

Legislative
Assembly
of Ontario



Assemblée
législative
de l'Ontario

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

No. 133B

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

N° 133B

1st Session
43rd Parliament
Monday
18 March 2024

1^{re} session
43^e législature
Lundi
18 mars 2024

Speaker: Honourable Ted Arnott
Clerk: Trevor Day

Président : L'honorable Ted Arnott
Greffier : Trevor Day

Hansard on the Internet

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

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

Index inquiries

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

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

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

Renseignements sur l'index

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

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



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

ISSN 1180-2987

CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Monday 18 March 2024 / Lundi 18 mars 2024

Working for Workers Four Act, 2024, Bill 149,

Mr. Piccini / Loi de 2024 visant à oeuvrer pour les travailleurs, quatre, projet de loi 149, M. Piccini

Mr. Wayne Gates	7759
Mr. Anthony Leardi.....	7762
Ms. Sandy Shaw	7762
Ms. Aislinn Clancy.....	7762
Mr. Andrew Dowie.....	7763
Mr. Joel Harden	7763
Ms. Aislinn Clancy.....	7763
Mr. Anthony Leardi.....	7764
Ms. Sandy Shaw	7764
Mr. Mike Schreiner.....	7764
Ms. Christine Hogarth	7765
Mr. Guy Bourgouin	7766
Mr. Brian Saunderson.....	7766
Ms. Sandy Shaw	7766
Hon. David Piccini	7767
Mrs. Lisa Gretzky.....	7767
Hon. Todd J. McCarthy.....	7769
Ms. Sandy Shaw	7770
Hon. Stephen Lecce.....	7770
Mr. Joel Harden	7771
Hon. Charmaine A. Williams	7771
M. Guy Bourgouin.....	7771
Third reading debate deemed adjourned.....	7774

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF ONTARIO

Monday 18 March 2024

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE
DE L'ONTARIO

Lundi 18 mars 2024

Report continued from volume A.

1617

WORKING FOR WORKERS FOUR
ACT, 2024

LOI DE 2024 VISANT À OEUVRER
POUR LES TRAVAILLEURS, QUATRE

Continuation of debate on the motion for third reading of the following bill:

Bill 149, An Act to amend various statutes with respect to employment and labour and other matters / Projet de loi 149, Loi modifiant diverses lois en ce qui concerne l'emploi, le travail et d'autres questions.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): Further debate?

Mr. Wayne Gates: It's always great to rise in the House and talk about labour, seeing as that's basically what I've done my entire life. Even here, it's a bit of labour some days.

I'm going to start with a positive story. I see the minister has left, unfortunately; I was hoping he'd stay, but I want to talk about the story of Captain Craig Bowman. He was a brave firefighter. He was committed to being a firefighter in Niagara. He was a committed dad, a husband, and he lost his battle with workplace cancer. He was a young man. He fought to have the cancer covered, because it wasn't covered then. You had to be over 50. His wife, Alisen, and kids Alexis and Colin made a promise to Captain Bowman that they would make sure that no other person would not be covered by this workplace cancer and do everything they could to lower the age, because this cancer just doesn't hit people over 50. Obviously, it hit Mr. Bowman, who was under 50.

When you ask, how did this happen, who brought it forward to make sure it was debated here in the Leg, I want to thank my colleague from Welland, Jeff Burch, who went and talked to the firefighters—I know he goes and visits the firefighters quite regularly—met with the family, and he brought a bill forward that the Conservatives have supported. But I really want to thank his family and I want to thank the brothers and sisters in their union in Niagara Centre that forced this government to act for Captain Bowman.

We can all talk about firefighters, how we support firefighters, but when a situation like this happens—and I'm going to say that I came out of a plant in General Motors; I was there for 30 years—there is nothing that I'm aware of that isn't more family than being a firefighter. I visit the

firefighters. We've seen a number of our firefighters get cancer, lose their lives, but I'll tell you what those brothers and sisters do: When the family needs a hand up, if they need to make sure their children or their daughter have to get to hockey or to dance, the firefighters are always there.

So I want to say to the brothers and sisters in the union, and to the family, obviously, I offer my condolences—Alisen, his wife, actually went to school with my daughter Chantel. On behalf of the NDP, I'm really pleased that this is going to get passed, and I want to say to Jeff Burch: Thank you for bringing it forward.

1620

Now I want to talk about Bill 149 not working for workers. I like coming here in the afternoon. Whether it's this bill or other bills, I always like to hear the other side, in this case the government side, because I'm actually on this side, so I guess I'm on the other side. I'm not sure if I explained that properly, but you know what I'm saying.

I like to hear your position when it comes to labour, because being a labour guy my entire life, I can tell you, the only thing that's ever happened from the Conservative government when it came to labour, whether it was in the auto sector—it didn't matter what sector it was in—health care, education, was the attacks on workers. We can go back to Mike Harris. We can go back 15 years, quite frankly—Tim Hudak. How many of you remember Tim Hudak, when he wanted to become the Premier of Ontario? What did he run on? He was going to cut 100,000 jobs, good-paying union jobs. Anybody remember that on that side? There's a couple. I think Ernie over there in the corner with his head down, he was here then. I'm sure you cringed when he said it. Do you remember him doing that? And what happened? We ended up having rallies. What happened is, the Conservatives didn't become the government, because one thing that's important is that people respect unions and the role they play in society. Without the union, we wouldn't have stat holidays, we wouldn't have pensions, we wouldn't have fair wages and fair benefits.

Even though your government continues—and I don't understand this. I already mentioned deeming; I'm going to get into deeming as I go through my speech. In communities right across Toronto and Windsor, they support having scabs in the workplace. Somebody try to explain to me, because you know what? Again, I think it's fair and reasonable if I mention what I did in the labour movement. I was a union president. I bargained a lot of collective agreements. In not one of the 150 agreements I negotiated were there scabs in our workplace—not one. And do you know what happened? Out of 150 collective

agreements, we had one three-day strike. Do you know why that was, Madam Speaker? I know you are listening very carefully here, but do you know why that was? Because it forced the employer and the union to go to the bargaining table and negotiate a fair and just collective agreement for both parties.

I have never, never had a member call me up and say, “Gatesy, can we go on strike for a week? Can I lose a week’s pay?” They were going to the bargaining committee, and you say, “Get a collective agreement for us.” That’s the way it is.

But when you allow scabs to come into your workplace, what happens? The scumbag employers, which, quite frankly, the prior minister called these employers; he called them scumbags. It didn’t come from me; it came from him. What happens? They decide they don’t have to go to the bargaining table. They can still get their work done, they can bring scabs across the picket line. It’s happening right now in the province of Ontario in a number of workplaces. I say to my colleagues on the other side, if you get 98% of all collective agreements as negotiated settlements, why are you sticking up for the 2% scumbag employers that are taking on workers? It makes no sense to me—none.

And we talked about, a little bit—I wasn’t going to go into anti-scab, but it just came out. But something that’s very similar, maybe not anti-scab, but something that’s very similar—I like to go for walks. I don’t know if anybody’s noticed I’ve slimmed down. I think the one member, from Durham, came up to me last week and said I’m looking pretty skinny. That’s because I’m in shape again. I can almost play goal again. Right here, he came up to me. He was saying he was worried about me, but it’s because I go for walks. I walk down Yonge Street.

I was walking down Yonge Street, not last week, because we weren’t here; we were back in our ridings. But the week before, I’m walking down Yonge Street, and I see about 10 bikes with the meals on the back of the bikes. I walk into the crowd, I introduce myself. I say, “I’m Wayne Gates. I’m the MPP from Niagara Falls. We’re debating a bill that talks about gig workers.” And do you know what it was, Madam Speaker? Do you know what I asked them? “How long have you been here?” There were eight or nine bikes out in front of a restaurant right across from the university, on Yonge Street. Do you know what they said? “We’ve been here for an hour.” I said, “You’ve been here for an hour? How much have you made?” And do you know what they all said? “Oh, we don’t get paid unless we’re delivering food.” In that hour, they made nothing.

Now, I’ve been here through a debate; I’ve been here since 1 o’clock. I was here for question period. I look around and there’s a number of members on that side of the House—an independent, I think that guy is a Liberal up in the corner, hiding in the corner, a Liberal—there are a number of people here that have sat here, have not said a word, didn’t have a question, didn’t speak on our motion to get doctors available in my community down in Niagara-on-the-Lake, Fort Erie. But do you know what

happened here? Every one of you guys, including myself, including my colleague here and my sisters here, got paid. Everyone got paid. Do you know why? Because you put your pants on today, or your skirt or your slacks or whatever you did, and you came into this place, and you got paid.

The sad reality is that the Conservatives get paid a lot more than the NDP do, because you guys gave yourselves a 16% raise. Do you guys remember when you did that? And do you know what? Do you know the problem with that? Do you know—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutila Karpoche): Order. The House will come to order.

The member from Niagara Falls can continue.

Mr. Wayne Gates: I appreciate that.

The reality is, that other side—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutila Karpoche): Order.

Mr. Wayne Gates: Conservatives can scream all they want at me, because I’m used to it. But do you know what? My point is, my little point is that you expect workers in the province of Ontario to go to work and make no pay. How is that done? This isn’t a Third World country. The province of Ontario, although they’re in debt, \$400 billion in debt—we know that. But the reality is, this is one of the richest provinces in the country. So why are we having workers go to work and get paid zero? And it’s in the bill. It’s in the bill—you can spin it any way you want—and the average works out to \$6.37. It makes absolutely no sense. They don’t even get the minimum wage. They’re not covered by the employment standards.

And do you know what else they’ve got to do? I’m talking to my colleague. I’m not talking to you guys right now; I’m talking to my colleague and the Speaker. Do you know what else they’ve got to do? They’ve got to provide the car or the bicycle. Or if they get hit while they’re doing their job, they’re not covered. Does anybody think that’s fair and reasonable? Guess what? It’s in the bill.

You’re talking about gig workers—very, very important. We probably all use them. I would think everybody phones and orders food. I’m pretty sure. We should be making sure they get paid at least the minimum wage for the time that they’re at work.

Interjections.

Mr. Wayne Gates: I know the Conservatives are heckling me and all that stuff because I raised that they gave themselves a 16% raise. But the reality is, that poor guy has got to raise his family. He’s got to pay his mortgage. He’s got to pay his rent. He’s got kids. Why should he have to go to work during any period of time in an eight-hour shift and get paid zero? Somebody explain that to me. I’ll take the questions. I’m not going to hide after I stand up here for 20 minutes. You can ask me any question you want. You can say to me, “Gatesy, I don’t think it’s fair that you said we got a 16% raise,” and I’ll respond to that.

But let me tell you, I firmly believe—and I’d say that to the worker working on the shop floor; I’d say that to

somebody that I'm going to get a suit from or a shirt or whatever I'm going to do—you deserve to be paid fairly, a fair wage, a fair day's work. That's what I owe the employer: a fair day's work, a fair day's pay. That's what I owe him.

The other part I owe him, or the other part that we should all make sure of, is that they go home to their family. We've had lots of deaths in the province of Ontario—lots. We continue to have them.

