decision-making;

“Whereas the majority of parents support the 2015 health and physical education curriculum;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

“That the Minister of Education not repeal the sexual health component of the 2015 health and physical education curriculum.”

I fully support this petition. I will be affixing my signature and giving it to page Jack to deliver to the Clerks.

#### WASTE REDUCTION

**M<sup>me</sup> Nathalie Des Rosiers:** This petition comes from Mrs. Jerreat’s class of grade 4 and 5 students.

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario

“Whereas plastic bags and polystyrene are so lightweight that they get blown into trees, streams, lakes and oceans. Only 11% of all plastic in Canada gets recycled annually...;

“Whereas Canadians use 2.86 billion plastic shopping bags per year...;

“Whereas plastic bags and polystyrene are made from petroleum, and mining it adds greenhouse gases to the air, and pollutes the ground and streams;

“Whereas plastic bags and polystyrene break down into microplastic bits and get ingested by marine life and birds making them sick, as well as entering the food chain;

“Whereas up to one million seabirds and 100,000 sea mammals and countless fish die each year from ingesting plastic...;

“Whereas plastic bags take 10-1,000 years to decompose and polystyrene never biodegrades and can be fatal for wildlife...;

“Whereas stores can sell reusable plant fibre bags, and takeout food and drinks can be served in cardboard or reusable containers;

“Whereas the students of Ms. Jerreat’s grade 4/5 class, and all grade 5s from Elginburg District Public School in Kingston, Ontario, and all children in the province of Ontario want and need clean lakes to swim in, clean air to breathe, and a healthy planet;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

“To ban plastic shopping bags and Styrofoam (polystyrene) packaging used for drinks and food from being manufactured, or commercially distributed, in the province of Ontario.”

I agree with this petition. I will sign it and give it to Julien.

1550

#### LIBRARY SERVICES

**Mr. John Vanthof:** I have hundreds of people from my own riding and from areas like South River, Callander, Port Hope and Cobourg.

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario ...

“Whereas value for money and respect for taxpayer dollars are the umbrella under which the” library services “agencies operate—allowing libraries to share resources and expertise in an efficient and cost-effective manner—while also allowing them to best serve their individual communities;

“We, the undersigned, therefore petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“—for the reinstatement of funding to the Ontario Library Service (north and south) agencies to, at minimum, the 2017-18 funding levels, in order for these agencies to continue the day-to-day support of Ontario public library services;

“—to continue to maintain base funding for Ontario public libraries.”

I wholeheartedly agree, sign my signature and give it to page Maisie.

#### CHILD CARE

**Ms. Doly Begum:** We have over 7,000 petitions here from residents across Ontario. These are along with the thousands that were submitted online. I also want to thank the Ontario Coalition for Better Child Care for bringing these to me this morning at their press conference.

This is entitled “Petition to Stop the Cuts to Ontario Child Care.

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas cuts to provincial child care funding will raise child care fees and freeze child care subsidies for low-income parents;

“Whereas over 400,000 Ontario families rely on licensed child care every day to work and study;

“Whereas over 100,000 families use child care fee subsidy;

“Whereas licensed child care supports Ontario’s families, communities and economy;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

“Stop the provincial child care cuts and restore child care funding.”

I fully support this petition, will affix my signature to it and give it to page Kian.

## MUNICIPAL PLANNING

**Mr. Tom Rakocevic:** It's always an honour to rise in the House. This petition was circulated at a packed town hall meeting regarding Bill 108 I held at St. Roch's Parish hall last month. It's called "Support Local Planning.

"Whereas provincial Bill 108 strips local voices of their say in the future development of our community; and

"Whereas the legislation that abolished the Ontario Municipal Board and replaced it with the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal received unanimous all-party support; and

"Whereas Bill 108 allows the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal to operate under the rules of the old Ontario Municipal Board, which was widely criticized for siding with developers; and

"Whereas Bill 108 is designed to allow developers to sidestep local planning professionals and community concerns, miring our city planners in costly appeals and litigation instead of good planning work; and

"Whereas Bill 108 will reduce development charges, and eliminate or reduce section 37 funding tools, park dedication levies or any other financial mechanisms that local communities have in obtaining benefits from new developments;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to halt the legislative advancement of Bill 108 which, in its current state, will have negative consequences on community building and proper planning and community input on local development."

I support this petition, and will be signing it and giving it to page Julien.

## TENANT PROTECTION

**Ms. Bhutla Karpoche:** I'd like to thank the residents of 100 High Park and specifically Julia Mendez for collecting signatures on this petition, entitled "Protect Tenants: Stop the Speed-Up of Evictions.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas recent reports show that the Ontario government plans to introduce new laws that would allow landlords to evict tenants faster and use private bailiffs to enforce eviction orders;

"Whereas there is an affordable housing and rental crisis in Ontario;

"Whereas many tenants who have lived in their units for years are being pushed out of their homes through renovations and other loopholes, allowing their landlords to double or triple the rent;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to act to: reject any proposed changes that give landlords the power to evict honest tenants more quickly; close all loopholes that give landlords incentive to drive people out of their units so they can rent at new, much higher rents, including action in above-guideline rent increases and renovations; and commit to immediate action to increase access to affordable housing in Ontario

by building more affordable housing, social housing, supportive housing and increasing rent supplements, etc."

I fully support this petition and will affix my signature to it.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Thank you. Now you can take a breath.

Further petitions?

## CAMPUS RADIO STATIONS

**Mr. Mike Schreiner:** I have a petition from my constituents entitled "Campus Radio Stations are an Essential Service.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Ontario campus radio stations consist of over 150 staff members and 3,500 volunteers, a majority of them youth and students;

"Whereas campus radio stations offer training and development for students, both as part of their on-campus course curriculum and within the community at large, including preparation for careers in broadcasting and journalism;

"Whereas campus radio stations in Ontario are key providers of emergency information under the National Public Alerting System;

"Whereas campus radio stations are an independent news and media outlet for students and communities that provides a platform for marginalized voices;

"Whereas campus radio stations have a high fixed cost compared to other student services;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to deem campus radio stations an essential fee under the Student Choice Initiative."

I support this petition, will sign it and ask page Liam to bring it to the table.

## CLIMATE CHANGE

**Mr. Ian Arthur:** I have a petition here about the climate crisis in Ontario.

"Petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas:

"(1) Atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>, now above 414 parts per million, continues to accelerate despite international agreements and efforts to slow down CO<sub>2</sub> emissions;

"(2) Northern latitudes are now warming much faster than the global average;

"(3) Arctic warming threatens ice cover, permafrost and frozen methane. The melting of these will accelerate global warming even more;

"(4) NASA data showing warming is already 1.4 degrees Celsius above the 1890-1910 baseline. If heating exceeds 2 degrees Celsius, then food loss, social disorder and extinctions may follow; and

"(5) City councils in Burlington, Hamilton, Kingston, London and Ottawa have declared climate emergencies;

"Therefore we, the undersigned residents of Ontario, request the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to pass a resolution declaring a climate emergency."

I fully support this petition, and will be affixing my name to it and handing it to page Aaryan to give to the Clerks.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Unfortunately, the time for petitions has now expired.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Before I turn it over to Mr. Fedeli, I'm just going to remind members that I expect civility in this House today. I expect you'll be on your best behaviour. I'm giving you a reputation to live up to. Don't disappoint me, or you'll find out what the repercussions might be.

Over to the Minister of Finance.

BRINGING CHOICE AND FAIRNESS  
TO THE PEOPLE ACT (BEVERAGE  
ALCOHOL RETAIL SALES), 2019  
LOI DE 2019 VISANT À OFFRIR  
À LA POPULATION PLUS DE CHOIX  
ET UN ACCÈS ÉQUITABLE EN MATIÈRE  
DE VENTE AU DÉTAIL  
DE BOISSONS ALCOOLIQUES

Mr. Fedeli moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 115, An Act to amend the Liquor Control Act with respect to the termination of a specified agreement / *Projet de loi 115, Loi modifiant la Loi sur les alcools en ce qui concerne la résiliation d'un accord particulier.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Back to Mr. Fedeli.

**Hon. Victor Fedeli:** I will be splitting my time with the member from Barrie–Springwater–Oro-Medonte.

Speaker, this is not just about putting beer and wine in corner stores; this is not just about creating choice and convenience for the people of Ontario; this is about creating fairness for Ontario consumers. I have said this many times in the Legislature and in many speeches that I've given in the last few days: It's surprising how many people in the province of Ontario do not know that the Beer Store is not owned by the government.

The LCBO is owned by the government. We, the people, own the LCBO and that beautiful brand. But the Beer Store is not owned by the government. I've been here eight years. When I was first elected here, I did not know that.

I can tell you it is owned by three global beer multinationals. So it is privately owned by these multinationals. Clearly, they have been given a sweetheart deal by the previous Liberal government. We had retained Ken Hughes as our investigator, and he stated unequivocally that the Liberals' sweetheart deal with these multinational corporations is the obstacle to us delivering on our commitment. In fact, Ken Hughes stated, "This is a bad deal for Ontarians" that "stifles competition, keeps prices artificially high, and prevents new craft beer entrepreneurs from getting a strong foothold in the market." It's

interesting that the previous government put multinational profits ahead of the consumer, but we plan to make good on our promise to put the people of Ontario first.

**1600**

What's really interesting are my visits over the weekend with several convenience stores in and around my riding of Nipissing.

