

Legislative
Assembly
of Ontario



Assemblée
législative
de l'Ontario

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

No. 69A

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

N° 69A

1st Session
44th Parliament

Tuesday
5 May 2026

1^{re} session
44^e législature

Mardi
5 mai 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 5 May 2026 / Mardi 5 mai 2026

ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

Building Billy Bishop Airport Act, 2026, Bill 110, Mr. Sarkaria / Loi de 2026 sur la construction de l'aéroport Billy Bishop, projet de loi 110, M. Sarkaria

Mr. Chris Glover	4191
Ms. Jessica Bell	4195
Mr. Will Bouma	4199
Mr. Peter Tabuns	4199
Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon	4199
Mr. Rudy Cuzzetto	4200
MPP Wayne Gates	4200
MPP Bill Rosenberg	4200
Second reading debate deemed adjourned	4200

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS / DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉES ET DÉPUTÉS

Project Give Back

Mrs. Michelle Cooper	4201
----------------------------	------

Sexual violence and harassment

MPP Lisa Gretzky	4201
------------------------	------

Special Olympics Canada Summer Games

Mr. Rob Cerjanec	4201
------------------------	------

Community Care Durham

Mr. Lorne Coe	4201
---------------------	------

519Pursuit

Mr. Terence Kernaghan	4202
-----------------------------	------

Rotary Club of Cambridge (Preston-Hespeler)

Ms. Jess Dixon	4202
----------------------	------

Toronto waterfront

Mr. Chris Glover	4202
------------------------	------

Police services

Mr. Logan Kanapathi	4202
---------------------------	------

Sexual violence and harassment

Ms. Aislinn Clancy	4203
--------------------------	------

Thornhill Community Health Centre

Ms. Laura Smith	4203
-----------------------	------

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEUSES ET VISITEURS

Mr. Terence Kernaghan	4203
Ms. Lee Fairclough	4203
Mrs. Michelle Cooper	4203
MPP Lisa Gretzky	4203

Mr. Lorne Coe	4203
Hon. Ernie Hardeman	4203
MPP Lise Vaugeois	4204
Ms. Aislinn Clancy	4204
MPP Bill Rosenberg	4204
Mr. Joseph Racinsky	4204
L'hon. Caroline Mulroney	4204
Hon. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria	4204
Mr. Adil Shamji	4204
Hon. Neil Lumsden	4204
Mr. Will Bouma	4204
Hon. Raymond Sung Joon Cho	4204

MPP athletes

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly)	4204
---------------------------------------	------

Remarkable Women at Queen's Park

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly)	4204
---------------------------------------	------

Visitor

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly)	4205
---------------------------------------	------

Legislative pages

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly)	4205
---------------------------------------	------

Opposition day motion

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly)	4205
---------------------------------------	------

Red Dress Day

Mr. Sol Mamakwa	4205
-----------------------	------

QUESTION PERIOD / PÉRIODE DE QUESTIONS

Student assistance

Ms. Marit Stiles	4206
Hon. Steve Clark	4206
Mr. Lorne Coe	4206

Hospital funding

Ms. Marit Stiles	4207
Hon. Sylvia Jones	4207

Government jet

Mr. John Fraser	4207
Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy	4207

Government jet

Mr. John Fraser	4208
Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy	4208

Land use planning

Mr. Chris Glover	4209
Hon. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria	4209

Public safety

Mr. Jonathan Tsao	4210
Hon. Michael S. Kerzner	4210

Red tape reduction

Ms. Effie J. Triantafilopoulos	4210
Hon. Andrea Khanjin	4210

Indigenous community safety

MPP Alexa Gilmour.....	4211
Hon. Greg Rickford.....	4211
Hon. Charmaine A. Williams.....	4211

Freedom of information

Ms. Lee Fairclough	4211
Hon. Stephen Crawford.....	4211

Housing

Mr. Mike Schreiner	4212
Hon. Rob Flack	4212

Energy policies

Mr. Will Bouma	4212
Mr. David Smith	4213

Freedom of information

Ms. Marit Stiles.....	4213
Hon. Stephen Crawford.....	4213

Education funding

Mr. Stephen Blais.....	4214
Hon. Paul Calandra	4214

Indigenous economic development

Mrs. Michelle Cooper	4214
Hon. Greg Rickford.....	4215

Notice of dissatisfaction

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly)	4215
---------------------------------------	------

**INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS /
PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEUSES
ET VISITEURS**

MPP George Darouze	4215
--------------------------	------

**INTRODUCTION OF GOVERNMENT BILLS /
DÉPÔT DE PROJETS DE LOI ÉMANANT
DU GOUVERNEMENT**

**HST Relief Implementation Act (Residential
Property Rebates), 2026, Bill 114, Mr. Bethlenfalvy
/ Loi de 2026 sur la mise en oeuvre de l'allègement
de la TVH (remises relatives aux biens
résidentiels), projet de loi 114, M. Bethlenfalvy**

First reading agreed to.....	4215
Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy	4215

**INTRODUCTION OF BILLS /
DÉPÔT DES PROJETS DE LOI**

**Julian Pepper Capital Inc. Act, 2026, Bill Pr52,
Ms. Dixon**

First reading agreed to.....	4216
------------------------------	------

**Black Health Equity Act, 2026, Bill 115,
Mme Gélinas; MPP Lennox; Mr. Rakocevic;
MPP Wong-Tam / Loi de 2026 sur l'équité en
matière de santé pour les Noirs, projet de loi 115,
Mme Gélinas; MPP Lennox; M. Rakocevic;
MPP Wong-Tam**

First reading agreed to.....	4216
Mme France Gélinas	4216

PETITIONS / PÉTITIONS

Water quality

Mr. Stephen Blais.....	4216
------------------------	------

Transportation infrastructure

Hon. Steve Clark	4216
------------------------	------

Ontario Drug Benefit Program

Mme France Gélinas	4216
--------------------------	------

Student assistance

Mr. Stephen Blais.....	4217
------------------------	------

Ontario economy

Mr. Anthony Leardi.....	4217
-------------------------	------

Affordable housing

Ms. Chandra Pasma.....	4217
------------------------	------

Ontario economy

Mr. Deepak Anand	4217
------------------------	------

Health care workers

MPP Jamie West	4218
----------------------	------

Highway 69

Mme France Gélinas	4218
--------------------------	------

Water quality

Ms. Chandra Pasma.....	4218
------------------------	------

ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

**Building Billy Bishop Airport Act, 2026, Bill 110,
Mr. Sarkaria / Loi de 2026 sur la construction de
l'aéroport Billy Bishop, projet de loi 110,
M. Sarkaria**

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon	4219
MPP Andrea Hazell.....	4222
Mr. Will Bouma	4225
Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong	4225
Mr. Steve Pinsonneault	4226
MPP Jamie West	4226
MPP Tyler Watt	4226
Hon. Graham McGregor	4226
Ms. Jess Dixon	4226
Hon. George Pirie.....	4228
Mr. Tom Rakocevic.....	4229
Hon. Greg Rickford.....	4229
Mme France Gélinas	4229
Hon. Todd J. McCarthy.....	4230

MPP Tyler Watt.....	4230
Hon. Greg Rickford.....	4230
Mr. Guy Bourgouin	4230
Mme France G��linas.....	4231
Mr. Stephen Blais	4233
Hon. Graham McGregor.....	4233
MPP Jamie West.....	4233
Mr. Stephen Blais	4233
Mr. Logan Kanapathi.....	4234
Ms. Stephanie Bowman.....	4234
Hon. Graham McGregor.....	4236
Mr. Stephen Blais	4237
Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong.....	4237
Mr. Mike Schreiner.....	4237
Hon. Todd J. McCarthy	4238
Mme France G��linas.....	4238
Second reading debate deemed adjourned.....	4238

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 5 May 2026

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE
DE L'ONTARIO

Mardi 5 mai 2026

The House met at 0900.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Let us pray.
Prayers.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

BUILDING BILLY BISHOP AIRPORT
ACT, 2026

LOI DE 2026 SUR LA CONSTRUCTION
DE L'AÉROPORT BILLY BISHOP

Resuming the debate adjourned on May 4, 2026, on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 110, An Act to enact the Building Billy Bishop Airport Act, 2026 / Projet de loi 110, Loi édictant la Loi de 2026 sur la construction de l'aéroport Billy Bishop.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Further debate.

Mr. Chris Glover: I'll be sharing my time with the member from University–Rosedale. I've got about 30 minutes to talk about the seizing Billy Bishop airport act.

Before I get into that, there's something that's been bothering me for about six weeks, ever since the Premier said it. It was an insult directed at the Toronto Islanders. He called them squatters. This is false. They own their homes, and the land the homes are on is under a lease signed by the government. So it's slanderous, what he said, and it's a horrific insult.

But there's a pattern of this Premier insulting people who can't punch back. Last week, he called a Liberal MPP, saying CP24 didn't want her anymore. He said that First Nations people come cap in hand. When he gutted OSAP grants to add another \$15,000 of debt to the low- and middle-income students, he accused students of taking basket-weaving courses. He's insulted judges, saying they're terrible bleeding-heart judges. He's called councillors in Niagara a bunch of turkeys. He said that immigrants are to blame for Ontario's housing crisis, that would-be immigrants were coming to Ontario to collect the dole. And without evidence, he blamed immigrants for the shooting at a girls Jewish school in Toronto.

This is a right-wing strategy of launching insults and dehumanizing people, of riling up a mob against a small group of people. We cannot allow our Premier to continue to use his position to insult and punch down on people who can't punch back. Many people have been victims of his insults, and if we allow him to continue, we'll eventually all be victims.

So I am demanding that the Premier apologize to the islanders, to the First Nations people, to the students, the

judges, the councillors and the immigrants that he has insulted. Personal insults are beneath the office of the Premier of Ontario. If he's not willing to apologize, he should step down from that position.

Interjections.

Mr. Chris Glover: Yes, it is embarrassing. It's embarrassing when your Premier, the leader who you support, insults people, when he punches down on people who are not able to punch back.

Interjections.

Mr. Chris Glover: Okay. I'll get to the bill. I have three major points to make on the bill. The first point is that the land grab is worse than we thought. The second point is that this takeover and redevelopment of Billy Bishop will cost taxpayers billions of dollars, not just in subsidizing the building of the airport but in the lost investment on the waterfront. The third point I'll be making is that Mark Carney is not just a casual observer in this episode but an active part of Ford's plans at Billy Bishop.

I'll start with what's in the bill. The land grab is worse than we thought. I'll go through some of the points in the bill. The bill gives the government the power to take control of land owned by the city of Toronto, including almost all of the Toronto Islands, Little Norway Park and Billy Bishop airport, and then once the province "prescribes" the land, ownership automatically transfers to the government, including all of the buildings, structures and improvements on it. The city is barred from selling, leasing or otherwise dealing with the land or related assets, and any attempt to do so, even before the bill reaches royal assent, would be considered void.

Currently, the city is renegotiating leases with boating clubs across the islands, and if this bill passes, all of those clubs will be at the mercy of the Ford government, which only listens to friends and donors. The city has legal grounds to fight the bill, to fight the takeover in court. What's described in the bill is clearly an expropriation, which gives the city certain rights under the Expropriations Act. But the bill says it's not an expropriation. The danger for the city is that expropriation limits the province to only taking the land necessary for the project, so this is supposed to be just the land necessary for the Billy Bishop airport. If it's not an expropriation, then they can seize any part of the islands and do whatever they want with them. So the Premier could start divvying up the island and giving it to his friends and donors to build private spas or private resorts or private homes.

The second legal ground that I believe the city has to fight this bill on is that it attempts to unilaterally take the city out of the tripartite agreement. The tripartite agreement is an agreement made by the city of Toronto, Ports-

Toronto and the federal government, and it lays out the terms under which the Billy Bishop airport operates. One of the clauses in that agreement says that no individual partner in that tripartite agreement can make a change to the agreement without the consent of all three partners. Built into this bill to stop the city from suing to protect its right, the bill states that the province can subtract costs related to the transfer from the total amount that it owes the city. In other words, I believe that it's saying to the city, "If you sue us, not only will you have to cover your own legal costs, even if you win the court case, you have to cover our costs. We'll deduct it from the amount that we're paying for the takeover of the land." So that's what's in the bill. This is why I think the bill is even worse—the land grab is even worse than we initially thought.

Now I'm going to get into seven reasons why expanding this airport is a bad idea. This is another giant real estate scam. It's as big as the greenbelt scandal or the Ontario Place scandal. The Premier said that he wants to increase the airport from 1.7 million to 10 million passengers a year. The problem with this is that the airport is too small. It is Canada's smallest airport at 210 acres. The next smallest North American airport that handles jets is San Diego at 630 acres. The next smallest major airport in Canada is Winnipeg at 1,700 acres, and it handles less than two million passengers a year. So to handle 10 million passengers a year, a massive expansion of that airport is going to be necessary.

0910

What is not necessary, though, is an expansion of the Billy Bishop airport because, next week, the governments are going to be breaking ground on an expansion of Pearson airport, so it will be able to go from accommodating 47 million passengers a year to 70 million passengers a year. This will give it excess capacity for years to come, so there's no need to expand the Billy Bishop airport.

The third reason that this is a really bad idea: The runway extensions would close off most of the harbour to boats and create a stagnant swamp on the west of the airport. In the *Globe and Mail* last week, PortsToronto said that they're going to need to extend the runway by 900 metres. Most of that is going to go to the west, so towards Humber Bay. But on top of that, according to Transport Canada regulations, if you're going to be landing jets at an airport, then you have to have another 600 metres of lighting on either side—that's another 1.2 kilometres of water that would be taken over. So it's 900 metres of runway, then another 1.2 kilometres—2.1 kilometres of waterway that would be obstructed in order to accommodate these jets. It would basically destroy a lot of water traffic in the harbour, which is a major tourist destination, and it would probably close off access to the Hanlan's Point ferry.

The fourth point not to expand this airport is that it's not safe. The airport already does not meet Transport Canada's safety standards—TP 1247, just for reference, if anybody wants to look it up. It currently has exemptions from the safety standards. The safety standards specify

that around any airport, there has to be a "primary hazard zone." There's a diagram by PortsToronto in an environmental assessment that they did about 10 years ago. The primary hazard zone includes all of the Toronto Islands, all of the buildings along the waterfront, Tommy Thompson Park, the mouth of the Don that has recently been re-naturalized, and the Port Lands, where we're supposed to be building housing.

Transport Canada says that "wildlife refuges" are high risk and "unacceptable land use" if within the prime hazard zone of an airport due to the risk of bird strikes. I want to emphasize this risk of bird strikes. This is not just some minor risk. In 2009, an Airbus A320 taking off from New York flew into a flock of Canada geese. They got sucked into the jet engines. Both engines died, and they suddenly had this massive glider. The pilots were able to land it on the Hudson River. It led to the movie *Miracle on the Hudson* with Tom Hanks.

The difference between jets and prop planes: When that happened, the CEO of Porter said, "Well, that won't happen at Billy Bishop airport because we have turboprops. We don't have jets"—because turboprops are quite different. If a bird hits a turboprop's exterior propeller, it just gets bounced off. It's probably not good for the bird, but it's not going to take down the plane. But jet engines, the way they work—they're basically a cylinder with turbines in them. They have massive suction into the turbines, and then massive expulsion of jet pressure. That's where they get their thrust from. So what happens is, if they fly into birds—whatever is in their way, the jet engines suck that in. Going from a prop plane every 20 minutes to a jet taking off—and the 10 million passengers—would mean that a jet plane would be taking off every two to three minutes, vastly increasing the risk of bird strikes.

In the Transport Canada regulations, it says that "other unacceptable land uses" within the primary hazard zone include municipal parks, picnic areas, marshes, swamps, mud flats, school yards, community and recreation centres, and marinas. This is basically a description of everything that is in the downtown waterfront, on the Toronto Islands and what's being built on the Port Lands. Tommy Thompson Park is a massive wildlife refuge. All of this is in violation of the safety standards set by Transport Canada.

To expand this airport and to allow jets on it is going to put the people on the waterfront at risk, and it's going to put the passengers in the planes at risk.

Let's see, the other thing: There was a 2017 environmental assessment that was commissioned by PortsToronto. I'll mention that PortsToronto is one of the members of the tripartite agreement, and they're one of the advocates for expanding the airport and allowing jets there. But their own environmental assessment in 2017 said that adding jets to the airport would increase the risk of lung cancer, throat lesions and respiratory illnesses of the people visiting and living along the waterfront.

Don't forget Billy Bishop airport is 300 metres from an elementary school. So what the Premier is proposing, and

what's proposed in this bill, is to have jets landing and taking off every two to three minutes 300 metres from an elementary school.

I was down there on the weekend. There was a Jane's Walk organized by Deputy Mayor Ausma Malik. We're going around, we're learning about the history of the area, the history of Little Norway Park, its role in training Norwegian pilots in the Second World War. As we're going around, you get to a certain point when the plane is coming in or the plane has got its reverse thrusters on because it's landing, and you have to stop talking for a minute because you can't hear. Then about 30 or 40 seconds later, you smell the fumes coming in. That's one turbo prop landing every 20 minutes.

What the Premier is proposing, and I believe also the Prime Minister is proposing, is to have jets landing every two to three minutes. So you will not be able to hear—anyway, you will not be able to have a conversation along the waterfront. You won't be able to hear the concerts at Budweiser Stage, at the Harbourfront Centre, at the Music Garden, at any of the venues along the waterfront. You're going to be in a constant cloud of jet fumes.

The last reason I want to mention about why this is a really bad idea: It's a waste of money. This is like the Ontario Place boondoggle on the waterfront. Taxpayers have invested literally billions of dollars along the waterfront.

My father told me that when he was a child and his family was driving to the CNE, they used to hold their nose as they drove along Lakeshore Boulevard because it was full of abattoirs and soap factories. It smelled really, really bad. It was an industrial zone.

Over the last 50 years, we have invested billions of dollars into making it a home to 100,000 people and into making it Canada's number one tourist destination, with 28 million visitors in 2025, generating over \$20 billion in economic activity. This compares to Niagara Falls, which is a wonderful place, but Niagara Falls, which is the best-known tourist destination in Canada, gets 12 million. I want to pump it up; I think everybody should go to Niagara Falls, to my members from Niagara Falls here, but it has 12 million visitors a year. The waterfront has more than double the number of visitors to Canada's second-best tourist destination, and all of that will be harmed.

That environmental assessment that I mentioned, commissioned by Ports Toronto, said that the businesses along the waterfront do not want jets because of the impact that it will have on their businesses. Will people want to come down to the Caribbean Carnival, to the dragon boat races, to all of the concerts that are on the waterfront? All of the other events—there are 28 million visitors, and 1.5 million visitors to the Toronto Islands every year. Will people want to live down there? Will people want to visit down there?

Among the investments that the government has made, that our taxpayer dollars have gone to—\$2 billion to rehabilitate the mouth of the Don and the Port Lands to accommodate 150,000 units of housing. Already, because of that primary hazard zone, those buildings that had been scheduled to be 40 storeys would have to be half of that or

less, so less than 20 storeys. So we're going to lose half of the housing that we've invested \$2 billion in preparing the site for.

It's a huge loss to our tourism industry. It's a loss to housing. It's also a destruction and a change in the use of the waterfront from a place for people to visit, from a place for people to live, to a place where it's the hub for a major airport.

The next point that I want to make is that every argument that the government has put forward for expanding the airport is false. For example, the government said that expanding Billy Bishop for jets will take pressure off of Pearson. This is not true. Pearson, as I mentioned, is already being expanded from accommodating 47 million passengers a year to 70 million passengers a year. There's no pressure to take off of Pearson, so that argument that they're making is a false argument.

0920

Let's see. It says that flights will be cheaper at Billy Bishop. This is not true, unless there's a massive subsidy. There was a study by Air Canada because at one point, about 10 years ago, Air Canada was thinking of expanding the airport and flying jets in there. They said it just doesn't make financial sense because you're going to spend—at that time, 10 years ago—a billion dollars to expand the airport. That was for an estimated five million passengers; the Premier wants to have 10 million passengers. So you're talking at least a \$2-billion to \$3-billion investment in that tiny airport, Canada's smallest airport, to allow it to accommodate jets and 10 million passengers a year. It doesn't make financial sense. Either the taxpayers will subsidize that or it will be added onto the airport fees. And if that's added onto the airport fees that everybody pays when you buy a ticket, then the prices at Billy Bishop will be much higher than at Pearson; it won't be cheaper. So this argument that it's going to be cheaper just doesn't make sense.

The other one is that it's going to create thousands of new jobs and new travellers, but if people are flying out of Toronto or flying out of southern Ontario, they're not going to say, "Oh, I'll take an extra trip because Billy Bishop is there." They're going to say, "Where do I fly out of? Porter is now flying out of Hamilton, so do I fly out of Hamilton? Do I fly out of Pearson? Where do I fly out of?" You look at the deals. If there's a flight available, you take the flight. This is not going to add new jobs; it's just going to transfer the jobs and the travellers from Pearson to downtown Toronto.

The other thing about this that the government is afraid to mention: Billy Bishop airport is not only Canada's smallest airport, it's also situated in the most congested part of Canada's busiest, most populated city, and the Premier wants to bring another 10 million passengers there. Many of them will be driving into downtown Toronto, not to visit downtown Toronto or to do anything here, but just simply fly out. Why bring people into the congestion, the traffic nightmare that is downtown Toronto already? Why bring people into that when they could go to Pearson and avoid all of that?

The other point that I wanted to make here is that Billy Bishop—it's a bad investment because Billy Bishop looks like they're losing money. It has chronically struggled to break even. Passenger volumes in 2024 were only 71% of 2019 levels, with approximately 1.7 million passengers last year. This compares to the 47 million at Pearson. I mentioned Billy Bishop has recovered 71% of the passenger volume since the pandemic; Pearson has recovered 93% of their passenger volume. Previously, Porter reported its island operations were a drag on its business, projecting a \$35-million net loss in 2019 due to the high terminal and flight fees at Billy Bishop. So Porter is moving out of Billy Bishop because it's too expensive; it's too small an airport; it's not in the right location.

Why invest billions and destroy Toronto's waterfront? Why would the government invest \$2 billion to \$3 billion expanding this airport, destroying the tourism industry and the housing and the potential housing over on the Port Lands—why destroy all that and invest all that money into this airport?

I've been doing some research, I've been following the money a little bit, and the main beneficiary of this investment and the expansion of the Billy Bishop airport is Nieuport Aviation, which is controlled by J.P. Morgan. Really, it's a J.P. Morgan bailout act that we're debating. This is a bill about seizing land so the Premier can do whatever he wants to it. It's about taking over, spending billions of taxpayer dollars because Nieuport Aviation is losing money.

Porter built the terminal building at Billy Bishop airport for about \$50 million. In 2015, Nieuport Aviation bought it for \$750 million. But one of the things in the contract was that Porter gave the promise to have a certain volume of flights in and out of the airport so that Nieuport would be able to make money.

Nieuport sued Porter for \$130 million just two years after they signed that deal and sold it because they were losing money, because Porter didn't have enough flights flying in and out of the airport to actually meet their quota, according to the contract. So Nieuport has lost money. They invested \$750 million. Nieuport/J.P. Morgan has invested \$750 million into that terminal, and now they're losing money on it.

So how can they make money? Well, they can make a deal with the federal and the provincial governments to expand the airport, to use taxpayer dollars to expand the airport, to allow jets there, and then they will be able to make money.

But in the meantime, they're going to be destroying the businesses along the waterfront. They're going to be destroying all the tourism. They're going to be destroying the housing along the waterfront.

The Port Lands: \$2 billion invested in the Port Lands to rehabilitate that land in order to accommodate 150,000 new residents, and that's going to be cut in half. Really, who will want to live there when you're just a kilometre away from the jets taking off and you have a constant stream of jets flying over your house? The housing there

will not be nearly as attractive, so it's squandering that investment.

The question, then, is, how do we fight back? The leverage point here is the federal Liberal government because airports are managed by the federal government. The Premier here, the Conservative government provincially, cannot do anything to that airport without the approval of the federal Liberal government.

In fact, I believe now, looking into this, that the Prime Minister has been involved in this for some time, because when the Premier announced his plans for Billy Bishop six weeks ago, one of the things he said was, "The feds are on board." So when did the Premier start negotiating with the federal government to plan this takeover of the Billy Bishop airport and of the Toronto Islands and of Little Norway Park? When did they start planning this? That's a question the Prime Minister really needs to answer.

Let's see. Until this bill passes, the province has no legal role in the Billy Bishop airport. A gentleman from Environmental Defence was at a town hall that I was speaking at. He said that he believes the political strategy is to have the Premier take the heat, to come out in front, to take ownership of this project at the Billy Bishop airport, even though legally, when he announced that and until this bill passes, he has no legal role in the Billy Bishop airport because it's managed and owned by the city of Toronto, PortsToronto and the federal government.

But he believes that Premier Ford is taking the heat on the redevelopment of the Billy Bishop airport in order to take the heat off of and to shield the federal Liberal MPs in Toronto. If we're going to stop this—and I hope that we are able to stop this—the leverage point is the Prime Minister, and the leverage point is the federal Liberal MPs in Toronto.

In 2015, Marc Garneau was a federal Liberal minister. At that time, when they were debating adding jets to the Billy Bishop airport, he stopped it, kiboshed the whole project with a tweet. He said that the federal government would not be renegotiating the tripartite agreement to allow jets.

A tweet from the Prime Minister or a federal Liberal minister could put the kibosh on this entire project. And so that is the leverage point. That's the group that we need to put pressure on because, as far as this Premier goes, this is just another real estate scandal. He's got a dozen under way right now.

0930

This one, though—he needs the partnership and the support of the federal government in order to make it happen. So I'm hoping that we can pressure him and the federal government to stop this because we need to save our waterfront. More than anything else, we need to save our waterfront and not allow this provincial government—and the federal Liberal government, if they work with this—to destroy our waterfront in order to bail out Nieuport Aviation.

That concludes my remarks. I'm going to pass it over to my colleague in just a moment.

But I want to acknowledge there are people here from the Toronto waterfront, from the Toronto Islands, who have come here for the debate. Usually, at the beginning of the question period, we're allowed to introduce guests, but it's limited to just a few minutes, and we've got over 70 guests in here. So I'm going to just quickly read the names to acknowledge them so that your names will be in Hansard as having been here to visit the gallery and watch the debate: A. Garrison, Adelina Pipher, Alice Norton, Allyson Baker, Andrea Bossence, Angela Baker, Aydin Thompson McGuire, Barbara Paull, Bie Engelen, Bonnie and Doug Hamburgh, Brian Smith, Cathy Barr, Céleste Sansregret, Charlotte de Heinrich, Christian Mueller, Coman Poon, Corrine F. Murray, Daina Green, Daniel Traves, Daria Essop, Darlene Edwards, David Kent, David Woodhead, Dawn Rivard, Dean Cameron, Demetri Manias, Edith Sinclair, Elizabeth Littlejohn, Frances Greenidge, Gillian Macdonald, Inge Johnson, Isabelle Espaldon, J. Lindsay, Jaskanwar Singh, John Nishikawa, Karen McKinnell, Katherine Miller, Kathleen Doody, Kelly McCray, Laurie Stevenson, Leo Logashov, Linda Wilson, Louise Chenier, Lucie Sparham, Marcy Hewson, Margaret Copeland, Margaret Harper, Mark Brillon, Mary Louis, Michelle Dsouza, Nada Alhams, Nadezhda Sinclair-Owugah, Nancy Solway, Nicholas Di Genova, Nimit Malavia, Norm Di Pasquale, Nuala Doherty, Paul Wagle, Paula May, Rajan Sidhu, Ronald Mazza, Sally Thomas, Sally Jane Wilson, Sapna Sharma, Scott Ling, Shelley Gautier, Sonia Tanney, Stacey Semple, Stephen Richards, Susan Ogurian, Trevor Duwyn and Yaël Freudmann.

