

Legislative
Assembly
of Ontario



Assemblée
législative
de l'Ontario

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

HE-23

**Standing Committee
on Heritage, Infrastructure
and Cultural Policy**

Building Billy Bishop Airport
Act, 2026

1st Session
44th Parliament

Thursday 21 May 2026

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

HE-23

**Comité permanent du
patrimoine, de l'infrastructure
et de la culture**

Loi de 2026 sur la construction
de l'aéroport Billy Bishop

1^{re} session
44^e législature

Jeudi 21 mai 2026

Chair: Hon. Laurie Scott
Clerk: Tanzima Khan

Présidente : L'hon. Laurie Scott
Greffière : Tanzima Khan

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; fax 416-325-7430
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; télécopieur, 416-325-7430
Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

ISSN 2816-7252

CONTENTS

Thursday 21 May 2026

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	HE-579
--	--------

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON HERITAGE,
INFRASTRUCTURE
AND CULTURAL POLICY**

**COMITÉ PERMANENT DU PATRIMOINE,
DE L'INFRASTRUCTURE
ET DE LA CULTURE**

Thursday 21 May 2026

Jeudi 21 mai 2026

The committee met at 1003 in committee room 2.

**BUILDING BILLY BISHOP AIRPORT
ACT, 2026**

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

Consideration 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 Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Good morning, everyone. The Standing Committee on Heritage, Infrastructure and Cultural Policy will now come to order. We're here for clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 110, An Act to enact the Building Billy Bishop Airport Act, 2026.

We are joined by Catherine Oh, legislative counsel, to assist with questions members may have. A copy of the amendments filed with the Clerk has been distributed electronically. A hard copy has also been provided to you.

As always, please wait until I recognize you before starting to speak. As always, all comments should go through the Chair.

Are there any questions before we begin? Seeing none, we will now begin the clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 110.

Before we begin with considering the specific sections of the bill and accompanying schedules, I will allow members to make comments to the bill as a whole. Afterwards, debate will be limited to the specific amendment, section or schedule under consideration.

Committee members, pursuant to standing order 83, are there any comments or questions on the bill as a whole? MPP Glover, please.

Mr. Chris Glover: We actually were debating about whether to introduce amendments to this bill because this bill is just appallingly wrong. This bill is a gross overreach, an attack on municipal rights and the rights of voters to elect a municipal government that actually can control their own municipality, their own parks—in this case, the airport.

There's been a tripartite agreement between the federal government, the Toronto Port Authority and the city of Toronto since 1983 that has managed the Billy Bishop airport in a generally successful way. This bill attempts to

usurp the role of the city, which is the people of Toronto, to have any say in the future of their airport. The future of this airport is tied into the future of the downtown Toronto waterfront, where we have spent billions of taxpayer dollars building Canada's number one tourism destination, with 28 million visitors in 2025. This bill attempts to usurp the role of the city so that it will only be the province and the federal government determining the future of this airport. And what they have said very clearly is that they want to have jets landing every two and a half minutes at this airport. This airport is Canada's smallest airport—210 acres. It's in the worst possible, most dangerous location for an airport. It only operates under exemptions from the Transport Canada safety standards, because it is sandwiched between high-rises on the one side and the Toronto Islands and Tommy Thompson Park, which operate as bird sanctuaries, on the other side. So the risk is to the residents.

I was at a town hall last night. One of the residents in my area said she had nightmares about a 9/11 terrorist attack. The 9/11 terrorist attack—they had to fly out of the airport and then back around to Manhattan to hit the World Trade Center. If there was ever a terrorist attack from the Billy Bishop airport, it would just on the takeoff, because those planes fly right by those high-rises.

The other risk here, the real risk, is bird strikes, because prop planes, if they hit a bird, the birds tend to bounce off. The birds probably die, but the birds bounce off; the plane is okay. Jets have turbines that suck in massive amounts of air, and if there are birds in that air volume, they get sucked in and they can kill the engine. This is what happened in New York where a jet flew into a flock of Canada geese. They lost both the engines and the plane had to land on the Hudson River. Fortunately, everybody escaped. There was a movie about it with Tom Hanks called *Miracle on the Hudson* because of this bird strike.

There are hundreds of thousands of birds on the Toronto Islands and in Tommy Thompson Park. There are 40,000 cormorants in those two areas; that's just one of over 200 species of birds that have been identified and they're a mid-sized bird. So if a jet is taking off at Tommy Thompson and flies into a flock of cormorants, would its engines not die? And if it does die, it's not flying into an empty Hudson River; it's crashing into the Toronto harbour, which is one of Canada's busiest harbours. Just in terms of paddling, in terms of all of the kayaks and the canoes and all the other boats that you paddle, that is

Canada's busiest paddling destination anywhere, in all of Canada. There are more paddlers, more paddle boats, out there. Plus there are cruise ships, there are ferries, there are sailboats, there are all kinds. There are at least—I was counting—nine marinas that I could count just off the top of my head in that area. This is where you want to build a Pearson on Lake Ontario. It's a really, really dangerous and bad idea.

When we look at the cost of this—this is one of the things. This government is looking at, "Okay, well, we're going to expand this airport." It's going to cost—what we discovered in the committee hearings—\$5 billion. That makes no financial sense whatsoever, because for \$5 billion, they're going to expand the capacity by eight million passengers a year, okay? At Pearson, they just announced—some of the government members were there for the groundbreaking at Pearson, for an expansion—they're going to spend \$3 billion and expand the capacity by 23 million passengers. So for \$3 billion, we get 23 million more passengers; at Billy Bishop, you're going to spend \$5 billion to get eight million passengers. For almost half the money at Pearson, you get three times the number of passengers. Why would we invest in Billy Bishop?

The other cost at Billy Bishop is the tourism sector will take a massive hit. If there are jets flying over the waterfront every two and a half minutes, how many people are going to come down to watch the dragon boat race or the Caribbean Carnival or the CNE? And how many people, after they go to a Jays game or a TFC game or a Raptors game, are going to walk along the waterfront and go to one of the restaurants or the bars, or get on a cruise ship or get on a ferry and go over to the Toronto Islands? How enjoyable will the Toronto Islands be if not just this government, but the federal government also, go ahead with their plans to have jets landing at Billy Bishop?

1010

The other thing that we discovered in the hearings here is that the provincial Minister of Transportation has been meeting regularly with the federal minister of transportation. We also learned that the Toronto Port Authority has been meeting regularly with the federal minister of transportation because the Toronto Port Authority's boss is the federal government. Seven of the nine members of the Toronto Port Authority's board members are appointed by the federal government.

Right now, the strategy seems to be for the provincial government to take the lead on this, even though, legally, until this bill passes, they have no legal right to do anything at that airport. They cannot do anything at this airport or any airport without the federal government's say-so because airports are federally regulated. The strategy seems to be to protect the federal Liberals—to let the provincial Conservatives take the lead, to let Premier Ford take the lead on this to take the heat on this, while in the backroom, the federal Liberals are actually pulling the strings because they are the only ones that have the authority to make any changes at this airport. We really need the federal Liberal government to stand up and say that they

will protect the waterfront and that they will not change the tripartite agreement.

I'll just pivot onto the tripartite agreement for a moment here. As I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks, the airport has been managed through a partite agreement with the city, the Toronto Port Authority and the federal government since 1983, and it's been managed fairly well. This bill would try to usurp the role of the city and put in place the provincial government.

One of the clauses in the tripartite agreement says that it can only be changed if there's the consent of all three parties. If the city is being taken out of that tripartite agreement, the city will probably have a good legal challenge to say, "Hey, you can't change this tripartite agreement without our say-so because we are a signatory to it." There will probably be a legal challenge there; there would certainly be grounds for it.