I got out to Anthony's store on Highway 17, just east of North Bay, on the way to Mattawa. Anthony has a really large store. He's right on the highway. He is ready now to put beer and wine in his convenience stores. It's a great location. It's right on the highway. It's going to be an absolutely perfect spot for him. He has a huge facility that's ready to go.

I stopped in Powassan and visited Emily at her convenience store. It's one of the only ones on the main street in Powassan. She also owns the convenience store in Bonfield. She gave me her business card and said, "Let us know the second that we can have beer and wine in corner stores."

I stop in the town of Callander every Saturday. I go in and I visit with Sargun. I'm telling you—and I tweeted about this—he asks me every single Saturday, "When am I going to have beer and wine in my corner store?" He's waiting for it. He knew we campaigned on it. I remember knocking on his door during the campaign and telling him that one of our campaign promises was to put beer and wine in corner stores, bring choice and convenience to families, end this near-monopoly. There's not a Saturday that goes by that I go in there and he doesn't ask me about when we are going to be able to bring beer and wine in his corner store. We campaigned on that. We campaigned on the promise to put people first, including growing jobs and expanding choice and convenience for Ontario consumers.

I'm telling you, our special adviser Ken Hughes told us what we need to do. He reminded us that the current Beer Store distribution system owned by those three global giants that were handed a sweetheart deal by the Liberals, who were more interested in protecting profits than bringing choice—that near-monopoly is a bad deal for consumers, a bad deal for business and truly unfair to the people of Ontario.

Speaker, let me read a couple of quotes about some of the things that we've learned over the past short while. By the way, the Retail Council of Canada says that this will create 9,100 new jobs in the province of Ontario and add \$3.5 billion to our economy. That's why this is so important. It brings choice and convenience.

If you look at the average price of the beer itself, it's 8.3% more expensive than in Quebec. I bring Quebec up, because it's interesting; if we were to open the same amount of stores per capita as Quebec has, we would need to open 11,500 more locations, just to match the per capita stores in Quebec. We don't have 11,500 convenience stores in the province of Ontario. So you can imagine that that's how far behind the province of Quebec we really, truly are.

The Convenience Industry Council of Canada said, "We look forward to working with the Ontario government to bring choice and fairness to the marketplace...."

“Convenience stores have been readying for the possibility of expanded sales for some time.... Recent testing ... shows a success rate of age testing verification of over 96%.”

Don't forget, Speaker—much like the privately owned Beer Store, but the retail stores already are in the business. They sell tobacco. They sell lottery tickets. They are trained in age-testing verification, and they're prepared to bring the product to Ontario responsibly, right across the province.

The craft brewers: “This is a great day for Ontario consumers and locally owned craft breweries,” said Scott Simmons, the president of Ontario Craft Brewers. “Ontario has some of the best craft beer in the world, but the Master Framework Agreement makes them too hard to find.”

What he means by that is the fact that if you go into a Beer Store, only 2% of the beer that's sold there comes from craft brewers. If you go to a grocery store, 10% of the beer sold there is from a craft brewer. If you go into the other stores, there is 15% of the beer—I'm sorry; 10% of the beer sold in the LCBO is from craft brewers, and if you go into a grocery store, 15% of the beer sold there is from craft brewers. So they really are looking forward to their opportunity.

Speaker, I'll end very quickly on the fact that this Bringing Choice and Fairness to the People Act provides a continuation of the Ontario Deposit Return Program. Even if and when we end the Master Framework Agreement, this Deposit Return Program will continue.

I thank you for this opportunity to speak.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Thank you very much.

Further debate?

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** I thought they were splitting their time.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** No, just rotation.

Further debate?

**Ms. Sandy Shaw:** Mr. Speaker, we are all aware in this House that the Minister of Finance likes to take every opportunity to remind us, quite regularly, of what a great business mind he has, and so I say: Good for him. That's fantastic. But you know what? He's not the only person in this chamber who has experience in business, including myself. I spent many years working in the business sector, and I can tell you absolutely that what this government is proposing makes no business sense whatsoever. It is, in fact, reckless and risky, and lots of actually successful business minds have said as much.

The minister likes to just fluff off those wise business minds as—what does he call them?—beer insiders. We're not quite clear who the minister thinks these beer insiders are. I can only imagine that he was referring to the Ontario Chamber of Commerce. Perhaps those are the beer insiders he's fluffing off. They have a lot to say about that. They sent a letter to the minister warning the government and cautioning them about the recklessness and irrationality of this bill and this plan. I'll just quote some of the

highlights from this because it really is quite a remarkable letter:

“Re: Ontario's Business Advocate Calls for Evidence-Based Plan on the Future of Alcohol Sales”—evidence, something we're not seeing much of from the government in terms of the bills they present us. They go on to say that they're writing to “express concerns about the announcement that the province intends to introduce legislation to terminate the Master Framework Agreement.” I would say that it's important to note that this legislation before us is very slim; it's two pages, and all it does is rip up the Master Framework Agreement.

It goes on to say, “Cancelling a contract sends an alarming message to the business community in Ontario and beyond which could potentially deter investment.” They go on to say that “breaking a legitimate contract is a short-sighted approach.” They recommend that this government come forward with a “comprehensive and evidence-based plan on the future of alcohol sales in the province.” They “look forward”—as we do here in the opposition—“to support evidence-based policies that strengthen Ontario's business competitiveness and economic prosperity.”

Lo and behold, Mr. Rossi's prediction came true.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** Really?

**Ms. Sandy Shaw:** Really, it came true. Imagine that.

This government—in fact, the Premier received an absolutely damning letter from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. It really is a remarkable thing; it's unprecedented. Again, allow me to quote from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. It was addressed to the Honourable Douglas Ford, and I will read most of the letter, because I could just read this and that would cover the things that I think are important to say about this bill:

“Dear Premier Ford:

“Once again, I want to thank you for taking the time to meet with us at the US chamber on your recent trip to Washington....

“I write to share with you our concern regarding the government of the province of Ontario's recent actions to introduce the Bringing Choice and Fairness to the People Act.” They go on to say, “It is essential—”

*Interjection.*

**Ms. Sandy Shaw:** I think that the member from Northumberland–Peterborough South is quite concerned about this bill, because he also understands that this is a reckless, not-very-well-thought-out bill. I would suggest that he might want to listen to what the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has to say.

They go on to say that “it is essential this process be conducted in a manner that ensures the sanctity of existing contracts be honored.

“Our strong concern is that terminating an existing contract, and doing so without compensation—something we understand is proposed in the case of” this act “—risks sending a negative signal to U.S. and other international investors about the business and investment climate in Ontario.”

The U.S. chamber goes on to say they believe that “there are few factors more critical to investment and economic growth than the legal certainty and predictability fostered by the respect for the rule of law.” I will repeat that: the respect for the rule of law.

What we have seen with this government, time and time again, is their undermining of the rule of law. We have seen them rip up contracts willy-nilly. This is a chilling signal to the business community. Business communities want predictability, they want stability, and these are two things that they are not seeing in this government.

You’ve risked more than just blowing up our reputation on the international stage, so congratulations on that. But your obsession with beer has risked a lot more things that are important to the people of Ontario. We talk about priorities, and here we are standing in this House, talking about beer yet again. It’s hard to imagine that this was a priority that any of us would imagine in this House.

The minister talked about the calls that he’s getting from his constituents about beer. I have to tell you that the calls I’m getting from my constituents are about access to health care. They’re about getting their parents into adequate, safe long-term care. They’re from young people, all kinds of people, who are concerned about the environment. Those are the calls I’m getting, and those are the priorities that we see. I don’t know what kind of beer goggles this government has on, because those are the priorities of this province.

Not only do you risk our reputation on the international stage; this is a government that’s willing to roll the dice. You have taken a risk with the kinds of penalties that we will see in this province. There are people who said this could be up to a billion dollars in costs to rip up a legally signed Master Framework Agreement. But I guess when you’re anteing up with other people’s money, when you’re using the taxpayers’ money, really, what’s the risk? What’s a billion? Let’s just roll the dice on that outcome.

I have to say, really, that it’s not just our reputational risk on the international stage, which now will need to be repaired. It’s not just that you’re risking taxpayers’ dollars willy-nilly. What you are doing is putting at risk the kinds of services that a billion dollars could pay for. We talk time and time again about health care, about people continuing to wait in hallways, about people who are continuing to not see the kinds of services they deserve. That’s what a billion dollars could pay for, but this government seems to think that that money just grows on trees, I suppose.

It’s hard to believe this government is really talking about beer over and over and over again.

*Interjection.*

**Ms. Sandy Shaw:** Exactly. It grows on trees, but you’ve cut 30 million trees, so I don’t know where you’re going to find a billion dollars.

Truly, you have lost your way. We have a Minister of Health who spent the weekend taking pictures of herself in a variety store to encourage the sale of beer. It’s bad enough that the convenience store she was posing in front of was convicted of selling cigarettes to a person under the age of 19. That’s bad enough. But I’m willing to bet that

in the province of Ontario, we have never had a Minister of Health who has been on record as pushing the people of Ontario to drink more alcohol. I mean, it’s just unprecedented. It boggles the mind that the Minister of Health thinks her job is to encourage access to alcohol, and to encourage people to drink alcohol. It’s just completely unprecedented, and it’s misguided, to say the least. It’s certainly a misplaced responsibility of the minister’s duty.

We all know that addictions are real, and they’re serious. The costs to families are tragic, and the costs to our health system, which is something that the Minister of Health should be quite aware of, are significant. So this promotion of beer and alcohol sales by the Minister of Health, at a time when we have seen a cut of \$330 million to our mental health and addictions program, including a cut of \$69 million to children’s mental health—I mean, it boggles the mind. Really, this just goes to show that this is a government that has truly, truly lost sight of why they were put here in the first place.