So I wanted to make sure I got that out about gig workers. And it was all from a walk, so get out and walk and talk to gig workers, and they will tell you. You might not get in shape like I am, but at least you'll be talking to them.

And then when you talk about—and this one drives me nuts, too, by the way. Bill 124: They stand up for four and a half years, and everyone on that side, every Conservative over there, stood up and supported attacking workers with Bill 124, every time. And do you know what's consistent? What's not consistent is that I have gone through different ministers over the last little while. At one time, I was part of the labour caucus that kind of did labour; this time, I'm not. But I have gone through all the ministers, and every time I went to committee on whatever the bill number was, I asked that question: “Do not support Bill 124.” And every single time we bring an amendment forward, guess what? Guess what they did? They voted it down, every single time.

1630

And in committee, as you know—Madam Speaker, I think you have been to committee a few times—there are six Conservatives on the one side, usually three NDP are on the other side, and then maybe an independent and a Liberal. We're never going to win the vote, so we've got to rely on the Conservatives—and that's if the Conservatives' leader, Premier Calandra, allows you to sit on committee. Sometimes he doesn't allow that to happen. That's only if he allows that. So—

Mr. Anthony Leardi: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): I recognize the member from Essex on a point of order.

Mr. Anthony Leardi: A member shall refer to other members either by their position or by their riding. This member is very experienced. He knows the rules. I know the game he is playing. I ask him to be called to order and that he follow the rules.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): The member from Essex is correct: All members are required to refer to another member through their ministerial portfolio or riding name.

Mr. Wayne Gates: I appreciate that, and I'm surprised it took that long, actually. I'm kind of fine with it, and I appreciate him standing up, because I am a rule breaker, so I'm not going to hide from that one.

But the reality is, as we're talking about workers—and you guys all do it. I listen to you. It drives me crazy, but I listen to you guys stand up and say this union loves you and that union loves you. Do you know what they didn't do in the bill? I found this out at committee when I came

here during the break. Remember we had—what did we have?—four months off or whatever that period of time was when we weren't sitting? It was quite a while. But we had a committee hearing with this bill, so I went. The NDP called me: “Can you go?” Of course I can go. I love to go. I love going to committee. Although the Conservatives don't like me on committee, I love to be on committees.

Guess what happened? I found out, and I didn't know. Guess who wasn't consulted for the bill? Does anybody on that side want to yell it out? You've been yelling for the last 10 minutes at me; do you want to yell something out at me? Who didn't you consult on the bill that you should have if you love labour? Yell it out. I'm going to tell you who it was, Madam Speaker. They don't want to yell it out. They want to yell at me on some things; they don't want to yell this out. Do you know why? They didn't consult the Ontario Federation of Labour, which represents over a million members.

So if you cared about workers—and this is just my thinking; I'm not saying I'm correct, but I think I am. But if you care about workers, wouldn't the Ontario Federation of Labour be somebody you want to talk on a labour bill? I don't know; I would think you would. But guess what? They didn't do that.

And then what we did at committee—and again, I told you: I like committee. I've got to save a couple of minutes, because I've got to talk about deeming, because that's another disgrace. We brought amendments to committee—good amendments. Again, the same situation: six on one side; I think we had three on one; I think the Liberal was there, but he's not allowed to vote. Their leader, their current acting leader was not allowed to vote. Every single amendment was voted down—every one.

I'm going to tell you a quick story. I've only got two minutes and something left. I've said this once before. Patrick Brown was the leader when you guys sat on this side and did absolutely nothing for 15 years. Patrick Brown was your leader, and do you know what he said? He said that it doesn't matter whether you're a Liberal or a Conservative or a Green; if you have good ideas, if you bring it to committee and make it an amendment, we should support it. That's reasonable to me.

I've only got two minutes left. I've got to talk about deeming, because my colleague from Niagara mentioned workers. I have raised this issue since I got here. People before me had raised the issue around deeming, to get rid of deeming. And I'm going to ask anybody. I know the labour minister is here. Why should anybody go to work, get injured on the job, get deemed—that means that WSIB will say, “Okay, you can do a job for \$20,” even though you are making \$22. They cut that benefit by \$20, that worker ends up living in poverty—50% of injured workers do. And guess what happens in most cases—because they have come to my office—they can't pay their rent. They can't pay their mortgage. They end up splitting with their families because their sons and daughters can't play hockey, can't play at school. They feel worthless, and they feel they can't do anything about it. Injured workers have been crying to this government, as we did four of these

types of bills, “Get rid of deeming.” It’s killing injured workers. It’s making them live in poverty.

And all that worker did wrong, Madam Speaker—you know what it was? He went to work. Do you know why? Because he wanted to make sure that he got paid so he could take care of his family, make sure he can buy a mortgage, buy a car, make sure his kids could go to university and college. The minute you get deemed, you lose all that, you lose all that respect.

I can tell you, most of the families that are deemed end up in severe marriage problems and they end up splitting up. And guess what? Everybody here on these bills, these labour bills that you guys keep bringing out, not once—as we brought amendment after amendment after amendment, after we begged you to take care of injured workers in the province of Ontario, not once did you support an amendment, as workers are living in poverty. It’s very similar, quite frankly, to the gig workers, where they go to work and they don’t get paid.

So I want to say to you, Madam Speaker, because I know I have to go through you to say anything: If you do anything in a labour bill, you should be eliminating deeming and getting rid of scab labour in the province of Ontario. Then you will have the full support of this House on those issues.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): Questions?

Mr. Anthony Leardi: Taking a look at the bill that’s before us today, we see that in section 14.1(1), the method of payment is set out with regard to gratuities, also known as tips. In my view, this bill makes certain progress with respect to that, ensuring that tips which are intended for the employee actually wind up with the employee. This is in the bill, and it’s described in a certain way, such as setting up an account which is authorized by the employee to ensure that the employee gets the tip that is destined for the employee.

My question to the member is this: Does he support that measure, and will he vote for it?

Mr. Wayne Gates: You know, I just spent 20 minutes talking about workers, talking about gig workers that aren’t being paid. I’m talking about injured workers that are living in poverty, and you are talking about tips, even though there is no enforcement. There is no enforcement in it. There is no enforcement in that legislation.

But if I’m going to stand up here and talk for 20 minutes—I’m looking right at you, from Windsor, because right now in Windsor, you have scabs going into workplaces. No, I’m looking at you. You raised a question. I’m looking at it. You raised it. So my question—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): Order.

Mr. Wayne Gates: I’m trying to answer your question. I’m talking about workers—

Mr. Anthony Leardi: Who’s from Windsor? I’m from Essex.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): Stop the clock.

The members will not speak to each other directly. Questions and responses through the Chair, please.

Start the clock. Next question.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I just have to say that it is always an honour to listen to you to talk about workers and labour. I know you have been an advocate all your life, and your passion is clear. So thank you for fighting on behalf of workers in the province of Ontario.

I would like to just add, as you have said, that we brought forward many, many amendments to this committee, and the government uses their majority every single time to squash good amendments—not just ours but amendments from the community. What I want to say very clearly: In addition to voting down an amendment that would have provided recognition of wildland firefighters—they voted that down—there was an amendment that was put forward by the Interfaith Social Assistance Reform Coalition and the Workers’ Action Centre that would have made sure that gig workers were reclassified so that they could see the benefit of being an employee in the province of Ontario under the Employment Standards Act because they are employees in the province. So why would this government stand up and say they’re working for workers and then turn their backs on the most vulnerable workers in this province?

1640

Mr. Wayne Gates: That’s a very good question. What I think we should really try to get the government to understand is that a lot of these workers are racialized, they’re new Canadians, have only been in our country a little while. They’re coming from countries that don’t have the blessings that we have when I’m talking about jobs and housing and stuff. And this government is making it hard for them to live the Canadian dream. When they talk about building housing in this province of Ontario, which one of those workers that are making nothing an hour are going to be able to buy a home? And, quite frankly, if you take a look at rents in the province of Ontario, particularly here in Toronto—\$2,900. I don’t know about you, I don’t know about my colleagues, but \$2,900 is a lot of money to try to pay your rent in the province of Ontario and raise a family as a gig worker because the government is bringing in bills that allow people to pay them nothing for an entire shift. It makes no sense to me.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): Next question?

Ms. Aislinn Clancy: Hi, there. I just wonder: What do you think the impact is on those people’s lives when they stand there for an hour not getting paid?

Mr. Wayne Gates: I really appreciate the question. It’s the first time I’ve been able to congratulate you, too, on your win. You don’t have to wear green every day into the Legislature, though—just letting you know that, just for the record.

That’s what I’m talking about: Who can go to work, make nothing and try to live in Toronto or buy groceries? Groceries are through the roof. We all know that. Groceries cost—I don’t even know how some people can afford to buy groceries today. I know the Westons can,

because they're making more money than they know what to do with, quite frankly, and now that they've got Shoppers, they've got that going.

What I'm trying to say to the government: Do not come here with bills, say you're working for workers, and then you have gig workers—or any worker, quite frankly—in the province of Ontario going to work for an hour—and it might have been longer; it just happened they had been there for an hour. They might have been there for two or three hours without getting a job. So that would have meant that for two or three hours they don't get any money. They only get it on engaged time. It's absolutely ridiculous.

Now, I have heard that in Third World countries. We fight to make sure those Third World countries are raised up. Yet we're allowing it to happen in the province of Ontario, and we have a government that's bringing in bills to support it. It makes absolutely no sense.

I really appreciate the question. Thank you.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutila Karpoche): Next question?

Mr. Andrew Dowie: I want to thank the member from Niagara Falls for his comments. I'd heard the reference to scabs. My wife is a Unifor member. She works at GreenShield, so she's currently on strike. I've had an opportunity to visit that picket line multiple times in the last number of days.

So my question for the member opposite is this: Is a management employee, in your view, a scab?

Mr. Wayne Gates: Well, I'm going to tell you, I'm going to be clear: It's my understanding, and I have talked to the local president down there, that they are using scabs. My position isn't whether it's GreenShield, whether it's General Motors, whether it's any unionized workplace; my position is, if you don't have scabs, you will be able to negotiate a fair and just collective agreement, because I did it for 10 years as president of a local union—150 collective agreements, one three-day strike, no scabs used in any of those workplaces.

And, by the way, you have I think Chrysler and Stellantis now in that riding. My understanding is, they don't use scabs in that workplace. Do you know why? Because the union doesn't allow it to happen, and they just bargained a really good collective agreement, something that I'm very proud to say, as a member of Unifor—before that, I was CAW, and before that, I was UAW. Think about that. I'm proud when they go to the bargaining table and negotiate a fair and just collective agreement for their members without having to go on strike, or if they go on strike, they're not going to use scabs.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutila Karpoche): Next question?

Mr. Joel Harden: I want to thank the member from Niagara Falls for holding forth in this place as he does to talk about justice for workers.

