

Legislative
Assembly
of Ontario



Assemblée
législative
de l'Ontario

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

No. 61B

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

N° 61B

1st Session
44th Parliament

Tuesday
14 April 2026

1^{re} session
44^e législature

Mardi
14 avril 2026

Speaker: Honourable Donna Skelly
Clerk: Trevor Day

Présidente : L'honorable Donna Skelly
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.

Hansard 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

Journal des débats et services linguistiques
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

CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Tuesday 14 April 2026 / Mardi 14 avril 2026

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS / AFFAIRES D'INTÉRÊT PUBLIC ÉMANANT DES DÉPUTÉES ET DÉPUTÉS

Meredith Act (Fair Compensation for Injured Workers), 2026, Bill 86, MPP Gates; MPP Vaugeois; MPP West / Loi Meredith de 2026 sur l'indemnisation équitable des travailleurs blessés, projet de loi 86, MPP Gates; MPP Vaugeois; MPP West	
MPP Lise Vaugeois	3663
Mr. Sheref Sabawy	3665
MPP Wayne Gates.....	3665
MPP Mohamed Firin	3666
Mr. John Fraser.....	3667
MPP Jamie West.....	3668
Mme France Gélinas.....	3668
Mr. Mike Schreiner.....	3669
MPP Lise Vaugeois	3669
Second reading vote deferred	3670

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE / DÉBAT SUR LA MOTION D'AJOURNEMENT

Impaired drivers	
Mr. Stephen Blais	3670
Mr. Ric Bresee.....	3671
Education funding	
Mr. John Fraser.....	3672
Mr. Billy Pang	3672
Education funding	
Mr. John Fraser.....	3673
Mr. Billy Pang	3673

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 14 April 2026

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE
DE L'ONTARIO

Mardi 14 avril 2026

Report continued from volume A.

1758

**PRIVATE MEMBERS'
PUBLIC BUSINESS**

MEREDITH ACT (FAIR COMPENSATION
FOR INJURED WORKERS), 2026

LOI MEREDITH DE 2026
SUR L'INDEMNISATION ÉQUITABLE
DES TRAVAILLEURS BLESSÉS

MPP Vaugeois moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 86, An Act to enact the Meredith Act (Fair Compensation for Injured Workers), 2026 and to repeal the Workplace Safety and Insurance Act, 1997 / Projet de loi 86, Loi édictant la Loi Meredith de 2026 sur l'indemnisation équitable des travailleurs blessés et abrogeant la Loi de 1997 sur la sécurité professionnelle et l'assurance contre les accidents du travail.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): Pursuant to standing order 100, the member has 12 minutes for their presentation.

MPP Lise Vaugeois: Bill 86 replaces the 1997 Workplace Safety and Insurance Act in order to return the WSIB to its original principles: compensation that lasts for the duration of the injury in a non-adversarial system that puts the well-being of the injured worker first, ensuring that the effects of the injury or disease do not become a burden on communities, workers' families, or the public.

The subtitle, "Meredith Act," refers to Sir William Meredith, the architect of the original workers' compensation system. His system was based on these principles: no fault; non-adversarial; compensation for as long as the disability lasts; the employer pays; there is collective liability; and the system is administered by an independent public agency. These principles were turned on their heads, however, when the Mike Harris Conservative government replaced the Workers' Compensation Act with the Workplace Safety and Insurance Act, marking a clear change of priorities, minimizing costs to employers regardless of the harm caused to workers. This change of focus is evident in the WSIB commission minutes that discuss employers as their clients without once mentioning injured workers. Think about that: a commission intended to support workers in their time of need that identifies employers as their clients and not workers.

Let's look at what the Meredith Act changes, starting with governance. The current WSIB is governed by

political appointees as a virtual extension of the Premier's office. Governance is neither independent nor representative. The Meredith Act, on the other hand, sets minimum qualifications for the head of the tribunal and requires that the commission consist of 14 equal worker and business representatives, with all commissioners nominated by bona fide worker and business groups, including at least one injured worker representative.

Compensation: The Meredith Act restores compensation for loss of income to 90% of net earnings. This is a return to the original rate that was cut to 85% by the Harris Conservative government in 1997.

The Meredith Act also includes CPP and pension benefits for the first time, ending age discrimination that cuts off permanently injured workers, consigning them to poverty at age 65.

The Meredith Act makes compensation for pain, intangible loss and suffering last as long as the suffering does and is to be proportionate to the pain, intangible losses and suffering. The current WSIB system is arbitrary and can be commuted with a one-time lump sum payment, a practice that not only leaves workers far short of what they need to survive, but it also skews their income taxes, leaving injured workers worse off in subsequent years.

The WSIA system for education and retraining for permanently injured workers is coercive, arbitrary, inadequate and grossly unrealistic. One of the worst practices of the WSIB is to deem that a permanently injured worker has been re-employed in a phantom job, using this as justification to cut off their compensation, regardless of the facts. Under the Meredith Act, deeming based on fantasy income ends now. Retraining and education must put the permanently injured workers into "at least as good a position" as they were in before the accident, based on real-world conditions.

Under the current act, there's no time limit for decisions. People can be left dangling with no income, no recourse and nothing but pain, anxiety and hopelessness for years on end. The Meredith Act, on the other hand, requires initial eligibility decisions within 15 days. If this deadline is not met, the injured worker is entitled to interim compensation that may not be clawed back if the claim is eventually denied.

Under the 1997 act, the WSIB has an internal appeal process fraught with a fundamental conflict of interest that can take months or even years to resolve before an injured worker can take a dispute to the actual appeals tribunal. Yet when decisions finally get to the appeals tribunal, the WSIB has its decisions overturned in whole or in part 70% of the time. What this tells us is that WSIB workers are

being told to deny claims in the hope that people will give up and go away—hmm—thus making so-called surpluses bigger. Again, who is the WSIB accountable to? Employers looking for rebates or workers whose lives have been shattered by a permanent injury?

Let me tell you about Teddy Bobrowski and his experience appealing his case to the WSIB after severely damaging his back in a construction job. It took 10 years before the WSIB finally granted him compensation. In the meantime, he had no income. He had to sell his house, sell his business. He became drug addicted in his attempts to mask pain and go back to work. He wound up homeless and suicidal. It was only after 10 years that he finally received the compensation he had been entitled to all along. This is what injured workers with complex injuries go through. Teddy, as documented by so many others, wound up with a permanent psychological disability because of what the WSIB put him through.

And in that vein, under the Meredith Act, all documents and communications—including internal communications—must be shared with workers launching appeals. This will eliminate covert practices, covert administrative advice documents, covert directives from managers, and other abuses common at the WSIB.

Regarding medical privacy, the Meredith Act mandates that the injured worker decides who examines them and makes medical reports. If the commission wants a second opinion, the injured worker will choose a second examining physician. There will be an in-person physical examination by the second physician, and this physician's first duty will be—as it should be—to the patient, to the worker. Reviews by doctors who have never met with the injured worker and simply decide to overrule the treating doctor's reports are eliminated in the new act. In addition, non-medical administrators will no longer be allowed to override a medical opinion, although under existing WSIB practices, they do this anyway.