To the members opposite: This risks not only the government’s credibility but your individual credibility as MPPs. I cannot believe for a second that when you were elected, this is what you thought you would be falling on the sword for, for the sale of beer in convenience stores. It’s hard to believe.

Not only have you risked the government’s credibility and your individual credibility; it’s quite clear that this is an issue that is not popular with the people. You’ve also made all of us look foolish, when in fact Ontarians are not foolish. They understand what matters most. They understand that access to vital health services is paramount.

While the Minister of Finance goes on and on about how beer seems to be the most important thing, people—especially young people—want action on climate change. You can talk about beer being fair—guess what? A healthy climate: That’s something that I would call “fair.” I don’t understand if this government knows that we are facing a climate emergency. They shot down our bill to declare a climate emergency; instead, we’re talking about beer.

I have to say that what the people of Ontario want is a credible government, a stable government and a responsible government. What I have to say, sadly, is this is not what we have before us today in Ontario.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Further debate?

**Mr. Doug Downey:** I’m glad to rise in the House again and talk about this very, very important bill.

I want to talk a little bit about the 32nd President of the United States. I want to talk about what was happening when FDR was president. This brings up some names: Vanderbilt and Rockefeller. Everybody knows of John D. Rockefeller. For those who know their history, John D. Rockefeller owned Standard Oil. Standard Oil was obviously a very up-and-coming and important company, and it had product that it needed to move.

Rockefeller understood—he was a very clever man, obviously—that not only should he control the extraction; he should control the movement. So he started to buy railways. What Rockefeller did is he then was moving his

product by railway and charging different prices to other small oil companies, so there's a differential in price. What he was able to do was effectively impose a tariff on the others, because there were limited options for them to move it.

Eventually, he would then have other railways that were competing with him, but he could give a lower price to his competitors to get their business and squeeze the railway out. Then the railway is distressed, and he buys that railway and jacks the price again.

So he's able to control not only the source; he can control the supply that's held back and he can control the transportation of it. He had himself a pretty good little gig, until people got tired of it. People got tired of this monopoly that had happened.

There were anti-monopolists around who opposed the railway's power and argued—not that the monopolies originated not as a result of investment strategies; their objection was that their benefit came from special privileges granted by the government, because the government enabled these monopolies. They enabled Rockefeller to be able to do this.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** It was Theodore, not FDR.

**Mr. Doug Downey:** No, FDR was president later.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** You said FDR—

**Mr. Doug Downey:** I'm going to talk about FDR in a minute. I'm just throwing out—

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Doug Downey:** Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, they were able to control the source, the transport and supply of a product, and they could set the price they wanted.

Fast forward then to FDR. FDR was known as “the Trust Buster.” He took a run at the railways and he stepped in. For the anti-monopolists, their objection was not that they were an efficient, smart business model; their objection was that they got special benefits from the government, and that's how they got there.

There's a direct parallel with what's happening with alcohol in this province, with beer. The railway companies made decisions not on innovation, but on the effect on their bottom line. They made decisions based on the bottom line, not societal values, not on other competitors. That's what we have with the Beer Store. They control the production of their product, they control the delivery of the product, they control the sale of the product and they control their competitors' access to the market. They control access for their competitors to the market.

1620

Now, it's really hard for me to twist around and find the NDP supporting a monopoly in this province. You really have to wonder why they are so opposed—not just the NDP, but the Beer Store itself—to us opening up their market to more stores, more points of sale. It doesn't make any sense. It doesn't make any sense why we wouldn't want the average person to be able to have more convenience and more fairness. Many people think that the Beer Store is owned by the government and is some sort of government monopoly, but it is not. It is a private monopoly. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, it's—

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Order.

**Mr. Doug Downey:** Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I should correct my record. I was listening to the heckles, but I was thinking through my thoughts and Theodore Roosevelt, of course, was the “Trust Buster.”

I just want to say that monopolies that are aided by governments are worse than monopolies on their own. What we saw with the previous Liberal government is they created a situation where they enabled the monopoly; they gave them a sweetheart deal to be able to do what they're doing. That's why they don't want access to more customers and that's why they don't want access to more locations, because it's just such a sweetheart deal, they don't want to let it go.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Further debate?

**Mr. John Vanthof:** An interesting debate this afternoon about—what's this bill called?—bringing choice and fairness. Basically, it's about bringing beer to corner stores. The way I see this going down is, okay, during the campaign, quick and easy promise: more access to beer. It seemed like an easy thing to do.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. John Vanthof:** Yes, they made lots of promises. They win the election and, “Oh, we're going to put beer in corner stores. Oh, there's a contract.”

There's a contract. Who would think that Conservatives, who are supposed to be businesspeople, who are supposed to respect something called a contract—because a contract is also finite. So you know what? They could just let this contract lapse, right? No penalties involved. But that would take a few years. They can't do that, right?

This is third reading of legislation to not only break the contract, but it says that they can't be held accountable for breaking that contract. These are supposed to be businesspeople.

Now, the Minister of Finance, in his speech today, didn't talk much about breaking the contract or about the penalties. His defence was, well, when he was elected, he didn't even know the Beer Store was a private company. He didn't know. There's lots of things I don't know. But I didn't know that because it's a private company, it's okay to break contracts. I didn't know the Conservatives thought that you could just decide one day to break a contract, and a major contract that involves international companies. Who would have thought?

Oh, and another thing the Minister of Finance used, that it's a “near-monopoly.” Well, there's a reason to break a contract: It's a near-monopoly. There are all kinds of other near-monopolies. I think they're going to enter into private-public partnerships regarding building subways, which are all near-monopolies. I'm sure if the next government—

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Can I remind the member to address the Speaker, please, as opposed to other members in the chamber.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** Yes, Speaker. Thank you, Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Thank you. Just a gentle reminder.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** I am sure, Speaker, if the next government came and decided that they were going to break a contract signed by this government regarding private partnerships building subways, the Conservatives—at that time opposition—would go apoplectic, and rightfully so. Who would have thought that the NDP is the one actually defending contract law in this province and defending business in this province? Because the one thing you know is, on a farm, when you shake your hand, that's a deal, and you don't break the deal. When you are a duly elected government and you sign that, you know, for the length of that contract, you feel fairly safe with duly elected governments.

I can assure you, Speaker, that future business partners of this government are not going to feel that safety, because this government seems to have no problem not only breaking the contract but attempting to protect itself from penalties. I highly doubt that that is going to stand up in international courts of law.

This government is making it worse for themselves, because if they had allowed this parliamentary system to work the way it should work, and allowed this to be fully debated, and actually allowed it to go to committee, where experts could have laid out, much more specifically than we are allowed to in this mere 20 minutes, exactly what the pitfalls were, then the government could have made remedies based on those expert opinions, and it probably would have had a better argument in an international court of law than it's going to have now. Quite frankly, it doesn't have an argument now. This government, this Conservative supposed-to-be-open-for-business, supposed-to-understand-business government, is going to risk future business dealings internationally.

**Hon. Sylvia Jones:** We also understand bad contracts.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** The Solicitor General heckled at me that they also understand bad contracts. There is no argument regarding whether the contract is bad or good. The argument is about whether this government stands by the word of a duly elected government, because if they don't, then no one is going to trust future deals from them, either. That's the issue. It's not about whether the contract is good or bad. It's whether this government has the honour to stand by that contract. The fact that they are trying to get out of legal prosecution with this legislation shows that they don't have any honour at all. That's one thing that business people respect, and that's one thing that business people must be incredibly disappointed by with this Tory government.

I am equally disappointed, but I'm even more perplexed, truly perplexed, because it's not that they don't have the inner knowledge. I've dealt with many of the ministers on the other side. The Minister of Finance—I know he knows this. I know that in his personal life, he wouldn't do this—I'd hope he wouldn't. Why isn't he warning the Premier?

The President of the Treasury Board has international experience on money markets, on finances. He has advised international companies; I'm sure of it. I had respect for his financial knowledge. Why is the President of the

Treasury Board not warning the Premier? Why is he not warning the Premier, or—the third, even more scary question—why is the Premier not listening to the President of the Treasury Board?

They're very perplexing questions, because a lot of Conservatives, and people who voted Conservative, expected a government that would be responsible with their finances. This government claims to be, but the fact that they're disregarding the basic tenets of contracts—it's like, we hear a lot about hockey and basketball from this government. You can't change the rules in the middle of the tournament, because if you try, no one will ever trust those tournament organizers again. That's what this government is doing. It's changing the rules to suit themselves. But it's trying, as a province, to change rules in an international tournament, and that is going to hurt us all.

1630

That is why this government—it still has a chance to pull this legislation. I know it's not going to. We all know it's not going to. I can't understand. I don't expect the Premier to listen to me, because he has the President of the Treasury Board, someone whose financial knowledge I truly respect. He's obviously not listening to him, or the President of the Treasury Board isn't telling the Premier, or quite frankly, the President of the Treasury Board is a sheep. And I didn't think that. Or the Minister of Finance is a sheep; I didn't think that either. But if this goes ahead, they are sheep, and unfortunately, we're all going to the slaughter along with those sheep. That is a huge issue.

Business confidence: I can assure you that the NDP understands that you have to honour contracts, and understands that once a contract is signed by a duly elected government, you honour it and you go forward, and if you don't like the contract, you negotiate a better one when that one is done. That's how business is done.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Further debate?