I want to think about the things that aren't in this bill, as you said. If we keep a two-tier labour force in place, who benefits? Uber benefits. Lyft benefits. All the apps that do DoorDash, that do the things that—as you said in

your remarks, we like them. We're watching the hockey game, we order these things, and food is conveniently delivered to our place. But the person bringing out the food is only paid for that trip, and then, as you said, they wait. So the billionaires in our economy and around the world—in many cases, they don't even live in Canada—benefit.

There are other countries that have different labour laws, where these people are not independent contractors; they're workers. They can be part of unions. I'm wondering if you can give the government ideas of how we can make a lot better than what we've got with this bill.

Mr. Wayne Gates: I think you hit it right on the nail: If you ever want to rise up in this society, join a union. I think that is probably the easiest thing to do, and I know that there are a lot of people over there who might not agree with me.

But DoorDash—do you know how much money they made in profit? They made \$40 billion, and they have workers going to work making \$0. Somehow that seems to me like not a fair balance: corporation, \$40 billion; workers, \$0.

I've got enough time here, I think. The reason why we live in one of the greatest countries in the world, for a long period of time, is that enormous wealth that was being created by workers was being shared with them in the form of better wages, better benefits, more sick time, more pensions. What has happened in the province of Ontario and this country, quite frankly, is that we've gotten away from that and sharing the wealth.

What's happening with the Westons and these corporations that are making so much money they don't know what to do with it—they're not happy making \$1 billion; they want to make \$2 billion or \$3 billion at the expense of that worker who's going to work every single day to put in a fair day's work for a fair day's pay, so they can raise their family, they can pay their mortgage and they can make sure their kids get a good education, which kind of flows into the grandkids and that whole cycle. We're getting away from it, and it had better stop soon, or this country is going to be in big trouble.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutila Karpoche): Further debate?

Ms. Aislinn Clancy: I do want to thank the governing party. This legislation has lots of good things in it. I appreciate that there's a bit more consistency and respect for part-time workers. There are protections for workers who experience esophageal cancer, and reinforcing that we disallow the term “Canadian experience” being required. These, among other things, are welcome changes.

But I also want to highlight that there is a canyon in our province—it's growing across the world; it's well documented—between the haves and the have-nots. What I mean by this is the corporate greed that governs and profits over the backs of workers. Lyft and Uber, in 2023, made \$2.6 billion. This is money from Ontario that we are shipping out of the country faster than we care to recognize. That means that that money isn't helping families right now. It isn't buying books. It isn't invested in our local economies. It instead goes to those CEOs to buy

themselves more yachts or private jets, or pays for their lavish lifestyles.

What I would like to see is inclusion of gig workers in these employment standards. I believe employment standards should be for all, and we're missing out on a population of 700,000 Ontario workers who are not included in this legislation. I hope Working for Workers 5 will ensure that gig workers will be included.

The city of Toronto, for example, said that 52% of the time, people providing rides in our city were not paid, so 52% of your time is unpaid. That means that people are getting about \$6 an hour, or just above. What did I notice? I noticed that in my community. I went for a meal, and I was watching someone who was waiting for their meal to be picked up. He was almost itching, he was so frustrated and agitated, because every minute he spent there waiting for that meal to come out, waiting for his gig to start, is time wasted from money that he could have been getting doing another job, while instead he's at this restaurant that takes forever. He was losing his mind. I talked to him. I said, "What's going on? You seem really frustrated." "Well, this has been 30 minutes, and I haven't made a cent. I don't get paid, and the way this kitchen is working means that I'm not getting paid."

As a former settlement worker, I take this very seriously. I work with so many new Canadians who are underemployed, and that means that they are not building the equity for their family. They're not investing in their children. That's what's missing in this legislation. When we give this money to workers, we keep it in Ontario, and we help families look forward to a better future.

1650

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): Questions?

Mr. Anthony Leardi: I thank the member for her comments. I'll draw her attention to part III.1, job postings, with regard to the bill that is before us today. It says that "no employer who advertises a publicly advertised job posting shall include in the posting or in any associated application form any requirements related to Canadian experience."

She made a brief reference to that in her remarks, and I'll give her an opportunity to address it again. Does she agree with that provision of this bill, and will she vote for it?

Ms. Aislinn Clancy: Thank you for the question.

I am welcoming it. I think it's covered under the Human Rights Code, but I think we can't say it enough. I hear from new immigrants all the time, "How can I get Canadian experience without getting Canadian experience?" So it is a hurdle that we need to address.

On one hand, it does recognize the barriers faced by new immigrants. But when we think of our gig workers, 60% of them are new immigrants. So, on one hand, we're creating another opportunity to reduce that barrier, but on the other hand, we're ignoring 700,000 gig workers, 60% of whom are landed immigrants.

I hope whenever you take a ride, whenever you get your DoorDash, you talk to those folks about their families,

about the realities they face, what the impact is of living in poverty and getting paid \$6-ish an hour.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): Question?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: We've been talking about how there's a two-tier employment system, about how gig workers are not treated with respect or fairly by this government and in this legislation.

I would also like to bring your attention to the fact that women in this province also operate under a two-tier system. We continue—women working full-time equivalent to men working full-time still earn 89 cents for every dollar that men make in this province. Pay transparency laws were an attempt to make clear, so that there is public disclosure, to help women address these kinds of pay discrimination in their workplace.

This government has introduced what has been described as the weakest pay transparency law in the country. Can you speak to the fact that no public reporting and this fluff of a Pay Transparency Act will not help to improve women seeking fair pay when there's such huge gender discrimination in the workplace?

Ms. Aislinn Clancy: Thank you for mentioning that. I also want to draw attention to that. Even though women are equally represented in the workforce, not as much has changed at home. As a mother and a wife, I see that not only are we paid less, but we have a lot more work at home to do. So I think we have a long way to go to recognizing women's equity not only in the workplace but in the household.

I would like to see us be specific about the actual pay. A range doesn't quite cut it because it can create too much grey space for this ambiguity and for this inequity that probably falls under the 89 cents to a dollar, right? I think when we give a range, we could give 89 cents to a dollar and that. So I would like to ask the governing party to be specific, tighten it up and make it a little bit better so it actually does what it's supposed to.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): Final question.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I want to thank the member from Kitchener Centre for her thoughtful remarks and for being such a champion for her constituents.

You alluded in your remarks to the fact that gig workers are being treated as second-class workers, basically—not fully covered by the Employment Standards Act and not even making close to minimum wage. What could the government do to actually bring justice and fairness for gig workers and their families?

Ms. Aislinn Clancy: I think we could pay these folks minimum wage, like we do for all other industries and all other groups of workers. Let's start with the minimum wage. Not only would that keep dollars in Ontario to help our economies, but it would also keep dollars in families to help young kids, who we know—in my community alone, rates of using of food banks have doubled for first-time users—doubled in one year. Why is that?

This is what's happening. Folks working in the gig economy are getting paid \$6 an hour, and if we know what

rents cost in Ontario, they're using their money for rent; they're not able to cut it for food. So we see a doubling of first-time food bank users in my region.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): Further debate?

Ms. Christine Hogarth: I am pleased to join the debate today, talking about Bill 149, the Working for Workers Four Act. I want to give a shout-out to the minister and his PAs for the work they did putting into this legislation—and also to our former minister, Monte McNaughton, for the one, two, and three parts of Working for Workers.

I'm very proud to stand here in a Doug Ford government that puts workers first. I heard my colleague talk about knocking on doors and hearing what people have to say about the labour market and how labour trusts the PC government. We are there in their corner, and we have their back.

My dad was a labourer. I remember when he came home from work with his dirty boots, and my mother would be so upset because he'd walk across the carpet. She'd say, "Take off your shoes at the door." He was exhausted from a heavy day, full of dirt. Oddly enough, he had a warm OV. I don't know if anybody still drinks OV. At the time, we were kids, and I remember him coming home and having a warm beer and making a mess on the carpet. He was a labourer, and it was a good job. It paid for my braces. It helped pay for our home. It helped pay for our groceries. He was proud to work, and we were proud of him working.

We always can do more for our labourers, and I just want to say, I appreciate the work that has been done.

I also want to say that in my riding of Etobicoke–Lakeshore, we have a great organization called Building Up. Minister Piccini came with me one day to look at Building Up. It's an organization that's set up to help those who may not have the opportunities that others do to get jobs. It's a trades training program. When Minister Piccini and I were there, we met with Marc and his team. They have an overwhelming group of young people who are very proud to go to train every day to get a job, because we need skilled trades. They actually made us get all geared up, and I used an electric saw; I never touched one before. We learned how to frame a house from one of the students, and they were learning how to drywall that day, so it was a really great experience. And what was more exciting was that these young fellows and ladies are going to have great jobs and a great future because of this program.

Our government has invested in this program, and hopefully, we'll be able to invest some more in this program because it is such a great opportunity for young people to move forward.

In listening to the debate today, I've heard a lot about jobs, gig workers. I can walk down any street in my riding and there are "help wanted" signs. There are so many jobs available in all sectors. We need people. Ever since COVID, we seem to have lost a lot of people. Everyone asks, "Where have they gone?" We need teachers. We need doctors. We need nurses. We need skilled trades

workers. We need people who work in restaurants and bars. And this is important—to get people into the business.

So if people are not happy with their job and they're looking for other careers, there are jobs out there. We want to make sure you get trained up and take the training you need.

This morning, in my member's statement, I spoke a little bit about health care workers, through the Black youth opportunity fund—and these were young people, again, who got some extra skills, trained to help let blood and other technical medical work that needs to be done.

So there is training out there, and there are funds to help get young people trained and ready for the economy.

I'll tell you, Ontario is an amazing place to work. And our government certainly wants people to have better jobs, bigger paycheques; we want to make sure that they have a good life here in Ontario. That's why we continue to work to make our economy strong—so it is there for a wonderful future for everybody.

I want to talk a little bit about what's in the bill. One piece that is very important is the injured workers and the firefighters piece. We haven't really talked much about that today. But in my riding of Etobicoke–Lakeshore, I have five fire stations. We have Fire Stations 431, 432, 433, 434 and 435. I just want to give a shout-out to thank all those firemen and women who, every day, put their lives on the line, and I know—

1700

Interjections.

Ms. Christine Hogarth: Yes, thank you. We should give a shout-out.

I know, not in my riding, but early this morning or late last night, there was a fire over on the island, and I know we lost one of our historic cafeterias that people used to go to and love. My heart goes out to that family who lost their business last night, but I thank the firefighters who got there within five minutes to protect the homes around that cafe, although summer will be a little different on the island this year.

When we talk a little bit about our firefighters, over time their body could be exposed to smoke inhalation and cause some occupational health hazards. One of the things in this bill aims to address the realities that firefighters are placed in. So we hope that the opposition will join us in passing this bill to improve cancer coverage for firefighters and fire investigators, by lowering the employment period needed to receive compensation when diagnosed with esophageal cancer from 25 to 15 years—really important that that's mentioned in this legislation, and it wasn't mentioned in any of the speeches from the opposition today. So I just wanted to make sure people were aware of the firefighters and that this government is going to protect our workers. They no longer have to contest that their cancer was connected to their employment, giving them faster access to WSIB benefits and other critical services. I believe, and our government believes, very strongly in this.