The WSIB does not currently gather any information from workplace health and safety committees; does not flag problem workplaces, employers, types of accidents, types of diseases, or any other safety-related information for the Ministry of Labour health and safety services. They also do not track what happens to injured workers over time to see the outcomes of their decisions. The Meredith Act requires the commission to gather, analyze, distribute information from its own processes, health and safety committees, scientific and medical sources, and to distribute this information widely. If the commission becomes aware of any safety problem, fraudulent activity, employer claims suppression, suspicious workplace deaths or serious injuries, they are required to report these incidents to the Ministry of Labour's health and safety services and to the appropriate police services.

Currently, whistle-blowers are not protected. The WSIB routinely prosecutes workers for alleged reporting infractions, despite having a vested interest in the outcome of such prosecutions. Under the Meredith Act, the commission will not have any prosecutorial powers of their own.

Finally, the WSIB's system of bill-backs, ratings and rebates that creates an inherent conflict of interest between employers and injured workers needs to end. The notion of returning so-called surplus dollars to employers came out of an amendment the Ford Conservative government made to the WSIA in 2021, when they created a financial incentive for employers to deny, harass and interfere with injured workers, their medical treatment, and the worker's relationship with compensation. This arrangement has left thousands of workers living in pain and poverty while companies have been gifted a financial bonanza.

Let's take the example of Fiera Foods to show that employers, no matter how notoriously bad their working conditions, still receive rebates. Five people died while working at Fiera Foods, and yet Fiera Foods received a \$45,000 rebate for supposedly having a good safety record. How is this even possible?

The Meredith Act ends bill-backs, ratings and rebates and restores the compensation system to one of collective employer responsibility, with premiums based upon the type of industry or business, thus removing the incentive to harass injured workers and deny workplace harms. This may be one of the most important aspects of the Meredith Act: eliminating the experience rating—an incentive for employers to not report incidents, because the fewer incidents, the greater the rebate. Get rid of the rebates. Workers should not be forced into poverty and forced into becoming a public expense. And remember, it is employers who are to fund the support for workers made ill or injured while working for them; it is not the public. These are not taxpayer dollars, but when the WSIB fails in its duty to support injured workers, it forces these workers to become a public expense.

1810

In conclusion, the harm to workers has been substantial and is long-standing.

Bill 86 is a comprehensive bill—much larger than most private members' bills. It represents years of work by injured worker support groups from across Ontario. It has the support of unions from across Ontario, including the Ontario Federation of Labour, the United Steelworkers, the Ontario Nurses' Association, the Canadian Union of Public Employees, United Food and Commercial Workers, and, interestingly and importantly, the Ontario Compensation Employees Union. That is the union that represents workers who work at the WSIB.

I especially want to thank Kendal McKinney, the retired lawyer who gave up his summer, and probably more, to create the language of this bill.

It's a very important bill for workers across this province.

If you receive an injury, if you break your arm, it's probably not a big deal in terms of getting compensation, but if you have an injury that could be lifelong or could go on for years, you are going to face so many hurdles. You will acquire mental health challenges out of despair, and you will be a pauper; you will be penniless. At best, you'll be able to get some ODSP support, and that is criminal; it is wrong.

I urge the government to support Bill 86, the Meredith Act.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): Further debate?

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: I am proud to rise today to speak to Bill 86. Let's be clear about what the debate is really about: It is about whether injured workers in Ontario have a system they can rely on, not just today, but years down the road. That means one thing: The system has to work—bulletproof.

Whether they are on a construction site building homes and hospitals or working in a care facility supporting vulnerable Ontarians, workers across this province show up every day to get the job done. They do demanding, physical work. They take pride in what they build, and they expect one thing in return: safety and security. But even with the best safety measures in place, accidents can still happen, and when they do, the impact does not stop at the work site. It follows a worker home. It affects their lives. It affects their families, their financial security and their future. And too often, an injured worker is left facing impossible choices, between paying the bills or focusing on recovery. That is a choice no worker in Ontario should ever have to make.

That's why our government's approach is simple. We are focused on protecting Ontario workers, with real action, not theoretical overhauls. When a worker is injured, they don't need a promise. They need support. They need stability. And they need a system that delivers when it matters most. That's exactly what we have been building.

We have strengthened enforcement across the province, with tens of thousands of inspections every year. We have cracked down on bad actors who cut corners and put workers at risk. We have introduced some of the toughest penalties in Canada for employers who break the law, because protecting workers is not optional; it is our responsibility.

That's why we have also modernized workplace safety rules to reflect the realities workers face today. From requiring AEDs on construction sites to ensuring properly fitting protective gear and equipment for every worker, we have taken action to keep people safe on the job.

But we also know that when injuries do happen, the system has to be there. That's why we are moving forward with targeted reforms to strengthen support for injured workers, including increasing income replacement benefits to 90% of take-home pay—the first increase in nearly 30 years—because for the worker recovering from an injury, that's not just a number; that's help with rent, help with groceries, help staying afloat while they focus on healing.

We are also modernizing the system to reflect today's workforce. Right now, benefits can end at the age of 65, even if a worker planned to keep working. That doesn't reflect reality. More Ontarians are working longer, contributing their skills and experience. And a workplace injury should not suddenly matter less because of

someone's age. If a worker intends to keep working, they deserve that protection.

Whether you are a PSW caring for someone in their home or a tradesperson working high above a job site, if you are hurt on the job, this government will be there for you.

That's how you build a system that works: step by step, targeted, responsible. We are focusing on real outcomes for real people.

Now compare that to what's being proposed in Bill 86. That bill doesn't focus on one issue. Instead, it proposes to overhaul the entire system in one shot, without a clear cost, without a clear implementation plan, and without a clear path forward. That's not responsible, because the system has to do two things at once: It has to support workers when they are injured, and it has to remain stable so it can continue supporting workers for years to come. That balance matters.

That's why our government is taking a direct approach. We are making real improvements where they are needed, by strengthening protections, supporting injured workers, and doing it in a way that keeps the system strong, stable and sustainable.

Ontario workers built this province. They build our homes, our hospitals, our infrastructure. They show up every day and keep our communities running. As a government, our job is simple: to have their backs.

When workers are protected, when they know that this government is in their corner, they can do their job with confidence, with pride, and without fear.

That's exactly what we are delivering as part of our plan to protect Ontario workers.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): Further debate? I recognize the member from—

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): Sorry, I didn't see you standing up.

I recognize the member from Niagara Falls.

MPP Wayne Gates: Oh, it's interesting. About that—the last time I stood up, you didn't see me either. Do you remember that? That was the last time I tried. You said, "I didn't see you stand up." I'm not that short. What's going on here?

Anyway, it's an honour to stand up and talk to this bill and this act.

I want to congratulate my colleagues for standing up for injured workers—

Interjections.

MPP Wayne Gates: Yes, give them a big round of applause.

I look at the other side, and I'm going to say that I'm a worker—that's all I am. I went to work every day. I worked for General Motors. I worked steady midnights for 20 years. I watched my colleagues get hurt on the job. I don't know how many of these guys have ever worked in a plant. It's dangerous. I don't know how many have worked on a construction site. It's dangerous. They get hurt on the job. When they get hurt on the job, they should be compensated.

When I go to work, I don't want anything but a fair day's pay for a fair day's work. That's what I owe the company. What I don't owe the company is my life, and I certainly don't owe them to live in poverty after I get hurt on the job. That's what's happening.

So I want to compliment the government. I don't do that very often, but they're making some minor improvements. Taking it from 85% to 90% of net income is an improvement, one that I can support—but I have to say, it went to 85% because of the Mike Harris government, under Bill 99, when he took it from 90% back to 85%. So here we are. I think Mike Harris hasn't been in there—let's see: The Liberals were 15 years; you guys are eight. That's over 20 years to back to 90%, when it was already that in 2010. Think about that.

