

Legislative
Assembly
of Ontario



Assemblée
législative
de l'Ontario

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

No. 173B

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

N° 173B

1st Session
43rd Parliament
Monday
28 October 2024

1^{re} session
43^e législature
Lundi
28 octobre 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 28 October 2024 / Lundi 28 octobre 2024

Reducing Gridlock, Saving You Time Act, 2024, Bill 212, Mr. Sarkaria / Loi de 2024 sur le désengorgement du réseau routier et le gain de temps, projet de loi 212, M. Sarkaria

M. Guy Bourgouin.....	9957
M. Stéphane Sarrazin.....	9960
Mme Sandy Shaw.....	9960
L'hon. Sam Oosterhoff.....	9961
M. Joel Harden	9961
Mr. Ric Bresee.....	9961
Ms. Aislinn Clancy	9962
Mr. Ric Bresee.....	9963
Ms. Sandy Shaw	9963
Mr. Brian Saunderson.....	9964
Mr. Anthony Leardi.....	9964
Mr. Wayne Gates.....	9967
Mr. Matthew Rae.....	9967
Mr. Wayne Gates.....	9967
Mr. Ric Bresee.....	9967
Mr. Joel Harden	9968
Mr. Brian Saunderson.....	9968
Mr. Joel Harden	9968
Second reading debate deemed adjourned.....	9971

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF ONTARIO

Monday 28 October 2024

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE
DE L'ONTARIO

Lundi 28 octobre 2024

Report continued from volume A.
1622

REDUCING GRIDLOCK, SAVING
YOU TIME ACT, 2024
LOI DE 2024 SUR LE DÉSENGORGEMENT
DU RÉSEAU ROUTIER ET LE GAIN
DE TEMPS

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

Bill 212, An Act to enact two Acts and amend various Acts with respect to highways, broadband-related expropriation and other transportation-related matters / Projet de loi 212, Loi visant à édicter deux lois et à modifier diverses lois en ce qui concerne les voies publiques, les expropriations liées aux projets d'Internet à haut débit et d'autres questions relatives au transport.

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

M. Guy Bourgoin: Ça me fait toujours plaisir de représenter le monde de Mushkegowuk—Baie James, puis parler du projet de loi 212, « Reducing Gridlock, Saving You Time ».

Je me demande où commencer quand ça vient à la sécurité. Quand on parle des routes, quand on parle du « gridlock », quand on parle de tout ce qu'on entend ce gouvernement dire, là, et ce qui vient me chercher encore plus, c'est quand j'entends le ministre dire qu'on a les routes les plus sécuritaires dans l'Amérique du Nord. À toutes les fois, je me dis : « qu'il sorte de sa tour d'ivoire qu'il vienne se promener sur la route 11 ou la 17. »

J'inviterais, en passant, tous les députés d'aller voir sur un site Web qui s'appelle la route 11 et 17 tue du monde—« Highway 11/17 Kills People ». Vous allez vous rendre à l'évidence : comment c'est dangereux sur les routes 11 et 17. Les choses qu'on voit sur ce site-là, ça nous fait lever les poils sur les bras, dans le cou. Je peux vous dire que vous allez voir des situations où vous ne croirez pas ce qui se passe sur nos routes.

On a entendu qu'il y a des mortalités qui se passent sur nos routes. J'entendais justement—tu sais, quand est-ce que c'est correct qu'il y a des morts sur nos routes? Depuis quand est-ce qu'on prend pour acquis que c'est sûr qu'il va y en avoir et on se contente que le montant, que j'ai entendu dans le débat, de personnes qui décèdent, c'est correct? Que tu sois en vélo, que tu sois en auto, que tu sois dans n'importe quel véhicule, c'est zéro, le chiffre. Arrêtons de dire qu'on a les routes les plus sécuritaires, mais il y a du monde par centaines qui meurt sur nos routes

et on dit que c'est correct. Je m'excuse. On doit faire pas mal mieux que ça.

Moi, je vis sur la 11. Il faut réaliser qu'on n'est pas comme dans le Sud. Puis, qu'est-ce que je vois de ce gouvernement, là—est-ce que c'est seulement ce qui se passe dans le sud de l'Ontario, et le reste du Nord, on s'en fout? On est un peuple oublié. On est des citoyens de deuxième classe. Je ne dis pas ça juste pour le dire, parce que je suis à l'opposition; c'est une réalité. Quand on voit des investissements—il faut qu'il y en ait, des investissements dans le Sud, mais il ne faut pas oublier qu'on en a besoin dans le Nord aussi.

J'entendais le député qui parlait juste avant moi, qui disait qu'on a le 2+1. C'est un projet pilote qu'on attend toujours, qui se travaille. Ça ne devrait pas—on sait ce qui se passe dans les autres pays. Il l'a mentionné, lui too : ça marche partout ailleurs dans le monde. Mais nous autres, on a des projets pilotes et vous autres dans le Nord, contentez-vous d'un petit projet pilote. On a besoin de bien plus que ça. On a besoin que ce soit soit à la grandeur du Nord ou bien donc qu'on ait, comme tout le reste, une autoroute divisée, que ça va sur les deux bords; qu'on soit en sécurité; qu'on ait des routes déblayées; qu'on ait des routes où on se sent en sécurité.

Moi, j'ai des concitoyens qui ont peur d'embarquer sur les routes. C'est ça la réalité que bien du monde qui sont dans la Chambre ici, vous ne comprenez pas et vous ne réalisez pas c'est quoi qu'on vit au jour le jour. Parce que si nos routes ferment, il n'y a plus rien qui bouge. Si nos routes ferment, on ne peut pas se rendre à nos rendez-vous médicaux. Si nos routes ferment, nos enfants ne sont pas capables de se rendre à l'école. Puis s'ils sont pris sur la route, qu'est-ce qu'ils font, là? C'est beau l'été, mais l'hiver, il fait froid.

Si nos routes ferment, comment est-ce qu'on se rend au travail? Si nos routes ferment—j'entendais justement mon collègue dire que les « goods » sont importants, que c'est bien de se rendre à destination, que ça fait partie de l'économie de l'Ontario. Je suis d'accord avec lui, mais il faut bien que nos routes restent ouvertes. Toutes les fois qu'elles ferment—moi, j'ai vécu 12 heures, parce qu'il y avait quelqu'un qui est décédé sur les routes. J'ai vécu des six heures, sept heures, huit heures derrière, que la route se déneige. Écoute, deux jours—on a vu deux jours des routes fermées, des routes hivernales.

Je me souviens que j'avais proposé que les routes 11 et 17 devraient être comme les 400 et comme le QEW, et qu'elles soient déblayées après huit heures. C'est une Transcanadienne, là. On va le dire en bon français : ce n'est pas une « trail » à vaches, là. Ce n'est pas une

« trail ». C'est une route primaire, pas secondaire. C'est la route Transcanadienne.

Puis, on a décidé de créer une nouvelle classification pour enlever un peu de pression, pour dire qu'on va le faire après 13 heures. C'est de huit heures qu'on a besoin; 13 heures, ça n'a rien changé dans notre vie. Ça n'a absolument rien changé dans notre vie.

C'est nous encore dans le Nord qu'on vit au jour le jour, puis qu'on voit comment ça impacte notre communauté. Comme vous le savez, on demeure loin. Les familles, que ce soit du hockey, de la natation, on doit sortir si on veut que nos enfants aient des tournois, des compétitions de nage, du volleyball et tous les sports qu'il y a alentour, pour aller compétitionner contre d'autres jeunes à travers la province. Ça fait qu'on est tout le temps sur la route.

Il y a une réalité que vous ne comprenez pas : on est toujours sur la route. Ça, c'est une réalité qu'on a, qu'on accepte. Où on vit, dans le Nord, on accepte ça. Mais on mérite des routes sécuritaires. Encore, je reviens à ça : quand j'entends le ministre, ça me fait—en tout cas, ça vient me chercher. Pourquoi? Parce que mes concitoyens, nous, on sait la vérité. On sait ce qui se passe. Peut-être que le ministre devrait voir le site, en passant, le même site que je vous ai mentionné : la route 11 et 17 tue le monde—or kills people. Allez voir. Je peux vous dire, vous allez avoir peur, vous aussi, de voyager sur cette route-là. Ce n'est pas moi qui le dit, là. Allez le voir par vous-mêmes. Rendez-vous à la réalité. Vous allez le voir. C'est donné à tout le monde d'aller voir ce site-là. C'est public. Tout d'un coup, vous allez faire le saut avec ce qui se passe sur ces routes-là.

Du monde qui dépasse sur des lignes doubles—tu sais, j'ai proposé « Chad's Law ». Ce n'est pas juste dans l'Amérique du Nord. On est la seule province dans l'Amérique du Nord qui n'a pas ça : que ce soit illégal de dépasser sur les lignes doubles. J'étais comme tout le monde, moi. Je pensais que les lignes doubles, quand tu prends ton permis de conduire, que tu ne peux passer une ligne double, que c'est illégal. Mais c'est une suggestion. La police peut te donner des amendes pour d'autres choses. Mais moi, c'est les policiers qui m'ont dit : « Guy, si tu veux nous aider, passe un projet de loi pour mettre ça illégal, sur les deux lignes. »

À la grandeur du Canada, toutes les autres provinces, ils l'ont. Et ça va bien plus loin que ça. En Amérique du Nord—on parle de l'Amérique du Nord, puis de l'Amérique du Sud. On parle de tout le continent nord-américain. C'est quasiment la loi partout. Il y a l'Ontario et quelques petits États proche des Lacs qui n'ont rien. On parle de deux ou trois États. Le reste, c'est toute la loi.

1630

Puis, ce gouvernement-là, dans sa sagesse, il a voté contre. Mais ils sont là, par exemple, pour se péter les bretelles, puis ils nous disent : « Mais non. Nous autres, on est là pour la sécurité du monde. On est là pour protéger les citoyens. On a un meilleur projet de loi. On veut faire certain qu'il n'y a pas de « gridlock ». On veut que les routes soient sécuritaires. » Mais je peux te dire, ça arrête

pas loin de North Bay, par exemple. Le reste de vous autres, ça ne compte pas, vous autres. Vous êtes à la merci.