I also want to add a thanks to all of the members and the people who worked with NoJetsTO and Waterfront for All. The reason we have such a beautiful waterfront in downtown Toronto, that we've been able to develop it to become Canada's number one tourist destination, is because of the advocacy of community groups like that. So thank you for your many, many contributions. Thank you to everybody who has come for the debate.

Now I'll pass it over to my colleague from University-Rosedale.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): I recognize the member from University-Rosedale.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Thank you to the member for Spadina-Fort York for your excellent and thorough work campaigning to protect Toronto's waterfront.

I want to acknowledge and thank the many people who came here today. I know how difficult it is to turn up very early and go through security to arrive here today, to not have your cellphones. I know the reason why you're here is because you deeply care about the outcome of this vote and you deeply care about the waterfront.

I hope the Conservative members who are here in the Legislature today are listening very carefully. The reason why I say that is because the decisions that will be made in this chamber affect these people's lives. They affect the lives of thousands of people who live along the waterfront.

I want to talk a little bit about what's in the bill. It's not a very big bill. It's called the Building Billy Bishop

Airport Act, and it authorizes the Minister of Transportation to take over lands owned by the city of Toronto. That includes the areas around Billy Bishop. It includes the beloved Little Norway Park. It includes most of Toronto Island.

Now, Doug Ford—I mean, the Premier—said, “Well, we're only taking over a part of Toronto Island.” But the Trillium did some research and looked up the actual GPS points that are in the bill, and, in fact, the Conservative government is looking at taking over almost all of Toronto Island, including Hanlan's Point, Centreville, the non-residential part of Ward's Island, the Toronto Island Marina, the Gibraltar Point Centre for the Arts and the Island school—all of the land, all of the buildings, all of the structures, everything. The city is prohibited from encumbering or disposing of these assets, so they can't just sell it off.

The act also exempts the city and this takeover from the Expropriations Act, which means that the city has less say over what kind of compensation they will be able to obtain as a part of this process of the Ontario government taking this land. The act also removes the city of Toronto as a party to the tripartite agreement to oversee the airport and the waterfront, substituting Ontario instead.

We are also hearing that the Ontario government wants to classify all this area as a special economic zone. Now, this was not in the law, but it was announced by the Premier in a press conference, which means that the activity that will take place in this area doesn't necessarily need to follow workplace rules. The workers there do not need to be paid minimum wage. Environmental assessments and environmental standards do not need to be kept. Health and safety rules do not need to be upheld either. What it means is that provincial and city laws do not need to be abided by, which is—as you can imagine, if you are a nearby resident to this development, you can imagine that this would set off alarm bells. That's what is in the bill.

I want to talk a little bit about why this bill is an absolutely terrible idea. Two weeks ago, I attended a town hall on the Conservative government's threat to expand the Toronto Island airport and permit larger jets. Maybe some of you were there. It was a very well-attended event. It took place on the waterfront, and there were over 200 people there. I would categorize the feeling in that room as deep anger towards the Conservative government for, once again, messing with Toronto's waterfront, and also a feeling of betrayal and dismay that the Carney federal government has not yet stepped in to stop this project from happening.

I have always opposed expanding the Toronto Island airport, because it doesn't make a lot of sense to have a major industrial airport right next to a major city. However, I did not realize how breathtakingly stupid this expansion was going to be until I attended this town hall. I learned some additional facts, and I would like to summarize some of the things that I learned at this town hall.

The first thing that I think is worthwhile talking about is that what is being planned by the Conservative government is not a minor tweak. Their plan is to make this a

major industrial project. And the reason why we know this is because citizens' groups have used the freedom-of-information process—remember that?—to get information, to uncover what has actually or is actually being planned. It took them years to do it, and a lot of the information that I am sharing right now came from those freedom-of-information requests, which speaks to the value of the freedom-of-information process.

So what we know so far is that the plan is to extend the runway to a length of 900 metres. That's a long runway. The government wants that runway to go into the lake, which means that parts of the lake will be paved over. Approach lighting would need to be installed up to 750 metres beyond the runway in both directions—pretty significant—and wall-like jet blast deflectors would be required to prevent boats from being overturned by engine thrusts, because jets create a lot of wind. It would mean that beaches on the Toronto Islands would be reduced.

The government has announced in a press conference that they expect Toronto Island's traffic or passengers to increase from two million people a year to about 10 million a year. Based on calculations that have been made, that means that there would be a plane landing every two minutes. Right now, a prop plane lands every 20 minutes, so that is a massive increase in airport traffic.

0940

It will also mean a massive increase in vehicle traffic because people will need to travel. Taxis and Ubers will need to travel down and back. Trucks carrying jet fuel will need to travel down and back. And the roads around the Toronto Island airport are pretty small.

You've been down Bathurst Street. Bathurst Street is what, two lanes in some areas, four lanes in others? That's not a big road. I don't know if it's going to be able to handle the increase in vehicle traffic along that way. My sense is that this government, as is typical of this government, hasn't really thought these details through. That's the general impression I get.

They came up with an idea, someone approached them, maybe someone who has close ties with the Premier, and said, "We really want to do this. I know you're obsessed with the waterfront. This is another way that you can mess up the waterfront. Make us some money. How about you move ahead with this idea?" They didn't think the details through. It's very concerning.

We still don't know all the details of the project, but what we do know and what we can safely say is that this expansion will be significantly, permanently and deeply damaging to the quality of life of residents who live near the waterfront. That's pretty safe to say.

I want to talk about some of those negative impacts, and I want to start with health. I remember, at the town hall, there was an individual who stood up. His name was Toby Heaps, and he described some of the concerns he had. I don't know if you've seen it today. And he said, "I'm a parent of three." He lives near the airport; he lives in an apartment, and he spoke about his concerns for his children's health.

I'm a parent. Every parent is worried about their children's health. They want their kids to grow up healthy. And he, unfortunately, has every reason to worry. An air quality study conducted by the Bathurst Quay residents' association—I am imagining that some of them are here today. Thank you for your work. There are some scientists and professors at the University of Toronto conducting an air quality study, like I said, and they found that levels of ultra-fine particles near the airport regularly exceed World Health Organization guidelines. And these levels spike dramatically during plane takeoffs and landings—no surprise there. These ultra-fine particles—they are about 1,000 times thinner than a human hair—can penetrate deep into the lungs and have been linked to serious health outcomes, including lung cancer.

Now, this is a study from the National Institutes of Health. They have found that high levels of ultra-fine particles—which will be inevitable if you send a jet down a runway every two minutes next to condos housing over 100,000 people. What they have found is that an increase in ultra-fine particles increases the likelihood of stroke, heart attack, lung cancer, cognitive decline, dementia, asthma, COPD and premature death. It also affects fetal development. If you are pregnant, do not move next to an airport if you can help it.

Those are the facts. That is the National Institutes of Health. I wonder how seriously the Premier is thinking about the health of the people who live along the waterfront right now—because he should be.

And this, the introduction of an expanded airport, is also occurring at a time when air pollution in Toronto is not great. I know we have closed down the coal-fired power plants in Ontario, which has led to an improvement in air quality in Ontario. But near the waterfront, we are already dealing with serious air pollution issues. That is because we have the Gardiner Expressway to the north; and we also have the gas plant to the east, which is running at far higher rates and for far longer hours than was originally intended. Adding jet traffic into this mix should alarm every single person who lives in the downtown core.

Next, I want to talk about noise. Now, for those Torontonians who live downtown, you know what happens on Labour Day weekend, when the jet show comes to town. We all collectively grit our teeth because it is extraordinarily loud. I remember having a small child, a toddler, and I would put her to sleep in the middle of the day, and, inevitably, during that Labour Day weekend a jet would come roaring over our apartment and she would wake up crying.

I remember at the town hall the MPP for Toronto Centre gave a good description of what it could be look to live in a condo with a jet coming by every two minutes, and they said, "Picture sitting on your balcony on a summer evening, having dinner with friends, only to have your conversation drowned out by a descending jet every two minutes. The conversation would have to stop. The jet would go by, and then you could continue your conversation for another one minute and 40 seconds until the next jet comes by." You can imagine people would stop using

their balconies after that because that is not a nice environment to have an evening dinner and appreciate the sunset. It's very, very concerning.

We have heard talk about these whisper jets. Anyone who has ever stood near a runway knows there is no such thing as a whisper jet. There is no such thing as a whisper jet. Now, the Premier has said, "Oh, you know, these jets will be quiet, and we're not even going to be allowing the bigger jets." Why would we trust you? Before an election, you said you weren't going to open up the greenbelt; after an election, you did. Before the election, you didn't talk about how you were planning to bring in a two-tier health care system into Ontario—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): Address the Speaker, please.

Ms. Jessica Bell: We have a private health care system and a public health care system for the rest of us. But then, after an election, you did. Your behaviour and your track record over the last eight years give me the impression, and a lot of people the impression, that you are not to be trusted when it comes to—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): I will ask the member to address her comments to the Chair.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Thank you, Speaker.

Not to be trusted—I think I've made my point pretty clear about that one.

The next issue is safety. At the town hall, we had an individual speak in the comment and question period, John Nishikawa. I wonder if he is here today.

Interjection.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Good. I was listening very carefully. I actually spent the whole time in the town hall—I was sitting kind of behind a plant. But I was spending the whole time in the town hall taking very careful notes because of what you were saying. The level of expertise and the stories you were sharing—I was learning a lot from them. John Nishikawa from the Toronto Ornithological Club raised another very serious issue about the expansion of the airport, and that issue is birds.

In his summary, he said that just this week—I'm sorry if I get your summary wrong, but I'm going to do my best here. John said that just this week, he observed 1,100 tundra swans, each weighing about 20 pounds, flying through the Toronto spit immediately east of the airport. You can imagine, if you think of a bird that is 20 pounds in size hitting a jet engine, that's not good for safety. It's certainly not good for the bird, and it's definitely not good for safety.

Then he pointed out that there are roughly about 170,000 birds in and around Toronto Island, so this is not a good mix. It is not a good mix to have 170,000 birds—Toronto Island and the nearby spit is a migratory route and then, in that area, you're looking at sending jets every two minutes. That is a safety issue, and this is not just me saying that. This is also Transport Canada.

Transport Canada has made it very clear and recommends that there should be no waterfowl refuge 3.2 kilometres or closer to an airport. Well, the Toronto Island

expansion is a lot closer than 3.2 kilometres from Toronto Island and the migratory spit.

My question to the Premier and the government is, what is your plan—if you're going to move ahead with this, which I actually don't think you will. What is your plan to keep the birds away? Are you looking at using drones, sound cannons, habitat destruction? Have you even thought of it? Do you have a plan? These are very valid questions. I think everyone here, and people along the waterfront as well, would like to know the answer.

The next concern I have is around Toronto Island. Now, this didn't come up in the town hall because we didn't know the full details, but it did come up shortly after the bill was introduced because when we saw the bill, we realized that the Ontario government wants to take over Toronto Island as well.

0950

And, my gosh, my hope is that you leave Toronto Island exactly as it is. The reason why is because it is a very, very precious place. Over one million people visit Toronto Island every year. It is this sanctuary from living in your apartment, living downtown. You want to get away and have a day-long vacation—Toronto Island is the place to go. You get on the ferry, you bring your lunch, you bring your dinner, you take your kids, you take the ferry across, and you have a lovely day.

That's what I do every year. I take my kids to Toronto Island. My kids come home exhausted. Everyone is happy. They feel like they've had an adventure. Sometimes we go to Centreville. Sometimes we go to the beach. Sometimes we just bike around. When I go there, I see thousands and thousands of parents doing exactly the same thing. It is a very precious place, and it needs to be kept.

The reason why I think it needs to be kept is because a lot of people, in Toronto in particular, do not have backyards. They live in apartments. That means your park is your backyard. The Toronto Island is your vacation area. It improves peoples' quality of life. Not everyone in Toronto has a cottage in Muskoka that they can fly to on their personal jet or maybe their OPP jet. Not everyone has that opportunity. The Toronto Island is the place they go to to enjoy themselves. I urge the Ontario government to keep Toronto Island as it is. I really do.

When I went to the town hall, I kept coming up with this question again and again and again. The question that came up for me was, who exactly is the waterfront for?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: The Premier.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I hope not, because over the last 20 years, the city, the province and the federal government have made a very clear choice that they want the waterfront to be for people. They made a very clear choice. They have invested billions of dollars into improving the waterfront: into moving out industry; into building more homes, building condos; making the waterfront desirable; making it a place where people can go to the Budweiser stadium, enjoy a concert; making it so that people can go for bike rides and hikes and just to enjoy the waterfront, just to enjoy the lake. It's that kind of place. It's nice; I like

it. I know sometimes maybe you go. It's a nice place, but it can't be everything for everyone. It just can't.

What also concerns me is that there are a whole lot of plans to build a whole lot more housing in that area. When I say this, I think about the development around the Don River. It's a massive investment—800 hectares. What we're seeing is plans to build up to 150,000 new homes in that area. The waterfront is already one of the densest residential neighbourhoods in North America, and we're looking at expanding it. Why would we have and encourage all these people to move down to the waterfront and then turn around and say, "Actually, we're going put a massive industrial airport right next to where you're all living."

It doesn't make sense. In fact, it feels like a betrayal. Encouraging people to part with their life savings and buy homes on the waterfront and then to strip that away feels like a profound betrayal. Encouraging people to move downtown to a very dense area and then taking away the amenities that make that area attractive—like green space, like Toronto Island and access to the water—feels like a betrayal. It really does.

Great cities are only great—and Toronto is a great city; it has a lot of improvement, but Toronto is a great city. Great cities are only great if they are good for people so that they can live there and also so that they can work, play and enjoy themselves there at the same time. It's very important, and I feel that some of this, especially when we're talking about the waterfront, is under threat.

I want to talk a little bit about why the government might be choosing to move forward with this plan. Now, I hear musings about, "Well, there's a need." The evidence shows that there is not a need to expand Billy Bishop airport to meet the demands for increased airport traffic. And the reason why I say that is because Pearson airport—we already have a massive airport in the GTA—is undergoing a very large expansion to deal with the proposed increase in air traffic. Pearson airport has a plan to grow to 65 million annual passengers a year, which is more than enough to meet the capacity for the GTHA—more than enough. Then, on top of that, we now have the Union Pearson Express, which means it's much easier to get to Pearson airport, even from downtown.

So what is the reason, what is the logic behind expanding Billy Bishop airport? Two things come to mind: Number one, the Premier is obsessed with downtown Toronto. Maybe it is because he wanted to have his private jet available for him to take it from Billy Bishop airport to Muskoka, where his cottage is. Maybe he wanted it for that. Or maybe he wanted it because individuals who are connected to Nieuport and JPMorganChase—the owners of Billy Bishop airport—said, "Look; we need to make some more money. Can you help us do that?" Because they are logically the only two reasons that I can think of that the government would move forward with this very harebrained, incredibly stupid idea, and both of them don't make sense. They really don't.

I want to talk about what we can do to push back against this terrible idea. I'm going to make a bet. I'm going to

make a bet that I think that Billy Bishop airport will not be expanded. I had that feeling when the Ontario government made the announcement that they were going to expand the greenbelt, and my instinct told me, "Nah, they're not going to do that." It turned out, you didn't. And my guess is that the Billy Bishop airport is not going to be expanded either, and the reason why is because not only is it a terrible idea, but there are a lot of people who don't like it.

I also think that there are many opportunities to push for change and to get the Ontario government to back down and not move forward with this idea, and I would like to move to ending my remarks by talking about them. First off, there is the upcoming Scarborough Southwest by-election, which must be held before September, and this provides a very clear opportunity to send a message to the Premier that expanding Billy Bishop airport is an incredibly dumb idea. In fact, I was recently in Scarborough Southwest, knocking on doors. We were talking to people one-on-one, talking about the Scarborough by-election, and the message that I found worked extremely well—we were actually right along the waterfront—is we said, "Do you know that the Premier has a plan to dramatically expand Billy Bishop airport?" And they would say, "We know." The residents would say, "Yes, we absolutely know." And I would say, "Why we're concerned about it is that they're looking at sending jets right near here. If you look up, they're going to be sending them right near here. This is the flight path." And the residents, by and large, said, "Yes, we know. We're really pissed off about it, and we're not going to be voting for that person." So Scarborough Southwest is going to be an opportunity to send a really clear message that expanding Billy Bishop airport is not a good idea.

The second opportunity for change is to focus on our Prime Minister, Mark Carney, and the downtown Toronto Liberal MPs. And the reason why it is important to focus on these people—give them an email, call them, try to arrange a meeting—is because this project can only go ahead with federal government approval. I find that the Prime Minister has taken the progressive vote for granted. They have taken the progressive vote for granted, and it is now the time to approach the Prime Minister and the Toronto Liberal MPs and say, "Now is the time for you to stand up for Toronto and oppose and say no and quash the expansion of the Billy Bishop airport. Now is the time." I think that's very important.

1000

I also think—I wonder this; I muse this. I'm not entirely sure, but I wonder about this. I think about all the developers that are looking at building very large condos along the waterfront or who are looking at selling off property that they're having difficulty in selling off because the condo market has changed. I think those individuals really should be placing a call to the Premier right now and saying, "Hey, I don't think this airport is a very good idea, because if you're going to build this airport, it means it's going to be even tougher for me to sell these condos, because not many people want to spend a lot of money buying a condo right next to a major

industrial airport.” I hope some of your donors are contacting you and asking questions. I hope some of these developers are contacting you and asking questions, saying, “This is not a good idea. Economically, this is this is not a good idea.”

The final reason why I think that we have a chance of winning this thing is because the Premier is tanking in the polls. You’ve still got a way to go, but you’re tanking in the polls. I have used the word “Teflon” to describe the Premier before. He’s remarkably good at getting away with a whole lot of stuff. But this whole jet thing really didn’t work well for you. Buying a private jet, secretly, in the middle of an affordability crisis was a very bad move because it undercut this myth that Doug Ford, the Premier, is a common man and he’s for the people. Because everyday people do not think to themselves, “I really want a \$28.9-million jet so I can fly from Billy Bishop airport to my cottage in Muskoka.” They just don’t. So it revealed the man behind the curtain.

It surprises me, given all the scandal with the jets and the polling showing that this is really not a good look for the Premier, it really, really surprises me that you would use this opportunity to introduce a bill to keep jets in the news even longer. It doesn’t even make sense. Why would you do that? Why wouldn’t you just wait? I don’t even understand it. It doesn’t make sense. Because now the Billy Bishop airport and this fight is forever twinned with the Premier and his obsession with his private luxury jet, and that’s not a good look.

I’m going to be concluding my remarks now. I want to thank once again all the citizens who are here today. It’s not easy to take time out of your day to be here, to listen, to get through security, to fight, but I feel a lot of hope that we are going to win this one, I really do. I think we’re going to win this one.

I want to conclude with a quote from Jane Jacobs, who has been in this fight before. Toronto urbanist Jane Jacobs said that you must win a fight three times. The NoJetsTO campaign has already beaten back attempts to expand the airport in 2003 and 2015. Let me tell you: Now it is time to win again.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): Questions?

Mr. Will Bouma: To all the people that are visiting today, thank you very much for joining us. I appreciate you making your voices heard.

To the members opposite, it seems that just a few years ago—very, very short, although it’s been a while now—we were talking about the Ontario Line that the Premier was envisioning. I remember that the opposition in those days was saying the exact same things that they are today: “It can never happen. It will never happen. It’s impossible.” Today, Speaker, the Ontario Line is being built.

I think that’s one of the reasons why I so enjoy being a part of a government that has a Premier who’s a visionary, who dreams. He doesn’t see what the world looks like today, but can dream about what the world could look like.

To me, coming from my riding, I understand the fear that the constituents can experience about the unknown,

about what it could look like. Change is the one constant in life.

I guess my question to the opposition members is: Will you be voting for this bill or against this bill, for the future of Ontario or against the future of—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): I recognize the member from Spadina–Fort York.

Mr. Chris Glover: Boy, if you’re asking that question, you didn’t listen to our speeches.

First of all, you’re rewriting history here. The Ontario Line—

Interjections.

Mr. Chris Glover: The member is rewriting history here. The NDP was in favour of the Ontario Line. We need more transit in the city. What we were opposed to is a P3, because this is a private-public partnership. That’s exactly what happened with the Eglinton Crosstown, why it became a big boondoggle with the LRT in Ottawa, the LRT in Hamilton. They were all P3 projects, so private control and ownership, but public money. Instead of the government just hiring a contractor to build a hospital or build a transit system, they keep it off the government’s books so it doesn’t show up on their deficit.

The Ontario Line, we’re in favour of it. But the Auditor General says P3 projects—

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

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Before I ask my question, I too want to welcome and thank everyone who has come down today to hear the debate. It’s a fairly critical one for the future of this city.

My question to the member from Spadina–Fort York: You’ve spoken previously about the economic value of the Toronto waterfront as a tourist attraction and compared it to another world-class premier attraction, Niagara Falls. Could you tell us the value of the waterfront as a tourist attraction and your concerns about this project as it would affect that economic engine?

Mr. Chris Glover: Thank you for that question. If you go down to the waterfront on any day of the year, particularly a warm day in the summer, there are literally hundreds of thousands of people going down. They’re catching a ferry or a water taxi over to the islands. There are people from the Harbourfront Centre getting in canoes and kayaks and kayaking over to the islands. There are people listening to concerts at the Harbourfront Centre, or at the music garden, or at the Budweiser Stage. There are people biking, walking, jogging along the Martin Goodman Trail. It is Canada’s premier, number one tourist destination.

If the Premier has his way and they’re landing jets, flying jets by every two to three minutes, you will not be able to hear anybody there and you will be in a constant cloud of jet fumes. It would destroy Canada’s number one tourist destination. That’s why we’re opposing this bill.

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

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Welcome to the beautiful Pink Palace to all the islanders and waterfront

residents. I represent beautiful Beaches–East York, also on the waterfront. But I do recognize that Toronto Island is a gem, an absolute gem, and we need to keep it that way.

I love listening to my colleague from Spadina–Fort York speak. I think his nickname is “the professor.” You learn something new every time, and I like the way you laid out your speech.

I would add that, in addition to speaking to the federal government and the MPs, also speak to the mayor of Toronto. It takes a village.

So what do you think actually is the obsession of this Premier with the Toronto waterfront? There’s the Ferris wheel. There’s the rumoured casino, Ontario Place and now the island. What is the obsession—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): I recognize the member for Spadina–Fort York.

Mr. Chris Glover: I think the Premier’s obsession with the Toronto waterfront is it’s just a piece of real estate to him. When he became the Premier, he thought that all of Ontario’s property that belongs to the people of Ontario through the government was his personal property to do whatever he wants with. And that’s what he did: He sold off the Hearn gas plant to his friend Cortellucci for \$16 million, for 16 acres of downtown property. He was going to give the foundry away in a backroom deal to the De Gasperis family—all of his donors. And then the Ontario Place scandal—everything he looks at is just a real estate scandal.

It’s not just those ones. All of the property along the 413 and the Bradford Bypass had been bought up—just before he announced those highways—by friends and donors of the Conservative government. So I think he sees the waterfront as just a real estate opportunity.

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

Mr. Rudy Cuzzetto: I was listening to the member from University–Rosedale speaking about the Pearson airport construction that’s going on. She was speaking about Ontario Place, what’s going on there, and the island as well.

Now, why would all this be going on in Ontario? That means more people are coming to Ontario, so we need to move these people much quicker. Why are you against all these well-paying construction jobs, unionized jobs, in the province of Ontario? Are you anti-union workers?

Ms. Jessica Bell: That’s a silly question. The NDP was founded by workers. We were founded by workers. We stand for an increase in the minimum wage. We stand for making it easier to join a union. Unions were integral to creating a middle class in Ontario, and I’m very concerned about what this government is doing with economic inequality right now.

1010

Pearson airport has plans to increase its capacity so it can manage 65 million annual passengers a year. That is more than enough to meet the growing demand for air travel for the GTHA and beyond.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): Further questions? I recognize the member from Niagara West.

MPP Wayne Gates: I want to say that I’m from Niagara Falls.

I was actually surprised when I heard this morning that 24 million visitors go to the island. That’s eight million more than Niagara Falls, and we want to destroy it by putting jets in it. It makes no sense.

To the member over there, thanking the people for being here as you cut their hearts out on what they’ve loved for all these years, making sure the environment is good: What did you guys do? No consultation—none. No plan. No future here. You should be caring about these residents, taxpayers. It’s public land. It’s public land. We don’t need more jets. Ask Spirit Airlines how they’re doing today.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): I’ll go to the member from Spadina–Fort York.

Mr. Chris Glover: I appreciate the comments/question from the member from Niagara Falls. But you know what? He’s right: Niagara Falls is Canada’s best-known tourist destination by far, and it’s a wonderful tourist destination. Every time I go there, I’m actually struck in awe by just how enormous that is, how big the volume of water is and how much fun you can have while you’re walking around.

But the waterfront is Canada’s number one tourist destination. That has been built up through billions of taxpayer dollars. That has made it a great place to live and is making it a better place to live every year as they expand and build new parks and new waterfront attractions, new festivals down there. So let’s save the Toronto waterfront. That’s what we’re fighting for on this side of the House.

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

MPP Bill Rosenberg: Speaker, we know our strong economy supports our health care and education systems. The Leader of the Opposition has called this legislation reckless, yet this project would support approximately 23,000 construction jobs, generate up to \$140 billion in economic output over 25 years, increase competition, and give travellers more choice and more affordable options.

Speaker, through you, I ask the member opposite: Do you believe creating thousands of good-paying jobs and strengthening Ontario’s economy is reckless, or are they simply opposed to building the infrastructure our growing province needs?

Mr. Chris Glover: So first of all, the numbers that the member is giving are wrong, because the Billy Bishop airport is just going to be competing with Pearson. We’re already investing billions of dollars to expand Pearson airport without destroying the waterfront. So let’s invest in the jobs. Let’s create the jobs there. Let’s invest the money there, rather than destroying the downtown Toronto waterfront.

And when a government member says that they’re going to generate a strong economy to invest in housing and health care, they are not. They’re bankrupting all our schools and colleges and universities.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): We’ll move to members’ statements.

Second reading debate deemed adjourned.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

PROJECT GIVE BACK

Mrs. Michelle Cooper: I rise today to recognize an organization that is truly shaping the next generation of compassionate leaders: Project Give Back, founded in 2007 by educator Ellen Schwartz, who co-founded Jacob's Ladder, honouring her son Jacob and raising millions of dollars towards neurodegenerative illness. Ellen is a remarkable woman who has also written two best-selling books.

Project Give Back began in a single classroom and has grown into a deeply impactful initiative in schools across our communities. I am especially pleased to share that Ellen and members of her team are here with us in the gallery today, and we're so glad to have you here.