1820

A lot of people are working past 65. Let's be honest. Why do they choose to work beyond 65? Seniors can't afford the rent. They can't afford their groceries. They're being forced to work longer because of the economy, because of some of the choices that are made over there on that side of the House. So that's a good improvement—but what you should do is make sure it's retroactive so it's covering the people who had to work before. They're not doing that.

When the government stands up and says they care about workers, here's how I feel. Your Working for Workers bills—we supported every one, I believe. Our labour critic is here. We supported them. But there's one piece when it comes to compensation that this government—even though they've had amendment after amendment and we've gone to committee and asked them, sometimes we begged them, to get rid of deeming.

When a worker gets hurt on the job—no fault of his own. He got up in the morning with his family, had a cup of coffee and went into work. He wasn't going to work to get injured. He was going to work to put in a fair day's work for a fair day's pay. So he goes home to his family, but this day he goes home to his family and he's injured. He's probably at the hospital, maybe hurt his back, maybe lost an arm. And he's deemed by WSIB. What happens? He's making \$20 an hour. They say this phantom job over here he can do for \$17, and they cut his benefits. They take that \$17 off, and then the amount he's making is obviously \$3 an hour. He can't live on it, so he goes on ODSP and ends up going into poverty. ODSP couldn't pay the mortgage. He couldn't provide for his family, couldn't take care of his kids and go to skating, go and play hockey—not because he did anything wrong. Do you know what he did wrong? He went to work because he wanted to provide for his family. That's all he wants to do. That's all I ever wanted to do—provide for my family when I went to work.

When they get injured on the job, all of us on that side of the House and this side of the House have to make sure that worker is taken care of. No worker in the province of Ontario, with this government, should end up having to live in poverty because he got hurt on the job and because this government is deeming him. They can take that

money—and instead of giving it to that worker, they're giving it to businesses, in the form of hundreds of millions of dollars. Yet that worker—all he did was go to work, and, unfortunately, he got hurt on the job.

I'm saying to this government that the two things you did that I think are going in Working for Workers Seven I think are a good idea. But none of you guys can stand up and say you work for workers or you care for workers if you're not making sure that you get rid of deeming. No worker in the province of Ontario should go to work, get hurt on the job and live in poverty. It should never happen. I know the House leader is here, and I'm saying to the House leader, put it in bill seven—get rid of deeming; take care of workers. I can't say this any clearer. No worker in the province of Ontario should live in poverty because they got hurt on the job.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): Further debate?

MPP Mohamed Firin: I'm pleased to rise today to speak to Bill 86, the proposed Meredith Act. I want to begin by acknowledging the member opposite and the sponsor of this bill. Any debate about how we support people after a workplace injury deserves to be taken seriously in this House, and their concern for Ontario workers' well-being is clear.

When a worker is hurt on the job, it not only affects the worker, but the loved ones around them. It's about whether that worker can recover with dignity, support their family, and have confidence that the system will be there when they need it most. Our government agrees with this principle. We believe injured workers deserve real support. We believe the system must be fair; we believe it must reflect the realities of today's labour market. And we believe any proposal that is focused on protecting our workers must be responsible, workable and built to last.

That is exactly what our government has done. Since 2021, our government has introduced seven Working for Workers acts, delivering more than 130 legislative and regulatory changes to strengthen health and safety protections for our Ontario workers. But we have not stopped there.

In the coming days, we will introduce a new package of measures through our protect Ontario workers and businesses plan that includes even more meaningful, targeted reforms that will strengthen support for injured workers and improve worker protection across this province. And that matters in the context of today's debate.

While Bill 86 proposes to reopen the entire workplace safety and insurance framework in one sweeping motion, our government is focused on delivering concrete improvements that reflect the modern working world.

Speaker, one of the most significant measures we are proposing would increase loss-of-earnings benefits from 85% to 90% of net average earnings. That is real improvement. For an injured worker, that means stronger income protection during recovery. It means more stability while they heal. And it means more support when they need it most. It brings Ontario more in line with other Canadian jurisdictions that already provide that level of wage replacement.

We're also proposing to modernize the system for workers who want to continue to work past the age of 65. Right now, many injured workers see loss-of-earnings benefits end at age 65, even if they are still working or plan to continue to work. That no longer reflects the reality of Ontario's labour market. More people are choosing to work later in life, often past the age of 65. If a worker intended to keep working, the system should be able to recognize that. That is why our proposed changes would give the WSIB discretion to continue benefits beyond age 65 where it's satisfied that the worker intended to remain in the labour force. That is a targeted change. It's a fair change. And it reflects the modern economy.

Speaker, our government is taking action to close a long-standing gap in coverage. If you're doing demanding care work in a residential care facility or group home, your access to workplace injury coverage should not depend on the ownership model of your workplace. A worker's protection should not change simply because the facility is publicly run, privately operated, or structured differently on paper. That is why we're proposing to extend mandatory WSIB coverage to privately operated residential care facilities and group homes, so more care workers have access to protection and support they deserve if they are injured on the job. That is practical. That is fair. And that is the kind of targeted reform workers need.

This is the work that's part of a broader mandate, a mandate to protect Ontario's workers. With the bill we're bringing forward, we're building on that record.

We're proposing measures to protect vulnerable workers, including ensuring workers are first in line when recovered wages are paid out, and prohibiting employers from charging workers for employer-mandated branded uniforms. That is what action looks like.

Speaker, let me be clear that Ontario workers deserve a workplace safety and insurance system that is fair, modern, and sustainable. They deserve meaningful support when they're injured. And they deserve a government that listens, acts and improves the system responsibly. That is the approach our government is taking. That is the work that we are doing. And that is the lens through which we are approaching Bill 86.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Effie J. Triantafilopoulos): Further debate?

Mr. John Fraser: I am pleased to rise and speak in support of Bill 86, the Meredith Act. I want to thank the members from Thunder Bay–Superior North, Niagara Falls and Sudbury for bringing it forward, and especially for all the work that went into creating this bill. It's a lot of work. I'm going to support the bill. I think it should get to committee. So I don't want what I'm going to say next to be taken as a negative; it's just what I think is something that is obvious.

This is a complex piece of legislation. It requires more than 45 minutes of debate. It will require more than just committee work, because one of the challenges that we've had—if you look back on the history, we created workers' compensation so that we protect workers, but also so it would protect employers, because our courts would get

clogged up; there was no uniformity. And so it was a benefit to both people. This is a large, complex organization to run, and one of the challenges that we had was that financially and administratively we weren't keeping up—not for the workers, and not for the employers—because the risk profiles that we had for certain jobs weren't updated. I know this because we were talking about the private member's bill for workers in residential care and group homes. Their risks were all over the place, but they were literally doing the same work. So what ended up happening is, we ended up with a large liability because, partly, our premiums didn't keep up and, partly, we weren't managing what we were actually paying out.

1830

Another example I'll give—just things I notice, and that's why I think that we have to build out the bill. When I look at the governance, I don't think three years is a long enough term; I think it has to be longer than that. That's not a big deal, but this organization manages billions and billions of dollars. It's complex. It deals with human need. It deals with complex situations. So you have to have the right people; you have to have some corporate memory, and I think that changing that over is not going to help. We have to be careful that the organization doesn't become—I'll use the word “bloating” because that's what will happen sometimes in organizations. You have to have some sort of financial, in terms of administratively—because it's responding to people, but it's also not ineffective. It's a big organization.