Pourquoi voter contre un projet de loi qui sauverait des vies? Chad, c'était un jeune homme qui s'en allait juste au travail, là, qui s'en allait chercher les pièces à Val Rita. Il arrive face à face avec deux camions de 18 roues. Deux gros camions qui s'en venaient face à face, qui passaient où il y avait deux lignes solides. Il a quasiment perdu sa vie. En passant, c'est sur le site aussi, son accident.

C'est rien que pour vous dire qu'on a un gouvernement qui dit une chose, mais à cause que le projet de loi—c'est un projet de loi qui fait du sens, qui est non partisan, mais qu'ils ont voté contre. Mais on dit que nos routes sont les plus sécuritaires en Amérique du Nord, puis on vote contre un projet de loi comme ça. Je ne comprends pas. Il va falloir que vous me l'expliquiez puisque—ce n'est pas juste moi qui ne le comprends pas; c'est plein de concitoyens qui ne le comprennent pas non plus.

Puis, j'aimerais parler aussi des conditions de nos routes hivernales. Depuis que les libéraux et conservateurs ont privatisé, on a des conditions de routes—ce n'est pas les personnes derrière les charrues qui sont le problème, là. C'est le financement qui vient avec ça, puis la privatisation, puis tout. Mais avant c'était toute la province qui le faisait, puis les conditions étaient beaucoup plus sécuritaires. Moi, je me souviens, je n'ai jamais manqué d'école à cause des routes hivernales. Puis, là, on voit que les routes sont fermées souvent, puis on paye le prix. Ce n'est pas juste les écoles dont on parle. À la grandeur des communautés qui vivent dans le Nord—pas le Grand Nord, mais dans le Nord—les routes 11 et 17, on vit ça. D'un coup, ce n'est pas normal, là. Ce n'est pas normal de vivre des conditions qui nous mettent dans une situation de danger, de peur, que là, maintenant, il y a des personnes qui disent : « Bien, Guy, j'aimerais aller faire mes groceries, mais les routes ne sont pas assez sécuritaires. J'ai vraiment peur d'être sur les routes. » Ils ont peur d'aller sur nos routes. Ça, c'est une réalité qu'on vit.

Mais, le temps va vite, et je veux parler de quelque chose qui me tient à coeur beaucoup : c'est la question qu'on a vu sur Marketplace sur la fraude qui se passe dans l'industrie du camionnage. Ça fait des années, sur ce côté de la Chambre, qu'on mentionne qui se passe de quoi dans l'industrie qui n'est pas correct. On voit trop souvent des camionneurs, dans des journées ensoleillées, qui sont rentrés en plein clos, ou qui sont parqués sur le côté, qui ont flippé, ou qui ont « jackknifé »—écoute, la liste est longue. Ça se produit constamment.

Puis, tout d'un coup, on voit sur Marketplace une investigation qui demande comment le problème est généralisé, là. Ce n'est pas juste un ou deux joueurs, comme le ministre semble dire : « Oh, a few bad players ». It's not about a few bad players. C'est systémique. C'est un cancer dans l'industrie. Puis, j'espère que vous l'avez vu. Puis, si vous ne l'avez pas vu, là, je vous demande d'aller le voir, tous les membres du gouvernement, puisque c'est vous autres qui êtes au gouvernement puis c'est vous autres qui pouvez changer des choses puis

adresser les problèmes qu'on vit comme c'est là en Ontario.

Tout d'un coup, à cause qu'on a privatisé, il y a plus que 500-quelque chose institutions qui donnent des licences. Tout d'un coup, si moi je voulais être un camionneur, le fameux MELT qu'on a introduit, ils ont trouvé une façon de le bypasser : c'est que je vais payer du cash—moins cher—puis l'institution signe comme quoi j'ai fait le training, ou j'ai fait la formation, pour me dire : « Guy, tu chauffes à contrat, tu as passé ton MELT. Tu es sécuritaire pour chauffer un camion de 18 roues. » Une méchante entente, ça là. Si tu ne t'es pas qualifié, tu ne devrais pas être derrière cette roue-là. Tu ne devrais pas conduire un camion de 18 roues qui charrie des tonnes derrière, tu sais, dans ce quoi tu transportes, puis tu t'en vas sur nos routes, puis tout d'un coup, tu mets la vie de tout le monde en danger—pas juste dans le Nord, là, partout en province.

Puis j'ai posé des questions au ministre. Ma collègue de Thunder Bay—Superior North a demandé des questions au ministre. Puis lui, il fait paraître comme quoi c'est quelques mauvais joueurs dans l'industrie. Ce ne sont pas « quelques ». L'investigation a démontré très clair, ce n'est pas un ou deux. C'est plus qu'un. Je pense qu'elle jouait dans les 14 institutions. Qu'est-ce qu'ils ont fait? Ont-ils retiré les licences à ces institutions-là? Non.

Honnêtement, à tous les conducteurs : ce n'est pas la faute du conducteur. Lui, c'est un travailleur. Il chauffe son truck et il veut travailler; il a une famille à faire vivre. Ces institutions-là, par exemple, elles ont donné des licences à du monde qui n'en méritait pas. À quelque part, il faut faire retester ce monde-là. Sont-ils qualifiés ou ne le sont-ils pas? Va-t-on attendre qu'il y ait du monde qui meurt encore plus sur nos routes pour dire qu'ils n'étaient pas qualifiés? Mais il est trop tard. Il y a quelqu'un qui est décédé.

Je peux te dire, sur la route, si tu rencontres un camion de 18 roues et tu es en auto, ou bien donc en camion léger—qu'on appelle un pick-up—ce n'est pas toi qui vas gagner, là. Tu vas gagner un ticket direct au ciel; ça, c'est certain. Mais ça, c'est une réalité qui se passe chez nous, là. Puis on a un gouvernement qui dit que tout va bien, qu'il n'y en a pas, de problèmes, qu'on n'a pas de problèmes.

Ça fait des années qu'on vous dit qu'on est concerné et qu'il manque d'inspecteurs. Il manque d'inspecteurs qui vont inspecter ces institutions-là qui donnent des licences. Ça n'a pas rapport, de quelle couleur est le chauffeur. C'est l'institution où l'inspecteur devrait entrer—pas appeler, et « je m'en viens »—à l'imprévu et vérifier ce qui se passe. Vous ne pouvez plus faire l'autruche. L'investigation a été faite. Vous avez les preuves devant vous autres, puis encore, ce n'est pas assez. Ce n'est pas assez.

Puis on voit ce qui se passe sur nos routes. Chad est un individu qui s'en est sorti chanceux. Il a eu du « PTSD ». Là, maintenant, il a une condition qu'il est pris avec. Je peux vous dire que l'individu à Thunder Bay, lui, n'a pas été aussi chanceux. Il a perdu sa vie. Puis ça, ce ne

sont rien que deux cas, là. Il y en a des centaines de cas comme ça qui se passent sur nos routes, comme c'est là. Il y a du monde qui a perdu leur vie. Puis tout d'un coup, on voit une investigation comme ça qui vient confirmer certaines inquiétudes qu'on avait, puis qu'on a les inspecteurs, que le gouvernement—il devra y avoir beaucoup plus d'inspecteurs.

On a des millions qui ont été investis pour des « scales », comme ils les appellent, les fameuses balances pour vérifier les camionneurs, qui sont fermées trois quarts du temps. Pourquoi elles sont fermées trois quarts du temps? On a une place à Shuniah où la route passe là. Tous les camions qui viennent au Canada passent par là. Ce serait une bonne façon de les pogner, si on gardait ça ouvert 24 sur 24. Je pense qu'ils l'ont ouverte à une secousse et sur 300 camions, il y avait plus de 100 camions qui ont été parqués parce qu'ils n'étaient pas sécuritaires ou qu'ils ne répondaient pas aux normes. Ça vous dit quoi, au gouvernement? Ça vous dit certainement que ça ne va pas bien, là. Mais ça, c'est une réalité qui se passe dans l'Ontario.

Imagine-toi que nous, on n'a pas les quatre lignes, les cinq lignes, puis on n'a pas de bypass, qu'on n'a pas les fameux bypass dont on entend parler tout le temps, qui coûtent des millions. On entend Metrolinx—ce sont des milliards et des milliards de dollars qui se payent, un salaire d'un million de dollars; il y a 82 v.-p., 19 « CEO ». Puis, je vois la situation que mes commettants vivent dedans, que nous, dans le nord de l'Ontario, on demande des routes sécuritaires, on veut des 2+1, on aimerait avoir une « divided highway » qui est rendu maintenant à Nipigon. On sait qu'elle est rendue aussi pas loin de North Bay—elle est à North Bay.

Pourquoi nous autres on ne mérite pas des routes plus sécuritaires comme ce qu'on voit dans le sud de l'Ontario? On est Ontariens comme vous autres. Ça me fait penser à une farce, une joke : « On-était-riens » dans le Nord, oui. Mais on est plus qu'« On-était-riens ». On est Ontariens du Nord. On est des Nord-Ontariens et on mérite les mêmes choses, pas qu'on ne mérite pas. Qu'est-ce qu'on vit comme c'est là, sur les routes? Puis on ne mérite pas qu'au jour le jour—puis là, je peux vous dire, là, on est dans l'automne. En passant, là, il a neigé à Kap. Il a neigé à Chapleau. Il a neigé à Geraldton. Il a neigé à Dubreuilville. On a de la neige qui commence, là. On est sujet à beaucoup plus de « black ice », de « slush », de neige que vous autres, souvent, vous ne voyez pas dans le Sud. Mais pour nous, c'est une réalité qu'on a constamment.

1640

Imaginez-vous, quand on a du monde qui n'a pas été qualifié sur les routes—que le MELT aussi, en passant, donne un petit peu d'instruction sur comment conduire sur les routes hivernales.

