

Legislative
Assembly
of Ontario



Assemblée
législative
de l'Ontario

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

No. 78A

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

N° 78A

1st Session
44th Parliament

Wednesday
27 May 2026

1^{re} session
44^e législature

Mercredi
27 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

Wednesday 27 May 2026 / Mercredi 27 mai 2026

Consideration of Bill 118

MPP Alexa Gilmour.....4847

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. Stephanie Bowman4847
MPP Tyler Watt4850
Mr. Andrew Dowie4854
Ms. Jessica Bell.....4854
Mme Lucille Collard.....4854
Hon. Sam Oosterhoff4855
MPP Wayne Gates4855
MPP Bill Rosenberg.....4855
Third reading debate deemed adjourned4857

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS / DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉES ET DÉPUTÉS

Soo Greyhounds hockey team

MPP Bill Rosenberg.....4857

Worth Fighting For campaign

Mr. Terence Kernaghan4857

Barbecue event in Don Valley East / Youth council

Mr. Adil Shamji4857

Health care

Mr. Sheref Sabawy.....4858

Missing persons

Mr. Sol Mamakwa.....4858

Cambridge RedHawks hockey team

Mr. Brian Riddell4858

Land use planning

MPP Alexa Gilmour.....4858

Government investments

Mr. Logan Kanapathi4859

Public safety

Ms. Natalie Pierre4859

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEUSES ET VISITEURS

Mr. Billy Pang.....4859
Mr. Adil Shamji4859
Hon. David Piccini.....4859

Mrs. Michelle Cooper4859
MPP Jamie West4859
Mr. Sol Mamakwa.....4859
Hon. Raymond Sung Joon Cho4859
Mr. Aris Babikian.....4860
Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens4860
Hon. Trevor Jones4860
Ms. Aislinn Clancy.....4860
Mr. Joseph Racinsky4860
Mr. Ted Hsu4860
MPP Mohamed Firin.....4860
Mr. Rudy Cuzzetto4860
Hon. Sylvia Jones4860
Hon. Kevin Holland4860

QUESTION PERIOD / PÉRIODE DE QUESTIONS

Cost of living

Mr. Tom Rakocevic.....4860
Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy4860

Justice system

Ms. Catherine Fife.....4861
MPP Monica Ciriello4861

Curriculum

Mr. Rob Cerjanec4862
Hon. Paul Calandra4862

Special-needs students

Ms. Lee Fairclough4863
Hon. Paul Calandra4863

Northern airports

Mr. Sol Mamakwa.....4864
Mr. Hardeep Singh Grewal4864

School boards / Conseils scolaires

Mme Lucille Collard4865
Hon. Paul Calandra4865

Primary care

Hon. Laurie Scott4865
Hon. Sylvia Jones4865

Environmental protection

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens4866
Hon. Todd J. McCarthy4866

Education funding

Ms. Stephanie Bowman.....4866
Hon. Paul Calandra4867

Rural Ontario

MPP Bill Rosenberg.....4867

Hon. Lisa M. Thompson	4867
Police oversight	
MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam	4868
Hon. Michael S. Kerzner.....	4868
MPP Alexa Gilmour.....	4868
MPP Monica Ciriello	4868
Education funding	
Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon	4869
Hon. Paul Calandra	4869
Women's employment	
Ms. Natalie Pierre	4869
Hon. Charmaine A. Williams.....	4870
Northern health services	
Mr. Guy Bourgouin.....	4870
Hon. Sylvia Jones.....	4870
House sittings	
Hon. Steve Clark	4870
Correction of record	
Ms. Jennifer K. French.....	4870

DEFERRED VOTES / VOTES DIFFÉRÉS

Fair Prices and Tax-Free Groceries Act, 2026, Bill 113, Ms. Bell; Mr. Rakocevic; MPP Wong-Tam / Loi de 2026 sur les prix équitables et les produits alimentaires non taxés, projet de loi 113, Mme Bell; M. Rakocevic; MPP Wong-Tam	
Second reading negatived	4871

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEUSES ET VISITEURS

Ms. Laura Smith.....	4871
Mr. Terence Kernaghan	4871
Ms. Catherine Fife.....	4871
Mr. Chris Glover	4871
Ms. Sandy Shaw.....	4871

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES / RAPPORTS DE COMITÉS

Standing Committee on Justice Policy	
Mr. Lorne Coe.....	4872
Report presented	4872
Standing Committee on Heritage, Infrastructure and Cultural Policy	
Mr. Guy Bourgouin.....	4872
Report presented	4872

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS / DÉPÔT DES PROJETS DE LOI

CIJ Consulting Inc. Act, 2026, Bill Pr48, Ms. Smith	
First reading agreed to.....	4872

Avant Assets Inc. Act, 2026, Bill Pr50, Ms. Bell	
First reading agreed to.....	4872
Protecting Homeowners from Title Fraud Act, 2026, Bill 126, Mr. Kernaghan; MPP Lennox; MPP McKenney; Mr. Rakocevic / Loi de 2026 sur la protection des propriétaires de logements contre la fraude sur le transfert des titres de propriété, projet de loi 126, M. Kernaghan; MPP Lennox; MPP McKenney; M. Rakocevic	
First reading agreed to.....	4872
Mr. Tom Rakocevic.....	4872
Fair Start for Young Workers Act, 2026, Bill 127, Ms. Bowman; Mr. Cerjanec / Loi de 2026 visant à offrir un début de carrière équitable aux jeunes travailleurs, projet de loi 127, Mme Bowman; M. Cerjanec	
First reading agreed to.....	4873
Mr. Rob Cerjanec	4873
Hot Days, Cool Homes Act, 2026, Bill 128, MPP Lennox; MPP McKenney / Loi de 2026 pour des logements frais lors des jours de grande chaleur, projet de loi 128, MPP Lennox; MPP McKenney	
First reading agreed to.....	4873
MPP Catherine McKenney.....	4873
Andre's Law (Bill of Rights for Residents of Supported Group Living Residences), 2026, Bill 129, MPP Vaugeois / Loi André de 2026 (déclaration des droits des résidents de résidences de groupe avec services de soutien), projet de loi 129, MPP Vaugeois	
First reading agreed to.....	4873
MPP Lise Vaugeois.....	4873

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES / DÉCLARATIONS MINISTÉRIELLES ET RÉPONSES

Affaires francophones	
L'hon. Caroline Mulroney	4873
Mme France Gélinas	4874
Mme Lucille Collard	4875

PETITIONS / PÉTITIONS

Mental health services	
Mr. Tom Rakocevic.....	4876
Snowmobiling	
MPP George Darouze.....	4876
Snowmobiling	
MPP Bill Rosenberg.....	4876
Social assistance	
MPP Lise Vaugeois.....	4877
Sexual violence and harassment	
Mr. Terence Kernaghan.....	4877

Highway 69	
Mme France Gélinas	4877
Student assistance	
Ms. Peggy Sattler	4877
Snowmobiling	
MPP Paul Vickers	4877
Sexual violence and harassment	
Ms. Catherine Fife.....	4878
Billy Bishop airport	
Mr. Chris Glover	4878
Education funding	
Mr. Tom Rakocevic	4878
Student assistance	
Ms. Sandy Shaw.....	4878
Private members' public business	
Hon. Steve Clark	4878

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	
MPP Bill Rosenberg.....	4879
Mr. Chris Glover	4880
Ms. Laura Smith.....	4880
Mr. Chris Glover	4880
MPP Stephanie Smyth	4881

MPP Paul Vickers	4881
Mr. Chris Glover	4881
MPP Lise Vaugeois.....	4881
MPP Stephanie Smyth.....	4884
Mr. Sheref Sabawy.....	4884
Mme France Gélinas	4884
Mr. Billy Pang.....	4885
Mr. Chris Glover	4885
MPP Stephanie Smyth.....	4885
Ms. Laura Smith.....	4888
Mr. Chris Glover	4888
Ms. Aislinn Clancy.....	4888
Mr. Sheref Sabawy.....	4888
Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon	4889
Mr. Adil Shamji	4889
Mr. Chris Glover	4889
Ms. Aislinn Clancy.....	4889
Mr. Andrew Dowie	4891
Ms. Catherine Fife.....	4891
Mr. Sol Mamakwa.....	4891
Mr. Terence Kernaghan.....	4892
Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon	4894
Mr. Billy Pang.....	4894
MPP Lise Vaugeois.....	4894
Ms. Laura Smith.....	4895
Ms. Peggy Sattler	4895
Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon	4895
Third reading debate deemed adjourned	4896

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 27 May 2026

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE
DE L'ONTARIO

Mercredi 27 mai 2026

The House met at 0900.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Good morning, everyone. Let's pause for a moment of silence for inner thought and personal reflection.

Prayers.

CONSIDERATION OF BILL 118

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Point of order? I recognize the member for Parkdale–High Park.

MPP Alexa Gilmour: I seek unanimous consent of the House that the member for Toronto Centre be added as a co-sponsor to Bill 118, An Act to proclaim the month of May as Buddhist Heritage Month.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): MPP Gilmour is seeking unanimous consent of the House that the member for Toronto Centre be added as a co-sponsor to Bill 118, An Act to proclaim the month of May as Buddhist Heritage Month. Agreed? Agreed.

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 26, 2026, on the motion for third 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?

Ms. Stephanie Bowman: It's an honour to rise today on behalf of my residents in Don Valley West to debate Bill 110, the so-called Building Billy Bishop Airport Act.

My residents care about Toronto's waterfront. They also care about this government's undemocratic takeover of the city's role in the tripartite agreement. And they care about the lands around the airport. That's because they believe in municipal democracy and that cities and the residents should have a say in determining how their communities are shaped. I have had hundreds of emails about this topic, and people are not happy. They know this debate today is about another controversial move and this government's overreach into the city of Toronto's affairs. It is about the Premier's desire not just to be the Premier of Ontario, but the Premier of Toronto. It's about the Premier not wanting to give the residents of Toronto a say

in any expansion of the Billy Bishop airport. No one asked for this.

It's not a coincidence that the Premier bought himself a luxury private jet with \$28.9 million of taxpayer money—borrowed money, I might add because the government is in a deficit—and that he bought that jet at basically the same time he announced that he wanted to expand Billy Bishop airport, so a jet like his could land there.

This is not about making our city better or making our province better. It's not about improving the lives of the people who live in Toronto or in the north or anywhere else in Ontario. There is no business case for this expansion, and there is no plan. It's just another day in Ontario, under the misguided leadership of the self-serving Ford Conservative government.

Speaker, the Premier likes to say he runs the province like a business. What kind of business would you call it—I'm curious—when you don't negotiate with your partners, but you strong-arm them? Parliamentary language won't allow me to answer that question, but I think you know where I'm going.

I want to share an excerpt from a letter written by one of my constituents on behalf of the Federation of North Toronto Residents' Associations, FONTRA. FONTRA "strongly opposes the expansion of Billy Bishop airport, and allowing the introduction of jets. We believe it will destroy the waterfront, a previous asset to the whole city, and removes anticipated housing opportunities to be produced through Waterfront Toronto multi-year planning.

"It overreaches on matters that should remain in the city's control, and is totally undemocratic. The Ford government has shared little information or analysis on this proposal, which is currently being promoted by private interests. No information has been provided regarding the value to taxpayers resulting from this proposal."

We heard from David Crombie, Toronto's "tiny, perfect mayor," when he spoke about this bill at the Standing Committee on Heritage, Infrastructure and Cultural Policy. He is actually one of the people we have to thank for Toronto's waterfront. He had the vision many years ago of what Toronto's waterfront could be, and he actually didn't strong-arm anyone into it. He worked together with the city, with the province, with the federal government to transform Toronto's waterfront into the beautiful space that it is today.

Here are a few facts that Mayor Crombie shared with the committee: The waterfront contributes \$13 billion to the GDP. It attracts 18 million tourists every year. It leverages more than \$10.5 billion in construction value, and generates more than \$2.7 billion in taxes.

Speaker, at 90 years old, I'm sure Mr. Crombie would like to retire from public life, assured that the work that he and his colleagues did had set the right precedent for balancing the many uses of the waterfront. Instead, he came to Queen's Park to say, "Bill 110, Mr. Chair, is a clear and present danger to all of the work that has been done by all of the people for so long. It is unconscionable to us who have been at it all this time that the province, with a wave of its hand, would unilaterally go about destroying it. I am asking you, to whatever strength you command: Please withdraw this bill. It'll wreck the waterfront."

But beyond the public's concerns and the city's concerns, when you look at this bill closely, four things become very clear: There's no plan, no business case, no credible economic benefit, and, really, it's just another example of this government's overreach into municipal affairs. Let's break that down.

This is clearly a half-baked idea. There is no plan.

Here's what the province is doing: They're expropriating lands from the city which would allow them to build a runway on the lake, to move forward without transparency or informing their partners, and to provide no insight for how the additional 10 million users will actually be able to function in this very small space, this very small airport.

We did hear from a representative from the Toronto Port Authority telling the standing committee that this project will cost between \$4 billion and \$5 billion—no number from the government. It's kind of like the 413. They came up with this idea to build a highway, and they won't tell us how much taxpayer money it's going to cost to build it. This is the same thing—introduce a bill with a half-baked idea about expropriating land from one of your partners, the biggest city in the country; just come in and strong-arm them, and don't even talk about what it's going to cost to build this expanded airport.

Speaker, let's talk about the connections to the city's transit infrastructure. Where is the investment in subways or streetcars or regional rail that would be required to support this potential growth that the government is talking about? It's a whole intricate web down there. You go down to Queen's Quay and Bathurst, and it is highly congested. It's an area that a lot of people want to avoid by car. That's why we've got so many cyclists down there, and others using the waterfront—because it's very congested. This government has offered no ideas about how to fix what's already a problem, and this will make it, according to their plans, five times worse. We'll go from two million passengers a year to 10 million, with no plan for how to move those people around the very busy downtown core.

0910

Maybe the Premier is going to, once again, pave paradise and put up a parking lot, kind of like what we have seen going on at Ontario Place. They've decimated it. Will he sacrifice public space, community access, environmental integrity? Well, of course he will, because we see him doing that all over, decimating our conservation authorities, paving over farmland—over 300 acres a

day in this province being paved over. The project just doesn't make sense.

I have asked this before but haven't really gotten an answer, so I will mention it again here today. I am curious. Which came first, the jet or the airport? As I think about it, I'm thinking they came together. I think the Premier said, "I'm tired of not having my own jet. I want to fly around like my friend Galen, so I'm going to buy a private jet. But do you know what? I need an airport to land it at downtown. And then the OPP will put their sirens on, and we'll zoom up to Queen's Park. No problem." That's what I think the plan was. Never mind how much it's going to cost taxpayers. It's clearly not in the best interests of taxpayers.

This government has added \$136 billion to the debt—this from a party that in 2018 campaigned on reducing the debt. They have made it worse. And building this expanded airport will make it even worse.

Let's talk more about the lack of a business case.

The Ontario Liberal government built the Union Pearson Express, known as the UP, that connects downtown Toronto to an international airport, Pearson, one of the busiest in North America. It remains a piece of infrastructure that people rely on every single day. That \$500-million investment now serves four million users a year, and that number continues to grow as more people choose using the UP as opposed to sitting in traffic. So that's good. It's good for the environment, it's good for those commuters—gets them home to their families faster. That's more than the number of visitors Billy Bishop sees today annually, and it demonstrates what happens when you do invest with purpose and foresight. That project was not a legacy project. It wasn't meant to get the Premier from one place in the city to another place faster. It was built with the best interests of Ontarians in mind.

That's what this government should be doing. That's what all governments should do. They should be thinking about the best interests of their province, the people who live in the province. And this bill just does not stand up to that smell test.

We see traffic congestion worsening across the GTA. Certainly, in the city of Toronto, they're very worried about it.

I was at a residents' association meeting last night. They've done a survey of one of the most desirable neighbourhoods in the city, Leaside, and residents there are very concerned about the traffic and the congestion. It took 15 years to get the Crosstown built. That's finally open, and people are using it, and we hope that will help. But we know that there are a lot of problems. Our city councillor is working hard to do her part to alleviate that.

Let's just say this were to come true. As I said, two million passengers today, and they say they're going to multiply that, up to 10 million passengers annually—two million annually up to 10 million annually. That is a significant increase in passengers and people either trying to get in a taxi or an Uber to where they're going, because there is not good transit at the waterfront. We know that.

People are taking buses. People are cycling. It's a very congested part of the city.

If the government had any ability to come up with a real plan, they would have said, "Hey, do you know what? Here's what we want to do with the airport, and here's the plan for the surrounding areas and how we're going to make sure that the waterfront remains a beautiful place to enjoy, and that it doesn't harm the economic benefit and the enjoyment of natural space that residents get. Here's the plan for how we're going to move all those passengers around."

It reminds me—one of the reasons I ran was, this government cancelled a plan that the city of Toronto had spent years coming up with called Midtown in Focus. They knew the Crosstown was being built. They came up with a plan to increase density, to make sure that there were sufficient public spaces, sufficient doctors' offices, all of those things—they had a whole plan that everyone bought in. And then what did this Premier do? He cancelled it.

Now we've got buildings going up in my riding—some of the new ones, of course, are paused—and there are big signs on the front of them that say, "If you live in this condo or buy a condo here, your children will not go to school here," because the schools are full. There's no plan to build more schools. The schools in that area are full. That's not good for community building. It's not good for the people of Toronto.

This is another example of that—no plan, just a hare-brained idea to allow the Premier to fly around like a billionaire. That's the only thing I can conclude, because the numbers don't make sense. I'll get into that more in a minute.

Let's talk about Pearson. Pearson is being invested in. It's going to expand. It's going to attract and serve more passengers. They came up with that plan with the right partners at the table. They didn't strong-arm anybody, like this government is doing with Billy Bishop. By the early 2030s, Pearson is expected to grow in usage by nearly 20 million additional passengers, double the highest estimate that the government talks about for the expansion of Billy Bishop. That will create jobs, trade, tourism and long-term economic opportunity for the province.

Speaker, even Porter Airlines knows that with the UP Express, the better business case lies with Pearson. On March 17, the Toronto Star's Matt Elliott wrote the following regarding the UP Express: "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, the UP Express gets you right to Union, right to where you need to be to get to the heart of the city. Billy Bishop is west of the downtown. You've got to find a way—again, find an Uber, find a taxi to get you there, and

often it takes almost half your flying time. It can take half an hour just to get there. What's the flight to Ottawa—an hour? And then it's another half hour to get a couple of kilometres, from Billy Bishop to Union Station.

So I don't understand why this government hasn't bought in to the idea that Pearson is the true growth opportunity. Why target the Toronto Island and the airport there instead of investing in, thinking about Pearson? Why pursue a project that's smaller in scale, more disruptive to the surrounding communities and far less impactful for the province as a whole? Again, we don't really know. The government isn't saying. But it's not because it's what's best for the people of Ontario. We know this government is more focused on helping their friends than the people of Ontario.

Just look at the bill the Premier recently sent to taxpayers—likely over \$100 million to write a cheque to his friend Carmine Nigro, to settle a lawsuit with Metrolinx. It's simple: This government is not in it for the people of Ontario; they're in it for themselves.