Early February, I had the opportunity with MPP Robin Martin and PA Anand to host a virtual town hall, a consultation, to talk about Working for Workers Four. We heard from people from Humber College, WoodGreen Community Services, labourers and business owners, and the support for the bill was overwhelming, because we know, and they know, that government is actually talking to workers. We're talking to workers of all shapes, sizes, jobs. We wanted to talk to everyone to make sure that they had their say in the legislation, so I want to thank the parliamentary assistant for labour for joining Robin and I in that public consultation to hear directly from workers.

Another thing that's in the bill is protecting the hospitality workers. I heard one of my colleagues, from Kitchener South-Hespeler, earlier today talk about her experience as a server. Well, my family used to be in the restaurant/bar business, and I remember my mom coming home pretty late after managing the night shift. Oddly enough, in those days she would smell like smoke because, if you can believe it—I know some of the young people don't know this—you used to be able to smoke in bars. So when she came home late at night, she'd have the smell of smoke—never smoked in her life but had a lot of smoke on her clothes. It's hard work. It's a lot of work. So we need to protect our servers. And when you're out there and you're getting your dinner or lunch, make sure you tip your servers well, if they do a great job, because they rely on some of those tips.

But one thing we do in my riding here—I have a couple of great restaurant and bar icons, like the Old Sod; we have Galway Arms; we have the great Timothy's Pub; Mamma Martino's, which is a great pasta dinner; Posticino; ViBo; Azarias—that's just to name a few. They have some of the hardest-working employees and servers that I've ever seen. They make us all feel welcome, whether they're serving just us or multiple guests. They have to coordinate with the kitchen in accommodating dietary needs. Everybody has a dietary concern these days, so our servers try to make sure they get their food right.

The service industry is a career for some, while for others it's a part-time job. For example, students getting through school might take a part-time job as a server, and some of them, in the larger restaurants, make it more of a career. But you know what? They learn a really good lesson, and that's the lesson of customer service.

If this bill is passed, we would help these types of workers in the service industry by updating the province's Employment Standards Act, including banning unpaid trial shifts and making it clear that employees can never deduct an employee's wages in the event of a dine-and-dash, a gas-and-dash or any other stolen property. I can't imagine having to go home without that paycheque or that extra little bill.

But on this note, I just want to say thank you very much for listening to this today. I thank you for those who are going to support this bill. It is a very good bill; it will help our labour market. And to all those workers out there who are finishing their shift, have a wonderful evening.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): Questions?

Mr. Guy Bourgoin: I was listening to her speech when she talked about building labour, building carpenters. Well, it's good to build, but also a way to build is voting on anti-scab legislation protecting these same labourers who are unionized. That is a way to protect their work from scabs. So why did you vote against our scab legislation?

Ms. Christine Hogarth: Well, today I want to talk about the Working for Workers Four Act, because that's the bill that's in front of us, Bill 149. Our government is introducing this legislation because it is important for workers. We have worked hard. We have consulted with our labourers and our labour workers on why we want to move this bill forward today, and I'm extremely happy to support this bill. I'm happy to support our firefighters, I'm happy to support our service industry, and I hope you will as well.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): Next question.

Mr. Brian Saunderson: I want to thank my colleague from Etobicoke-Lakeshore for her comments. I know she's the PA to the Solicitor General. Last fall, we had a wonderful visit with the Solicitor General in the fire department in Collingwood, Ontario, and we know the incredible work our front-line firefighters do fighting fires, but also being first responders to many types of critical accidents.

I'm wondering if the member could comment on how this legislation will help firefighters who have been diagnosed with life-changing illnesses as a result of their service or when they've been injured on the job.

Ms. Christine Hogarth: Thank you very much to my colleague there on the justice team for the question. I have five fire crews in my riding, and we want to make sure that our firefighters are looked after and feel safe on the job. When there's a fire, we run away from it and they run in. I had the example of something that happened earlier this morning in the city of Toronto.

We're moving forward with cancer coverage for firefighters and fire investigators, and lowering the employment period needed to receive automatic compensation when diagnosed with esophageal cancer from 25 to 15 years. This means a firefighter with 24 years of service would no longer have to contest that their cancer was connected to their employment, giving them faster access to WSIB benefits and critical services. It's really important that they have those services. I know this is just one of the things that the Minister of Labour has been working on since 2018, and I know there will be more to come in Working for Workers 5.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): Next question.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I would like to begin by saying that I think it's really disgraceful that you said that no one on this side addressed Captain Craig Bowman. You must have missed the 10 minutes when the MPP from Niagara Falls talked about Jeff Burch's Captain Craig Bowman

Act. You may also not have heard when I said Captain Craig Bowman is a member of my family. He was my cousin. He's a member of my family. His mother-in-law came over on the boat with my father, so I have deep connections to Captain Craig Bowman, and I find that disgraceful, that you would say that. Shame on you for saying that. You should be listening when these things are that important.

What I would like to say: You said that we're not discussing the bill. I know for a fact that Captain Craig Bowman would have wanted this government to extend these same protections to the wildland firefighters, and you voted down an amendment to extend this protection in the memory of Captain Craig Bowman and his family. Why did this government do that?

Ms. Christine Hogarth: Well, I'm going to talk a little bit about Bill 149, which is the Working for Workers Four Act, 2024. Our province—we want to continue to be the best place to live, work and raise your family. That is why we're bringing forward this legislation, and that's why our government supports employers. We support unions and workers to provide the support they need to ensure that the workers are able to find better jobs and bring home better paycheques. That's what this government stands for and that's what we're going to do.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): Next question.

Hon. David Piccini: I'll be very quick. I, too, really enjoyed visiting you at Building Up and the great work that they're doing. If you could just explain a little more about steps that we've taken and, really, just the impact that this is having on under-represented groups that you saw at Building Up and so many more we visited across Ontario.

1710

Ms. Christine Hogarth: Well, that's a great question, and thank you, Minister, for all the work you do. It's seeing the smile in people's eyes because they know they're going to get a job. These are people that maybe have been shoved aside, didn't think they had the opportunity, and this government has given them the opportunity to have that pride of a job. There's nothing better than every day getting up and going to work. So I want to thank you for your ongoing support for Building Up, and I want to thank Marc, if you're listening, for the work you do.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): Further debate?

Mrs. Lisa Gretzky: It is my honour and privilege to rise to speak to Bill 149 today.

Again, I want to say to my colleague opposite: When my colleague stood up and talked about how it was Jeff Burch from our side of the House that actually tabled the Captain Bowman act, when my colleague from Niagara Falls spoke at length for 10 minutes about it, when my colleague from Hamilton West–Ancaster–Dundas talked about how he was family and how shameful it was that you tried to play politics with somebody's life, the member opposite deflected and said, "Well, I want to talk about the

bill." It was about the bill. Really, no low is too low, obviously.

Speaker, I'm going to focus a lot of my time today on this bill, talking about not only the inequities that we have seen—consistent, long-standing inequities—and attacks on women workers in this province by the Conservatives, but I also want to talk about anti-scab labour legislation. I know some of the members opposite were saying, "Well, it's not in the bill." Do you know why it's not in the bill? Because (a) you didn't put it in the bill; and (b) because when we tabled the amendment for you to put it in the bill, you voted against the amendment. So it is relevant to be talking about anti-scab labour legislation when we're talking about Bill 149 and, frankly, what's glaringly missing.

I want to start by mentioning the workers at GreenShield in Windsor and some in Toronto. There are 600 workers in Windsor from GreenShield Canada on strike. They went on strike March 1; they've been out for almost 18 days now. I believe there's another 24 GreenShield workers here in Toronto that are out on strike. The member from Essex was saying, "I don't have workers on strike at GreenShield." These people live in your riding too. They don't just live in Windsor West. They live in—

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): The member from Essex will come to order.

Mrs. Lisa Gretzky: Maybe the member from Essex would like to get up and say what he just said on the record.

Anyway, Speaker—

Mr. Anthony Leardi: You're quoting incorrectly. Stop making it up.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): The member from Essex will come to order.

Mrs. Lisa Gretzky: If the member from Essex would like to get up on the record and call me a liar, like he's implying right now, then I welcome him to do so. I challenge him to do so.

Speaker, these workers at GreenShield live in Windsor West, they live in Windsor–Tecumseh, they live in the riding of Essex, whether the member from Essex wants to acknowledge that or not. The vast majority of the 600 workers in Windsor on the GreenShield picket line are women. I don't even know if the member from Essex has bothered to go by the picket line and talk to the women on the line yet.

The member for Windsor–Tecumseh had mentioned to my colleague that his wife works at GreenShield and is on the picket line, and she is indeed. She is indeed on the picket line. And he asked about whether management are considered scabs, with an implication that there are no scab workers there. Right now, they have scab workers in accounting, scab workers in the IT department, scab workers at a call centre, scab workers doing claims adjudication, scab workers doing client enrolment, scab workers doing mail preparation. Scab workers have replaced the 600 workers on the line in Windsor, 24 workers at GreenShield here in Ontario.

Mr. Guy Bourgoin: And you voted against anti-scab.

Mrs. Lisa Gretzky: And yet the Conservative government—I believe it was November last year—voted against Bill 90, the NDP Anti-Scab Labour Act. The members opposite, when we had Windsor Salt workers on the picket line for I believe it was 192 days—when those workers came to Queen’s Park, Unifor members came to Queen’s Park for the tabling and debating of that bill, the government members wouldn’t even look at them when they sat just over here, asking this government to support them by passing anti-scab labour legislation. Those workers were on the line 192 days. Those weren’t just Windsor West people. Those were constituents of Windsor–Tecumseh; those were constituents of Essex; some of them were constituents in Chatham-Kent–Leamington.

The government members wouldn’t even look at them when they were here asking for the government to pass anti-scab labour legislation. When workers at Highbury Canco out in Leamington were out on strike for 23 days, the company was so bold that they were literally busing the scab workers in past the picket line and asking those workers on strike to move out of the way while they brought scabs in to do their work.

This government didn’t support anti-scab labour legislation. Sixteen times we as New Democrats have tabled anti-scab labour legislation and 16 times the Conservatives, propping up the Liberals, voted against it.

For 15 years the Conservatives were the official opposition in this place, with the Liberals being government, and every single time the Conservatives voted with the Liberals against workers and for corporations that either lock workers out or push them out on strike and then bring in scab labour to do their work, to starve them out.

I referenced the Windsor Salt strike—192 days. Some of those workers lost their homes. They couldn’t feed their families. You know what they were fighting for? Job security, because the company wanted to outsource their jobs. A foreign company, hedge fund company, that bought Windsor Salt was pushing the residents of Windsor–Essex out of their jobs to bring in lower-paid workers, yet those workers came here, asking for support, and the government didn’t give it to them.

And now we have a similar situation with GreenShield. Some people in the House may not realize that GreenShield Canada was founded by, I believe it was, four pharmacists. It was not-for-profit. The goal was to ensure that every single person in this province has access to health care coverage. That’s the goal. We benefit from it in my house, whether that’s my coverage here through the Legislature or my husband’s as a Unifor member who works at Windsor Assembly—GreenShield benefits. That was the goal when GreenShield was founded, I believe back in 1957-ish. I could be wrong on that, on the date.