The other part, though: The federal government certainly has the power to say that they will not change the tripartite agreement. They will not recognize the provincial government as a partner in the tripartite agreement. They will continue to recognize the city as the partner in the tripartite agreement. The only way the city can be usurped is if the federal government allows it to happen. If that happens, if the federal government does not protect the city's role in the tripartite agreement, what Prime Minister Carney is saying is that he does not want the people of Toronto and the city of Toronto to have a role in determining the future of that airport.

It's absolutely incumbent upon us who want to protect the waterfront to stand up and say not only is this bill wrong, but we also need the Prime Minister to make a statement about which side of this issue he is standing on. Is he with Premier Ford in destroying the waterfront by allowing jets onto this airport, or is he with the people of Toronto who want to protect their waterfront? Because that is our playground. That is where everybody in Toronto, most people in Toronto, come to enjoy the events, they come to enjoy the parks, they come just to enjoy the waterfront because most of the people in Toronto do not have a cottage in Muskoka like the Premier. Most of them have come to the waterfront in downtown Toronto. This bill and the actions of this government and the federal Liberal government would destroy that waterfront.

Those are my comments.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I'm not going to speak for long. The reason why we're here today is because we're very concerned about this bill to take over the city of Toronto's control over most of Toronto Island and the Billy Bishop airport area because it is part of the government's plan to dramatically expand Billy Bishop airport and have jets land there every two and a half minutes, which is a real worry for a lot of reasons.

We just went to committee and we heard a lot of stakeholders talk about some of the concerns that they raised, and there were a lot of them. I was really struck by what David Crombie had to say when he talked about the

history of the waterfront and how all levels of government agreed that this is an area where we could have a shared vision, where there was a balance and where there was a possibility for mixed uses. And when I go down to the waterfront, that's exactly what I see. I see a place where there is housing, I see a place where people go to recreate, and I also see an airport. Things are working pretty well, and a lot of money has been invested into that area to make sure it works well.

What we also heard from stakeholders was a lot of concerns about what would happen if this expansion moved ahead. We heard about the health impacts, especially for nearby communities. We heard about the impact of noise, the impact of pollution. We heard about questions regarding safety. Sending a whole lot of jets near condos raises some concerns. Sending a whole lot of jets along bird migratory pathways also is raising a lot of concerns.

And then, we also heard about the business case. What we heard with the business case is that the numbers don't necessarily add up, and there's a lot of questions about whether this project could even be economically feasible without massive government investment. There's a lot of questions about that.

It seems like it's a pretty poorly thought-out plan. It's certainly something that's happening behind closed doors, and there were a lot of people that are asking a lot of questions because they just want to know what's going on. How long is the runway? How much, exactly, is it going to cost? How did you come up with this \$8.5-billion figure? There are a lot of questions.

We will be introducing amendments today in an attempt to improve this pretty terrible bill. A lot of our amendments are really practical: Show us a business case, do a full environmental assessment, protect Toronto Island—you said you would; the minister said he would. Protect it.

That's going to be our agenda today and that's the extent of my comments.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Any further debate, discussion? MPP Grewal.

Mr. Hardeep Singh Grewal: Good morning, everyone. While the opposition is busy fearmongering and providing sensational language against this bill, what we're actually doing is taking Toronto's position in the tripartite agreement. What that means is that the Ontario government will have a third of the voting right when it comes to making decisions, and two thirds will still be with the federal government and the port authority.

This is about having the opportunity to expand Billy Bishop to provide better access to northern Ontarians that need urgent health care, as well as just leisurely travel for them to come down into Toronto, actually be able to enjoy a Blue Jays game, enjoy the city, enjoy the very waterfront that we're talking about here today—improving access not only for northern members, but also giving Torontonians the opportunity to fly out of the city, and then also provide the opportunity for new tourism to fly into the city.

The conversation around the jets that are coming in and all of this—it's going to be in partnership with the port authority. The port authority is going to ensure that that

equilibrium is balanced, because not only are they in charge of the air rights and managing that, they're also in charge of the marina rights as well. Making sure things operate smoothly is the goal of the government.

When this was last brought forward, we talked a lot about, in this committee, RESA 1 versus RESA 3, and the conversation that took place at that time where the city voted down the opportunity to introduce berms and improve safety at the airport, and making this a very localized issue. Instead of this, we're able to look at the broader aspect of things and ensure that this airport not only serves the needs of downtown Toronto but also serves the needs of our northern members.

So as we take over that role in the tripartite agreement, we're going to work together with the federal government. We're going to work together with the port authority to ensure that we have safe, reliable transportation that not only improves transportation connectivity across the province and around the world, but ensures Toronto is a world-class city—bringing in more tourism, increasing our economic benefit to the tune of almost \$140 billion over the next 25 years, creating another 20,000 jobs in construction and 10,000 airport jobs, as well as maintaining and enjoying the waterfront that we all love today.

1020

The waterfront isn't just enjoyed by a certain group. The waterfront is enjoyed by everybody. I know my colleagues on this side of the aisle love going into downtown Toronto and enjoying what the city has to offer.

We're going to continue to make sure Ontario grows. Everything that we have put forward, not only in this bill but previous bills, in improving the waterfront, the opposition has voted down. They have sat on their hands for the last 15 years, did absolutely nothing with Ontario Place, and let it rot. Our government is moving forward. We're transforming the waterfront. We're making it a destination where more tourism would like to come into the city, more people would like to come into the city and enjoy the very asset that we all love.

On behalf of this government, we're very excited to table this bill and move things forward with this new partnership agreement, working together with Ports Toronto and the federal government.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Good morning, everyone. I'm looking for the happy medium with this. What it was, was at the October 2024 council meeting when safety measures were discussed about at the city of Toronto and the options were put forth to improve the safety—which we know is a concern at Billy Bishop airport—there was a choice of the RESA 1, 2 or 3 options. RESA 3 was the one that would provide the most safe measures all around, including working to mitigate the 800 vehicles that currently traverse across the runway, which is dangerous at any point in time, and that includes school buses driving across an airport runway.

That is alarming. We would never allow that nowadays, and we shouldn't allow that. RESA 3 would have dealt with that. That was up to the mayor of Toronto and her

council, and that did not happen. That is why we are where we are today, unfortunately. Now this government is just big eyes in a candy shop, seeing more than what is required and demanding more access, extensions and expansions at the cost of many things.

First of all, there's no business case. You should do a business case before you propose something, especially of this magnitude. You have a plan. You're open and transparent with that plan, especially if you're proud of it. You'd be showcasing it to the world.

We're lucky in Toronto. We have two existing airports that work exceptionally well. One is a boutique airport called Billy Bishop, and what people love about that airport is the quaint, cozy boutique-ness of it. That will completely change if this bill is allowed to go through. We have Lester B. Pearson. There is a \$3-billion investment there, right now. It is going to increase the capacity up to around 68 million passengers per year. We have amazing transit to get there. The UP Express is phenomenal. The TTC, which I've shared with you, I take for \$3 and change, and zip across the city and up in no time.

There's already a major airport. We don't need two major airports in the city, especially one shoehorned into a very tight space that is one of the busiest, most congested intersections—with 400 vehicles per hour, currently, going to down to Eireann Quay—in the busiest city in the country. That, in addition to all of the proposed housing in Ookwemin Minising and Port Lands area, capping those heights when I know this government is bragging repeatedly about housing and the need to build more housing, which we all are in agreement with. So then why would you kibosh a bunch of housing in the Port Lands? It just doesn't make sense.