Speaker, I've talked about the debt, and let me just talk about what that looks like for families and households here in Ontario. Every household's share of the total debt that this government has added—\$136 billion—is about \$85,000. Compare that with other provinces—highest in the country. In 2018, the PCs campaigned on reducing the debt; instead, they've increased it by almost 25% per household. Every dollar that goes to this Billy Bishop expansion is a dollar not going towards reducing the debt, or it could be used for other things, like fixing the \$50-billion infrastructure repair backlog that would benefit people across the province, in every community.

We think about the economic benefit, and this is where the argument really falls apart. I'm really not sure they did any analysis at all.

0920

The government says they'll expand the airport from two million to 10 million and generate \$8.5 billion for Ontario's GDP, but when you compare that to real-world data, the numbers just don't hold up.

Look at Pearson, one of the largest and busiest airports in North America: Last year, passenger volume—47 million people. Pearson added \$19.6 billion—call it 50 million people; \$20 million to Canadian GDP.

The government is asking us to believe that Billy Bishop, after the expansion, will generate almost half as much GDP as Pearson with only 20% of the passengers. The math doesn't make sense.

MPP Stephanie Smyth: The math doesn't math.

Ms. Stephanie Bowman: The math is not math. It's, I don't know, Conservative government math.

Here are some real numbers. If the government actually wanted to look at some real numbers about what this project would do—let's look at a 2015 study of 80 US cities. They suggest that a 10% increase in passenger volume generates a 3% increase in economic growth. Let's just say that again: 80 US cities were studied—80; that's a lot. The study concluded a 10% passenger volume increase, 3% increase in economic benefit.

Billy Bishop—we have a 6% passenger expansion annually, so that means about a 2% growth in GDP, only \$3 billion annually, far from the \$8.5 billion that this government is dreaming about.

They haven't shown us the math because they can't. They haven't shown a plan because they don't have one. And they've got no idea how they are going to move 23,000 people per day to the island airport.

Let's talk about what the Toronto Waterfront BIA said: It contributes more than \$13 billion to Ontario's economy and attracts 18 million visitors per year.

On one side, you've got a government that says they're making Ontario Place and the Therme spa with their friends from a foreign country, giving billions of taxpayer dollars to—so much for “Buy Ontario.” They're saying it's going to be this great destination. Well, just imagine, you're sitting at this spa, you've spent a couple of hundred bucks to be there, and you've got jets flying over and over and over your head. I wouldn't call that a very relaxing day at the spa. You go to a concert at their new—I don't know what it's being called; the new concert venue. You're listening to your favourite band. You spent a couple of hundred bucks, probably, to get tickets—maybe more, because this government cancelled the bill that would have protected ticket prices. Now they're fumbling around trying to fix that again—fixing a mess of their own creation. So you spend a couple of hundred dollars, maybe \$400, on a ticket to go hear your favourite band. What do you hear instead? Jets flying over your head.

It just doesn't make sense. There's no plan from this government. We can only conclude, in my opinion, that this is all about the jet; it's all about the Premier wanting to land his private luxury jet—and if not that one, maybe the OPP jet there, because we know he flies around in that a lot too.

Again, the overreach is something that is really, really concerning to my residents in Don Valley West. They don't like what this Premier is doing as it relates to interfering in the city of Toronto.

Whether it is speed cameras—even the police chiefs in Ontario begged this government, “Don't remove the speed cameras. They save lives.” This government ignored that, on a whim of the Premier. We heard that the Premier's daughter got a lot of speeding tickets from those cameras; maybe that's why. So he did that on a whim.

Then he decided he likes flying private. He has been flying jets around for a while now. Last year, according to his own records released by the government, he chartered a jet to fly himself and a staffer, I guess—maybe there were a few others—to Calgary; \$18,000. That's a lot of money. It's a lot more than economy or even a business class ticket. That's the kind of thinking that this Premier is offering the people of Ontario.

So we know that when he talks about expanding Billy Bishop airport, it's not about making life better here, it's not about creating jobs; it's about him landing his private jet. The overreach is astonishing, that he would go to the lengths he's going to, strong-arming and, basically, coming in like—I can't say it, but coming into the room and

saying, “Sorry, everyone. I'm here now. We're taking over. City of Toronto, you're out.” That's essentially what this bill amounts to.

So I can't support this bill. My residents do not support this bill.

The government needs to be held to account on this decision because it is absolutely not in the best interests of the people of Toronto or Ontario.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): I recognize the member for Nepean.

MPP Tyler Watt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's always lovely to see you in that chair.

We're here chatting about Bill 110, Building Billy Bishop Airport Act. I want to start off by discussing what I'm hearing directly from folks in my riding of Nepean, and the biggest question is, why? Why is this government so focused on Toronto? As you heard yesterday in question period, my Ottawa colleagues and myself brought up many issues that are going on in Ottawa, from health care to transportation, lack of access to primary care. This government promised to upload the LRT in Ottawa, during the last election. It has been a year and a half now, and we have heard nothing but a recommitment from this government—let alone the Barnsdale interchange that has been promised in my riding since 2019, among many other projects that we need to get done in Nepean, like expanding the Greenbank realignment project, expanding other roads and highways. So, again, when the residents of Nepean hear of yet another Toronto-centric bill that this government is spending the majority of their time on, it concerns them, and I'm sure it concerns people in other ridings, and especially people in rural and northern areas.

I do have to commend this government on the consistency with which they shut Ontarians out of decisions that affect their lives and then expand their own powers behind closed doors. It's truly remarkable.

Let's think back: This is the Premier who went on television and looked Ontarians in the eye and told them that he had heard them and that he would never touch the greenbelt. This was after he was caught on a secret camera in a room full of developers saying, “We're going to open up the greenbelt.” Of course, there was a lot of backlash. He backed off in 2018 but then tried to get it done years later. And then, with no consultation, no public process, no input from communities affected, his government carved out 7,400 acres through backroom dealings and handed them to a small circle of well-connected developers for an \$8.3-billion windfall.

This is the Premier who told Ontarians that every single dollar of the Skills Development Fund, a \$2.5-billion fund, would be used to support the talent pipeline of this province. We've seen time and time again how that funding has been abused—the one that comes straight to my mind is the \$10 million that went to a strip club owner. Instead of working with workers, employers and training institutions to direct that money where it was needed—the Auditor General found the process was not fair, not transparent and not accountable. His own labour minister is now under investigation by the Integrity Commissioner.

And now, with rents in the province increasing tenfold since 2018, with home prices in the millions, and grocery prices set to rise another 4% to 6% this year, did this Premier sit down and ask Ontarians what they needed? No. He spent nearly \$29 million of public money on his new toy, a luxury private jet—a decision made without a single Ontarian being consulted, and I have a sneaking suspicion it would have been an overwhelming, unanimous “no” on that one. When Ontarians forced him to give it back, taxpayers were still left on the hook for nearly \$200,000 in holding costs, legal fees and management services.

The Premier said, just a few days ago, “No one is more ticked off than me about this, about wasting taxpayer dollars.”

Well, this is your own fault, Premier. If you truly want to atone for this, give that money back yourself, if you truly want to respect taxpayer dollars, because this is absurd.

0930

This Premier constantly tells Ontarians they are the priority and consistently makes the biggest decisions without ever asking them. This bill is yet another example—no meaningful consultation, no effort to work alongside Ontarians to come to a shared resolution; just another decision made for Ontarians instead of with them.

Now let's look at what Bill 10 actually does.

On June 30, 1983, the city of Toronto, the government of Canada and the Toronto Port Authority signed a 50-year agreement governing what we now call Billy Bishop Toronto City Airport. That agreement was a compromise. It permitted limited commercial turboprop service. It explicitly banned commercial jets. The city of Toronto recently agreed to extend that deal to 2045, with new federally required runway safety buffers that are in process right now. That compromise was holding. That system was working.

However, in an attempt to improve Billy Bishop airport, this Premier decided to skip a few steps—tradition and behaviour that we constantly see with this Premier and government. In the formulation of this bill, neither stakeholders nor the three actors in the tripartite agreement were consulted in establishing best practices and ensuring that the most common-sense strategy is approached to this endeavour.

What Bill 110 does to that compromise:

Section 2 vests all city-owned lands at the airport, land, buildings, structures, fixtures, improvements in the crown by ministerial regulation.

Section 3 strips the city of Toronto of its power to encumber, sell or otherwise dispose of its own property. Any such transaction is deemed void retroactive to first reading.

Again, this government is obsessed with Toronto. I know the Premier might have his own personal vendetta against the city, but his focus and obsession on Toronto is just beyond evident. Instead of working in partnership with the city, he just decided, “Do you know what? We're just going to do it ourselves. We're going to take all the

power to the province. Who cares? We don't need to listen to that city—the biggest city in this country.”

Section 5 deems the city of Toronto to have assigned all of its rights and obligations under the tripartite agreement to the crown, erasing the city as a signatory entirely.

And section 7—part of the bill that this minister and government have not been honest about to Ontarians.

The bill includes a schedule 1 of property identification numbers that lets the minister, by regulation alone, expropriate land covering almost the entirety of the Toronto Islands, including Hanlan's Point—I personally know a lot of people who will be quite upset with that one—the non-residential portions of Ward's Island and one third of Little Norway Park on the mainland.

There has been no plan, no consultation, and certainly no honesty.

Again, I want to bring back the point I made earlier during this debate, and that is that this government has been consistently overachieving in winning the award of hiding the truth from Ontarians.

Upon making the announcement that this Premier will not have control of Billy Bishop airport, this minister could not answer the questions Ontarians have been asking: How much longer will the runway be? How much of the harbour will be filled? How much will this project cost? What is the timeline? Why does one third of Little Norway Park need to be seized? No master plan has been tabled. No environmental assessments have been completed. No proper public consultations have been done.

This government is now claiming that this move will have an \$8.5-billion economic impact, yet no actual economic study has been completed.

Expanding Billy Bishop does not automatically definitively mean that we will see more travellers. You're bringing in more competition to the market, meaning more options for travellers to choose between two products, shifting consumer demand from Pearson to Billy Bishop and vice versa. This means that the existing market of travellers will remain the same, and they can just land in either of two airports.

Unless this government is willing to produce a detailed economic impact assessment report and explain how a new \$8.5 billion will be injected into the economy as a result of this government's hostile expansion of Billy Bishop, these numbers are just a way to try to hide the fact that no public consultations were held.

This government seems more focused on press releases rather than conducting due diligence on these bills. Again, that's another common theme that I see here. We get flashy titles for bills—Keeping Criminals Behind Bars Act—and then you actually look at the substance in the bill and it's like, “Okay, actually, this doesn't really achieve any of that.”

This one has a less flashy title, but, again, I'm more focused on what's actually in the bill. We should have a proper debate on the purpose of this. And if we truly want to do this expansion, then it needs to get done right. It needs to be done right through proper consultations. It needs to be done right with proper studies and expert en-

vironmental assessments. If that's the goal of this government, then that is the proper way to do it; not bypassing every type of check and balance you possibly can just by writing a bill that gives you all powers and the prevention to be sued—I notice that that one is always slipped in bills lately. They need to work with other parties. They need to work with the public and experts on these things.

For instance, no consultation with the city has occurred. The mayor of Canada's largest city, representing 3.2 million Ontarians, found out the same day the public did that the province is going to take control of city land.

And let us be clear about what “no plan” means in this bill.

Section 7 hands the minister broad regulation-making powers to require the city to take specific actions, to prescribe which lands are vested and when, to amend schedule 1.

This is not a bill that lays out a plan. This is a bill that hands the minister a blank cheque to write the plan later, behind closed doors, by regulation.

The lack of transparency and accountability that this government has exhibited as of recent is very concerning. It's as if you don't think Ontarians deserve the right to know how the politicians they democratically elected are operating in their best interests.

Now let's talk about who wins and who pays. The minister and the Premier continue to tell us that this bill is about the public interest. Let us examine who benefits and who actually pays—the 3.2 million residents of Toronto, whose elected council was overridden without a single consultation by this government; the residents of Bathurst Quay, Harbourfront and the Port Lands, whose neighbourhoods will absorb the noise, the emissions and the traffic.

Toronto's housing pipeline: Lower jet flight paths means reduced building heights in the Port Lands, fewer homes built in a city that desperately needs them.

This government is already well behind their promised housing investment.

Are you sure you don't want to reconsider this bill?

In their rather sad housing numbers, they are including long-term-care beds and student dorms as new homes in this target.

Now let's look at the claims versus reality.

This government claims that this will reduce pressure on Pearson. The reality is, Pearson is already adding capacity. On May 11, 2026, the GTAA broke ground on the \$3-billion Pearson LIFT program, a 10-year expansion that will add capacity for 20 million more passengers annually by the early 2030s. That is 10 times Billy Bishop's entire current annual passenger count.

0940

The claim that more competition will drive down airline ticket prices—Billy Bishop is currently dominated by one carrier, Porter, and would be dominated by the same handful of carriers after expansion. Adding jets does not add carriers. The Competition Bureau's own data shows fare reductions come from new entrant airlines on new routes, not just from runway extensions.

The claim that Little Norway Park will remain a park—this is from the Premier's office. Then why is this province seizing it? If it's going to remain a park, just leave it alone. The Toronto Port Authority's own stated rationale is to use the land to relieve airport pinch points and congestion. You don't expropriate parkland to keep it as parkland.

The claim that this is about modernizing and the public interest—the bill's schedule 1 covers almost the entire Toronto Islands. The minister gets unilateral regulation-making authority. No master plan has been tabled. No environmental assessments have occurred. No consultations have happened. This is not modernization. This is a blank cheque drafted by and for private interests.

The claim that the federal government supports this, from the Premier—the federal government has done no such thing. The Prime Minister has called it an “interesting vision”—nothing more. Federal Transport Canada's position is clear: Any change to the tripartite agreement requires consensus of all signatories and meaningful consultations with stakeholders and Indigenous peoples, and neither has happened.

Now let's talk about the timeline. I want every member in this House to sit with the sequence of events, because it tells the story of this bill more clearly.

On January 19, 2026, the Premier's office signed a letter of intent to purchase a \$29-million Bombardier Challenger 650 private jet, the Premier's new toy. A \$500,000 USD deposit was placed—no public notice, no consultation with the Legislature, no conversations with the Ontarians whose money was being spent for the Premier's new toy.

On March 23, 2026, Premier Ford announced at Billy Bishop airport his intention to designate it a special economic zone, a status that would suspend provincial and municipal laws to fast-track expansion—no prior engagement with the city of Toronto, no consultations with the residents of the waterfront, no input from the Ontarians whose laws were about to be suspended on their behalf.

On April 17, 2026, the jet purchase became public—not because the Premier told Ontarians, but because Ontarians found out, and the moment they did, they spoke out against it. The consultation this government refused to hold, Ontarians held themselves.

April 23, 2026, morning: Bill 110 was tabled in the House, drafted without consultation, introduced without warning. Afternoon: Toronto city council—the level of government closest to the people most affected—passed an emergency motion opposing the bill. They were not asked. They were not informed.

On April 27, 2026, the jet was sold back to Bombardier—not because the Premier reconsidered, but because Ontarians forced him to, and rightfully so. Ontarians are still on the hook for nearly \$200,000 in non-recoverable costs: \$140,000 in aircraft management services, \$34,000 in outside legal counsel, and \$18,000 in aviation acquisition support, for a decision they were never consulted on—quite the price to pay to allow the Premier to act selfishly just because he wanted to travel in luxury.

Now let's look at the Davis standard. In 1971, Toronto faced another waterfront-altering mega-project: the Spadina Expressway. A Conservative Premier, William Davis, stood in this very chamber and stopped it. He listened to community members, he listened to the city of Toronto, and he said, in words that defined his premiership, that cities are for people, not cars. It has kind of completely flipped under this Premier.

I still remember that weird video of the Premier driving in Toronto, saying something about how this is the “war on the car,” and he couldn't believe the traffic in Toronto. Well, it is horrible driving in Toronto. But it's just interesting how priorities and values can change.

Premier Davis did not need a bill to seize the city's land. He did not need a schedule of property identifiers covering the Toronto Islands. He did not need to bypass the mayor of Toronto. He needed only the conviction that the people of Toronto deserved a say in the shape of their own waterfront.

This Premier could have followed the Davis precedent, to sit down with the city, to sit down with the federal government, to sit down with Indigenous groups, to sit down with Ontarians in general.

Show your plan. Make your case. Build consensus. That is what governing looks like.

Again, I want to bring it back to what I am hearing from my constituents in Nepean. Some aren't even opposed to the idea of the expansion; they are opposed to the way that this is being conducted. They are opposed to the way that this government often conducts themselves in quite an anti-democratic way here. Bills rarely go to committee, and when they do, it's a lovely treat for opposition members and for the public to at least seem like they're able to give feedback, put forward amendments—all are always rejected by opposition members; sometimes the government will put in their own. Then it comes back to the House, often time-allocated, meaning that the time for debate on the bill is lowered. That way, we can rush through and ram through this bill as fast as possible. The people in my riding are noticing this.

They're also noticing the fact that Ottawa is being completely ignored. The Premier has made several trips up there recently for an announcement here and there. I'm surprised he found where Ottawa was. It's always a nice treat to have the leader of the province show up to the capital of the province. But the Ottawa new deal is—there's nothing happening from it. The Ottawa LRT has not been uploaded, as promised by this government in this last election. It would save the city of Ottawa billions of dollars that they could put into investing in critical road infrastructure, critical housing infrastructure, health care, and things that we desperately need. OC Transpo is running a \$7-billion deficit—I think that was the number that my colleague from Orléans mentioned yesterday. Something as little as uploading that—they've done a ton of this for the city of Toronto. But places like Ottawa, places like Guelph, places all around this province are constantly being ignored.

It will be interesting to see, when we all attend AMO this summer, what these different municipalities have to say about this session in particular, which has been extremely Toronto-focused. Just off the top of my head, we got the 401 fantasy tunnel; we got the Premier's convention centre in the middle of Lake Ontario—taking over land by Billy Bishop. I've heard something about a Ferris wheel. Who knows what else is coming? Frankly, if the Premier is this passionate about the city, then he should run for mayor of Toronto again. Instead of being the Premier of Toronto, he needs to be the Premier of the province.

We have so many more pressing matters in this province.

The number one thing I hear at the door: cost of living. What is this government doing to address the cost of living? Whenever we ask this question, the answer I always hear is, “Well, we lowered the gas tax.” Okay, that saves a couple of cents for people who drive cars. But you promised to cut the tax for middle-income folks back in 2018, and you still haven't done it. That is the simplest thing you could do to actually make a meaningful change and put money back in the pockets of people.

You could get rid of HST on home heating and hydro. The Ontario Liberals put that idea forward a year ago.

Sometimes you take our ideas a year later and put them in—such as the HST on housing, which I was disappointed to hear is a one-and-done deal. That's nowhere near what we're going to need to actually even begin to hit that 1.5 million housing target.

0950

Ontarians want to know, why isn't this government doing more for the cost-of-living crisis? Why aren't they doing more about the housing crisis? Why aren't they doing more about access to public health care? Why aren't they doing more—or something entirely different, in fact—for our public education system? It has been completely thrown into chaos. I have custodians in my riding who are being fired and replaced by outside contractors now. I can't imagine that those cost any less or will be efficient at all, compared to the custodians we already had there.