Today, GreenShield Canada is acquiring for-profit acquisitions and paying those workers half of the pay that they pay current workers, and that is their goal with the workers at GreenShield in Windsor and in Toronto—624 workers total, 600 of them back home in Windsor—and this company wants to push them out of their jobs.

Some of them have been there decades doing this work, and GreenShield wants to push them out and bring in lower-paid workers. And right now they are using scabs to do that, because they know if they use scabs, apparently this government says that’s okay. So the corporation says, “Well, hey, we can keep those workers out on the line as long as we want. We can starve them out.”

I have a single mom that I talked to on the line the other day who had to move in with a friend. She doesn’t know how long she’s going to be able to stay there with her kids. That’s how desperate the situation is.

As I said, 70% of the workers there are women. I’ve asked the question before. I will ask it again and I’ll keep asking it: Why does this government allow and actively engage in—not just allow but actively engage in—the erosion and the attack on women workers? Why are you comfortable with that? Why is that okay?

1720

You see, Speaker, I raise these issues, especially about GreenShield, because I want every single worker on that line to be paid a fair wage, at the very least a bloody living wage. I want to know that when I call up GreenShield for questions—I used to work in a dental office. I used to work with the workers at GreenShield all the time. I’d call them on a line that only the dental offices were allowed to use, and I know that doctors’ offices do the same thing, and others—optometrists. We all do the same thing. There’s a special line where you can call as an office, as a professional, to talk to somebody about somebody’s coverage. And when you call, that somebody that answers the phone is usually somebody who knows what they’re doing. If I’m calling with a dental question, they know what I’m talking about when I call with a dental question. I want to know that those highly skilled people are being paid a fair wage. I want to know that when those women go home to their children, they’re able to put food on the table that didn’t come from a food bank because they could go grocery shopping because they could afford it, that they have a safe, stable roof over their heads.

When I stand here and I talk about the government and their attack on women with Bill 124 and then another attack on women-led professions with Bill 28, when I hear the government side talk about, “Oh, we’re working really hard at getting women into the skilled trades”—well, make sure that they have access to child care so they can actually go to work.

There is nothing in this bill before us that deals with the gender inequality when it comes to pay. As my colleague from Hamilton West–Ancaster–Dundas said, I believe it was women make about 89 cents on the dollar compared to men. Why is it that our work is worth less? Why is the expectation by this government and others before them that we’re going to go to work and we’re going to give it our all—not just our all, give extra? Because the expectation for women is that you always have to do more to prove yourself.

Where are the paid sick days in this bill when kids are sick? Because we know—no offence, men; some of you are great, but largely that falls on the women. In my

household at the time, because I made less, if my kids were in child care and they were sick, it was me that got the call at work to come home—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): Sorry to interrupt the member.

Members on the government side will keep their conversations quiet or take it out of the chamber, please.

I turn to the member from Windsor West to continue.

Mrs. Lisa Gretzky: Thank you, Speaker. It's not unexpected; I mean, I'm just talking about women, so why would they want to listen over there?

Interjections.

Mrs. Lisa Gretzky: I think the Minister of Labour just called me a smartass. Look, standing up and defending women in the workplace or anyplace, if that makes me a smartass, I'll take that every single day. I've been called worse by a lot better than you, sir.

Speaker, I would like to quote from the Equal Pay Coalition. They talk about pay transparency in this bill. This is what the Equal Pay Coalition had to say about it: "Ontario's Proposal on Pay Transparency Is Weakest in Canada." That's what they think about women in the workplace. And then it says, "While this is important, it is not anywhere close to a full pay transparency law." Do you know who that impacts the most? Women.

Speaker, I have the privilege of standing in this place and making equal to the men in this place—except for the Conservative side, for the ones where they gave themselves raises. I make the same as the men in this place. So I'm asking: Why does that not apply to every woman in the province? Why is that expectation not there for every woman in the province? Why do you not enforce it?

We have been talking about pay equity since before I can remember, since I was little, and we're still standing in places like this—and it's largely women doing the work; big surprise, having to advocate—and we're still talking about the gender pay gap. I've been here almost 10 years. This was a problem before I got here. It will probably be a problem by the time I'm gone. Why do we still have to talk about it? Why do women not deserve equal pay for equal work? There's nothing in this bill to ensure that that happens. There's nothing in this bill to enforce equal pay for equal work.

Speaker, last week, during the constituency week, I had child care workers come in, and I will tell you that one of them broke down in tears because her job is becoming darn near impossible. And she loves her job. She loves the people she works with. She loves the kids she works with. She loves the families that she works with. They have gotten to the point where when somebody calls or emails to get put on the list for child care, she's saying, "I'm not even going to bother because the wait-list is too long. We will never get your child into child care before they're full-time school." And it's even harder to get before and after care.

Think about that. We have child care workers; a large chunk of them are living in poverty because of the terrible wages they're paid. This government doesn't make sure

that child care workers are paid a fair wage, a living wage, that they're respected for the work they do—probably because it's a women-led profession. Then you add to that that child care workers also oftentimes need child care. So not only are they fairly low paid, but while they're providing this service to families, they can't access child care themselves. We have schools in Windsor where the child care provider in the school has given notice that they're not going to operate anymore. They're shutting down and the kids are going to be bused to another school in another neighbourhood for child care.

Speaker, in the last few minutes that I have, I want to again go back to the workers at GreenShield. Earlier today, I believe it was the Premier who said, during question period—I think it was him—he mentioned Windsor and that he was down in Windsor to do a tour and he went to the EV plant.

The GreenShield workers are on picket lines, a huge, U-shaped picket line for blocks on three different streets, all right outside the EV plant. The member for Windsor–Tecumseh is nodding his head because I think he knows where I'm going with this. They had signs that they put out—I've got pictures. I'll send it to any one of you, unless you want to drive down and actually join the picket line. It says, "Pass anti-scab legislation now."

These workers—again, a largely women-led workplace—are begging this government to pass anti-scab legislation. I read off to you all of the job classifications where they have scab workers right now working at GreenShield. These women—all of the workers there, but especially these women—are begging you to please pass anti-scab legislation.

The Premier went to the EV plant, and he did one of two things: He either went around the side because they knew there were folks out on strike, so he went to the side of the plant where he didn't have the pass the workers on strike, which is shameful. Or even worse, he drove past them while they stood on that line with those signs begging for help so that they could get back to the table and get a fair collective agreement, so the company would stop using scabs and prolonging the labour dispute, so they could address the issue of the company trying to outsource their jobs, on top of using scabs. And the Premier either drove right past them and ignored them, or he purposely avoided them by going to the other side of the plant. Either one is shameful.

1730

So I ask the government side: Why? Why would you continue to vote against anti-scab legislation? Why do you keep taking sides with these big corporations whose goal is to cut the pay of these workers as low as they possibly can, to outsource their jobs and to keep women, like those in my community, on a picket line while they are bringing scab workers in to do their jobs?

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): Questions?

Hon. Todd J. McCarthy: I have a question for the member for Windsor West. When I addressed the House at second reading of Bill 149, I referenced artificial

intelligence. His Majesty's loyal opposition House leader had thanked me for my submissions on AI. Section 8.4 of Bill 149 addresses AI in this respect: "Every employer who advertises a publicly advertised job posting and who uses artificial intelligence to screen, assess or select applicants for the position shall include in the posting a statement disclosing the use of the artificial intelligence." My question, then, is: Is the member supportive of this provision, given that our government's policy is "no AI in secret"?

Mrs. Lisa Gretzky: I just spent 20 minutes in this House largely talking about the gender pay gap, the inequality for women in the province, the workers who are currently out on strike—600 in Windsor, most of them women—and anti-scab legislation that is desperately needed and the fact that this government has voted against it 16 times. And that was the question I got. That was the response I got. It wasn't about the women on the line. It wasn't about the gender pay gap that keeps growing and growing and growing. It wasn't about the lack of child care for women workers in this province. I would like to say that I'm astonished by it, but after five years, six years of this government, it really doesn't surprise me anymore that the government member didn't want to get up and talk about women in the workforce.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): Next question?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I want to thank my sister from Windsor West for always bringing to the table the gender inequalities that continue to exist in this province and this government's abysmal failure to address them as a serious concern for the women and girls in this province.

You talked about all the government's bills; Bill 124 froze the wages of primarily women workers in the province. You've talked about the GreenShield workers—and my guess is, they're primarily women, as you said, in this province—silence from this government.

I just have to say, it was unfortunate to hear the Minister of Labour say that your comments were smartass when you were talking about women. It's unfortunate. Not only does their legislation show a lack of respect for women; their behaviour in this House shows a lack of respect for women in this province.

When it comes to child care now, one agency in Hamilton, just one alone, Today's Family, has 1,169 children waiting for care, with only 314 spaces being allocated under the early learning and child care plan. How are women supposed to get back to work or keep their jobs when the government not only freezes their wages but doesn't make sure that they have access to child care in this province?

Mrs. Lisa Gretzky: I appreciate the question from my colleague from Hamilton West–Ancaster–Dundas. It makes it darn near impossible for women to work. I'm going to share a story: When I was working in the dental field—it's not a high-paying job; I can tell you that—and I had children in child care, I worked to pay the child care bill. That's the only reason I kept working when I had children, so that when my kids went to school, I would

already have an established job, that I wouldn't have to worry about not being able to get a job. That is something that many women face: Do they stay home with the children? That's largely the expectation even these days, that the women are going to stay home and take care of the children and do everything.

So that's the decision they have to make and then risk not being able to get a job once their kids are in school because people say, "Well, you don't have enough experience. You haven't worked in a few years," or they try to find a child care spot and they can't get one, and they're automatically excluded from being able to work because they can't have child care. That's why it's so important that this government recognize that when we're talking about pay equity, we need to ensure that the people that are providing the supports and services that we need as women and as families in order to be able to go to work and do that kind of thing like we want to, that this government has to bring in policies that address all aspects of things. They can't just say that we're putting money into training women in certain fields and not recognize that if they don't have child care, if they don't have paid sick days, if they don't have a fair wage, then you are still excluding them from being part of the economy.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): Next question?

Hon. Stephen Lecce: Our government has cut fees for families by 50%, representing \$8,000 to \$12,000 per child. We are committed to building 86,000 net new spaces for the people of Ontario. I'm curious, though, when the member opposite was in this House and had the balance of power with the Liberals—I mean this honestly—what was the rate decrease you were able to negotiate from the Liberal Premier of the day to save families money? What was that percentage of decrease that you achieved that this government wasn't able to do?

Mrs. Lisa Gretzky: First of all, to the Minister of Education, I wasn't here then. But you know who did have the balance of power when I got elected? You. You guys. You were the official opposition.

I also want to point out that the Minister of Education—
Interjections.

Mrs. Lisa Gretzky: I'd like the opportunity to respond to the question.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): The House will come to order.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): Stop the clock. Members will come to order. Comments through the Chair.