We also have heard from people, the other day at committee, about the importance of historical monuments and heritage of the area, which recognizes the famine sculptures called Arrival by Rowan Gillespie down at Ireland Park—there are five here and seven in Dublin—and the Corleck, which has investment from this government, finally, in addition to the government of Ireland, the federal government and the city of Toronto. It's going to be a phenomenal immigration event and showcase space.

Little Norway Park, the Norwegian aviation training centre back in the day during World War II: The King of Norway has come several times, including to commemorate the stone that was brought over from Norway 50 years ago. I don't think we want to pave over any war memorials. I don't think you would want to do that in your own ridings, in cenotaphs or legions. I think we respect history in this country. We're proud of it.

All that to say, this is a step way too far.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Glover.

Mr. Chris Glover: I'll just respond to one comment that was made. I started two businesses, and in both cases, I started with a business case. I actually sat down: "What am I going to need to invest in this business? What are the costs? What are the opportunity costs, if I'm working on that business and not on something else?" You don't leap

into a business. I've never known a business person who sat down and said, "I'm just going to start a business and hope it works out." Everybody sits down and they do the calculations. They do the arithmetic first to make sure that they're making a good investment—or at least, the best investment that they think is possible.

This government is once again leaping forward, seizing control of the Toronto Islands, Little Norway Park and Billy Bishop airport. They're probably going to be involved in a lawsuit around the tripartite agreement with this. And they do not have a business case. So they have not actually looked at, "Is doing this worthwhile?" They haven't weighed the costs and benefits of this.

And the costs that we already know about, just based on previous studies—we know there's going to be a cost, because there's going to be a loss of housing, or the housing potential in the Port Lands, where we just invested \$2 billion in order to rehabilitate an industrial site so that we could build 40,000 units of housing. There's going to be a cost to the tourism sector in the downtown waterfront. There's going to be a cost to the residents along the waterfront, people who bought housing along the waterfront over the last 30 years because they wanted to live on the waterfront, not because they wanted to live beside "Pearson-on-the-Lake," which this government is proposing.

You're leaping into this. The strategy has always been with this government to leap in, and then when it's too late to go back, then the numbers start to come out. This is what happened at Ontario Place. The government, I remember, was just boasting about Ontario Place. Ontario Place is a disaster. It's costing us. We, the Ontario taxpayers, are subsidizing a private Austrian spa to the tune of \$2.2 billion, so that they can build a spa on our public parkland with a 95-year lease. No one thinks that this is a good idea. This spa company lied to the people of Ontario about their own financial credibility in order to land the contract, and four years after the contract, still does not have a financial backer to actually build the spa.

Now the government is after the Billy Bishop airport and the Toronto Islands and Little Norway Park. They have got no business case and we're looking at another financial boondoggle on the waterfront. So I would ask the government members: Be fiscally responsible with the people of Ontario's property and with our finances, with our tax dollars. Do not lurch ahead with this bill until you've at least done a business case, until you've at least weighed the costs and benefits. So I'd ask the government members to vote against this bill, or at least defer until you have a business case, so that the people of Ontario can see where you're planning on investing their \$5 billion.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Any further debate? Seeing none: Bill 110 is comprised of 14 sections and one schedule.

We will begin our clause-by-clause with section 1. There are no amendments to section 1. Is there any debate about section 1? Are the members ready to vote, then? Okay. All those in favour, please raise your hands.

1030

Mr. Chris Glover: Recorded vote, but just on amendments, not on the sections.

Interjection.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I'm so sorry. No recorded votes necessary.

All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare section 1 carried.

Moving on to section 2, we do have an amendment. I'll look to MPP Glover.

Mr. Chris Glover: I move that section 2 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Public approval of the Prime Minister

“(7) Despite subsection (1), no land prescribed for the purposes of that subsection is vested in the crown unless the Prime Minister of Canada has expressed public support for the land being vested in the crown.”

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Debate? MPP Glover.

Mr. Chris Glover: Basically, this amendment is asking for the Prime Minister to have to approve of any expropriation of city land for the purpose of expanding the Billy Bishop airport. Airports are managed and regulated by the federal government, so no expansion of the airport, no changes to the airport can happen without the Prime Minister's approval. This province does not need to seize or expropriate the Toronto Islands, Little Norway Park or even the city's portion of Billy Bishop airport unless the Prime Minister's going to approve of this expansion of the airport.

What this amendment does is just say, “Hey, the Ontario provincial government cannot expropriate the land unless the Prime Minister makes a public statement approving of that expropriation for the purpose of this airport.” So the Prime Minister would have to commit to his support for the expansion of this airport and his support for the purpose of this bill.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: This is a motion that I support. The motion calls on the Prime Minister to express their public support for the land being vested in the crown before proceeding, and the reason why I think this is important is because the Prime Minister has been really wishy-washy on this. His quotes have included, “It's a very interesting vision” with “big possibilities.” Well, what does that mean?

We also heard from the port authority two days ago that the Ontario government and the federal government are negotiating in secret, behind closed doors, on what this plan could look like, and there is no finalized business case. So all this is happening in the dark, and the rest of us are left out, the city of Toronto included.

I'm thinking—and I think, Chris, you'd agree with me here—this is a major project. This bill is very drastic and it's contingent upon the Prime Minister's public support for it to proceed, so it would make sense, before we move ahead with this project, that the Prime Minister is clear on where they stand.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate?

Mr. Chris Glover: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Glover.

Nays

Anand, Babikian, Grewal, Sandhu, Saunderson.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment number 1 lost.

There is a Liberal notice to section 2 to the bill. I'll look to the Liberal member MPP McMahon for debate.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I just recommend voting against section 2 of the bill.

Did you want me to read the reason, or no, just “voting against”? Okay, thank you.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): It's up to you.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Basically, it's talking about the land grab. We're just back to the basics of needing a business case before we do anything. We're not interested in having the province seize any land or take it under control without—first of all, it's a tripartite agreement, so that's three other parties involved to have the discussion and not be the unilateral controller, the dictator taking the land without conversations—first off, a business plan. So, I'm just voting against this and asking you to join me.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? This is a vote on section 2 as a whole.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Anand, Babikian, Grewal, Sandhu, Saunderson.

Nays

Bell, Glover, McMahon.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare section 2 carried.

There are no proposed amendments to sections 3 to 7. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed, okay.

Is there any debate? No? Okay. Are members ready to vote? Shall sections 3 to 7 carry?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Anand, Babikian, Grewal, Sandhu, Saunderson.

Nays

Bell, Glover, McMahon.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare section 3 carried.

We're now moving on to section 8.

Mr. Chris Glover: Point of order, Madam Chair.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Yes, question?

Mr. Chris Glover: I may have misheard, but I think you said that you declare section 3 carried.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): It's sections 3 to 7 carried. Sorry; I'll be clearer.

We're now going on to schedule 3, section 8. Is there any debate on section 8? There's going to be—

Mr. Chris Glover: An amendment.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Yes, after.

Okay. I see no debate, but there is a Liberal notice to section 8 of the bill. I'll look to the Liberal member for debate—MPP McMahon, if you want to comment on your notice.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I'm just recommending voting against section 8 of the bill.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Okay. Thank you.

We will now ask, shall section 8 carry? Is there any debate on section 8 as a whole?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Mary-Margaret, would you like to explain why you've put this amendment in?

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: This section extinguishes all potential legal proceedings as a result of government actions under this bill, so no legal remedies are available and no costs, compensation or damages, direct or indirect, are owed by anyone in connection with this act. I don't agree with that.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Thank you. Just going back, we did ask, and you just said you didn't agree, so I just let you expand further at the encouragement.