This government's priorities are all over the place, and people in Nepean are noticing, people in Ottawa are deeply noticing, which is why we wanted to give the government a reality check yesterday on Ottawa. People around this province are noticing. My constituent email inbox is constantly flooded with passionate people sending their deep concerns about a lot of the legislation that is going on in this government.

When I go through this legislation—often, there's good stuff in there, but there's always that one poison pill. There's always something in there that is so dangerous that it makes it impossible to actually vote for, which I think is actually a strategy from this government so they can just continue claiming that we vote against everything. Even in times when we vote with them, they still will say, “You voted against it.” At the end of the day, it doesn't even matter.

My plea with this is, no matter what happens with this, please just do it right. Work with the tripartite, work with the city of Toronto, work with the key stakeholders, the residents and everyone who needs to be involved in getting this right. It's going to happen. This government is going to pass this bill. So let's make sure that we get it right. And please, please listen to opposition, please listen to people who are speaking out, please listen to experts who want to improve this bill, because that way, if we get it done right the first time, it doesn't need to become a colossal mess and failure that we will be cleaning up for decades to come.

In closing, I want to talk about consistency. That is what this government has been good at—consistently telling Ontarians they're the priority and consistently doing the exact opposite.

Bill 110 is the same pattern in a more brazen form. It takes municipal land. It overrides the elected council of Canada's largest city. It hands the minister a blank cheque to expropriate at will.

Ontarians deserve to have a say in the laws that govern them, and know that even if they are laws they may not agree with, they still have the opportunity to voice their concerns and engage in the democratic process. This Premier stole that opportunity from Ontarians, and they deserve better.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Questions?

Mr. Andrew Dowie: I want to thank both members for their remarks.

I continue to struggle on this question about who's governing the project, because my understanding, based on the legislation, is that this is solely about the land involved with the modernization proposal by PortsToronto, the Toronto Port Authority, which is federally governed. And seven of the nine appointees are from the federal government.

As I mentioned in second reading debate, just a few days before debate started, I was at an event with Senator Sandra Pupatello, the previous chair of the Toronto Port Authority, who was effusive in her praise for the province's work on this.

Given that this is federally led, supported by the funds from air travellers, not from the province—the province is not managing this project—how is it that this is not a federal initiative?

Ms. Stephanie Bowman: Thank you to the member from Windsor–Tecumseh for the question.

I have a great deal of respect for Sandra Pupatello. I didn't hear the conversation. But let me just talk about the facts here.

This government tabled this bill; not the federal government. This government needs to own this. If the government of Ontario wants to do something with the airport, it should bring those suggestions to the tripartite group and talk about it.

Expropriating land like a bully—coming in and saying, “I want this toy, and I'm taking it from you”—is what this government is really, really good at. There is example after

example—again, conservation authorities, regional leads not being elected.

This government wants the land, to do something for the Premier's jet, and that's all we know about it.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Ms. Jessica Bell: My question is to the member for Don Valley West.

In committee last week, we learned a few concerning things. We learned that the port authority and the federal government were meeting behind closed doors, in secret, without communicating with the city of Toronto about the expansion of the Billy Bishop airport.

My question to you is, do the Ontario Liberals oppose the expansion of the Billy Bishop airport?

Ms. Stephanie Bowman: Thank you to the member from University–Rosedale for the question. I'm not sure if she was listening to my debate or not. I think I made it pretty clear. Having jets fly over downtown Toronto will affect the quality of life for residents in downtown Toronto. It will negate the relaxing spa experience that we all can apparently pay \$200 or \$400 for. And it will affect the environment. They're going to pour dirt into the lake to expand an airport so the Premier can land his jets. So I certainly think I've been pretty clear about this. I am not in support.

If the mayor of Toronto could have done something differently, she could have done something in 2024 to—

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Response?

Ms. Stephanie Bowman: —and that might have prevented this government from starting this bill in the first place.

But responsibility for this decision lies with this government.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

M^{me} Lucille Collard: I listened very intently to all of the debate that has been happening in the chamber here, and all of my colleagues—I haven't heard a single peep about anyone saying that they would support this project. So I don't know where the NDP is coming from when they're trying to pin on us some kind of support that is non-existent and certainly hasn't been verbalized in any way. I just wanted to put that on the record because I've been hearing about it too many times, and it needs to be said.

I want to ask a question to my colleague the member from Nepean, because we travel together from Ottawa to the Billy Bishop airport very regularly. Just recently, on Sunday, we were both stuck at the airport. Because of the fog at Billy Bishop, our flights were being cancelled. So is it the belief, do you think, of the government, or anyone, that having jets will actually allow them to be more effective in trying to land when the airport is simply closed?

MPP Tyler Watt: Thank you to my wonderful colleague for bringing up that wonderful memory of us panicking on how we're going to get here this week. But

it is the reality. I was lucky enough to catch a later flight, to fly into Pearson—where they have the capability of actually doing that.

There are often issues with Billy Bishop because of weather conditions that can't handle even the smaller jets that many politicians use to get here.

This is what I'm talking about. You've got to actually listen to the experts, listen to Ontarians and advocacy groups and people who actually know what this Billy Bishop airport is like, what it's capable of and what it possibly can do.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Hon. Sam Oosterhoff: I appreciate the members opposite sharing their perspectives, although I don't think we really agree.

I'm going to take things from a totally different angle, perhaps.

Obviously, Billy Bishop is named after Billy Bishop, the amazing ace defender of freedom—72 confirmed kills—an incredible Canadian and incredible human being. I'm wondering if we could spend a moment talking about his legacy. I don't know if you have any thoughts on the actual Billy Bishop. We are spending all this time talking about the airport, which is named after the person. I realized we haven't really talked much about the person. The purpose of naming the airport after him was to remember him.

1000

I know I'm taking things from a different angle, but I'm wondering if you wanted to share any of your thoughts about Billy Bishop, the person, and his testament to freedom in the past and his defence of that freedom, but also a little bit of the legacy of why these airports are important to remember those who have gone and served.

Ms. Stephanie Bowman: Thank you to the associate minister for the question.

Billy Bishop is attributed with shooting down the Red Baron and helping to defend our freedom.

This bill has nothing about freedom. This bill is all about autocracy and dictatorship. This bill is about the Premier and this Conservative government tabling a bill, without talking to its partners—including the city of Toronto, apparently—to take over the role of the city of Toronto on Billy Bishop airport. Defending freedom is not something this government can talk about.

I will add that my grandfather, in World War II, was in the armed forces and he taught people how to fly the Gipsy Moth airplane and served with distinction. I'm very proud of that.

And of course, we are proud of Billy Bishop's contributions.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

MPP Wayne Gates: I want to talk about how beautiful the waterfront is.

What are we doing? We have all kinds of tourists—I think it's 20 million tourists who will come to Toronto—

and what we're doing is destroying the waterfront. That is what we should be talking about.

In Niagara Falls, they want to put a Ferris wheel in the park, right down by the Falls.

What are we doing to this province? If we say we want tourism to come to Canada, to come to Ontario, the last thing we should be doing is expanding Billy Bishop airport, to have jets fly over the waterfront every couple of minutes. It makes absolutely no sense.

My question is, does the member agree that airport expansion should start with consultation with the residents of Toronto or Niagara-on-the-Lake or wherever it's going to be before the expansion take place?

Ms. Stephanie Bowman: Thank you to the member from Niagara Falls for the question.

Yes, I absolutely agree. Again, I talked about it in my debate—how this being done without any consultation.

What's going to happen to the housing that is going to be built on the waterfront? The government hasn't talked about that.

The tourists that you talk about coming to enjoy the waterfront—are they going to still come when there are jets flying overhead?

Like I said, you pay \$400 to go to a concert, and all you hear is jets flying overhead? It makes no sense.

We know that this will be done without an environmental assessment. That is exactly what this government wants to do—because they know if they were to assess the impacts, that they would be very damaging. It was supposed to be that you weren't allowed to pour dirt into the lake to expand the airport—there is some needed for security reasons, but this will absolutely destroy the Toronto waterfront.

Absolutely, people should have a say.

And just to be clear, I am against jets flying over downtown Toronto.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Further debate?

MPP Bill Rosenberg: We all know Ontario's economy is expanding, our population is rising, and the demands on our infrastructure are increasing every single year. This is not a temporary trend. This is not a short-term spike. It is a long-term structural shift in how this province is growing, how people are moving, and it requires a government that is prepared to act, not react, to the scale of change we are experiencing.

Our government is focused on ensuring this province has the capacity, the competitiveness and the connectivity to support long-term economic growth. That means building infrastructure that matches the size of our economy.

And that is why we are here today—because Billy Bishop airport is one of those systems. It is a critical asset for Toronto and Ontario, and it is not keeping pace with the scale of growth we are experiencing.

With the Building Billy Bishop Airport Act, our government is bolstering its commitment to building infrastructure that will make Toronto and Ontario stronger. It means making decisions that reflect the needs of a province that is growing faster than almost anywhere else

in North America. That requires clear decisions and decisive action, especially when key infrastructure is not keeping pace with provincial needs. We cannot afford hesitation. We cannot afford to delay. And we cannot afford to let outdated processes hold back assets that are essential to Ontario's long-term success. Billy Bishop airport is one of those assets, and unlocking its full potential is essential for jobs, tourism, productivity and Ontario's long-term economic strength. It is essential for the resilience of our transportation network. It's essential for the future of a province that depends on efficient, reliable, modern infrastructure to support our growth.

People are choosing Ontario because of our economic strength, our quality of life, and the opportunities that this province offers. The growth is reshaping our cities, our regions and our infrastructure needs.

The greater Golden Horseshoe alone is projected to grow from roughly 11 million people in 2025 to nearly 14 million over the next 25 years. That means more people moving, commuting, working and relying on infrastructure that is already stretched to its limits. That growth does not happen in isolation. It affects housing, transit, highways, hospitals, schools and airports.

Province-wide, Ontario is expected to reach 20.5 million people by 2051. That is a level of growth that demands long-term planning, long-term investment and long-term vision.

Ontario needs infrastructure engineered for long-term growth, not short-term repairs that stretch the limits of what we already have. If we do not build, we fall behind. If we fall behind, we lose investments. If we lose investments, we lose jobs. And if we lose jobs, we lose the economic momentum that has made Ontario the engine of our country. If we fail to act, the cost of inaction will be paid in lost investment and lost jobs and in opportunities.

Ontario cannot afford to watch growth pass us by because our infrastructure wasn't ready, our decisions weren't timely, or our planning didn't match the scale of our economy. We have seen this story before in jurisdictions that waited too long to modernize their infrastructure, and we are not going to let that happen here.

That is why our government has taken a province-wide approach to building the infrastructure Ontario needs—not project by project, but through a coordinated, strategic, Ontario-first plan.

We accelerated construction on the Gardiner Expressway by more than a year, on a corridor that carries 160,000 vehicles every single day, because commuters cannot wait, businesses cannot wait, and a growing province cannot wait.

We are delivering the largest transit expansion program in North America, with new subways, new LRT lines, and new connections across this province, because a world-class region needs a world-class transit system, and because transit is essential to our economic growth.

We are rebuilding Ontario Place, transforming the waterfront into a destination that reflects the scale, the ambition and the identity of this province.

We are purchasing new subways and streetcar fleets for the TTC, replacing aging vehicles with modern, reliable, efficient equipment that can keep up with our demand, because a growing city cannot run on yesterday's transit system.

And through the historic new deal for Toronto, we have committed \$9 billion to stabilize the city's finances and support transit, housing and critical infrastructure, because Toronto's stability is Ontario's stability, and Ontario's stability is Canada's stability.

These are not isolated projects. They are part of a coordinated, province-wide strategy to strengthen Ontario's economy, support one of the fastest-growing regions in North America and prepare for the future.

1010

Madam Speaker, the modernization of Billy Bishop airport is a key part of that strategy, because a province of nearly 16 million people needs an aviation network that can meet the demands of our next generation. Billy Bishop airport is Ontario's third-busiest airport. It serves roughly two million passengers a year. It supports business travel, regional connectivity, tourism, and essential medical transport. It is a gateway for entrepreneurs, investors and visitors. And it is a lifeline for patients who rely on rapid medical transport.

More than 4,000 air ambulances and medical flights are conducted from the airport annually by Ornge. Modernizing facilities will improve the reliability of medical transport operations. Billy Bishop's downtown location allows Ornge to move patients quickly to the hospitals and the trauma centres providing life-saving services.

Modernizing this airport is not just about supporting travellers or strengthening the economy; it is about protecting a vital piece of Toronto's emergency response system and also ensuring that the province can continue to deliver life-saving care when it is needed most.

But the airport is operating below its potential. Its facilities are aging. Its capacity is constrained. And its governance structure has not kept pace with the needs of a modern, growing province.

Under the Toronto Port Authority's modernization plan, passenger volumes could rise to as many as 10 million people annually. That is a fivefold increase, and the existing infrastructure simply cannot support it. Without modernization, Ontario will face capacity constraints that limit economic growth and reduce system-wide resilience. We will see more congestion at Pearson. We will see fewer options for travellers. We will see lost opportunities for tourism and business. And we will see a transportation system that is less flexible, less resilient and less competitive.

And let's be clear: When Ontario's infrastructure falls behind, the entire country feels it. Our province is the economic engine of Canada. We generate more than 40% of our national GDP. We lead the country in population growth, job creation and private sector investment. We cannot simply allow outdated infrastructure to hold back a province of this scale and this importance. A province that powers nearly half of Canada's economy cannot be con-

strained by systems built for a different era. We need infrastructure that keeps up with our growth and supports our communities.

That is why our government introduced the Building Billy Bishop Airport Act, 2026. This legislation allows the province to take ownership of the city of Toronto lands required for the modernization, as a necessary step to move this project from concept to construction. By assuming responsibility for the lands that underpin the airport, the province can work directly with the Toronto Port Authority and the federal government to streamline planning, accelerate approvals, and eliminate jurisdictional gridlock that has stalled progress for years. It ensures that the decisions shaping Billy Bishop's future are made by the level of government best positioned to deliver results, backed by a clear mandate, a coordinated strategy, and the ability to act with the urgency our growing province demands. It also allows the province to assume the city's role in the tripartite agreement that governs the airport—

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): We will now be moving on to members' statements.

Third reading debate deemed adjourned.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

SOO GREYHOUNDS HOCKEY TEAM

MPP Bill Rosenberg: The Soo U15 Greyhounds, who finished first in the Northern Ontario Junior Hockey League, travelled to Thunder Bay to compete against the top teams from across Ontario. They came within one goal of completing an incredible comeback, ultimately falling 3-2 to the Vaughan Kings in the gold medal game at the All-Ontario U15AAA Championships.

Despite the results, these young Greyhound players showed remarkable growth, determination and resilience throughout this tournament and pushed one of the province's top teams to the limit in a thrilling final. This achievement is a source of great pride and inspiration for our northern Ontario boys, highlighting the strength, talent and potential of our local athletes.

Adding to the pride of the north are four young players from down the line—from the pond in Wharncliffe, Jeremy and Jasper Jarratt; Greg Beckerson of Echo Bay; and Ben Campbell from St. Joe Island, all part of this team's great success.

Congratulations to all the players and coaches for their outstanding dedication and achievements.

And not to be forgotten are the parents, who put an incredible amount of time into these young players' dreams.

As you look forward to the 2026-27 season, I hope you all keep your heads up, sticks on the ice, and fill the back of the net.

And go, Habs, go tonight!

WORTH FIGHTING FOR CAMPAIGN

Mr. Terence Kernaghan: I rise today in solidarity with developmental services workers in London, including members of OPSEU Local 166 and nearly 600 Community Living London workers on the picket lines, along with approximately 4,500 front-line social service workers across Ontario, as part of OPSEU-SEFPO's Worth Fighting For campaign. These workers are the backbone of our social safety net. They include developmental services workers, social workers, child therapists, addiction counsellors, shelter staff, and legal aid workers who provide essential care to some of the most vulnerable in our province.

Over 78% of these workers are women. Many are paid less than a living wage. Too many are working multiple jobs just to get by, and some are relying on food banks to make ends meet, all while continuing to support children, adults and families in crisis. These workers wake up every day to help people who are struggling, while far too often they are struggling themselves.

These workers are not only standing up for themselves, but for the future of public services Ontarians rely on every day, including in London. They are raising concerns about chronic underfunding, unsafe staffing levels, and growing wait-lists.

Since 2018, per person funding for social services in Ontario has declined by over 16%, contributing to service gaps, long wait-lists, and instability across the sector.

They are calling for the 6.5% retroactive increase that other public sector workers received after Bill 124 was struck down.

Our caucus, leader Marit Stiles, and New Democrats across Ontario stand with them in this fight, because these workers are worth fighting for.

BARBECUE EVENT IN DON VALLEY EAST YOUTH COUNCIL

Mr. Adil Shamji: It's almost that time of year again: Sham Jam 2026 is right around the corner, and Don Valley East, you're invited. Join us for a delicious barbecue on Saturday, July 4 at Broadlands Park. I'll be there, bringing my appetite and exchanging this suit for shorts. We'll have food, fun, activities and community booths to shine a spotlight on all of the amazing work happening right here in Don Valley East. Every one of our barbecues has been better than the last one, and this one will be no different. Come on out. Let's kick off our summer the right way. Sham Jam, sha-bam!

There are many things happening in Don Valley East, and I want to shine a spotlight on our youth council; more specifically, on the brilliant young people who are on it.

Our youth are our future. The work we do in this chamber may be for society today, but it will be inherited by our youth tomorrow, and that's why it's so important to make sure their voice is reflected in our voice.

My youth council has been clear: They're worried about education and changes to OSAP. They need to see movement on the massive youth unemployment they face across the province. And they need to see better public transit delivered reliably and on time. And, while they're not getting it yet, I'm ready to fight to deliver the better, brighter, healthier future that they deserve.

If you're a young person in Don Valley East and want to join that fight, join our youth council.

1020

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: I'm taking the opportunity today to wish Muslim communities of Erin Mills, Mississauga, Canada and all over the world Eid Mubarak.

I rise today to recognize the important contributions physician assistants are making to health care systems across Ontario. Physician assistants are health care professionals who work with physicians and interdisciplinary care teams to help improve access to timely, high-quality care for patients.

Across Ontario's health care system, workforce demand continues to grow. Ontario has made important progress in supporting the growth of health care capacity by training new physicians, physician assistants, nurses, nurse practitioners, and other health care professionals.

Physician assistant education programs at McMaster University and University of Toronto continue to train the next generation of providers, with additional programs currently in development.

Our government is continuing to build on that progress. Earlier this year, we announced a \$16-million investment to add 150 new physician assistant education seats beginning in 2027. This will help strengthen Ontario's health care workforce for the future. This investment complements our government's \$3.4-billion investment to connect every person in Ontario to primary care by 2029.

MISSING PERSONS

Mr. Sol Mamakwa: This past month, three people from Kiiwetinoong have gone missing in Thunder Bay. After searching efforts, they have all been found. The families and the communities are now grieving.