The member from Windsor West.

Mrs. Lisa Gretzky: As I had pointed out earlier to the Minister of Education, we have child care centres in Windsor that are not even putting people on wait-lists because the wait-lists are so long. Do you know why they're so long? Because these workers aren't paid a fair wage. They're not getting paid a fair wage so they're leaving the sector—

Interjections.

Mrs. Lisa Gretzky: I didn't realize we're debating directly across the floor. I would be happy to do this, though, Madam Speaker.

Interjection.

Mrs. Lisa Gretzky: I appreciate that the Minister of Education is mansplaining child care to me and women's wages—seriously.

My point is, when we're talking about building child care spaces, if you are not—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutila Karpoche): Members will come to order. The government side will come to order.

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutila Karpoche): The minister of labour, training and immigration will come to order.

Next question?

Mr. Joel Harden: I want to thank my friend from Windsor West for her remarks. I must admit, I'm not surprised that the Minister of Education is once again asking the province for financial literacy when he, himself, was probably given the biggest spanking I've ever seen at a committee before this House when the critic for education had to remind the minister, when he keeps telling the member and others that the province is doing great things for childhood education—the member for Ottawa West—Nepean had to explain to that minister that were this government to keep up with inflation, he would have had to put 17% in increased funding. He stumbled over his answers.

I'm going to ask the member for Windsor West to maybe help the minister, help this government after that horrific spanking. Can we just please have some clarity, my friend, about what women workers want from this government on a bill that is purportedly working for them?

Mrs. Lisa Gretzky: What they want is equal pay for equal work, and we want the government to enforce that. What they want is paid sick days—provincially paid sick days. What they want is for this government not to pass unconstitutional legislation like Bill 124, or then attack them again with Bill 28. They don't want them to spend millions upon millions of dollars in court defending their unconstitutional legislation when what they could do is actually pay women better for the work that they do. They could pay those child care workers better so they would actually be able to stay in the sector they love so much rather than having to move to go to other jobs in order to put food on the table and keep a roof over their head. What they want is a government that invests in women instead of pushing them into shelters and food banks. That's what this government could be doing rather than wasting money on things, say, like the greenbelt and countless other court battles that they seem to be losing.

1740

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutila Karpoche): Next question?

Hon. Charmaine A. Williams: I'm just listening to this debate, and I'm really confused because I believe

when our government was moving forward to make sure we secured the highest federal contribution out of any province, \$13.2 billion, the members opposite did vote against that, and actually wanted us to agree to the smallest amount that other provinces did. That increase made sure that 30% of families would be able to have access. That increase also ensured an increase in the salary for the ECE workers and the laddering to ensure that our ECEs become registered to get the same pay as those in schools. Those are all things that the members opposite did not—

Mrs. Lisa Gretzky: You know what we didn't support? You know what we didn't support?

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutila Karpoche): The government side will come to order. Minister of Transportation. The member from Brampton East.

Unfortunately, we don't have enough time for a response. Further debate?

M. Guy Bourgouin: Ça me fait tout le temps un plaisir de me lever, puis de parler d'un projet de loi : le G149, un projet de loi qui dit qu'il est pour les travailleurs, mais la question se pose. La question se pose : pourquoi? Quand on commence à regarder un petit peu ce que le gouvernement a eu la chance de passer—des propositions que l'opposition officielle avait amenées pour améliorer les conditions des travailleurs.

Vous le savez, moi—écoutez, ce n'est pas compliqué. Je viens du milieu syndical. J'ai négocié des conditions de travail pendant 21 ans pour améliorer les conditions de travail des travailleurs. Mais quand je pense à la loi antiscab—on va commencer avec la loi antiscab parce qu'il y en a six qu'ils ont voté contre, mais je vais commencer avec la loi antiscab. Je vais essayer de me rendre à travers toutes, mais le temps passe vite quand je me laisse aller.

Quand on parle de la loi antiscab chez nous, quand on parle de mon comté de Mushkegowuk—James Bay—quand tu vas sur la route 11, il y a un monument qui est près de 30 pieds de haut. Ce n'est pas un petit monument; c'est un gros monument. Il y a une famille qui est au-dessus de ce monument-là. Ça s'appelle Reesor Siding. Pour le monde qui ne le sait pas—pour éduquer le monde du gouvernement qui n'a jamais été sur la route 11, qui n'a jamais été dans le Nord, qui n'a jamais passé devant ce monument-là—c'était une dispute de travailleurs. Il y a eu trois personnes qui ont été tuées, puis huit blessés.

Dans ce temps-là, c'était Kimberly-Clark qui avait engagé une coopérative—c'étaient des fermiers—puis il y avait le syndicat, les travailleurs de bois. Tout ce temps-là, c'était pour de la pitoune. On appelle ça la pitoune. C'est du huit-pieds qu'ils mettaient sur les trains pour être capable d'emmener.

Il y a 300 hommes qui sont arrivés. Je pense que c'est plus que 300 hommes qui arrivaient le soir pour ça, mais tout ce temps-là, il y avait un groupe de fermiers qui étaient armés qui étaient là. La compagnie, pour essayer de faire des briseurs de grève, ils ont payé ce monde-là. Bien, le monde—ils ont paniqué, puis il y a eu trois personnes qui sont mortes, puis huit blessées.

C'est pour vous dire comment ça peut marquer une région, encore aujourd'hui. Il y a eu des livres qui ont été écrits sur le sujet, même sur les deux bords. Je me souviens encore, c'est Doric Germain qui avait écrit sur l'autre côté, sur le bord des « scabs », si on peut utiliser le terme—ou bien donc, c'était les fermiers. Quand il est venu présenter son livre, le monde, ils ont dit : « C'était facile pour toi. Ce n'était pas toi qui se faisait tirer dessus. »

Là, on a des familles qui sont mariées entre eux autres—je me souviens, dans ce temps-là, j'étais président du syndicat et il y avait le monument. Je suis allé voir ceux qui ont des survivants. Il restait des survivants. J'ai dit : « Écoute, le local parle de faire, peut-être, quelque chose de grand. » On voulait fêter, je pense, le 50^e de la dispute. Ils ont dit : « Guy, laissons les morts être des morts. » Pourquoi? Parce que là, on a des familles qui sont mariées—écoute, il y a encore des familles aujourd'hui qui ne se parlent pas à cause de ça. Ça a déchiré des familles. Ça a déchiré des communautés. Le monde en parle encore comme—souvent, quand tu vas parler de ce sujet-là, c'est très sensible. Il faut faire attention, même encore. On est rendu que ça fait longtemps, là. Ce n'est pas d'aujourd'hui. On parle des années 1960—1963, si je ne me trompe pas. C'était une grève qui a marqué une région.

Fait que, quand on parle d'une loi antiscab, c'est protéger les communautés, c'est protéger les travailleurs, c'est protéger des familles, c'est protéger—ce n'est pas juste une question de philosophie. C'est parce que ça vient mettre fin, premièrement, à une dispute beaucoup plus vite. Je peux vous dire, j'ai négocié dans la région pendant 21 ans. Quand on le mentionnait, c'était pris au sérieux. On dit : « Écoute, il ne faut pas créer la même situation. »

Et tout ce temps-là, c'était pour des bûches. Il y a du monde qui est mort pour du bois—la pitoune, on l'appelle; les huit-pieds, là. Tu dis : « Ça a-tu du bon sens? Comment est-ce qu'on s'est rendu là? »

Mais on avait un gouvernement dans le temps qui ne supportait pas les travailleurs et, tout ce temps-là, ils savent qui ont tiré; ils savent quelles armes ont été tirées. Ils avaient toute l'information. Moi, je le sais. J'avais les archives chez nous, à ma section locale. Puis les seules personnes qui ont été chargées, c'étaient les travailleurs, et non les personnes qui les ont tués.

Là, tu dis : « Bien, baptême, on est rendu en quoi, 2024? Puis on se bat encore pour la loi antiscab » que, en passant, on avait en Ontario avant. C'était le gouvernement NPD qui l'avait amenée. On a dit : « Non, il faut protéger les travailleurs. » Et ça règle les disputes, qu'on ne crée pas un autre Reesor Siding—et il y en a eu d'autres Reesor Siding, en passant. On n'a rien qu'à voir dans le passé qu'est-ce qui est arrivé.

Puis là, on a un gouvernement aujourd'hui—16 fois; pas une fois, là—16 fois qu'ils ont voté contre les lois antiscab. Puis tu dis, bien, comment est-ce qu'ils peuvent penser—j'ai entendu un des députés qui dit que sa femme est en grève, puis il y a des scabs. Je me dis—

Interjection.

M. Guy Bourgouin: Je te cherchais.

Mais je me dis, imagine-toi si ça tourne en dispute puis ta femme meurt pour une dispute de même. Mettons que ça arrivait. Je peux te dire que tu n'aurais pas la même vision que tu as aujourd'hui.

C'est pour ça que je dis au gouvernement, quand ça vient à la loi antiscab, quand moi je vis dans une région où ça a marqué une région—pas à peu près, là; ça a marqué creux. Ça a divisé des familles. Il y a du monde qui ne se parle même pas—des frères et des soeurs—parce qu'il y a eu un frère qui est mort. Il y avait un cousin qui tirait sur l'autre cousin. Tu parles de marquer une région? S'il y avait eu une loi antiscab, on n'aurait pas vécu ça. Mais il y a un monument de 30 pieds de haut qui rappelle à tout le monde dans la région et tout le monde qui passe sur la route 11 ce qui peut arriver si ça dégénère.

Ça a l'air qu'on demande de quoi—la mer à boire, comme on dit—quand on dit antiscab, que c'est une philosophie. Parce que c'est facile à dire ça, que non, on va être contre : « On supporte les employeurs. » C'est exactement ce que vous faites là. Mais c'est à la faveur de l'employeur quand qu'on a des antiscabs.

Parce que, quand on l'avait dans le temps, ça se réglait beaucoup plus vite. Là, on a des disputes qui durent plus longtemps, qui durent pour longtemps. C'est seulement pour casser les reins des travailleurs. C'est seulement pour nuire, et ça ne nuit pas au travailleur lui-même; c'est sa famille. On a entendu ma collègue en parler. Elle a parlé des femmes qui se battent pour leurs droits, leurs salaires. Elles veulent juste l'équité salariale. On est en 2024 en Ontario et on se bat encore pour l'équité salariale—pas fort, pas fort. Mais on vote 16 fois—16 fois—contre un « anti-scab legislation », qui aiderait cette situation-là, en passant. Parce que quand tu es assis devant l'employeur et il ne peut pas aller chercher des travailleurs de remplacement, qu'on appelle « scabs », quelle autre option a-t-il? Il va être assis à la table et on va y mettre le temps. Mais ça—faut pas oublier, là, que les deux parties doivent mettre de l'eau dans leur vin.