Is there any further debate? MPP Glover.

Mr. Chris Glover: The whole bill is a gross government overreach. Our democracy works because we have different levels of government that we vote for, and we elect them to do different things: the more local the issue, the more local the government. This is why we have municipal governments to handle things that are local, because people in Ottawa are not going to know what is needed in Newmarket; they're not going to know what's needed in downtown Toronto. This is why we have a municipal government. Members of the Ontario Legislature coming from all parts of the province are not going to know what's needed in downtown Toronto.

1040

The whole bill is a government overreach. It's seizing control of Toronto public parkland and Toronto's role in managing this airport. But the other thing it does—and this is where it's a real assault on our democratic rights—is it's saying, "Look, what we're doing may be illegal. It may breach the rights of the municipality of Toronto or of the residents of Toronto, but we're saying that it doesn't matter. You can't take us to court." So this bill is saying they're going to try to strip the municipality—the city of Toronto and the residents of Toronto—of their right to take the government to court if there's a cause for action from this bill.

And I think there is—I mentioned it earlier—a cause for action; there are two causes. One is this government is saying, "Hey, we're seizing the Toronto Islands, all that Toronto public parkland, the Little Norway Park. But this isn't an expropriation," and they don't explain why it's not an expropriation, but if it is—when the government want to take over somebody's property, they have to expropriate the property. It falls under the Expropriations Act, and the Expropriations Act gives the owner of the property certain rights.

One of the rights is that the government can expropriate—they have to show just cause for why they're expropriating the property, but they also can only expropriate the property that's necessary for the project. If they want to build a highway through a farm, they can expropriate the land necessary for that highway, but they can't take the whole farm. They have to only take what's necessary for the highway.

In this case, the government is seizing almost all of the Toronto Islands, except for little carve-outs for the housing on Algonquin and Ward's Islands. If this bill goes through as-is—they're saying, "This is not an expropriation." So they could use the islands for any purpose that they want. It doesn't have to be limited to expanding the Billy Bishop airport.

If one of the Premier's friends wants to put a resort on Centre Island, the Premier could just say, "Oh, yeah, you know what? We just expropriated Centre Island. Put your resort over here, right on the public beach." There are no limits to this.

The government, in this bill, is actually not only seizing the property; they're stripping Ontarians—and this is not just Torontonians—of the right to take the government to court when the government is doing something wrong, where there's cause to take them to court. That's an assault on the democratic rights of everybody in Ontario.

I hope the government will vote against this assault on our democratic rights in this section 8.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I support the move to vote against section 8 of the bill. The reason why I support voting against this section is because I've got pretty big concerns about this section because it means that the government is protecting themselves from being taken to court because of the consequences of this pretty drastic bill.

I think it's safe to say that the right to pursue legal action is a cornerstone of a well-functioning democracy. It's also important to note that legal action has been pretty effective at holding this government to account when you've overstepped the line, such as with Bill 124 and other violations of collective bargaining agreements.

I think courts should continue to be an option for people when/if the project moves ahead, especially given the consequences or the concerns that we have around safety, health, noise, property values and the takeover of city property.

That's why I'll be voting against section 8.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Any further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote this time?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Anand, Babikian, Grewal, Sandhu, Saunderson.

Nays

Bell, Glover, McMahon.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare section 8 carried.

We're now moving on to R3 in your package for amendment. I look to the NDP.

Mr. Chris Glover: I move that section 8.1 be added to the bill:

“Environmental impact assessment report

“(8.1) No development project in respect of the vested real property may proceed until the minister has commissioned an environmental impact assessment report respecting the project and published the report on a government of Ontario website.”

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Debate? MPP Glover.

Mr. Chris Glover: This is the business case. You don't proceed with a massive project like this without doing a study first. One of the studies—there was an environmental assessment commissioned by the Toronto Port Authority, who is a big advocate of expanding this airport, a federal agency that wants to expand the airport, wants to have jets there. But their own environmental assessment from 2017 said that one of the dangers of expanding the runway, lengthening the runway, is that you reduce the water flow in the Toronto Harbour. You make it stagnant. So at that time in 2017, the proposal was to add 200 metres on each end of the runway. They did a hydrology study that said that this would reduce the flow of water through the harbour from the eastern channel and out the western channel by half. This would result in greater concentration of pollutants in the harbour, so the water would become more polluted.

What this government is proposing, what the Toronto Port Authority has said that the federal government wants to do, is to expand this runway not by 400 metres, as was originally proposed, but by 900 metres, most of it going out to the west end. This would create a very, very small channel on the west end where you probably could not get a boat through and where there would be an even more reduced level of water flow. So what you're proposing is potentially to create the Toronto Harbour—Canada's number one tourist destination, as I mentioned again—turn it into a stagnant swamp where there's no water flow, there's no cleansing of the water. That's just one of the things that needs to be looked at before you forge ahead with this proposal, you know? We're asking this because we're trying to stop the government from potentially making a catastrophic mistake and destroying our waterfront.

All we're asking for is, before you proceed with this, do an environmental assessment, publish the results of the environmental assessment so that the public can see what the environmental costs of proceeding with this project are—a very simple ask. There should be nothing controversial about wanting to do this environmental assessment.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: This is a major industrial project. Expanding the airport right next to downtown Toronto is going to have significant impacts on the surrounding environment. It's important to note that an environmental assessment means that you're not just considering the impacts on birds or water, you're considering the overall impact on the surrounding area, which means you're looking at the health impacts, the traffic impacts. Especially when we're looking at the southern part of Bathurst Street, which is not a major highway, it's difficult to understand how that street is going to be able to handle the proposed increase in traffic.

The impact on housing construction, not just in the docklands but also now, we're hearing, in Etobicoke; noise issues; safety issues; impact on local businesses; impact on tourism, impact on the water quality in the harbour—all these things need to be evaluated and assessed before we move ahead with this big project. It remains to be seen whether the provincial government is going to do that.

With the special economic zone law, the government has given themselves the authority to decide that a certain area could be exempt from workplace rules, the need to do an environmental assessment, any kind of city or provincial law, essentially. I worry what that means, which is why we've put in an amendment to ensure that before this project proceeds, there's a full environmental assessment so that Torontonians know what's actually at stake.

1050

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Yes, I'm happy to support this amendment. Thank you to my colleagues. Environmental assessments are the right thing to do. They are the logical thing to do.

I do, however, worry about what's happening with Bill 105 and environmental assessments, but I hope this goes through.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none—

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Glover, McMahon.

Nays

Anand, Babikian, Grewal, Sandhu, Saunderson.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare amendments on section 8.1 lost.

We're going to move then on to amendment R4, which is the new section 8.2. NDP amendment: MPP Glover.

Mr. Chris Glover: I move that section 8.2 be added to the bill:

“Health equity impact assessment report

“8.2 No development project in respect of the vested real property may proceed until the Prime Minister has commissioned a health equity impact assessment report respecting the project and published the report on a government of Ontario website.”

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Debate? MPP Glover.

Mr. Chris Glover: We put this in because one of the areas that would be most impacted by having jets land and take off every two and a half minutes at the Billy Bishop airport is housing that is immediately adjacent, that is within 200 metres of the airport. There is a school right there; there is an elementary school, a high school. There is a community centre right there. There is TCHC housing. There are several co-ops in the area. There are a number of people with disabilities.

In the submissions, we had a report from the Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment. They talked about the health risks of having jets take off and land that close to an elementary school, that close to residences where a disproportionate number of people have disabilities or are low-income. They said that—

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): MPP Glover, I'm sorry. I have to interrupt you.