Je veux rien que prendre les deux dernières minutes que j'ai—j'ai parlé avec une institution de camionnage. Eux autres, ils ont un simulateur. Ça m'a impressionné. Et le monsieur, même dans l'entrevue, il pleurait parce qu'il pensait aux joueurs d'hockey qui sont décédés. Est-ce que

ça va prendre un autre—comment ça s'appelle, les jeunes qui sont morts au hockey en Saskatchewan?

M. Joel Harden: Humboldt.

M. Guy Bourgouin: Humboldt—pour que le gouvernement de l'Ontario se réveille? Un camionneur qui est passé drette sur un stop et est rentré à travers un autobus—ou que ça soit des personnes âgées, parce que les personnes âgées aiment voyager. Non, ils s'en vont dans le Sud. Ils vont partout. Est-ce que ça va prendre une école scolaire? Est-ce que ça va prendre—tu sais, est-ce que ça va prendre pour que vous vous réveilliez et pour que nous, dans le Nord, on ait les mêmes conditions routières que vous autres?

Quand on dit que la communauté Smooth Rock Falls veut réduire leur « speed limit » dans la ville—il y a 50 kilomètres en rentrant, mais ils veulent l'« extend » juste pour sortir puisqu'on passe en avant de l'hôpital, on passe en avant des maisons, on passe où les autobus s'arrêtent. Puis ils sont après se battre avec le ministère des Transports pour réduire, dans leur communauté—qui est l'autoroute 17, qui passe en ville—de 70 à 50 pour protéger leurs concitoyens, puis le ministère dit non.

Dites-moi si ça fait du sens que le maire s'astine avec le ministère des Transports pour faire réduire un « speed limit » qui est dans sa communauté, puis on n'est pas capable de faire réduire un « speed limit » à 50.

Je vous demande, gouvernement, de faire les bonnes choses. On a droit aux mêmes services, on a droit à la même sécurité sur nos routes. Puis je demande au ministre de retirer les licences à ces institutions-là qui ont « licencié » ou qui ont donné des permis à ceux qui ne devraient pas en avoir.

Et toutes ces institutions-là, les 14 en question, qui devraient demander à ce monde-là de réécrire le test avant qu'il y ait quelqu'un qui meure sur nos routes ou qu'ils tuent quelqu'un sur nos routes—c'est la moindre des choses. Je demande au ministre de faire la bonne chose, parce que nous, on a le droit d'arriver à la maison en santé, en sécurité, sains et saufs, puisqu'on a des familles comme tous vous autres. Je ne pense pas qu'un des commettants veuille perdre un membre de la famille sur nos routes.

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

M. Stéphane Sarrazin: Je demanderais au membre de—j'ai toujours de la misère à dire ce—

M. Guy Bourgouin: Mushkegowuk.

M. Stéphane Sarrazin: Mushkegowuk—James Bay. J'imagine que tu as vraiment pris connaissance du projet de loi. Je vous écoutais parler, justement, des problèmes liés aux municipalités puis liés aussi aux permis donnés. Est-ce que vous avez vu que dans ce projet de loi, ce sont justement des choses auxquelles on va toucher, à voir, à faire sûr que les choses soient mieux faites, que les gens soient mieux certifiés? Puis aussi, l'autorisation des chemins : souvent, comme nous, vous devez avoir des projets qui ont été « post-ponés ». Souvent vous avez entendu parler des projets dans le nord comme dans l'est de l'Ontario, où on était pour faire des routes, mais à cause de certaines difficultés, ça ne s'est pas concrétisé. Donc

ces projets de loi-là vont faire que ça va être plus facile de concrétiser ces projets-là puis il va y avoir une meilleure surveillance. Je me demandais c'était quoi votre avis à ce sujet-là.

M. Guy Bourgouin: Merci de la question, mon collègue de Prescott-Russell. Merci pour la question en français, en passant.

Ceci dit, la licence, tu sais, qu'elle soit gratuite, si je ne me trompe pas, dans le projet de loi—non, « freeze », de geler, excusez, de geler les licences. C'est correct de les geler, mais il ne faut pas oublier que même une investigation a démontré, justement, pour les permis de conduire, que c'est un autre problème qu'on a. Puis il ne faut pas oublier que ça a été privatisé, là. C'est depuis la privatisation qu'on a ces problèmes-là—c'est récent. Depuis que vous avez privatisé le « DriveTest ». Même ceux qui conduisent avec des licences d'auto—tu sais, pour les questions d'assurance, le test pour le test d'assurance, là, pour réduire tes tests d'assurance—payent pour avoir la certification pour réduire les assurances, même s'ils ne l'ont pas pris.

Fait qu'on le voit : ce n'est pas juste les camionneurs. On voit aussi que c'est pour la conduite d'auto pour essayer de baisser les assurances—encore de la fraude—où on paye pour avoir la—

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

M^{me} Sandy Shaw: Merci pour votre discours cet après-midi. J'espère que nous sommes tous d'accord que c'est une priorité d'un gouvernement de protéger les gens. Vous avez parlé bien des routes 11 et 69 qui tuent des gens. Et si c'est un gouvernement qui est vraiment, vraiment sérieux à propos de protéger les gens, je me demande pourquoi ils ignorent les grands problèmes que nous avons maintenant dans les « DriveTest centres » et aussi avec le « training ». Parce que s'il y a des gens qui conduisent sur nos autoroutes, c'est une grande cause des problèmes. Et aussi, toujours, ce gouvernement dit que nous avons les autoroutes les plus sauvées du monde, mais si seulement on—

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): Thank you. Response?

M. Guy Bourgouin: Merci à ma collègue. Ce qu'on voit c'est que, depuis la privatisation, le problème est devenu plus problématique. On se souvient avant, c'était géré par la province. On a voulu encore privatiser un système—c'est pour ça que la collègue a fait un projet de loi pour ramener à la province, pour enrayer que quand ça vient aux certifications, aux tests et tout ça, que ce soit par la province et non privé, pour éliminer toute la fraude qui est attachée à ce qu'on voit, comme c'est là, avec les investigations.

Que ce soit pour les tests, comme je viens de le mentionner, quand tu veux passer des licences pour être capable d'avoir la certification pour réduire tes assurances de conduite quand tu es jeune. Bien, il y en a qui ont payé et ils ne l'ont pas fait, ça, mais ils ont la certification. Même affaire pour les camionneurs quand on a vu—c'est exactement la question que j'ai demandée. Puis j'en ai

parlé, puisque Marketplace a démontré comment corrompu le système était. Ce n'est pas un ou deux joueurs; c'est systémique. C'est un problème qui est très réparti dans le camionnage—

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

L'hon. Sam Oosterhoff: Je vous remercie aussi cet après-midi pour votre présentation. Votre circonscription, la circonscription de Mushkegowuk–James Bay, est vraiment une circonscription très éloignée. Au sud de l'Ontario, ma circonscription, Niagara-Ouest, est éloignée mais pas comme votre circonscription. Mais en même temps, dans ma circonscription, nous avons beaucoup de conducteurs/conductrices. Je suppose aussi pour vos résidents—vous avez beaucoup de personnes qui utilisent les voitures. J'aime beaucoup votre passion pour défendre les conducteurs dans votre circonscription.

Mais en même temps, quand tu supportes la taxe de carbone, la tarification sur les émissions, dans votre circonscription, qu'est-ce qu'ils disent, vos « constituents »? Quand tu arrives ici et votre parti supporte la taxe de carbone, même avec le parti fédéral, qu'est-ce qu'ils disent quand tu reviens à ta maison?

M. Guy Bourgouin: Honnêtement, le monde de ma circonscription, ils voudraient avoir bien plus des routes sécuritaires, comme c'est là, que de la « carbon tax ». Tu sais, je veux dire, quand tu joues avec ta vie ou la vie de tes enfants ou la vie de tes frères, tes soeurs—tu te promènes sur des routes où tu sais qu'il y a du monde non qualifié qui se promène sur la même route que toi, je ne pense pas que la « carbon tax », c'est la première affaire à laquelle ils pensent.

Moi je peux vous dire, à maintes reprises, je les voyage, ces routes-là. À maintes reprises, j'ai été obligé soit de me parquer sur le côté puis même monter sur la bande pour ne pas me faire frapper, ou bien donc ralentir assez loin pour donner à un camionneur qui a décidé de dépasser mon truck plus deux autres gros trucks en avant de moi, des 18-roues—il a été obligé de se ranger. Moi—on connaît la route parce qu'on vient de ce coin-là, et il y avait un coche qui s'en venait. Bien non, on était obligé de lui laisser la place.

Je peux te dire, ils sont bien plus concernés avec la santé et la sécurité. Il semble que pour votre gouvernement la « carbon tax » est la plus grosse affaire, mais je peux vous dire, il y a trop de monde qui meurt sur nos routes. Ça, ça fait peur au monde de ma circonscription.

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

M. Joel Harden: Encore, merci, mon ami de Mushkegowuk–Baie James, pour votre discours—toujours bon, toujours passionné. Franchement, avez-vous un avis pour le gouvernement pour s'assurer qu'il y a des bonnes routes—les autoroutes 69, 11—en bonne condition? Parce que j'ai eu la chance beaucoup de fois ici de t'écouter, et il y a des solutions. Il y a des solutions pour enlever la neige, améliorer les routes, mais ici on parle d'un projet de loi où je crois, à mon avis, comme je

t'écoute, il n'y pas de vraies solutions. Ce sont quoi les solutions pour les personnes qui vivent au Nord?

1650

M. Guy Bourgouin: Je remercie mon collègue de la question. Les solutions sont qu'on veut des routes sécuritaires. Ça commence par l'entretien des routes hivernales. On veut avoir la même affaire que dans le Sud. On devrait avoir classe 1, qu'après huit heures, nos routes sont déblayées. On parle de « Chad's Law », les « two solid lines ».