Mais à quelque part, par exemple—même avec un antiscab, la balance, elle ne vient pas égale pareille. C'est encore toujours le bras—le pouvoir est toujours sur l'employeur. Il a plus de poids, tout le temps, que le travailleur. Mais ça ramène, au moins, la pendule plus égale. Ça donne à l'employé de dire : « Écoute, tu ne vas pas me remplacer. Trouvons des solutions. Travaillons ensemble pour trouver des solutions. »

1750

Moi, quand j'ai commencé dans le métier, je m'en souviens, c'est Normand Rivard qui m'a engagé. C'était un de mes mentors. Je ne sais pas s'il m'écoute aujourd'hui, parce qu'il rirait, là, mais il m'avait dit : « Guy, n'importe quel stupide peut négocier une grève. C'est facile. Tu dis “non, non, non”, puis tu es en grève. » Mais il dit : « La personne, par exemple, qui va trouver une solution pour régler la grève ou éviter une grève, là, par exemple, on a quelqu'un qui va travailler pour les travailleurs et va trouver des solutions. »

Ça, c'est le même bord que l'employeur. L'employeur, lui, veut avoir une entente juste. Si on avait ces outils-là,

un outil comme l'antiscab, on aurait ce niveau-là qui se produirait. L'employeur, il n'y a pas de presse, là. On a vu comment de fois que ce gouvernement a légiféré pour ramener des travailleurs essentiels au travail sans leur donner la chance d'aller négocier. Ils ont joué à ça avec l'éducation, la santé. Ce sont tous des droits constitutionnels qu'ils ont, mais on les a enlevés à cause qu'on leur a dit qu'astheure, ce sont des travailleurs essentiels. Mais, tu sais, je veux dire, à quelque part, les syndicats font un travail : représenter les travailleurs. Puis quand j'entends le gouvernement dire : « on est pour les travailleurs », excusez-moi, mais si vous étiez pour les travailleurs, ça, c'en est une que vous passeriez. Parce que ça, sans fautes, ça aide les travailleurs. C'est une demande qui existait en Ontario, qui a été retirée par les conservateurs de Mike Harris, mais qui mettait un terrain égal de négociation puis qui aidait à la situation.

L'autre projet de loi qu'ils ont refusé, c'est « Bill 76, respecting workers in health care ». Ça, c'est un projet de loi que—j'étais pour dire « tomber sur le derrière », pour ne pas utiliser le vrai terme, en bon québécois. Mais on était en pleine pandémie et on avait un projet de loi 124. On disait des travailleurs de la santé qu'ils étaient des héros, mais qu'on va geler leur salaire—une loi anticonstitutionnelle. Puis nous autres, pour essayer de réparer ça, comme opposition officielle, on a amené un projet de loi, soit le « respecting workers in health care ». Qu'est-ce que le gouvernement, dans sa sagesse, fait? Il vote contre. Il vote contre. Mais par exemple, le projet de loi 124, ils ne l'ont pas ôté. Ils l'ont battu en cour. Ça a coûté des millions à la province. Tout ce temps-là, qu'est-ce qu'il est arrivé à la santé et à l'éducation? Le monde a commencé à sortir. Le monde est sorti, et pourquoi? Ils n'étaient pas respectés. Le monde est parti parce qu'ils n'étaient pas bien payés. Ils n'étaient pas rémunérés; ils n'étaient pas respectés. Mais, je vais te dire, la plus grosse, c'est de ne pas être respecté, parce que, tu travailleras dans n'importe quel domaine—n'importe quel domaine—et si ton employeur ne te respecte pas, tu ne restes pas. Parce qu'à rentrer du travail à reculons, comme on dit en bon français, tu ne restes pas parce que tu n'as pas d'entrain, pas d'initiative à rentrer travailler, tu ne veux pas donner ton 100 %. Tu sais, tu ne te sens pas apprécié. Tu veux être apprécié? Rémunère ton monde. Rémunère ton monde.

Bien non, on a regardé ça et ils l'ont retiré. Ça a pris assez de temps, assez de pression des éducateurs, des syndicats à l'éducation, de la santé, des syndicats de la santé—tous les travailleurs qui ont été impactés. Ça a pris ça. Mais même encore là, ils ont bocqué le système; ils l'ont « appealé » une autre fois. C'est certain qu'ils étaient contents quand ils ont décidé de ne pas faire appel, mais ça a pris comment de temps? Deux ans? Trois ans, si je ne me trompe pas? Trois ans, puis en plus de ça ils ont passé une crise de pandémie, puis ils ont dit : « Non, c'était nécessaire. » Ce n'était pas nécessaire. Ce n'était pas nécessaire. Ça, c'est la plus grosse farce, si je peux user le terme—pour ne pas dire « menterie »; bien oui, je vais le dire pareil, et peut-être que je vais m'en sauver. C'était la plus grosse bulle, qui ne faisait pas de sens de dire que

« bien non, c'était pour des coûts économiques ». Arrêtez-moi ça. Ça a été la pire affaire qu'on aurait pu mettre dans un projet de loi : attaquer ces travailleurs-là.

Moi, je le sais; ma fille est enseignante, et elle aime son domaine. Elle est qualifiée, mais elle parle de sortir du métier. Pourquoi? Ça ne paye pas. Les heures ne sont pas là. Puis pourtant, elle est appréciée, les professeurs l'aime, les enfants autistes—elle, elle prend les cas lourds. Elle est dans son milieu. Elle est bonne à ce qu'elle fait. Le monde me dit : « Guy, ta fille est excellente là-dedans. Elle est dans son milieu. » Puis, elle parle de sortir du milieu. Pourquoi? Parce qu'elle est obligée de—elle veut avoir de l'avancement. Elle veut s'acheter une maison. Elle veut être capable de vivre de meilleures conditions. Mais avec le salaire qu'elle fait comme aide-enseignante, elle ne peut pas se le permettre. Mais si on veut garder ces expertises-là—ce n'est pas parce que c'est ma fille; je pourrais parler d'un autre exemple d'une autre personne. Pourquoi a-t-on tant de personnes dans l'éducation qui s'en vont? Pourquoi a-t-on des permissions et des permissions qu'on donne parce qu'on n'a pas de professeurs qualifiés? C'est encore pire dans l'éducation française. Le service en français—on est pénalisé doublement.

Mais c'est juste pour vous dire qu'avec des projets de loi comme le 124—puis on avait le projet de 76, où on demandait de respecter les travailleurs en « health care ». J'ai parlé de l'éducation, mais c'est tout dans le même bateau, ça. C'est surtout en santé, parce que le monde de la santé—il faut que j'en parle, là; il y a une lumière qui vient d'allumer, puis je vois que je suis [*inaudible*].

J'ai eu une appendicite à Toronto durant ROMA. Sais-tu où je me suis ramassé? Lit numéro 7 dans le corridor. On a des lits numérotés dans les corridors à des hôpitaux. Ça a-tu du bon sens? Et cette semaine, j'écoutais la période des questions; aujourd'hui, la ministre qui dit qu'il n'y a pas de problèmes en Ontario. Coudonc. On vit dans deux provinces.

On vit dans deux provinces. Tu as le gouvernement qui dit : « Hé, tout va bien. On a investi des millions et des milliards. » Oui, mais où est-ce qu'il va, cet argent-là? Parce que moi, je sais qu'il ne vient pas chez nous. Il ne vient pas chez nous, cet argent-là.

J'en ai parlé pour deux minutes de temps dans notre motion : j'ai une communauté qui va perdre un autre médecin, qui est brûlé parce qu'il fait trop de paperasse; il a trop de rapports à remplir; il ne peut pas répondre à sa clientèle. Ils sont brûlés, et ils lâchent le métier. Il n'y a pas de relève, parce que les médecins de famille, je peux vous dire, sont rares. Ils sont assez dispersés, encore plus en français—parce que c'est une communauté qui est 98 % ou 99 % francophone.

Qu'est-ce qu'ils vont faire? Là, ils sont obligés de voyager trois heures pour aller voir—je vais vous donner un exemple : pour un oculiste, trois heures pour aller à Timmins. Qu'est-ce qui arrive? Parce que ce ne sont pas des spécialistes qu'ils vont voir, le « travel grant » ne s'applique pas. C'est trois heures pour aller à Timmins. Il y a des oculistes à Kap, il y a des oculistes à Hearst, mais ils sont débordés. Les médecins, c'est la même chose. Il y

a une communauté qui avait 50 % des orphelins de docteurs. Là, on a encore un docteur qui s'en va; ça vient de monter à 70 %. Qu'est-ce qu'on fait avec cette communauté-là?

Puis, on dit—j'entendais la ministre : « Tout va bien, tout fonctionne. Qu'est-ce que vous faites, opposition officielle? Qu'est-ce que vous faites? Vous êtes dans la brume. » Bien, je vais le dire, moi : qu'elle sorte de sa tour d'ivoire, qu'elle vienne chez nous, qu'elle vienne parler à l'hôpital, qu'elle vienne parler aux personnes qui sont affectées par ça, qu'elle vienne faire, justement, un « community hall » avec moi. Je vais te le dire : elle va se faire bombarder—pas à peu près, là. Mais je ne pense pas qu'elle veuille l'entendre, parce qu'ils disent des millions et des millions—bien, ces millions, vont-ils au privé? Je me pose la question.

On a juste demandé de « caper », parce que les hôpitaux disent qu'il faut régler la situation des infirmières privées des agences. On ne veut même pas faire ça. Les hôpitaux nous disent : « Une grosse portion de notre budget s'en va là. » Le gouvernement, qu'est-ce qu'il fait? Pas intéressé.

Tout ce temps-là, parlant de l'argent des contribuables et d'où est-ce qu'il va, il va dans le système privé. Puis, vos hôpitaux, ceux que la ministre dit qu'il faut faire de quoi—les soins à long terme nous disent la même chose. Ils disent : « On plaide avec le gouvernement de mettre un cap, au moins mettre un cap, et on les réduit par attrition. » Ce n'est pas—comment on dit ça—« rocket science ». En français : ce n'est pas un secret de Polichinelle. On dit ça.

Mais avec ce gouvernement, ce qu'on propose tombe dans l'oreille d'un sourd—bien non. C'est juste parce que ça vient de nous.

Écoute, je peux continuer. Je manque de temps; j'aurais dû rester sur mes notes. J'ai le projet de loi 57, Respecting Injured Workers Act—

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): I'm sorry to interrupt the member, but it is now 6 p.m.

Third reading debate deemed adjourned.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): The House will stand adjourned until tomorrow at 9 a.m.