Having said all that, the things that you're doing in the bill—some of them the government has moved on just recently, with the 90%, and with talking about retirement. That's a good thing.

But the member from Niagara Falls does bring up one very, very important point, and that's deeming. It's not working for people, the whole process of deeming. So that's an important part of this bill. It's something that's driving people who, through no fault of their own, are going into poverty.

I was in the grocery business for 22 years, so—I don't want to say I dealt regularly with worker's compensation, but it was part of doing business and reporting, and the impact that workplace injuries would have on some people was really significant. And the instances of people taking advantage of the system wasn't as great as people sometimes said when I got to government. Sometimes, in workplaces, people made assumptions about what people were and weren't able to do.

Anyhow, just to the point: Most people want to work. Most people want to contribute. Most people want to be fair and on the up and up. They just want to be treated fairly. So I will echo the comments from the member from Niagara Falls with regard to deeming.

I've got a couple of minutes, so I do want to thank the government for—and I know my colleague just mentioned extending WSIB coverage to workers in residential care and group homes, and this is one of the things that we have to watch. There were people who were doing literally the same work, but because their employer wasn't the prov-

ince, they weren't getting coverage, which means, in these instances, some of those workers worked two or three jobs because if they didn't have WSIB coverage and they got injured, they only got covered at one job, but they needed the other two jobs to pay the bills. And these were mostly women caring for the people you care for most—the toughest jobs: PSWs, DSWs, working with vulnerable populations. So it was really unfair.

I just want to say this—I'll say it again: I introduced the bill six times, debated it twice. We were almost going to debate it a third time, until the minister said, "We're going to do this." I'd heard it, and I finally got him in the corridor and asked him this. It's a good thing. So good things can happen. Workers—it's about protecting families.

Again, I want to thank the members for bringing it forward. I'm glad to support it. I like to see it. I think I'm good with getting it to committee. I think it's going to need more than that, but that's not a criticism. That's just a statement of how important this is—that you have to take the kind of time to make sure that you get the outcome that you want.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Effie J. Triantafilopoulos): Further debate?

MPP Jamie West: I want to thank my colleague our shadow minister for WSIB for her amazing work on this file. Originally having labour as my file there was—I keep wanting to use her first name, which we're not allowed to do. I was going to my colleague for advice so often that I recommended she should have the file on her own. She has done amazing things, and I want to thank—the resources and the people in the gallery who've worked with her to bring their voices forward on this very important bill.

I come out of Steelworkers Local 6500. We're lucky, in a large union like ours; we have two full-time compensation officers who work full-time on this, and we don't win as many as we lose. It's an exhausting, frustrating process.

I reached out to my friend Sean Staddon, and I asked him if he wanted to say anything about this. He gave me a bunch of things to say, but the one that stood out to me most was, "The only consistency for Ontario miners is consistent denials." I want to say that to the government, because you cannot be working for workers if you're not working for injured workers. You cannot stand with mining workers if you're not standing with injured mining workers. You cannot talk about trades workers and the importance of trades workers if you don't fight for injured trade workers. That's important.

There have been rebates of over \$2 billion, and those rebates came because people who are injured in our workplace—like Wayne in the gallery—got ripped off by the WSIB; they got denied because the government that talks about working for workers has a WSIB program that does not work for workers.

So when my colleagues from the Conservative government talk about adjusting and nudging—our shadow minister is talking about giving it a shove so it works properly for our workers, so it supports our workers.

SWEAC sent me a quote. They said, "We have supported numerous workers with WSIB issues over the

years. Many have had to fight years for their benefits, finally winning at the WSAT. It shouldn't be so hard for workers to access what is rightfully theirs. Too many others just give up, and instead of being supported through the WSIB system, are supported by taxpayers through social benefits."

Bob, who asked me not to use his name because he's worried he'll be denied again, talked about having to fight WSIB for an active back injury that he has. WSIB keeps telling him to go back to work. He keeps giving them notes from doctors and specialists saying he's still injured and can't even get out of bed. He's terrified he's going to be a burden to his family.

Clayton says he's the self-described poster boy for how "malicious and unorganized" WSIB is. He's a locomotive operator for one of the largest steel manufacturers in the world. He said, "This insurance company has costed me my health. My family has to take care of me. I can no longer even do chores around the house, and have no more friends because I can't do anything with them without complaining about" pain "and ability to pull my weight during outings.

"Living this way since my injury, April 12, 2019, has been the biggest nightmare of my life"—2019, still no compensation, still in pain.

This isn't something that needs a nudge. This is something that needs a shove. It needs a rehaul.

I agree with my colleagues: Let's take this to committee; let's get it right. But let's stop pretending colouring on the edges or lightly sanding is going to help injured workers in Ontario.

You want people to work for critical minerals and mining. You want people to go into the skilled trades. Well, God forbid they talk to their parents who work in those fields. My dad, who worked in mining, begged me not to work in mining before I went. And my friends who work in mining—when they talk to their kids, they tell them, "You don't want to be choking on this, because when you get a respiratory disease, a workplace cancer, WSIB will fight you tooth and nail." And right now, in my workplace, I know that there is a worker who is hoping he's going to get WSIB before he dies so his wife and kids will have some coverage.

I'm going to sit down and give my colleague time to speak.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Effie J. Triantafilopoulos): Further debate?

M^{me} France Gélinas: J'aimerais remercier la députée pour avoir amené un projet de loi aussi important et pour lequel on a attendu tellement longtemps.

La Commission de la sécurité professionnelle et de l'assurance contre les accidents du travail, qu'on appelle la CSPAAAT en français, est supposée soutenir les travailleurs et travailleuses blessés au travail. Ils doivent couvrir les pertes de salaires, ils doivent couvrir les soins médicaux et doivent aider au retour au travail.

1840

Il n'y a rien de ça qui se passe. C'est le contraire. Comme on l'a expliqué, pour bien des travailleurs et

travailleuses blessés, le processus pour venir à bout d'avoir un soutien salarial peut prendre des mois et des années. Dans mon bureau de députée, on s'occupe—je ne sais plus comment—on en a des centaines de cas qui ne sont pas syndiqués, qui n'ont personne d'autre pour les aider. Ils viennent nous voir, et c'est nous autres qui les aident.

Je vous dis, madame la Présidente, on les gagne pas tout. On en perd beaucoup, beaucoup. Après avoir attendu pendant des années, si tu finis par être accepter, bien là, tu as ce qu'on appelle la présomption. La présomption c'est quand on te dit, « Okay, on va t'envoyé prendre un cours pour voir si tu serais capable de faire un travail qui est adapté au problème physique ou mental que tu as subi au travail. » Une fois que tu as fini de prendre ce cours, que tu sois capable d'avoir un job ou pas, on va présumer que tu as un emploi et on va limiter le montant de salaire qu'on te donne, basé sur un emploi qui n'existe pas.

Ce qu'on est en train de faire en ce moment—ce sont des gens qui n'ont rien fait de mal. Tu ne choisis pas de te faire faire mal; tu ne choisis pas d'avoir un accident au travail, mais ça arrive, et puis quand ça arrive, on a tellement de ces travailleurs et travailleuses là qui finissent par vivre dans la pauvreté. Ce n'est pas acceptable. Ce n'est pas acceptable.