Écoute, ce n'est pas moi qui a pensé à ça tout seul. C'est venu des polices, des « OPP », puis j'ai parlé à mes commettants et ils disent, « Guy, ça fait du sens. C'est du “common sense” quand tu vois que ça se fait à la grandeur. »

Ça prend aussi que nos routes soient bien entretenues. Tu sais, la 69, qu'elle soit terminée. Ça fait, quoi, six ans et demi qu'on est élu et on en entend encore parler. Tu sais, ça prend du 3+1—« two plus one ». Oui, on le sait que ça marche ailleurs. On aimerait l'avoir parce que ce qui arrive sur la route 11, c'est qu'il n'y a pas assez de place de déplacement. Si on avait ça, c'est à tous les dix kilomètres que ça change de chaque bord. Fait que ça nous donne une chance de dépasser, puis aussi aux camionneurs de le faire sécuritairement. Mais là, on est juste, nous autres dans le Nord, on nous donne un projet pilote puis, « contentez-vous de ça » et « on travaille fort pour vous autres pour que ça soit sécuritaire pour nos routes 11 et 17. On vous fait ça. On fait des projets pilotes. »

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

Mr. Ric Bresee: I apologize for not being able to do this in French—

Interjection.

Mr. Ric Bresee: I'm learning, but I'm not there quite yet.

Speaker, to the member, we know that this government has done a tremendous amount of work improving commercial vehicle safety, especially across northern Ontario. We added the new vehicle inspection station on 11/17 at Shuniah—if I'm pronouncing that one correctly—and we've increased enforcement across the entire region on 11, 17, 144 and 101. With that, and with this bill, we're proposing to increase the authorities and the abilities of our MTO inspectors and all of the hard-working people who are trying to keep the roads safe—

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): Thank you.

Response?

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: Not enough, because these inspection stations you're talking about are closed half the time, and truckers know when they are closed because they talk to each other. So they're getting away with a lot. And you need more inspectors because that's the reality we have: not enough inspectors. We've been telling you that for years but yet you failed.

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

Ms. Aislinn Clancy: I am honoured to talk about this bill today. While there is some good in there, I'll admit, there's a few big problems leading our province in the wrong direction.

I'll start by talking a little bit about Highway 413. I have a business degree and I hear from this government a lot that they want to be fiscally responsible and do things that are good for business. I think we can see from the way we've organized today that this isn't working very well. I have to admit, I was planning to speak on Wednesday, but we keep shuffling the deck making it very difficult for us to be productive.

We know that highways are a good way to flush money away, especially when we don't have the data to support them actually solving the problem. When we do find a solution that doesn't have data to support it, we are not going to end up further ahead, and it is more like smoke and mirrors, looking like you're doing something but not actually moving anyone further ahead.

I think if you're a business, you want to make sure you have good partnerships. From what I've read, the city of Toronto, Orangeville, Mississauga and Halton Hills have all said they do not support Highway 413. We know it's very expensive, costing between \$6 billion and \$10 billion, which would do a lot to help our crumbling health care and education systems. So not only is it money that we should be spending elsewhere; we know it's very expensive and that's just the costs we have today. There is a construction price index that is way above the consumer price index, at about 8%. We see all of our projects doubling in price in a matter of a few years. So we can anticipate that the numbers we have today will almost surely increase.

It shows also that we are not taking the climate crisis seriously. We saw what happened this year in Toronto and that storm cost us \$1 billion. We know that for every dollar we spend on climate adaptation we save \$17. Think of the money we could save by investing this money in climate adaptation. You know what helps us adapt to climate change? Wetlands. Wetlands not only sequester carbon but they act like the very infrastructure we're spending billions on, and they're already there right now. A lot of the wetlands that the 413 will pave over will actually make these climate disasters worse than they are now. Swamps and things like that are known to reduce the negative impact of rain and extreme climate events.

It also shows that we're not serious on reducing pollution. We know that by shoving people into cars, we will most surely increase not only carbon emissions but pollution. Look around the room, everyone. When you were growing up, do you remember having that one kid in your class who had asthma? How many kids in our children's classrooms have asthma today? Really, think about it. We are doing nothing to reduce the health issues that people all over this province face.

I heard the Minister of Rural Affairs say today that he cares about preserving precious farmland—413 will destroy 2,000 acres of prime agricultural land. How can you look farmers in the face and say you're doing the right

thing when this very highway goes against the very protection of prime farmland we say we stand for?

I know that in my community, one way that would get us out of our cars is by having two-way, all-day GO. We know transit and opening up the 407—a highway that already exists—are solutions that will work today, not in 10 years. When I miss the train at 6 o'clock, it can take almost three hours to get home, and I'm on a very crowded bus. We can do better than that. For my roommate to get from my downtown Kitchener location to the MPP for Cambridge's riding, which is a 20-minute drive, it takes her two hours. For someone to get from downtown Kitchener to Hamilton, it can take three and a half hours. This is unacceptable. No wonder people are getting into cars. We can get inner-city transit that will solve that tomorrow. We already have Grand River Transit and other municipal transits. Let's get them talking and let's fund it.

Most of all, I care about the safety of our vulnerable road users. Not only is this highway fiscally irresponsible, but it's dangerous to our climate and future generations. As a mother, I bike to work every day. I use these bike lanes, which Kitchener has won many awards for, by the way, and I use them to get to work. I have fun, I enjoy myself, I get fresh air, and I'm healthier for it.

I know all of us are doing what we can as MPPs to stay healthy because this job is not a healthy one, right? We're trying to eat our vegetables. We're trying to get our steps in and move around. That is what I do to stay healthy. It's cheaper, it's easier, it's more affordable, it's healthier. But not only that—fine, if you want to endanger my life. But my daughter is 14. She just started high school this year. She gets on her bike, and sometimes, because she has a really wonderful hairdo, she doesn't put her helmet on, and it drives me crazy. I want to run down the street yelling at her and screaming, saying, "Put your helmet on."

Here, I'm faced with a government that doesn't seem to care about the well-being of my child, a 14-year-old who's just trying to make it to school safely, and a mother who just wants to have her child arrive back home and not be injured. We know that these evenings are getting darker every day. I gave her lights, I bought her a new helmet, but when that dump truck is turning right and he can't see her, that doesn't mean anything. I've done all that I can. I feed her properly, I try to put her to bed on time and made sure she does her homework. I wish this government cared as much about my child's well-being as they do about somebody who's stuck on the 401 when we could solve that problem. It's not okay.

We could do better for all of our students all across Ontario. We know, locally, active transportation is meant to improve children's well-being. It will prevent cancer. Our cancer societies are trying to get people to commute to school without having to use a car.

Just this year in the US, there was a declaration of crisis for parent mental health. Raise your hand if you as a parent would prefer to do something else instead of getting in your car and driving your kid to school. As a city councillor, I can't tell you how many times I heard from families saying that traffic around school zones was a

nightmare. Not only will we improve the health and well-being of kids by empowering them, helping them feel happy and healthy by getting them to school on time, we'll improve the well-being of the very parents who are sending them there. We know that this is better, and we can do better.

1700

Bike lanes are something that we already have. I don't see why this is a priority for this government when we know there are so many other priorities. One of the priorities mentioned today was mental health. As a school social worker for 11 years, one of the main therapeutic interventions I would try to get students to do was getting them on a bike. Why? If that child, who doesn't really want to go to school anyway, misses their bus at 7:30 in the morning, guess what? "Sorry, Mom, I missed the bus. I'm not going to school." I begged our school principals to give us some transit passes so that that kid, if they missed the bus, maybe could catch period 2, period 3 or period 4.

I know a bike would go the distance to address the mental health of our young people if they got outside, if they move their bodies, if they had fresh air. Raise your hand if you wish your kids would get outside, move their bodies and get more fresh air. I know I try to do that even just as an MPP.

We know that the data is there that we need more active transportation, we need alternatives to just having a car. I have my car, I appreciate my car and use it all the time, but we need alternatives. We need bikes, we need the ability to walk around and we need to build housing where we work and play. So not only have we invested in a very regressive type of transportation plan, but also we have invested in a regressive type of housing plan. We know that by building density, opening up options within cities, people could walk and bike to work and it's more affordable to allow all the people to develop, not just big developers with big pockets who can build subdivisions.

So I ask of you today to recognize the work of our great city of Kitchener in moving people onto bikes. If you want a business plan, we can show you there has been significant growth, significant use, and I'm really proud of our city for the awards we've won and the amount of ridership increase. I hope that you'll consider all road users when you're building your next transit plan.

I do thank you for the investments in transit. I know a lot of money has been put forward into expanding GO Transit, expanding the One Fare system. I think this is great. We need all young people and all Ontarians to have transit options, but we have to make sure that we're not doubling down on investments, in a carbon crisis, in infrastructure like highways and reducing the choices of people who bike.

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

Mr. Ric Bresee: I thank the member from Kitchener Centre for her presentation. I want to say thank you for mentioning the wonderful expansions that we are doing with transit, and we'll continue to work towards that.

One of the things that, unfortunately, you didn't mention—and it is part of this bill—is the move towards

analyzing and regulating e-bikes. We've seen the modes of technology change dramatically because the users are on the leading edge. They are the ones out there utilizing these and we now need to catch up and make sure we have appropriate analysis, and appropriate definitions of these bikes.

I was wondering if the member actually agrees with that move so that we can continue to promote the e-bikes and such devices.

Ms. Aislinn Clancy: Just like we're trying to make driving less bureaucratic and easier, we also need to ensure that we don't over-bureaucratize e-bikes. That is my form of transportation, an e-bike. I encourage any of you to come across and talk to me. My main criticism of this government is when you put forward a policy and you haven't actually listened to anyone who lives this reality—you're going to get it wrong.

I understand the need for regulation. Right now, mine only reaches a maximum of 30 kilometres an hour. There are rules in place; they don't get enforced. That's another criticism I have for the government. It's great to have rules, it's great to have punishments, but if we don't have a system that ensures follow-through, we're not further ahead.

And from my understanding, a lot of growth is from low-income folks finding this as a way out of poverty, a way for them to get around in an affordable way. So let's not create red tape that disadvantages folks who are already trying to move their lives forward.

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

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Thank you for sharing your personal story of trying to keep your family members safe. As a mom and a grandmother, it's a nightmare to think about your kids being unsafe. In Hamilton, and all of our communities, we've seen unnecessary tragedies. In Hamilton, we've had two kids killed on their way to school. This should never, ever have happened. I question the fact that this government wants to remove bike lanes without providing any evidence as to whether they are safe for people, for vulnerable road users, and as to whether or not they do make traffic slower. They have provided no evidence at all.