The House adjourned at 1800.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenante-gouverneure: Hon. / L'hon. Edith Dumont, OOnt
Speaker / Président de l'Assemblée législative: Hon. / L'hon. Ted Arnott
Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day
Deputy Clerk / Sous-Greffière: Valerie Quioc Lim
Clerks-at-the-Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Julia Douglas, Meghan Stenson,
Christopher Tyrell, Wai Lam (William) Wong
Sergeant-at-Arms / Sergent d'armes: Tim McGough

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	
Arnott, Hon. / L'hon. Ted (PC)	Wellington—Halton Hills	Speaker / Président de l'Assemblée législative
Babikian, Aris (PC)	Scarborough—Agincourt	
Bailey, Robert (PC)	Sarnia—Lambton	
Barnes, Patrice (PC)	Ajax	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième Vice-Présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Begum, Doly (NDP)	Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjointe de l'opposition officielle
Bell, Jessica (NDP)	University—Rosedale	
Bethlenfalvy, Hon. / L'hon. Peter (PC)	Pickering—Uxbridge	Minister of Finance / Ministre des Finances
Blais, Stephen (LIB)	Orléans	
Bouma, Will (PC)	Brantford—Brant	
Bourgouin, Guy (NDP)	Mushkegowuk—James Bay / Mushkegowuk—Baie James	
Bowman, Stephanie (LIB)	Don Valley West / Don Valley-Ouest	
Brady, Bobbi Ann (IND)	Haldimand—Norfolk	
Bresee, Ric (PC)	Hastings—Lennox and Addington	
Burch, Jeff (NDP)	Niagara Centre / Niagara-Centre	
Byers, Rick (PC)	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	
Calandra, Hon. / L'hon. Paul (PC)	Markham—Stouffville	Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire du gouvernement Minister of Legislative Affairs / Ministre des Affaires législatives
Cho, Hon. / L'hon. Raymond Sung Joon (PC)	Scarborough North / Scarborough- Nord	Minister for Seniors and Accessibility / Ministre des Services aux aînés et de l'Accessibilité
Cho, Hon. / L'hon. Stan (PC)	Willowdale	Minister of Long-Term Care / Ministre des Soins de longue durée
Clancy, Aislinn (GRN)	Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre	
Clark, Steve (PC)	Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes / Leeds— Grenville—Thousand Islands et Rideau Lakes	
Coe, Lorne (PC)	Whitby	
Collard, Lucille (LIB)	Ottawa—Vanier	Third Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Troisième Vice-Présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Crawford, Stephen (PC)	Oakville	
Cuzzetto, Rudy (PC)	Mississauga—Lakeshore	
Dixon, Jess (PC)	Kitchener South—Hespeler / Kitchener-Sud—Hespeler	
Dowie, Andrew (PC)	Windsor—Tecumseh	
Downey, Hon. / L'hon. Doug (PC)	Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte	Attorney General / Procureur général
Dunlop, Hon. / L'hon. Jill (PC)	Simcoe North / Simcoe-Nord	Minister of Colleges and Universities / Ministre des Collèges et Universités
Fedeli, Hon. / L'hon. Victor (PC)	Nipissing	Chair of Cabinet / Président du Conseil des ministres Minister of Economic Development, Job Creation and Trade / Ministre du Développement économique, de la Création d'emplois et du Commerce
Fife, Catherine (NDP)	Waterloo	

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Flack, Hon. / L'hon. Rob (PC)	Elgin—Middlesex—London	Associate Minister of Housing / Ministre associé du Logement
Ford, Hon. / L'hon. Doug (PC)	Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord	Leader, Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti progressiste-conservateur de l'Ontario
		Premier / Premier ministre
		Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / Ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales
Ford, Hon. / L'hon. Michael D. (PC)	York South—Weston / York-Sud—Weston	Minister of Citizenship and Multiculturalism / Ministre des Affaires civiques et du Multiculturalisme
Fraser, John (LIB)	Ottawa South / Ottawa-Sud	
French, Jennifer K. (NDP)	Oshawa	
Gallagher Murphy, Dawn (PC)	Newmarket—Aurora	
Gates, Wayne (NDP)	Niagara Falls	
Gélinas, France (NDP)	Nickel Belt	
Ghamari, Goldie (PC)	Carleton	
Glover, Chris (NDP)	Spadina—Fort York	
Gretzky, Lisa (NDP)	Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest	
Grewal, Hardeep Singh (PC)	Brampton East / Brampton-Est	
Hardeman, Ernie (PC)	Oxford	
Harden, Joel (NDP)	Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	
Harris, Mike (PC)	Kitchener—Conestoga	
Hazell, Andrea (LIB)	Scarborough—Guildwood	
Hogarth, Christine (PC)	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	
Holland, Kevin (PC)	Thunder Bay—Atikokan	
Hsu, Ted (LIB)	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les Îles	
Jama, Sarah (IND)	Hamilton Centre / Hamilton-Centre	
Jones, Hon. / L'hon. Sylvia (PC)	Dufferin—Caledon	Minister of Health / Ministre de la Santé
		Deputy Premier / Vice-première ministre
Jones, Trevor (PC)	Chatham-Kent—Leamington	Deputy Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint du gouvernement
Jordan, John (PC)	Lanark—Frontenac—Kingston	
Kanapathi, Logan (PC)	Markham—Thornhill	
Karpoche, Bhutla (NDP)	Parkdale—High Park	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Première Vice-Présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Ke, Vincent (IND)	Don Valley North / Don Valley-Nord	
Kernaghan, Terence (NDP)	London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord	Deputy Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint de l'opposition officielle
Kerzner, Hon. / L'hon. Michael S. (PC)	York Centre / York-Centre	Solicitor General / Solliciteur général
Khanjin, Hon. / L'hon. Andrea (PC)	Barrie—Innisfil	Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks / Ministre de l'Environnement, de la Protection de la nature et des Parcs
		Deputy Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjointe du gouvernement
Kusendova-Bashta, Natalia (PC)	Mississauga Centre / Mississauga-Centre	
Leardi, Anthony (PC)	Essex	
Lecce, Hon. / L'hon. Stephen (PC)	King—Vaughan	Minister of Education / Ministre de l'Éducation
Lumsden, Hon. / L'hon. Neil (PC)	Hamilton East—Stoney Creek / Hamilton-Est—Stoney Creek	Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport / Ministre du Tourisme, de la Culture et du Sport
MacLeod, Lisa (PC)	Nepean	
Mamakwa, Sol (NDP)	Kiiwetinoong	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjoint de l'opposition officielle
Mantha, Michael (IND)	Algoma—Manitoulin	
Martin, Robin (PC)	Eglinton—Lawrence	
McCarthy, Hon. / L'hon. Todd J. (PC)	Durham	Minister of Public and Business Service Delivery / Ministre des Services au public et aux entreprises
McCrimmon, Karen (LIB)	Kanata—Carleton	
McGregor, Graham (PC)	Brampton North / Brampton-Nord	
McMahon, Mary-Margaret (LIB)	Beaches—East York	
Mulroney, Hon. / L'hon. Caroline (PC)	York—Simcoe	President of the Treasury Board / Présidente du Conseil du Trésor
		Minister of Francophone Affairs / Ministre des Affaires francophones
Oosterhoff, Sam (PC)	Niagara West / Niagara-Ouest	
Pang, Billy (PC)	Markham—Unionville	

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Parsa, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (PC)	Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill	Minister of Children, Community and Social Services / Ministre des Services à l'enfance et des Services sociaux et communautaires
Pasma, Chandra (NDP)	Ottawa West—Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest—Nepean	
Piccini, Hon. / L'hon. David (PC)	Northumberland—Peterborough South / Northumberland—Peterborough-Sud	Minister of Labour, Immigration, Training and Skills Development / Ministre du Travail, de l'Immigration, de la Formation et du Développement des compétences
Pierre, Natalie (PC)	Burlington	
Pirie, Hon. / L'hon. George (PC)	Timmins	Minister of Mines / Ministre des Mines
Quinn, Nolan (PC)	Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry	
Rae, Matthew (PC)	Perth—Wellington	
Rakocevic, Tom (NDP)	Humber River—Black Creek	
Rasheed, Kaleed (IND)	Mississauga East—Cooksville / Mississauga-Est—Cooksville	
Rickford, Hon. / L'hon. Greg (PC)	Kenora—Rainy River	Minister of Northern Development / Ministre du Développement du Nord Minister of Indigenous Affairs / Ministre des Affaires autochtones
Riddell, Brian (PC)	Cambridge	
Romano, Ross (PC)	Sault Ste. Marie	
Sabawy, Sheref (PC)	Mississauga—Erin Mills	
Sandhu, Amarjot (PC)	Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest	
Sarkaria, Hon. / L'hon. Prabmeet Singh (PC)	Brampton South / Brampton-Sud	Minister of Transportation / Ministre des Transports
Sarrazin, Stéphane (PC)	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	
Sattler, Peggy (NDP)	London West / London-Ouest	
Saunderson, Brian (PC)	Simcoe—Grey	
Schreiner, Mike (GRN)	Guelph	
Scott, Laurie (PC)	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock	
Shamji, Adil (LIB)	Don Valley East / Don Valley-Est	
Shaw, Sandy (NDP)	Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas / Hamilton-Ouest—Ancaster—Dundas	
Skelly, Donna (PC)	Flamborough—Glanbrook	Deputy Speaker / Vice-Présidente Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Smith, Dave (PC)	Peterborough—Kawartha	
Smith, David (PC)	Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre	
Smith, Hon. / L'hon. Graydon (PC)	Parry Sound—Muskoka	Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry / Ministre des Richesses naturelles et des Forêts
Smith, Laura (PC)	Thornhill	
Smith, Hon. / L'hon. Todd (PC)	Bay of Quinte / Baie de Quinte	Minister of Energy / Ministre de l'Énergie
Stevens, Jennifer (Jennie) (NDP)	St. Catharines	
Stiles, Marit (NDP)	Davenport	Leader, Official Opposition / Chef de l'opposition officielle Leader, New Democratic Party of Ontario / Chef du Nouveau Parti démocratique de l'Ontario
Surma, Hon. / L'hon. Kinga (PC)	Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre	Minister of Infrastructure / Ministre de l'Infrastructure
Tabuns, Peter (NDP)	Toronto—Danforth	
Tangri, Hon. / L'hon. Nina (PC)	Mississauga—Streetsville	Associate Minister of Small Business / Ministre associée déléguée aux Petites Entreprises
Taylor, Monique (NDP)	Hamilton Mountain / Hamilton-Mountain	
Thanigasalam, Hon. / L'hon Vijay (PC)	Scarborough—Rouge Park	Associate Minister of Transportation / Ministre associé des Transports
Thompson, Hon. / L'hon. Lisa M. (PC)	Huron—Bruce	Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
Tibollo, Hon. / L'hon. Michael A. (PC)	Vaughan—Woodbridge	Associate Minister of Mental Health and Addictions / Ministre associé délégué au dossier de la Santé mentale et de la Lutte contre les dépendances
Triantafilopoulos, Effie J. (PC)	Oakville North—Burlington / Oakville-Nord—Burlington	
Vanthof, John (NDP)	Timiskaming—Cochrane	Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire de l'opposition officielle

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Vaugcois, Lise (NDP)	Thunder Bay—Superior North / Thunder Bay—Supérieur-Nord	
Wai, Daisy (PC)	Richmond Hill	
West, Jamie (NDP)	Sudbury	
Williams, Hon. / L'hon. Charmaine A. (PC)	Brampton Centre / Brampton-Centre	Associate Minister of Women's Social and Economic Opportunity / Ministre associée des Perspectives sociales et économiques pour les femmes
Wong-Tam, Kristyn (NDP)	Toronto Centre / Toronto-Centre	
Yakabuski, John (PC)	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	
Vacant	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	
Vacant	Milton	