**Mr. John Fraser:** It's always a pleasure and hard to follow the member from Timiskaming–Cochrane. I would like to add to his remarks by saying they are trying to pull the wool over Ontarians' eyes. I've been trying—

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** They're trying to shear the sheep.

**Mr. John Fraser:** Something like that, yeah. We're not going any farther.

**Ms. Sandy Shaw:** It's baaaad.

**Mr. John Fraser:** Thank you.

What is this obsession with booze? I don't understand. We go back to the fall economic statement, and the priority is tailgating and MMA fighting—in the fall economic statement, tailgating. Then we have a budget that mentions booze I think 50 times; women, four. It's totally out of whack, and the budget is all about booze. And then, now we have the penultimate—I wanted to use that word today—action by this government, which is beer and wine in corner stores.

Last weekend, all the MPPs fanned out across the province because they had to post on social media to talk about beer and wine in corner stores. That was the most important thing for them to do that weekend. And if they got the owner of the store, they got bonus points.

You know what I really would have preferred last weekend? If all the Conservative MPPs went out and said, “You know that standard of four hours of care in long-term care that we agreed to, that was in last year’s budget and we all said was important, that we didn’t actually throw out the window in the last budget”—and they were fighting for that—or they went out and talked to people about smaller class sizes or spent time with parents of children with autism and listened to them and heard their concerns.

There were a lot better things to do last weekend, and that’s my point: The priorities are out of whack; they’re not in line with Ontarians’ priorities. We have a special adviser for alcohol, and we fired the child advocate. If that says anything about what this government has been about in the last year, those two sentences do. It’s out of line with Ontarians’ priorities.

We have six years left on this deal, and whether you like it or not, it’s six years after 100 years of incremental change in alcohol laws in Ontario. Why not plan your way out? It’s incredible to me. There are so many things that are more important to Ontarians that need to be worked on, and this government is spending its time hawking beer and wine in corner stores. I’m not saying that’s a bad thing. I’m just saying, on a list of 100 priorities, this is 99.

And the people are sending this government a message. It’s not that the Premier is personally unpopular; I don’t think that. I think that the message they’re sending to them is, “You know what? Your priorities are not the same as mine. My priority is my kid’s school. I want to make sure that my mom or dad, when they’re in long-term care, are going to get the kind of care they need; that my hospitals are there; that there’s public transit; that I take care of environment; that we take care of those people who are vulnerable and need our help. Those are priorities. Beer and wine in corner stores? Ninety-nine.” And that’s not a reference to “99 bottles of beer on the wall.” But we could go there; we have a little bit of time. The government needs to get its priorities straight.

The minister will not say how much money it’s going to cost to get out of this contract. Hundreds of millions of dollars? He won’t say. The only thing the minister says is, “Fitch, Fitch.” He doesn’t work for Fitch.

The President of the Treasury Board is downstairs right now attacking bargaining rights and telling a million employees out of seven million employees in this province that they have to accept 1%. But they can spend hundreds of millions of dollars to make sure that you can go to your corner store to buy beer, when that’s going to happen in six years if they want it to happen; that they can start right now.

And here’s the kicker. This is the kicker: Tens of thousands of business people, through the Ontario Chamber of Commerce, said, “Don’t do this. It’s wrong.” The Ontario Chamber of Commerce, the Conservative Party’s natural constituency, is saying, “Don’t do this.” On top of that, today we hear the American chamber of commerce, our biggest trading partner, representing way more businesses, is saying, “This is not a good idea.” Does the minister not

realize that they’re our biggest trading partner, that there’s reputational risk?

What the government is doing is crazy. It’s unnecessary. There are way more important things for us to be dealing with in this chamber than beer and wine in corner stores and the rush we’re in to get it. I thank you for your time, Mr. Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Further debate?

**Mr. Mike Schreiner:** I rise to speak on Bill 115, the beer bill. But I don’t really want to talk about beer right now. What I want to talk about is respect for the rule of law and responsible government. When I was elected as Ontario’s first Green MPP, I thought I would be the big disruptor at Queen’s Park. But now I feel like I’m the person talking about responsible government and the rule of law, because that’s exactly what Bill 115 undermines.

It says—and I’m a small business owner—that a contract with the government of Ontario is not worth the paper it’s written on. I can’t tell you how many business deals I did with a handshake or just even my word over the phone. We didn’t even need a contract. My dad did million-dollar grain deals on our farm with his word, because his word was his honour. He didn’t need a contract. Now, what we’re saying to people around the world is that a contract in Ontario is not worth the paper it’s written on.

I just want to quote from the Ontario Chamber of Commerce: “Cancelling a contract sends an alarming message to the business community in Ontario and beyond which could potentially deter investment.”

Now, today, the US Chamber of Commerce—Neil Herrington, the chamber’s senior vice-president—wrote, “It is essential this process be conducted in a manner that ensures the sanctity of existing contracts be honoured.

“Our strong concern is that terminating an existing contract, and doing so without compensation ... risks sending a negative signal to US and other international investors about the business and investment climate in Ontario.”

Speaker, think about this for a second. That’s from our largest trading partner, a country that just lifted steel and aluminum tariffs a couple of days ago, a country that we’re trying to renegotiate a trade deal with. It’s a bit precarious right now on whether or not that’s actually going to happen, but it’s going to be essential for Ontario’s economy. We have a government ripping up contracts and the largest business organization in the United States sending letters questioning whether Ontario is a safe place to do business, whether we can still attract business investment to this province. So the Premier can put up all the signs he wants, he can say we’re open for business all he wants, but I guarantee you, Speaker, that actions speak louder than words. And the actions of this government with this bill send the wrong signal.

1640

We’ve already seen how irresponsible and reckless actions cost the people of Ontario. The Premier interfered

in the workings of Hydro One. I would argue that the previous government's sell-off of Hydro One was a horrible decision, and then Hydro One made an even worse decision by doing a deal with Avista. But then when the Premier interfered with the operations of Hydro One, the Avista deal was cancelled by US courts, and it has cost the people of Ontario well over \$100 million. How fiscally irresponsible is that? Now we have people warning us that because of the contractual risk associated with Bill 115, businesses may start asking and demanding from the province of Ontario sweetheart premiums and contracts with this government, because they can't trust the government.

What kind of signal is that sending, Speaker? Why are we exposing the people of Ontario to legal, financial and reputational risk, all over beer? Like, beer—it's not as if you can't get beer in the province. I'm assuming most of us are going to watch the Raptors' game tonight. Some of us might even have a beer while we watch the game. I have a feeling you're not going to have a problem finding one somewhere.

But over the weekend, I checked Twitter, and it appeared that we had a beer crisis in Ontario. I was worried for a second, Speaker; I was worried that the beer crisis had hit. It seemed like the entire government was out dealing with this crisis.

Well, I wish the government would take some time to speak to the hundreds of thousands of young people marching every Friday to talk about the climate crisis. I wish they would take some time to meet with front-line health care workers about the hallway medicine crisis. I wish they would talk with the young person who pulled me aside the other day, talking about how he had to wait 18 months to get mental health supports, even though he was on suicide watch. Or maybe they could take some time to meet with the students who came to Queen's Park this afternoon from Guelph, students part of the Cadence program, an alternative high school program for at-risk youth, a program that these recent graduates said if it wasn't in place, they likely wouldn't have graduated from high school. And it's now on the chopping block because of the increase in class sizes.

There are many, many crises that this government could have spent some time talking to people about, tweeting about and dealing with over the weekend. But instead, it was about beer. So let's look at what their special adviser on alcohol sales had to say. I want to remind members opposite and the people watching at home that the report from this adviser was just delivered on May 24—so that was, what, about 10 days ago? Certainly less than two weeks ago.

I want to quote the first three recommendations from their adviser, Ken Hughes. He says:

“(1) Do everything possible under the Master Framework Agreement to authorize additional alcohol retail outlets.

“(2) Consider other available options within its powers that would provide ways to expand retail sales should negotiations ... prove unsuccessful.

“(3) Take a phased approach toward authorizing new retailers and beverage alcohol products available for sale.”

None of that says, “Rip up a contract.” None of it says that we have a crisis. Yet in less than two weeks, they've essentially ignored the recommendations of their hand-picked adviser and just ripped up the contract and moved full steam ahead. I ask them why. Is it really worth it?

Do you know what? It might be a bad deal, and I personally am not opposed to expanding beer sales. As a matter of fact, I ran a campaign a few years ago, “Liberate local beer,” and received a cease-and-desist letter from Brewers Retail, telling me to not use some of the language that some of the members opposite used today in the debate. It's a good thing they were in the chamber and said it, because I was out of the chamber when I said it.

But the implications of what the government is doing go far beyond beer, and so I want to close by asking my colleagues from across the aisle: You were elected with a promise to expand beer sales, but you weren't elected to do it in a way that is reckless and irresponsible. You weren't elected to do it in a way that undermines the rule of law. You weren't elected to do it in a way that threatens business investment in this province, that threatens our trading relationships with our largest trading partners.

Why don't we go about this in a responsible way? I think you have an opportunity to say, “Do you know what? We are going to listen to our adviser. We're going to take the time to negotiate, and if we can't negotiate our way out of this deal, then we'll start putting in place the building blocks that we need to, to deal with this over six years.”