Now we have this bill before us, and the Premier was asked whether the government wanted certain criteria to be met before removing lanes, and Ford said no. Really, what are we doing here? Why are they attacking bike lanes without evidence, any plans and any criteria for either removing them or building more?

Ms. Aislinn Clancy: I think that's why I encourage people to use data. As a city councillor, I knew that if I counted on two hands and two feet, that's probably 90% of the people that I hear from in my constituency, right? We all have people in our ridings who we hear from more than others. Those folks should not be owning the narrative. They should not be making decisions. We should be measuring twice and cutting once. If we're making decisions based on somebody's discomfort with change, I say lean in.

When I had someone who had a problem with a bike lane in my riding, I brought out the manager of active transportation. We looked at the bike lane. They were complaining because people were moving onto the other side. He was like, “You’re right. Why don’t we move it back? We’ll change the shape of it so we can address the concerns you have, measure to see if what you’re complaining about is actually fact or anecdotal, and create a solution together that doesn’t pit one person against another,” because it’s all of Ontario we’re here to serve, not those 20 people who we hear from most.

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

Mr. Brian Saunderson: I would like to pick up on this thread of bike lanes. It seems to me that there’s a broad interpretation that this act is closing bike lanes. I think that’s incorrect. What this act is trying to do is look at making sure that we intentionally preplan where bike lanes go and how they’re constructed.

I take the member opposite’s comment about having her daughter ride to school with a cement truck next to her. I can tell you in my community of Collingwood, we’re a bike-friendly community; I think we’ve got bronze accreditation. We have very much active transportation with trails. In connecting our bike lanes, we’re looking at connecting trails so that people can move safely and we can separate the two users. Will the member opposite not agree that—

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutila Karpoche): Thank you.

A very quick response.

Ms. Aislinn Clancy: I find it quite insulting. I don’t know how your city runs, but my city has a very robust and well-educated transportation department. They didn’t decide to just slap a bike lane here or there. They put a lot of thought into it. I regret your overstep of the jurisdiction.

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

Mr. Anthony Leardi: It’s my pleasure to participate in this afternoon’s debate on Bill 212, which is before us this evening. It’s got a long title. I like the short title: Reducing Gridlock, Saving You Time Act, 2024.

During the course of my very brief comments, I’m going to make some observations about the actual content of the bill itself. I’m going to make some comments about what the bill does regarding broadband. I’m going to make some comments about what the bill actually does on a practical level with respect to building highways faster. If I have a sufficient amount of time, I’m going to talk about the interactions between this provincial legislation and municipal bylaws, and I might have an opportunity, also, to make some comment about Indigenous consultation.

Starting out with schedule 1, which is the schedule that deals with building broadband faster: I note that section 26.2 deals with the minister having the power to assign an easement “in respect of a designated broadband project to a distributor, proponent, or a telecommunications provider, within the meaning of the Telecommunications Act

or any other entity, if the assignment is necessary to further the purposes of this act.”

That is a method that is commonly used by governments around the globe. It is the creation of an easement. Maybe people have heard this phrase before: an easement is a section of land—my colleague from Simcoe-Grey is well aware of what that means. A person who has an easement has the right to put something in the easement, be it a waterline, be it a telecommunications line. But the owner of the easement—the owner of that land—is not deprived of use of that land. The owner of that land can continue to use that land, notwithstanding that there is an easement on the land. The easement simply provides that a person can put something, typically speaking, in the ground and not deprive the owner of the land from continuing to use the surface.

1710

That is the main concern of owners of land. They want to continue using the surface for purposes such as driveways, for farming and for other uses that the owner might want. This section or this schedule of the bill also provides for reimbursement to the crown—that is, reimbursement to the taxpayer. That’s a good structure to have in place as well.

I’d like now to turn to schedule 2, which is the building highways faster portion of the bill. The purpose of schedule 2 is to expedite—I am reading straight from the bill itself: “The purpose of this act is to expedite the construction of priority highway projects by streamlining and supplementing existing processes in order to alleviate delays to the timely completion of such highway projects.”

It’s a common quip or joke, or whatever you want to call it, across Canada that there are two seasons in Canada: There’s winter and construction. Those are the two seasons according to that joke. What we’re trying to do, Madam Speaker, is we’re trying to make sure that these construction projects are actually done faster—building highways faster. We’re trying to expedite these projects, so there are some practical criteria set out in this particular bill before us that would help us do that. I think that we can refer to, in our own minds, a few projects that have been very well expedited. The reason why they were completed fast is with 24-hour, around-the-clock construction. Because the best time to construct a highway is when people aren’t driving on it, obviously.

I’m specifically reading from the bill, and section 4 of this particular schedule provides that “the minister may by notice require a utility company to take up, remove or change the location of utility infrastructure if ... the taking up, removing or changing in location is for the purposes of a priority highway project.”

What does that mean? It’s not so common in my area, but in lots of areas of the project, there is already a utility that is in the way of a particular highway project. It’s commonly the situation where that particular utility is going to be interrupted for the period of time under which that highway is under construction. So obviously, you have to move the utility for the period of construction and maybe even move the utility permanently if the particular

highway is going to remain there and interfere with the provision of that utility. This particular portion of the bill allows the minister to require that the utility company move the utility.

What if we didn't do that? Well, then a utility company could essentially hold up the building of a highway project indefinitely, and the whole thing could be tied up and mired with red tape and mired in even litigation and a court process. We certainly don't want that to happen. We don't want these things to be mired in those kinds of processes. We want these projects to be moving forward, to be expedited at a proper pace. That's what that section does. If the utility company is required by the ministry to do that, the utility has the right to make submissions to the ministry by a specified date, including submissions in respect of any technical or other difficulties with completing the work by the date referred to.

That's another very practical function of this particular bill. Ideally, the situation would be that there would be some level of co-operation between the ministry and the construction team building the highway and they would co-operate with the utility company, and the utility company would show some co-operation back. They would agree on a schedule to move the utility and a method by which the utility is going to be moved. That is the ideal situation. Sometimes we don't have the ideal situation so we have to have provisions in the act where there is an opportunity for the utility company, essentially, to push back, I will say.

Then, there is another provision in this schedule of the bill which says that for any work that's caused to be done in accordance with this section, the utility company shall compensate for the value of any loss or expense incurred. Compensate who? Well, compensate the taxpayer, obviously—compensate the cost.

There's also a provision in this schedule for site inspections, and that probably touches upon a little bit about what I just spoke about. When a highway is being constructed, it might oftentimes run into a utility and the utility has to be moved. Then there should be a meeting, and everybody goes down to the meeting, and they say, "Well, how are we going to do this?" Ideally, there will be a site inspection.

A site inspection is actually a very common function in provincial legislation, and also in municipal legislation. For example, when it comes to the Drainage Act, there's often a site inspection where people meet and discuss how the drain is going to be built. There might be some back-and-forth regarding who pays and who's the main beneficiary, but the site inspection, of course, is a common function of provincial legislation, especially when it interacts with municipal functions.

I'm now looking at the compensation section, which is 11(5). "Compensation dispute" is the title of that section. It says, "If the minister and the property owner do not agree on compensation, either of them may apply to the Ontario Land Tribunal to determine compensation." I wanted to highlight that section, because there might be some people thinking, "Gosh, the ministry might be

exercising some extraordinary powers to get these highways built," and admittedly the whole purpose of this legislation is to expedite the construction of highways. But I wanted to highlight that section, because if there's anybody going to suggest that somehow property owners are put out financially by anything, that's just simply not true. None of the rights of property owners to apply to the Ontario Land Tribunal with regard to compensation are taken away. Any property owner who is affected in any way, shape or form by this legislation still has all of their compensation rights preserved by the legislation.

I wanted to jump forward now to schedule 3 of the act. Schedule 3 refers to the intended Highway 413. I am now referring to section 4, which says that there will be an Indigenous consultation plan. That, in my view, is important as well. It says:

"4(1) The minister shall prepare an Indigenous consultation plan that includes,

"(a) a list of Indigenous communities that have or may have existing Aboriginal or treaty rights, as recognized and affirmed in section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982, that may be impacted by the Highway 413 project;

"(b) a list of any Indigenous communities that may otherwise be interested in the Highway 413 project;..."

I want to pause there for a second. That word, "interested," is a technical legal term. You can't say that you're interested in something just because it piques your imagination or something. When that word, "interested," is used, it means you have an interest in either compensation or some kind of rights. So when you have an "interest" in something, it means you have a legal interest, not just an intellectual interest or a curiosity. That's what that refers to.

"(c) the plan for,

"(i) consulting with Indigenous communities referred to in clause (a) in respect of the impacts of the Highway 413 project, including any significant change, on existing Aboriginal or treaty rights, as recognized and affirmed in section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982, and

"(ii) consulting with Indigenous communities referred to in clauses (a) and (b) in respect of the assessment of the impacts of the Highway 413 project and identification of mitigation required by section 5, the draft environmental impact assessment report prepared under section 6, any significant change and any draft addenda prepared under section 9," all of which is to say that there is an Indigenous consultation plan that is required.

This is in keeping with section 35 of the Constitution. I thought that was worth pointing out, as well, because these are significant projects and sometimes they do entail some legal interest on the part of Indigenous communities.

1720

J'aimerais offrir quelques mots en français, et j'aimerais souligner quelques arrêts de notre projet de loi, surtout la désignation de chantiers routiers prioritaires, la section « Livraison de biens et de services : construction 24 heures sur 24 ». L'arrêt que je souligne, c'est celui-ci :

« Si un chantier routier prioritaire est désigné par voie de règlement pour l'application du présent article, toute

restriction imposée par un règlement municipal qui empêche une personne de livrer des biens ou des services au chantier ou qui lui impose des restrictions à cet égard, notamment une restriction relative au bruit ou à l'utilisation de voies publiques relevant de la compétence de la municipalité, est sans effet dans la mesure où elle empêcherait ou restreindrait la livraison des biens ou des services.»