You just need to reread the whole amendment.

Mr. Chris Glover: Reread the amendment?

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I think you just misspoke and said “Prime Minister,” not “minister.”

Mr. Chris Glover: Oh, did I? Okay.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): So you have to reread it, and then we'll allow you to continue debate.

Mr. Chris Glover: You all caught that? Nobody stopped me till now? Okay.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): We're catching up here.

Mr. Chris Glover: Okay.

I move that section 8.2 be added to the bill:

“Health equity impact assessment report

“8.2 No development project in respect of the vested real property may proceed until the minister has commissioned a health equity impact assessment report respecting the project and published the report on a government of Ontario website.”

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): You may resume debate.

Mr. Chris Glover: Okay, so I was just mentioning one of the deputants who came here was a representative of the Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment, and they talked about the environmental impact of having jets versus the turboprops. Right now, the turboprops land every 20 minutes or so. The proposal is to have jets landing or taking off every two and a half minutes.

They said that compared with turboprop aircraft, commercial jets generate substantially higher emissions because they must accelerate to higher speeds and climb to greater altitudes. This raises fuel burn and reduces efficiency, resulting in roughly 30% to 50% more carbon dioxide per passenger mile, significantly higher emissions per nautical mile on short-haul flights and more pollution.

The pollutants emitted by commercial jets carry well-documented human health risks. These pollutants include ultrafine particles, nitrogen dioxide, sulphur dioxide and other harmful substances, such as carbon monoxide, black carbon, volatile organic compounds and hydrocarbons. UFPs, ultrafine particles, are linked to multiple system diseases. UFPs provide an exposure pathway associated with dementia, Alzheimer's disease and stroke. Additional harms include increased rates of diabetes, lung cancer and significant pregnancy risks. UFPs have been detected in placental tissue and are associated with low birth weight and possible birth defects.

Low monitoring confirms that the UFP levels near Billy Bishop airport are already elevated because of the current operation of the airport. Researchers from the University of Toronto's Transportation and Air Quality Research Group found that airport activities are the primary source of UFPs in the Bathurst Quay neighbourhood. When the wind blows from the airport during operating hours, UFP levels can spike two to three times from baseline, possibly exceeding 100,000 particles per cubic centimetre. This exceeds what the World Health Organization considers high for ultrafine particles, which is 20,000 particles per cubic centimetre.

Basically, they're saying: “We already know there's a health risk. We know there are low-income housing projects in that area.” What they're asking for is simply to do—not just an environmental assessment, but a health equity impact assessment to see what the impact is.

I know that many of the members in this room have children or grandchildren. You've got to ask yourself, if your child was going to a school that was 200 metres from an airport and the government was proposing to have jets land and take off there every two and a half minutes, would that be something you would be voting for? I'll leave it there.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate on amendment R4? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I think we're all in agreement: We want to keep Ontarians safe and healthy. So I will be supporting this amendment—anything to monitor air quality, especially for vulnerable populations. I'm all about air quality, and I'm proving that.

I would note the previous Liberal government closed the coal plants, so you are breathing a lot easier these days. The Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment—in addition to what my colleague said, what they spoke about the other day was they hadn't even factored in all the congestion and the poor air quality from the 400 vehicles per hour down there, which is only going to increase. So, I'm happy to support.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I want to just elaborate on some of the issues that MPP Glover raised around the health impacts of putting a major industrial airport next to a very congested area. I want to read specifically about what studies already show when you study the health impacts of having an airport near a major congestion area.

I want to quote from the Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment: “Given the health harms from elevated air and noise pollution from airports, it is not surprising that studies consistently show that people living closest to airports face greater health impacts. Research has found that residents living within five kilometres of an airport have approximately 20% higher risks of diabetes and dementia, along with a 7% higher risk of high blood pressure. Evidence also suggests that elevated health risks can extend up to 20 kilometres from major airports.”

The reason why I read this out is that these are doctors. This isn't fearmongering. These are doctors. I think we should take the health impacts of this expansion very seriously, and conducting a report means that we will be taking it seriously. So I will be voting in support of this amendment.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote on new section 8.2 and R4 in your package?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Glover, McMahan.

Nays

Anand, Babikian, Grewal, Sandhu, Saunderson.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare new section 8.2 lost.

Now, moving on to amendment 4—

Mr. Chris Glover: Oh, 4—we're skipping that.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Okay. We're now moving on to R5, which is a new amendment for section 8.3. MPP Glover.

1100

Mr. Chris Glover: I move that section 8.3 be added to the bill:

“Business case

“8.3(1) No development project in respect of the vested real property may proceed until the minister has publicly presented a business case for the project.

“Same

“(2) The business case referred to in subsection (1) shall incorporate the costs of,

“(a) lost housing;

“(b) lost revenue from tourism;

“(c) lost revenue for Toronto Pearson International Airport; and

“(d) negative effects on the healthcare system.”

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Okay. Got it. Good. Debate?

Mr. Chris Glover: Yes. Again, this goes back to my earlier comments. Before you lurch into a project, you should do a business case. You should sit down and figure out what are the costs and what are the benefits of this. This is basically what this amendment is giving the government the opportunity to do: just to be responsible purveyors of our tax dollars, of our government resource, of our public parkland. This amendment is not even saying don't do this project; it's just saying do a cost-benefit analysis before you lurch into it.

And the business case: The Toronto Port Authority says that this expansion would generate \$8.5 billion in economic activity. Well, that number, first of all, makes no sense because they would have 10 million passengers a year if they met their projections and if this all went through. They generate, they say, \$8.5 billion in economic activity. Pearson airport has 47 million passengers a year and generates \$19.6 billion in economic activity a year. So they have got five times the number of passengers, but they only generate two times the amount of economic activity. Somewhere, those numbers are just not accurate, so you should look into that business case.

The other side of that is, if you're going to look at potential economic activity there, what are the costs? If people are flying into or out of Toronto, are they taking an additional flight because Billy Bishop is available, or do they look at it like—if I'm flying out, I look online, I find a flight, I look at the cost. Am I flying out of Billy Bishop, or am I flying out of Pearson? Where will you fly out of? Most people don't take an extra trip because there's a Billy Bishop airport. So what the government is proposing is to spend \$3 billion expanding Pearson to accommodate 23 million more passengers and then \$5 billion to expand Billy Bishop to accommodate eight million passengers, but there won't be an additional that many more passengers. They're going to be competing against each other, so we're investing our tax dollars or our passenger fees into two competing airports. Why would we do that? They're going to raise the cost of flying out of—that \$5 billion is either going to come out of our tax dollars or it's going to come out of passenger fees, you know? So we're going to be paying higher costs for flying out of Toronto. Why would we want to do that? So that's just the competition with Pearson.

The other cost, lost housing: As I mentioned before, we've invested two billion taxpayer dollars rehabilitating the Port Lands to accommodate 40,000 units of housing. What the city of Toronto has done is made deals with developers and said, “Look, you can build a 40-storey building there, but we want a third of the units to be affordable.” And with the jets flying overhead, that would be reduced because jets take off faster and they land lower, and so you would have to reduce the height of those buildings to 15 to 20 storeys. So you're cutting the potential housing in half. You also destroy the partnership that the city has made with the developers to say, “Yeah, you can build a taller tower, but a third of the units have to be

affordable.” If it’s a shorter tower, we could lose 1,800 units of affordable housing.

This government has been an abysmal failure at building housing. We have the second-lowest number of housing starts per capita of any province in Canada. What the government is doing here is saying, “Look, we’ve got an opportunity to build housing, including affordable housing, but we’re going to squander it in order to expand this airport.”