One of those building blocks—and I want to close on this. The bottle return program for Brewers Retail is one of the most successful environmental programs in the province. One of the members opposite actually just introduced a bill today about litter day. Well, one of the best ways we can reduce litter in this province is to expand the bottle return program, not bring forward legislation that threatens the bottle return program. If you spent the extra few years negotiating it, maybe we could have a pathway to ensuring that whatever new framework is in place actually has a solid bottle return program.

I encourage the members opposite to reconsider their position on this bill, say no today and protect the rule of law.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Further debate?

Pursuant to the order of the House dated June 4, 2019, I am now required to put the question.

Mr. Fedeli has moved third reading of Bill 115, An Act to amend the Liquor Control Act with respect to the termination of a specified agreement. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? I heard a no.

All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.”

All those opposed to the motion will please say “nay.”

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Call in the members. There will be a 20-minute bell.

*Interjection.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** I have a deferral slip:

“Pursuant to standing order 28(h), I respectfully request that the third reading vote on Bill 115, An Act to amend the Liquor Control Act with respect to the termination of a specified agreement, be deferred until deferred votes on June 6, 2019.” It’s signed by Mr. Coe, the chief government whip.

*Third reading vote deferred.*

MORE HOMES, MORE CHOICE  
ACT, 2019

LOI DE 2019 POUR PLUS DE LOGEMENTS  
ET PLUS DE CHOIX

Resuming the debate adjourned on June 5, 2019, on the motion for third reading of the following bill:

Bill 108, An Act to amend various statutes with respect to housing, other development and various other matters / Projet de loi 108, Loi modifiant diverses lois en ce qui concerne le logement, les autres aménagements et d’autres questions.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Further debate? I recognize the member from Timiskaming—no, from Timmins.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** I really like the member from Timiskaming; we’re good friends. But I am the member from Timmins.

I only have a couple of minutes, so I just want to put on the record that with this particular bill, what is interesting is that the Conservative government is following the same pattern and the same strategy as the former Wynne government. That is, every time they introduce a bill, they use an interesting title to try to describe the bill in such a way that exactly the opposite of what the bill does is what’s in the title.

1650

If you remember when the government under Kathleen Wynne was there, and the previous Liberals under Mr. McGuinty, they did it all the time. They would bring in a bill where you wanted to, let’s say, have blue skies, and the sky was blue and they wanted to do something with blue skies. They’d bring in a bill and they’d say, “A bill in order to do something contrary,” and they would put it in the title and make it look as if they were doing something that actually the bill wasn’t doing.

This is the same thing, because what is this going to do to deal with the real problem of housing we’ve got across Ontario? All of our constituencies are in the same spot. There are not enough units out there, especially for those people at the lower end of the income scale: seniors, people on ODSP, people on low-wage income. It is really, really difficult to be able to get a place to stay. How many people in our province are surviving on strictly an old-age pension and, if they’re lucky, a bit of Canada pension?

The average income for seniors is somewhere around \$1,700 a month, if you’re lucky; if you’re a widow, it might even be less than that. So you’re having to pay your rent, and this bill will do nothing in order to increase the housing stock that is going to be made for affordable

housing. If anything, it’s going to maybe increase housing stock in the higher-price range of condominiums in places like Toronto and other cities and houses that are worth \$1 million or \$800,000. It will do something for that, because this is a developer’s dream. They’re doing things that municipalities are quite upset about, because they’re making changes to how the planning system works within municipalities and, as they say, riding roughshod over what municipalities are able to do now when it comes to the planning in their own communities.

So the bill purports to do one thing in the title, Mr. Speaker, but it does quite the opposite when it comes to what is going to be the final outcome.

One of the most proud moments I had in government, from 1990 to 1995, is that the NDP government built more not-for-profit housing across this province than any other government in the history of this province. If it wasn’t for that not-for-profit housing that was built, communities from Whitby to Timmins to Kenora to Cornwall would not have the not-for-profit housing stock that we currently have. What we need to do is develop real housing policies that encourage developers to build houses for people at the lower-income scale, but also allow not-for-profit housing to be able to once again do what it has to do best.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Further debate? Further debate?

Pursuant to the order of the House dated May 28, 2019, I am now required to put the question.

Mr. Clark has moved third reading of Bill 108, An Act to amend various statutes with respect to housing, other development and various other matters. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? I heard a no.

All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.”

All those opposed to the motion will please say “nay.”

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Call in the members. This will be a 20-minute bell.

I’ve just been handed a deferral slip: “Pursuant to standing order 28(h), I respectfully request that the third reading vote on Bill 108, An Act to amend various statutes with respect to housing, other development and various other matters, be deferred until deferred votes on June 6, 2019.”

This was signed by the chief government whip, Mr. Coe.

*Third reading vote deferred.*

ONTARIO SOCIETY  
FOR THE PREVENTION  
OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS  
AMENDMENT ACT  
(INTERIM PERIOD), 2019

LOI DE 2019 MODIFIANT LA LOI  
SUR LA SOCIÉTÉ DE PROTECTION  
DES ANIMAUX DE L'ONTARIO  
(PÉRIODE INTERMÉDIAIRE)

Ms. Jones moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 117, An Act to amend the Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act / Projet de loi 117,

Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société de protection des animaux de l'Ontario.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Back to the Solicitor General.

**Hon. Sylvia Jones:** I'm proud to begin third and final reading of Bill 117, our government's proposed amendments to the Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act. To be clear, if the OSPCA had acted in good faith and worked collaboratively with our government, we would not have had to bring forward Bill 117—including the Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals abandoning its century-long role of enforcement of animal welfare laws in Ontario.

Despite the court's decision, OSPCA has decided to shirk their obligations to protect animals in Ontario. Our government is signalling that the province will greet the new year with a new animal welfare enforcement model that is stronger, more transparent and more accountable than the model we leave behind.

The OSPCA rejected our repeated requests that they continue their valued role as enforcers of animal welfare laws until the new model was in place. They have even refused to have a chief inspector in place, thereby contravening a portion of their own act. But animal protection must not exist in the vacuum created by the OSPCA's unfortunate decision to withdraw from the enforcement of animal welfare laws by the end of this month.

If our proposed amendments are passed by the House, today will have turned out to be a good day for animal protection. Today we will have filled a pending gap in enforcing animal protection laws in Ontario, and with the consultation framework we have in place, with the support of the people, we are well along the path to creating that new enforcement model.

Let's talk about the proposed amendments first. I'm asking the House to pass legislation that will empower humane societies to seamlessly pick up where the OSPCA will soon leave off. Under the current OSPCA Act, only the OSPCA or the chief inspector can appoint animal welfare inspectors and the chief inspector must be an employee of the OSPCA. But the OSPCA is getting out of the enforcement business and suggests they won't appoint a chief inspector. Our proposed bill corrects this situation. If passed, the Solicitor General would be enabled to appoint a chief inspector who would no longer have to be an employee of the OSPCA. The chief inspector would be empowered to appoint animal welfare inspectors. The Solicitor General would also be able to prescribe a class of persons who may exercise the powers of inspector.

I want to stress to the House that these measures are temporary and are intended to get the province through the transition period from when the OSPCA withdraws from enforcement services and the introduction of our new animal protection enforcement model.

Ontario's humane societies are ready to do the job. They have shared their desire with our ministry and publicly.

From Adrienne McBride, executive director of the Guelph Humane Society: "The Guelph Humane Society is

one of the affiliated humane societies that has willingly stepped forward to offer our continued assistance as the province works towards a new, permanent enforcement model ... Bill 117, which, if passed, would enable our organization to continue the enforcement work it is already doing to protect animals."

From the Hamilton/Burlington Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals: "The Hamilton/Burlington SPCA is ready to continue serving [our] community through animal protection, enforcement and investigation services as the province works toward a new, permanent enforcement model."

From Kathrin Delutis, executive director of the Humane Society of Kitchener Waterloo and Stratford Perth: "The Humane Society of Kitchener Waterloo and Stratford Perth is one of the affiliated humane societies that has stepped forward to offer our continued assistance ... Our board of directors has been very clear that we want to continue to provide animal protection in our communities."

From Humane Canada: "Humane societies are the only specialized force in the country dedicated solely to animal protection and we look forward to working with the government of Ontario throughout this consultation to ensure an enforcement role for local humane societies ensuring protection for our animals."

Humane societies are also supportive of our government's leadership and determination to take the steps needed to make this transition as smooth as possible. Our proposed amendments, if passed, will allow these organizations to continue the important enforcement work that we've already begun doing for many years and allow other willing partners.

My excellent parliamentary assistant, the member from Brampton South, will now share additional details of the proposed interim legislation.

1700

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Further debate?

**Mr. Kevin Yarde:** Once again, it's a pleasure to rise in this House to speak to third reading of Bill 117. Earlier this week, a member from the opposite side stated, "We do have a bit of an emergency in the province of Ontario right now in regard to the OSPCA and what's going on there."

Well, members from the opposite side stated that this is an issue in dire need of our attention and that something needs to be done to address it as soon as possible. The thing is, Mr. Speaker, we on this side 100% agree with that. We agree that we need to keep animals safe and healthy, so we need a new system that will be comprehensive, robust and accountable and, most importantly, that will serve and protect the animals that we all appreciate and adore. We also agree with them that this is something that we cannot wait on, but where we stand differently from them is on how we go about rectifying the issue. If the government really cares about animals and animal welfare as much as they claim they do, then why did they wait so long to address this issue?

For months, we have known about this issue. I have referenced the past debates on this bill. We need change,

and everyone knew that. For some time now, academic studies have called for this change. The organization that has been tasked with enforcement, the OSPCA, also believes that change is needed as well. An Ontario Superior Court judge, in January, told this government that things need to change, yet this government is pushing forward a bill in the last week before the House rises. There has been little sign that this government has been prepared to meaningfully act on this issue for some time, even though the alarm bells have been going off.