The search also led to the finding of remains of a man who had been missing in Thunder Bay for almost two years.

I want to say meegwetch to everyone who came out to help with the searches.

The problem of missing people in Thunder Bay is not new, but it feels like we are at the tipping point.

I want to offer my condolences to the families mourning the losses of Ashlynn Bottle and Nodin Skunk of Mishkeegogamang Ojibway Nation, Kelsey Anderson from Webequie and Kasabonika Lake First Nations, and Richard Graham from Thunder Bay.

I also want to acknowledge that there are many more who continue to grieve lost loved ones who went missing in Thunder Bay.

On behalf of Kiiwetinoong, our thoughts and prayers are with all of you.

It is time to come together to end this crisis, because no more families should go through this. Meegwetch.

CAMBRIDGE REDHAWKS HOCKEY TEAM

Mr. Brian Riddell: Everybody knows how big of a sports town Cambridge is, and it has been an unforgettable hockey season for the Cambridge RedHawks, capped off by winning both the Sutherland Cup and the Commissioner's Cup. Not only did they dominate the regular season in the playoffs, but they did it in style and secured their place in the GOHL history books. This marks the first championship in their franchise history, built on an extraordinary season that saw the RedHawks post an incredible 61-6 record, including a remarkable 23-game winning streak—remarkable—just two wins shy of the league record.

Several players delivered outstanding performances throughout the season, especially forward Reid Gammage and goaltender Aidan Hill. Early in the season, Hill broke the franchise record for rookie goalie wins after recording 16 victories. Meanwhile, Gammage etched his name into the record books by becoming the franchise's all-time points leader, reaching 142 points—amazing—in just 123 games with the RedHawks.

From start to finish, this season belonged to Cambridge—I'm just amazed, to be honest—and it all came to a dramatic conclusion with a 4-3 overtime win over St. Marys.

I have to apologize to Matt Rae, who has St. Marys in his area—but too bad.

LAND USE PLANNING

MPP Alexa Gilmour: Last night, 120 people came to the Argonaut Rowing Club from all over my riding. They were deeply distressed by the Billy Bishop airport expansion, and we looked over the water, and we spoke about jets coming in every two and a half minutes. My people were angry, and they were motivated.

They were particularly disturbed by this government's ongoing pattern—just like the greenbelt scandal—of taking over land in secret, backroom deals and then giving it to rich developer friends, or in this case, an American-controlled company.

My constituents and residents are in love with the beauty of our Sunnyside beaches, of High Park, of the ways in which we can paddle and boat. We cannot stand for jet blasts that knock over our children learning to sail, pollute the lungs of our grandmothers, and ensure that our waterfront—a gem in this world, a place where 28 million tourists come every year—is going to be defaced and

destroyed by a government that cares more about profit for one company than people.

GOVERNMENT INVESTMENTS

Mr. Logan Kanapathi: As we approach the end of the spring session, I rise to highlight the work our government has advanced, particularly in my riding of Markham–Thornhill.

For years, our government has been focused on strengthening local economic growth and creating real opportunities for small businesses and entrepreneurs.

Last week, we were proud to welcome the hard-working Associate Minister of Small Business to Markham to announce a \$5-million investment that will help nearly 450 Ontario small businesses go digital, modernize and grow.

I want to thank Scott Harnett of Sable Metal Fabrication for empowering our economy and communities.

Speaker, through our Racialized and Indigenous Supports for Entrepreneurs Grant Program—RAISE—we support small businesses such as Daniel Yao CPA Professional Corp.; Demo Design and Renovation; Foresway Group Inc.; GoQuality group; Goldenlink Academy; Hot-Star Large Fried Chicken; R3 Home Staging; Sunshine Art and Craft; and Warden Optometry, a Markham neuro vision and ortho-k clinic.

Thank you to the amazing small businesses for their commitment to strengthening their local economy.

Under Premier Ford's leadership, we will continue supporting entrepreneurs and building—

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): I recognize the member for Burlington.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Ms. Natalie Pierre: Last week, in my riding of Burlington, I attended the Roseland community safety meeting alongside the Associate Solicitor General for Auto Theft and Bail Reform, local city councillors, members of Halton regional police and Crime Stoppers, and residents from across the Burlington community. This meeting brought together neighbours, law enforcement and elected officials for an important conversation about crime prevention, automobile theft, bail reform and community safety. One message was clear: People want to feel safe in their neighbourhoods.

That's why our government continues to make community safety a priority through investments in law enforcement that give police services the tools and resources they need to help keep our community safe.

Speaker, Ontario has invested more than \$110 million to strengthen enforcement and stop repeat violent offenders, including funding for dedicated bail compliance and warrant apprehension teams. We're also supporting initiatives that combat organized crime and auto theft, while improving coordination between police services across the province of Ontario.

Public safety depends on strong partnerships and open dialogue.

I want to thank everyone from the community who attended the meeting and shared their concerns and ideas.

Our government will continue working every day to protect Ontario families and keep our communities safe.

1030

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Mr. Billy Pang: I would like to welcome the College of Traditional Chinese Medicine Practitioners and Acupuncturists of Ontario to Queen's Park today. Traditional Chinese medicine and acupuncture play an important role in Ontario's diverse and evolving health care landscape. It is a pleasure to have you here this morning.

I'd also like to welcome representatives from Lupus Ontario. As May is Lupus Awareness Month, we are pleased to have families, friends and advocates from the community with us today.

Welcome to Queen's Park.

Mr. Adil Shamji: This morning, I would like to welcome the Canadian Association of Physician Assistants to the Legislature, including Patrick Nelson, executive director; Kristy Corrente, director of advocacy and communications; and Kevin Kitzul, Ontario director. Welcome to the chamber.

Hon. David Piccini: I'd like to welcome to the Legislature today three young students I have the privilege of working with in my constituency office this summer: Victoria, Daphne, and Juliane, who are sitting here. Welcome to Queen's Park. I'm looking forward to having you here with us today.

I'd also like to welcome the team from COCA, the Council of Ontario Construction Associations, who are here today: Ted Dreyer, Graeme Aitken, Dave Stubbs, Romeo Milano and Ian Cunningham, whom I just the privilege of meeting with. I hope everyone gets an opportunity to meet with COCA today. Thank you for your advocacy and the work you do every day.

Mrs. Michelle Cooper: I want to welcome Charlie Batori here. She's an intern in my constituency office. I believe it's her first time at Queen's Park. Welcome to Queen's Park, Charlie.

MPP Jamie West: I want to welcome one of Ontario's youngest new citizens. Baby Jasper was born in Sudbury. His big brother Boken is helping to take care of him. And his mom, Lili, and his dad, Adams, are absolutely over the moon.

Mr. Sol Mamakwa: It's not every day that I have people from Kiiwetinoong come visit, but today, my brother Jonathon Mamakwa is in the House.

Welcome to the House.

Hon. Raymond Sung Joon Cho: I'm so honoured to introduce nine fabulous guests from my riding of Scarborough North and six guests from the University of Toronto to our House today.

Tina Zhang and her friends Sylvia Park, Sena Park, Herace Paek, Hye Jeong Gong, Se Hoon Park, and Ga Yeong Son, thank you for coming, and welcome to Queen's Park.

Mr. Aris Babikian: I would like to wish a happy birthday to our colleague the member from Brampton North.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: I would like to welcome members of the Coalition for a Better St. Catharines group today. Welcome to the House this morning, Ed Smith, Michael and Jackie Scott, Mark and Gwen Kennedy, and John Pula.

I also want to welcome my constituency assistants Taylor and Penny and my executive assistant today here to Queen's Park. Thanks for all you do in keeping us strong in St. Catharines.

Hon. Trevor Jones: I'd like to welcome the Beef Farmers of Ontario to Queen's Park today. Please join us on the south lawn—the front lawn—for fresh air, sunshine, and good Ontario beef.

Ms. Aislinn Clancy: I'd like to welcome to the House Ayo Owodunni, our ward 5 councillor from Kitchener, and Julius Ilori, a representative from the state ministry of youth and social development for the government of Nigeria.

And I want to wish all our Muslim colleagues, friends and neighbours an Eid Mubarak. Happy Eid.

Mr. Joseph Racinsky: I'm happy to welcome Councillors Liebig, Bouwmeester and Woods, as well as Councillor Liebig's daughter Clara to Queen's Park, from Guelph/Eramosa township. Welcome to Queen's Park.

Mr. Ted Hsu: I also want to welcome the Beef Farmers of Ontario, whom I just met in my office a few moments ago.

I also got to meet Wren Ley, who is the grandchild of a constituent of mine and who is serving as a page this week.

MPP Mohamed Firin: I'd like to welcome Dianne Riccio and Robert Riccio from my riding of York South-Weston.

Mr. Rudy Cuzzetto: Today, I would like to welcome Tania Da Fonseca and David Lachapelle of Trican Masonry Contractors in Mississauga-Lakeshore.

Hon. Sylvia Jones: Thank you to the Canadian Association of Physician Assistants for joining us today. Welcome, Patrick Nelson, Kristy Corrente and Kevin Kitzul, to Queen's Park.

Hon. Kevin Holland: Speaker, with your indulgence, I would like take this opportunity to wish my beautiful wife a happy retirement.

Lori, I'm so incredibly proud of you and everything you have accomplished in your career. I am so happy for you. Congratulations.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): I recognize that we have a lot of guests here today. Unfortunately, we are out of time for introduction of visitors. I apologize on behalf of the members.

But members, of course, you may come back at 1 o'clock to introduce your guests.

QUESTION PERIOD

COST OF LIVING

Mr. Tom Rakocevic: Speaker, grocery prices are out of control. Ask the working mom I met in Scarborough last week, who just wants to buy a hot meal for her children after a long shift.

Instead of making the cost of food cheaper, this government took money out of people's pockets to buy the Premier a private luxury jet. Yesterday, we tabled a bill to scrap the tax on all groceries and bring more competition to the billionaire grocery monopoly. Embarrassingly, they voted no. After their restless night's sleep, we're giving them a second chance to do the right thing today.

Will they side with us to bring down the price of groceries, or will they side with the billionaires yet again?

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

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: Madam Speaker, through you to the member opposite: "Will you side with us?" Let's think about that for a second.

When we cut the gas tax, which is saving people 10 cents a litre at a time when the price of gas is going up, did they side with us?

Interjections: No.

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: The member opposite, did you hear that answer?

When we cut the small business tax by over 30%, helping 375,000 businesses right across Ontario, did you side with us?

Interjections: No.

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: I heard a no.

When we put One Fare in place, saving commuters \$1,600 a year, did they side with us?

Interjections: No.

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: When we tabled \$12 billion of savings into the pockets of individuals and families in this province, did they side with us?

Interjections: No.

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: Madam Speaker, this is the party of yes. They are the party of no.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Back to the member for Humber River-Black Creek.

Mr. Tom Rakocevic: Playtime is over, Minister.

He's so out of touch. After listening to that, I suggest he put down the champagne and step out of the limousine.

Let me get this straight: This government spent \$30 million for a private luxury jet with a custom gourmet kitchen, but they won't take the tax off of rotisserie chicken at a grocery store. Why?

Mr. Stephen Blais: Tax the chicken. Tax the chicken.

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: "Tax the chicken"—yes, I heard that. "Tax the chicken," they're calling.

Madam Speaker, when we got into power—and I'm from Durham and Pickering, and the member from Whitby is here, and the member from Durham, who is hard at work at his table there—we campaigned on taking the tolls off the 412 and 418, thanks to the leadership of the member

from Whitby, and taking the tolls off the 407 east. This is saving the daily commuters \$7,200. Did they side with us?

Interjections: No.

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: No.

At every opportunity this member and that party and that party have had to put more money back in the pockets of hard-working families, hard-working individuals, hard-working people who run businesses right across Ontario, did they side with the people of Ontario?

Interjections: No.

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: And did we support the people of Ontario?

Interjections: Yes.

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: I rest my—

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Back to the member for Humber River—Black Creek.

1040

Mr. Tom Rakocevic: Boy, did the minister sail by that question. It makes you wonder if their next big toy purchase will be a luxury government yacht.

Speaker, this government voted against making food cheaper. They voted to allow predatory surveillance pricing. The Premier even said, “God bless the billionaire grocers.”

Our bill will mean cheaper food and more competition.

So, last chance: Will the Premier side with us and make groceries more affordable for families, or will he side with the billionaire grocery monopoly?

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: I wish that when we launched the \$30 billion of tariff relief to support individuals, families and businesses, given the threat on tariffs from our neighbour to the south—did they support the \$30 billion? Absolutely not.

Madam Speaker, let's go to another place: the most vulnerable in Ontario. When no government in history in Ontario indexed ODSP payments to inflation, no government in history indexed ODSP payments to the lowest-income seniors, the most vulnerable in Ontario, but they had the opportunity to help the most vulnerable—did they support us? They did not.

This is what leadership is about. This is what building an economy for all is about. We're taking care of everyone—the most vulnerable, the patients, the students in Ontario. We're building Ontario with record infrastructure. It's about time they recognized that and supported that.

JUSTICE SYSTEM

Ms. Catherine Fife: My question is for the Premier.

In 2019, the Auditor General made several recommendations to ensure timely justice for survivors of sexual assault. She recommended that the Attorney General prepare a progress report on intimate partner violence and sexual assault cases annually, and review the victim response program and the independent legal advice program—and for good reason. Seven years later, these have not been actioned.

Why does the Attorney General refuse to fix Ontario's broken justice system?

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

MPP Monica Ciriello: I thank the member opposite for the question, as it gives us an opportunity to be extremely clear: The people of Ontario and this government have no tolerance for sexual assault. Anyone who commits these horrific crimes will, and must, be held accountable.

Victims of sexual assault deserve justice in a justice system that has the capacity to make sure that the cases are heard in a timely manner. This means us, our government, investing half a billion dollars in 2027, in 2028 to help the courts address backlogs and manage a growing number of complex cases they continue to hear. This means appointing 52 new judges to the Ontario Court of Justice and hiring nearly 700 additional prosecutors, victim support and court staff to ensure victims get the justice that they deserve.

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

Ms. Catherine Fife: Since I tabled Lydia's Law, so many survivors of sexual assault have come forward because they, too, were denied justice in Ontario.

A survivor from a 2020 case against Toronto-based neurologist Allan Gordon was delayed and then dismissed due to court delays. She told me, “I was being gutted, retraumatized, degraded and called a liar.

“My abuser was not found guilty but I was sentenced to life.

“We did our job by coming forward. Now we're asking” the Attorney General to do his.

Speaker, the Attorney General has the chance today to support our private member's bill, Lydia's Law. Will he do so?

MPP Monica Ciriello: Our government is taking action to put victims first and hold offenders accountable for sexual assault and gender-based violence. Across government, this is underscored by our ongoing commitment to investments.

This includes—and this is only a fraction of what our government has done to date—\$2.3 million to expand the independent legal advice program, \$5.6 million for the Child Victim/Witness Program, \$10.6 million to the Partner Assault Response Program, \$1.4 billion to address and prevent gender-based violence, \$13.5 million to support women and children.

I find it rich, but not surprising, that this question is coming from the member opposite, who has voted against each and every one of these investments we have put forward to support victims across this province.

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

Ms. Catherine Fife: This government seems very committed to the ongoing court backlogs which are denying survivors justice in Ontario.

These are the numbers: 1,639 sexual assault cases were withdrawn or stayed before trial in 2025.

When I raised concerns about the Sloka case, where 48 women were deemed “unreliable,” the Attorney General described my actions as victim-trolling.

Let me be clear: When survivors come to us and they ask for our help, our job is to bring those concerns here to Queen’s Park. That is not trolling. That is the work that we do.

If Lydia’s Law passes today, the Attorney General for the province of Ontario will actually have to do his job. I would accept his apology for the victim-trolling—and I would work with him to strengthen the justice system in Ontario.

To the Attorney General: Will you support Lydia’s Law today, apologize for those comments, and bring hope to sexual assault survivors—

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Member for Hamilton Mountain.

MPP Monica Ciriello: Again, I thank the member opposite for the question, as it gives us an opportunity to be extremely clear. Our government has continued to support victims every step of the way.

Our government is ensuring we and survivors of crime have access to resources and tools to ensure that they are getting through the justice system smoothly and quickly. Again, this includes 52 new judges to address a backlog, 700 additional crown prosecutors, victim support and court staff.

Madam Speaker, it is important that we continue working across government to find more and better ways to support victims of crime, their families and community.

CURRICULUM

Mr. Rob Cerjanec: We recently learned that 70% of high school students are now opting out of mandatory online learning. The data has shown that students and parents don’t want it. Our educators know that it isn’t the best for learning.

It’s clear that this government is trying to save money on the backs of future generations by pushing digital materials in all forms. Meanwhile, they’re shortchanging our economy instead of preparing students for the future.

Speaker, does the Premier think he knows better than students and families?

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

Hon. Paul Calandra: What the member failed to also mention is that close to 50,000 students have continued to take online courses because it provides them a valuable opportunity to take courses, in many instances, that they would not have otherwise had the opportunity to take. We’re hearing from students in all parts of the province, and particularly some of our northern communities, who have said that online courses have given them the opportunity to take a course that they would have never otherwise been able to take.

The whole point of it is—and he mentions it in his question—some students have decided to opt out. Do you know why they have decided to opt out, Madam Speaker?

Because you are allowed to opt out. That’s the whole point. Some students are in; some students are out. It’s about optionality for the students so that they can decide what is best for them.

I’m very, very pleased that so many have taken up the opportunity to take online courses, because it is part of building a system that puts our students first, by listening to students, parents and teachers, and giving our kids the best opportunity to succeed.

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

Mr. Rob Cerjanec: The minister might talk about options, but at Hamilton Catholic, the mandatory grade 10 civics and careers course is only delivered online. That’s the only option for students.

With this government, kids are being pushed to learn remotely, workers need to be in person, and the Premier gets to work from his cottage this summer. Maybe that’s why he wanted to buy his own private jet.

Here’s the reality on the ground: Online e-learning courses mean online exams where AI can be used, instead of students showing their work. There is no software provided by the ministry for secure exams and no requirement for in-person exams with pen and paper. It means that a student needs to log in just once a week for attendance purposes, while some are walking around the hallways and hanging out in the washrooms. So much for this government getting tough on attendance.

Speaker, how can our young people learn about career pathways, financial literacy and participating in our democracy only online?

Hon. Paul Calandra: I know that this member worked for the Durham District School Board, so I guess if the experience at the board that he was working for is that kids were wandering the hallways and not doing work, it speaks more to his experience at a board that he was working for than it does in the rest of the province.

1050

This is coming from the Liberal Party, that said that kids didn’t have to do exams anymore. And now he’s worried about kids doing exams. This comes from a Liberal Party that said kids didn’t even have to go to school anymore; that they could mail it in and still get 100% on their courses.

He voted against a bill that we put forward that said kids had to do mandatory exams, that kids had to show up to school, that kids had to participate. He voted against that and then has the nerve to get up and ask a question about kids participating in school.

So I would say this to the member opposite: I appreciate that the board that you were a high-level member of was a disaster. That’s why we are fixing school boards across the province. It’s too bad that you didn’t support any of that.