The other cost that needs to be looked at is the lost tourism revenue. Right now, in 2025, 28 million visitors to the Toronto waterfront in a year—that’s generating somewhere around \$20 billion of economic activity. How many tourists would come to the waterfront if there were jets taking off every two and a half minutes? What would the cost to the tourism sector be?

The final one is the negative impacts on the health care system. I just quoted the Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment, and they were talking about the health impacts of having jets that close to a residential community and the negative impacts. While we—still today, although it’s being dismantled—have a public health care system, what is the cost to the public health care system of having jets that close to residential communities, just 200 metres from an elementary school, just 200 metres from major residential units, from the 100,000 people who already live along the waterfront? What is going to be the cost, not just in pain and suffering, but what will be the cost to the health care system?

All this amendment is asking for is, let’s just do a business case and incorporate not just the potential benefit but also the cost of the expansion that this provincial government and the federal government are proposing.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: What gets measured gets managed, and therefore I will be supporting this amendment.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I am supporting this amendment to have the government do a business case before proceeding with this project and making sure that this business case is public.

The reason why is because we’ve heard all these astronomically high figures, but there’s no evidence to back up these claims. What we’re hearing from the government is that this project, this expansion will boost the nearby economy and generate up to \$8.5 billion in revenue, but when asked questions about how you came up with that number, we are not getting any information. It’s not being explained. It’s just this big, magical number.

During committee, we had the representative from the port authority come and admit that the project could cost between \$4 billion to \$5 billion, which is a lot more than it was going to cost in 2015, which is when the last study was done. That’s a huge amount of money.

And then when we asked the government, “Okay, who is going to pay for that?” they said the city of Toronto is

not going to pay for it. The Ministry of Transportation was very clear: The provincial government is not putting money into it. It’s not clear what the federal government is going to do. That means it’s going to be passengers that are going to be paying for that.

Flights are already really expensive, and then we have Pearson as a competitor, which is really nearby. So how do the numbers add up, when you’re expecting passengers to pay \$4 billion to \$5 billion more over a period of time in fares? The numbers just don’t add up; it doesn’t seem economically feasible.

It makes sense to do a business case to assess whether it’s going to work and then also to assess what we already can see are the negative consequences of this project proceeding. We outline them here: What is the impact on lost housing? What is the impact on tourism? What is the impact on the Toronto Pearson International Airport? What is the impact on the health care system, given that we know there are health impacts? It makes a lot of sense to have that information in front of us before we proceed on this project.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Glover, McMahon.

Nays

Anand, Babikian, Grewal, Sandhu, Saunderson.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare new section 8.3, that amendment, lost.

We’re now going to page five. Is there nothing? Okay.

1110

We will now move on to R6, which is the new section 8.4 by the NDP. MPP Glover, would you like to read this in too?

Mr. Chris Glover: Okay, yes. I move that section 8.4 be added to the bill:

“Preservation of Toronto Islands

“8.4 The government of Ontario shall ensure that any development project in respect of the vested real property does not have detrimental effects on the Toronto Islands.”

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Debate? MPP Glover.

Mr. Chris Glover: We are so fortunate in Toronto to live in a waterfront city. It is something that gets opened to people, visitors from around the world, for Caribbean Carnival, for the CNE, for the dragon boat festival. There are hundreds of events every year along the waterfront that draw in millions and millions of tourists.

One of the biggest attractions of the waterfront is the Toronto Islands. If you’ve never been to the Toronto Islands, you’ve got to get over there because it is absolutely fantastic. There is something fantastic for everyone there.

There’s Hanlan’s Point.

There's Centreville, an amusement park for kids on Centre Island. Centreville includes a historic merry-go-round. You can actually ride a merry-go-round that has been operating for well over a hundred years.

Also, there's Far Enough Farm. There aren't a whole lot of farms in Toronto. There are two that I could think of and Far Enough Farm. It's an opportunity for kids from the city, from the 905, from the area in southern Ontario to come and see some animals. In the spring, there are usually some goats and some pigs that get born. Oh, and there are some horses there. You can see the new generation of animals. You can see the calves and the ponies. It's absolutely a fantastic opportunity for kids in the city. Let's see.

There's a natural science school, and kids in the TDSB have an opportunity for three days of outdoor education in their entire educational career. From grades JK to 12, they get three days, and one of the places they go is the natural science school on the Toronto Islands. They go there; they stay overnight. If you ask anybody who went through the TDSB what the highlight of their entire educational career was, they will almost always talk about the three days that they spent at an outdoor education centre because it is just such a fantastic opportunity.

All of this—all of the islands—are at risk with this bill. All this amendment is saying is, "Hey, you may go ahead with the expansion of Billy Bishop, but please don't destroy the Toronto Islands and all of the opportunities that it provides for the people of Toronto and the visitors to Toronto"—two million visitors a year to the Toronto Islands, every year.

If you've never been, I highly recommend you go. If you are on the government side, I highly recommend that you vote to protect the Toronto Islands by passing this amendment.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: This motion would protect the Toronto Islands from unnecessary development. It would protect them, and the reason why we think it's important is because the Minister of Transportation did imply that the goal is to not move ahead with a lot of development on the Toronto Islands. He can say whatever he wants, but the reason why we put this motion here is to say, "Well, you talk the talk. Now let's see if we can put it actually into the bill so that we can protect it."

I love the Toronto Islands. I've been there many times. I take my kids there. I'm one of those two million visitors every year. A lot of the people that live downtown don't have access to a cottage in Muskoka or do not have a backyard, and the Toronto Islands is like a day-long vacation that you get. It's awesome. There's Centre Island. There's Centreville. There's Ward's Island. There's the beach. There's taking your kids biking in a car-free area for a day.

It's wonderful, and I fear that I'm putting a massive airport right next to the Toronto Islands and giving the Ontario government the right to do essentially what they want with that island puts a lot of that at risk. I urge this

government to put in this bill a commitment to protect the Toronto Islands for what it is right now.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none—

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Glover.

Nays

Anand, Babikian, Grewal, Sandhu, Saunderson.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare the amendment to new section 8.4 is lost.

We can now move on to R7. MPP Glover, if you would like to read that, please?

Mr. Chris Glover: I move that section 8.5 be added to the bill:

"Worker health and safety

"8.5 The government of Ontario shall ensure that all health and safety protections for workers are enforced during any development project in respect of the vested real property."

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Debate? MPP Glover.

Mr. Chris Glover: When the Premier announced this project on March 23, he said two things. He said that the federal government is on board, so he had the support of the Prime Minister in the seizure of this property and the expansion of the airport. And the other thing he said is that they're going to apply Bill 5, and Bill 5 is a bill that allows the government to declare any part of the province, or the entire province, a special economic zone where they can break any municipal or provincial law. This includes environmental laws, health laws, safety laws, labour laws, and this is a real concern for the workers of the province, this Bill 5. Also, Indigenous rights are another thing that Bill 5 could allow them to override.

Just focusing on labour laws: Labour laws are designed to protect workers. We have a horrific record in Ontario of workers dying on the job. And the only reason we have safety precautions now in place that save lives every year is because of labour laws that have been fought hard for, primarily by the unions of this province. So when somebody dies, there's a coroner's inquest and then there are recommendations so that another worker doesn't die in the same way.

I'm old enough now to remember when worker deaths were a common feature; where you would read in the newspaper about a mine that had collapsed in Nova Scotia or somewhere else, and there were 20 workers trapped underground. That doesn't happen nearly as often anymore because of labour laws.