Instead of focusing on the clear direction from the court's decision and the very unified calls for transformation of the animal welfare enforcement system, this government has apparently seen fit instead to focus on public mudslinging. How is that a good use of time, Mr. Speaker? How is that a good use of resources or of the public's need to be able to trust that this government is working on their behalf or on behalf of animals in this province who cannot advocate for themselves?

In fact, after months of neglect on this issue, the government decided to ram through this bill and time-allocate it to shut out any debate and public consultation of this bill. By limiting debate, scrutiny and committee work on this bill, this government is sending a wrong message to the activists, academics, animal lovers and citizens of Ontario.

There could have been time, and there should have been time, to consider and debate and consult on matters of public interest. It is your job to listen to those people and let the debate play out in this House, so you are aware of how people are reacting to your bill and what changes they want to see, but this is not going to happen.

We expect better from the government. They need help from their government, and we need help from them, but it looks like they are not going to help us in terms of legislating this OSPCA bill.

The government claims that this is their temporary or interim stopgap solution to this problem and how it is necessary to ensure animal welfare policing in this province. In fact, Mr. Speaker, as I've referenced before, this temporary—we're told—legislative measure may in fact prove worse than the status quo if it is not accompanied with a serious withdrawal, a complete withdrawal away from relying on private charitable delivery of animal welfare enforcement. That's what we need, Mr. Speaker. As I mentioned before, the public demands it and the courts have also decreed it.

It's true there are considerable criticisms of how animal welfare has been enforced and by whom in this province. It is also true that the province only provides about \$5 million historically towards this enforcement. That's \$5 million to enforce the OSPCA Act across the entire province. That doesn't seem like enough. My question to the government: Will it now be less? Does this government plan to allocate more? What is the plan? So far, we don't know. What we do know is that the organization that has provided enforcement for 100 years will no longer, and so it is the government's full responsibility to make sure that this enforcement does take place, so we don't have another Stouffville, so we don't have instances where

animals are left neglected and abused, and where we do, that the appropriate charges can be laid and even can be offered.

By any measure, those who have been enforcing the act are minimally equipped to enforce the act, and sometimes work under dangerous and hostile environments to fulfill their duties as law enforcers. That has been the case and situation in animal welfare and protection in this province for a very, very long time. This government knew for months that they could no longer continue with that arrangement and change was needed, yet they stood silent on the issue for months.

As I've referenced before, Mr. Speaker, something that everyone seems to agree on here and that a court has ruled on is that it is this government's responsibility to provide transparent, accountable, properly resourced and publicly transparent animal welfare law enforcement in the province. I will say it again: To my surprise, there was little movement from the government on that end. They did not seem to prioritize animal welfare until the 11th hour, until now—

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Kevin Yarde:** Mainly on beer, exactly.

With this legislation now, there are more questions than there are answers. As we stated earlier, it's not even clear that this government intends to truly fulfill their responsibility to provide animal welfare enforcement. The regulation in place that would allow some of the humane society affiliates to continue with status quo enforcement, along with this legislation, could simply stand in place as the animal welfare regime in this province without further vigilance by the public and the official opposition.

Where was the urgency last fall, when the OSPCA informed this government they would no longer be providing enforcement or inspection of livestock and horses? There is nothing here that commits you to actually train, empower and equip public law enforcement officials to provide this enforcement. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this government is sincere when the minister says that a new act will be in place in six months. That's what she said. That will be your year since the court ruled that this was your responsibility, so when will the enforcement regime be in place? A year, two, or after that? We still don't know, Mr. Speaker.

New Democrats agree: We need a robust, publicly accountable animal welfare enforcement system in the province, not another back-of-the-napkin solution and not more pushing the ball down the road.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Further debate?

**Mr. Mike Schreiner:** It's a pleasure to rise to speak on Bill 117, because I believe strongly in animal welfare. I have long advocated for stronger animal welfare rules for animals in human care and animals in our food system. It's important for animals all across Ontario that they are not left vulnerable to abuse.

While I appreciate the government bringing this bill forward as an interim solution, I want to remind them that

it's not a permanent solution. As Gandhi said, the greatness of a nation can be judged by the way its animals are treated.

Earlier this year, Speaker, I was contacted by hundreds of constituents concerned that the OSPCA decision to stop investigation and enforcement activities would create a gap that puts animals at risk. One of my constituents, Kelly, wrote:

"We need strong protection for animals, provided by those, like the Guelph Humane Society OSPCA agents, who have specialized knowledge on animal laws and are ... well-connected with the health, social services and policing agencies within the community they serve...."

"Animals in Guelph and Wellington county need our officers' expertise while a long-term plan is being developed."

In March, on behalf of my constituents, I asked the government about this issue, and it was clear from their response that they really hadn't given it the thought it was due. We then asked the government to create a transition plan that would allow people like Guelph Humane Society agents and other humane society agents to be able to continue the good work that they're already doing in our province while a long-term plan was developed. And we asked the government to immediately start consultations for a permanent plan to bring investigation and enforcement of animal cruelty laws under public jurisdiction.

**1710**

Speaker, I'm going to do something that doesn't happen often on the opposition benches: I'll actually compliment the government for listening to what we asked for, or at least what I asked for, in terms of a transition plan. Bill 117 largely does that. In the words of the Guelph Humane Society: "This temporary legislative measure will keep animals safe in the interim, while a more robust, transparent and accountable animal protection system can be developed for Ontario."

So, as the government looks for a long-term plan—and I remind the government that they have six months to deliver that long-term plan—I ask the members opposite and the Solicitor General to consult, and incorporate the valuable insight from organizations like the Guelph Humane Society and others who, from their direct experience in the enforcement of animal cruelty laws, can provide direction, can provide guidance and can provide information on best practices.

I also encourage the government to be transparent in who is being consulted, and transparent on the timelines for proposing a new system.

We need to use this opportunity that an interim solution provides for Ontario to lead the way on a national level to create the most effective system for upholding animal welfare laws in Canada. Other jurisdictions across the country right now are moving enforcement from the private sphere to the public sphere, and looking for models for how to do it well. Ontario can set the tone for how to do this transition, if we do it properly. We must bring investigation and enforcement of animal cruelty laws under public jurisdiction.

The lack of funding for animal protection must be addressed. This is a huge issue, Speaker. Whoever is in charge of enforcement responsibilities needs money, needs training and needs the proper structure to do this job right.

I want to give you one example. In Edmonton, the city quadrupled the budget for animal protection when they recently assumed public responsibility for it, moving from spending \$200,000 a year to \$800,000 a year. I put into comparison, as the member just spoke to recently, that in Ontario we spend about \$5 million. If you compare the two, you can see they're not on the same level. We need to fix this as well as fix the system.

While I want to thank the government for listening to the recommendations that I put forward and that Guelph Humane Society and other humane societies put forward for an interim solution, I challenge them—I challenge the government, Speaker—to bring forward a robust system under public jurisdiction, to consult, to be transparent and to deliver a system that protects animals and the people who care for them.

I encourage members to vote for this bill, but I encourage them, in voting for this bill, to demand that the government act to fix the system permanently.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Further debate?

**Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria:** I just want to start this conversation off by thanking the ministry staff for all the hard work that has gone into this piece of legislation, for meeting with so many stakeholders across this province and speaking to so many individuals to make sure that we really do get this right in the interim.

I especially want to give a big thank you to my executive assistant, Jenna Bendayan, who has been working day and night on this project. I also want to thank the Solicitor General for her leadership on this. Dating back to January, our ministry has been working hard on this.

I also want to appreciate the comments from the member from Guelph, who added some very constructive dialogue to the debate, recognizing that some of the humane societies in his region have also recognized the great work that we are doing. We would look forward to working with all societies across this province, just like we have been in the past couple of months, meeting with—I had a chance to go up to the member from Simcoe North's riding, where we met with a diverse group of stakeholders. I went up to the riding of Sarnia-Lambton with my colleague, where we also had a good, diverse group of stakeholders from across the province. It's with their input and with input from thousands across this province that we were able to come up with this interim solution, and it's something that we look forward to working towards.

The interim amendments to the OSPCA Act will tap into the depth of experience of animal welfare organizations across the province and leverage the willing capacity in the province without having to rely on the co-operation of the OSPCA, which they have made perfectly clear that they have no interest in providing. They set the stage for a new permanent animal protection enforcement model that

will secure Ontario's place as a leader in animal protection.

Animal welfare is complex. Its stakeholders range from veterinarians to pet owners, animal advocacy groups, livestock and dairy farmers. The enforcement of animal welfare law is also complex. Willingly abusing an animal can be a sign of other crimes and criminal activities. As laypersons, we recognize animal abuse when we see it. A skilled and knowledgeable inspector picks up the hints of when an animal is being neglected or abused, and when and to what extent we involve the police. These are all things we are looking at when putting together the pieces that will result in a new animal welfare enforcement model.

Ontarians love our animals and are disgusted by animal abuse. I get asked a lot, "What will this model look like? How will it work and how will it be supportive?" I tell them what I'm telling to this House: You don't replace 100 years of animal welfare law enforcement with an overnight solution. We are taking the time, and the justice has given us a time frame, to get it right. Pet owners, animal welfare organizations and animal advocates would expect no less. I consider our government fortunate that we have their knowledge, lived experiences and passion for animals to tap into.