But I’ll tell you what I have faith in: I have faith in the students. I have faith in the teachers. And we are going to give them the tools that they need to give our kids the best opportunity to succeed.

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

Mr. Rob Cerjanec: The minister wants to talk about attendance and exams, but it's the approach of his own government that is actually putting that entirely to the side.

You can't build a strong economy without a strong education system, without investing into our kids and the future.

This government is cutting OSAP. It's bringing down the quality of our education system. And it's making it harder for young people to get ahead. It's failing young people on all fronts.

What we're seeing at Hamilton Catholic and other boards—the push to move civics and careers entirely online, Minister—is going to make it even more difficult for young people. How does that prepare kids for the workforce or career pathways, or understanding our democracy? How does that ensure students can learn the financial literacy component that's in the curriculum?

Speaker, is the Premier trying to dumb things down and avoid teaching our kids the fundamentals?

Hon. Paul Calandra: Dumb things down? And this is coming from a member—there was no financial literacy when the Liberals were in charge of the education system.

The civics course has been modernized to ensure that our kids have every opportunity to understand parliamentary democracy and what makes it the best way of giving government to the people of this—frankly, parliamentary democracy, we should all be proud of.

Under Progressive Conservatives, we have the highest graduation rates. We have increasing standards in literacy. We are seeing our students succeed in a way that they have never done before. How are we doing that, colleagues? By looking at everything the Liberals did, throwing it out and starting over. And what does that mean? Investing in our schools—a record level of investment in building new, modern schools. They closed 600; we're building hundreds of schools—179 projects, with over 200 currently in the pipeline.

We're updating the curriculum. And do you know what we are doing? We're listening to teachers, we're listening to students, and we're listening to parents, because they're what matters in the education system, not Liberal ideology.

SPECIAL-NEEDS STUDENTS

Ms. Lee Fairclough: My question is for the Premier.

I believe in an Ontario that works for everyone and where our schools will work for our students, our parents and our educators. But today, too many students are being left behind.

The independent Ontario Auditor General recently reviewed special education services in our schools, and the findings were shocking. To quote from the report: “The ministry did not provide clear guidance on the circumstances under which schools could refuse a student's entry.... This resulted in students with special education needs being sent home when schools could not meet their needs.”

Speaker, does the Premier believe it's acceptable in Ontario for students with special education needs to be sent home from school instead of being taught in class?

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

Hon. Paul Calandra: I guess it's Liberal leadership day today, colleagues. I guess that's what we're going to see.

Do you know what, Madam Speaker? Here's the difference between Conservatives and Liberals: We see a problem, and we're fixing that problem.

As I've said in the House a number of times, I don't think parents care that the Minister of Education gets up and talks about the record levels of investment in special education, the record levels of investment in education. Do you know what they care about? I think what they care about are the results and the things that we have put in place. Whether it's special education, whether it's the courses, are they giving our students the best opportunity to succeed?

Yes, special education is working better in some boards than other boards. Well, what is it that is making some boards more successful than other boards? That's what we want to know. If it means more money, that's okay, but if it means that we have to change the system so that all students have the opportunity to succeed better, we're actually going to do that as well.

I know the Liberals and the NDP—the only solution that they ever have is to put more money in the system regardless of the outcomes.

For Progressive Conservatives, it's about outcomes and how you can make sure that people succeed.

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

Ms. Lee Fairclough: I checked the Hansard, and the last time the Premier said “special education” in this House was in March 2020, six long years ago. Back then, he said Ontario was turning the corner in education, and he trumpeted billions being invested in special education. That was six years ago.

Today, students with special education needs are being sent home from school instead of being taught in class. It's wrong, and it's embarrassing. Imagine the heartbreak of a parent hearing time and again that their school can't teach their child.

Speaker, what is the Premier going to do to stop the shameful practice in Ontario of students with special education needs being sent home instead of being taught?

Hon. Paul Calandra: To the member opposite: It will take a little bit more than that to be successful in your leadership.

This is a member who has not talked about special education the entire time—colleagues, this is literally only the third time I have got up to answer a question on education.

Now, all of a sudden, the Liberals care about education? Nobody believes that for a second—not for a second—because when we came to office in 2018, the Ministers of Education who preceded me had to increase funding to

special education by over 36%. Do you know why? Because the previous Liberal government starved special education. Do you know what else they did? They closed schools. We had to invest record levels to build new schools across the province of Ontario.

So while they were closing schools, firing teachers, starving the system, we are reinvesting. And do you know why we're doing that? Because we understand that what matters in the education system is outcomes, and the only way you can have positive outcomes is by ensuring that students have the resources, that teachers have the resources, and that it's a system built on listening to parents, students—

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

Ms. Lee Fairclough: The Auditor General found that in 2023-24, 46 school boards collectively spent \$398 million more than they were funded for by the province to support special education needs in the classroom. She cited that the need for special education support for kids had grown faster than what was funded.

The Minister of Education just blamed school boards and trustees.

Speaker, this is not a governance issue. This is a funding issue. And it will only get worse.

Yesterday, we learned that the TDSB will see another \$6.4-million drop in special education funding next year. Yet, of course, when the Premier needed a private jet, \$29 million was easily available. It's about priorities.

Will the Premier do the right thing by parents and children and fund special education in Ontario's classrooms?

Hon. Paul Calandra: We've done just that—an over \$3.85-billion increase to special education since we got here.

But this comes from a Liberal Party that spent a billion dollars to try to save two seats, right? That's this Liberal Party.

I don't blame school trustees and school boards for what is happening in special education and what's happening in the education system. I actually blame the previous Liberal government that, for 15 years, ignored education entirely. Do you know what they did? They put a little extra money here; they put a little pet project here. They didn't care about student outcomes. While math scores were plummeting, the Liberals said, "It's okay. Let's keep going."

What we're doing is saying this: Let's bring a more consistent level of education across the province. The Ministry of Education has to step up and support that consistent level of education. We want our students to succeed. We want the curriculum to match the jobs of tomorrow. And the investments that we are making have to show results, because that's what parents care about, that's what our teachers care about and, ultimately, that's what students need—a system that supports—

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

NORTHERN AIRPORTS

Mr. Sol Mamakwa: Meegwetch. I learned a few weeks ago that the Ministry of Transportation remote airports office in Thunder Bay walked away from the Northern Ontario Aviation Committee.

At the same time, this government is forcing an expansion to Billy Bishop airport that nobody asked for.

Why is this government walking away from their responsibility to improve air transportation in northern Ontario?

1100

Mr. Hardeep Singh Grewal: To the member opposite's question, Speaker: Billy Bishop airport is going to help expand and modernize air transportation throughout this province, not just for international transportation, but for those members who are in the north.

Last week, I had the opportunity to talk to many people from the north during committee hearings, and the conversations that we were having were all about how this is going to expand air transportation, not only for those individuals who are travelling down from the north to Toronto to have medical appointments, visit their friends and family, go to sporting events and games, but it's also going to help hospitals send more doctors up into the north, and bring more patients and doctors down, back into the airport, and utilizing that between Toronto—in downtown Toronto's core.

For those patients who now have to travel to Pearson and go to the hospitals here in downtown Toronto—they're adding another 40 to 50 minutes to their commute. This is going to get them to the care they need faster.

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

Mr. Sol Mamakwa: For the Minister of Transportation to use northern health care as an excuse to expand Billy Bishop airport—it's just outrageous. It does not make sense.

We have 27 gravel airstrips in the north that need to be modernized—27.

Through the Speaker: When will this government properly fund the safety and the infrastructure of these airstrips?

Mr. Hardeep Singh Grewal: Again to the member: We're working hard to make sure northerners have the opportunity to connect with Toronto. The work that we've been doing is not only on air transportation, but the Northlander as well. The members opposite voted against the Northlander, and we're bringing it back. We're making sure that we're connecting northern communities to Toronto.

When we're talking about airport modernization and expanding—that's \$140 billion to Ontario's GDP. Northern hospitals and northern communities support that investment. It gets patients down into the city faster and more reliably. And when we take a look at the investments this is going to make—it's about 20,000 jobs that that's going to add to the core. It's going to let people travel more conveniently and faster. And I'm sure that a lot of mem-

bers here will be taking those flights back and forth, because it will be more convenient for their communities.

SCHOOL BOARDS CONSEILS SCOLAIRES

M^{me} Lucille Collard: Speaker, the supervisor appointed by the government to the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board is forcing the board to cut 83 teaching positions and two principal and vice-principal positions for the next school year. Those are not just numbers on a spreadsheet; those are adults who could help reduce class sizes, support students who are struggling and make schools safer.

Parents, educators and students have been clear: Our schools need more adults, not less. Yet, after years of underfunding, this government continues to shift the blame instead of taking responsibility for the growing pressures facing our education system.

So my question to the Minister of Education: Now that Bill 101 gives the government even greater control over all school boards, can parents expect more cuts to classrooms and fewer supports for their children?

Hon. Paul Calandra: Actually, the member will know that the problem in the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board was the fact that trustees were so dysfunctional, that many of the parents in that board decided to send their kids to different school boards.

We saw a significant increase in the Ottawa Catholic system while the Ottawa-Carleton system decreased. So some of the challenges that the member opposite mentions is that there are just fewer students who will be in the schools, so that means that there will be reduction in some of the staffing for sure. Having said that, most of the reductions in staff, as the member will know, happens through attrition. So there will be nobody, ultimately, in the final analysis, who will lose their job.

Now, what the supervisor did do was cut executive positions at the Ottawa board itself in the administration offices. That's over a million dollars' worth of savings that are at the administration office that will be put right back into the classroom, coming in September.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Member for Ottawa-Vanier.

M^{me} Lucille Collard: Madame la Présidente, le ministre a promis que les conseils scolaires francophones seraient épargnés par sa réforme afin de protéger les droits des conseils francophones à se gouverner—une gouvernance par et pour les francophones.

Or, la directive qu'il vient d'envoyer aux conseils scolaires empêche maintenant tous les conseillers scolaires de participer à des événements, à des formations et à des conférences pourtant essentielles à leur rôle. C'est assez ironique venant d'un ministre qui, lui, voyage à l'international pour assister à des conférences sur l'éducation.

Le ministre argumente que les conseils scolaires dépendent de façon exagérée. Pourtant, je le mets au défi

de démontrer de tels abus au sein de nos conseils scolaires francophones.

Alors, je demande au ministre : va-t-il revoir sa position et permettre aux conseils scolaires francophones de se gouverner en donnant aux conseillers scolaires les moyens de faire leur travail pour assurer la survie de l'éducation en français en Ontario?

Hon. Paul Calandra: Again, I think that question itself speaks to the difference between Conservatives and Liberals. What the member is asking me to do is restore funding to trustees so that they can go to conferences and they can go to other events. The answer to that is absolutely not; I'm not going to do that. The boards themselves and the professionals who work in the boards themselves can continue to do that because that's an important part of the work that they will do to help build their system. They're going to continue to do that.

But a direct answer to the member: No, I will not allow a trustee to expense conferences and association memberships.

The job of the trustee is to represent parents—to represent and ensure that the funding that is being sent to them is being used in an appropriate fashion. That is what a trustee does.

To compare the work of a trustee to a minister of the crown or to an MPP shows a complete lack of understanding of the role of a trustee.

PRIMARY CARE

Hon. Laurie Scott: My question is for the Minister of Health.

Our government is working hard to ensure every person in Ontario can connect to high-quality primary care, no matter where they live.

Last month, I had the pleasure of visiting the Kawartha Lakes family health team, where I announced that our government is investing over \$1.8 million to connect more than 5,000 people in my community to a primary care provider. This funding will be used to hire additional health professionals, thereby improving access to comprehensive, team-based care. This builds on the success of last year's expansion, which has already seen over 2,000 people in my riding attached to the high-quality primary care that they need and deserve.

Speaker, can the minister highlight how our government is meeting its goal of attaching every Ontarian to a primary care provider by 2029?

Hon. Sylvia Jones: To the member for Haliburton-Kawartha Lakes-Brock, a staunch advocate and a registered nurse: Thank you for your advocacy.

Through our \$3.4-billion primary care action plan, our government is in fact on track to attach every single person in the province to a primary care provider by 2029. In fact, we have exceeded our 2025-26 target by 10%, attaching over 330 people to ongoing care this past year alone.

Today, I am pleased to announce that our government is investing over \$3.5 million to connect nearly 7,500 people in Etobicoke-Lakeshore to primary care.

We are investing \$235 million to connect 500,000 people to primary care across Ontario.

It is unfortunate that the member from Etobicoke–Lakeshore chose not to invest and vote in that investment.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Back to the member for Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock.

Hon. Laurie Scott: Thank you to the Minister of Health for all her hard work and sharing these important investments.

I must say, however, that it is truly unfortunate to see the member for Etobicoke–Lakeshore refuse to stand in support of this important investment that is being made in her community.

Residents in northern Ontario are connecting to primary care at historic rates.

In the member for Thunder Bay–Superior North’s community, the Port Arthur Health Centre family health team has exceeded their patient attachment target by over 180%, connecting more than 7,000 residents to team-based primary care.

Speaker, can the minister outline what else residents of northern Ontario can expect from our government’s primary care action plan?

1110

Hon. Sylvia Jones: The member from Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock really raises an important issue of how we are, across Ontario, doing this expansion, and of course, the success of the Port Arthur family health team.

I’m delighted to announce that two primary care teams in Thunder Bay–Superior North will be directly benefiting from the 2026-27 expansion of our primary care action plan. The Nipigon District Family Health Team is receiving nearly \$1 million, and the Marathon Family Health Team is receiving nearly \$600,000 to collectively connect approximately 3,000 more people to ongoing primary care.

Unlike the NDP and the Liberals, we will continue to invest, and we will continue to ensure that across Ontario we have these investments impacting our local communities.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: This morning, I tabled a motion calling on this government to use the existing powers under the Environmental Protection Act to protect residents living near the former GM site in St. Catharines. Last week, the city issued multiple infractions over the dangerous conditions of the property, where residents have long raised concerns about asbestos, PCBs and contamination.

Will you, Minister, use the province’s existing tools to ensure this site is cleaned up and made safe for the community and existing neighbourhoods around?

Hon. Todd J. McCarthy: I thank the member for St. Catharines for the question.

We, as the government of Ontario, are committed to the protection of human health and our shared environment in every way. That is the primary mandate of the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks.

We began to monitor this situation in 2023. We received dust complaints originally during the construction of the stormwater management system, and at that time, we required the property owner to implement dust mitigation measures.

During our most recent site visit, on April 22, 2026, no off-site impacts were observed, and drone observations confirmed there were no on-site activities that could generate dust.

We are aware of the concern about PCBs. That issue has been resolved. The work has been completed that we directed to be done. Follow-up monitoring has confirmed that PCBs are no longer an issue in the stormwater.

We’re aware of the municipality’s directive and order, and we support that, and we’ll continue to monitor that situation with our ministry officials.

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

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: Thank you for the answer, Minister. However, I would have loved to have been able to relay that a couple of weeks ago to my residents. We have not heard from you in my office.

Speaker, local residents are tired of finger-pointing and delays while this contaminated site continues to sit in the middle of a community and a neighbourhood. The city has now taken action within its authority, but municipalities cannot shoulder the financial burden of remediation alone.

The province already has enforcement tools to hold polluters accountable. Will the minister commit today, during this question period, to use those powers and ensure the former GM site in St. Catharines is cleared of cancer-causing chemicals in the ground?

Hon. Todd J. McCarthy: Again, I appreciate the member’s concerns. The issue of the protection of our shared environment is not a partisan issue. We stand with you in our desire to assist in the situation.

I can tell you that we are well aware that untreated stormwater was being collected and stored on-site at one time. This matter was referred to our Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks enforcement and investigation branch for potential investigation. As this matter may be subject to investigation, it would be inappropriate to speculate further. But our government expects that all regulated parties can and will follow Ontario’s strict environmental laws, and we will take appropriate action if we see non-compliance that is identified.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Ms. Stephanie Bowman: My question today is from a Don Valley West constituent, Vivian, who is concerned about this government’s cuts to education. She wrote: “Since the province suspended the elected” Toronto District School Board “trustees in 2025 and installed a supervisor, the scope of what’s being eliminated has been staggering. More than 600 teaching positions ... cut for the” next “school year. That includes 175 teachers in schools serving students with the greatest needs, and 95

ESL teachers who work with children still learning English. Fifteen specialized kindergarten classrooms designed for children with complex disabilities are being closed ... outdoor education programming is ending. The class size cap to protect for grades 4 through 8 has now been overturned by the provincially appointed supervisor.”

Speaker, through you to the education minister: What about these cuts is good for our kids?

Hon. Paul Calandra: The member mentions ESL cuts. The member will know, of course, that ESL funding was cut by the federal government, not by the provincial government.

The member mentioned the outdoor education centres. The member will also know that outdoor education still exists in the city of Toronto. What we have done is moved away from facilities that were owned by the city of Toronto that required millions upon millions of dollars worth of upgrades and renovations to make them safe for the kids to attend. That's not something that I think the Toronto board of education should pay for. That's why we're ensuring that other opportunities for outdoor education still exist.

The member mentioned there may be some fewer teachers in the system. That's as a result of 5,000 fewer students going to the Toronto District School Board. None of those reductions will mean teachers losing their jobs. As a matter of fact, there are far more retirements coming in the TDSB than there are surplus notices.

In the supplementary, if she would like to talk a little bit more about some of the additional investments that we are making in the TDSB to put money back in the classroom, I'd be delighted to do that.

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

Ms. Stephanie Bowman: The minister's ideological talk about consistency is harming our kids. Robots are consistent; kids' learning needs are not.

The education minister and his highly paid supervisor are cancelling the model schools program at TDSB, which supports kids, like children in my riding in Thorncliffe Park, who come from higher-needs areas. He seems to believe the fiction that every student starts from the same place. That is just simply not the case. Think of an Afghani refugee child in Thorncliffe Park starting her first day of kindergarten at Fraser Mustard—very different from children born to English-speaking parents in a wealthy neighbourhood in Toronto. Schools like Thorncliffe Park Public School, Fraser Mustard, and Sunny View and Park Lane schools for children with complex disabilities benefited from having more staff through that model schools program.

Through you, Speaker, to the education minister: Will you reverse your harmful cuts so you don't harm these kids?

Hon. Paul Calandra: The member mentions the model schools. Of course, the challenge we're having and the TDSB was having with some of the model schools was that enrolment was absolutely cratering in these model schools—there were simply not enough people to go.

What we know from education professionals is that when there are not enough students in a school, the educational experience and opportunities for those students greatly diminish.

What we're doing is ensuring that all students have the opportunity to succeed in the school that is closest to their home, and that they have the resources they need.

I don't need to take any lessons from the member opposite. When I started school—a long time ago, granted—I didn't speak a word of English. I only spoke Italian. But I made it through by the support of educators who helped me better understand English, and my parents also—so we understand this.

The best way to help a child to succeed is by delivering for them the tools and resources that educators need so that they can succeed, giving the parents an understanding of what it is that they can expect for their kids.

What we want is for all kids to succeed—not specific targeting of specific communities just for specific electoral purposes.

I want all kids to have the understanding that Ontario is behind them and that we will give them the best opportunity for the best future possible.