Le projet de loi 86 sur la loi Meredith, nous offre une opportunité de changer ça. On veut tous que les travailleurs et les travailleuses soient traités avec respect. On a l'opportunité de faire ça. Votons en faveur de la loi 86, qui était apportée par ma collègue.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Effie J. Triantafilopoulos): Further debate?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I rise today to speak in favour of Bil 86, the Meredith Act. I want to thank the members from Thunder Bay–Superior North, Sudbury and Niagara Falls for bringing this important legislation forward.

Sometimes—and it's often not when we're debating private members' bills, but today is one of those times, where you debate a private members' bill that talks about what kind of society you want to live in. Do we want to live in a society where people who go to work, do a fair day's job, ask for fair wages to take care of their family—and when they get hurt and they can't go home that day, their family faces poverty? That happens too many times in this province. I have met with too many injured workers who can't get compensation, who can't get through the appeals process, who get deemed and live in poverty. Is that really the kind of Ontario we want to live in? Is that the message we want to send to our kids—when we tell them, “Do you know what? Get a good job, work hard, play by the rules, and you'll get ahead. But if you get injured, at no fault of your own, that's not going to happen.”

I want to give a shout-out to somebody by the name of Paul Taylor. Paul and I ran against each other a few times in Guelph. We had some pretty good campaigns together, and I learned to respect Paul almost more than anyone I've ever run against. Paul is a truck driver. He hurt his back driving a truck—a debilitating injury—fought WSIB to get compensation, finally got training to transition into

information technology, but he was colour-blind, and it turns out he couldn't do that job. WSIB said, “Sorry, we trained you. You should be able to do this job. We're not going to recognize your disability, and if you can't do the job, you're out of luck.”

Paul was part of a group of people to start the Ontario Network of Injured Workers Groups, a fantastic group of individual workers who have said, “This may have happened to us, but we're going to fight to make sure it doesn't happen to other people.”

And this is what Bill 86 is all about. I can't tell you how many people come into my office and ask for help to navigate a broken appeals process that this bill addresses. I can't tell you how many people come into my office and tell me their doctor tells them they can't work and yet WSIB forces them to go see some phantom paper doctor who doesn't even examine them and says, “Oh, you can work and so you can't get compensation.” This bill addresses that. I can't tell you how many people come to my office and say, “I'm being told by WSIB there's this other job that exists, but I can't do it—or if I do do it, I get paid at a way lower wage.” That's the practice of deeming. This bill addresses that.

The member opposite, earlier in debate, said that if you're injured this government will have your back. I can't tell you how many injured workers in this province that—right now, in Ontario, the government doesn't have their back.

And how does it feel to be one of those injured workers, when \$2 billion is sent back to employers instead of providing compensation for workers who deserve it, who are being forced to live in poverty? Imagine if it happened to any one of us or any of our kids who worked hard, got hurt, and now they can't support their families.

I was a long-time small business owner before I got into politics. I paid WSIB. I can tell you, as a small business owner, I'd like to get some rebate money back, but not at the expense of my fellow Ontarians who are having to live in poverty because they got hurt on the job. That's what society is about.

On this big sign that says “Protect Ontario”—yes, we need to protect Ontario from the unhinged tariff wars coming from south of the border. But part of protecting Ontario is making sure we're there when our fellow citizens need us. And right now, injured workers need us. That's exactly why we should vote in favour of this bill—because they deserve a government and a province that cares about them, that's going to take care of them.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Effie J. Triantafilopoulos): Further debate? Further debate? Further debate?

I recognize the member from Thunder Bay–Superior North.

MPP Lise Vaugeois: I want to begin by thanking my colleagues from Sudbury, Niagara Falls and Nickel Belt for their support. I also want to thank the member from Ottawa South for his comments and the member from Guelph for his comments.

Listening to the government side, you would think that they actually supported the bill. But they do not have the backs of workers, and they need to start listening.

The reason that we did such a comprehensive bill is because the system has been so distorted out of shape that workers are being abandoned and forced into poverty, forced onto the public purse, while corporations are getting billions of dollars that should be going to those workers. It is completely distorted. It is wrong.

The government talked about these big fines. Those fines are meaningless, because if they aren't applied or they're so small, it's just the cost of doing business. Think of Fiera Foods. If Fiera Foods can get a rebate of \$45,000 after five people died working at Fiera Foods, then there are no guardrails. That just means that money is a slush fund that's going back to employers no matter how bad they are treating their workers. And the system is designed to pit workers against employers because it has been set up with this experience rating. That needs to end.

The government could do something for injured workers by taking the things seriously that are in this bill—move it to committee, say yes. The work has been done.

Stand up for workers. It's not enough. You are just allowing lives to be destroyed and pretending it's not happening. It is happening.

The WSIB is not consistently serving the interests of workers, particularly those with permanent injuries.

You need to support Bill 86.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Effie J. Triantafilopoulos):

The time provided for private members' public business has expired.

MPP Vaugeois has moved second reading of Bill 86, An Act to enact the Meredith Act (Fair Compensation for Injured Workers), 2026, and to repeal the Workplace Safety and Insurance Act, 1997.

1850

Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? I heard a no.

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

All those opposed to the motion will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

A recorded vote being required, it will be deferred to the next instance of deferred votes.

Second reading vote deferred.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Effie J. Triantafilopoulos):

Pursuant to standing order 36, the question that this House do now adjourn is deemed to have been made.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

IMPAIRED DRIVERS

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Effie J. Triantafilopoulos):

The member for Orléans has given notice of dissatisfaction with the answer to a question given by the Attorney General. The member has up to five minutes to debate the matter, and a minister or parliamentary assistant may reply for up to five minutes.

I recognize the member from Orléans.

Mr. Stephen Blais: I do rise tonight because I was not satisfied with the government's answer to my question about the serious criminal activity of drinking and driving.

I asked the government about a crossing guard in Ottawa who was killed by a driver who was already before the courts on an impaired driving charge. I asked why someone already charged with impaired driving was still allowed to be behind the wheel. The minister's answer was revealing. He spoke about what happens after a conviction. He spoke about penalties that apply after the process is over. But that is exactly the problem. By the time the process is over, someone else may already be dead, and in this case, someone is. A crossing guard in Ottawa has died. A family is grieving. Children who crossed at that intersection every day have lost a familiar face and sense of safety. And yet, when I asked the minister why someone already charged with impaired driving was still behind the wheel, the minister responded by joking that he thought it must have been April Fool's Day.

Speaker, there is nothing funny about the question. There is nothing funny about a crossing guard who is dead. There is nothing funny about a family that is grieving. And there's nothing funny about allowing people charged with impaired driving to keep driving until someone else is killed.

If this government wants to laugh off the question, that is their choice. But Ontarians deserve an answer, because the Premier says that he's tough on crime. He lectures the federal government about bail. He says dangerous people should not be back on the streets. Fine. I agree. Then why, in Ontario, are dangerous people already charged with impaired driving allowed to get behind the wheel while they await their trial?

If the government truly believes that driving is a privilege, then they should act like it.

Right now, this government has a different standard for impaired drivers than it does for almost anyone else. If someone is charged with a violent offence, they will often face conditions—the Premier would like to deny them bail and keep them in jail until their trial. But someone charged with impaired driving—a heinous crime that I hope everyone in this House agrees has no place in our society—will almost always keep their licence, keep their keys, keep their car and keep driving, putting our communities at risk, putting lives at risk. That makes no sense. We are not talking about a paperwork mistake. We are not talking about forgetting to renew the sticker on your licence plate. We're talking about people who are alleged to have gotten behind the wheel after drinking or using drugs. We are talking about conduct that kills. These are the dangerous offenders the Premier should be talking about.