On April 8 of this year, the ministry began surveying municipalities, local service boards, municipal police services, First Nations police services and the OPP. They ended on April 24, and the results are being analyzed carefully. Additional consultations are ongoing. We are also consulting the agriculture industry, veterinary organizations, advocacy stakeholders and other animal welfare organizations. In addition, we are studying enforcement models in other jurisdictions to see what works and what doesn't, and we are hearing from the people. I am truly moved by the volume and quality of the responses we have received from our online survey. We received 6,000 responses in the first three days. As of this morning, we are up to over 13,000 submissions.

Our government was clear from the outset: We want to hear from the public before finalizing a modern animal welfare law enforcement model, and this response rate tells us that the public wants to be heard. The online survey closes tomorrow at midnight. I encourage everybody who has not yet done so to have their say by going online and participating. I assure everyone who answers the survey that your opinions do count and will help shape what this new enforcement model will look like.

1720

It would be irresponsible to jump out ahead of all this consultation by sketching out a new model before the consultation phase is complete. Indeed, these consultations are further highlighting the complexity of the issues that the new model must respond to, which is why our government today is asking the House to focus on transition. After careful consideration and in preliminary consultation with others, it has determined that these amendments are the best options to protect animals throughout this period.

Our proposed Bill 117 removes the potential harm from the OSPCA's refusal to appoint a chief inspector, which is a centrepiece of the current OSPCA Act. In doing so, it hands the province greater flexibility to enable local humane societies and prescribed enforcement entities the ability to delivery enforcement of animal welfare laws.

Humane societies, animal welfare organizations and others are anxious to offer their continued assistance as the government works towards a new, permanent enforcement model. Through careful deliberations, leadership and a commitment to keep animals protected, our government has presented legislative pieces to enable them to do just that.

Bill 117 is the best approach for a seamless transition from when the OSPCA withdraws from enforcement to the implementation of the new animal welfare law enforcement model. I call on all members of the House to pass this important piece of legislation.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Further debate? Further debate?

Pursuant to the order of the House dated June 4, 2019, I am now required to put the question.

Ms. Jones has moved third reading of Bill 117, An Act to amend the Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Be it resolved that the bill do now pass and be entitled as in the motion.

*Third reading agreed to.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Orders of the day.

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

**Mr. Doug Downey:** I seek unanimous consent to put forward a motion without notice regarding the waiver of notice for ballot item number 79 on the order of private members' public business.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** Just on a point of order.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** I recognize the member from Timmins.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** I'm aware of what the motion is about, and we're going to be supportive, but I'd ask that you give those in writing before you actually table them in the future.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Mr. Downey is seeking unanimous consent to put forward a motion without notice regarding the waiver of notice for ballot item number 79 on the order of private members' public business. Agreed? Agreed.

Back to the member.

**Mr. Doug Downey:** I move that the notice for ballot item number 79 standing in the name of Mr. Gravelle be waived.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Mr. Downey has moved that the notice for ballot item 79 standing in the name of Mr. Gravelle be waived. Agreed? Carried.

*Motion agreed to.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Back to Mr. Downey one more time.

**Mr. Doug Downey:** I'll give one of these to the page for the House leader, please.

#### ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

**Mr. Doug Downey:** I seek unanimous consent to put forward a motion without notice regarding the adjournment debate.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Mr. Downey has put forward a motion seeking unanimous consent regarding adjournment debate. Agreed? Agreed.

**Mr. Doug Downey:** I move that, notwithstanding standing order 38(b), today's adjournment debate take place before 6 p.m., and that at the conclusion of the adjournment debate, the Speaker shall adjourn the House.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Mr. Downey has moved that, notwithstanding standing order 38(b), today's adjournment debate take place before 6 p.m., and that at the conclusion of the adjournment debate, the Speaker shall adjourn the House. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

*Motion agreed to.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** The House now stands adjourned until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

*The House adjourned at 1725.*





**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO**  
**ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO**

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenante-gouverneure: Hon. / L'hon. Elizabeth Dowdeswell, OC, OOnt.  
Speaker / Président: Hon. / L'hon. Ted Arnott  
Clerk / Greffier: Todd Decker  
Deputy Clerk / Sous-greffier: Trevor Day  
Clerks-at-the-Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Tonia Grannum, Valerie Quioc Lim, William Short  
Sergeant-at-Arms / Sergente d'armes: Jacquelyn Gordon

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Anand, Deepak (PC)	Mississauga—Malton	
Andrew, Jill (NDP)	Toronto—St. Paul's	
Armstrong, Teresa J. (NDP)	London—Fanshawe	Deputy Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjointe de l'opposition officielle
<b>Arnott, Hon. / L'hon. Ted (PC)</b>	Wellington—Halton Hills	Speaker / Président de l'Assemblée législative
Arthur, Ian (NDP)	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les Îles	
Baber, Roman (PC)	York Centre / York-Centre	
Babikian, Aris (PC)	Scarborough—Agincourt	
Bailey, Robert (PC)	Sarnia—Lambton	
Barrett, Toby (PC)	Haldimand—Norfolk	
Begum, Doly (NDP)	Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest	
Bell, Jessica (NDP)	University—Rosedale	
Berns-McGown, Rima (NDP)	Beaches—East York / Beaches—East York	
<b>Bethlenfalvy, Hon. / L'hon. Peter (PC)</b>	Pickering—Uxbridge	President of the Treasury Board / Président du Conseil du Trésor
Bisson, Gilles (NDP)	Timmins	Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire de l'opposition officielle
Bouma, Will (PC)	Brantford—Brant	
Bourgouin, Guy (NDP)	Mushkegowuk—James Bay / Mushkegowuk—Baie James	
Burch, Jeff (NDP)	Niagara Centre / Niagara-Centre	
Calandra, Paul (PC)	Markham—Stouffville	
<b>Cho, Hon. / L'hon. Raymond Sung Joon (PC)</b>	Scarborough North / Scarborough-Nord	Minister for Seniors and Accessibility / Ministre des Services aux aînés et de l'Accessibilité
Cho, Stan (PC)	Willowdale	
<b>Clark, Hon. / L'hon. Steve (PC)</b>	Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes / Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands et Rideau Lakes	Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Coe, Lorne (PC)	Whitby	
Coteau, Michael (LIB)	Don Valley East / Don Valley-Est	
Crawford, Stephen (PC)	Oakville	
Cuzzetto, Rudy (PC)	Mississauga—Lakeshore	
Des Rosiers, Nathalie (LIB)	Ottawa—Vanier	
Downey, Doug (PC)	Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte	
Dunlop, Jill (PC)	Simcoe North / Simcoe-Nord	
<b>Elliott, Hon. / L'hon. Christine (PC)</b>	Newmarket—Aurora	Deputy Premier / Vice-première ministre Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / Ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
<b>Fedeli, Hon. / L'hon. Victor (PC)</b>	Nipissing	Chair of Cabinet / Président du Conseil des ministres Minister of Finance / Ministre des Finances
Fee, Amy (PC)	Kitchener South—Hespeler / Kitchener-Sud—Hespeler	
Fife, Catherine (NDP)	Waterloo	
<b>Ford, Hon. / L'hon. Doug (PC)</b>	Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord	Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / Ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales Premier / Premier ministre
Fraser, John (LIB)	Ottawa South / Ottawa-Sud	
<b>French, Jennifer K. (NDP)</b>	Oshawa	Third Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Troisième vice-présidente du comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative

<b>Member and Party / Député(e) et parti</b>	<b>Constituency / Circonscription</b>	<b>Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités</b>
<b>Fullerton, Hon. / L'hon. Merrilee (PC)</b>	Kanata—Carleton	Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / Ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités
Gates, Wayne (NDP)	Niagara Falls	
Gélinas, France (NDP)	Nickel Belt	
Ghamari, Goldie (PC)	Carleton	
Gill, Parm (PC)	Milton	
Glover, Chris (NDP)	Spadina—Fort York	
Gravelle, Michael (LIB)	Thunder Bay—Superior North / Thunder Bay—Supérieur-Nord	
<b>Gretzky, Lisa (NDP)</b>	Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Première vice-présidente du comité plénier de l'Assemblée
<b>Hardeman, Hon. / L'hon. Ernie (PC)</b>	Oxford	Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
Harden, Joel (NDP)	Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	
Harris, Mike (PC)	Kitchener—Conestoga	
Hassan, Faisal (NDP)	York South—Weston / York-Sud— Weston	
<b>Hatfield, Percy (NDP)</b>	Windsor—Tecumseh	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième vice-président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Hillier, Randy (IND)	Lanark—Frontenac—Kingston	
Hogarth, Christine (PC)	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	
Horwath, Andrea (NDP)	Hamilton Centre / Hamilton-Centre	Leader, Official Opposition / Chef de l'opposition officielle
Hunter, Mitzie (LIB)	Scarborough—Guildwood	
<b>Jones, Hon. / L'hon. Sylvia (PC)</b>	Dufferin—Caledon	Solicitor General / Solliciteure générale
Kanapathi, Logan (PC)	Markham—Thornhill	
Karahalios, Belinda C. (PC)	Cambridge	
Karpoche, Bhutla (NDP)	Parkdale—High Park	
Ke, Vincent (PC)	Don Valley North / Don Valley-Nord	
Kernaghan, Terence (NDP)	London North Centre / London- Centre-Nord	
Khanjin, Andrea (PC)	Barrie—Innisfil	
Kramp, Daryl (PC)	Hastings—Lennox and Addington	
Kusendova, Natalia (PC)	Mississauga Centre / Mississauga- Centre	
Lalonde, Marie-France (LIB)	Orléans	
Lecce, Stephen (PC)	King—Vaughan	Deputy Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint du gouvernement
Lindo, Laura Mae (NDP)	Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre	
<b>MacLeod, Hon. / L'hon. Lisa (PC)</b>	Nepean	Minister of Children, Community and Social Services / Ministre des Services à l'enfance et des Services sociaux et communautaires Minister Responsible for Women's Issues / Ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine
Mamakwa, Sol (NDP)	Kiiwetinoong	
Mantha, Michael (NDP)	Algoma—Manitoulin	
Martin, Robin (PC)	Eglinton—Lawrence	
Martow, Gila (PC)	Thornhill	
McDonell, Jim (PC)	Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry	
McKenna, Jane (PC)	Burlington	
<b>McNaughton, Hon. / L'hon. Monte (PC)</b>	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	Minister of Infrastructure / Ministre de l'Infrastructure
Miller, Norman (PC)	Parry Sound—Muskoka	
Miller, Paul (NDP)	Hamilton East—Stoney Creek / Hamilton-Est—Stoney Creek	
Mitas, Christina Maria (PC)	Scarborough Centre / Scarborough- Centre	
Monteith-Farrell, Judith (NDP)	Thunder Bay—Atikokan	
Morrison, Suze (NDP)	Toronto Centre / Toronto-Centre	
<b>Mulroney, Hon. / L'hon. Caroline (PC)</b>	York—Simcoe	Attorney General / Procureure générale Minister of Francophone Affairs / Ministre des Affaires francophones
Natyshak, Taras (NDP)	Essex	
<b>Nicholls, Rick (PC)</b>	Chatham-Kent—Leamington	Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée Deputy Speaker / Vice-président
Oosterhoff, Sam (PC)	Niagara West / Niagara-Ouest	