Ça, c'est important, parce que c'est un pouvoir qui effectivement affecte les pouvoirs des municipalités, et quand on fait ça, c'est important de souligner le fait que les sections qui suivent ne détruisent pas entièrement les pouvoirs des municipalités, mais donnent des pouvoirs aux municipalités de continuer leurs fonctions importantes. J'aimerais souligner les mots qui indiquent cela :

« (2) Malgré le paragraphe (1), les restrictions suivantes continuent de s'appliquer à l'égard de la livraison de biens et de services au chantier routier prioritaire désigné :

« 1. Une restriction de poids sur un pont, un ponceau ou un ouvrage similaire.

« 2. Une limitation de la vitesse.

« 3. Une interdiction d'utilisation d'une voie publique relevant de la compétence d'une municipalité pour la circulation des véhicules en raison de travaux d'entretien ou de construction.

« 4. Une interdiction, pendant trois jours au plus, d'utilisation d'une voie publique relevant de la compétence d'une municipalité en raison d'un événement de rue ou d'un événement spécial sur cette voie publique.

« 5. Une restriction prescrite. »

Tout cela pour dire que même s'il y a des restrictions sur les municipalités, des restrictions sur leurs pouvoirs, ce n'est pas une restriction absolue; nous avons conservé quelques pouvoirs des municipalités pour continuer leurs fonctions importantes.

With the remaining time that I have, I'd like to offer some perhaps, I don't know, philosophical observations regarding highway systems in North America, comparing those to the distribution system or the transportation system as it exists in Europe. It is often remarked upon that the European transportation system relies heavily on train traffic and that sometimes the European transportation system, which relies very heavily on trains, can deliver things without the necessity of building highways.

There is a historic reason for that, and it is essentially because the train system in Europe was developed in order to serve the industrialization of that continent. When industrialization took place, the train systems were put in place and the routes for train systems were put in place. Of course, as I spoke at the very beginning of my speech about easements, the rail easements were put in place to make all that happen, and that's why there is an integrated rail system in Europe which is very—I will use the phrase “has great interior lines,” which means you can get from the exterior across the continent very quickly.

That is in contrast to the transportation system as it exists in North America because the industrialization of North America took place much later than the industrial-

ization in Europe. When industrialization in North America took place, it took place at a time when the development of the automobile was in full force. There was little industrialization prior to the development of the automobile. The North American continent remained, for a great portion, an agrarian economy. Even as late as 1905 or 1906, 95% of Canadians made their living through subsistence agriculture. Industrialization came to our continent much later and when it did finally come to our continent, we had the full-fledged development of the automobile.

The decision was made, and it was a conscientious decision on behalf of the United States government, that the United States should have a comprehensive highway network. That was a decision made immediately after World War II. It was made by the Eisenhower and Truman administrations. That's where we get all these famous intersecting highways that criss-cross the United States. That was a decision that Canada was happy to go along with because, of course, our economy is integrated into the United States economy and not the European economy. Even if there were a time where our economy were integrated into the European economy, it was integrated in such a way that water travel was more important than rail travel. That's why we had a great shipbuilding industry in Halifax, because of the incredible water systems that we have on the continent.

But, as I said, as industrialization took place, that led to the growth of the highway system in the United States, Canada had to follow suit, and I think it's a good thing we followed suit because imagine not being able to keep up with our American trading partners, imagine if we didn't have a highway network that was, to a certain degree, integrated with the American highway network, how much more difficult it would be for us to make trade possible with the United States, which is still our number one trading partner? For all those reasons, it's important to have a very fast and integrated highway network.

That doesn't preclude any other forms of transportation, and it certainly doesn't preclude intermodal transportation. I have a great railway in my riding, the Essex Terminal Railway—everybody knows what it is. It's a fantastic railway. It's still operating today. In fact, it goes right down 2nd Concession where I grew up and terminates right at my constituency office. Quite frankly, I could step outside my constituency office, walk down the driveway, walk past the four wild turkeys that live on that property and walk down the railroad track right back to my house.

That is a bit of a philosophical treatment of what's before us today, Madam Speaker. I thank you very much for this opportunity.

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

Mr. Wayne Gates: I'm not really sure what the member was talking about for that 20 minutes, but I do have a question.

Niagara Falls has 14 million visitors every single year. Tourism in Niagara creates 40,000 jobs in Niagara Falls,

Niagara-on-the-Lake and Fort Erie. A majority of the visitors are coming from the GTA. Why is there nothing in this bill to deliver all-day, two-way GO trains all the way to Niagara Falls, which would also support and protect our environment by getting cars off the QEW?

Mr. Anthony Leardi: Perhaps the reason why the member from Niagara didn't understand what I was saying was because I was speaking in French. That might have been one explanation. I won't speculate on anything else.

But I think that what the member from Niagara Falls is saying is that he supports the expansion of the transportation network in the province of Ontario, and he wishes that it would be even more extended to his area. I know that there are services that do go to his area, and what he is asking for are more. So maybe if he actually votes in favour of this legislation, we might see projects in the future—more and more projects in the future—that service the Niagara region and the growing wonderful tourism section that—the tourism possibilities that that creates.

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

Mr. Matthew Rae: Thank you to my colleague from Essex for his very in-depth deputation this afternoon on Bill 212. He mentioned that his constituency office—it sounds like it's at the end of the line on the railway line, but I'm sure it's a beautiful location in his riding.

1730

I want to ask the member about rural broadband. Obviously, it's something very important in my riding and also in Essex, I'm sure, and our government's making significant investments. Can you tell us a little bit more about how this bill will ensure we're getting shovels in the ground and getting more communities and homes connected to rural broadband?

Mr. Anthony Leardi: Sure. That's an excellent question from the member, and I'm sure that the residents of his rural riding are very appreciative of the steps that this government is making to ensure that we expand broadband across all of the province of Ontario and especially in rural areas.

What this bill does is, it makes it actually easier for us to build broadband projects in the province of Ontario. I specifically referred to the section where a distributor, a component or a telecommunications service provider can be assigned an easement, which is the land route through which those services are built, and that that easement can be assigned and that compensation for that can also be ordered to be paid.

These are very, very important functions to provide rural broadband to places like Essex county and to places all across Ontario which are rural and harder to serve. So I'm glad to see that that was included in this bill, and I think that people in rural communities across the province of Ontario will appreciate that.

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

Mr. Wayne Gates: I'm not sure if it was in what he talked about, but I know a number of their members had talked about the fact that they want to twin the Garden City

Skyway. I want to be clear, seeing I'm from Niagara Falls but I lived in St. Catharines for a long time too: There is no problem with traffic on the Garden City Skyway as we stand today. The people in Niagara know it; everybody knows it.

But the problem that we have—

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoche): The Associate Minister of Energy-Intensive Industries will come to order.

Mr. Wayne Gates: The problem that we have is that there was an environmental study in 2016 that the deck of the Garden City Skyway should have been replaced by 2025. Well, 2025 is exactly six weeks from now, and I haven't seen the deck replaced. My concern is the safety of the Garden City Skyway.

So my question to the member—

Interjection.

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

Mr. Wayne Gates: Some guy's chirping over there, but I can't see who it is.

To the member: Are you aware that it's not a traffic issue, it's an environmental study that the deck should have been replaced in 2025?

Mr. Anthony Leardi: Well, if I understand the member's question, it's similar to the first question, in that he would like more services extended to the Niagara Peninsula and he's referred exactly to the Garden City Skyway, which is clearly a concern that's very dear to his heart.

Although there's nothing in this bill that specifically says that we're going to build the Garden City Skyway this way or that way, bills like this make projects such as that easier and faster to complete. That is why the opposition members should vote in favour of this bill, because at such a time where such a project is engaged in anywhere in the province of Ontario, whether it's the Garden City Skyway or anywhere else in the province of Ontario, when and if it becomes a priority project, this will make it more expeditious to build.

So I think that's a great observation for the member to make, and I think it's another great reason for the opposition to vote in favour of this bill so that that member can have the assurance that, in the future, projects such as the one he mentions get expeditious treatment.

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

Mr. Ric Bresee: Unfortunately, across the province, we have seen tremendous increases in car theft. We know that damage to our economy, that it's damaging to all of our insurance rates and is, quite simply, frightening to many of our residents.

I know the member is a lawyer. I'm wondering if he could speak to the activities that this government is doing with regard to combatting auto theft in Ontario.

Mr. Anthony Leardi: That's a great question. First of all, we are increasing our funding to the police. Not everybody believes in increasing funding to the police, but I certainly do believe in increasing funding for the police.

One of the most important things that we're doing to combat auto theft in the province of Ontario is to give our police the tools to enforce the law, because they will enforce the law if they have the proper tools.

Again, not everybody supports the police receiving the proper tools to enforce the law, but I certainly do because the police are the people who are protecting us from violent crime. They're also the people who are protecting us from the kind of theft that none of us wants to experience.

I want to point out that one great project that would be great for the federal government to undertake is to inspect the Port of Montreal. That would be a great project.

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

Mr. Joel Harden: I want to thank the member for his remarks. I'm just wondering, because I know he has a sharp legal mind, if he could help me resolve a contradiction that I see from the Premier that relates to this legislation.

At one point recently, the Premier told the province the following about transit-oriented hubs, which seems to be at odds with this legislation. He said: "Personally, I don't think the province knows best all the time. We should not be dictating to great mayors when it comes to building along transit lines," even though the government had promised a transit housing strategy.

Now, all of a sudden, when it comes to active transportation infrastructures, the Premier knows best. The Premier knows better than the transportation departments that the member for Kitchener Centre was talking about. The Premier knows better than the people that are entrusted—the non-partisan civil service—to give the best advice to city councillors.

Why is the Premier at odds with, on the one hand, respecting municipalities and, on the other, overreaching and taking their rights away?

Mr. Anthony Leardi: I respect that question from the member from Ottawa Centre. It is a fair question.

I think that all members in this House—I can tell you, I get it all the time. I get requests from the taxpayers in the municipalities that I represent. I get requests all the time from taxpayers who want the province to intervene to overrule a decision of this municipality or overrule the decision of that municipality. I get requests all the time for the province to intervene and overrule a decision of the university of fill-in-the-blank or to overrule the decision of a particular school board.