A constituent of mine's brother was killed while working at the Billy Bishop airport a few years ago, and the inquest showed that the health and safety labour laws were not being properly followed. If they had been followed, his brother would be alive today. So what we've done is we're

just saying—first of all, you should not have Bill 5 in your deck of cards. The government should not be able to say, “Oh, we’re going to declare a special”—

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Can you keep it to the bill at hand? I see you’re broadening, but I want to just narrow your scope to focus on the bill that we have in front of us.

Mr. Chris Glover: Okay. So the amendment here is to say that the labour laws must be enforced on any expansion of the Billy Bishop airport. The threat is that the government has said they will impose Bill 5, which would allow them to override those labour laws that protect workers’ lives.

All we’re doing here with this amendment is saying, “Vote in favour of keeping in place the labour laws that protect workers’ lives at the Billy Bishop airport.”

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none—

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Glover, McMahon.

Nays

Anand, Babikian, Grewal, Sandhu, Saunderson.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare new section 8.5 lost.

Moving to section 9: There are no proposed amendments to sections 9 to 11. I therefore propose that we bundle—

Interjection.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Wait a minute. We have one more to stand down—if you want. Amendment number 7: Any comment? None? Okay—I’m sorry.

Now we’re going to section 9. There are no proposed amendments to sections 9 to 11. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? There is agreement.

1120

Shall sections 9 to 11—is there any debate? Seeing none—

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Anand, Babikian, Grewal, Sandhu, Saunderson.

Nays

Bell, Glover, McMahon.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare sections 9 to 11 carried.

Now, to section 12: There is a Liberal notice to section 12 to the bill. I look to the Liberal member for debate, if any.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I am just recommending voting against section 12 of the bill. Can I speak to that?

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Yes, please. Debate.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: It’s talking about things applying retroactively, which we know is not a good thing. We have been down that road before recently in the chamber with the freedom of information act, and so I am dead against the retroactive aspect of this. I am voting against it and would love you to support me.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Any further debate? MPP Glover.

Mr. Chris Glover: There is a lack of transparency from this government that is just mind-boggling, but one of the potential reasons for this section is, this section 12 of the bill says that all of the actions that this bill takes are retroactive not to the date when it gets royal assent, but to the date when the bill is introduced. That’s a very strange thing to put into a bill and I was wondering, why would the government want to do that?

Well, it turns out that some of the marinas in the Toronto Islands, in the land that this government is expropriating, their leases are up and they are renegotiating with the city of Toronto renew their leases. The city of Toronto is doing the negotiation and they’re saying, “How long will you continue? How much will it cost?” What this section is saying is if the city of Toronto did complete the negotiations, did sign the contract with those marinas, that it would be null and void because of this bill, and so those marinas are now going to have to negotiate with the provincial government in order to renew their leases.

That’s a real concern, because we don’t know what the intention of the government is in seizing the property of the Toronto Islands. What we do know is that they have overreached. It’s not just to expand the Billy Bishop airport. The way they have worded this bill—saying it’s not an expropriation, which would limit the uses they could make of the property that they’re seizing—it could be used for anything that Premier Ford dreams of. If he wants to put another Austrian spa on the Toronto Islands, then he would be able to put another Austrian spa there, if this bill goes through as is.

So, two reasons to vote against this section of the bill: One is that we don’t know the intent, and the other is it’s a breach of democratic process to say that the bill is going to take effect even before it gets royal assent, before it actually becomes a law. It’s just one more attack on the democratic rights of the people of this province. You should follow democratic process. You go through a public debate with a bill and then the bill gets passed or voted down, but if it gets passed, it becomes a law. That’s the day that it becomes the law, not the day that it was introduced in the House. That’s what this is proposing.

And so this section of the bill is a threat not only to the Toronto Islands; it’s a threat to anybody, all the people of Ontario, because this government is saying, “We’re going to change the laws and it’s going to be retroactive. You may have negotiated a contract with the government, but we’re going to change the laws around that contract and

retroactively implement them, or say they're retroactive so that contract that you now have is null and void and you have no legal recourse."

If you care about the rule of law, which is a fundamental principle of democracy, then you should be voting against this section of the bill.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Any further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote on section 12?

Mr. Chris Glover: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Anand, Babikian, Grewal, Sandhu, Saunderson.

Nays

Bell, Glover, McMahon.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare section 12 carried.

There are no proposed amendments to sections 13 to 14. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement to bundle? Seeing agreement, any debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote on sections 13 to 14?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Anand, Babikian, Grewal, Sandhu, Saunderson.

Nays

Bell, Glover, McMahon.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare sections 13 to 14 carried.

We'll now move on to schedule 1. Is there any debate on schedule 1? I believe there's a Liberal motion—

Interjection.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): We just did 13; we're now on 14.

MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I move that paragraph 6 of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Debate? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Yes. So this, essentially, is removing the plot of land that corresponds with Little Norway Park from the act. As we know, there was a little map with some pins in it, and there was a pin in Little Norway Park. That is not a good thing.

I'm going to read you a submission that I'm sure you read and you've memorized—because you've read all the submissions, I'm sure. This submission is from a lady named Kari Beese; I hope I pronounced her last name well. She started the Norwegian Club of Toronto 40 years ago. She writes about the importance of Little Norway Park:

"Little Norway Park commemorates the Norwegian military training program established in Canada during the Second World War.

"Following the German invasion and occupation of Norway in April 1940, the Norwegian government-in-exile established a training base in Canada so that Norwegian pilots and military personnel could continue the fight alongside Allied forces. Canada became a safe and essential partner in this effort.

"The original 'Little Norway' training camp was established in Toronto. The now Billy Bishop airport was where they trained and their offices and barrack (a home away from home) was where the park is today. Additional training activities later occurred at locations including Muskoka and elsewhere in Canada.

"The pilots trained through this went on to serve with distinction in the Allied war effort (RAF). Many lost their lives in service. The park exists to honour their sacrifice, courage, and enduring friendship between Canada and Norway.

"The significance of the site was formally recognized by Norway after the war through the presentation of a commemorative monument stone to Canada" from Norway. "In 1987, His Majesty King Olav V of Norway travelled to Toronto to dedicate the monument at Little Norway Park personally. This was an extraordinary diplomatic and historical gesture that reflected the deep gratitude of Norwegian people and the enduring bond between the two countries.

"The presence of this commemorative stone—dedicated by the King of Norway himself—elevates Little Norway Park beyond a local historical marker. It is an internationally significant memorial site representing wartime alliance, sacrifice, and democratic solidarity between Canada and Norway.

"This history is not abstract. It represents:

"—Canada's role as a defender of democracy during World War II;

"—Ontario's contribution to the Allied victory;

"—the sacrifices made by Norwegian servicemen in exile; and

"—the long-standing relationship between Canada and Norway.

"Little Norway Park serves as both a memorial and an educational space. It connects present and future generations to a powerful story"—

Mr. Aris Babikian: Madam Chair, point of order.

1130

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): MPP McMahon, I'm sorry, I have to interrupt—

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I have one more sentence, if you can just be patient.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Do you want to—MPP Babikian.

Mr. Aris Babikian: I wanted to find out—we have a bill and we have an amendment; that's fine. What is the purpose of reading historical facts or lecturing on history when we all know what is the history?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Do you? I feel if you did—

Mr. Aris Babikian: No, of course, we know the history. We are not that stupid.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I thank the members, MPP Babikian. MPP McMahon, just keep to the bill and carry on, please.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Thank you for the patience, concern and attention from my collegial members across the floor.

Back to the history: “It connects present and future generations to a powerful story of international co-operation in the face of fascism and war.”

Mr. Aris Babikian: This is a farce.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: That’s the end. And I feel that no one’s history is a farce, so I take serious umbrage to that comment by the member.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate?