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Pang, Billy (PC)	Markham—Unionville	
Park, Lindsey (PC)	Durham	
Parsa, Michael (PC)	Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill	
Pettapiece, Randy (PC)	Perth—Wellington	
<b>Phillips, Hon. / L'hon. Rod (PC)</b>	Ajax	Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks / Ministre de l'Environnement, de la Protection de la nature et des Parcs
Piccini, David (PC)	Northumberland—Peterborough South / Northumberland—Peterborough-Sud	
Rakocevic, Tom (NDP)	Humber River—Black Creek	
Rasheed, Kaleed (PC)	Mississauga East—Cooksville / Mississauga-Est—Cooksville	
<b>Rickford, Hon. / L'hon. Greg (PC)</b>	Kenora—Rainy River	Minister of Energy, Northern Development and Mines / Ministre de l'Énergie, du Développement du Nord et des Mines Minister of Indigenous Affairs / Ministre des Affaires autochtones
Roberts, Jeremy (PC)	Ottawa West—Nepean / Ottawa- Ouest—Nepean	
Romano, Ross (PC)	Sault Ste. Marie	
Sabawy, Sheref (PC)	Mississauga—Erin Mills	
Sandhu, Amarjot (PC)	Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest	
Sarkaria, Prabmeet Singh (PC)	Brampton South / Brampton-Sud	
Sattler, Peggy (NDP)	London West / London-Ouest	
Schreiner, Mike (GRN)	Guelph	
<b>Scott, Hon. / L'hon. Laurie (PC)</b>	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock	Minister of Labour / Ministre du Travail
Shaw, Sandy (NDP)	Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas / Hamilton-Ouest—Ancaster—Dundas	
Simard, Amanda (IND)	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	
Singh, Gurratan (NDP)	Brampton East / Brampton-Est	
Singh, Sara (NDP)	Brampton Centre / Brampton-Centre	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjointe de l'opposition officielle
Skelly, Donna (PC)	Flamborough—Glanbrook	
Smith, Dave (PC)	Peterborough—Kawartha	
<b>Smith, Hon. / L'hon. Todd (PC)</b>	Bay of Quinte / Baie de Quinte	Minister of Economic Development, Job Creation and Trade / Ministre du Développement économique, de la Création d'emplois et du Commerce Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire du gouvernement
Stevens, Jennifer (Jennie) (NDP)	St. Catharines	
Stiles, Marit (NDP)	Davenport	
Surma, Kinga (PC)	Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre	
Tabuns, Peter (NDP)	Toronto—Danforth	
Tangri, Nina (PC)	Mississauga—Streetsville	
Taylor, Monique (NDP)	Hamilton Mountain	
Thanigasalam, Vijay (PC)	Scarborough—Rouge Park	
<b>Thompson, Hon. / L'hon. Lisa M. (PC)</b>	Huron—Bruce	Minister of Education / Ministre de l'Éducation
<b>Tibollo, Hon. / L'hon. Michael A. (PC)</b>	Vaughan—Woodbridge	Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport / Ministre du Tourisme, de la Culture et du Sport
Triantafilopoulos, Effie J. (PC)	Oakville North—Burlington / Oakville-Nord—Burlington	
Vanthof, John (NDP)	Timiskaming—Cochrane	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjoint de l'opposition officielle
Wai, Daisy (PC)	Richmond Hill	
<b>Walker, Hon. / L'hon. Bill (PC)</b>	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	Minister of Government and Consumer Services / Ministre des Services gouvernementaux et des Services aux consommateurs
West, Jamie (NDP)	Sudbury	
Wilson, Jim (IND)	Simcoe—Grey	
Wynne, Kathleen O. (LIB)	Don Valley West / Don Valley-Ouest	
<b>Yakubski, Hon. / L'hon. John (PC)</b>	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry / Ministre des Richesses naturelles et des Forêts
Yarde, Kevin (NDP)	Brampton North / Brampton-Nord	
<b>Yurek, Hon. / L'hon. Jeff (PC)</b>	Elgin—Middlesex—London	Minister of Transportation / Ministre des Transports

**STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
COMITÉS PERMANENTS DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

**Standing Committee on Estimates / Comité permanent des budgets des dépenses**

Chair / Président: Peter Tabuns  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Wayne Gates  
Stan Cho, Jill Dunlop  
Wayne Gates, Randy Hillier  
Stephen Lecce, Gila Martow  
Jane McKenna, Judith Monteith-Farrell  
Lindsey Park, Randy Pettapiece  
Peter Tabuns  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Timothy Bryan

**Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs / Comité permanent des finances et des affaires économiques**

Chair / Président: Stephen Crawford  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Jeremy Roberts  
Ian Arthur, Stephen Crawford  
Doug Downey, Sol Mamakwa  
David Piccini, Kaleed Rasheed  
Jeremy Roberts, Sandy Shaw  
Donna Skelly  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Timothy Bryan

**Standing Committee on General Government / Comité permanent des affaires gouvernementales**

Chair / Président: Dave Smith  
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Natalia Kusendova  
Jessica Bell, Chris Glover  
Christine Hogarth, Logan Kanapathi  
Daryl Kramp, Natalia Kusendova  
Amarjot Sandhu, Mike Schreiner  
Dave Smith, Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens  
Daisy Wai  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Julia Douglas

**Standing Committee on Government Agencies / Comité permanent des organismes gouvernementaux**

Chair / Président: John Vanthof  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Taras Natyshak  
Roman Baber, Rudy Cuzzetto  
Amy Fee, Vincent Ke  
Andrea Khanjin, Marie-France Lalonde  
Taras Natyshak, Rick Nicholls  
Jeremy Roberts, Marit Stiles  
John Vanthof  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Jocelyn McCauley

**Standing Committee on Justice Policy / Comité permanent de la justice**

Chair / Président: Parm Gill  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Aris Babikian  
Roman Baber, Aris Babikian  
Nathalie Des Rosiers, Jill Dunlop  
Parm Gill, Lindsey Park  
Ross Romano, Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria  
Sara Singh, Monique Taylor  
Kevin Yarde  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Jocelyn McCauley

**Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly / Comité permanent de l'Assemblée législative**

Chair / Présidente: Jane McKenna  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Vijay Thanigasalam  
Robert Bailey, Rima Berns-McGown  
Lorne Coe, Michael Coteau  
Mike Harris, Faisal Hassan  
Jane McKenna, Christina Maria Mitas  
Sam Oosterhoff, Gurratan Singh  
Vijay Thanigasalam  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Valerie Quioc Lim

**Standing Committee on Public Accounts / Comité permanent des comptes publics**

Chair / Présidente: Catherine Fife  
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Peggy Sattler  
Toby Barrett, Catherine Fife  
Goldie Ghamari, Michael Gravelle  
Jim McDonell, Norman Miller  
Christina Maria Mitas, Suze Morrison  
Michael Parsa, Peggy Sattler  
Kinga Surma  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Christopher Tyrell

**Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills / Comité permanent des règlements et des projets de loi d'intérêt privé**

Chair / Président: Kaleed Rasheed  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Will Bouma  
Will Bouma, Paul Calandra  
Lorne Coe, Stephen Crawford  
Mitzie Hunter, Laura Mae Lindo  
Paul Miller, Billy Pang  
Kaleed Rasheed, Amarjot Sandhu  
Jamie West  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Eric Rennie

**Standing Committee on Social Policy / Comité permanent de la politique sociale**

Chair / Présidente: Nina Tangri  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Deepak Anand  
Deepak Anand, Doly Begum  
Jeff Burch, Amy Fee  
John Fraser, Joel Harden  
Belinda C. Karahalios, Robin Martin  
Sheref Sabawy, Nina Tangri  
Effie J. Triantafilopoulos  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Eric Rennie