Ontario recognized the danger of impaired driving decades ago, introducing a warn range in 1977 to intervene early, to give people the chance not to have a criminal record—because the purpose of public safety is not simply to punish after the fact; the purpose is to prevent tragedy before it happens. Yet this government's approach is to wait: wait for the trial, wait for the conviction, wait for another family to get the phone call.

Speaker, if someone is charged with impaired driving, there should be an immediate licence suspension that lasts until the matter is resolved; there should be an automatic vehicle impoundment. And if they are ever allowed back behind the wheel, there should be an ignition interlock requirement to ensure they cannot drive after drinking—not after a second offence, not after a conviction. As soon as they have earned the privilege to drive again, these measures need to be put in place, before someone is killed.

For eight years, this government has told Ontarians that it's tough, it's strong, and it takes public safety seriously. But being tough is not a slogan. Being tough is not a press conference. Being tough means making the hard decision before tragedy strikes, not after.

I asked the government last week why it is tougher on rhetoric than it is on drunk drivers. I did not get an answer then. Tonight, I am still waiting.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Effie J. Triantafilopoulos): Further debate?

Mr. Ric Bresee: It is a pleasure to rise today to address this very serious issue of impaired and dangerous driving.

Our government takes road safety very seriously. We remain committed to helping prevent impaired and dangerous driving and ensuring that there are consequences for those who put others at risk.

Ontario's roads have ranked among the safest in North America for more than 25 years, with one of the lowest fatality rates per 10,000 licensed drivers.

In 2023, Ontario also recorded one of the lowest impaired-driving incident rates in Canada, well below the national average.

But we know that more needs to be done to improve safety and to prevent tragedies before they even happen.

No family should ever have to experience the loss of a loved one or the lasting trauma of a serious injury just because someone made the reckless decision to drive dangerously or while impaired.

This is why, under the leadership of the Premier, our government is taking bold action to hold dangerous offenders accountable.

As part of the Keeping Criminals Behind Bars Act we introduced last fall, we are exploring more ways to keep Ontario roads and communities safer. If passed, this legislation would improve safety on Ontario roads and highways by introducing new measures to target high-risk driving behaviours, including dangerous driving, careless driving and driving while suspended. These proposed new measures include:

- giving police the authority to immediately suspend a licence for 90 days and impound a vehicle if a person is driving dangerously;

- imposing a lifetime licence suspension for anyone convicted of dangerous driving causing death;

- increasing fines and vehicle impoundment periods for driving while suspended; and

- doubling fines and imposing longer licence suspensions for distracted driving while operating a commercial motor vehicle.

As well, we are increasing minimum fines for commercial motor vehicle speed limiter offences, including operating without a functioning speed limiter.

We've also established a new provincial fund to help support road and school zone safety without raising costs for drivers. This fund will help affected municipalities implement alternative safety measures to prevent speeding, including proactive traffic-calming initiatives like speed bumps, roundabouts, raised crosswalks and curb extensions, as well as more public education and improved signage, to slow drivers down.

Our government is focused on measures that truly protect the safety of all Ontarians, and we will continue working hard to ensure that Ontario maintains its position as one of the safest jurisdictions in North America.

Speaker, this gives me the opportunity to turn to the record investments that our government is making to strengthen public safety.

1900

I'm proud to say that our government has made one of the largest investments in Ontario's history to build on court capacity. Just to give you a sense of the magnitude of our effort, by 2027-28, Ontario will have invested more than half a billion dollars to address court backlogs, strengthen public safety and build a more sustainable justice system. This includes allocating up to 52 new judges to the Ontario Court of Justice and hiring nearly 700 additional crown prosecutors, victim support workers and other court staff. Since 2024, we've also appointed 87 new justices of the peace to the Ontario Court of Justice. These investments are helping ensure that courts have the capacity to manage a growing number of complex cases, while giving court staff the resources they need to deliver justice faster and more effectively.

As of last year, our intensive serious violent crime bail teams are a permanent measure, with dedicated prosecutors working alongside police all across Ontario.

We're cracking down on crime by strengthening the bail system and giving prosecutors the tools they need.

Speaker, any tragic death is a heartbreaking reminder of the devastation that reckless and impaired driving can cause.

We will continue using every tool available to help prevent future tragedies and ensure that those responsible for criminal behaviour are held accountable.

EDUCATION FUNDING

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Effie J. Triantafilopoulos): Next, the member for Ottawa South has given notice of dissatisfaction with the answer to a question given by the Minister of Education.

Hon. Steve Clark: He's always dissatisfied.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Effie J. Triantafilopoulos): The member has up to five minutes to debate the matter, and a minister or parliamentary assistant may reply for up to five minutes.

The member for Ottawa South.

Mr. John Fraser: Thank you very much, Speaker. I do want to say happy birthday to the Clerk because I missed singing this morning. So now I'm—no, I'm not going to sing. It's not going to happen. Sorry. It would be out of order; I know you'd call it right away.

We are going to do a Hansard search to see if I am the most dissatisfied member of the current Legislature.

Interjection.

Mr. John Fraser: Well, if you can come up with some numbers, that would be okay.

The House leader on the other side—I remember when I was on the other side, and I think I had as many late shows as I'm asking for right now. I remember one where Jeff Yurek, after he finished his five minutes, just walked out on me and left me all alone. I was literally by myself. And I can say that because he's not here anymore.

Here's the thing—and I've been saying this for weeks and months right now: Our schools aren't safe places to learn or to work. That's because class sizes are too big, special education has been starved, and there's a mental health crisis that we're not addressing.

In this question, I was focused on special education. We know there is an \$800-million hole that boards had to fill for special education—money that the government wasn't giving them. We've just introduced Bill 101, which came after I asked for this late show and after this question, and there is nothing in that bill that's going to fill that hole in special education. But here's the thing it's going to do: It's going to take the voices of parents that were expressed through trustees at the board level—those voices that found the \$800 million. With those voices gone—because they can't control the budget, they can't influence it; it's all up to the new CEO or the supervisor or whoever is there. So how is that hole going to get filled? The reality is, it's not just that hole—that \$800 million. There are more resources that are needed to ensure that the most vulnerable kids, the kids with exceptional needs, get what they need.

Every child deserves to have opportunity—deserves the opportunity to learn.

I told a couple of stories; I'm going to tell them again.

I know my colleague from Orléans told the story of Juliet, a girl with exceptional needs who was happy, thriving one year—the next year, no supports. She was colouring in her seat—as my colleague said, “Just another bum in the seat.”

I've told the story about Marigold, who lives in my riding of Ottawa South. She's six years old. She goes to Hawthorne Public School. Both of her parents work. When she got into school, she had an assessment that the family paid for, not the government—that the family paid for. Two years later, she's not getting the help that she needs. It's not there. Two years is a heck of a long time when you're six years old.

I'm going to bring it back to this: Bill 101 is not going to get a child like Juliet or Marigold the help that they need. In fact, the way that I read it, it's going to make it harder for their families, and that's because the people who have been trying to fill the hole—the people who

have been trying to be the voices for Juliet and Marigold and their families—will no longer be able to fill that hole because it's going to be the role of a CEO.

The government is not giving enough money. Simply put, there's not enough money that's going into special education. Bill 101 and blaming trustees and blaming everybody else is not going to fix that.