Project Give Back runs during the school year, offering engaging lessons for elementary students. Through discussion, presentations and critical thinking, students build confidence, empathy and a strong sense of community.

What makes this program so special is that students focus on the charitable causes that matter to them, creating a shared experience where everyone learns and grows together, and they also give back to their communities. Along the way, meaningful connections are formed, and students are motivated, challenged and inspired through their own personal journey.

I'm also looking forward to attending their appreciation event next week. Project Give Back reminds us that leadership and community begins with kindness and action.

SEXUAL VIOLENCE AND HARASSMENT

MPP Lisa Gretzky: Today is Red Dress Day for murdered and missing Indigenous women, girls and two-spirit people. May is Sexual Assault Prevention Month, a time to recognize the profound impact of sexual violence and recommit to prevention, support and justice. While still under-reported, data shows a rise in sexual assaults, underscoring that this crisis is widespread. Behind every statistic is a person whose safety, dignity and trust have been violated.

This government must respond with more than platitudes. That means strengthening survivor-centred supports, improving access to trauma-informed care and ensuring our legal system delivers justice and accountability.

Lydia's Law, introduced by my colleague from Waterloo, reflects an important step in enhancing protections, closing gaps and better supporting those navigating the aftermath of assault. We brought forward the Intimate Partner Violence Epidemic Act, which acknowledges IPV is an epidemic, requiring coordinated and sustained action across sectors.

Yesterday, my colleague from Waterloo questioned the Attorney General about the Sloka verdict. The judge acquitted Dr. Sloka of 48 counts of sexual assault, saying each patient was "unreliable" and "deliberately dishonest."

The Attorney General's response mirrored the ingrained, systemic barriers survivors face. He diminished and discredited the seriousness of the question and shifted blame to my colleague and survivors for the government's failure to act.

Last year, this Conservative government shut down debate on Lydia's Law. Survivors robbed of justice were also robbed of their voice in this Legislature. Ending sexual violence is not the responsibility of survivors; it is a collective responsibility that we take seriously.

SPECIAL OLYMPICS CANADA SUMMER GAMES

Mr. Rob Cerjanec: I rise today to recognize the incredible athletes of Team Ontario as they prepare to compete at the Special Olympics Canada Summer Games in Medicine Hat this August. The Special Olympics provides individuals with disabilities an important opportunity to highlight their talents, show that they can contribute meaningfully and play such an important and crucial role in all of our communities. These athletes embody the very best of Ontario. Their dedication, discipline and perseverance are truly inspiring.

I recently had the privilege of meeting some of these outstanding individuals in Ajax who will be competing as part of the rhythmic gymnastics team. I can say with confidence that they are ready to represent Ontario with pride.

I'd also like to thank Donna Edwards for her tireless role in Durham region supporting Special Olympics, for making these opportunities possible. These athletes' commitment to excellence is something we can all admire.

The Special Olympics reminds us that sport is not just about competition. It's about showing up for one another, breaking down barriers and celebrating achievement. To Team Ontario, know that your province is behind you every step of the way. We're cheering you on and wish you the very best of luck. Thank you to all the athletes, coaches, parents and organizers. Good luck.

COMMUNITY CARE DURHAM

Mr. Lorne Coe: Organizations like Community Care Durham play a vital role in supporting seniors and other residents across the region. That's why I was pleased to recently announce, in Whitby, an investment of \$361,000 from the Ministry of Health for Community Care Durham. Through structured programs, meaningful activities and social connections, Community Care Durham helps reduce isolation, supports independence and promotes overall health and well-being, while also providing much-needed respite and support for families, volunteers and caregivers.

Speaker, by strengthening these programs, our government, under the leadership of Premier Ford and health minister Sylvia Jones, allows more local seniors and their loved ones to connect for the compassionate services and supports they need in Whitby and other parts of the region of Durham.

I'm pleased to share this information with the other members of the chamber today.

519PURSUIT

Mr. Terence Kernaghan: I rise today to speak about an incredible local organization in London, the 519Pursuit. What began with a simple but powerful act of kindness—a Crock-Pot of soup shared with people experiencing homelessness—has since grown into a vital non-profit organization that provides support, care and friendship to the most marginalized members of our community.

1020

The 519Pursuit's mission is clear: to offer a friendship-based approach to individuals facing housing insecurity, financial hardship and social isolation. They provide daily meals, clothing, care packages and much more. They deliver over 1,000 meals each week and have collected hundreds of thousands of socks for those in need.

Recently, I had the honour of attending Together at the Table, the 519Pursuit's inaugural charity dinner. It was an inspiring event where community members came together not just to share a meal, but to share stories, experiences and a profound sense of belonging. It reminded me of the strength of community and how vital it is to create spaces where everyone feels seen, heard and valued.

What started as a small act of kindness has now become a place of hope and empowerment. The 519Pursuit isn't just providing services; they're offering a future, helping people transform their lives, building relationships and creating a community where everyone can thrive.

I'm proud to support the 519Pursuit for the extraordinary work they do in our community by providing dignity, opportunity and hope to those who need it most.

ROTARY CLUB OF CAMBRIDGE (PRESTON-HESPELER)

Ms. Jess Dixon: I rise today to congratulate the Rotary Club of Cambridge, Preston-Hespeler branch, on its 100th anniversary. I attended the celebration this past weekend.

The club was chartered back in 1926 and has since spent a century living its motto of "service above self" in our community in Cambridge. Generations of Rotarians have built and maintained the Whitney Boardwalk in Riverside Park. They've partnered with Cambridge Memorial Hospital and KidsAbility. They've funded bursaries for students and for Cambridge students with physical disabilities, and have stepped in directly to help local families with things like accessible vehicles. Their work also reaches well beyond our national borders, with them supporting health care and education in Tanzania, Guatemala and the Dominican Republic.

As they enter their second century, the club has taken on one of the urgent issues currently facing our region: human trafficking. Through their End Human Trafficking Committee and many community partners, they're working to support survivors and raise awareness in Waterloo region.

I want to highlight, in particular, their human trafficking awareness event on June 17 at Tapestry Hall, which I will be speaking at as well. I encourage members and the broader community to attend.

To President Keith Peers and all of the members, thank you. Cambridge is stronger, kinder and more accessible because of 100 years of your work. Here's to the next century.

TORONTO WATERFRONT

Mr. Chris Glover: We're debating about the future of the waterfront here, and the weather is getting warmer. I just want to reach out to people from across this province to come down this summer and visit Canada's number one tourist destination. It's the waterfront in downtown Toronto.

You can visit one of five new parks: Sugar Beach, Toronto Music Garden, Love Park, HTO Park, and Biidaasige Park, which is the most recently opened park. It is honestly the most fun park I've ever taken a child to. You don't just play in the sand there; they actually have running water, and the kids can play in the mud. There are also ziplines. You can zipline, and it's safe; they're fairly low ziplines. But kids as young as five and six can zipline like 50, 60 metres. It's an incredible place.

But also, come to the Toronto Islands, to the Centreville theme park, to Hanlan's Point, to Tommy Thompson Park, to any of the beaches—Ward's Island beach, Hanlan's beach.

Come and visit. And what are you going to do when you come to the Toronto Waterfront? Well, come for, of course, the CNE, the Caribbean Carnival, the Toronto International Dragon Boat Festival. But also come for the Toronto Waterfront Festival, for the Luminato Festival. Come and take a boat tour or rent a kayak or a canoe at the Harbourfront Canoe and Kayak Centre, and paddle over to the islands.

There is so much to do in Canada's number one tourist destination, the waterfront in downtown Toronto. I invite people from across the province to come down this summer.

POLICE SERVICES

Mr. Logan Kanapathi: This week, we are proud to host a policing recruitment symposium in Markham, in partnership with the York Regional Police. This symposium is about creating meaningful pathways for youth and community members to explore careers in policing.

This is an opportunity to connect directly with the YRP, to learn about the profession and understand the meaning of policing today beyond the uniform.

We are especially focused on encouraging young people from under-represented communities to see policing as a respectful skill- and community-driven profession. For many families, policing may not have been seen as an immediate career choice. They may not have encouraged it, but that has changed.

Speaker, I am pleased to welcome Superintendent Chirag Bhatt from district 5, along with the YRP team, Staff Sergeant Andy Gill and communicator Aakarsha Datta for their commitment to community engagement, clearly represented in their presence today.

Policing today depends on compassion, communication, cultural understanding and commitment to community safety. That's why our government, under Premier Doug Ford's leadership, is fully covering tuition for basic constable training at the Ontario Police College. This is how we build the community to focus on policing in Ontario.

SEXUAL VIOLENCE AND HARASSMENT

Ms. Aislinn Clancy: Last week, I visited the Sexual Assault Support Centre of Waterloo Region, where survivors met for support regarding the sexual assault trial of Jeffrey Sloka. Between 2010 and 2017, women went to see Sloka at a neurology clinic at Grand River Hospital to address migraines, seizures and brain injuries. Instead, they faced violations and abuse of power.

On April 24, Sloka was acquitted of all 48 charges of sexual assault. Survivors are left shaken, shocked and retraumatized by the verdict. They shared that court delays held their lives hostage; that, on the stand, they were belittled and badgered; and that the whole process negatively affected their mental health. Judge Perry's verdict said that the testimony of every single one of the 48 women was unreliable. This verdict comes nine years after complaints were made to the CPSO, seven years after charges were laid, five years after the court trial began and 15 years after some of the women first experienced harm.

Mr. Sloka's medical licence has been revoked, which prevents further harm, but we can do better than that. We know that only 6% of survivors report the abuse they have experienced, and of that 6%, only 10% of charges laid end in a guilty verdict.

I say to the survivors today, you are worthy and your voice matters. And I say to the Attorney General, please make the systemic changes like those recommended in the Renfrew county inquest so that when survivors share their story—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): Members' statements?

THORNHILL COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTRE

Ms. Laura Smith: I rise today to highlight an exciting new partnership in my riding of Thornhill. It's a collaboration that reflects the best of our community now taking shape at the Thornhill Community Health Centre, where Reena and Concord Family Health are coming together to deliver compassionate, inclusive and community-driven care.

Reena, under the leadership of Bryan Keshen, has long been a pillar of support for individuals with intellectual

and developmental disabilities, and under the leadership of Dr. Surkont, Concord Family Health brings that same commitment, ensuring individuals and families can access the primary care they need.

This new community health project is part of our government's primary care action plan where we are investing, just in Thornhill, \$1.9 million this year to connect over 4,400 people to primary care in Thornhill, and this is all happening locally at the Promenade mall. It's very exciting.

I want to recognize the incredibly generous donors for this project, including Harry Lebovic, who showed up for our announcement last week. Together, they are creating something truly meaningful: a health care hub that ensures our most vulnerable, including seniors and individuals who are neurodiverse, are supported, understood and cared for. Speaker, this new hub represents the very best of Thornhill: compassion, collaboration and commitment to lifting each other up.

I want to thank our Premier and the Minister of Health for their leadership in this incredible new primary care health hub.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Mr. Terence Kernaghan: It gives me great pleasure to welcome individuals from CNIB, including Suzanne Decary-van den Broek, senior VP of programs; Keya Osborne, the director of disability justice; and the Honourable Dr. Asha Seth. I'm very much looking forward to our meeting today. Welcome to Queen's Park.

1030

Ms. Lee Fairclough: In recognition of May as Vision Health Month, I would also like to welcome representatives from the Canadian National Institute for the Blind: Diane Bergeron and Gabriella Rabaa, also the Honourable Dr. Asha Seth, Larissa Proctor, Alice Clark, and guide dogs Tulip and Carla. Welcome to your House.

Mrs. Michelle Cooper: I want to welcome Project Give Back to Queen's Park: Ellen and Jeff Schwartz are here, Jody Kimelman, Andrea Hecht, Melanie Levovich. Welcome to Queen's Park.

MPP Lisa Gretzky: I'm pleased to welcome folks from CNIB: Dr. Asha Seth, Suzanne Decary-van den Broek, Keya Osborne, Rhonda Underhill-Gray and Raidah Saraf.

Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to also say hello to my grand-nugget. Today is her sixth birthday. I'm really looking forward to getting home to celebrate.

Applause.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I'd like to welcome two guests from Northern College: Kraymr Grenke, who is the chair of the board of directors at the college, and president Mitch Dumas. Welcome to Queen's Park.

Hon. Ernie Hardeman: I'd like to welcome to the House, from the Canadian National Institute for the Blind, Melanie Burgess, Larissa Proctor, Alice Clark, and the Honourable Dr. Asha Seth.

MPP Lise Vaugeois: I'd like to welcome, visiting from Unifor, Melissa Wood, Gwen Campbell, Nicole Cayer and Ramon Souto and Chanza Falconer. Welcome. I look forward to meeting with you.

I also would like to welcome, from the CNIB, Dr. Asha Seth, Patrick Milne, Raidah Saraf and Rhonda Underhill-Gray, who I want to also thank for introducing me to Braille Lego. Thank you very much and welcome.

Ms. Aislinn Clancy: I'd like to say hello to Hitarth Chauhan, a page from Kitchener Centre, and his mom, Hilor Patahk. And I want to say congrats to Minister Flack on becoming a grandpa.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Members, not only is he a grandfather, but he's a grandfather of two beautiful twin girls.

Applause.

MPP Bill Rosenberg: I'd like to introduce long-time friend Joanne Marck from Algoma, and my better half, Jeannine.

Applause.

Mr. Joseph Racinsky: I'm happy to welcome the mayor, members of council and senior staff from the town of Erin to Queen's Park today. Welcome.

L'hon. Caroline Mulroney: C'est un grand plaisir d'accueillir à Queen's Park, pour la première fois, Éric Duhaime, le chef du Parti conservateur du Québec, et Cédric Lapointe. Bienvenue à Queen's Park.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): I will be adding 30 seconds to the clock, just so you know, because we had a few clapping.

I acknowledge the Minister of Transportation.

Hon. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria: I'd like to welcome delegates from the Ontario Motor Coach Association who are visiting Queen's Park, specifically Ray, Nick and Sash. Thank you, and welcome.

Mr. Adil Shamji: This morning, I wish to welcome the CNIB to our house, notably, the honourable Dr. Asha Seth, Suzanne Decary-van den Broek and Keya Osborne. Welcome.

Hon. Neil Lumsden: I'd like to welcome visitors joining us today from the Bruce Trail Conservancy, an organization dedicated to protecting Ontario's most treasured natural assets, and especially CEO Michael McDonald and his team—a huge team, I understand—today for all the work that you do and continue to do. They are inviting everyone at 5 o'clock to join them at the reception, and there will also be a picture on the staircase after question period.

Mr. Will Bouma: I would like to welcome my great friend Delia Reiche to the House today. Thank you for the meeting this morning with your economic development colleagues.

Hon. Raymond Sung Joon Cho: I'm so honoured to introduce seven fabulous guests here at Queen's Park today: Melanie Burgess, Larissa Proctor, Alice Clark, Christall Beaudry and Paul Hamilton from CNIB; and former Senator Honourable Dr. Asha Seth and her husband, Arun Seth. Thank you for your service to our people, and welcome to Queen's Park.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Unfortunately, we are out of time for introduction to visitors. A reminder: You can also—and to our guests who are here—come back at 1 o'clock for introduction of visitors.

Before we move on to another introduction, I just wanted to bring to the attention of the House that there is a new display on the first floor, just outside my office, on the east side. I want to shout out to the team at public relations and protocol for putting this together.

MPP ATHLETES

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): We have, sitting in this chamber today, four MPPs who have had a remarkable career in sport: The member for Etobicoke–Lakeshore played on the Canadian women's rugby team; the member for Simcoe–Grey is a two-time Olympic athlete who competed in rowing; the member for Haldimand–Norfolk is an accomplished kickboxer who holds a black belt in martial arts; and the member for Hamilton East–Stony Creek played for the Edmonton Eskimos in an incredible, successful career in the CFL.

I'm so proud of all of you.

REMARKABLE WOMEN AT QUEEN'S PARK

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Colleagues, I want to mention that in 2025, you will remember that I launched the Remarkable Women in the Workplace initiative, a monthly recognition program celebrating the outstanding women who work for the Office of the Assembly. These individuals exemplify dedication, professionalism and leadership in their roles, and this initiative is a small but meaningful way to honour their contributions to the Legislature.

Today, I am pleased to draw your attention to the Speaker's gallery and introduce our newest honouree. Roberta Mabee is an editor from Hansard Publications and Language Services. Roberta's dedication, leadership and commitment to fostering a supportive workplace make her highly deserving of this recognition.

She actively builds connections across branches by organizing knowledge-sharing sessions, supports colleagues by training new staff and creates opportunities for team engagement and learning. Her contributions to staff initiatives and branch-wide activities reflect her commitment to service, inclusion and organizational excellence.

Joining Roberta in the Speaker's gallery is her mother, Gina Tucci.

On behalf of all members and staff, I extend our heartfelt congratulations and gratitude to Roberta. Thank you for your remarkable service.

Applause.

VISITOR

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Also in the Speaker's gallery is our new chaplain, Cindy Manohararaj. Thank you also for joining us today.

LEGISLATIVE PAGES

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): If I can ask our pages to assemble by the Clerks' desk. Thank you very much.

Members, our new group of pages includes, from Northumberland–Peterborough South, Ashmitha Ajenthuran; from Toronto–St. Paul's, Michaela Beer; from Parkdale–High Park, Kieran Campbell; from Brampton Centre, Aneet Kaur Chahal; from Hamilton East–Stoney Creek, Maidah Chaudhary; from Kitchener Centre, Hitarth Chauhan; from Scarborough North, Yunxi “Juliana” Chen; from London North Centre, Sienna Chung; from Thornhill, Alyson Guan; from Aurora–Oak Ridges–Richmond Hill, Evalyn Ho; from Durham, Kaleigh Ireland; from Barrie–Innisfil, Daniel Kotchetkov; from Don Valley North, Tej Maini; from Don Valley East, Owen Morton; from Pickering–Uxbridge, Devin Rajkumar; from Sudbury, Onyioza Salawu; from Leeds–Grenville–Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, Azaad Sekhon; from Scarborough–Rouge Park, Aarav Sujeevan; from Mississauga–Malton, Johanan Wong; and from Markham–Unionville, Jason Wu.

Welcome to Queen's Park.

Applause.

1040

OPPOSITION DAY MOTION

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Members, on May 4, 2026, the member for Sudbury raised a point of order relating to the “same question rule” described in standing order 55. The member sought clarification as to whether Bill 104, An Act to amend the Consumer Protection Act, 2002 and the Consumer Protection Act, 2023 with respect to personalized algorithmic pricing is out of order given the defeat of opposition day motion number 3, moved by the leader of the official opposition on April 20, 2026. The third party House leader spoke to the point of order, as did the leader of the third party, who is sponsor of Bill 104.

Standing order 55 states, “No motion or amendment, the subject matter of which has been decided upon, can be again proposed during the same session.” As I explained in a ruling I gave on December 11 last year on the application of the same question rule to two bills containing identical provisions, this rule exists to protect the time of the House and to avoid putting the House at risk of making contradictory decisions in the same session.

In considering this point of order, I reviewed our precedents and consulted the relevant parliamentary authorities, and found that the threshold for similarity is quite high. In a ruling on December 8, 1997, which can be found on page 860 of the journals, the Deputy Speaker explained that “if a matter before the House is not substantially the

same, or identical, to one already decided upon, it is not prohibited from being considered.” That same ruling also states that “there are many examples of debates on variations of the same or similar subject matters being debated more than once in a session.”

Furthermore, in explaining the same question rule, the fourth edition of the House of Commons Procedure and Practice notes on page 496 that “a motion on a topic similar to the topic of another motion already negated or adopted is admissible, provided it is different enough to constitute a new question.”

The question before us, then, is whether opposition day motion number 3 and Bill 104 are similar enough to be considered substantially the same.

Opposition day number 3 called upon the government “to ban surveillance pricing practices that misuse personal data to unfairly inflate prices and ensure a fair and affordable price for groceries and other goods and services.” It also offered six separate statements in justification for this call on the government, referring to corporations and other governments by name in making a case for the motion's request.

Bill 104, in contrast, seeks to amend the Consumer Protection Act, 2002, and Consumer Protection Act, 2023, in order to add “personalized algorithmic pricing” to both acts as a prohibited unfair practice.

Where opposition day number 3 called on the government to act in face of a number of conditions, Bill 104 offers a specific legislative proposal to achieve a policy change. Although they relate to the same subject matter, I am not convinced that they have proposed the same question to the House for its consideration and decision.

For these reasons, I do not find that Bill 104 is out of order.

Thank you for your attention.

I call upon the member of the third party on a point of order.

Mr. John Fraser: Thank you very much for your ruling. I appreciate it greatly. I am disappointed, though, that the Leader of the Opposition would use procedure to try to eliminate a bill that she agreed with.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): That is not a point of order. I'm disappointed that it was raised as a point of order.

RED DRESS DAY

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): I recognize the member for Kiiwetinoong on a point of order.

Mr. Sol Mamakwa: Speaker, I seek unanimous consent of the House for a moment of silence to honour all missing and murdered Indigenous women, girls, two-spirit and gender-diverse people on this national day of awareness and remembrance, also known as Red Dress Day.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): The member from Kiiwetinoong is seeking unanimous consent of the House for a moment of silence to honour all missing and murdered Indigenous women, girls, two-spirit and gender-

diverse people on this national day of awareness and remembrance known as Red Dress Day. Agreed? Agreed.

The House observed a moment's silence.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): You may take your seats.

QUESTION PERIOD

STUDENT ASSISTANCE

Ms. Marit Stiles: Speaker, my question is to the Premier. Last week, the Premier took some time to fly a private plane down to Michigan, collect a free degree and address a group of American students.

But there's a group of students that this Premier won't face, a group of students that this Dr. Premier has turned his back on. They are the students here in the province of Ontario, the same students whose future he is destroying with his cuts to OSAP.

What's up, Doc? Why is this Premier giving speeches to American students in Michigan, but refusing to speak to students here at home?

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): I recognize the government House leader.

Hon. Steve Clark: I want to thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question, and I know that the parliamentary assistant will be pleased to take the supplementary.

Yesterday, we saw the Leader of the Opposition invoke dangerous American-style Trumpian rhetoric that, quite frankly, has no place in this Legislature—

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): I apologize to the government House leader.

I'm warning members now. The behaviour will be respectful in the chamber, or members will be warned and asked to leave.

You may continue.

Hon. Steve Clark: Thanks, Speaker. Again, through you, that type of rhetoric lowers the tone in this House. It has no place in this Legislature, our province or our country.

I want to make it very clear what the Premier is focused on. He's focused on this generational threat that we have with the Americans on the tariffs. We will continue to focus on the economy and on jobs. That's the Premier's mandate. That's our government's mandate.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Leader of the Opposition.

Ms. Marit Stiles: Well, Speaker, pretty rich coming from a government that is under RCMP criminal investigation.

I'll go back to the Premier on this. On this side of the House, when there were thousands of students assembled on the front lawns just outside, we went out and we met with them. We spoke to them. We listened to them.

But the Premier, he hid. He refused to show his face in person. Instead, he went to the media. He insulted students.

He told them what classes they should and shouldn't take, as if he had aced a single college class.

Can the Premier tell us, during his speech to the American students in Michigan, did he insult those American students in the same way that he insulted the students here at home?

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): I recognize the member for Whitby.

Mr. Lorne Coe: Our new grant-to-loan ratio is right in line with other provinces. OSAP loans are not like standard bank loans. These loans do not accrue interest while the student is in school. There is a six-month grace period on repayment after graduation, and the interest that does accrue is extremely low, at prime plus 1%.

On top of that, Speaker, our government offers numerous programs that financially support students, like the Ontario Learn and Stay Grant, which, since its introduction, has provided over \$173 million to cover the tuition—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): The member for Spadina–Fort York has been warned.

1050

Continue.

Mr. Lorne Coe:—books and other educational costs of more than 12,800 nursing, medical lab and paramedic students across Ontario.

Speaker, higher education is an investment students make in themselves and their future. Our government will—

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Question?

Ms. Marit Stiles: That response just shows you again that this government is not listening to students or families. If the Premier had listened to students in Ontario, he would have heard from the thousands who are dropping out of school because of his OSAP cuts: regular working people whose plans are shot, whose choices are either drop out now or take on decades of debt.

While he's jetting off to the US to get a free degree—which is, by the way, nice for him, but not so nice for the people of Ontario who are footing the bill for that—here's the kicker: We have record unemployment for youth in the province of Ontario. Some 700,000 Ontarians are unemployed right now, and it is one in five young people.

So tell us, Premier: When are you going to stand up for students here at home and reverse your OSAP cuts?

Mr. Lorne Coe: Speaker, when we took office, Ontario had the highest tuition in Canada, a direct result of the previous Liberal government hiking tuition by 48%. Now, our government cut tuition by 10%, and we froze it, making post-secondary education more affordable for students and hard-working families across the province.

Now the landscape has changed, largely because of destabilizing federal policy decisions that have shaken the post-secondary systems across Canada. That's why we're allowing institutions to increase tuition by up to 2%, keeping Ontario among the lowest tuition growth rates in the country.

And let me be clear, absolutely clear: Low-income students will see this increase fully covered through our enhanced student access guarantee, ensuring—

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Back to the Leader of the Opposition.

HOSPITAL FUNDING

Ms. Marit Stiles: Well, Speaker, I tell you, the people of Ontario are not buying that.

I want to go back to the Premier again, because this Premier ran on a promise to end Liberal-era hallway health care. They were calling it, at the time, an epidemic, and we knew at the time, of course: staff stretched too thin, patients receiving care in hallways.

Eight years later, it is so much worse. Patients are not only being treated in hallways, but now they are being treated in broom closets. There are twice as many people being treated in hallways than there were when this government, when this Premier, took office. So why has the Premier let hallway health care become twice as bad under his watch?

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): The Minister of Health.

Hon. Sylvia Jones: I'm happy to speak about the investments we've been able to make across our health care system, whether it is a \$3.4-billion enhancement to primary care—

Interjections.

Hon. Sylvia Jones: In the last year alone, we have seen 330,000 people who didn't have a primary care provider, who now have that primary care provider.

Even as Ontario's population increases, we have seen investments in our hospital systems where, currently, we have already added 3,500 new hospital beds to our hospital system, but we are on track to actually add an additional 3,000 hospital beds to our hospital system.

Those changes make a difference to the people of Ontario, and we're going to continue to do that work.

Ms. Marit Stiles: Well, I've got to say, tell that to the people of Clinton. The hospital in Clinton was closed again last weekend. They had the worst record of closures in the province last year, and the people there—let's be very clear: the health care workers on the front line are doing their very best to make it work, but the government has done nothing to help them.

People are sitting in emergency rooms right now for 10 hours, 12 hours, 18 hours, only to look up and see some ad on the TV gaslighting them, telling them how this government is fixing the problem. He can't convince them, this Premier, with ads when they are experiencing these delays themselves.

So will the government stop gaslighting Ontarians and actually fix the—

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Will the member withdraw? I'll ask the member to withdraw.

Ms. Marit Stiles: Withdraw.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): The Minister of Health.

Hon. Sylvia Jones: I'm sure eventually they'll figure out which side of the issue they want to be on.

Listen, we have done scope of practice expansions where now we have seen 2.4 million people access primary care options outside of a hospital system. Why does that matter to hospitals? Because it means that those less acute patients have options. They don't always have to go to an emergency department. They can go to other primary care providers. They can go to their local pharmacy. And since we've put that policy in effect, we've seen 2.4 million people accessing those scope of practice changes.