I have to remind the taxpayers of my municipality that we cannot as the provincial government constantly intervene in every single situation. But it is the fact of the matter that municipalities are the creature of provincial legislation, and from time to time, it is important for the province to intervene, and we do.

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

Mr. Brian Saunderson: I would like to pick up on that question and ask the member: Does he see an analogy or a comparative aspect with planning legislation that desig-

nates how municipalities will implement planning and growth to looking at how bike lanes would be integrated with the current transportation strategies?

Mr. Anthony Leardi: Yes. Listen, every municipality needs to have an official plan; I am certainly engaged in those discussions. A municipality can certainly put a bike plan inside of its official plan, and make that part of its official plan and seek the co-operation of the provincial government and provincial legislation as well.

But these are matters of—I won't describe them as matters of discussion or give and take. Sometimes there are priorities that must rule over other considerations. And again, I have no hesitation in saying that from time to time, it becomes necessary for the provincial government to exercise its authority and to do so.

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

Mr. Joel Harden: Let's talk about Bill 212 and what it does for road safety and what it doesn't do.

I write a column for the community every week in our newsletter, and I described my experience in this House last week as going through a trip through the Twilight Zone. I don't know if anybody else in this House is a huge fan of that show, but I love that show. I think Rod Serling is one of the underrated geniuses of 20th-century television. He used satire, he used absurdism, he used surrealism, he used horror, he used suspense, often to bring social commentary to topical issues not just in the United States but around North America—and, you could argue, around the world, although the Americans often think they can dictate to the world. Don't take me too far. I'm not a TV critic.

My point is this: Last week was like a trip into the Twilight Zone. Why? Because the Premier had set the stage for this discussion on road safety we're having right now by ruminating about the idea of a tunnel under the 401. Do people remember that? He was standing in front of the 401 that, yes, was jammed with traffic, and he was standing with ministers. I've got to say, with a big part of my heart, I felt bad for those ministers because there he is, bloviating about the idea of a tunnel under the 401, like, "I'm going to do an estimate about a back-of-the-napkin plan for a tunnel under the 401."

It had to be embarrassing, because the biggest tunnel that engineers know of in North American construction and engineering history is the Big Dig in Boston. The Big Dig in Boston was literally—depending upon the Premier's ambition for this, it might have been a quarter of what the Premier's proposing. So when people were trying to make sense of what he was figuring out he was studying the feasibility of, they were talking about a \$55-billion project that might be finished in 15 to 18 years—might—while people are stuck in traffic on the 401.

1740

You know, the thing about the 401 that's really problematic? It's all the bike lanes on the 401. My God, if you guys would just remove the bike lanes off the 401, those poor drivers would just be able to get where they're going so much faster.

I'm just trying to articulate a perspective from the Twilight Zone, because that's really what the poor people of Ontario had to deal with. Rod Serling would have loved that speech the Premier gave.

The fact of the matter is this: We do have gridlock in our province, and the origin of that gridlock is not active transportation lanes. The origin of that gridlock is this government's failed transit plans. I can't recall another government in Canadian history that has done more press conferences talking about aspirational transit plans than this government. Meanwhile, the people who actually conduct the buses, that fix the buses, that conduct the streetcars, that fix the streetcars, the riders that rely—your city here. Here in Toronto, I think it's 2.5 million users a day. That's a lot of people relying on public transit in the greater area of Toronto. But the mayor of Toronto had to literally strong-arm this government to get its own deal, to get \$330 million into the Toronto Transit Commission, because there's a formidable leader of this city.

But in my city, we're still waiting. We're still waiting in gridlock in our city because we have no new money to operate transit. It's so bad—there's a story running in CBC today—that of the trips that were scheduled for a given week last week, 8,210 planned daily trips, 348 were cancelled on Monday, 297 cancelled on Tuesday and 270 of those cancelled on Wednesday. Why? Because the government keeps cutting money to the operational funds of OC Transpo. That is not just an Ottawa story. It's a London story. It's a Windsor story. It's a Sudbury story. It's a Peterborough story. It's a Brampton story. We have a government that loves to cut ribbons about aspirational transit plans that may happen at some point soon, but the actual buses and streetcars that we've got are being shortchanged.

And then guess what people do? Guess what students going to college or university do? Guess what people getting around their communities do? They take a car. They take an Uber. The last estimates that I know of for 401 usage is that about 85% of the users on a given day—just over a million users—are single-passenger occupants of their car—I'm sure, frustrated. But they're not going to be helped by the Twilight Zone ambitions of the Premier, who, on the one hand, is talking about this fantastic idea, that must have been dreamt up over breakfast, and on the other hand, you've got people who are actually stuck. People are mad for being stuck, and they have a right to be mad for being stuck. But the Premier is plunging this House, this esteemed House, into a Twilight Zone and, frankly, making a mockery of our democracy. It's embarrassing. It's embarrassing to answer questions from residents back home about a 401 tunnel.

But I always say back to people who've texted or called or emailed, "You know, you have to remember the following about this Premier: It's not about actually doing something. Rather, like Mr. Trump has done in the United States, it's about saying something ridiculous so you get all of the attention and we don't talk about serious ideas."

We don't talk about serious ideas, like taking trucks off the 401 and putting them on the 407 and subsidizing them,

or making sure public transit is regular and affordable so people could actually use it. These are the things—the One Fare movement was a win for the TTC riders; the Minister of Energy just mentioned this. I salute the Toronto transit riders for winning that One Fare initiative. But it's difficult, if someone is commuting from Scarborough into downtown Toronto, to be waiting for their schedule because this government continues—we're doing a little bit better in Toronto, thanks to Mayor Chow—to lowball the operating funds for public transit. That is the reason people are stuck in traffic.

It's interesting. In Etobicoke, there was a public meeting recently about this whole war on bike lanes. It was fascinating, because the Premier, once again into the Twilight Zone, has been saying all the time, "Oh, my god. One of the most dangerous things about these woke bike lanes is that first responders are being delayed in responding to accidents."

Do you know what was interesting about that town hall, hosted by Deputy Mayor Amber Morley, was that the local fire chief took the stage and said, "Actually, our response times are faster with the active transport lanes." Why? Because they've been built to a width that allows the paramedic bus or the police car to get through and to get where they need to go quickly. The delay in response times in traffic, according to the city staff who provided the estimates, are about five minutes delayed going eastbound and three minutes delayed going westbound. That's reality. That's not the Twilight Zone; that's reality.

We are stuck in traffic out there because this government continues to underfund operating transit. They're addicted to press conferences, but they're not providing funds for transit. They have put a lot of faith in Phil Verster and his army of executives at Metrolinx.

I have a joke for you, Speaker, a joke for the House. How many Metrolinx executives does it take change a light does it get to change a light bulb? Anybody know the answer? It's difficult to say, but my best guess is 103: 82 vice-presidents—up from 27, six years ago—19 C-suite executives and a Premier willing to authorize the pay-cheques. But I guess we're assuming that those overpaid, overstuffed executives on the public dime are actually going to be able to change a light bulb.

The last job Mr. Verster had, before the Liberals hired him to run the public transit system of Metrolinx when they were in office here, was Scottish rail. Do you know what's interesting? The people of Scotland chased Mr. Verster out of their country because they pressed for information. They found out Mr. Verster was making an incredible amount of money, north of \$300,000 Canadian. They found he had a housing allowance. He had a personal car. He had a clothing allowance. He had private health care for himself and all his family.

Scottish people—I was raised in a Presbyterian household; let me tell you, Scottish people don't put up with that nonsense. He was run out of Scotland in disgrace and the Liberals hired him, and this government has kept him in power.

In what universe does a Conservative government reward someone who can't finish a transit project? The

Eglinton Crosstown, the Hurontario, the Ontario Line they keep talking about, the tunnelling for which being complete. As the transit critic for the province, I get to talk to transit experts from around the world. I've got to tell you what they say when they look at Ontario. They think Ontario has become the most expensive place to build transit in the world because of the vultures of the consultants, the tapeworms of all of these people—like, consultants managing consultants in Metrolinx. You know that the marketing department at Metrolinx on its own is more than 400 staff—the marketing department. So embarrassed Metrolinx executives approach me, approach us, because they can't believe what they're seeing. But this Conservative government that purports to care about the public purse keeps Mr. Verster in power. While they do, traffic is delayed.

Let's talk about the genius idea inside the Twilight Zone to wage a war on safe infrastructure and bike lanes. I want to quote the words that I cited earlier in debate from the Premier himself. Outside this very building, in November 2017, he took a bike ride with the federal leader of the NDP, Jagmeet Singh. It used to be on TVO's Blind Date episode. You used to be able to go find the episode. Curiously, you can't right now. However, people have managed to track it down and the Premier was following—if people know, outside here at Queen's Park, there's protective bike infrastructure. But there's a moment when you merge onto University when you have to take a bit of a risk, right? You go across the road, and you can see in the video there's a moment when the Premier kind of swerved into traffic a little bit and swerved back. He admitted that he hadn't been on a bike in a long time. These were his words to the TVO camera crew when he was finished his ride with Jagmeet: "You're nervous when there's no bike lanes. At least I was. We have to do everything we can to make there's never a death in our city. One death is too many when it comes to bicycle riders."

Wow. That's a very interesting perspective, having actually gone into the experience of trying to ride a bike in a major city in our province. So what's behind the change of mind? What has plunged us into the Twilight Zone seven years later? The best answer I've been able to give constituents back home is crass politics. This government is taking advantage of people's justifiable frustrations with traffic and gridlock and turning them not on viable solutions like public transit and encouraging trucks onto the 407; they're telling them to blame cyclists. They're telling them to blame wheelchair users. They're telling them to blame people who scooter. And that's, frankly, a shameful way to behave. It's a shameful way to behave.

1750

I honestly believe—I want to believe that everybody in this House cares that people be able to get around their communities and get home safely at the end of the day. But what the Premier has done, by plunging us into a debate without any evidence, not a shred of proof—and I'll get into a couple of little blurbs of proof he's attempted—he is actually putting people's lives at risk. If

he's going to go into municipalities, claiming he knows better than municipalities and remove safe infrastructure, he's going to be putting people's lives at risk.