The Acting Chair (Mr. Ric Bresee): I recognize the member from Markham–Unionville.

Mr. Billy Pang: I welcome the opportunity to rise tonight again and set the record straight, because despite what we continue to hear from the opposition, the facts are clear: This government has made historic investments in education, and in particular, in special education. Every single year, since 2018, we have increased education funding, including a more than 36% increase in special education funding, bringing it to the highest level in Ontario's history.

And yet, night after night, the opposition stands in this House and repeats the same talking points, claiming that special education is somehow being underfunded. That claim simply does not hold up to the facts.

We have increased per pupil funding by more than 23%, and we have increased special education funding by over 36%. Those investments are making a real difference in classrooms across this province. They have supported the hiring of over 4,000 additional education assistants—people who are on the front lines every day, working directly with students who need extra support to succeed. They are helping children with autism receive the individualized attention they deserve. They are helping students with learning disabilities stay engaged in the classroom. They are helping teachers ensure that students get the help they need. That is what real support looks like.

But what is most striking in this debate is not just what the opposition is saying; it's what they are choosing to ignore—because when they had the opportunity to govern, their record on special education tells a very different story. Under the previous Liberal government, school boards were forced to make millions in cuts to special education funding. So when members opposite stand today and attempt to rewrite history, Ontarians see through it. They see an opposition that for 15 long years had its chance and failed to deliver for the very students now they claim to champion.

But we also recognize that funding alone is not enough. It's not enough to simply announce investments if those dollars are not reaching the students they are intended to support.

This is why our government is focused not only on increasing funding, but on ensuring accountability, making sure that every dollar is spent where it belongs: in classrooms, supporting students, because parents expect that, teachers expect that and, most importantly, students expect that. And they deserve it.

Speaker, our approach is simple. We are building an education system that puts parents first by giving them confidence that their children are supported. We are building a system that supports teachers by ensuring they

have the resources and staff they need in the classroom. And most importantly, we are building a system that puts students first, by making sure every child, regardless of their needs, has the opportunity to succeed. This is why we continue to make record investments. This is why we will continue to focus on accountability. And this is why we will continue to ensure that every education dollar goes where it belongs: in the classrooms, supporting the success of Ontario students.

1910

EDUCATION FUNDING

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): The member from Ottawa South has given notice of dissatisfaction with the answer to a question given by the Minister of Education. The member has up to five minutes to debate the matter and the minister or parliamentary assistant may reply for five minutes.

I recognize the member from Ottawa South.

Mr. John Fraser: Apparently, I can't get no satisfaction.

I do want to thank you, Speaker, for being here and the table for being here and everybody behind the—I can't believe you're still here—and my colleague for being here for the second part of the late show.

I'll make sure to let Marigold and Juliet know about your record investments, your historic investments.

Just a word of advice: Everything that a government does is generally historic—because it's usually more than the year before, so it is historic.

What is actually epic is the failure of this government—eight long, hard years. And now they're even more tired, out of touch, and out of ideas. That's why I was dissatisfied today—because Bill 101 is not going to address what's wrong in our schools, because they're not safe places to learn or to work, and a big reason for that is class sizes.

In Ontario, right now, between grades 4 and 8, there are 1,000 classrooms with more than 30 kids. That's a lot of kids, I know. My grandson Vaughn is in one of them. And when you have more kids in a class, what does that mean? It means less time for each kid. They're only there a certain amount of time. That's the math—at least, that's the math that we have over here. I'm not sure what your math is over there.

Mr. Matthew Rae: Well, it's not discovery math, that's for sure.

Mr. John Fraser: Well, you guys have had eight years, and the EQAO results for math are pretty bad. I just thought I'd add that in. Go and check that. It's all on you—eight long, hard, tiring, exhausting years. The government is out of touch and out of gas.

The challenge is that when you put more kids into a classroom, there's less time for each child. Then, when the education system takes on inclusion, which is a good thing as a policy, that means there are more children in the classroom who have exceptional needs. And when those needs aren't met, every child in that classroom suffers—every child. So what that creates is an unsafe situation. And we ask ourselves, why are behaviours so bad?

Why was my neighbour, who's a vice-principal—why did he have a 12-year-old girl throw a chair at him? And then, when he told me this story, he said, "It's just another day." One of my friends—his wife ended up with her arms badly scratched by a six-year-old. Why did that same principal tell me a story about a 12-year-old who's going after an eight-year-old girl, and got in between them and got hit more than 20 times, and then a colleague got hit and had to go to the ER?

These stories happen every day in Ontario schools—every day—and the way to fix them is: Make class sizes smaller. Don't starve special education. And let's actually get serious about the mental health crisis in our schools.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): I return to the member from Markham–Unionville.

Mr. Billy Pang: Another debate, and yet again, we see the same—same old same old—tired talking points from the opposition.

They've said class sizes are somehow exploding across this province. But the facts simply do not support that narrative. In fact, the reality is quite the opposite. Don't take my word for it. The independent Financial Accountability Officer has confirmed that since 2018, Ontario's student-to-teacher ratio has remained stable, at around 15 to 16 students per teacher. That means class sizes have remained steady, not increased. That matters, because when we talk about class sizes, we are really talking about the learning environment our students experience every single day. We are talking about whether students are getting the attention they need and whether the teachers have the support they deserve.

Despite what the opposition continues to claim, Ontario is actually a leader in this area. We are one of only a handful of provinces in the entire country that have legislated class sizes. That means class sizes in Ontario are not left to chance; they are protected by law. We have some of the lowest class sizes in the country, particularly in the early years, where it matters most—including the lowest class sizes for grades 1 to 3, and one of the best pupil-to-adult ratios in kindergarten anywhere in Canada.

While the opposition is focused on rhetoric, we are focused on results, and those results are grounded in a clear commitment: putting students and teachers first. Every decision this government makes is guided by that principle.

We know that a strong education system starts in the classrooms. It starts with giving teachers the tools they need and ensuring students are set up for success from day one. This is exactly why our government has continued to increase education funding every single year we have been in office. This is why we have made record investments in our schools. And this is why we continue to take practical, meaningful steps to support the people who are on the front lines of education every day.

Speaker, that brings me to one of the most recent examples of that commitment: the Classroom Supplies Fund. Through this initiative, we are providing elementary school teachers with direct access to \$750 per year to purchase the supplies they need for their classrooms. What makes this program so important is not just the funding

itself; it's the approach. We are trusting teachers. We are recognizing that teachers are professionals who know their students best. They know what resources will make the biggest difference in their classrooms. Instead of forcing them to navigate bureaucracy or spend their own money, as has too often been the case in the past, we are putting resources directly into their hands. This is what it means to put teachers first. It is about respect. It's about trust. And it's about ensuring that every dollar is used where it will have the greatest impact: right in the classroom.

Speaker, the opposition can continue to stand here and paint a picture that simply doesn't reflect reality, but we will continue to focus on the facts.

Class sizes are stable. They are protected by legislation. And they are supported by historic investments in education—because at the end of the day, it's not about politics; it's about giving every student in this province the opportunity to succeed, and it's about ensuring that our education system truly puts students and teachers first. That is the work we are doing, and that is the work we will continue to do.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): There being no further matters to debate, pursuant to standing order 36(c), I deem the motion to adjourn to be carried.