Those are the innovations that we're doing. We're working directly with clinicians to make sure that people have opportunities outside of their local hospitals, which will continue to provide world-class care. But they have to provide and be available to provide acute care.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Back to the Leader of the Opposition.

Ms. Marit Stiles: Back to the Premier: The people have figured you out. While people are waiting in crowded emergency rooms, this Premier is fixated with buying himself a private luxury jet. While people are waiting days, weeks, months for surgeries, the Premier is focused on hiding his phone records.

How has this Premier and this government become so out of touch with the experience of Ontarians?

Hon. Sylvia Jones: How do the NDP members look at themselves and say, "We are going to privately advocate for community paramedicine, for ensuring that there are options for cataract surgery outside of hospitals," but then, when they come in here and actually vote for those initiatives, they vote against them?

Speaker, on a weekly basis, I am getting lobbied by NDP members asking for enhancements and expansions in their communities, whether it's youth wellness hubs, whether it's a HART hub, whether it is individual items that they actually vote against when they come forward for debate and discussion. But then they come and lobby me for them. Which is it? Do you want the enhancements in your community, or do you want to keep sticking with the status quo? I know where our government is going.

GOVERNMENT JET

Mr. John Fraser: My question is for the President of the Treasury Board. Here is what we know about the Premier's purchase of a \$29-million luxury jet: The Premier bought a jet, and then he told us he sold it—no details, no receipts. That's it—nothing, only the Premier saying, "Trust me." That's not good enough. It's been two weeks—two weeks, no details.

So my question is simple, to the President of the Treasury Board: Can you produce some receipts, and if not, what are you hiding?

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): The Minister of Finance.

Interjections.

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: Thank you for that applause from the other side.

Madam Speaker, I think the Premier was clear on this. I've been clear. The House leader has been clear.

A bit of a shout-out to our House leader, the great MPP for Leeds–Grenville–Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes: I was in his community not that long ago, and he took me to Alan Browns. And Alan Browns, on the corner—beautiful. If you've ever been to Brockville—a small business in Brockville. I got this tie. I just happen to be wearing this tie today from Alan Browns in Brockville. And do you know what he's benefiting from? A small business tax cut of 30%. That's what the people of Ontario care about. That's what they're focused on. Some 375,000 jobs will benefit from that tax cut. It would have been good if the member opposite had supported that tax cut.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): The leader of the third party.

Mr. John Fraser: Back to the President of the Treasury Board—but I have to say, I know the government House leader was so happy that he didn't have to join the conga line that the cabinet was in approving this luxury private jet.

Judging by the minister's response, we all know how this went down at the Treasury Board, right? The silence speaks all.

1100

Two weeks ago, we learned that the Premier bought himself a luxury private jet. Now, that would have had to go to Treasury Board. It's a big-ticket item. He can't expense it, so it had to come to Treasury Board.

So a simple question to the President of the Treasury Board: When did the luxury private jet purchase first come to Treasury Board?

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: Same answer, Madam Speaker—same answer. The Premier was clear: He listened to the people, and we've moved forward.

You know what we are doing for the people of Ontario? We are building Ontario. The infrastructure plan: \$236 billion of infrastructure money. You know what that does, Madam Speaker? It would be good for the member opposite to listen. You know what that money does? That puts hundreds of thousands of people to work in this great province, building schools, building hospitals, building highways, building transit, building long-term-care facilities. Madam Speaker, is that not what the people of Ontario want from their government? Put them to work, build Ontario and support this province.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Leader of the third party.

Mr. John Fraser: Everybody on this front bench, except for the government House leader, said, "Yes, Premier. You deserve a luxury private jet." And right now, Ontarians—well, they're just struggling to pay the bills, buy groceries, gas, pay the rent, kids' clothes. They need to know the details of this extravagant purchase of a luxury private jet—\$29 million. They need the receipts. I think that's fair.

Maybe the President of the Treasury Board can answer this question: Does she agree with the Premier while he's

still saying that buying the luxury private jet was the right thing to do?

Interjection.

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: Thank you, Minister, first off, for that round of applause.

Madam Speaker, I work day-in, day-out with the President of the Treasury Board. I used to be the President of the Treasury Board. This is the best President of the Treasury Board this government has had, right? Right, okay. We have got a consensus here. She works tirelessly day-in, day-out, protecting taxpayers' money.

That is why we were able to publish a deficit—one of the lowest deficits in the land; and if you look across the globe, one of the lowest deficits relative to GDP in the developed world. It's not "either/or," it's "and." You're able to be fiscally responsible while investing in the infrastructure spend in this province, while building hospitals and schools, while investing in tax cuts for the hard-working people, the hard-working businesses of this province.

Madam Speaker, we're moving Ontario forward. It's time for them over there to join us moving Ontario forward.

GOVERNMENT JET

Mr. John Fraser: Speaker, back to the President of the Treasury Board—but the finance minister is not asking us to move ahead; they are asking everybody to move on from the luxury private jet, the purchase. They're saying, "Just move on. Nothing to see here." There is lots to see here.

To the President of the Treasury Board: You don't get to spend \$29 million of taxpayers' money in an affordability crisis—or at any time—without any receipts, without any documents, without anybody answering one single question about this.

So simple question, President of the Treasury Board or anybody else who can answer: Will you table the documents related to the purchase of the luxury private jet today?

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Minister of Finance.

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: Madam Speaker, what we are tabling is a plan for Ontario, which includes an HST cut of 13% to get more houses built in Ontario.

You had the opportunity to support that tax cut—and they did not support that tax cut. You know what that is doing? That is making housing more affordable. It's putting 21,000 construction workers to work on those new house builds. Almost \$3 billion additional GDP to the province of Ontario and they said no—can you imagine? They said no to that.

I have got the great Minister of Housing right behind me, and he's telling me that housing starts and housing activity are booming right now in this province because of our actions.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Leader of the third party.

Mr. John Fraser: We know nothing about this. Who did we buy it from? Who are we actually selling it back to? How much does it cost to operate? Did we hire some pilots? What was the business plan? How was it procured?

Whose idea was it? Well, we know it was the Premier's idea. Every time I mentioned the luxury private jet, I see a bunch of eyes go dead over there, so I'm not sure that everybody over there thinks it was a good idea. I'd just like somebody over there to stand up and say, "You know what? It wasn't a good idea, but we did it anyway because the boss asked for it."

Once again, back to the President of the Treasury Board: Will you provide the receipts? Will you table the details around the purchase of the luxury private jet today?

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Minister of Finance.

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: Thank you again to the member opposite for that question. We're very clear: What are the people of Ontario asking us in our ridings? They want good jobs. They want us to move the economy forward. That's why we have a plan. Let's start with the Minister of Energy and Mines: a plan to build energy right across the province; building an energy superpower; \$800 billion in extra GDP; 150,000 new construction jobs, including in my riding of Pickering. Thank you to the Minister of Energy for that vision.

While we're at it, why don't we talk about critical minerals as well? That same minister is getting permits for shovels in the ground right across the province because we have what the world needs right here in Ontario. And while we're at it, why don't we talk about all of the infrastructure, the \$236 billion of infrastructure?

Why don't you stand up and support Ontarians in the construction industry, in housing and beyond?

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Leader of the third party.

Mr. John Fraser: If you're out of work in Windsor, Thunder Bay, Sault Ste. Marie, Amherstburg or Kingston—I could go on and on—you're saying to yourself, "I don't know what I'm going to do next." Then you see the Premier buying a luxury private jet, right? What do you think? They're not worried about moving forward; they're wondering what's in the Premier's head—what's in all of your heads—since apparently you all thought it was a great idea. That's what they want to know. Just provide the receipts. If it was such a good idea, why can't you be transparent about it?

Speaker, my question, through you, is, if the President of the Treasury Board can't provide the receipts, can she tell us what we're all supposed to do?

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Minister of Finance.

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: The member opposite and all those in the opposition had the opportunity to vote for Bill 97, which was our plan to build Ontario, our budget, and they voted against it.

Let me tell you what they voted against. They voted against tax cuts—tax cuts for small businesses, tax cuts for HST for building houses, tax cuts for corporations to hire more people. They voted against \$236 billion of infrastructure spending. They voted against hiring and supporting labour, retraining and reskilling. They voted against supporting colleges and universities—\$6.4 billion. They just voted against all of it.

Madam Speaker, we had 15 years when nothing got built. They taxed everything and built nothing. This government is cutting taxes and building everything.

LAND USE PLANNING

Mr. Chris Glover: My question is to the Premier. On March 12, the Premier said "the federal government is on board" when he announced he wanted to seize Billy Bishop airport. When did the Premier and Prime Minister Carney begin negotiations to plan the seizure of the Billy Bishop airport, the Toronto Islands and Toronto parks?

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Minister of Transportation.

Hon. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria: As I said yesterday, when you look across this country, leaders across the country and the province are looking to build legacy infrastructure. When you look at Billy Bishop airport, you have a group of individuals like the NDP that want to shut it down. They want to shut two million passengers out of air travel and access. They want to shut down access to northern Ontario airports.

This is a generational project. When we look across the world, leading jurisdictions, whether that's New York, Chicago, London, have multiple airports. It makes them more competitive. This project will bring thousands of jobs online for future generations of this province. Today, 4,900 people rely on Billy Bishop for a job. We're going to continue to ensure its longevity in Toronto and its importance as an asset not only to this province and city but also this country.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Member for Spadina–Fort York.

Mr. Chris Glover: This Premier's legacy is a private jet. This Premier's legacy is a \$2.2-billion Ontario Place scandal, the closure of the science centre and all of the real estate scandals, along the 413 and the Bradford Bypass. That's this Premier's legacy, and it looks like the seizure of Billy Bishop airport is yet another billion-dollar boondoggle on the waterfront.

1110

So while the Premier is obsessing over airports and his private luxury jet, residents in places in Toronto—in places like Scarborough—have less transit since the closure of Line 3 three years ago. They face unaffordable rents and long wait times in hospitals. So why are there tax dollars for yet another real estate scandal along the waterfront but not for housing, health care and education?

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): The Minister of Transportation.

Hon. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria: We were elected because the status quo was not acceptable. This Premier, our government, were elected on a mandate to build. Every single time, whether it be Billy Bishop, a generational investment; whether it be the Ontario Line, the largest public infrastructure investment in this country's history, the NDP and the opposition have stood in the way of that progress. Whether it's the 413 or the Bradford Bypass—projects that will create thousands of jobs for people across

this province—the NDP and Liberals have found every excuse to try to stall it, whether it's through legislation that has been brought forward in this House.

Madam Speaker, we were elected on a mandate to build, and that's exactly what we're doing. Whether it's Billy Bishop, whether it's the Ontario Line, the Scarborough line, the Yonge North subway extension, whether it's the 413 or Bradford Bypass, we're getting shovels in the ground and we're building for the future.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Jonathan Tsao: My question is to the Solicitor General. Conservatives love to talk tough on crime, but, as we all know, talk is cheap. The reality is, this government has lost control and criminals are running free. Over 150 prisoners have gone missing under their watch, and five—five—are still at large on our streets right now. And what has this government done? Absolutely nothing. Deny, deflect, distract: That's all this government knows how to do.

So my question to the minister: Why is this government hiding who these escaped criminals are and what crimes they committed?

Hon. Michael S. Kerzner: Quite the contrary, we've done a lot. We inherited a problem, but we didn't accept it, so we're fixing it. And I'll tell the member opposite everything we've done: hired over 3,300 new correctional officers, brought thousands of new spaces online, and, unlike the prior government, we actually tell people where and when these spaces will open.

But wait, there's more. We did something else, Madam Speaker. We put a rigorous program of oversight in place, where the courts speak to the correctional institutions every single day in real time to minimize any improper release. And if there is an improper release—and we're going to bring that number to zero—the police will issue a public safety announcement. Do you know why they do it? Not to panic our public, but to keep them safe.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Back to the member for Don Valley North.

Mr. Jonathan Tsao: This answer speaks for itself. The minister can't even tell us if more have gone missing. Are there more prisoners on the street right now? He can't even tell us—or he won't even tell us.

Speaker, these are criminals. Criminals belong behind bars, not on our streets. This is about public safety. This is about the safety of our kids, our parents and our grandchildren, the people we love, the people you promised to protect. After eight long years, this tired, out-of-touch Conservative government is clearly more interested in buying themselves private luxury jets and living the high life while our families live in fear.

So I'll ask the minister again: Will he commit—yes or no—to releasing full details about the missing prisoners so Ontarians can protect themselves? Because clearly he's not interested in doing that.

Hon. Michael S. Kerzner: Notwithstanding the fact that under the Liberal watch, over 2,000 beds were taken offline in their reign of closing seven jails that they don't

talk about, we decided that, in order to protect Ontario, we will add more spaces and hire thousands of new correctional officers.

But we'll do something else: We'll be a tough, law-and-order government, unlike the Liberals that pandered to the criminals—they pandered to them. They had a revolving door. They never once advocated for bail reform, even when they had the chance, and do you know why? Because they believe that it's better to be soft on crime. That's how you keep people safe.

We don't agree with it. We will be tough on crime. Our actions will speak loud, and our words will be great.

RED TAPE REDUCTION

Ms. Effie J. Triantafilopoulos: Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Red Tape Reduction. Protecting Ontario means ensuring our economy is strong, competitive and resilient, especially in these economic times. Under the previous Liberal government, propped up by the NDP, red tape piled up, permits stalled and investment ground to a halt. They had years to fix it, and they failed. That is why our government is taking a hard look at how long permits take and where outdated processes are delaying projects and costing jobs.

Speaker, can the minister explain how the Protecting Ontario's Workers and Economic Resilience Act, if passed, will deliver targeted red tape reduction while at the same time supporting workers and keeping Ontario's economy strong, competitive and resilient?

Hon. Andrea Khanjin: Thank you to the great member from Oakville North—Burlington for the hard work she not only does in her riding but the great work she did in trade law, which positions her very well when it comes to reducing interprovincial trade barriers that add red tape.

Speaker, it's this government, under the leadership of Premier Ford, that's bringing forth a common-sense approach when it comes to red tape reduction so we can get projects off the ground faster, so we can get people employed faster. We can go from an economy that the Liberals left us of reliance to an economy of resilience, especially in unprecedented times.

It's through our Team Ontario approach, through the work we've done with our ministry of forests, which is bringing the forestry sector and reducing red tape when it comes to innovation and technology. Whether it's the work our minister of mines is doing to unleash our full economic potential of critical minerals, or our Minister of Health, who's making sure we put patients above paperwork, Speaker, we will not stop reducing red tape, making sure we have a competitive economy.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Back to the member for Oakville North—Burlington.

Ms. Effie J. Triantafilopoulos: Thank you to the minister for that great answer. The opposition often dismisses the importance of red tape reduction, even though small businesses and workers see the difference on the ground. Under the previous Liberal government, propped up by the NDP, businesses fled Ontario, jobs vanished and paper-

work exploded. Ontario became a cautionary tale, and families and workers paid the price.

Under Premier Ford's leadership, we are cutting bureaucracy, restoring confidence and getting shovels in the ground. Speaker, can the minister outline the real results of our red tape reduction efforts and explain how Ontario's business community is responding?

Hon. Andrea Khanjin: It was under the Liberal government that the Canadian Federation of Independent Business gave them a C-, the lowest grade when it comes to red tape reduction. Under leadership of this Premier and this government, that grade is now an A.

Speaker, under the Liberals, Ontario was the regulatory capital of Canada. Under Premier Ford, Ontario is now the lowest place in regulatory burden in order to do business. Under the Liberals, they cost individual businesses \$33,000 a year. That was \$4,000 more annually than any other province in red tape burden. But under this government, under this Premier, we're saving people and businesses \$1.3 billion annually and saving them 1.8 million working hours.

Speaker, what does that mean? It means more time and money for folks to put into their communities, into their businesses and growing our economy so we can be the most competitive in the G7.

INDIGENOUS COMMUNITY SAFETY

MPP Alexa Gilmour: Speaker, red dresses are hanging from trees, windowsills and lapels today. Each represents an Indigenous woman, girl or two-spirited person who should be with us. There are over 4,000 missing or murdered since 1954—mothers, aunties, sisters, daughters, children whose lives were lost to violence and the legacy of colonialism.

1120

Indigenous leaders are calling on us for a red dress alert system. They are asking the government to save lives and bring home the missing. Manitoba has already. When will the Premier implement the red dress alert in Ontario?

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Minister of Indigenous Affairs.

Hon. Greg Rickford: I appreciate the honourable member's question. This government, since March 2024, in light of various reports, has taken bold action to protect missing and murdered Indigenous women's legacy moving forward. It has included \$13.5 million over three years to enhance support for women, children, youth, Indigenous and racialized communities who are particularly at risk of violence and exploitation.

It builds on a previous investment of \$1.4 billion that includes care units across this province, including one in Kenora for trauma-informed supports for Indigenous children and youth. It includes victim quick response programs, particularly with respect to communities where First Nations populations are higher, and expanding outreach to children in the welfare system, linking them with appropriate educational supports to—

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Back to the member for Parkdale—High Park.

MPP Alexa Gilmour: In addition to the pieces that my colleague has mentioned, the red dress alert would help women across the province. It would cost \$1.3 million, one twenty-ninth of what the airport jet would cost.

Speaker, Indigenous women, girls and two-spirit people are 12 times more likely to be murdered or go missing, and in the last decade, nearly 500 Indigenous women and girls were the victim of homicide. An Indigenous-led red dress alert system would help end this crisis—\$1.3 million.

This government has failed to meet so many of the commitments to First Nations, Inuit and Métis. How can this government wait any longer on the red dress alert?

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): I recognize the Associate Minister of Women's Social and Economic Opportunity.

Hon. Charmaine A. Williams: Madam Speaker, let us be clear: The tragedy of violence towards Indigenous women, girls and two-spirit people must be met with real solutions. We don't believe in speaking for Indigenous women; we believe in speaking with Indigenous women and making sure that their voices are at the forefront of the discussions and the decisions that we are making together.

That's why we have the Indigenous Women's Advisory Council. We meet four times a year with Indigenous women from across the province to come up with the solutions that we need to have. We've created Pathways to Safety, which is Ontario's response and strategy to address the calls for justice in the final report of the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls. The women around this council work with us, and we've committed millions of dollars, like the \$121 million in the Indigenous Healing and Wellness Strategy.

We are going to continue to work together—

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Question?

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Ms. Lee Fairclough: Speaker, as of last February, the Premier and I have something in common: We both represent the good people of Etobicoke in this Legislature. And I can tell you, in Etobicoke—Lakeshore, there is no comparison to any other issue, when I measure the volume of emails or phone calls I have received, over the Premier's decision to gut the freedom-of-information law, especially retroactive to 1988, to avoid a court order. My constituents are telling me they are angry and frustrated because they believe that in a democracy, no one is above the law.

Through the Speaker, my question to the Premier: What is he trying to hide from the people of Etobicoke and all the other people across this province?

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): The Minister of Public and Business Service Delivery.

Hon. Stephen Crawford: I want to be very clear that we're modernizing legislation that's almost 40 years old. The legislation that pre-dates what we just updated in the budget was written before cloud computing. It was written before text messaging, cellphones, anything like that, so these things were not contemplated.

What I can say is that all government decision-making is open, transparent—you have full accessibility. Cabinet confidentiality will remain as such, as it should, as it does in just about every jurisdiction in Canada and other Westminster democracies. Take a look around: New Zealand, Australia, UK—it's no different.

In fact, your federal cousins in Ottawa—perhaps you should knock on their door and ask them to change the law, if you're so upset with it.

Speaker, I'll have more to say in the supplementary.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): The member for Etobicoke–Lakeshore.

Ms. Lee Fairclough: I know that the team across the aisle likes polls. According to one poll, nearly three quarters of Ontarians oppose allowing the government to apply changes to the freedom-of-information laws in a way that will block access to records already requested or before the courts.

Through the Speaker: Premier, do you believe that three out of four people in Ontario are wrong?

Hon. Stephen Crawford: What I believe is that Ontarians are concerned with Trump's tariffs, with the economy, and they question why would the opposition not support the budget.

What we're doing in the budget that we just passed a few weeks ago: We're supporting consumers with a ticket resales cap. We're supporting them with a small business tax cut. We're supporting them with record investments in colleges and universities and an HST tax reduction. That's what we're doing.

Speaker, we're focused on the economy, on building jobs, bringing a million jobs back to Ontario since 2018. We're proud of that record. We're going to continue focusing on attracting investments, travelling the world, as our Minister of Economic Development does, to bring investment here, because we know the most important thing that Ontarians care about right now is affordability and economic growth, and we're going to continue on that path.

HOUSING

Mr. Mike Schreiner: My question is for the Premier. On behalf of people struggling to pay the rent, buy a home or even have a safe place to sleep tonight, during the worst housing crisis in Ontario's history, I'm pleading with the Premier to stop standing in the way of building affordable homes.

It's bad enough that the Premier says no to legalizing multiplexes and mid-rises so we can quickly build affordable homes; now we learn that his obsession with private jets and expanding Toronto's island airport could result in 40,000 fewer homes being built on the city's waterfront.

The island airport terminal is owned by a company controlled by J.P. Morgan—one of the largest banks in the world. Speaker, can the Premier explain why American corporate profits are more important than building homes that everyday Ontarians can afford?

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): I recognize the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

Hon. Rob Flack: I'm happy to answer that question. In fact, when you take a look at housing starts year to date, you will see they're up significantly year over year. Why, Speaker? Because we're creating the conditions to get more homes built faster. That does not include the impact of the HST and the DC relief program that's going to be coming down the pipe here: \$8.8 billion.

What's important about the housing sector in this province is that we've protected 100,000 jobs by reducing the HST—100,000 jobs. That's what this is all about: A rising tide lifts all boats.

Our economy is strong. It's going to get stronger thanks to initiatives in the budget that just passed. We're getting it done, Speaker.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I have a lot of respect for the minister. I want to congratulate him on being a grandpa. But I'm wondering if he actually read the budget, because the budget document clearly shows that housing starts are at historic lows in the province of Ontario.

We have a whole generation of young people wondering if they'll ever own a home. We have rent—nobody with a full-time, minimum-wage job can afford average monthly rent anywhere in Ontario. We have the largest number of people experiencing homelessness in the province's history. And now 40,000—think of that, Speaker, 40,000—affordable homes are at risk because the Premier wants to land a private jet at an expanded Toronto Island airport.

1130

We know that the airport terminal is owned by large American banks, so I wonder why the Premier wants to prioritize the bankers at J.P. Morgan over homes that everyday Ontarians can afford.

Hon. Rob Flack: Let's cut to the chase here: Rental costs in this province are down. They're at a record low in the last number of years—fact. Secondly, rental starts are up last year, year over year: 24,000 units, up 51,000 units over the last three years—fact. Rents are coming down. Why, Speaker? Because we reduced the HST on purpose-built rentals. That's creating affordability.

As to new starts, yes, we've had a housing crisis; we still do. But you know what? Housing starts are up in this province. It is a fact. Just talking to a large builder this morning, since the HST announcement, we have seen an additional 500 sales from this one builder alone—500 new sales that would not have taken place had we not cut the HST.

We're creating the conditions to get more homes built faster. We're going to continue on that path.

ENERGY POLICIES

Mr. Will Bouma: My question is for the Minister of Energy and Mines. Speaker, as part of our plan to protect Ontario, we are delivering the affordable, reliable and clean energy needed to build homes and power the most competitive economy in the G7.

In August 2024, we launched the largest competitive procurement for new electricity in Ontario's history. Through that process, our government has secured more than 1,300 megawatts of new supply through 14 projects across our province. This is a major step forward to meet growing demand while keeping costs down for businesses and for families.

Speaker, can the minister please share with this House how this procurement is delivering better value for Ontario ratepayers?

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): I recognize the member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. David Smith: Thank you to the member from Brantford–Brant for the question. Our plan is simple: Keep costs down and keep lights on here in Ontario. That is exactly what this procurement delivers.

By using competition, we are securing new electricity at prices as low as 73%, way better than the previous Liberal government contracts. That means real savings for families and businesses across Ontario. Our results are among the most competitive in North America, coming in lower than procurement from Quebec, British Columbia and New York state.

Unlike the Liberals, who relied on expensive sole-source deals, we are following the Auditor General's advice and delivering better value through competition. That is how we are keeping energy affordable while building new power in Ontario.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Back to the member for Brantford–Brant.

Mr. Will Bouma: Thank you to the parliamentary assistant for that answer.

Speaker, as we continue building a stronger, more self-reliant economy, our government is taking action to expand electricity infrastructure in northern Ontario. The Red Lake transmission line has now been declared a priority project, with Hydro One designated to move it forward. This project will play a critical role in connecting communities, supporting mining development and unlocking economic growth in the north. Reliable electricity is essential to creating jobs and attracting investment.

Through you, Speaker, can the parliamentary assistant explain how this project will support economic growth and strengthen northern communities?

Mr. David Smith: The Red Lake transmission line is a critical investment in Ontario's future. This new 162-kilometre line will help keep power on and is one of the most promising mining regions in all of Canada, supporting 5,800 jobs and generating over \$830 million in economic activity. It will connect communities, enable new mining developments and support long-term growth across northern Ontario.

We are also launching the new hydro program to ensure communities have access to clean, reliable and affordable energy. Demand in the Red Lake region is expected to significantly increase in the years ahead, driving new mines and expanding communities.

Unlike the previous Liberal government, which delayed projects and held back development, we are taking action

to build infrastructure in Ontario. That means job growth and opportunity, especially in the north.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Ms. Marit Stiles: This question is for the Premier. Over 200 greenbelt records were stopped dead in their tracks from coming out. The Premier's phone records court case has now collapsed. Why? Because this government made freedom-of-information law changes in the dead of night, under cover of darkness.

My question to the Premier is very simple: Did the Premier change the laws of this province to evade his day in court?

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): I recognize the Minister of Public and Business Service Delivery and Procurement.

Hon. Stephen Crawford: Let's be quite frank here: The member of the opposition is quite off base in what she says. This was debated in the House. In fact, on March 13—almost two months ago—we had a public press conference detailing what we were doing in modernizing legislation and bringing it into the 21st century, lining up with other jurisdictions, including NDP British Columbia, including NDP Manitoba, the federal government—it's no different.

What we're doing is modernizing the privacy framework, Speaker. And what we're also doing is modernizing the cyber security services for the broader public sector. That's not spoken about much, but I think it needs to be known. I don't know where the member stands on that, but we're mandating cyber maturity assessments and privacy for students in schools. This is something we're very proud about. I'll have more to say in the supplementary.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): The Leader of the Opposition.

Ms. Marit Stiles: Well, Speaker, respectfully, what's different is that this government and this Premier are under criminal investigation by the RCMP for these very matters. That's the difference.

And respectfully, Speaker, hiding the Premier's texts is not creating a single new job in the province of Ontario. Hiding calendar records of meetings with developers is not making groceries more affordable for regular people. Buying a luxury jet is not bringing down the price of gas one bit.

So I want to ask the Premier once again: Did the Premier change the laws of this province to cover his own records?

Hon. Stephen Crawford: I'll tell you what the Premier of this province has done: He's given his phone number out to the people of Ontario dozens and dozens of times. I encourage the Leader of the Opposition: Put your phone number on the public record so you can hear from the people. What are you afraid of? Are you afraid to hear what the people are saying?