RURAL ONTARIO

MPP Bill Rosenberg: My question is for the Minister of Rural Affairs.

Rural Ontario is the backbone of our province, from family farms and small-town main streets to the forestry, mining and agricultural sectors that power our economy and define our way of life. It's home to hard-working families, small businesses and entrepreneurs who keep our province moving.

But rural communities face real pressures, from rising costs and global economic uncertainty to US tariffs on local employers and jobs. Supporting them is not the work of one ministry alone. It takes a whole-of-government approach, with partners right across the government delivering for rural Ontario.

1120

Speaker, can the minister please share with the House how our government, working together across ministries, is supporting rural communities and ensuring that they have the tools they need to grow and thrive?

Hon. Lisa M. Thompson: I appreciate the question very much from the member from Algoma-Manitoulin because it allows me the opportunity to stand in front of the House today, as Minister of Rural Affairs, to say how incredibly proud I am of the support from Premier Ford to enable a whole-of-government approach in support of our small, rural and northern communities.

For instance, I announced, on behalf of the Minister of Finance, that we increased by \$100 million the Ontario Municipal Partnership Fund that sees support to our communities that will enable them to address local priorities and critical services across Ontario.

Another ministry that we've worked with is the Ministry of Infrastructure. We're seeing \$400 million invested through the Ontario Community Infrastructure Fund.

I'd be remiss if I didn't touch on the Ministry of Transportation support that we're seeing, through \$30 million invested through the Ontario Transit Investment Fund, as well as the \$13 million for winter road maintenance.

There is so much more to talk about. I look forward to the supplemental.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Back to the member for Algoma–Manitoulin.

MPP Bill Rosenberg: Thank you to the minister for that incredible update.

It's great to see our government on the ground, listening to communities that for too long were taken for granted under the previous Liberal government.

Speaker, last week the minister travelled to Timmins to host a rural summit on the heels of the Federation of Northern Ontario Municipalities conference. This event brought together municipal leaders, business owners, not-for-profits, and rural champions from across northern Ontario.

Can the minister please share with the House what came out of the recent rural summit in Timmins, and how our government is helping plan for the future of our rural communities in the north and beyond?

Hon. Lisa M. Thompson: First things first, Speaker: I want to share with the member from Algoma–Manitoulin that a very prevalent message I received while we were at FONOM is the incredible job he's doing representing his riding of Algoma–Manitoulin. His municipal colleagues love the work that he's doing.

I want to touch on the fact that when we kicked off our rural summit series, we had the opportunity to touch on the 10 programs that the Ministry of Rural Affairs is facilitating right across this province by an amazing team on the ground in rural and northern communities. The other thing we did was, we updated the business owners, the municipal leadership, as well as not-for-profit organizations on what our strategy, Enabling Opportunity, is achieving. We highlighted, again, the whole-of-government approach that we're taking to support our small-town communities. The fact of the matter is, we also highlighted the Rural Ontario Development Program. I want to give a shout-out to the Minister of Indigenous Affairs and First Nations Economic Reconciliation because he shared with me that communities like Pickle Lake—

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

POLICE OVERSIGHT

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: Exactly six years ago today, 29-year-old Regis Korchinski-Paquet was in crisis when her loved ones called 911 for help. Shortly after the police arrived, Regis fell 24 storeys to her death.

The coroner's inquest into Regis's death is finally beginning. Her family and friends are watching from the gallery, still fighting for accountability and justice.

This government has a responsibility to keep Ontarians safe, including those who are Black, racialized, living with mental illness or disabilities and seeking help.

Speaker, my question on behalf of Regis's parents is, will the Premier commit today to reforming the Coroners Act so that the recommendations from those inquests, including the one that is reviewing the moments leading to Regis's death, are binding with real consequences?

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

Hon. Michael S. Kerzner: I want to thank the member from across the way.

Any loss of life is tragic anywhere in Ontario at any time.

The member opposite knows that the purpose of a coroner's inquest is to determine the cause of death. When the Chief Coroner of Ontario calls an inquest, that's exactly what will happen.

We can't prejudge now what the recommendations will be in the case of this inquest.

But in each case, when recommendations come forward from an inquest, they are reviewed, they are considered, and in some cases, they are even acted on before the inquest is actually finished, because we take our safety and we take the concerns of everyone in Ontario very seriously.

I say to the member opposite: The coroner's inquest will proceed. The coroner will do his work, and we'll find out what happened.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): The member for Parkdale–High Park.

MPP Alexa Gilmour: I was there in my riding the day Regis died, in that angry, mourning crowd, staring at the police tape that marked her last breath. And I have to say, Minister, with respect, your answer will leave cold comfort to my community's pain.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Through the Speaker.

MPP Alexa Gilmour: Regis Korchinski-Paquet, her family, her friends, her community, deserve justice and a government that acts to show that Black lives matter.

For decades, Black lives, Indigenous, racialized Ontarians have demanded a ground-up overhaul of police oversight and the SIU.

Everyone in Ontario should be able to trust that the police are meaningfully accountable to the communities they serve.

Will this government listen to Black, Indigenous, racialized Ontarians, and reform the Special Investigations Unit Act so that police oversight is independent, honest and accountable?

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

MPP Monica Ciriello: I do want to echo the comments that the Solicitor General has also mentioned. Any loss of life is tragic, especially when it happens to a young person within our province.

The SIU is an independent agency that investigates police-involved deaths, serious injuries and allegations of

sexual assault, free from any interference of the public, police or government. The SIU has a mandate to conduct comprehensive investigations in an effective and timely manner, and that is exactly what we are expecting the SIU to deliver.

While the SIU is independent and we do not comment on its operations, on this specific matter or any other, we expect the SIU to carry out its mandate to the highest standards possible.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Speaker, May is Get Outside Month, and what better way to celebrate than by announcing a plan to shut down five outdoor education centres in the TDSB? It's not the typical way to promote nature and health, but alas, the Ontario government plans to do just that. These facilities provide unparalleled opportunities for students and teachers to establish valuable relationships and to develop hands-on, vital skills, to practise land-based learning, and to improve overall physical and mental health.

For many students, outdoor education centres present an incredible opportunity to explore the natural world in ways they have never done before—especially new Canadians and marginalized populations. Nurturing resilience, independence and confidence throughout the entire stay, children often return home flourished.

Speaker, my question to the Premier: Why deprive generations of children of the sheer joy of learning at outdoor education centres?

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

Hon. Paul Calandra: This is going to surprise you, Madam Speaker, but I agree with the member opposite.

Outdoor education opportunities are very important across the province of Ontario, especially in the city of Toronto. That is why we are ensuring that that opportunity still exists for the students at the TDSB.

What we're not doing is we're not going to be spending millions upon millions of dollars upgrading city-owned facilities that, over the years, the trustees neither invested in nor the city invested in.

I think the people of the province of Ontario and the city of Toronto would rather us invest in those facilities that are working well and giving those students the opportunity to get out and enjoy outdoor learning activities. That is why centres will still stay open.

Those centres that are working, that are modern and give the students the best opportunity will stay open. Those facilities that had been neglected, that should have been closed some time ago—well, those will be closed. I'm sure the member opposite, from her time on council, would know that some of them needed a lot of repair. I wish she would have put—

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Back to the member for Beaches–East York.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Well, I was on council with the Premier, so he should have done the same, I guess.

Speaker, when education is treated like a business, teachers become dollar amounts and students are seen as nothing more than test scores.

This government fails to see the real value of education: putting children first and ensuring we are providing the best possible learning environments, and that absolutely includes outdoor experiential learning. The skills being developed are endless—survival, sense-of-place awareness, systems thinking, ecological literacy—and cannot be duplicated inside a classroom. Looking at the cost-benefit analysis, the worth of outdoor education centres is priceless.

1130

Speaker, my question to the Premier: Why not focus on solutions to keep outdoor education centres open, like partnerships and other shared uses?

Hon. Paul Calandra: It's music to my ears, colleagues—partnerships. Partnerships are a very important part of giving a fulsome educational experience. The member opposite will know very soon—we will announce some additional partnerships to actually expand opportunities for kids to get that outdoor education that is so important. So I look forward to the member's support on these partnerships that we will be announcing very soon.

She talks about the Premier. Well, the Premier actually did make those investments when he was on council. That is why Hillside and Mono Cliffs will remain open. Unfortunately, those facilities that were outside of the Premier's area and where Conservatives were—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): The member for Don Valley North will come to order.

Hon. Paul Calandra: Those facilities were deemed to be old, outdated and not the best opportunities for students to succeed.

I see what the Liberals would want. They would want us spending money upgrading old, outdated facilities, as opposed to putting more money into the classroom and giving the students the best opportunity to succeed—

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): I'll recognize the member for Burlington.

WOMEN'S EMPLOYMENT

Ms. Natalie Pierre: My question is for the Associate Minister of Women's Social and Economic Opportunity.

As Ontario's economy continues to grow, employers across our province are looking for skilled workers to help meet labour demands in important sectors such as technology, construction, and clean energy. Women are seeking opportunities to participate in these growing industries and build rewarding careers for themselves and for their families. However, many of them still face barriers when it comes to accessing training or mentorship, workplace supports, and advancement opportunities in some of these high-growth sectors.

Our government must continue to support programs that connect women with the skills, tools and opportunities they need to succeed in high-demand industries and strengthen Ontario's workforce for the future.

Speaker, can the associate minister please explain how the new WELL Fund will help connect more women to opportunities in Ontario's—

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

Hon. Charmaine A. Williams: Thank you to the member from Burlington for that question.

Our government is committed to ensuring that women have opportunities to participate in and benefit fully from Ontario's growing economy. But we do have a challenge, and that challenge is retaining women in high-growth sectors like the trades, clean energy and cyber security. I've heard loud and clear from multiple stakeholders and from round tables, that if women had support to navigate obstacles and challenges, they would have stayed in their careers.

At the same time, women who have experienced human trafficking need help and support to rebuild their lives, develop skills and confidence in a career of their choice.

That is exactly why we launched the Women's Economic Leadership and Legacy Fund, or the WELL Fund. It's an \$11-million investment that will help women gain the skills, supports and leadership opportunities needed to succeed in high-growth sectors.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): The member for Burlington.

Ms. Natalie Pierre: Thank you to the associate minister for that response.

It's encouraging to hear how our government is supporting women through programs that provide mentorship, workplace training, and leadership opportunities.

Many women across the province of Ontario continue to rely on local community organizations to help overcome barriers to employment, education and financial independence. These organizations understand the unique needs of women in their communities, including those balancing caregiving responsibilities, rebuilding after trauma, or entering industries where women have traditionally been under-represented.

That's why we're supporting community-based programs that provide flexible, locally driven services that create pathways to stable employment and long-term success for women across the province of Ontario.

Speaker, can the associate minister please explain why our government chose a community-based approach for delivering the WELL Fund?

Hon. Charmaine A. Williams: The member from Burlington made some important comments. We need to support the community organizations that are doing the work of helping women rebuild.

The WELL Fund is here because of the important work our government is doing in seeing women be in leadership positions. I want to thank the President of the Treasury Board, who really understood the importance of sup-

porting women; the Minister of Finance for his commitment; and the Minister of Children, Community and Social Services. This is an important fund that is going to community organizations across Ontario, and it will provide practical supports, including mentorship, leadership training, financial literacy, career coaching and job-readiness programming, to help women stay in the field and climb that ladder to success.

We know that when women succeed in Ontario, Ontario succeeds.

NORTHERN HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. Guy Bourgoin: Since January 7, Kapuskasing has been supporting about 240 evacuees from Kashechewan First Nation who were forced from their community because of water contamination. Our local hospital has stepped up to provide essential care and services, without additional provincial support or funding.

As of May 20, Kapuskasing's hospital alone has already seen 396 emergency room visits, with 510 hours of care logged. This places enormous pressure on emergency departments, front-line workers and hospital budgets.

Will the minister commit today to providing emergency funding and a long-term strategy for hospitals supporting evacuees?

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

Hon. Sylvia Jones: Speaker, the member opposite raises an important issue that, unfortunately, we deal with almost on an annual basis. That is supporting our communities that host evacuees. We have always made sure and we will continue to make sure that they have the necessary support, whether it is in terms of visiting physicians and other primary care providers, clinicians who can step in and support on a short-term basis, or, of course, longer term, where we will assist them financially if and when there is an opportunity for additional costs as a result of supporting these evacuees.

HOUSE SITTINGS

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): I recognize the government House leader on a point of order.

Hon. Steve Clark: Point of order: I just want to advise members that the night sitting scheduled for this evening is cancelled.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

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

Ms. Jennifer K. French: I rise on a point of order to correct my record. Yesterday, when I was tabling petitions, I misspoke. I had 100 pages in the petition, and in all the excitement, I said I had 100 names. So I wanted to correct my record.

DEFERRED VOTES**FAIR PRICES AND TAX-FREE
GROCERIES ACT, 2026****LOI DE 2026 SUR LES PRIX ÉQUITABLES
ET LES PRODUITS ALIMENTAIRES
NON TAXÉS**

Deferred vote on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 113, An Act to address food affordability and price competitiveness / Projet de loi 113, Loi traitant de l'abordabilité des produits alimentaires et de la compétitivité des prix.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Call in the members. This is a five-minute bell.

The division bells rang from 1138 to 1142.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Members, please take your seats.

On May 25, 2026, Mr. Rakocevic moved second reading of Bill 113, An Act to address food affordability and price competitiveness.

All those in favour, please rise and remain standing until recognized by the Clerk.

Ayes

Armstrong, Teresa J.	French, Jennifer K.	Rakocevic, Tom
Bell, Jessica	Gates, Wayne	Sattler, Peggy
Blais, Stephen	Gélinas, France	Schreiner, Mike
Bourguin, Guy	Gilmour, Alexa	Shamji, Adil
Bowman, Stephanie	Gretzky, Lisa	Shaw, Sandy
Brady, Bobbi Ann	Hazell, Andrea	Smyth, Stephanie
Burch, Jeff	Hsu, Ted	Stevens, Jennifer (Jennie)
Cerjanec, Rob	Kernaghan, Terence	Stiles, Marit
Clancy, Aislinn	Mamakwa, Sol	Tabuns, Peter
Collard, Lucille	McCrimmon, Karen	Tsao, Jonathan
Fairclough, Lee	McKenney, Catherine	Vaugeois, Lise
Fife, Catherine	McMahon, Mary-Margaret	West, Jamie
Fraser, John	Pasma, Chandra	Wong-Tam, Kristyn

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): All those opposed, please rise and remain standing until recognized by the Clerk.

Nays

Allsopp, Tyler	Ford, Doug	Pinsonneault, Steve
Anand, Deepak	Gallagher Murphy, Dawn	Racinsky, Joseph
Babikian, Aris	Grewal, Hardeep Singh	Rae, Matthew
Bailey, Robert	Hardeman, Ernie	Rickford, Greg
Bethlenfalvy, Peter	Harris, Mike	Riddell, Brian
Bouma, Will	Holland, Kevin	Rosenberg, Bill
Bresee, Ric	Jones, Sylvia	Sabawy, Sheref
Calandra, Paul	Jones, Trevor	Sandhu, Amarjot
Cho, Raymond Sung Joon	Jordan, John	Sarrazin, Stéphane
Cho, Stan	Kanapathi, Logan	Saunderson, Brian
Ciriello, Monica	Kerzner, Michael S.	Scott, Laurie
Clark, Steve	Khanjin, Andrea	Smith, Dave
Coe, Lorne	Kusendova-Bashta, Natalia	Smith, David
Cooper, Michelle	Lecce, Stephen	Smith, Graydon
Cuzzetto, Stephen	Lumsden, Neil	Smith, Laura
Cuzzetto, Rudy	McCarthy, Todd J.	Tangri, Nina
Darouze, George	McGregor, Graham	Thanigasalam, Vijay
Denault, Billy	Mulrone, Caroline	Thompson, Lisa M.

Dixon, Jess	Oosterhoff, Sam	Tibollo, Michael A.
Dowie, Andrew	Pang, Billy	Triantafilopoulos, Effie J.
Dunlop, Jill	Parsa, Michael	Vickers, Paul
Firin, Mohamed	Piccini, David	Williams, Charmaine A.
Flack, Rob	Pierre, Natalie	

The Clerk of the Assembly (Mr. Trevor Day): The ayes are 39; the nays are 68.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): I declare the motion lost.

Second reading negatived.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): There being no further business, this House stands in recess until 3 p.m.

The House recessed from 1146 to 1500.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Ms. Laura Smith: It is my very great pleasure to welcome to the House Mr. Jaian Dhebar. Jaian will be working in my constituency office this summer and has just finished his first year at York University.

Jaian, welcome.

Mr. Terence Kernaghan: It's my incredible honour to welcome Amiel Ostrander and Rick Mulvaney from Changing Ways in London, who are here to support the Lydia's Law tabling. Thank you very much.

Ms. Catherine Fife: I'm so pleased to welcome my constituency staff here to Queen's Park today. Shel Secrett and Nigel Gordijk are here; of course, Karissa Singh is always here, in support of Lydia's Law. I can't wait for the debate.

Mr. Chris Glover: Over the last two days, members of Unifor have been here to fight to rebuild our public health care system in Ontario, and I'll just read out their names: Lilly Aiello, Shinade Alder, Tatyana Banasik, Candice Basara, Martha Bedminster, Ruth Bendzel, Kathleen Brooks, Jon Brown, Ryan Cameron, Nicci Chambers, Elaine Chantler, Jamie Clegg, Jennifer Dow, Adriana Espinal, Lee Ann Evans Terrence, Lisa Fleming, Nicole Foster, Susan Fournier, Samia Hashi, Geoff Hebb, Catharine Hope, Catherine Humalamaki, Kellee Janzen, Jennifer Kennedy, Rebecca Kitchen, Karen Marchesky, Donna Massong, Amanda McGaughey, Fallon Millyard, Carrie Moffitt, Danielle Morash, Sem Ngam, Kelly-Anne Orr, Ruth Pryce, Alicia Rivera, Mary Rymal, Kari Selmes, Jennifer Shott, Jean Simpson, Amanda Snarr, Colleen Stevens, Christina Thompson, Barbara Thoms, Jody Versteeg, Paul Whyte, Jensen Williams, Melissa Wood and one more, Mike Yam.

Thank you very much for your advocacy.

Many of these are health care workers in Ontario.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): I just want to remind members: We do not make political statements when we are introducing guests. We simply introduce our guests.

I recognize the member for Hamilton West–Ancaster–Dundas.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Speaker, I didn't get an opportunity this morning, so as you instructed, I'm introducing con-

stituents from my riding: Anna D'Angela and Justin Lautenbach. They're here today at Queen's Park for physician assistant advocacy day.

Welcome to Queen's Park.

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE POLICY

Mr. Lorne Coe: I beg leave to present a report from the Standing Committee on Justice Policy on the estimates selected by the standing committee for consideration.

The Clerk-at-the-Table (Mr. Christopher Tyrell): Mr. Coe from the Standing Committee on Justice Policy presents the committee's report as follows:

Pursuant to standing order 63, your committee has selected the 2026-27 estimates of the following ministries for consideration: Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery and Procurement, Ministry of Francophone Affairs, Ministry of the Emergency Preparedness and Response, Ministry of Indigenous Affairs and First Nations Economic Reconciliation, Ministry of the Attorney General, Ministry of the Solicitor General.