I’m sure that members enjoy banter among themselves, but you are really supposed to go through the Chair.

Who had their hand up first here? MPP Bell? On further debate on the member’s motion: MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I am supporting this motion. What this motion does is it removes the authority of the Conservative government to take over Little Norway Park.

Little Norway Park has a lot of historical significance, and it is also heavily used by local residents. It’s a loved park. People want to keep it a park. That’s why we are calling and I am going to be supporting this motion to remove it. Let’s just keep the park.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Any further debate? MPP Glover.

Mr. Chris Glover: I will also be supporting this amendment to the bill, which removes Little Norway Park from the bill. It means that Little Norway Park will remain a city park and will not fall under the control of the provincial Conservative government.

This makes a lot of sense. The park is a historically significant park. As was just mentioned, it was where, when Norway was invaded by the fascists in the Second World War, the Norwegian air force trained. Their barracks were in that park, and so that is where they were training in order to fight to liberate their country. King Olav V came to present a commemorative monument, a stone, that is still there in the park.

The other reason for the government side to vote in favour of this amendment to the bill is that it allows them to honour the word of the Premier of Ontario. Because the Premier of Ontario said recently that we are not going to touch Little Norway Park. So if you are not going to touch Little Norway Park, then you can certainly remove it from the bill, and then you don’t even have the possibility of touching the park.

My concern is that the Premier said that, but then the Minister of Transportation said that we will replace it with something equally as good. And so it sounds like the Conservative government is backtracking on the Premier’s word. We know that the government wants the Premier’s word to be honoured, and so you should support this

motion, because you don’t want another experience where the Premier said, “I won’t touch the greenbelt,” and then introduced legislation to gut the greenbelt; or where he said, “I’m going to stop the gravy train,” and then he got all of his friends on board the gravy train; or where the Premier said, “I’m the only Premier in history who doesn’t use the Premier’s plane,” and then bought himself a gravy plane.

Here’s an opportunity for the government side to actually honour and respect the words of the Premier. He said he’s not going to touch Little Norway Park, so let’s just remove Little Norway Park from the bill, and then you’ll be able to honour the word of the Premier. So I hope the Conservative government members will be voting in favour of this amendment.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Any further debate? Seeing none—

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Glover, McMahon.

Nays

Anand, Babikian, Grewal, Sandhu, Saunderson.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment number 10 lost.

No more amendments are before us, so we’ll now go to schedule number 1, which is the preamble. Is there any debate?

Interjection.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I apologize. I should not have said “preamble.” It is just: Shall schedule 1 carry? Are members ready to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 1 carried.

Now, shall the preamble carry? Any debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: We’re very close to passing this bill through committee and moving it back to the House for third reading. So I just want to make some concluding remarks about this bill and what has happened. Essentially, this bill allows the Conservative government to move ahead with expanding a major industrial airport right next to the downtown city of Toronto.

Mr. Brian Saunderson: Madam Chair, point of order.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I’m not going to speak long.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): MPP Saunderson has a point of order. Yes?

Mr. Brian Saunderson: Right now, we’re voting on the preamble. We had time at the outset for members to make statements about the bill. If the member has comments about the preamble, that’s fine, but talking about the bill generally—I think we need to stay in scope.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Yes, MPP Saunderson is correct: You did comment before, but you can discuss the preamble.

Ms. Jessica Bell: The preamble does provide an overview of the bill, and I'm not going to be long. Okay, good.

Essentially, we've got a lot of concerns with this bill. We introduced a series of amendments in an attempt to improve it—bring in an environmental assessment, do the business case, protect Toronto Island—and the government members have voted every single one of those motions down. I think that is not a good move. It is just not a good move. It is true you're getting this bill passed through committee today, but my hunch is that you're not going to win this fight. You're not going to win this fight because it doesn't make economic sense—

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I do ask the member to keep to the preamble. I've allowed you a chance.

Ms. Jessica Bell: That's true; you did—and the health impacts are real.

If anyone is listening here and they have concerns about this bill, I urge you to contact the Prime Minister, Mark Carney, and ask him to quash this project before it begins.

Interjection.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Thank you. I agree that I don't think that was in the preamble, MPP Bell.

Is there any further debate? Is it going to be about the preamble, MPP Glover?

Mr. Chris Glover: I'm going to start by reading a part of the preamble. This is the preamble to this bill on the Billy Bishop act: "The government of Ontario is committed to:

"Modernizing Billy Bishop Toronto City Airport to unlock the airport's economic potential for all of Ontario" and "advancing Ontario's economic and tourism objectives."

The government has no idea whether it will be advancing the economic and tourism objectives with this bill, with the expansion and landing jets at the Toronto airport, because you have not done a business case; you have not looked at the cost and benefits of this. The number one tourist destination in Ontario is the downtown Toronto waterfront, with 28 million visitors in 2025. How can you say that you're going to be expanding the tourism objectives if you're going to have jets fly over our number one tourist destination every two and a half minutes? How many people—

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): MPP Glover, I'm going to rein you in also. You've had these discussions. This is specific to the preamble. So I asked you—

Interjection.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Well, but you've already had these discussions. Are you going to reiterate everything else that you've already discussed? It's in the preamble, which you've already discussed with amendments. So for consideration, I would prefer you keep—

Mr. Chris Glover: Okay, I'll focus on the preamble as much as I can here.

The preamble lists the objectives of the government in passing this bill. The government has no idea whether the costs will outweigh any potential benefits, and I believe that they will outweigh any potential benefits. In fact, the costs in health, in well-being, in the tourism sector, in housing—all of these costs will far outweigh any potential benefit of expanding this airport.

I hope the government will vote against not only the preamble but the bill as a whole.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Any further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of the preamble, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare the preamble carried.

Shall the title of the bill carry? Are members ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare the title of the bill carried.

Shall Bill 110 carry? Are members ready to vote?

Mr. Chris Glover: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Anand, Babikian, Grewal, Sandhu, Saunderson.

Nays

Bell, Glover, McMahon.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare Bill 110 carried.

Shall I report the bill to the House?

Interjection.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): All those in favour? All those opposed? I shall report the bill to the House.

There is no more business in front of the committee. I declare that the clause-by-clause on Bill 110 is finished and the bill will be reported to the House. Thank you, everyone.

The committee adjourned at 1142.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON HERITAGE, INFRASTRUCTURE AND CULTURAL POLICY

Chair / Présidente

Hon. Laurie Scott (Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock PC)

First Vice-Chair / Premier Vice-Président

Mr. Guy Bourgouin (Mushkegowuk–James Bay / Mushkegowuk–Baie James ND)

Second Vice-Chair / Deuxième Vice-Président

MPP Tyler Watt (Nepean L)

Mr. Deepak Anand (Mississauga–Malton PC)

Mr. Aris Babikian (Scarborough–Agincourt PC)

Mr. Guy Bourgouin (Mushkegowuk–James Bay / Mushkegowuk–Baie James ND)

Mr. Hardeep Singh Grewal (Brampton East / Brampton-Est PC)

MPP Catherine McKenney (Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre ND)

Mr. Amarjot Sandhu (Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest PC)

Mr. Brian Saunderson (Simcoe–Grey PC)

Hon. Laurie Scott (Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock PC)

MPP Tyler Watt (Nepean L)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Ms. Jessica Bell (University–Rosedale ND)

Mr. Chris Glover (Spadina–Fort York ND)

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon (Beaches–East York L)

Clerk / Greffière

Ms. Tanzima Khan

Staff / Personnel

Ms. Catherine Oh, legislative counsel