Speaker, we want to hear what the people are saying. And the people right now, they care about affordability and they care about the economy. We've got legislation in

motion. We're making changes, expanding Billy Bishop Airport to expand the economic growth of the province and the city of Toronto. We're cutting taxes for small businesses so small businesses will have more money in their pockets. We're enhancing and supporting investments across the world, globally, to attract them here. We're creating the environment for investment to flourish, so we can continue fighting against the unjust tariffs from the US, and we'll continue without exception to focus on the economic growth—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): The Leader of the Opposition has been warned.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr. Stephen Blais: My question is for the Minister of Education. Madam Speaker, parents in Ottawa have some basic expectations. They expect clean classrooms, they expect safe buildings and they expect, when their child turns on the tap at school, that the water will be safe to drink.

But across the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board, multiple schools have reported dangerous levels of lead in drinking water. And today, we learn that while they're still managing those risks, the board is planning to lay off custodians and tradespeople, the very men and women who are charged with maintaining and cleaning our schools. At the exact moment when parents and the system need confidence to be restored, the government is allowing people to be laid off.

1140

Madam Speaker, at a time when Ottawa schools are dealing with water safety issues, how can the government justify cutting the very staff who maintain these schools?

Hon. Paul Calandra: Madam Speaker, I think the member actually has his facts wrong. Of course, across the province of Ontario, we're making significant investments in schools. In fact, just last week, we announced a historic, frankly, \$1.6-billion investment in schools, which is about 179 new schools which will be built across the province of Ontario.

Of course, that compares favourably, because the Liberals, as you all recall, were closing schools across the province of Ontario. While they were closing them, we are building them.

Part of that is also upgrading 132 other schools. Every part of this province is receiving either a new build or repair.

It also includes over 10,000 child care spaces, Madam Speaker. Now, what this means is better facilities for our students, state-of-the-art facilities for our teachers to teach in. But it also means thousands of jobs as we've accelerated the pace of construction across the province of Ontario so that we can keep more people working in every part of the province.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Member for Orléans.

Mr. Stephen Blais: Again, to the Minister of Education: Clean classrooms, safe buildings, water parents can

trust—these are the basics that confidence is based on, Madam Speaker. But in Ottawa, that confidence is shaken. Schools have unsafe levels of lead in the drinking water, posing real health concerns for their kids, and parents are rightly concerned about that.

Custodians who work late into the night to keep schools clean, to ensure that they're safe—safe for learning, safe for community use—are the very people that this government is allowing to be laid off by the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board.

How can parents have confidence in school safety when the government is allowing cuts to the very men and women who are charged with keeping our schools clean and safe?

Hon. Paul Calandra: I'll agree with the member on one thing: Trust in Ottawa was hard to come by when the trustees were in charge of that system, Madam Speaker.

In fact, parents were in an absolute uproar because of the changes that trustees had been proposing that they were not in agreement with and that they had not been consulted on. And parents were showing that disfavoured: Over a thousand of their kids were going to the Catholic system in Ottawa. Now we're starting to see a reverse of that trend as the supervisor in that area starts to bring back confidence. There is obviously less infighting that is happening in that system.

We're building on that by building new schools in Ottawa. In the member's own community, there will be some new schools. But it's also 179 additional schools with over \$1.6 billion across the province of Ontario, 10,000 child care spaces so that more people can have access to a space, Madam Speaker. It's thousands of jobs being created as we build these new schools.

While they were closing schools, we're building new spaces for our teachers, students and parents so that we can have state-of-the-art facilities and we can unleash the economic activity that is so important in so many parts of this province.

INDIGENOUS ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mrs. Michelle Cooper: My question is for the Minister of Indigenous Affairs and First Nations Economic Reconciliation. At recent gatherings like the First Nations Major Projects Coalition Conference, we heard a clear message: Economic reconciliation is no longer just about participation but about ownership, equity and long-term prosperity for First Nations communities.

At the same time as global demand for critical minerals continues to grow, jurisdictions are competing not just on resources but on the strength of their partnerships and their ability to deliver major projects. Here in Ontario, we are seeing a model take shape that brings together infrastructure, investment and First Nations leadership to move projects forward.

Speaker, can the minister explain how our government is supporting First Nations to take on greater ownership—

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): I recognize the minister.

Hon. Greg Rickford: I want to thank the member for her question and the work she does in her riding and in our caucus.

Part of that message at the First Nations Major Projects Coalition came from our Premier. He spoke clearly and unequivocally about his leadership and this government's commitment to First Nations businesses. It's why, for the second consecutive year, the conference was held in Toronto. As was discussed, they know that Toronto leads the country and the world in mining, in banking, in financing, and also that it generates more than a third of our gross domestic product for the country.

First Nations business groups are responding. The Canadian council of Aboriginal business wants to set up and is advancing a centre for innovation and entrepreneurship. Big companies, like Bird Construction, are entering into shareholder agreements with Marten Falls First Nations for the work that's going to be done in the Ring of Fire.

Madam Speaker, it's clear: First Nations economic opportunities are here and now. They represent incredible opportunities for employment for First Nations in northern Ontario and, in fact, across this province. We're ready, and so are—

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Back to the member.

Mrs. Michelle Cooper: We are starting to see the kind of economic opportunities that take shape that the minister has been speaking about. These opportunities go above and beyond participation and move towards real ownership and leadership by First Nations communities.

This is about building long-term capacity, creating jobs and ensuring communities are well positioned to benefit directly from development in their regions.

Through you, Speaker, can the minister share how partnerships on the ground are helping First Nations communities take on a greater leadership role in infrastructure and economic development tied to the Ring of Fire?

Hon. Greg Rickford: Under the leadership of this Premier, we have seen a number of concrete examples where First Nations communities and First Nations businesses are pairing up with other companies to create local opportunities which represent surges in their respective areas—focused, in particular, on critical minerals.

I'm thinking of the Berens River bridge and Pikangikum First Nations's leadership in building that, which will unleash the potential to the Whitefeather Forest Initiative for sustainable forest development and to Frontier Lithium's mining operations farther north.

The Keewaytinook corner fuel station represents a cluster—or a clowder—of businesses and First Nations communities operating for communities that are heading farther north where development is taking place.

In Greenstone, I've spoken before about Migizi Plaza. Esso and A&W are examples of businesses which will be owned and operated in commercial plazas designed to serve greater capacity, economic—

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Thank you.

NOTICE OF DISSATISFACTION

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Pursuant to standing order 36(a), the member for Orléans has given a notice of dissatisfaction with the answer to the question given by the Minister of Education regarding staff cuts in Ottawa. This matter will be debated today following private members' public business.

There being no further business, this House stands in recess until 3 p.m.

The House recessed from 1148 to 1500.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MPP George Darouze: Today we welcome representatives from Asthma Canada visiting the Legislature: Rachel Anne Normand from Ottawa, a dedicated patient advocate for her son Jacob, who lives with severe asthma; and Josh Rheume. Please join me in welcoming our guests.

INTRODUCTION OF GOVERNMENT BILLS

HST RELIEF IMPLEMENTATION ACT (RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY REBATES), 2026

LOI DE 2026 SUR LA MISE EN OEUVRE DE L'ALLÈGEMENT DE LA TVH (REMISES RELATIVES AUX BIENS RÉSIDENTIELS)

Mr. Bethlenfalvy moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 114, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act to enable credits and payments to be made respecting certain tax paid or payable in respect of residential property and to provide for other related matters / Projet de loi 114, Loi modifiant la Loi sur la taxe de vente au détail pour permettre l'octroi de crédits et le versement de paiements relativement à la taxe payée ou payable à l'égard de biens résidentiels et pour traiter d'autres questions connexes.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

First reading agreed to.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Would the minister like to explain the bill?

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: Thank you for the opportunity. This should only take about 30 minutes.

The legislation I'm introducing today, the HST Relief Implementation Act (Residential Property Rebates), 2026, would, if passed, provide greater clarity and certainty for Ontario's building and construction industry and, for homebuyers, support faster construction timelines and more affordable new housing. If passed, these legislative changes and related measures would help deliver meaningful savings for families across the province.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

JULIAN PEPPER CAPITAL INC.
ACT, 2026

Ms. Dixon moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr52, An Act to revive Julian Pepper Capital Inc.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Is it the pleasure of the House that this motion carry? Carried.

First reading agreed to.

BLACK HEALTH EQUITY ACT, 2026

LOI DE 2026 SUR L'ÉQUITÉ EN MATIÈRE
DE SANTÉ POUR LES NOIRS

Madame Gélinas moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 115, An Act respecting health equity for Black Ontarians / Projet de loi 115, Loi concernant l'équité en matière de santé pour les Ontariennes et Ontariens noirs.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Is it the pleasure of the House that this motion carry? Carried.

First reading agreed to.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Would the member like to speak to the bill?

M^{me} France Gélinas: This bill is co-sponsored by the MPP for Hamilton Centre, the MPP for Humber River–Black Creek, as well as the MPP for Toronto Centre.

Basically, we have a very good health care system in Ontario. We have to make sure that it treats everybody equally. For many years now—you'll remember, when MPP Jill Andrew was here, we brought the race-based data bill forward. This is a bill that comes following Voices Unheard: Healthcare Barriers and the Lived Experiences of Black Women in Canada.

Basically, what the bill will do is it will provide that the government of Ontario recognize the rights of Black residents to equitable, culturally safe and anti-racist health care. It demands that the Ministry of Health base a framework on this recognition. One of the things that the framework brings forward is that it includes annual racial equity audits of all publicly enforceable measures within our health care system. It requires that every public health unit develop an action plan that focuses on methods for reducing anti-Black racism throughout our health care system. It also works to make sure that we do collect race-based data.

The bill goes on—it has quite a few sections. All of those sections are focused on different parts of our health care system to make sure that what our health care system has to offer is available to all, including people who want Black health equity.

I fully support this, and I'm looking forward to the House doing the same.

PETITIONS

WATER QUALITY

Mr. Stephen Blais: I have a petition here signed by many dozens of parents in Orlean's.

At present, the government of Ontario allows 10 parts per billion of lead in drinking water under certain regulations; the national standard in Canada is only five parts per billion. There are also systemic problems with issues with lead in schools across Ottawa and Orlean's. This petition asks the government to adopt the national standard and to make efforts immediately to address the problems with those schools.

I completely agree with this petition. I will sign it and hand it to Owen.

TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE

Hon. Steve Clark: I have yet another petition which calls on the federal government to restore full navigation to the Rideau Canal by installing a structure that enables all marine traffic to go through the LaSalle Causeway for this boating season, which, as a matter of fact, is the 200th anniversary of the construction of the Rideau Canal.

The federal government has installed a temporary-fix bridge that essentially restricts marine traffic. It doesn't allow for full navigation of the Rideau Canal, which, by the way, is a UNESCO World Heritage Site. It's vital to the economy in the communities between Kingston and Ottawa.

Just for your own information, Speaker, the Rideau Canal contributes about \$309 million annually to the economy in eastern Ontario, through marinas, shops, restaurants, and seasonal employment opportunities.

1510

We're calling on Public Services and Procurement Canada to establish a clear timeline, a plan and demonstrate the urgency with this matter in terms of this bridge at the LaSalle Causeway.

I'm pleased to affix my signature, and I'll send this petition to the table with page Evalyn.

ONTARIO DRUG BENEFIT PROGRAM

M^{me} France Gélinas: I would like to thank Gillianne Fuller, who, within a week, gathered over 140 names on this petition. This petition is called "make hormone replacement therapy free in Ontario."

As you know, Speaker, menopause costs the Ontario and Canadian economy billions of dollars. We're looking at about \$2 billion in Ontario alone in lost productivity, increased health care utilization and workforce absenteeism.

Menopause hormone replacement therapy, including transdermal, is clinically proven to reduce the severity of menopause symptoms, lower long-term disease risk, and improve quality of life.

The Ontario drug benefit currently covers only oral estrogen, which leaves a lot of medication—especially the transdermal one, where you have to go through the Exceptional Access Program, which means there are a lot of delays, denials and administrative burden on patients and prescribing physicians.

British Columbia and Manitoba already provide menopause hormone therapy to residents at no cost. They want Ontario women to have the same access to the standard of care.

So they petition the Minister of Health to add all clinically approved forms of menopause hormone therapy, including transdermal and micronized, to the Ontario drug benefit as a standard, covered benefit.

I fully support this petition. I will affix my name to it and ask my good page Tej to bring it to the Clerk.

STUDENT ASSISTANCE

Mr. Stephen Blais: I'd like to thank Mighty, Colton, Olivier and Magali, high school students from Orléans who have collected over 300 signatures on this petition.

As we know, the government recently made dramatic changes to OSAP that will detrimentally impact the ability of young people to afford college and university. This petition calls on the government to urgently change their mind, return to the previous system and ensure that students who are able to get into university and college have the financial means to do so.

I 100% support this petition and will hand it to Daniel to bring to the table.

ONTARIO ECONOMY

Mr. Anthony Leardi: I have a petition here from Nathalie MacDonald of Amherstburg, Ontario.

This petition talks about the tariffs that have been imposed by Donald Trump's government. It talks about how these tariffs have been ruled illegal by the United States Supreme Court. It talks about how the Congress of the United States has voted against these tariffs. It talks about how Ontario is the number one customer of 15 American states.

It calls upon this assembly to adopt regulations that would prioritize Ontario-made goods and Ontario-made services in the supply chain and public sector procurement system. This includes capital projects, it includes construction projects, and it includes infrastructure projects. It is our way of putting Ontario first and supporting Ontario's economy, protecting Ontario workers and protecting Ontario businesses.

I support this petition. I will sign it and give it to this fine page, Jason, to bring to the Clerks' table.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Ms. Chandra Pasma: It's my pleasure to rise on behalf of the residents of Ottawa West–Nepean to table a petition entitled "Real Rent Control Now."

The average rent for a one-bedroom apartment in Ottawa is now over \$2,000. There was a recent report that examined what kind of wage people would need to earn in order to meet the definition of affordable housing—which is that you're spending 30% or less of your income on housing—and that amount was \$38 an hour, which is more than twice what minimum wage is in Ontario. Of course, far too many people in Ottawa are earning wages that are well below that, and so they're paying an enormous portion of their income on rent, which means that they're being doubly squeezed, when grocery prices are also going up higher than the rate of inflation. That's leaving many people in a position where they can't afford their home. They're very worried about losing their home, if their landlord were to renovict them or to try to push them out illegally, which we see happen far too often. We're seeing many tenants who are dealing with landlords who are not maintaining properties, who are charging above-guideline rent increases. They don't feel that they can actually enforce the legal protections that they have under the Residential Tenancies Act because they know that if they get kicked out, they'll never be able to afford another apartment in Ottawa, or rental housing.

And so, what the petitioners are asking that the Legislative Assembly do:

- pass rent stabilization legislation and rent control that operates over the course of time when somebody is in a rental unit;

- there can't be above-guideline rent increases, but also between tenants, so that the landlord can't jack up the rent on the next tenant, which gives them an incentive to get someone out;

- there is a public rent registry so that tenants can find out what former tenants paid;

- ensure access to legal aid for tenants who want to contest an illegal rent hike, because far too often, they're going up against corporate lawyers who are representing landlords, without any legal representation of their own; and then they also want

- stronger enforcement and tougher penalties for landlords who are not properly maintaining a home.

I wholeheartedly endorse this petition. I will add my name to it and send it to the table with page Alyson.

ONTARIO ECONOMY

Mr. Deepak Anand: Speaker, do you know what the best thing we have in Ontario is? It's the people of Ontario. I always feel blessed when I see Ontarians helping Ontarians.

For example, I was having a little sore throat, so another fellow Ontarian, Patricio, gave me these cough drops. Feeling better, I was walking on Wellesley Street, and I saw a school, St. Joseph's College, and they actually had big paintings outside there, on their fence. Take a look at it. They're talking about Donald Trump. They're talking about how we, as Ontarians, as Canadians, are stronger together. And this is exactly what this petition is talking about.

This petition is about making sure that the government of Ontario should adapt our regulations and issue procurement directives so that we can help Ontario-made goods, services, supply chains in the public sector procurement, including capital infrastructure and construction projects. So much of it is going on right now, when we talk about capital infrastructure projects, like 50 hospitals, highways, an LRT in my riding, Highway 413, and many other projects. And all of those projects—

Interjection.

Mr. Deepak Anand: I'm not on my phone.

That's another example of Ontario helping Ontario.

Speaker, this is exactly what this petition is talking about—making sure we are supporting Ontario's economy and workers.

I absolutely support this petition. I will give it to wonderful page Azaad.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): Before we go to further petitions, I will remind all members, before you rise to speak—if you would take your phones off your desks to prevent that sound from coming through the microphone system.

Further petitions?

HEALTH CARE WORKERS

MPP Jamie West: This petition is entitled “Stop Privatization and Support Staffing Ratios.” It's very similar to a bill that the member for Nickel Belt and I tabled recently about having proper staffing ratios so nurses and health care workers aren't burning out.

Basically, they talk about the data—that we understand causes burnout due to understaffing and lack of funding. They point out that the Conservative government is undermining the public system by transferring the public dollars to private companies and how that's detrimental to it and creates vacancies and more burnout.

They're asking the government to invest in the public services so we have better nursing staffing agencies for our patients. That means better health care for the patients and better outcomes for everybody.

I fully support this. This is such a smart idea. I'll give it to page Owen for the table.

HIGHWAY 69

M^{me} France Gélinas: I would like to thank Eleanor Sonley from my riding—but really, there are over 10,000 people who have signed this petition; I think we're closer to 12,000 as of this morning. It is called “4-Lane Highway 69 Now!”

As you know, Speaker, despite this government making promises in the elections in 2018, in 2022, in 2025 that they were going to four-lane Highway 69, there are still 68 kilometres of Highway 69 between Toronto and Sudbury that are not four-laned.

1520

Since January of this year, there have been multiple traffic injuries; there have been over 200 accidents; there

have been over 13 deaths on this stretch of highway. This cannot continue.

The member for Sudbury and I held a town hall last week about Highway 69. It affects everybody in the north. We want to be safe. We want to be able to travel down south and back up north on a highway, not on a two-lane road where so, so many people get into car accidents—many of them, unfortunately, fatal.

We watched the last budget. There was zero money allocated to the four-laning of Highway 69.

We want Highway 69 to be safe.

So 12,000 people have signed this petition to say, “Negotiate seriously ... to immediately fund, tender, and begin construction of the remaining 68 kilometres of Highway 69 and establish a clear, public timeline for completion.”

I fully support this petition. I will affix my name to it and ask page Alyson to bring it to the Clerk.

WATER QUALITY

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I'm honoured to rise to present a petition entitled “Petition to Protect Our Children from Lead Exposure in Schools and Child Care Centres.”

We know that there is no safe level of exposure to lead and that lead can have particularly pronounced effects in young bodies and brains, and the impacts that they can have on development are lifelong.

But the Ontario government has adopted a standard for lead exposure which allows exposure to twice the level of lead than what Health Canada says should be the safe guideline. That's despite the fact that the science is the same for the federal and provincial governments. So there's no good scientific reason to have a much higher guideline.

We also know that in the past four years, nearly half of schools in Ontario have failed at least one test, according to the federal guideline, which means that our children are being exposed to drinking water that contains lead in it.

The provincial government has, so far, refused to acknowledge that this is a problem or to do anything about it, to put any funding towards removing lead from our schools or protecting children in schools and child care centres from drinking water that has lead in it. We know that they've also adopted outdated safety practices, like flushing, which is not recommended to protect people from lead.

But they have also not put funding towards addressing the enormous number of repairs in our schools. There's already a more than \$16.8-billion repair backlog that the government is not addressing. Now the Minister of Education wants to give himself the power to even approve or not approve whether repairs are done in schools, which is immensely concerning now that the minister could veto a school board from trying to remove lead from the drinking water in their schools.

So I think it's incredibly important that the Legislative Assembly listen to this petition, which is calling for the immediate adoption of the federal guidelines for lead ex-

posure, a lead remediation plan for Ontario schools and child care centres with proper funding and eliminating the school repair backlog with the necessary resources to fix our schools.

I fully support this petition. I will add my name to it and send it to the table with page Evalyn.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

BUILDING BILLY BISHOP AIRPORT ACT, 2026

LOI DE 2026 SUR LA CONSTRUCTION DE L'AÉROPORT BILLY BISHOP

Resuming the debate adjourned on May 5, 2026, on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 110, An Act to enact the Building Billy Bishop Airport Act, 2026 / Projet de loi 110, Loi édictant la Loi de 2026 sur la construction de l'aéroport Billy Bishop.

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

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: First, it is always a pleasure and an honour to rise in this gorgeous chamber, with all of you, actually, to represent beautiful Beaches–East Yorkers.

I'll be sharing my time with my firecracker colleague, who represents all of Scarborough, actually, but is the member for Scarborough–Guildwood.

Today feels like a freaky Friday, actually. I'm brought back to city council in 2013, when this expansion of the Billy Bishop island airport—the proposal was tabled. It was debated at length forever. It was rejected by members of Toronto city council and, eventually, the federal government and thousands and thousands of Toronto residents. I pledged to serve all of Ontario—actually, all of us have done that. That is why we ran. We were elected as members of provincial Parliament—not municipal, not federal; provincial. Yet this government, led blindly by this Premier, is chasing his glory days back on city council in Toronto.

Unsurprisingly, Bill 110 was introduced the day that the government adjourned the House for a week, leaving no time for debate, no time to object—just the usual surprise bill just before we rise. Perhaps they thought that the week back in our constituencies would mean that this would all blow over by the time we were able to return. Instead, what it did was give people time to mobilize—and boy, did they.

I've heard from hundreds of constituents who have all had different connections to the Toronto waterfront—not just Beaches–East Yorkers, but beyond. The resounding story, however, was that this waterfront is an oasis in the city, and they are against a Billy Bishop airport expansion. I am sure that the government side has heard the same.

This government is throwing around words like “modernization” and “unlocking potential.” But do you know what else this government claims is necessary action in the

name of safety, modernization, unlocking potential, streamlining for the good of Ontario? Well, that would be shielding members of this government from disclosing records, donating Skills Development Fund money to a strip club, killing green development standards, helping Barrie annex land from Springwater and Oro-Medonte, removing bike lanes, unilaterally appointing heads of councils in municipalities across Ontario and giving them strong powers, axing protections for endangered species, and creating special economic—or as they have rightfully been dubbed, lawless zones.

It is not progress to pollute the air and water, dole out millions of dollars unnecessarily, and bulldoze communities, parks, schools—all to benefit a select few from the business class in and around Toronto.

Ontario has not forgotten about this Premier's snazzy, new, bougie private jet. The Premier justified his purchase with claims that it is necessary for business to travel around North America quickly. Conveniently, Billy Bishop primarily serves corporate customers. It is advertised as a hub for business to jet in and out of the province. Its role will disproportionately benefit a select few people who frequently travel for work, maybe even the Premier. It's very, very interesting and coincidental timing that the Premier purchased this snazzy, bougie jet at the exact same time he proposed an expansion of the Billy Bishop island airport. You connect the dots on that one.

Let's talk about the disruption to the community.

Little Norway Park: I actually just asked the Premier a question on this very significant park this week. He did not seem to be aware that “the other park,” as he referred to it, is not just a park. Little Norway Park is a wonderful gem of green space equipped with amenities for baseball, soccer and swimming, like most parks, but it is also a historical landmark. This park marks the Royal Norwegian Air Force training base, where Norwegian pilots would train to then rejoin Allied efforts to defeat Nazi Germany in World War II. It commemorates the thousands of heroic people who contributed to, and sacrificed their lives in the fight against Nazi Germany. They fought for our freedom.

I know many of your ridings have Legions. They have cenotaphs. They have war memorials. Can you imagine someone proposing to pave over those and how you would feel about that? Think about how the Norwegians in Ontario feel about that.

It is a site where King Olav V and the crown prince and princess of Norway have attended ceremonies. And it is the spot where Norwegians, to this day, continue to host cultural events—including this Friday, when they'll be there.

1530

What this government cannot seem to understand when it comes to green space, or, really, any land that their developer friends deem as prime for bulldozing is that communities, economies, strong nations are not built by simply slapping in some million-dollar condos or, in this case, dropping a massive airport in the middle of a tight cluster of community that includes schools, several parks, memorial sites, housing in downtown Toronto, in what I

would say is probably the busiest area in downtown Toronto—definitely the busiest intersection. And if it's the busiest area in downtown Toronto, it's the busiest area in Canada.

Communities need schools. They need parks to gather. They need homes that are safe and affordable. They need grocery stores that are priced appropriately. They need air to breathe that is clean. And they need a government they can trust. Currently, this government is not delivering any of these—not a one.

This government does not have a Billy Bishop airport expansion plan. They have not thought this through. They haven't considered all of the scenarios, and they do not know the extent of its impact.

Let me tell you a little bit about the infrastructure for Billy Bishop. Bill 110 is riddled with “regulation this” and “regulation that.” Want to know who is exempt from the act? They will be set in regulations that are forthcoming; stay tuned. Curious about compensation? This will be set in regulations that are forthcoming; stay tuned. Looking for hard dates? They will be set in regulations that are forthcoming; stay tuned. How will issues that may arise from the act be dealt with? This will be set in regulations that are forthcoming; stay tuned. It's a nail-biter. This government has no set regulations, and they have barely provided us with an updated proposal of what the Billy Bishop airport expansion may entail.

Does this all sound vague and hypothetical? Well, that's because it is, actually. This is not a plan, and there's no concrete evidence to justify making this dream a reality. So when the government asks us to vote, when they ask the public to trust them, they're requiring blind belief.

Here are the details the government does not give you.

Let's talk about the hypocritical Toronto focus. This government never misses a chance to criticize another member in this chamber for focusing on Toronto. “Toronto is not the centre of the universe,” you have said over and over again. One minute, you're bashing Toronto, and now you're loving it—at least, the waterfront you're loving. In fact, yesterday I was in committee, and I was so shocked that I nearly keeled over, off my chair, when the member from Brampton East—I actually thought he was moonlighting as a Tourism Toronto representative, the way he was raving about Toronto and downtown and its waterfront and this airport. I just really had to check that I was in the right room with the right people.

I agree that MPPs are here to create and debate legislation in the best interest of all of Ontario, and, frankly, I would love to get back to that, but this government will not let us.

All I'm seeing from this bill is hypocrisy. This is a bill about Toronto's waterfront, to bring in business to Toronto, to bring jobs to Toronto. But who will be paying for it? Taxpayers all over Ontario—some taxpayers who perhaps may not even ever use Billy Bishop airport.

We have airports all over Ontario, in some of your own ridings—and I actually feel like taking a tour out to all the airports in Ontario. I will not take a bougie, private, snazzy

jet like the Premier just purchased, but I would like to see those airports and see what kind of state of repair or disrepair they are in. I'm wondering, where are their investments? Don't you feel a little robbed that, yet again, it's all about downtown Toronto and the investment, the money is flowing into downtown Toronto and Billy Bishop airport, but not yours?

This government claims that this expansion is necessary to bring in competition to our aviation sector and bring down costs. Well, a few things that would have helped with that is to retain the flight schools that were at Billy Bishop that are no longer because the costs are way too prohibitive—even then, how does the business case have legs to stand on, especially when Lester B. Pearson airport already has plans and capital to expand their capacity and are doing so right now? Do you know what? I don't know if you've talked to them, but they're pretty peeved about this new focus on Billy Bishop.