Report presented.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON HERITAGE, INFRASTRUCTURE AND CULTURAL POLICY

Mr. Guy Bourgoin: I beg leave to present a report from the Standing Committee on Heritage, Infrastructure and Cultural Policy on the estimates selected by the standing committee for consideration.

The Clerk-at-the-Table (Mr. Christopher Tyrell): Mr. Bourgoin from the Standing Committee on Heritage, Infrastructure and Cultural Policy presents the committee's report as follows:

Pursuant to standing order 63, your committee has selected the 2026-27 estimates of the following ministries and offices for consideration: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing; Office of the Lieutenant Governor; Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism; Ministry of Transportation; Ministry of Sport; Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Gaming; Ministry of Infrastructure.

Report presented.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

CIJ CONSULTING INC. ACT, 2026

Ms. Smith moved first reading of the following bill:
Bill Pr48, An Act to revive CIJ Consulting Inc.

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

First reading agreed to.

AVANT ASSETS INC. ACT, 2026

Ms. Bell moved first reading of the following bill:
Bill Pr50, An Act to revive Avant Assets Inc.

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

First reading agreed to.

PROTECTING HOMEOWNERS FROM TITLE FRAUD ACT, 2026

LOI DE 2026 SUR LA PROTECTION DES PROPRIÉTAIRES DE LOGEMENTS CONTRE LA FRAUDE SUR LE TRANSFERT DES TITRES DE PROPRIÉTÉ

Mr. Rakocevic moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 126, An Act to amend the Land Titles Act with respect to notices of lodgement of title / Projet de loi 126, Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'enregistrement des droits immobiliers à l'égard des avis de dépôt d'un titre.

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 member like to briefly explain?

Mr. Tom Rakocevic: I'm proud to rise today to introduce a bill that will protect homeowners, especially vulnerable seniors, from predatory door-to-door scams and title fraud. I'd like to thank co-sponsors from London North Centre, Ottawa Centre and Hamilton Centre. Thank you very much.

Fraudsters have exploited an outdated legal loophole to register lodgements on property titles without the homeowner's knowledge and are using them to intimidate and extort homeowners for tens of thousands of dollars or more. This is wrong; it must end.

Our bill will expire and delete all lodgements automatically from property titles across Ontario, eliminating this tool of abuse once and for all.

I would like to thank the Advocacy Centre for the Elderly for their important work and help in drafting this bill.

FAIR START FOR YOUNG WORKERS ACT, 2026

LOI DE 2026 VISANT À OFFRIR UN DÉBUT DE CARRIÈRE ÉQUITABLE AUX JEUNES TRAVAILLEURS

Mr. Cerjanec moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 127, An Act to amend the Taxation Act, 2007 to reduce taxes for individuals who are under the age of 27 / Projet de loi 127, Loi modifiant la Loi de 2007 sur les impôts afin de réduire les impôts des personnes ayant moins de 27 ans.

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 member like to explain the bill?

Mr. Rob Cerjanec: I'm proud today to introduce the Fair Start for Young Workers Act. I'd like to thank the member from Don Valley West for co-sponsoring the bill.

This bill would eliminate provincial income tax on the lowest tax bracket for Ontarians under 27 for a period of five years. Under this proposal, a young worker will keep up to \$2,700 in their pocket—money for rent, groceries, transit, paying down student debt or to save for a down payment on a home.

1510

Young Ontarians are working hard, but many are struggling with the rising cost of living. Housing is out of reach, and many young people are delaying having families. They want to know that working full-time and doing everything right will buy them a decent life and a path forward.

This legislation would give young workers breathing room during the critical early years of building their lives and careers, whether entering the workforce, skilled trades, or going to college or university. It's a practical step to help young people stay in Ontario, work in Ontario and build their future here.

We want young people to succeed and contribute to Ontario's economy. We need to make life more affordable for them.

HOT DAYS, COOL HOMES ACT, 2026

LOI DE 2026 POUR DES LOGEMENTS FRAIS LORS DES JOURS DE GRANDE CHALEUR

MPP McKenney moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 128, An Act to amend the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006 / Projet de loi 128, Loi de 2026 modifiant la Loi sur la location à usage d'habitation.

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 member like to explain the bill?

MPP Catherine McKenney: The bill amends the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006, by adding "cooling" to the definition of vital services in subsection 2 of the act.

This bill is an important and necessary step toward protecting tenants from increasingly extreme summer heat.

ANDRE'S LAW (BILL OF RIGHTS FOR RESIDENTS OF SUPPORTED GROUP LIVING RESIDENCES), 2026

LOI ANDRÉ DE 2026 (DÉCLARATION DES DROITS DES RÉSIDENTS DE RÉSIDENCES DE GROUPE AVEC SERVICES DE SOUTIEN)

MPP Vaugeois moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 129, An Act to amend the Services and Supports to Promote the Social Inclusion of Persons with Developmental Disabilities Act, 2008 to establish a Bill of Rights for residents of supported group living residences and to provide for related matters / Projet de loi 129, Loi modifiant la Loi de 2008 sur les services et soutiens favorisant l'inclusion sociale des personnes ayant une déficience intellectuelle afin de formuler une déclaration des droits des résidents de résidences de groupe avec services de soutien et de traiter de 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 member like to explain the bill?

MPP Lise Vaugeois: The bill enacts Andre's Law, also known as the bill of rights for residents of supported group living residences. It establishes a list of rights of residents of supported group living residences known as the Residents' Bill of Rights.

It provides for the creation of residents' councils and family councils for supported group living residences and provides for the respective roles of these councils, as well as other related matters.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

AFFAIRES FRANCOPHONES

L'hon. Caroline Mulroney: C'est avec une très grande fierté que j'interviens aujourd'hui pour déposer le cinquième rapport annuel sur les affaires francophones. Cette année revêt une signification particulière pour la francophonie ontarienne. Alors que nous déposons ce cinquième rapport annuel, nous pouvons aussi mesurer le chemin parcouru au cours des dernières années.

Il y a cinq ans, notre gouvernement entreprenait une modernisation ambitieuse de la Loi sur les services en français afin de mieux répondre à la réalité d'une francophonie ontarienne moderne et tournée vers l'avenir. Depuis, nous travaillons à bâtir une francophonie ontarienne plus forte, plus visible et toujours mieux outillée pour demain.

Cette année marque également plusieurs jalons importants : le 40^e anniversaire de la Loi sur les services en français, le 50^e anniversaire du drapeau franco-ontarien et

le cinquième anniversaire de l'Université de l'Ontario français. Ces anniversaires témoignent des avancées réalisées et de la place grandissante qu'occupe la francophonie au sein de notre province.

La société franco-ontarienne est partie intégrante de l'identité de l'Ontario. Elle contribue à notre richesse culturelle, à notre dynamisme économique et à notre rayonnement à travers le monde. Et aujourd'hui, plus que jamais, notre gouvernement reconnaît que la francophonie ontarienne n'est pas seulement un héritage à préserver; c'est une force à bâtir.

Avant d'aller plus loin, madame la Présidente, je tiens à remercier sincèrement le premier ministre pour son appui constant envers la francophonie ontarienne, ainsi que mon adjoint parlementaire, le député de Glengarry–Prescott–Russell, M. Stéphane Sarrazin, et l'ensemble de l'équipe du ministère des Affaires francophones. Merci beaucoup.

Au cours de la dernière année, nous avons continué à bâtir une francophonie ontarienne visible, fière et rassembleuse. Comme je viens de le mentionner, l'année 2025 a été marquée par le 50^e anniversaire du drapeau franco-ontarien. Partout dans la province, des milliers de Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes se sont réunis pour célébrer ce symbole qui incarne la résilience et la vitalité de notre communauté.

Dans des écoles et des communautés à travers l'Ontario, des milliers de jeunes ont hissé le drapeau franco-ontarien avec fierté, portant bien haut une identité toujours bien vivante. Afin de souligner cette date marquante, notre gouvernement a investi un million de dollars pour soutenir des initiatives culturelles, éducatives et communautaires aux quatre coins de la province.

Madame la Présidente, bâtir une francophonie forte, c'est aussi bâtir des services et des institutions. Cette année, nous soulignons le 40^e anniversaire de la Loi sur les services en français, une mesure législative fondatrice qui a profondément transformée la place du français dans notre province. Depuis sa modernisation, notre gouvernement poursuit le travail afin d'améliorer concrètement l'accès aux services en français dans toutes les régions de l'Ontario.

C'est dans cette optique que nous avons annoncé l'élargissement de six régions désignées, une mesure qui permettra à plus de 7 700 francophones supplémentaires d'avoir accès à des services gouvernementaux en français là où ils vivent et travaillent. Derrière ces avancées, il y a des familles qui pourront recevoir des services dans leur langue plus près de chez elles et des citoyens qui pourront être accompagnés en français avec davantage de confiance et de dignité. Nous avons également poursuivi nos efforts afin de renforcer l'offre active grâce au déploiement d'une nouvelle identité visuelle destinée aux organismes désignés.

Les cinq dernières années ont aussi marqué une période importante de construction institutionnelle pour la francophonie ontarienne. L'Université de l'Ontario français en est un exemple concret. Depuis l'ouverture de ses portes, cet établissement d'enseignement supérieur contribue à former une nouvelle génération de leaders francophones

qui sont appelés à façonner l'avenir de notre province. Je pense également au Centre de planification des services de santé en français, ainsi qu'au développement du nouveau centre communautaire francophone du MIFO à Orléans. Chacune de ces initiatives ouvre la voie à des jeunes qui pourront apprendre et s'épanouir dans leur langue et dans leur communauté, qui traceront leur chemin avec confiance.

Madame la Présidente, une francophonie forte contribue également à une économie forte. C'est pourquoi le développement économique francophone demeure un pilier fondamental de notre action. Notre gouvernement est le premier dans l'histoire de l'Ontario à s'être doté d'une Stratégie de développement économique francophone. Nous reconnaissons que la langue française est non seulement un marqueur identitaire, mais également un levier de croissance, d'innovation et d'attractivité internationale. Partout en Ontario, des entrepreneurs francophones font croître leurs entreprises en français, créent des emplois et alimente la prospérité de notre province.

1520

Madame la Présidente, à l'extérieur de l'Ontario, nous sommes fiers d'exercer un rôle de leadership au sein du Conseil des ministres sur la francophonie canadienne, ainsi qu'à l'Organisation internationale de la Francophonie. Partout où nous représentons l'Ontario au sein de la francophonie internationale, nous portons un message clair : lorsque le monde pense à la francophonie canadienne, il doit aussi penser à l'Ontario—à ses communautés dynamiques, à ses institutions, à ses artistes, à ses entrepreneurs, à ses jeunes—parce que la francophonie ontarienne contribue pleinement au rayonnement du Canada français, ici comme à l'international.

Depuis cinq ans, nous avons posé les fondations d'un avenir solide pour la francophonie ontarienne. Nous avons modernisé nos services. Nous avons renforcé nos institutions. Nous avons soutenu nos communautés. Nous avons accru notre rayonnement ici comme à l'international.

Nous poursuivrons ce travail avec la même énergie et la même détermination, car la francophonie ontarienne, c'est beaucoup plus qu'un héritage. C'est une force qui unit, une force qui bâtit, une force qui propulse l'Ontario vers l'avenir. Et ensemble, nous continuerons de la faire rayonner. Vive l'Ontario et vive la francophonie ontarienne.

La Présidente (L'hon. Donna Skelly): Déclaration ministérielle?

M^{me} France Gélinas: Je dois remercier la ministre des Affaires francophone pour sa présentation aujourd'hui. Ça me fait beaucoup de chagrin de savoir qu'elle quitte l'Assemblée législative et qu'elle ne fera plus partie de la Chambre des députés. Ça fait depuis 2018 que nous travaillons ensemble, et je dois dire que ça a toujours été des relations très humaines où, peu importe pourquoi j'allais la voir, elle prenait le temps d'écouter, elle prenait le temps de comprendre et elle prenait le temps de me dire : « Voici les étapes que je vais faire, et je te reviens. » Parfois, c'était étonnant.

Je ne suis même pas sûr si c'était un coup de fil ou un texto que je lui ai envoyé par rapport à chanter l'hymne national dans les deux langues, et elle m'a dit : « OK, je

comprends. Je m'en occupe et je te reviens.» Dans l'espace de quatre heures, elle est revenue avec : « J'étais capable de me mettre en contact avec les personnes au centre Roger ici à Toronto, et ils vont chanter l'hymne national dans les deux langues. » Et ce soir-là, ça a chanté l'hymne national dans les deux langues, et ça c'est grâce à la députée de York-Simcoe; c'est grâce à la ministre déléguée aux Affaires francophones.

Je dois dire qu'en 2018, lorsqu'elle était nommée ministre des Affaires francophones, la vie n'était pas facile. Comme tous les Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes, on va se souvenir du jeudi noir lorsque le ministre des Finances—dans ce temps-là, c'était le député de Nipissing—avait annoncé la fermeture de l'Université de l'Ontario français ainsi que la fermeture du Commissariat aux services en français. Ça a été très mal reçu par la population francophone. Il y a eu des immenses, des grosses manifestations le 1^{er} décembre. Mais je dois dire que la ministre, tout en respectant son caucus, a toujours démontré qu'elle avait les Franco-Ontariens, Franco-Ontariennes à coeur.

Ça l'a pris du temps, mais on a fini par avoir notre Université de l'Ontario français depuis cinq ans maintenant, et c'est en grande partie grâce au travail qu'elle a fait pour faire changer d'idée le gouvernement, qui avait annulé l'Université de l'Ontario français, et qui l'a remis sur pied.

Je dois dire également que nous, dans le nord de l'Ontario, voulons une université pour, par et avec les francophones à l'Université de Sudbury. Ça l'a été très difficile, mais on a recommencé à avoir des étudiants qui étudient en français dans une université pour, par et avec, au travers d'une collaboration avec l'Université d'Ottawa. Ça l'a demandé beaucoup d'effort au niveau de bien des ministères, mais je sais très bien que la ministre était là, avec sa voix douce mais en même temps persistante, pour s'assurer que ce grand projet-là—pour s'assurer que les gens du Nord, les Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes du Nord, avaient accès à des services en français à l'Université de Sudbury. C'est maintenant une réalité, et je la remercie pour ça.

Du côté du commissaire aux services en français, le commissaire n'existe plus. Le poste est maintenant avec le Bureau de l'ombudsman. Lorsque l'on a mis de l'avant une annonce de poste pour recruter une ou un nouvel ombudsman en Ontario, le français était un atout—ce n'était pas quelque chose de nécessaire. Maintenant, ça sera quelque chose de nécessaire lorsqu'on va embaucher un nouvel ombudsman en Ontario, pour s'assurer que cette personne-là qui est en charge, l'ombudsman des services en français, sera bilingue.

Je veux juste vous dire un immense gros merci. Vous avez aidé la francophonie pendant toutes les années que vous avez été députée. Je vous en remercie. On était chanceux de vous avoir comme ministre des Affaires francophones. Je vais m'ennuyer, c'est sûr.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Response?

M^{me} Lucille Collard: Il me fait vraiment plaisir aujourd'hui de saisir l'occasion qui m'est donnée en

réponse à la déclaration ministérielle de la ministre des Affaires francophones, pour m'exprimer avec beaucoup de sincérité afin de souligner le départ de l'honorable Caroline Mulroney et de lui rendre hommage, tout en la remerciant non seulement pour le travail qu'elle a accompli comme ministre, mais aussi pour l'avoir eue comme collègue.

Même si nous avons siégé de part et d'autre de cette Chambre et que nous n'avons pas toujours partagé les mêmes positions politiques, j'ai toujours apprécié travailler avec elle de façon collégiale et respectueuse.

Comme porte-parole en matière d'affaires francophones, j'ai eu l'occasion de collaborer régulièrement avec la ministre Mulroney. Elle a toujours été disponible pour discuter des enjeux qui touchent les Franco-Ontariens. Elle était à l'écoute, ouverte aux échanges et profondément convaincue de l'importance de protéger et de faire rayonner notre francophonie.

J'avoue qu'il est très difficile de trouver quelqu'un dans la communauté francophone, peu importe son allégeance politique, qui aurait des choses négatives à dire à son sujet.

Un des souvenirs de ma vie politique que je garderai toujours précieusement est sans aucun doute le débat électoral de la dernière campagne où nous nous retrouvions adversaires sur scène, avec la députée de Nickel Belt. Malgré la nature même de l'exercice qui nous place inévitablement en opposition, j'en suis ressortie sans aucun ressentiment. Au contraire, j'en garde un souvenir profondément positif.

Peut-être que le fait que ce débat réunissait quatre femmes ait contribué à créer un climat différent—un échange ferme, certes, mais empreint de respect et de civilité. À une époque où le ton en politique peut parfois devenir très dur, cela mérite d'être souligné.

Malgré toute la pression et le stress qu'un tel exercice représente, surtout lorsqu'on veut bien faire et être à la hauteur, ce souvenir demeure pour moi un bon souvenir, un moment où il était possible de défendre ses convictions avec vigueur, sans perdre de vue l'humanité de l'autre.

1530

Au fil des années, nous avons développé une relation basée sur un profond respect et un intérêt commun : celui de défendre la place du français en Ontario. Et au-delà des titres et des lignes de parti, il y avait aussi des qualités personnelles qui rendaient les échanges faciles et humains. Caroline Mulroney est une personne avec qui il est simple d'échanger. Elle a cette capacité de dialoguer avec respect, même dans le désaccord. Et je pense qu'il est important de le dire aujourd'hui, parce qu'en politique, on parle souvent des divisions. Pourtant, il est possible de travailler ensemble, de bâtir des ponts et même de développer une relation qui frôle l'amitié, malgré nos différences partisans.

Cela dit, madame la Présidente, rendre hommage à une collègue ne veut pas dire mettre de côté nos convictions. Je ne peux pas passer sous silence le fait que, malgré certaines avancées importantes pour les francophones sous son mandat, il y a eu des reculs.

Le jeudi noir demeurera un mauvais souvenir, c'est vrai, et la perte du commissaire aux services en français

indépendant continue de créer des obstacles importants à une analyse pleinement autonome des besoins et des défis vécus par les Franco-Ontariens. Cette indépendance avait une valeur réelle pour la communauté.

Malgré une volonté sincère d'appliquer une lentille francophone aux décisions gouvernementales, force est de constater que, dans les faits, nous n'y arrivons pas encore complètement. Le récent projet de loi du ministre de l'Éducation en est malheureusement un exemple. Plusieurs Franco-Ontariens ont eu l'impression que leurs préoccupations particulières et leur droit à une gouvernance par et pour les francophones n'ont pas été pleinement entendus. J'espère que, peut-être, la ministre peut donner un conseil à son voisin de banquette avant de quitter.

Il reste encore beaucoup de chemin à faire, évidemment, pour que les Franco-Ontariens sentent pleinement qu'ils ont leur place en Ontario, non seulement en théorie, mais aussi dans les décisions concrètes prises par le gouvernement.