We've talked a lot about cyclists, Speaker, and they've been outspoken in the last couple of weeks. I want to talk about pedestrians; in particular, I want to talk about seniors. I want to talk about my good friend here from St. Catharines and her mom, Pat Lindal, who was crossing the street in St. Catharines in front of an elementary school—this way, Speaker—and a car thought they could speed quickly and turn right in front of Pat. Well, they collided with Pat, almost a direct hit. She was knocked 50 feet into the opposite sidewalk and missed a fire hydrant by about a foot. She had a broken tibia; she had a broken clavicle; she had pins in her leg. The witnesses who saw this said that she looked like a ragdoll in the air. Seven months she was in hospital—seven months.

Was there any consequence for this reckless driver? Did the reckless driver have their licence mandatorily suspended for a year? Were they required to witness a victim impact statement from Pat? No. I proposed such legislation before this House with Bill 40, but the government voted against that legislation, and they're ignoring Pat now.

I'll think about others, because there are many others. I'll think about a six-year-old who was killed in Tweed—a six-year-old. I see the member for the area in this House today—a six-year-old killed in Tweed on September 2. Will there be any mandatory driver's licence suspension for that person who killed that six-year-old in Tweed? Will there be any responsibility for that person to volunteer to become a better driver? No, not in this bill.

I also learned about Charlotte Light, a 14-year-old killed on County Road 2 in Long Sault, just outside Cornwall. I know the family.

Hon. Nolan Quinn: That's a highway. That's a highway. Watch where you're going.

Mr. Joel Harden: The member is saying, Speaker, in debate that it's a highway, therefore you can mow a cyclist down, I guess. That's the claim.

Interjection.

Mr. Joel Harden: But this cyclist, this 14-year-old beloved cyclist, Charlotte Light, oldest sibling in a family of five—I know the family. I know the uncle, a personal friend. Will there be any mandatory driver re-education for the person who committed this incident? To their credit, they stayed at the scene. The answer is no, and this bill will not require that. Will there be any restorative justice?

Hon. Stephen Lecce: Like a mandatory minimum sentence.

Mr. Joel Harden: The minister's joking; I'm not joking. I'm actually saying, I proposed legislation before this House based on best practices elsewhere in the world that would say to someone who's committed a highly dangerous and reckless act with their car, "Commit yourself to being better." It's reasonable legislation, but the government voted it down.

I can tell you right now that this young woman is missed by her community, missed by her uncle who's a personal friend of mine.

Speaker, the numbers in the real world, outside the Twilight Zone: Ministry of Transportation Ontario statistics tell us that last year, 49,106 incidents were caused by reckless drivers. People were either killed or seriously injured. That is a rate of 134 a day, and the members opposite have said—and I bet in questions will still say—that we have the safest streets in the world. Well, if you're comfortable with the rate of 134 people being hurt or killed every day, then, yes, but that means you're governing from the Twilight Zone. You're not governing in reality.

I look to governments in Finland, I look to governments in Denmark, who set the mark where my city has set it: Vision Zero. The goal is that no one gets—

Hon. Trevor Jones: Sweden.

Mr. Joel Harden:—Sweden has embraced the vision too; I take the member's point—hurt or killed on their way home.

It's not just cyclists, wheelchair users, pedestrians. It is road workers and construction workers. It is first responders. I've talked to police, paramedics, fire who have recounted horrible incidents of reckless behaviour behind the wheel, but as long as there's no criminal intent, there's no criminal consequence—there is no serious consequence, I should say, correcting my words just now.

We know that driving should be seen as a privilege, regardless of what vehicle you drive. It's a privilege, not a right, but right now in Ontario, if you critically injure or kill someone with your car, it's a few hundred dollars of a fine and you hope you have a good day in court if you're trying to support justice for the aggrieved party, and that is unacceptable. It's unacceptable, and there's nothing in this legislation to change that.

The Premier is causing a fight that is unnecessary—unnecessary. I believe in the transportation departments of the municipalities of this province, the 440 municipalities, who we entrust to ensure safety, I believe in the first responders that serve those communities, but I also know that, all too often, tragedies continue to happen. As the critic for this area, I will not be happy with that, and I wish

my friends opposite not to be happy with it either because there are things we can work on together to fix it.

The big thing I think we need to fix is getting to the front bench of this government and encouraging them to speak in reality and evidence and not from the perspective of the Twilight Zone—quit besmirching a wonderful show; sorry, I'll go for levity there.

Here is my point as I wrap up: I know, increasingly, people in this province want choice with how they get around our communities. I am a driver, I am a cyclist, I am a pedestrian. People want to have that choice. Particularly when your children are involved or when your mom or dad, who may be frail, are involved, you want to make sure there is a safe way in which they can get around, and when someone hurts or harms them, you want to make sure that those people are held accountable.

This is our opportunity. When this bill goes to committee, I will be coming with amendments—you better believe it—based upon good evidence to make sure that we do right by those folks; we do right by Charlotte; we do right by Serene Summers, who was critically injured in my city in 2022 by a driver who fled the scene; and we do right by Audrey Cameron, who was hit as a pedestrian crossing Carling Avenue back in September, who's going to live with brain injuries for the rest of her life. There's just too much carnage happening in our streets, and I'm disappointed, frankly, that the government isn't acknowledging that carnage.

All of these children of our province are all our children. All the elders of our province are all our elders. The elders built everything we have here. Everything we have here, we got from our elders, so we need to make sure they don't end up like Pat, and that's on us—that's on us.

We need to fix this bill at committee, and I invite debate.

Second reading debate deemed adjourned.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bhutla Karpoché): Thank you. Seeing that it is now 6 o'clock, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow morning at 9 a.m.

The House adjourned at 1758.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenant-gouverneur: 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
Allsopp, Tyler (PC)	Bay of Quinte / Baie de Quinte	
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
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 Tourism, Culture and Gaming / Ministre du Tourisme, de la Culture et des Jeux
Clancy, Aislinn (GRN)	Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre	
Clark, Steve (PC)	Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes / Leeds— Grenville—Thousand Islands et Rideau Lakes	Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire du gouvernement
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, Hon. / L'hon. Stephen (PC)	Oakville	Associate Minister of Mines / Ministre associé des Mines
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 Education / Ministre de l'Éducation
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	Minister of Agriculture, Food and Agribusiness / Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et de l'Agroentreprise
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 (IND)	Carleton	
Glover, Chris (NDP)	Spadina—Fort York	
Gretzky, Lisa (NDP)	Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest	
Grewal, Hardeep Singh (PC)	Brampton East / Brampton-Est	
Hamid, Zee (PC)	Milton	
Hardeman, Ernie (PC)	Oxford	
Harden, Joel (NDP)	Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	
Harris, Hon. / L'hon. Mike (PC)	Kitchener—Conestoga	Minister of Red Tape Reduction / Ministre de la Réduction des formalités administratives
Hazell, Andrea (LIB)	Scarborough—Guildwood	
Hogarth, Christine (PC)	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	
Holland, Hon. / L'hon. Kevin (PC)	Thunder Bay—Atikokan	Associate Minister of Forestry and Forest Products / Ministre associé des Forêts et des Produits forestiers
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, Hon. / L'hon. Trevor (PC)	Chatham-Kent—Leamington	Associate Minister of Emergency Preparedness and Response / Ministre associé de la Protection civile et de l'Intervention en cas d'urgence
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
Kusendova-Bashta, Hon. / L'hon. Natalia (PC)	Mississauga Centre / Mississauga-Centre	Minister of Long-Term Care / Ministre des Soins de longue durée
Leardi, Anthony (PC)	Essex	Deputy Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint du gouvernement
Lecce, Hon. / L'hon. Stephen (PC)	King—Vaughan	Minister of Energy and Electrification / Ministre de l'Énergie et de l'Électrification
Lumsden, Hon. / L'hon. Neil (PC)	Hamilton East—Stoney Creek / Hamilton-Est—Stoney Creek	Minister of Sport / Ministre 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 and Procurement / Ministre des Services au public et aux entreprises et de l'Approvisionnement
McCrimmon, Karen (LIB)	Kanata—Carleton	

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
McGregor, Hon. / L'hon. Graham (PC)	Brampton North / Brampton-Nord	Associate Minister of Auto Theft and Bail Reform / Ministre associé de la Lutte contre le vol d'automobiles et de la Réforme relative aux mises en liberté sous caution
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, Hon. / L'hon. Sam (PC)	Niagara West / Niagara-Ouest	Associate Minister of Energy-Intensive Industries / Ministre associé des Industries à forte consommation d'énergie
Pang, Billy (PC)	Markham—Unionville	
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 Deputy Government Whip / Whip adjointe du gouvernement
Pierre, Natalie (PC)	Burlington	
Pinsonneault, Steve (PC)	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	
Pirie, Hon. / L'hon. George (PC)	Timmins	Minister of Mines / Ministre des Mines
Quinn, Hon. / L'hon. Nolan (PC)	Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry	Minister of Colleges and Universities / Ministre des Collèges et Universités
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 Indigenous Affairs and First Nations Economic Reconciliation / Ministre des Affaires autochtones et de la Réconciliation économique avec les Premières Nations Minister of Northern Development / Ministre du Développement du Nord
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 / Ministre des Richesses naturelles
Smith, Laura (PC)	Thornhill	
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 des Petites Entreprises
Taylor, Monique (NDP)	Hamilton Mountain / Hamilton-Mountain	
Thanigasalam, Hon. / L'hon. Vijay (PC)	Scarborough—Rouge Park	Associate Minister of Housing / Ministre associé du Logement

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Thompson, Hon. / L'hon. Lisa M. (PC)	Huron—Bruce	Minister of Rural Affairs / Ministre des Affaires rurales
Tibollo, Hon. / L'hon. Michael A. (PC)	Vaughan—Woodbridge	Associate Minister of Mental Health and Addictions / Ministre associé délégué à la Santé mentale et à 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
Vaugeois, 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	