Those in favour of the Billy Bishop expansion claim that it will be a major economic driver, bringing in \$8.5 billion. This figure is almost half of what Pearson grosses, at \$19.6 billion, and that is with a share of 95% of all air travel. How will Billy Bishop—a fraction of the size; one of the smallest airports, if not the smallest airport—offering a fraction of the flights, even with an expansion, produce as much? Beyond these figures, nothing adds up. It is a nonsensical option.

In Pearson airport's plans, the expansion is mapped onto already empty acreage, not land that literally needs to be built, like Billy Bishop airport. Time and money have been rightfully invested in transit to and from Lester B. Pearson already. The UP Express—easy to get to, easy to ride. It gets you there stress-free. Personally, from beautiful Beaches—East York, I hop on the TTC and I take it straight across and grab the bus. It's easy-peasy, for basically \$3. The UP Express is under 30 minutes from Union, the heart of the city. No traffic, no waiting on the highway to get in and out of the city—that is pure convenience.

If someone cannot bear a less than 30-minute express train, then they certainly cannot handle the unavoidable congestion to get in and out of Billy Bishop airport. I am sure you have seen it—that Bathurst-Queens Quay-Eireann Quay intersection is a bottleneck. That would be a compliment—a bottleneck. No matter which way you split it, Billy Bishop is not a congestion solution; it is a congestion problem, and adding a couple of million passengers to that traffic will not help matters. It will be a nightmare.

Connecting Ontario—what will help is expanding transit options equitably around the province, varying in both mode and area. When we think about transit, as the provincial government, we ought to be thinking beyond Toronto. We need to think about how we can connect our whole province.

The Montreal-Ottawa high-speed rail is an excellent start. This is a commuter option that connects two major hubs, cuts out traffic completely, and limits greenhouse gas emissions. This is the transit we need—long overdue.

Ontario has tons of airports—Hamilton airport, North Bay Jack Garland Airport, Sarnia Chris Hadfield Airport. There you go. These all need investment—more or continued investment—not to mention the 29 northern remote airports that the Ministry of Transportation operates that need runway extensions, updated navigational aids, safer waiting facilities, and other options for travel, like all-weather roads. We heard that from our colleague the other day.

1540

Ontario has over 25 fly-in communities. There should be no question when it comes to prioritizing this infrastructure. This government cannot skirt their duty to consult. They need to speak with and listen to First Nations to ensure that they fill these major gaps.

The details of the Billy Bishop plan: the runway. First, the expansion is far beyond what is presented. Billy Bishop airport would demand 900 metres of new land mass, a 600-metre runway and a 150-metre buffer zone on each end.

Unfortunately, this extra 900 metres does not even scratch the surface of waterfront disruption. The Billy Bishop airport expansion would need hundreds more metres of buoys and guide lights extended into the water; repair hangars; new customs facilities if flight paths are added; exclusionary zones; and more.

Before I get into all the infrastructure, let's just take a minute to touch on a pretty fundamental piece of infrastructure in any airport: the tarmac. I don't know if any of you have thought about this.

The jets used at Billy Bishop airport were never meant to be there. The tarmac, which is asphalt topped on sand, gets too hot in the summer and these Q400 jets sink into the heat. We know also, with the climate emergency upon us, how much hotter our summers are getting. Last year, we hit records and we know that there's been scientific modelling that southern Ontario will have a heat dome effect at some point in the future. With hotter summers, this is not a good idea.

Consequently, they cannot be stored at Billy Bishop airport in the summer. Can you believe that? Did you know that? Instead, they reside in London. So right off the bat, this airport cannot even house its critical equipment.

We have all seen the heavy layer of fog that can fall over Toronto, sometimes thick enough that all you can see on the road in front of you are car or bike headlights. Toronto's Billy Bishop airport, especially being on the waterfront, is susceptible to fog, low visibility and delays, so these lights are non-negotiable.

I think many of you who fly in and out of Billy Bishop—which is great that you can do that—you have had your flights cancelled. You have had your flights postponed or rescheduled due to fog. It is one of the foggiest areas for airports in the country.

The list goes on. We're talking about the weather at the island airport. We haven't even got into the bird strikes, which were mentioned this morning by my colleague from Spadina-Fort York; the environmental disruption with aquatic life; the underwater berm that will need to be built

to support a massive new runway expansion; and the absolutely ludicrous, ludicrous idea of trying to shoehorn a massive airport into one of the tightest, most congested downtown urban spaces in the country.

If you haven't been down there—but I feel many of you have, because you've flown out of there, but for those who have not, I would urge you to go down, have a tour and see the nightmare of the traffic already.

When I was on city council, I said the opposite of what the Premier said to me the other day. I did not want to destroy the Billy Bishop airport and turn it into a park; it is sufficient the way it is. Let it operate as is, on the current footprint as is.

I'm not proposing that anyone here pull a Mayor Daley of Chicago, send transportation services out in the dark of the night, carve Xs in the runway and render that airport obsolete, which is what happened in Chicago. The Premier is well aware and well familiar with Chicago. That's what happened. They have a glorious, glorious waterfront. You have to admit that.

But I'm not saying that. I'm saying, "Keep it as is. Keep investing in transit to an existing airport that you are now expanding, Lester B. Pearson." That is the logical, practical, economical, smart thing to do.

But I don't know what is going on. I've said this to you guys before: You are obsessed. You continually destroy things that are working well, instead of fixing the things that are broken. Imagine if you just focused on fixing things that are broken instead of meddling continually in municipal affairs, especially Toronto's. Especially the Premier has this obsession, and now you guys have the obsession, obviously—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): I'll remind the member to address the Speaker.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: —with the Toronto waterfront. There was the Ferris wheel. There was concern about Waterfront Toronto—I think that's settled down now—the island airport, the convention centre, Ontario Place. It's all about Toronto's waterfront.

Thanks for the attention, but I'd rather you put that attention into hospitals, like Michael Garron, who have been waiting for you to sign off for three years on phase 2 of their renovation. They are at double the capacity that their ER department can handle. They're doing it, because they're amazing people, but it's not going to last forever. So focus on fixing your hospitals, fixing health care, fixing the air quality, improving your schools, dealing with the autism wait-list, reversing your idiotic decision for OSAP. Focus on things that are working.

Never mind the Great Lakes. We are so blessed in in Ontario to have access and to have these five Great Lakes, and many of your ridings border those Great Lakes. You're going to mess with that with this airport? I don't think so.

The last factor is housing. It's all about housing starts with you, and you're trying to—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): I will once again remind the member to please address the Speaker.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: This government is keen on building housing, supposedly, but there are so many housing proposals proposed for the Port Lands—19-to-49-storey proposals. With this idiotic idea of expanding the Billy Bishop airport, that just shaves it all down and caps it at 15 storeys.

So it's not true that you care about housing, because any chance the government has to build, you do not. You have a prime opportunity here. Billions and billions of dollars have been spent to flood-protect the area of the Port Lands: all three levels of government, a rock-solid tripartite agreement that has been left that way and not been meddled with, and now you're going to wreck all the housing proposals for that area?

1550

The math is not going to work. The logic is not there. We all have an existing airport at Lester B. Pearson. The taxpayers of Ontario should not be on the hook to expand an island airport in Toronto's downtown waterfront for the Premier's new snazzy jet plane.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): I recognize the member from Scarborough–Guildwood.

MPP Andrea Hazell: I rise today on behalf of my constituents of Scarborough–Guildwood, on behalf of the people of Toronto and on behalf of every Ontarian who believes in local democracy, responsible governance and a government that prioritizes people over power.

I rise today to speak against Bill 110, the so-called Building Billy Bishop Airport Act. But let us be clear about what this bill truly is. This is not a building bill; it is a demolishing bill. It demolishes municipal authority, it demolishes decades of careful planning, it demolishes community consultation and it demolishes the real priorities of the people of this province.

This legislation stands on one of the most cynical power grabs this chamber has witnessed so far. It claims to fix a problem that isn't there, responding to concerns raised only by a few well-connected insiders.

Speaker, for 40 years, the Billy Bishop Toronto City Airport has been governed by a unique, successful partnership: the tripartite agreement, a three-way pact between the federal government, the city of Toronto and PortsToronto. It was designed to ensure that the airport served the public interest with checks and balances to protect the waterfront and the surrounding communities.

With Bill 110, this government takes a wrecking ball to that agreement. It tears up a legal agreement without consultation—nothing new with this government; treats the city of Toronto as an afterthought—nothing new, again, with this government; and concentrates unchecked authority in the hands of the province—a one-power state.

Speaker, this bill empowers the minister to seize city-owned land, including cherished public spaces like Little Norway Park, a park that holds real historical weight as the former training site for the Royal Norwegian Air Force during the Second World War—a place tied to international co-operation and sacrifice. Today, it serves the community as a vital public space with a baseball diamond, a walking path, a playground and a wading pool. It is a

community park, a place where families gather, children play and residents live in a city that already has too little public space.

This land grab shows a government that is completely disconnected from the people it's supposed to serve. Despite assurances from this government that the province will not touch the park, there is clear and growing public distrust. We see this with almost every bill that is being tabled by this government, and I'm speaking about all their omnibus bills.

When residents hear promises like this, especially when the bill explicitly overrides local authority, they are doubtful. The local residents continue to push back, warning of increased congestion, pollution and the loss of community space. This is totally a land grab opportunity without any power that the public can check this government on.

The issue here is not just what is being said, it is whether Ontarians believe it. And right now, they don't. We can see it in the polls. The public distrust in the Premier is not surprising. It is something he has built totally by himself. This is a government that made major changes to the freedom-of-information laws in the middle of the night, at midnight, closing the door on one of the only tools Ontarians have to hold their government accountable.

Speaker, freedom of information is how people learned the truth about the greenbelt, the Ontario Place spa deal and the Skills Development Fund financial abuse. Yet, instead of strengthening transparency, this Premier moved to weaken it. And while Ontarians were being told to tighten their belts, while families are struggling to buy groceries, rent, gas and pay their hydro bill, this Premier and his cabinets decided to purchase a jet for \$28.9 million.

My question to the cabinet—and there are some lovely cabinet people on the other side.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: A few.

MPP Andrea Hazell: A few. You cannot tell me that you have a Premier that you cannot challenge and say, "Premier, this is not the right time to purchase a private jet." He silences all his cabinet, just like he silences the people in Ontario.

Speaker, it really does not seem like this government is prioritizing the safety, well-being or trust of Ontarians. And now, with Bill 110, the Premier is showing that he does not respect the land, history or communities that helped build this province. This government's priorities are far beyond misaligned. It is frightening how far he is willing to go to push through his luxury projects while ignoring the real problems facing Ontario. This government focused on undermining public transparency, overriding local planning and the concentration of power while families are just struggling to survive.

Speaker, I want to talk about the young people in Ontario. I'm speaking about this because I really think this government's priorities are so messed up. I care about what is happening to our young people in Ontario. Young people are feeling the pain living in Ontario, while this Premier is focused on secrecy, control and luxury mega-projects. Young people are leaving Ontario because they

cannot see a future here. They're leaving in droves. Many of them have all but given up on their dreams of owning a home, and that is sad.

What I'm getting at is these are the crises that demand this government's urgent attention. Ontario's youth unemployment rate is through the roof. We are the worst in Canada. To make things worse, this government cut OSAP grants from 85% to 25%, crushing the dreams of students who want to pursue post-secondary education. Now we know why—he cut millions of dollars from all the files. He's cut millions of dollars, even billions, from the crucial files that are supposed to give Ontarians a quality life.

I feel sorry for my young people of Scarborough, with families with low incomes that wanted to pursue their post-education, and now those dreams are out of reach. They didn't seem out of reach; now they are out of reach.

I spoke to an Indigenous female student who goes to UTSC, University of Toronto Scarborough campus. She is the first in her family to pursue post-secondary education. The ugly truth is that this student cannot pursue her education because she will become homeless to be able to pay her way to finish her post-secondary education. She's now deciding to move back home.

1600

Again, while this government has the audacity to put forward Bill 110 to expand the Billy Bishop airport, to land his private jet, it just keeps getting worse in Ontario for people to survive.

Speaker, mental health supports are being cut. Young people are doing everything they were told to do—go to school, work hard, build a future—and this government keeps pulling the rug out from under them. Young people are supposed to be the future of Ontario. How does that become expanding Billy Bishop airport? How are we not investing in our young people, and we're telling them that they are the future of Ontario?

In my own riding of Scarborough—Guildwood, I have seen the neglect of this government for eight years. We are dealing with the consequences of this government's neglect every single day. While this Premier is building his legacy of luxury projects, my community is grappling with youth unemployment soaring towards 20%. This is almost three times the provincial youth unemployment rate. Don't talk about child poverty rates—it's as high as 37%. And we are lacking supports for mental health for our students.

In Scarborough Southwest, 70% of the Scarborough Southwest population are having a hard time getting mental health help, support, or to get to their hospital. Transportation is a disaster for Scarborough Southwest's people.

I want to echo that, because as my colleague said, I love representing Scarborough, and that is because I know Scarborough. I have lived there from day one, when I entered in this country. I will never leave Scarborough, because it's a special place. It's unique. We have a very strong community, and we're always pulling through with what has been given to us. So I will stay forever, and I will

continue to fight for a better quality of life for the people of Scarborough.

The neglect has real consequences. All across Ontario, we have seen a rise in school violence, and a wave of crime that sees children as young as 12 involved in stabbing and robbery incidents. The crime rate is through the roof. We can't even find who we let out of jail. We have no control over crime, and we have no control over who we put in and let out of the jail system.

Speaker, I want to move to the cost of living, because to expand Billy Bishop airport, and the land grab of Toronto Island—it's going to cost billions of dollars. We don't know how much that is going to cost, but we're going to spend billions of dollars on all the government fantasy projects, and we're leaving Ontarians to suffer through this unbearable unemployment and housing crisis—unaffordability crisis.

I can go on and on with the crises that we are experiencing in Ontario, but what I would say to you—I'll go back to Scarborough, because I have Scarborough stats: 46% of residents would go hungry without the food banks, and 87% of food bank clients live in unaffordable housing in Scarborough. These are not just numbers. These are families. These are children. These are seniors. These are people working hard and still falling behind.

In Scarborough, the annual salary threshold is under \$50,000, while this government is deciding to build a tunnel under the 401 costing us \$100 billion.

These are fantasy projects, and these projects are mega-projects for this Premier.

So when this government brings forward Bill 110, we do have to ask the question, why is it a priority? Why is this Premier so focused on taking control of Billy Bishop airport? Why? I am looking through Bill 110, and I'm trying to understand the why. When you put forward a bill in this House, it always gives the reasons why, so you can have all parties in this House vote for that bill and, especially, consultations from your stakeholders, from the people of Ontario. But with these bills that are being put forward, what I'm seeing is that consultations are being neglected and not respected.

I'm going to say this again, because I really want this to resonate with the people who I know are tuning in and listening to my debate: Why is the Premier so focused on taking control of Billy Bishop airport when Ontarians cannot afford to live, students cannot afford school, hospitals are overwhelmed, classrooms are losing support, and communities like Scarborough are crying out for support? I hear it—I hear it in my town hall meeting I had, that almost 500 people attended. It was all about the affordability crisis. There were so many young people present, and they were talking about the cuts to their OSAP.

So this isn't just about an airport expansion. We're not fooled. The people of Ontario are not fooled.

Under this government, we cannot trust what is in Bill 110. This land grab sets negative precedent that should concern all of Ontarians, not just us in this House. If the province can move to seize land and discard agreements with its largest city, what municipality is safe at this time?

Local councils cannot trust that their decisions won't be overturned by this Premier and his legacy projects. No one is safe under this government's operation. This is deeply troubling. This is a deeply troubling decision that cuts away the democratic foundations of our province.

Speaker, this is a government with grossly misplaced priorities.

Let's talk about the why this is happening now. While this Premier is obsessed about expanding an airport for the select few—friends, donors, insiders—there are real concerns for the people who live in Ontario.

1610

This time around, I am so proud of all Ontarians, because they are finally waking up. They are waking up because of the suffering that they're going through—and moving to this affordability crisis, and also a high unemployment deficit.

Families are struggling to afford groceries. Our health care system is in crisis, with emergency rooms closing and nurses experiencing burnout. We are in the middle of a housing crisis, mental health crisis, affordability crisis. These are the crises that demand the government's attention—not expanding Billy Bishop airport. And what is this government's response? To focus its energy and political capital on a legacy project for the Premier.

Speaker, all of this is a staggering display of this government being out of touch with the reality that millions of Ontarians face every single day. The hypocrisy is breathtaking.

While families are stuck in traffic, struggling with affordability and losing hours of productivity every day, congestion in the greater Toronto and Hamilton area is costing Ontario an estimated \$56.4 billion year over year. That's what the government should be fixing. That is a loss of time, lost wages, and a loss of economic potential for Ontario. This pressure does not stay static. It worsens when additional demand is injected into already constrained corridors. And that is what we're going to be experiencing in downtown Toronto.

This is a bill that was not thought out. This is a bill that was not planned. This is a bill that was not on the table for public consultation.

Official traffic studies for Billy Bishop airport show that surrounding downtown streets are already operating under heavy airport-related pressure. Up to 50% to 60% of traffic on Bathurst Street near Queen's Quay is directly related to the airport activity.

Environmental and transportation analyses linked to past runway expansion proposals found that even modest increases in flights would lead to measurable spikes in taxi, rideshare and ferry traffic congestion in the downtown core. Why do we need that for the downtown core?

While Ontarians are told, "Tighten your belts," this government is loosening the runway for his insiders, friends, donors, and his legacy fantasies.

Speaker, this expansion isn't about easing congestion at Pearson. This expansion isn't about economic development. This expansion is about building a legacy on the

backs of taxpayers and at the expense of our communities. It is a vanity project, plain and simple.

The government will tell Ontarians it's all about economic opportunities; it's all about increasing jobs. They will also mention the federal RESA requirements, the runway end safety areas. And they will hope that the people of Ontario do not look at the details of the bill. This is not about increasing employment. It is not about expansion of an airport. This has nothing to do with the economy.

Speaker, let's be perfectly clear: The federal government requires a safety area of about 150 metres. The city of Toronto, PortsToronto and the federal government already agreed to a plan to meet this requirement with minimal land mass expansion—a plan that was sensible, responsible, and respected the tripartite agreement.

But this bill isn't about 150 metres. This bill proposes enabling runway extensions of up to a kilometre into Lake Ontario. Why? One reason, and one reason only: to allow his private jets to land.

Let us not forget that the people of Toronto have already had this debate. In 2015, after extensive public consultation and study, the proposal to allow jets at the island airport was soundly rejected. The community spoke loudly and clearly. They did not want the increased noise, the increased pollution, the increased traffic, and the irreversible damage to the waterfront. This government heard that verdict, read that verdict and still decided to power through with the decision, because this is a government that's full of ego. They are using the guise of safety and economic opportunity as a Trojan Horse to sneak in a plan that has already been defeated. It is dishonest, it is manipulative, and the people of Ontario see right through it.

Speaker, this project will cause harm beyond repair. Extending runways into Lake Ontario threatens aquatic ecosystems and the integrity of our shoreline. This government has designated the area as a special economic zone to fast-track development, silencing environmental assessments and community feedback.

The introduction of jets will shatter the peace of waterfront neighbourhoods, from the islands to Fort York.

This Premier has shown his contempt for the vibrant community on the Toronto Islands, disgracefully referring to the residents as squatters. That's a shame. They are not squatters. They are families, and they are communities, and they are Ontarians whose voices are being ignored.

In conclusion, this is what I want to leave the people of Ontario with, and the people who have tuned in to listen to me today. This is the legacy being built in real time under this Premier, and Bill 110 is part of that pattern. At a time when families cannot afford groceries, rent or rising energy bills, this government brings forward a bill to take control of Billy Bishop airport—not a plan to ease the affordability crisis; not a plan to fix health care, when over 2.5 million Ontarians still don't have a family doctor; not a plan to support students as classrooms grow and 600 teaching positions, 40 vice-principals, 186 support staff are all being cut, with the Toronto District School Board's

renewal backlog projected to reach \$4.65 billion. Instead, this government wants more power, more control, and more decisions made without the people of Ontario.

We are watching a government that has cut OSAP grants from 85% to 25%.

I want this to really ring in to the people who are listening, and so I think I've mentioned this three times—cut mental health supports. The government is cutting mental health supports and leaving hospitals underfunded by over \$1 billion.

This Premier chooses to build a \$100-billion tunnel under the 401, a \$2.2-billion luxury spa at Ontario Place, and now the expansion of Billy Bishop airport, while everyday Ontarians are being told that there is no money for them and that money doesn't grow on trees.

Speaker, when Ontarians go looking for the truth, this government puts up roadblocks, hiding its actions and blocking accountability at every turn. The very laws that once allowed the public to uncover the truth through freedom of information are being weakened. Those are the same laws that exposed the greenbelt decisions, the Ontario Place deal and the Skills Development Fund crisis. This government changed them quietly in the middle of the night.

1620

This government cannot claim to protect Ontarians while shutting down transparency. Shutting down transparency is what got the people of Ontario wild. That's why I said I am, for the first time, so proud of all of the people that live in Ontario, because they are now standing up for democracy.

Let's be clear about what Bill 110 really represents. It is not just about an airport expansion. I've said this many times: It's about a government that continues to overspend. It's not his money. He's spending and overspending and abusing the taxpayers of Ontario's dollars while centralizing power, doing forceful land grabs, taking over the Toronto Islands, and working for his insiders, donors and friends.

Ontarians deserve a government that invests in them, listens to them and is accountable to them. I am happy that I was able to get an opportunity to talk on Bill 110, because it's really, really sad. It's really sad that Ontarians right now are not living a quality life. They deserve better from this government in power, and they're losing it in the eighth year.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): Questions?

Mr. Will Bouma: Speaker, I think you heard it; we all heard it here in the House. Here is the Liberal Party platform: The Liberal Party platform, very simply, is build absolutely nothing anywhere near anyone. That's it. That's what they're standing on: no progress, nothing going forward. For 15 years, the previous government did that. I remember the Premier of the day saying, "We're investing in people. We're not going to invest in schools. We're not going to invest in hospitals. We're not going to invest in highways."

The Eglinton Crosstown was one of their projects. What a disaster that's been that we've been trying to fix for eight years already.

I was just wondering: Is the member going to look back, when she shows up for the opening of the new expanded Billy Bishop airport, and regret their decision to not support this today?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: To the member from Brantford—Brant: That is simply not true, your accusation of us not wanting to build. I want to build. You know what I want to build? I want to build housing, and I want to build it now. I actually wanted to build it eight years ago—

Mr. Matthew Rae: You weren't even here.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: —even though I wasn't even here—six years, four years ago.

Here's how you build housing: You stand tall, you be bold and you be brave. You don't give out strong-mayor powers for the mayor of Markham to use to kill housing when he killed the fourplexes; what you do is, you look at provincial lands and you build on provincial lands. That's the easiest thing you could do. You build on parking lots. You make four stories as of right, fourplexes as of right, and you get—

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

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: I didn't think the Premier of Ontario and the Conservatives, quite frankly, could come up with another bill that dreams something up this fantastic. They're helping themselves, but they're not helping the people of Ontario under this bill.

This bill exempts land grabs from the Expropriations Act. It also exempts the Premier—he's refusing to present a plan, an actual public case, for this project.

There have been so many bad decisions with this Premier. We know the recent one: the luxury jet. It'd be great to know how much that cost, because you know who is going to foot the bill is the people of Ontario for that bad decision. To make matters worse, Speaker, what they do is they've also—in every bill that they present, they waive any lawsuits, even in the case of a bad-faith decision.

My question is, can you tell us why this Premier thinks he is above the law and doesn't have to pay for his bad choices?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I'm not sure on that last question, other than he was born that way, because that's the way it operated those tumultuous eight years I was at Toronto city hall.

But what I want to tell you is things that have not been factored in—the math is not going to work on this. This government is not thinking about what it would mean—to carry the new load of the runway, you would need a massive amount of underwater infrastructure. You would need berms and retaining walls, just to name a few. It would disrupt the underwater aquatic system, including endangered species—the American eel, Jefferson salamander, redbreasted dace etc. You need so much more than they are saying. They don't even understand—

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

Mr. Steve Pinsonneault: The member from Scarborough–Guildwood said this isn't about jobs. This project would support approximately 23,000 construction jobs, generate up to \$140 billion in economic output over the next 25 years, increase competition, and give travellers more choice and more affordable options.

Speaker, does that member believe that thousands of good-paying jobs and strengthening Ontario's economy is reckless, or are they simply opposed to building infrastructure and growing our province's needs?

MPP Andrea Hazell: To the member, thank you for that question, because I want to build, and like my colleague, we want to see home builds. He's talking about increasing employment. Where is the plan? Where is the information in the bill? Stop making up numbers. Stop making up stories. This government needs to be held accountable.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): I'll ask the member to withdraw.

MPP Andrea Hazell: My statement is done.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): I ask the member to withdraw.

MPP Andrea Hazell: Withdraw.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): I recognize the member from Sudbury.

MPP Jamie West: [*Inaudible*] debate, they spent about an hour talking about all the reasons why Billy Bishop's expansion is a bad idea, everything from environmental controls to noise pollution to just the cost of the fiscal irresponsibility when there's going to be expansions happening in Pearson already. I want to know if my colleagues agree that no level of government should be supporting the expansion of Billy Bishop.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Thank you very much to the member from Sudbury for that question. I was on city council, as you know, when this was debated before, and city councillors did not approve it, and we fought against it, as well as Torontonians and beyond. What I would say is, yes, we need to talk to our federal counterparts and we also need to talk to our municipal counterparts. It was great that the leader of the official opposition wrote a letter to the Prime Minister. I would encourage the leader of the official opposition to write a letter to the mayor as well, because the mayor is involved in Billy Bishop. It takes a village.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): I recognize the member from Nepean.

MPP Tyler Watt: Thank you to my two wonderful colleagues for that passionate debate on an important bill. The theme that I see reflected, time and time and time again, with this government is the Premier's obsession with Toronto. He travels a lot to the United States—I was actually pleasantly surprised he found Ottawa just a few weeks ago; it was nice that he made a pit stop there. But, again, everything is about Toronto. When I'm talking to people in my riding, they don't understand about this tunnel under the 401, the mega spa at Ontario Place. Everything is about Toronto.

1630

So my question to my colleague from Scarborough–Guildwood is, does it make sense to expand a small airport while Pearson is going through a massive—

MPP Andrea Hazell: Thank you to my colleague. That's a great question. If you're asking me if it makes sense what the government is doing, nothing that they have been doing lately makes sense to the people of Ontario. It's impacting the lives of Ontario. It's not giving the people any quality of life. Our schools are suffering. Our health care is suffering. They've cut OSAP from our young people.

Our young people have lost their dreams of living in Ontario. They're leaving Ontario in droves.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): I recognize the Minister of Citizenship and Multiculturalism.

Hon. Graham McGregor: This question is for either of the speakers from the Liberal caucus.