This House now stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow.
The House adjourned at 1919.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenante-gouverneure: Hon. / L'hon. Edith Dumont, OOnt
Speaker / Présidente de l'Assemblée législative: Hon. / L'hon. Donna Skelly
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	
Armstrong, Teresa J. (NDP)	London—Fanshawe	
Babikian, Aris (PC)	Scarborough—Agincourt	
Bailey, Robert (PC)	Sarnia—Lambton	
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	Deputy Third Party House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjointe de parti reconnu
Brady, Bobbi Ann (IND)	Haldimand—Norfolk	
Bresee, Ric (PC)	Hastings—Lennox and Addington	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième Vice-Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Burch, Jeff (NDP)	Niagara Centre / Niagara-Centre	
Calandra, Hon. / L'hon. Paul (PC)	Markham—Stouffville	Minister of Education / Ministre de l'Éducation
Cerjanec, Rob (LIB)	Ajax	
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
Ciriello, Monica (PC)	Hamilton Mountain / Hamilton-Mountain	
Clancy, Aislinn (GRN)	Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre	
Clark, Hon. / L'hon. 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 Party House Leader / Leader parlementaire de parti reconnu
Cooper, Michelle (PC)	Eglinton—Lawrence	
Crawford, Hon. / L'hon. Stephen (PC)	Oakville	Minister of Public and Business Service Delivery and Procurement / Ministre des Services au public et aux entreprises et de l'Approvisionnement
Cuzzetto, Rudy (PC)	Mississauga—Lakeshore	
Darouze, George (PC)	Carleton	
Denault, Billy (PC)	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	
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 Emergency Preparedness and Response / Ministre de la Protection civile et de l'Intervention en cas d'urgence
Fairclough, Lee (LIB)	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	
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

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Fife, Catherine (NDP)	Waterloo	
Firin, Mohamed (PC)	York South—Weston / York-Sud— Weston	
Flack, Hon. / L'hon. Rob (PC)	Elgin—Middlesex—London	Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Ford, Hon. / L'hon. Doug (PC)	Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord	Premier / Premier ministre Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / Ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales Leader, Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti progressiste-conservateur de l'Ontario
Fraser, John (LIB)	Ottawa South / Ottawa-Sud	Leader, Third Party / Chef du troisième parti
French, Jennifer K. (NDP)	Oshawa	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Première Vice-Présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Gallagher Murphy, Dawn (PC)	Newmarket—Aurora	
Gates, Wayne (NDP)	Niagara Falls	
Gélinas, France (NDP)	Nickel Belt	
Gilmour, Alexa (NDP)	Parkdale—High Park	
Glover, Chris (NDP)	Spadina—Fort York	
Gretzky, Lisa (NDP)	Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest	
Grewal, Hardeep Singh (PC)	Brampton East / Brampton-Est	
Gualtieri, Silvia (PC)	Mississauga East—Cooksville / Mississauga-Est—Cooksville	
Hamid, Hon. / L'hon. Zee (PC)	Milton	Associate Solicitor General for Auto Theft and Bail Reform / Solliciteur général associé responsable de la Lutte contre le vol d'automobiles et de la Réforme relative aux mises en liberté sous caution
Hardeman, Hon. / L'hon. Ernie (PC)	Oxford	
Harris, Hon. / L'hon. Mike (PC)	Kitchener—Conestoga	Minister of Natural Resources / Ministre des Richesses naturelles
Hazell, Andrea (LIB)	Scarborough—Guildwood	Third Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Troisième Vice-Présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
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	
Jones, Hon. / L'hon. Sylvia (PC)	Dufferin—Caledon	Deputy Premier / Vice-première ministre Minister of Health / Ministre de la Santé
Jones, Hon. / L'hon. Trevor (PC)	Chatham-Kent—Leamington	Minister of Agriculture, Food and Agribusiness / Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et de l'Agroentreprise
Jordan, John (PC)	Lanark—Frontenac—Kingston	
Kanapathi, Logan (PC)	Markham—Thornhill	
Kernaghan, Terence (NDP)	London North Centre / London- Centre-Nord	
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 Red Tape Reduction / Ministre de la Réduction des formalités administratives
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 Mines / Ministre de l'Énergie et des Mines
Lennox, Robin (NDP)	Hamilton Centre / Hamilton-Centre	
Lumsden, Hon. / L'hon. Neil (PC)	Hamilton East—Stoney Creek / Hamilton-Est—Stoney Creek	Minister of Sport / Ministre du Sport
Mamakwa, Sol (NDP)	Kiiwetinoong	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjoint de l'opposition officielle
McCarthy, Hon. / L'hon. Todd J. (PC)	Durham	Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks / Ministre de l'Environnement, de la Protection de la nature et des Parcs
McCrimmon, Karen (LIB)	Kanata—Carleton	
McGregor, Hon. / L'hon. Graham (PC)	Brampton North / Brampton-Nord	Minister of Citizenship and Multiculturalism / Ministre des Affaires civiques et du Multiculturalisme
McKenney, Catherine (NDP)	Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	
McMahon, Mary-Margaret (LIB)	Beaches—East York	

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
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	Deputy House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjointe de l'opposition officielle
Piccini, Hon. / L'hon. David (PC)	Northumberland—Peterborough South / Northumberland—Peterborough-Sud	Minister of Labour, Immigration, Training and Skills Development / Ministre du Travail, de l'Immigration, de la Formation et du Développement des compétences
Pierre, Natalie (PC)	Burlington	
Pinsonneault, Steve (PC)	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	
Pirie, Hon. / L'hon. George (PC)	Timmins	Minister of Northern Economic Development and Growth / Ministre du Développement et de la croissance économique du Nord
Quinn, Hon. / L'hon. Nolan (PC)	Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry	Minister of Colleges, Universities, Research Excellence and Security / Ministre des Collèges et Universités, de l'Excellence en recherche et de la Sécurité
Racinsky, Joseph (PC)	Wellington—Halton Hills	
Rae, Matthew (PC)	Perth—Wellington	
Rakocevic, Tom (NDP)	Humber River—Black Creek	
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 Responsible for Ring of Fire Economic and Community Partnerships / Ministre responsable des Partenariats économiques et communautaires pour le développement du Cercle de feu
Riddell, Brian (PC)	Cambridge	
Rosenberg, Bill (PC)	Algoma—Manitoulin	
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, Chris (IND)	Sault Ste. Marie	
Scott, Hon. / L'hon. 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, Hon. / L'hon. Donna (PC)	Flamborough—Glanbrook	Speaker / Présidente 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	Associate Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre associé des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Smith, Laura (PC)	Thornhill	
Smyth, Stephanie (LIB)	Toronto—St. Paul's	
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
Thanigasalam, Hon. / L'hon. Vijay (PC)	Scarborough—Rouge Park	Associate Minister of Mental Health and Addictions / Ministre associé délégué à la Santé mentale et à la Lutte contre les dépendances
Thompson, Hon. / L'hon. Lisa M. (PC)	Huron—Bruce	Minister of Rural Affairs / Ministre des Affaires rurales

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Tibollo, Hon. / L'hon. Michael A. (PC)	Vaughan—Woodbridge	Associate Attorney General / Procureur général associé
Triantafilopoulos, Effie J. (PC)	Oakville North—Burlington / Oakville-Nord—Burlington	Deputy Speaker / Vice-Présidente Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Tsao, Jonathan (LIB)	Don Valley North / Don Valley-Nord	
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	
Vickers, Paul (PC)	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	
Wai, Daisy (PC)	Richmond Hill	
Watt, Tyler (LIB)	Nepean	
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	
Vacant	Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough- Sud-Ouest	