My colleague asked the question about 23,000 construction jobs, so just to clarify for the people at home, the people of Ontario and members of this caucus that are wondering, I guess: Are the Liberal Party pro 23,000 good-paying construction jobs or against 23,000 good-paying construction jobs?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I am absolutely for jobs to build hospitals, starting with Michael Garron Hospital's renovation. I'm absolutely about jobs to build Secord public school's long-awaited rebuild. They have the largest and oldest portapac portable system in the country. They have been waiting for that. I am all about building housing, upzoning all our areas—in the Portlands, 19- and 49-storey—and upzoning all the avenues as of right.

Don't be shy. Let's get those shovels in the ground. Let's do it.

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

Ms. Jess Dixon: I'll note I'll be sharing my time with the member from Timmins.

Interjection: Great guy.

Ms. Jess Dixon: Great guy, yes.

My birthday was on Saturday. I raise it because—I'm not going to say how old I turned, but it was one of the first birthdays I had where I started sort of thinking, "Oh, man. I feel like I'm getting older."

My point is, the tripartite agreement that governs this airport is an undisclosed amount of years older than I am. As a bit of a nerd, I looked up the tripartite agreement to see what it said and what was in it. It is a scanned copy of a typewritten document that I actually had to run OCR—optical character recognition—on in order to actually be able to Ctrl-F my way through it, which I think indicates just how stale this is.

The debate today has been very heavily focused on what could come about as a result of the bill and less so on what the bill actually is and why it is so important to do. The challenge here is, Billy Bishop is governed by this tripartite agreement, which came into force in 1983.

There are three parties to it; it had to be amended to have that: the city of Toronto; what's now the Toronto Port Authority, formerly the harbour commissioners; and the federal government. So essentially, it's a set of cross-leases between all these three parties where they are all agreeing for each other to use each other's land in order to make this airport actually function. The province wasn't in this original one, because at the time aviation was not—and is not, technically—a provincial responsibility from a constitutional perspective, and it didn't appear there was an obvious reason in 1983 to include it.

What we have now is a situation where this structure gives any one of those three parties to the agreement a functional veto. So the Toronto Port Authority, the federal government and the city of Toronto can hold this entire airport hostage by the functioning of an agreement signed and developed in 1983. I want you to think about that for a little bit because it's really genuinely unusual.

The Billy Bishop Airport is a sort of regional and provincial transportation asset. If you consider the 401 or the Ontario Line, GO stations, Pearson etc., these are all transportation initiatives and assets that run through multiple municipal jurisdictions. Imagine how frozen we would be if those jurisdictions had all had a veto power on whether or not we were able to do that. Pearson is in Mississauga. Mississauga does not have a veto power on what actually happens in Pearson.

But throughout all of that time, Billy Bishop has been the anomaly, this piece of regional aviation infrastructure that one municipality in Ontario has had a structural veto on for many, many years at this point in time. As we know, Toronto is certainly a powerhouse of Ontario's economy, generating a significant portion of our GDP. The truth is that what happens from a transportation perspective in this city has relevance to constituents all across Ontario, all the Ontarians who understand that their economy also does run through this city's airports and highways and rail lines.

Again, the principle that the province would take responsibility for regional infrastructure such as this is in no way new in any capacity. Of course, Billy Bishop is Ontario's third-busiest airport. I did note in the minister's comments—because at times the debate has wandered towards this idea that it's somehow the privilege of the business class who use it. But we also had that number of 4,700, which is approximately how many air ambulance and medical transport flights depart from the Ornge base at Billy Bishop almost every year.

The thing to understand here is that what this bill does is it gives the province Toronto's seat at that table. It doesn't in any way actually say that much about jets because jets technically remain a federal responsibility at this point in time. But the idea that this would simply be occurring without any reasonable consultation or partnership with any other government groups—federal, the port authority etc.—is frankly absurd, given what I've just explained about how this agreement actually operates, with every one of the three parties having their own veto power. This doesn't give the province an additional authority over the federal government or the Toronto Port

Authority; it simply supersedes the Toronto council, essentially, from making decisions that hold a piece of regional infrastructure hostage.

I also wanted to note one other thing that I started thinking about as I was listening to the members opposite. I will confess I am in no way a historian of Toronto or of Toronto geography in any capacity, but my understanding is that back in, I don't know, 1793, the Toronto shoreline was basically Front Street. Through the 19th and 20th centuries, most of what we would recognize as Toronto's waterfront today—Union Station, Rogers Centre, Harbourfront, the south edge of the financial district, the Gardiner corridor, Ontario Place, Port Lands, really most of the eastern waterfront—was actually built entirely on lakefill.

1640

This idea that the Toronto waterfront is this enduring and sacred and original thing that must be maintained, to the detriment of all else, in no way matches the actual truth of how Toronto and Toronto's waterfront has evolved over the years of its existence.

I, frankly, imagine that, were I to ask the members opposite, if they feel so powerfully about it—would they like to go back to the 1793 shoreline, untouched by human hands? I have a feeling that they probably would not accept that as a suggestion. Even, again, to go a little bit more into my geography here, Billy Bishop itself sits on a combination of original island land and, again, more fill, and the now-Tommy Thompson nature reserve—which, to my understanding has become one of the ecologically interesting parts of the city—was basically just construction fill that was dumped into the harbour in order to create a breakwater. It's called an accidental reserve, where that wasn't even the original intention of this space.

Ultimately, I think that it really speaks against this idea that putting any type of fill or in any way modifying Toronto's waterfront is somehow this monstrous sort of sacrilegious act. It is not some unprecedented violation of the sanctity of Toronto's waterfront. In many ways, I would say that, should this proposal to expand the runway and continue on with the expansion of Billy Bishop airport—it's actually a completely natural continuation of what has been the process of the city of Toronto's development, particularly its waterfront development over the years. And should the airport be expanded, I'm sure that 10, 20, 30 years from now, again, what was once there will have been forgotten the same way that the 1793 shoreline has been forgotten, and the new convenience, the boost to the economy, the jobs—all of the things that the potential expansion of the Billy Bishop airport will bring—will be the thing that is now what we focus on, versus the fact that it was ever fill that was used to create it.

Ultimately, this is a bill that I am happy to support. It's a bill that I'm happy to vote in favour of. It is a governance bill that makes sense, that shows the general continuation of how Toronto has operated, and I will be happy to vote on it.

I will pass the mike over to the member from Timmins.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): I recognize the Minister of Northern Economic Development and Growth.

Hon. George Pirie: It's my honour to rise in the House today to speak in support of Bill 110, the Building Billy Bishop Airport Act.

Ontario, if it was a sole domain, would have one of the globe's largest economies. Ontario is the economic driver for Canada, and Toronto is the economic driver for Ontario. Toronto is a world-class city, and it deserves world-class infrastructure like they have in Boston and New York City and Washington and San Francisco and, the mother of them all, Hong Kong, which all have airports right downtown. But it's more than that.

For people who live in the north, being connected is not an abstract concept. It's not a convenience. It's a literal lifeline. Billy Bishop airport is a critical gateway that connects communities across northern Ontario directly with downtown Toronto, and from there to cities across Canada and the rest of the world. There are flights from Timmins, Thunder Bay, Sault Ste. Marie, Sudbury and North Bay. That matters. It matters because it provides choice to the people of northern Ontario—choice for families, for workers, for students, and for seniors. Whether someone is travelling to Toronto for a specialist medical appointment or making the trip to close a deal, secure investments or visit family, Billy Bishop airport's modernization will play a vital role.

Speaker, this airport supports life-saving services. Every year, approximately 4,700 air ambulance and medical transport flights depart from Ornge's base at Billy Bishop airport. For the people of northern Ontario, that means faster access to care when time truly matters. When air service is constrained, unreliable or unavailable, the consequences fall hardest on remote northern communities.

Speaker, as I've said many, many, many times before, northern Ontario is booming, especially in its resource industries—sectors like mining, agriculture and forestry. Quite simply, northern Ontario has everything the world needs. We have the minerals required for advanced manufacturing. We have world-class agricultural lands and a high-quality fibre basket—the world's best, actually. These sectors are not theoretical; they are operating today, growing today, and positioned to expand even further. These are the industries northern Ontario relies on. They create good-paying jobs, anchor our communities, and drive regional prosperity, and prosperity throughout Ontario and throughout Canada. But for that growth to continue, these industries must be able to attract investments, secure partnerships and make business deals. And to do that, they need reliable access to downtown Toronto, the financial capital of Canada and, as I said, a world-class city. Modernizing and expanding Billy Bishop airport helps make that possible.

My own background is in mining. I remember very clearly how difficult it was to travel between Timmins, Thunder Bay, Sudbury and Toronto before 2006. Trips took longer, routes were less predictable, opportunities were harder to seize. Then, in 2006, something changed.

Robert Deluce, another businessman, proudly from northern Ontario—actually, Timmins—launched Porter Airlines, operating out of Billy Bishop airport. That was a game-changer. It introduced competition across Toronto's airports and gave people the ability to get right into the heart of Toronto. It made it easier to attract investment, attend meetings and, yes, make it to a doctor's appointment on time.

Today, Billy Bishop airport is Ontario's third-busiest airport, serving approximately three million passengers a day, and the region it serves is one of North America's fastest-growing urban corridors.

Growth brings opportunity, but it also demands capacity. We cannot expect an airport serving a rapidly growing region to stand still, and that is why we need to unlock Billy Bishop's next phase of growth. This need is even more urgent as northern Ontario industries face unjustified tariffs from the United States. Forestry, mining, steel and critical minerals producers are being forced to look for new partners and new markets. In that environment, international connectivity is not an option; it's essential. Downtown Toronto is a global hub.

Our government is expanding Ontario's trade relationships, strengthening supply chains, and positioning our province as a competitive jurisdiction in a changing global economy.

Modernizing Billy Bishop airport is another part of our plan to protect Ontario, by building the infrastructure needed for the future and ensuring northern Ontario remains connected to global opportunity.

Northern employers, hospitals, universities and small businesses rely on fast, predictable access to southern Ontario. They need it to attract talent. They need it to deliver specialized health care. They need it to secure investment and grow.

That is why Bill 110 is not an isolated policy decision. It's part of a broader strategy to improve regional connectivity—a strategy that includes bringing back the Northlander, which will return to service later this year, after being cancelled 14 years ago by a previous government.

The Northlander and Billy Bishop serve different purposes, but together, they increase connectivity for the north. Our government understands the importance of connecting people across the north to opportunities, to school, to work, to vital appointments, and to each other. Both modernizing Billy Bishop and restoring the Northlander will strengthen the communities they connect to, creating good jobs, supporting economic growth, and building resilience across northern Ontario for decades to come.

Speaker, the economic benefits of modernizing Billy Bishop airport are significant. An expanded and modernized airport could generate up to \$140 billion in economic output over 25 years, by attracting investment, creating good-paying jobs, improving regional and international connectivity, and supporting Ontario's tourism sector.

1650

I often say that northern Ontario is home to some of the most stunning landscapes in the world. As more Canadians

choose to travel within Canada and as international travel patterns shift, it is essential that Ontario has the airport capacity to make it easier to experience our province, including the north.

Through Bill 110 and allowing capacity expansion at Billy Bishop airport, our government is taking steps to help more families visit Sleeping Giant Provincial Park; spend time along the shores of Lake Superior; see wolves at Cedar Meadows, near my home in Timmins; or paddle the Mattagami River. Every one of those trips means more spending in northern Ontario communities.

Speaker, with all of these reasons, it's clear that modernizing Billy Bishop airport is a direct economic enabler for northern Ontario. By increasing capacity and modernizing operations, this airport can improve the frequency, reliability and competitiveness of short-haul routes that connect northern communities to Toronto—connections that regional leaders consistently identify as essential infrastructure, not a luxury.

That is why I find it disappointing that some of my colleagues opposite, including those who represent northern Ontario, oppose this legislation. That position is especially troubling when many people in the north have been among the strongest advocates for modernizing Billy Bishop airport.

I will end by calling on members across the aisle to do what is best for northern Ontario. Work with us. And support Bill 110, so together we can build a more resilient, connected and prosperous Ontario for everyone who calls it home.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): Questions?

Mr. Tom Rakocevic: I want to thank the members for their contributions to debate today.

We've all heard that Prime Minister Mark Carney has been a big supporter of putting jets at Billy Bishop airport in downtown Toronto.

Can you talk a little bit about Mark Carney's big support for this bill that we are debating today?

Hon. George Pirie: I think the Prime Minister supports growth. I think the Prime Minister supports diversification from the dependency on the US markets. Billy Bishop is all about that. It's all about the future, about bringing people together and ensuring that our economy in Ontario and Canada is capable of expanding and meeting the challenges of the geopolitical tensions that we face today. I think that's what the Premier stands for. I know our Premier stands for that.

Economic growth—that's what we stand for.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): Questions?

Hon. Greg Rickford: I thank the member, my dear friend and colleague from Timmins. We live a long way away from each other—even though we are very much northern Ontario.

To his point: I'm a bit concerned, if I represent Greater Sudbury, Nickel Belt, or parts close to Timmins or Thunder Bay—and not supporting this, because this isn't just about the transportation service to Billy Bishop, to there, to see what we have been celebrating in northern Ontario. It's very much about the communities, including

Kenora, who only recently got commercial air service—can now, once a day, get to Thunder Bay, and then Thunder Bay down to Toronto, downtown Toronto.

I was at the First Nations Major Projects Coalition conference here, and I think they're going to stick with Toronto because they see—from many communities that came from northern parts of Ontario, especially—they saying out loud, "It was really cool and great that we could get directly to Toronto, to our event, because we already came from far."

Can the minister speak about the opportunity, or the opportunity cost, for communities who don't have air service but get to Timmins, Thunder Bay and Sudbury?

Hon. George Pirie: My colleague right here knows it very well—distances are important.

If you think about the distance from Thunder Bay to Cochrane, that's a distance that's equal to Windsor to the Quebec border. It takes a long time to get across northern Ontario. It's huge. And getting from one place to another place as quick as you possibly can is very important. Why? Because northern Ontario's economy is booming, and our communities need to be connected from the west to the east to the north and south into Toronto, which is the economic capital of Ontario. It's very important that those communities are connected to the heart of Toronto.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): Questions?

M^{me} France Gélinas: I was wondering if the member knew that there are no flights from Billy Bishop to Sudbury. Porter doesn't come to Sudbury. Air Canada doesn't come to Sudbury. There are no flights from Billy Bishop to North Bay—there used to be; there are none now.

So to say that this is important for northern Ontario—Sudbury is the heart of mining. There are more companies that support mining in Sudbury than anywhere else. Do a lot of people come from all over the world to come to Sudbury? Yes, absolutely. If they land at Billy Bishop, then they have to take the bus to downtown, then the UP to Pearson, because there are no flights.

Does that change your point of view regarding the expansion of Billy Bishop? It's not going to do anything for us in Sudbury or North Bay.

Hon. George Pirie: What we're talking about is the future. We're talking about an expanded Billy Bishop airport that will service more people than they've ever served before.

And the quicker you get from Sudbury and downtown Toronto, the better it's going to be for Sudbury and North Bay.

There is, I think, a small airline right now that travels from North Bay into Billy Bishop. You can correct me on that.

There are places like Detour—Detour is just south of James Bay, and that's one mine. On an after cash-flow basis, they generate over \$2 billion a year.

And Agnico in northeastern Ontario is going to be spending \$26 billion between now and 2030.

We need that airport.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): Questions?

Hon. Todd J. McCarthy: It's a big province, and we've heard perspectives from northern Ontario in the questions and in the answers.

This is a perspective from the GTA, in Durham: Businesses and people are looking for modern and improved infrastructure. We're also looking for choice. From my perspective in the riding of Durham, one can travel to Pearson along the 407, and one, at the moment, can also travel to Billy Bishop. It's largely equidistant.

An expanded Billy Bishop airport will create even more opportunity for choice for families, individuals and businesses alike. Is that an important priority for you, in speaking to this as a minister of this government?

Hon. George Pirie: It certainly is, because an expanded Billy Bishop will mean one thing: speed—travelling faster between downtown Toronto into a place like Timmins.

When you're travelling on turbo planes, it takes about an hour and 20 minutes. If you're travelling in small jets, it's up and down, up and down—it's about 30 minutes. You get your business done quickly.

The economy, as I said many, many times, in northern Ontario is booming—I mean from the west to the east; I mean from Kenora to Kirkland Lake. It's booming all across, and we need more world-class infrastructure—which the expanded Billy Bishop airport will give.

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

MPP Tyler Watt: First, I want to correct something that my colleague to my right said. The Prime Minister said, "That's interesting." That's all he has said about this. I wouldn't call that a raving endorsement.

To the government: How much will this cost, and is there a timeline for a return on investment?

1700

Hon. George Pirie: Mr. Speaker, I don't think we've seen any figures about the cost or the time. This bill isn't about that.

This bill is about the future, as I've said over and over and over again. It's a future that's going to provide more reliable service to all the communities across northern Ontario. And northern Ontario has been crying for that service for as long as I can remember. I'm one of the older guys around here, so I've got a long memory about us needing service—better, quicker—into downtown Toronto. That's what this is all about.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): Questions?

Hon. Greg Rickford: Just to double click on my friend from Nickel Belt—that's precisely the point. Airline companies, because of limited choices and options, have cancelled—for example, Air Canada has cancelled several destinations in northern Ontario.

Porter, the more nimble, proved over time a company to get to places in northern Ontario, like the cities that we mentioned. Whether they're there now or whether they will be in the future—and I believe it's the latter—is precisely why we need—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): Question, please.

Hon. Greg Rickford:—infrastructure and service into those communities.

Can the minister tell us about what Porter has done for the communities it's currently flying in and the hope and promise for other—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): I recognize the Minister of Northern Economic Development.

Hon. George Pirie: Mr. Speaker, it's one word: service. Getting people from their communities to downtown Toronto—I'll tell you what it meant to me, to be able to get off a flight into downtown Toronto and actually be right in the business community within minutes. That's convenience, it's service, and it translates into—

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

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: I will be splitting my time with the member from Nickel Belt.

I'm pleased to rise and speak on Bill 110.

I use Billy Bishop airport to get to Queen's Park every single week that the Legislature is in session. Many northerners use Billy Bishop when they are travelling to Toronto for work, for medical appointments, or to connect to other parts of the province.

Billy Bishop is efficient. Compared to Pearson, Billy Bishop is smaller, easier to navigate, and far less stressful.

At Pearson, everything takes longer—longer lines for security, long waits for baggage, long waits for taxis, and heavy congestion getting into and out of the airport. After a long flight, the last thing people want is to stand in another line.

At Billy Bishop, those barriers don't exist, because the airport is reserved for smaller jets and fewer flights. For short domestic travel, for business travel, for people trying to get in and out of the city quickly, it works very well. It is predictable, accessible, and it reduces the stress that often comes with air travel. So, to expand the airport, I think, would ruin what makes Billy Bishop great. Expansion risks longer wait times, increased congestion, and the loss of the very efficiency that makes this airport attractive in the first place.

I must ask: Why are we debating the expansion of an airport that really functions well, when communities in the north do not have anything comparable?

I was listening to both ministers speak about this, and I remember, also, that when we had a lot more flights—because I used to use a lot of flights when I was a union rep or president of a local that would come to Toronto and be able to fly out. I remember that Billy Bishop used to have a lot more Porter flights that were coming in—they've reduced. So you don't need to expand; you just need to add planes. That's the reality of it. We need more flights, more Porter flights. Dash 8s will come in. We just have two flights from Timmins; we used to have four—no need to expand. When you think about Thunder Bay, there used to be more flights. Everywhere, there used to be more flights. So, "We need to expand"? I don't buy that.

We need to make it more efficient so that the fuel costs—and help these companies, maybe, to reduce their costs, because right now, it's costing a lot of money to fly.

One way, my last ticket was \$1,000—something to come just from Timmins to Toronto, and I can tell you, it's probably a lot more when you go from other communities up north.

Northerners understand what it means to have limited transportation options. Let's be honest: Billy Bishop is not the airport that needs urgent attention. The airports that need investment are the ones where we are flying out of the north, or, in many cases, the ones we can no longer fly out of. There are a lot of them that we can't even fly out of. Porter used to come to Kapuskasing. That's a perfect example.

In northern Ontario, the issue is not convenience; it is access, it is whether you can travel at all.

For many remote First Nations, air travel is the only year-round link to health care, food, emergency services and economic participation.

In 2026, over 50,000 First Nations people across northern Ontario requiring medical attention needed air transportation to access care for physicians and specialists. Yet, in just one month, in November 2016, 200 passenger flights to First Nations communities were cancelled or missed because of weather/low ceiling and visibility. With LPV approach technology, these flights could have landed safely. The lack of technology means that 1,900 health patients were unable to attend medical appointments that month due to cancelled flights, because the airports don't have the same technology available in southern Ontario.

Many airports still rely on gravel. Think about this: In 2026, airports on gravel—

Mr. Sol Mamakwa: Thirty-five hundred feet in length.

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: Thirty-five hundred feet in length—

Mr. Sol Mamakwa: They're airstrips.

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: Yes, they're airstrips.

We've been asking them. I know my colleague here from Kiiwetinoong has been asking to pave these for a long time.

Many airports are still on gravel, unpaved runways. In some communities, residents have raised concerns that airports are too close to their communities, citing dust and fuel odours as ongoing issues.

But let's modernize an airport that doesn't need modernization. Yet we are lacking so many services up north—but we don't want to talk about that. Loin des yeux, loin du coeur, monsieur le Président—far from the eyes, far from the heart. These people have been asking for this for a long time.

The 2025 NAN aviation report highlights that the system is under significant pressure due to rising costs, limited competition, regulatory barriers, and insufficient infrastructure investment.

Since 2020, First Nations have requested financial support from the government of Canada and the province of Ontario to pave gravel runways at many northern airports.

Hey, we heard about the Ring of Fire. Pave the landing strips if you want to be efficient, so you have more place to land.

The report also highlights that MTO-operated airports serving First Nations do not meet the minimum standards set out in Transport Canada's Aerodromes Standards and Recommended Practices. Think about this, Speaker: We don't even meet the minimum. These standards have been in place for 10 years, but there has not been any significant action by the province to meet these standards.

What are we going to be doing? Expand an airport that we don't have. All we have to do is put more flights, and that would answer the problems we have and fix the airports that we have up north that deserve some of the services that we should be delivering—minimum standards, monsieur le President.

1710

The report explains that many airports are lacking basic passenger infrastructure, including adequate seating and shelter while waiting for flights.

Across the 29 northern airports that are serviced by the Ministry of Transportation, there are gaps in weather-monitoring technology and services levels needed to maintain reliable flights and flight schedules. As a result, carriers are often forced to delay or cancel flights due to insufficient weather-observation systems or a lack of de-icing services. There you go.

Contrast with Billy Bishop: On one hand, First Nations and northern communities continue to rely on under-resourced airports for essential services. Critical upgrades such as runway improvements, weather systems, and basic passenger facilities remain outstanding despite years of identified need. But at the same time, significant attention and investment are being directed towards major urban aviation projects such as the proposed expansion of Billy Bishop airport. This is the contrast that we see across the Ministry of Transportation's service delivery—from highways, airports, and public transit.

I will hand this off—because I could speak for another 10 minutes—to my colleague from Nickel Belt.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): I recognize the member from Nickel Belt.

M^{me} France Gélinas: I'm also happy to say a few words about the expansion of the Billy Bishop airport.

I want to start by saying that I have been a pilot for the last 35 years. You can talk to any pilots from northern Ontario—and is the expansion of Billy Bishop at the top of our list? Absolutely not. Do we want the province to become co-owner of Billy Bishop? Absolutely not.

The province already owns 29 airports in northern Ontario, and all of them are in need of repairs. All of them are in poor condition. There will be cracks. There will be potholes in the middle of the landing strips. In the winter, they are so poorly maintained that it is very hard.

In the summer, most people from the north will switch to a pontoon plane. I don't want to land on most of the airstrips maintained by the Ministry of Transportation in northern Ontario. I will go to a pontoon and land on the water. Is it slower? Yes, absolutely. You're carrying those big pontoons rather than the little sets of wheels. It takes longer, but at least you know that you will be able to land, and at least you know you will be able to take off. When

you go to one of the 29 airports maintained by the government of Ontario, it is pretty iffy—chances are that if you manage to land, you'll be lucky if they have gas for you to refuel, and you will be lucky if you're able to get out of there.

This is not the way forward. This is not what northerners want. Do we need to make it easier to travel? Yes, absolutely. Would I love to be able to get on a plane in Sudbury and fly to Billy Bishop? Yes, absolutely. There are zero flights that go from Sudbury to Toronto, or from Toronto Billy Bishop to Sudbury—zero. Porter doesn't do it. Air Canada doesn't do it. WestJet doesn't do it. None of them do this.

If you take your own plane and land beside Billy Bishop, they will actually lift your plane to bring it in to put gas in it before you can go back into the water, charging you hundreds of dollars to do something that you don't need to do. Everywhere else, you land on the float plane, you go next to the dock, and you fill up, end of question—not when you come to Toronto.

Are there things that can be done so that it's easier for people of the north to gain access to Billy Bishop? Yes. Is bringing jet planes to Billy Bishop going to help northern Ontario? Absolutely not. There is not a single airport in northern Ontario that could welcome a jet; 3,500 feet of gravel will never—if one ever managed to land, they will never take off again. They will be stuck there for the rest of the time. We'll cut them in pieces and fly them to Toronto and reassemble them. This is not for northern Ontario.

Do we need better transportation in northern Ontario? Absolutely.

Not a day goes by that this government doesn't talk about the Ring of Fire, doesn't talk about mining.

There are people who come from all over the world—there's some mining happening all over the world—who come to Sudbury. We have some of the best businesses that support mining. They are located in Sudbury. They support people in mining all over the world. People will come, and then they feel a bit like they're going to a Third World country. You land at Billy Bishop, then you take a bus to the downtown terminal at Union Station, then you take a train that takes you from downtown to Pearson airport, and then you go through security and all of that again. And then there are two flights, that's all: one flight at 8 a.m. and one flight at 12:40 that will bring you to Sudbury. What is this? Or you can drive on Highway 69, and if you drive on Highway 69, I guarantee you, if you've never been scared driving, you will be scared. It doesn't matter how brave of a driver you are—if you have never driven on Highway 69, get ready. When Highway 69 goes down from four lanes to two lanes for 68 kilometres of it, when there are 12 big trucks following you behind and at least 20 of them coming at you non-stop, and it's the middle of the winter and it's icy, you have to be pretty brave.

This is what we expect people to do—the people who come from all over the world to see all that we know and are able to do in northern Ontario for mining. But there is

no way to get to Sudbury—as I said, no flight from Billy Bishop; two flights from Pearson in the morning only, so if you're coming from a long-distance flight, there is no flight after 12:40, so you will sit there till the next day. You'll say, "That doesn't make any sense. Let me try to drive." And then there's a good chance that Highway 69 will be closed. Between January and right now, Highway 69 has been closed 13 times. It's non-stop. It's about to be tourist season. I don't wish harm on anybody, but I know, because it has been like this for so long—we have the stats; we have the data.

My colleague the MPP from Sudbury and I held a forum on the four-laning of Highway 69 last Wednesday night. The place was packed. We kept receiving—and the stories were all the same. There were people who have had life-changing accidents on the two lanes of Highway 69. There were people who have lost loved ones, who died on that highway. There are people who have survived, but their lives—they feel responsible for the death of people who were involved in an accident that they survived. The stories go on and on. They are really hard to listen to.

This is what northerners want. They want the four-laning of Highway 69. They want Highway 11 and Highway 17 to be made safe. They don't want a bigger airport in Billy Bishop. Billy Bishop serves us well the way it is. No, it's not able to take on jets because it's too short, but it's certainly able to take propeller planes and do a good job of it. Could we increase the amount of propeller planes leaving Billy Bishop? Absolutely. There are lots and lots of places to have more. We used to have five—and at some point, we had six—flights from Sudbury to Billy Bishop. Same thing with North Bay: They used to have three or four flights from North Bay to Billy Bishop. None of those exist anymore. There is lots of room to expand with what exists now.

1720

I also have to put my pilot hat back on for a few minutes here. There are many birds close to Billy Bishop. Anybody who has flown or landed close to Billy Bishop will know that on a propeller plane, if you hit the birds, it's not good. You've made damage to your plane, but you'll usually be able to land. With a jet, the birds get into the engine, and that's it—the engine doesn't work anymore. What are we going to do with all of those birds?

As I say, talk to any pilot. You all know Norm Miller. He was MPP for Parry Sound for a long time, over 20 years. He had a plane—he still does. He has a little Piper. We see one another quite a bit because he flies out my way; I fly out his way. He will tell you this is not what we need. You'll remember my colleague Gilles Bisson. Gilles is also a pilot that has flown all over northern Ontario.

We all agree that we need better airports in northern Ontario. We need better landing strips. What we have now is too short. It's too narrow. It is poorly maintained. It is dangerous. It is hard. As I said, most of us in northern Ontario switch to pontoons the minute that the ice is off the water because we don't want to have to land on those poorly maintained, too short, too narrow strips. There's a lot that the government could do—should do—to make

sure that us northerners have a way to fly and be safe, but none of this includes Billy Bishop.

The last thing I would say is that with most landings, you turn on your left. This is a standard left-hand traffic pattern. With Billy Bishop, depending on where the winds come from, you have to do a right-hand landing, which is not good for pilots because pilots sit on the left.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): Questions?

Mr. Stephen Blais: Thank you to both my colleagues for their discussions about Billy Bishop and the challenges that Billy Bishop faces. As someone who frequents the airport twice a week—and I think you both do. I've seen you many times.

Come to think about it, Mr. Speaker, I've rarely, if ever, seen any members of the government using Billy Bishop. I think most of them drive to Toronto for work, and so it's not shocking for them to not have a full understanding of the challenges that already exist at Billy Bishop. To add jets to that, I think, would be an enormous challenge.

I, in fact, remember one time where Air Canada flew me all the way to Billy Bishop. After already leaving Ottawa two hours late, we circled the airport for an hour, and it was so cloudy we couldn't land. We then diverted back to Ottawa.

I'm wondering, based on your experiences with the weather conditions at Billy Bishop, just how bad do you think jet travel might be to the island.

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: Thank you for the question. I do fly a lot with Minister Pirie. He does use the airport because we've sat beside each other a couple of times already.

That being said, of course, I faced the same issue about the weather. Luckily, though, we had to circle, but it did clear, so we were able to land.

What is really important to say is that—and my colleague from Sudbury said it well—we used to have a lot more flights. So we don't need to expand; we need to increase flights.

I remember Porter used to come to Kapuskasing—makes sense. They don't come to Kapuskasing, yet they land here at Billy Bishop. So all we need to do is increase flights—same planes—don't need to expand and waste that money—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): Questions?

Hon. Graham McGregor: I want to thank my colleagues from the NDP for contributing to the debate.

Earlier, we heard from the Liberal Party, and they're against the jobs. We asked them pretty clearly. We said that there's 23,000 good-paying construction jobs from this project. We asked, are they for those jobs or are they against those jobs? And maybe to sweeten the pot for my New Democrat friends, a lot of those jobs will be unionized jobs, of course, which I know is important to our party. I believe it's important to their party. Liberals are a bit wishy-washy on the issue.

I'm just wondering, for my colleagues from the NDP, are they for 23,000 good-paying, unionized construction jobs or against 23,000 good-paying, unionized construction jobs?

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: Do you know what I'm for? If you really wanted to save money and increase the economics of the province and also Canada, keep our highways open. Use that money to fix our roads on northern highways and you'll save tons and tons and millions of dollars. That's how you're going to be a lot more prosperous in this thing. Because right now, you don't need to expand this. We need to add flights? You fix your problem.

Also, the Ring of Fire—pave the freaking airports. That's what First Nations have been asking you. You talk about the Ring of Fire; you'll have to land there somehow. Increase the business—that's another one.

Hon. Greg Rickford: It's coming, for you.

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: Well, then do it now. Increase now. But fix our highways, because you're not going nowhere, Minister, until we fix our highways.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): I recognize the member for Sudbury.

MPP Jamie West: Thank you to my colleague from Nickel Belt. She talked a lot about Highway 69 and how Billy Bishop came out of nowhere with this massive expansion. The Premier has promised in every election since I was elected in 2018 to finally four-lane Highway 69, but has put zero dollars in the budget every single year. We had a couple of fatalities this year that were tragic in our community—had a town hall about it. The Premier, prior to the last election, actually promised; he said, "If you're off by two inches, you're gone." But in the budget, there was nothing about four-laning Highway 69.

Why is it that the Premier buys himself a \$30-million jet and decides that the priority no longer is the safety of the people of Sudbury and Nickel Belt, and the priority now is where can he land this fancy-pants jet?

M^{me} France Gélinas: I would say this is a question that only the Premier can answer. There is no valid reason when you look at northern Ontario. There are more mines in Nickel Belt than in any other riding. There are lots of good jobs in mining. We know how to mine in a way that respects the people, respects the environment, respects First Nations, but you can't get there because Highway 69 is so, so dangerous. We had Vinod Patel and Shilpa Patel who, on April 7, unfortunately died.

We have a Premier who keeps saying that they will do this, but when the budget comes out, there is zero money for this. But there's \$30 million for a jet plane. How can you defend that? How can you defend that many northerners are hurt or die on a stretch of highway you promised to fix, and yet you spend—

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

Mr. Stephen Blais: To my colleagues: We heard the government talk about wishy-washiness. They want us to trust them about those 28,000 jobs. I haven't seen a report, a financial analysis or anything that shows what the economic benefit of the expansion might be, how many jobs might be created.

We know that they've been wishy-washy about their budget projections. We know they've been wishy-washy about the deficit increasing the province's debt to almost

half a trillion dollars. We know they were wishy-washy with how many convicted criminals they accidentally let out of prison and how quickly they were or, in fact, were not recaptured. In fact, the minister had to apologize to the House for basically misleading the Legislature.

We know that the government is often wishy-washy with their numbers, and so I'm wondering if you can talk about just how wishy-washy the government tends to be about investments in northern Ontario.

M^{me} France Gélinas: I agree with the question that unless I see a plan that has the data, the evidence to support it, then—it's not because a member will say "23,000 jobs." There are no work plans. There is no data. There is nothing to support this. And we all know that we cannot ask for freedom of information to get that information, because they passed the law in the budget that says that we're not allowed to ask those kinds of questions through freedom of access of information.

Will there be 23,000 jobs? Your guess is as good as mine. Is there data in evidence to convince us that this is the right number? Absolutely not. Is there a plan that shows this is when this will happen and how much it would cost? None of this has been shared with us. All we know is a pipe dream that don't make much sense.

1730

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

Mr. Logan Kanapathi: Thank you to the member opposite for your presentation and your perspective about connectivity from the GTA to northern Ontario. I think one of the features of this bill and this project is about connectivity. Modernizing the regional capacity will help strengthen the province-wide connectivity by connecting more flights from Billy Bishop to regional airports around Ontario.

Speaker, through you to my members opposite: If they say they don't support better connectivity for all Ontarians, including those travelling to and from northern Ontario, why are they against the option to expand and improve the system?

Mr. Guy Bourgoïn: I just want to be clear: We're against expansion, not connecting. I think we have demonstrated that we used to have more flights, so you can have more people getting connected. If we had more flights, you could connect more people to northern Ontario and vice versa. So it's not about the connection; it's about expansion that's not needed.

We had, what, five flights in Sudbury—we used to have four or five; now we only have two flights. It used to come to Kapuskasing; that's gone too. We had more flights. All we need is to have more flights and then you have the connectivity you're asking. But to add or expand—I don't think you're being truthful for the people of northern Ontario or Ontario when you know we used to have more flights—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): I'll ask the member to withdraw the statement.

Mr. Guy Bourgoïn: Withdraw.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): Thank you.

We will now move to further debate.

Ms. Stephanie Bowman: It's an honour, as always, to rise today on behalf of my residents in Don Valley West and to talk about Bill 110, the Building Billy Bishop Airport Act. But, Speaker, I have to say that I also feel that I'm speaking on behalf of many other residents in Toronto and across the GTA who have reached out to talk about this, whether through email or just in casual conversation.

Speaker, people are concerned about this project for many reasons, and I'll get into those during my debate today. But one thing it definitely shows is, it's just one more example of this government not being able to manage the economy, not being able to manage its books. They have yet to table a balanced budget. They've had eight years and they still haven't done it. They're on their way to half a trillion dollars in debt and, in the midst of all that, what do they do? They add another almost \$30 million in debt to buy a luxury private jet for the Premier to jet around like a billionaire. So, of course, he wants an airport that can handle jets close to Queen's Park.

Speaker, I asked yesterday, I think it was, about which came first: the jet or the expansion of the airport? I didn't get an answer to the question. In fact, the answer to the question didn't even mention the word "jet" or "airport," so it's clear that the government does not want to talk about the jet. But today we are here to talk about the airport, and we will talk a little bit more about the jet.

My debate today isn't focused just on the jet, which is what I think this bill is really all about, Speaker. Again, apparently the Premier has been talking about this for a while. It's just that, sadly, we only found out about it here in the Legislature and taxpayers only found out within the last few weeks about his plan to buy a jet. It wasn't in the budget, Speaker.

This is a very controversial move, right? It's a very controversial move to expand the Billy Bishop airport, which sits in the middle of Lake Ontario—or not in the middle but in Lake Ontario off the waterfront of Toronto. And people are concerned that this expansion will destroy the beautiful tourist-attracting waterfront of Toronto.

Speaker, you really have to wonder who asked for this expansion. It certainly wasn't the residents of Toronto. It wasn't the residents along the waterfront. Certainly not my constituents in Don Valley West. I've received hundreds of emails just in the last few weeks from constituents telling me that they don't want to see jets at Billy Bishop airport and the expansion that would require.

Here's an excerpt from one of the letters I received:

"Dear MPP Bowman:

"We all cherish the Toronto waterfront as a place to live, work and play. But the waterfront from Etobicoke to the Beaches to the Scarborough Bluffs could soon be scarred by jet aircraft from an expanded island airport....

"With the mainland waterfront activities and location of the island, which attracts millions of people every year, as well as being home to a vibrant community, the revitalization of the mouth of the Don River, park land and residential sites being developed in the Port Lands (which may have to become much shorter due to the jet emer-

agency landing path), and waterfront and residential areas east and west, the last thing Toronto waterfront needs is an airport that allows jets. This is an area that has had huge investment to make it a great place to live, work and play. It is also home to many aquatic animals and birds. The birds are numerous in this area and there should be a huge concern about bird strikes. Large sums of money have been invested to make living on the waterfront a possibility and it is a place of recreation for many. Jets are not and should not be part of this scene. Their impact will not only be felt near the airport but all surrounding areas.”

This constituent goes on to say, “I also have grave concerns about noise, air pollution, potential contamination of the lake, our source of drinking water, safe recreation and support for the wildlife in the area. This is a highly populated area with entertainment sites, tall residential and commercial buildings as well as many enjoying the water, island and waterfront on a regular basis. The consequences of a needed dump of fuel or a crash in this area would be catastrophic.”

Let’s talk a little bit about Little Norway Park. There’s been a lot of talk about it. I’m sure many even on the government side didn’t even know about Little Norway Park before, but as young person in Toronto, I knew about it. I actually played baseball there with my work team many times. It was a beautiful place. And I know many people still enjoy playing baseball today. They take their kids to the wading pool. I have a friend who recently moved to the waterfront, and she has shared pictures of the beautiful park that’s there, of kids and families enjoying the space.

Even more than that, this park represents a sacred relationship that we have with an ally from World War II. The park marks the royal Norwegian air training base where Norwegian pilots would train to then rejoin Allied efforts to defeat Nazi Germany in World War II. It commemorates the thousands of heroic people who contributed to and sacrificed their lives in the fight against Nazi Germany. It’s the site where King Olav V and the crown prince and princess of Norway attended ceremonies.

Speaker, we know that this is a valuable space. It’s a valuable green space in a densely populated city and waterfront community that is used on a daily basis year-round by residents. So it’s interesting that while the government side will say, “Oh, don’t worry, we’re not touching Little Norway Park”—well, I guess what I would say is if you’re not touching it, then why don’t you remove that parcel of land from the bill? Maybe they could commit today to doing that. That would be a great amendment at a minimum to this bill.

There are four things that become clear when you look at this bill. There’s no plan, there’s no business case, there’s no credible economic benefit and there’s no communication with the city that this government says it wants to work with. Let’s talk about this.

No plan to appropriate lands from the city to build a runway, moving forward without transparency and providing no credible insight or plan on how they’re actually going to do it—how are they going to move these sup-

posed 10 million users of an island airport? There’s just no plan.

Again, it’s kind of like the cart before the horse here. They put forward a bill about expanding an airport, but they don’t actually know if they can even do it. There has been no recent study about it. In fact, all of the studies point to the many, many challenges that will face the government if they try this, just based on the limited geographic space around the airport.

1740

Where are the plans to connect the airport with the city’s infrastructure? Where’s the investment in transit, streetcars, regional rail that would be required to support even a fraction of the proposed growth? Why can’t the minister tell us about what they will do with that additional congestion? What will it mean for our already strained roads and the park spaces?

Speaker, it looks like the Premier once again is going to pave paradise and put up a parking lot, just like he’s doing at Ontario Place. It looks like he once again plans to sacrifice public space and community access to help his friends, maybe, or to help himself so he can land his private jet. We don’t know because, again, the government won’t answer the questions about it, but I don’t think it’s a coincidence. I find it hard to believe it’s a coincidence that the Premier is buying a jet and then he’s expanding Billy Bishop airport. It just doesn’t seem like a coincidence. I think that was the plan, Speaker: Buy myself a jet and build myself an airport that can let my jet land.

We know that this is really all about the jet. It’s all about the \$28.9-million jet that the Premier bought, that he says he sold, but we have no paperwork to support that, so we don’t know what’s happening with that. But there’s no business case for this.

The Ontario Liberal government built the Union Pearson Express—the UP Express, as it’s known—that connects downtown Toronto to an international airport: Pearson. It’s one of the busiest in North America and it’s a critical piece of infrastructure that we rely on, Speaker.

We know that people are choosing to fly into Pearson even more so than Billy Bishop because it does have that convenient UP Express right downtown. So it’s a real value to our city and to the visitors who are trying to get downtown from Pearson. That project—the Ontario Liberal government, when they built that, it made it easier for people to leave their cars at home and it made it easier for transit users and, therefore, everyone who uses our roads, because there are fewer cars on the road.

We know that Pearson is, again, a global gateway. It’s an economic engine. It’s a hub that connects Ontario to the world. And it’s expected to grow in usage by nearly 20 million additional passengers, double the highest estimation anyone can come up with for the expansion of Billy Bishop. That also represents jobs, trade, tourism and long-term economic opportunity for the province. Even Porter Airlines, which arguably may benefit from this, knows that with the UP Express, the better business case lies with Pearson.

On March 17, Matt Elliott wrote in the *Toronto Star* that “The new train was one of a few reasons cited by former Porter Airlines CEO Robert Deluce for reducing the company’s runway slots on the island. In a letter dated December 21, 2018, released as part of a prolonged court battle between Porter and Nieuport Aviation, the owner of the airport’s terminal building, Deluce said the train had ‘reduced the locational advantage that [the island airport] once had relative to Pearson.’”

Speaker, that’s an important point. The UP Express removed some of the advantage of the Billy Bishop island airport being close to downtown Toronto.

We don’t know why this government—other than buying this jet for the Premier, why else do they want to expand this airport? We don’t know the cost. They haven’t told us the cost yet, so, again, no credible business case. And every dollar that goes into expanding Billy Bishop is, maybe, one less dollar for Pearson. And we know they have got the space. We know they have got the capacity.

It’s also one less dollar that doesn’t go towards fixing our infrastructure backlog that runs all across this province, from Bay of Quinte to Scarborough to Thunder Bay to James Bay. It’s all across this province, Speaker: \$50 billion of infrastructure backlog. This government could be putting people to work now in every single community if it started to tackle that repair backlog.

Let’s talk about, now, these claimed economic benefits—the alleged economic benefits. This is where the argument really starts to fall apart. These numbers are so inflated that, honestly, I question whether or not they did any analysis at all. It’s kind of shocking.

Here’s the government’s claim: that they’ll expand from two million passengers a year to 10 million and generate \$8.5 billion annually for Canada’s GDP. But when you take a closer look, it just doesn’t seem to hold up.

If you look at Pearson, one of the largest and busiest airports in North America—last year, they had a passenger volume of 47 million, call it close to 50 million people. Pearson added about \$20 billion to Canadian GDP. This government is asking us to believe that Billy Bishop, after expansion, will generate almost half as much GDP as Pearson, while serving only a fifth of the passengers. Speaker, the math just does not add up. A first-year finance student could figure this out. Fewer passengers, fewer connections, less capacity, and yet somehow nearly half the economic output of Pearson? It just doesn’t make sense.

I do actually challenge anyone on the government side of the House to stand up and to explain that math. Show us your business case. Again, this Premier talks about running the province like a business. He has yet to show us the business case for this investment. We don’t even know what it’s going to cost taxpayers. It’s taxpayer money, and this government has not shown us what the business case is or what it will cost.

There have been studies, there have been examinations of this challenge around the airport. The experts, the Toronto Port Authority, has said that while it will be possible to expand the runway by the additional 900 metres to service jet aircraft, that expanded portion would run parallel to the shoreline of Ontario Place—where, again, this government is building an expensive spa and parking lot and science centre; they’re moving it and building a new one, even though the Auditor General told them it would be cheaper to fix it where it is.

Speaker, the Toronto Waterfront BIA says that the Toronto waterfront contributes more than \$13 billion to Ontario’s economy and attracts 18 million visitors per year. I’m not sure if they’re going to want to go down there and ride in kayaks and canoes along our beautiful waterfront when they’ve got jets spraying the water all around them. So on one side, you’ve got the government saying that they want to revitalize the waterfront destination at Ontario Place, but then we have this proposal to increase jet traffic. They just don’t seem to go together.

I think it really comes down to, again, this government’s tendency for overreach and a Premier who says, “I want that. I’m going to go get it. I’m going to go take it.” Whether it was the greenbelt, whether it’s Exhibition Place, whether it’s, again, the Ontario Science Centre—it goes on and on, Speaker. Rather than listen to experts who have been discussing this issue, researching it for years, they say, “Trust us. We’re going to make this happen.” They really have got no idea. It was really about the Premier’s jet and wanting a place to land it.

The city of Toronto debated this; they looked at, does it make sense? Has the government sat down and talked to them? No, Speaker. Again, no sense of collaboration or willingness to work together with the people who have a stake in this—elected officials in Toronto, residents of Toronto, Toronto Port Authority.

I think that that is one of the things that really speaks to the intent of the government. It’s not about building better for Toronto. It’s not about building better for Ontarians. It’s about building an airport that will handle the Premier’s private luxury jet.

Until we see a plan and hear otherwise—see a concrete plan with economic benefits and the cost and that it’s actually feasible to build this airport or expanded airport without destroying all of what people love about Toronto’s waterfront—I’m sorry, but it’s just not a bill that I can support.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): Questions?

Hon. Graham McGregor: Thank you, Speaker.

Interjections.

Hon. Graham McGregor: And thank you to my colleagues for the great applause. Feel free to continue.

Interjections.

Hon. Graham McGregor: When you’ve got it, Speaker.

Listen, I’m not a Toronto guy. I know my colleague’s an MPP from Toronto. As I understand it, the shoreline of

Toronto has adapted over the years. You could look at a map from 1793 and you'd see the shoreline ends at Front Street. Of course, if the shoreline still existed there today, we wouldn't have the CN Tower, we wouldn't have the SkyDome, we wouldn't have the Air Canada Centre—or the Rogers Centre, I think they call it now. After the way the Leafs played, I think that might be a good thing. But surely the member would see some benefit in the shoreline that was filled in—actually filled in—over those 200 years to create that land where all these things are.

1750

So I'm wondering if the member opposes all filling in of Lake Ontario throughout history or is it only when a Conservative comes up with the idea?

Ms. Stephanie Bowman: Well, admittedly, the minister apparently is an expert on history or geography, so asking a question like that is kind of interesting.

Look, I'm not an expert in that. I am an expert, though, in finance and numbers and I know that the numbers this government is talking about make absolutely no sense. I know they have no credible business plan for this expanded airport. I know that they will not tell us what it's really costing the government and taxpayers to buy the Premier a private jet and to sell it again. And what I would like to see from this government is some accountability around a real plan and have a conversation with people about what this would look like.

So, until we get to that point, I don't think we need to worry about expanding the Toronto waterfront.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): Questions?

Mr. Stephen Blais: Thank you very much for your presentation. As you quite rightly pointed out, the government has yet to provide a business plan, a business case or any kind of reliable documentation on cost. I could be corrected, but I have yet to see anything from Air Canada or Porter, the two operators out of the island, saying how this will enhance their business operations. In fact, I just got a text message from a pilot at Air Canada who says the trip from Ottawa to Toronto, which is one of the most frequent trips out of the island airport right now, would only marginally be faster—maybe by a couple of minutes—and the procedure to land jets might actually make the total travel time longer.

We do know that the government is wishy-washy on numbers. In eight years in government, they've racked up 29.7% of all of Ontario's historical debt. So I'm wondering if you might take a moment to educate us more about that.

Ms. Stephanie Bowman: I thank my colleague from Orléans for the question. It's interesting: In 2018, the Conservatives campaigned on reducing Ontario's debt. Guess what, Speaker? They've added about \$130 billion so far and they're on their way—they're at a record level now—to a bigger record, with half a trillion dollars. So there's been no reduction in Ontario's debt under this government; in fact, they're running deficits. And, Speaker, 30% of the new debt that they've added to the taxpayers of Ontario is from deficit.

So while they talk about running the government like a business, this business would be bankrupt. It hasn't made any money. So, absolutely, this government has taken our debt to a terrible level and, until they change course, it will continue.

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

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: We've talked about the misuse of public funds in this place. It's not the first example that we've come to. The most recent example I think is the luxury jet that the Premier—again, with horrible judgment; I don't know where the forethought is when it comes to planning. And in this bill, actually, the government isn't declaring what their business plan is—again, keeping people in the dark, saying that they know what they're doing, but we have so many examples that they don't.

One of the things that I feel is particularly important in this legislation is that they're blocking lawsuits, even in the case of bad-faith negotiations or acts. Why does this government continually want to escape the consequences of their bad actions? Why do you think you're better than the people of Ontario?

Ms. Stephanie Bowman: Thank you to the member from London—Fanshawe for the question. Yes, it's a very good point. Once again, it's become a pattern of this government, that they add a clause to their legislation to say that they don't have to take any responsibility for the consequences, basically giving them carte blanche to do what they want, to cause whatever harm they want to whomever gets harmed by their actions, and they don't have to pay the consequences. So, yes, absolutely, it's actually quite shameful. It's not the kind of province that I want to do business in where the government isn't actually willing to take accountability for its actions and I think the people of Ontario are seeing that. They are seeing that this government doesn't want to take accountability; that's why they've passed these FOI changes which are retroactive, which go back and protect the Premier's phone records and government records. It's just one more action that shows their lack of accountability.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): I recognize the member from Guelph.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I just want to ask the member—I know you represent a Toronto riding, and while there's a housing crisis across the entire province, it's especially awful in Toronto. This expansion of Billy Bishop airport is likely going to mean 30,000 fewer homes built along Toronto's waterfront. Do you think it makes any sense whatsoever, when we're in the worst housing crisis in Ontario's history, to actually build something with no business plan that would cost up to 30,000 homes not being built?

Ms. Stephanie Bowman: Thank you to the member from Guelph for the question.

Speaker, he raises another very valid point. Again, this legislation kind of came out of nowhere, and the experts

are questioning whether or not jets can fly. We have a pilot right here who knows the risks and knows the kind of airspace a jet needs. Even the experts are trying to understand what the implications are.

We are in the middle of a housing crisis—of this government's own making, Speaker; let's be clear. Every other province has been able to expand the number of homes being built. It isn't happening here in Ontario. We have the same interest rates, but we do have a different government—a government that continues to add complexity to housing and can't get the job done, so badly that they removed their target to build 1.5 million homes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): Questions?

Hon. Todd J. McCarthy: I want to be positive; I don't want to be negative. I could say that the member's party left Ontario with a massive infrastructure deficit; that the Liberal government, enabled by the NDP, failed to invest in the Ontario of tomorrow, but I'm going to be positive. I'm going to say this is about making sure Ontario is competitive. We're going to have six million new, additional residents here by mid-century. That's good news, but we've got to be able to compete, grow, and that means investing in the infrastructure that builds the Ontario of tomorrow. The Billy Bishop investment is about that. It's also about providing more choice.

The member was elected, with me, in 2022, and the member and all members of this House supported unanimously four bills for my former ministry—four government bills. Can we not come together and say, yes, we believe in choice for Ontarians when it comes to air travel? Yes, we believe in being competitive. Yes, we believe in convenience. Yes, we believe in being the best. Can we say yes to this bill?

Ms. Stephanie Bowman: Thank you to the minister and member from Durham for the question. I would love to say yes to fiscal responsibility.

Interjections.

Ms. Stephanie Bowman: I will. This government can't do it, Speaker, but since he brought up infrastructure, let me just talk about that for a moment. I mentioned the UP Express; the Liberal government built that. The Liberal government built the Toronto-York-Spadina subway extension; Mississauga Transitway; Viva bus rapid transit; GO Transit expansion; Highway 407 East phases 1 and 2; Highway 404 extension to Keswick; Highway 417 widening in Ottawa region; Highway 11/17 improvements; the Rt. Hon. Herb Gray Parkway in Windsor to Detroit; PanAm Games infrastructure, the athletes' village in the Canary District and the aquatic centre in Scarborough; St. Michael's Hospital redevelopment; the Women's College Hospital new facility; Bridgepoint Active Healthcare, now Sinai Health; the Trillium Health Partners Credit Valley expansion; Oakville Trafalgar Memorial Hospital; Humber River Hospital—thank you.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): Question? I recognize the member from Nickel Belt for a very quick question.

M^{me} France Gélinas: Very quick.

Airports are governed by the federal government. Do you think you can ask your federal cousin to stop this, given that they have a tripartite agreement about Billy Bishop?

Ms. Stephanie Bowman: It's a good question, but I think that we should start with the mayor. Let's ask the mayor what she'd like to do with this airport. The NDP mayor has had a chance to shut this down. She could have shut down Therme, and she didn't, Speaker, so let's ask her about that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ric Bresee): It is now time for private members' public business.

*Second reading debate deemed adjourned.
Report continues in volume B.*

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	