Et c'est dans cet esprit que je souhaite tendre la main à la prochaine ministre responsable des affaires francophones. J'espère sincèrement que nous pourrions travailler en collaboration afin de continuer à faire avancer les droits et les aspirations de notre communauté, parce que la francophonie ontarienne mérite plus qu'une reconnaissance symbolique. Elle mérite des gestes concrets, une écoute constante et une véritable volonté politique.

Mais aujourd'hui, avant tout, je veux remercier Caroline Mulronez pour les échanges que nous avons eus au fil des années, pour son ouverture et pour le respect avec lequel elle a toujours abordé nos discussions. Au moment où elle quitte cette Chambre, ce qui me restera surtout d'elle, c'est une impression profondément positive—une impression de respect, d'humanité et d'authenticité. Et oui, madame la Présidente, même en politique, même dans des partis différents, cela est possible. Merci.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): I recognize the member for Ottawa South on a point of order.

Mr. John Fraser: Speaker, I seek unanimous consent of the House to immediately move private member's notice of motion number 81: That the government of Ontario should end the requirement for mandatory e-learning credits for secondary school students and restore online learning as an optional pathway.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Mr. Fraser seeks the unanimous consent of the House to immediately move private member's notice of motion number 81: That the government of Ontario should end the requirement for mandatory e-learning credits for secondary school students and restore online learning as an optional pathway. Agreed? I heard a no.

Mr. John Fraser: Point of order, Speaker, and I beg your indulgence: I didn't have an opportunity to say things, but I just wanted to say thank you to the minister for all her hard work. I know we've had a few exchanges, but she really brings grace and presence to this Legislature. We will miss you.

PETITIONS

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. Tom Rakocevic: Today, I rise to table a petition brought forward by Kamelah Blair and Royalty Helping Hands through the Weight We Carry campaign, calling on the Ontario government to declare trauma a public health crisis.

The petition urges the government to establish a province-wide, trauma-informed care strategy, restore victim services funding, mandate trauma-informed practices across our health education and justice systems and invest in the community organizations already doing this work every day.

I'm proud to table this petition, affix my name to it and give it to page Julia.

SNOWMOBILING

MPP George Darouze: Today, I'm presenting a petition regarding protecting our snowmobilers. I presented an initial batch and they are continuing to trickle in from my riding and across Ontario.

As some members may recall, the government provided an additional \$3.9 million to the Ontario Federation of Snowmobile Clubs last year to ensure that clubs were able to reopen and maintain approximately 4,500 kilometres of trails. The petition I'm presenting today, signed by almost 50 people, says that the government of Ontario should explore options to develop a sustainable funding framework in collaboration with the Ontario Federation of Snowmobile Clubs, and ends off by stating that these discussions should focus on viability in the sector for years to come.

I support this petition, and I support our riders, volunteers, landowners and clubs. So I will sign my name to this petition and give it to page Finn to bring it to the table.

SNOWMOBILING

MPP Bill Rosenberg: Today, I am also presenting a petition signed by my constituents in Algoma-Manitoulin. The petition talks about the importance of our snowmobiling sector in Ontario and the impacts on our economy. I have always been proud to support this sector. I know the hard work that clubs, landowners and volunteers put in each year to make sure that this trail network is taken care of.

The petition I'm presenting today, signed by over 280 people, calls for the Ontario government to work with the Ontario Federation of Snowmobile Clubs to develop a sustainable funding model that will ensure the sustainability of our trails for years to come. It's definitely important to make sure that steps are taken to support this sector that provides so much for rural tourism and our economy.

I support this petition fully. I'll sign my name to it and give it to page Simon to bring to the table.

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

MPP Lise Vaugeois: This is a petition about doubling social assistance rates. I would like to thank Dr. Sally Palmer for her steadfast advocacy for people living on social assistance, particularly Ontario disability and Ontario Works.

We know that the rates create poverty—that the rates are so low that it's legislated poverty. It's extremely difficult for people to manage on \$733 a month for those on OW and about \$1,300 for those on ODSP. It's expensive to have a disability; there's nothing to live on with that level of support.

I fully support this petition and I will give it to page Philip.

SEXUAL VIOLENCE AND HARASSMENT

Mr. Terence Kernaghan: The petition I have is entitled "Listen to Survivors and Believe Them—Pass Lydia's Law (Bill 112)!"

In 2025, 1,639 cases of sexual assault were withdrawn or stayed before trial, allowing the accused to walk free. In this very chamber, we heard the Attorney General of Ontario accuse the official opposition of trolling victims. Well, I would say that we actually listen to survivors, believe survivors and are advocating for survivors, and that would include the passage of Lydia's Law.

You see, the system is not set up to believe women, to trust women and to advocate for them, and we need a system that does not allow those accused of sexual assault to walk free. This bill in the past was sent to committee without any respect, without any honour and without any debate. As men in this chamber, it is our role to ensure that bills like this are passed, to reject toxic masculinity.

I look forward to all men in this chamber ensuring that this bill passes not only second reading, but passes through committee quickly and third reading so that we stand up to ensure that violence against women is acknowledged as a societal problem, not a women's issue.

1540

I fully support this petition, will affix my signature and deliver it with page Abi to the Clerks.

HIGHWAY 69

M^{me} France Gélinas: I would like to thank Gary and Constance Laframboise from Hamner in my riding for this petition, and it's called "4-Lane Highway 69 Now!"

As you know, Speaker, since the 2018 election, when this government was first elected, they had promised that they would four-lane the 68 kilometres of Highway 69 that is still only two lanes.

Many, many families in communities in northern Ontario have suffered devastating and preventable injury as well as loss of life on this dangerous stretch of Highway 69. The delays are always accompanied by different, shifting explanations, but there has been no dedicated

funding in the eight budgets that have been presented by this government specifically for Highway 69. There is no plan, there is no time frame, there is no money, but what we do have is closure pretty much every week in the winter time because of accidents, many of them deadly.

I think we are close to 32,000 people that have signed the petition so far and they want the government to act; they want them to four-lane Highway 69. No more excuses; save northern lives.

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

STUDENT ASSISTANCE

Ms. Peggy Sattler: I have a petition signed by hundreds of young people who are joining the thousands who have already signed petitions calling for the government to save OSAP and to fund our colleges and universities to the level that they require.

The petition notes that young people are facing a vicious cycle; they are caught in a trap of having to pay very high rents, jobs are increasingly out of reach and affordability is a huge pressure. In this context, the government is making life harder for young people by increasing tuition and gutting OSAP grants. This means that young people will have to face the choice of taking on a mountain of debt in order to go to college or university or, if they can't take that risk, they will have to give up their dreams of post-secondary education all together.

Both Liberal and Conservative governments have left Ontario dead last in per-student funding, which has really brought our post-secondary education system to the brink, and now young people are having to pay for consecutive government failures.

So the petitioners are calling on the Legislative Assembly to direct the Minister of Colleges and Universities to reverse the cuts to OSAP grants and provide young people with the opportunities and the post-secondary education that they deserve.

I fully support this petition and will send it to the table with page Arshiya.

SNOWMOBILING

MPP Paul Vickers: Today I'm pleased to present a petition signed by snowmobilers from across Bruce and Grey counties who are calling on the government to continue our efforts to support the snowmobiling industry, not only in my riding, but all across the province. I know how big an economic driver snowmobiling is in our rural tourism industry. It injects billions of dollars into the province's economy and sustains jobs across the province. It's not just a reflection of the recreational opportunities available in our amazing province but also a key part of our rural economy.

This petition calls on the government to work with the Ontario Federation of Snowmobile Clubs to ensure the long-term sustainability of the industry, which will con-

tinue to support riders, volunteers and clubs across the province for years to come.

I support this petition. I've been a snowmobiler for many years myself. I don't do it much anymore; I find it a little cold out there on the trails now in my older years, but also, for probably 40 years, the snowmobile clubs have used my property to form a link from Rocklyn to Meaford.

I will sign this petition, and I will give it to page Julia to bring to the table.

SEXUAL VIOLENCE AND HARASSMENT

Ms. Catherine Fife: My petition is entitled, "Justice for Sexual Assault Survivors (Bill 112: Lydia's Law)." Later on today, this House will get the opportunity to vote on this private member's piece of legislation.

Last year, 1,639 sexual assault cases got dispensed or stayed—no justice for those women who had the courage to come forward and disclose assault. The Auditor General came forward in 2019. She asked the Attorney General to report back to this House about these cases that are being disposed. She also asked him to improve the legal aid and legal supports as well as counselling. To date, seven years later, this has not happened.

Today, you have the chance to change that. I'm looking at my male colleagues across the way from the PC caucus. I hope they stand in solidarity with us so we can fix the justice system in the province of Ontario. We can do this work today.

BILLY BISHOP AIRPORT

Mr. Chris Glover: The petition that I'm reading today is "Stop Ford's Takeover of Billy Bishop," and it's addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

It's saying that whereas Premier Ford has indicated:

—that he has the support of the federal government to expand and allow jets to land at the Billy Bishop airport;

—that he has declared this project will be a special economic zone under Bill 5, which allowed the government to bypass environmental safety and municipal laws because there would be basically a lawless zone; and

—that this land grab, because of the bill that they have introduced, actually includes almost all of the Toronto Islands, Little Norway Park.

It also attempts to usurp the role of the city of Toronto in the tripartite agreement that manages the airport.

This expansion of Billy Bishop to include jets threatens affordable housing along the waterfront that has been planned and is just incredibly dangerous for the waterfront communities and for the tourism industry that the waterfront supports.

The undersigned members here have said that they are asking Premier Ford to stop the takeover of Billy Bishop from the city of Toronto.

I fully support this petition. I will affix my signature and pass it to page Naya to take to the table.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr. Tom Rakovec: I rise with a petition to save a gifted program in our community. We are living under a regime, a government that is so obsessed, so addicted to cuts within the education system that our schools, our parents, our educators are all under attack. In fact, we have a Minister of Education whose addiction to cuts are so much that he makes Edward Scissorhands look like he has a soft handshake.

And so hundreds of parents have come together in a school in our community to stand up to these cuts and stop the relocation of a gifted program in our community. This is so important, and it's surprising coming from a government that talks about math and English in the classroom, but to now cut a gifted program is beyond any sense.

We're urging the government to change this cut, bring back the program. I'm proud to sign this petition and stand with the parents and students in my community and everywhere in Ontario.

STUDENT ASSISTANCE

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I have a petition entitled "Save OSAP." I think it's particularly relevant now that we have a youth unemployment rate of about 18% in this province. I think that we have students that are trying to learn. They are trying to work. We want them to stay and succeed in Ontario.

But what we have here now is that cutting grants has made it so difficult for students to actually get the education that they deserve and that they have worked so hard for. They're facing sky-high rents, high costs at every turn, taxes on the kinds of food that they might want at the grocery store. I don't understand why this government would be putting more burden on students at a time when we want to support them, when we want them to succeed.

1550

Really, what we're seeing is a government that hasn't properly funded OSAP, and now these cuts are on the backs of students to try and make up for some of the failures of this government. We deserve a government that invests in the future of young people. I have had so many people—parents, grandparents—in my riding who are so upset about this because they see that the future of their children are in jeopardy.

I'm going to affix my name to this and send it with page Levon to take to the table.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): I recognize the government House leader.

Hon. Steve Clark: I seek unanimous consent that the member for Mississauga East–Cooksville assume ballot item number 46 and that no private members' public business proceeding be conducted on May 28, 2026.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): The government House leader is seeking unanimous consent that

the member for Mississauga East–Cooksville assume ballot item number 46 and that no private members' public business proceeding be conducted on May 28, 2026. Agreed? Agreed.

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 27, 2026, on the motion for third 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 (MPP Andrea Hazell): I recognize the member from Algoma–Manitoulin.

MPP Bill Rosenberg: I'll start where I left off: A province that powers nearly half of Canada's economy cannot be constrained by systems built for a different era. We need infrastructure that keeps up with our growth and supports our communities.

That is why our government introduced the Building Billy Bishop Airport Act, 2026. This legislation allows the province to take ownership of the city of Toronto lands required for modernization as a necessary step to move this project from concept to construction.

By assuming responsibilities for the lands that underpin the airport, the province can work directly with the Toronto Port Authority and the federal government to streamline planning, accelerate approvals and eliminate the jurisdictional gridlock that has stalled progress for many years.

It ensures that decisions shaping Billy Bishop's future are made by the level of government best positioned to deliver results, backed by a clear mandate, a coordinated strategy and the ability to act with the urgency our growing province demands.

It also allows the province to assume the city's role in the tripartite agreement that governs the airport.

These changes streamline governance, reduce delays and ensure that long-term planning reflects provincial priorities, not fragmented decision-making.

For too long, Billy Bishop's future was shaped by outdated agreements and competing jurisdictions. That approach held the airport back. It limited growth, created uncertainty and prevented Ontario from fully leveraging one of its most important economic assets.

Our government is changing that. We are bringing clarity, we are bringing coordination and we are bringing the leadership required to move this project forward.

We're also engaging directly with impacted First Nations. These consultations are essential in ensuring that Indigenous rights and interests are respected. They inform environmental assessments, land use planning and the overall design of the modernization program. This work is not a formality; it is a foundational part of responsible development.

Following these consultations, our government intends to designate Billy Bishop airport as a special economic zone. This designation will streamline regulatory processes. It will shorten the construction timelines, and it will support Ontario's competitiveness within the G7 while maintaining strong safety and environmental protections.

The economic case for modernization is clear. Billy Bishop airport currently contributes approximately \$900 million to Ontario's GDP each year. It generates \$1.8 billion in annual economic output and supports 9,000 jobs across aviation, tourism, construction and related sectors.

With modernization, the economic impact increases dramatically. The airport could add up to \$8.5 billion to Canada's GDP by 2050. It could support 23,000 construction sector jobs during the building phase. Over 25 years, the modernization effort could generate an estimated \$140 billion in economic output. These are not abstract numbers; they represent real jobs, real investment and real economic activity that benefits communities right across Ontario. They reflect direct and indirect economic impacts from construction and engineering to tourism, hospitality and professional services.

But the economic case goes deeper. Modernization strengthens Ontario. It improves productivity by reducing travel times for business travellers. It supports tourism by improving access to the downtown core. It enhances Ontario's ability to attract global investment by offering more efficient regional connectivity, and it reduces pressure on Pearson international airport, which is also already operating near capacity.

Billy Bishop provides essential redundancy, a second point of access that supports system-wide stability and flexibility. A more balanced regional air system improves reliability, reduces congestion and supports long-term growth. Billy Bishop's downtown location provides efficient access for business travellers and tourists, and expanded capacity will improve route availability and affordability.

We saw during the pandemic how critical it is to have redundancy in our transportation network. We saw how important it is to have multiple points of access, multiple hubs, and multiple pathways for goods, services and people. Modernizing Billy Bishop strengthens that resilience. It gives people in the GTA more flexibility. It gives our economy more stability, and it gives our emergency response system more reliability.

Of course, a project of this scale requires careful planning. Environmental assessments must be completed. Waterfront land constraints must be managed responsibly. Noise, traffic and community impacts must be addressed through transparent engagement. And coordination with federal partners, including Transport Canada and the Toronto Port Authority, is essential. These issues are being examined through engineering studies, environmental reviews and ongoing stakeholder discussions. Our government is committed to ensuring that modernization proceeds in a way that balances economic opportunity with environmental stewardship and community well-being.

We are also committed to transparency. We're committed to accountability. We're committed to ensuring that every stage of this work is guided by the public interest and the public good.

But beyond the steps, beyond the process, beyond the technical work, there is a bigger picture: Ontario is at a turning point. We are growing faster than expected. We are attracting more investments than ever before. We are leading the country in job creation, and we are competing globally for talent, capital and innovation. To succeed in that environment, we need infrastructure that matches the scale of our ambitions. We need infrastructure that reflects the size of our economy.

Modernizing Billy Bishop airport is part of that vision. It strengthens our aviation network, expands our capacity to move people and ideas, and ensures Toronto remains a gateway for business, tourism and economic activity. It is a strategic investment in the province's future—in our competitiveness, our connectivity and our ability to meet the demands of a rapidly changing economy.

Billy Bishop is an underutilized asset in Ontario's transportation system, and our government is stepping in to ensure it reaches its full potential in the next phase of our growth. It is part of ensuring our province remains the economic engine of Canada and is part of delivering our government's commitment to protect Ontario's future.

1600

Ontario cannot afford to stand still. Our population is growing, our economy is expanding and our infrastructure must keep pace. Modernizing Billy Bishop airport is not optional; it is essential for Ontario's long-term growth. If we want to remain a top destination for investment, talent, innovation, we must match that ambition with infrastructure that is equally forward-looking. The expansion of Billy Bishop airport is part of that commitment. It signals to the world that Ontario is not only keeping pace with global competitors; we are prepared to lead.

And as we transform this airport, we are also changing the way Ontario approaches infrastructure planning. We are moving away from the old model of fragmented decision-making toward a coordinated, province-wide approach that aligns transportation, economic development, housing and land use planning.

Billy Bishop airport is one project, but it represents a broader shift in how this province plans for the future: with confidence, clarity and purpose. Our government is taking action. We are providing leadership, and we are building the foundations of Ontario's future economy—

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Chris Glover: I want to thank the member for Algoma–Manitoulin for your comments today.

The expansion of Billy Bishop, we learned from the Toronto Port Authority, is going to cost \$5 billion. There's just no way the airport could possibly self-fund that, so that's going to come out of taxpayers, either federal or provincial. That's \$900 for every household in Ontario.

To the member from Algoma–Manitoulin: Do the residents of your riding want to invest \$900 from each of their households into the expansion of Billy Bishop airport?

MPP Bill Rosenberg: I want to thank that member for that question. The proposed special legislation does not have any costing implications for the province, though it does commit the province to pay the city of Toronto fair compensation for the land that's required.

The Toronto Port Authority estimates that the cost of the modernization project at \$5 billion, to be funded largely through third-party financing, including arm's-length government agencies such as the Canada Infrastructure Bank and Building Ontario Fund, as well as private lenders such as banks and investors. These funds would be for runway relocation, mainland development and new terminal redevelopment.

The port authority is a financially self-sufficient, federal public authority, with airport infrastructure enhancements funding primarily through third-party financing, including the banks—

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Ms. Laura Smith: Thank you to the member. I want to thank him for his remarks. He cares about his community.

One of the things that I'm interested in is travel. Now, I'm not talking about luxury travel; I'm talking about travel that is required due to necessity: medical travel, accessing health care and services and opportunities that some areas of Ontario are not afforded because of a lack of connectivity. I'm wondering if the member can talk a little bit about how this will help improve health care access and connectivity to our communities.

MPP Bill Rosenberg: I'd like to thank the member for that great question. Even people like myself, from the north, from no man's land, do need to travel. We would have to travel to Toronto for medical services.

This legislation does offer that stronger regional connectivity across Ontario by modernizing Billy Bishop airport. We know that it has up to 4,000 flights coming through Ornge now; it's enhancing that even more. This means better access to a specialist from northern Ontario—we don't have that that luxury in the north—to the communities and health care system right here in Toronto. A stronger area of work supports regional equity, economic opportunity and reliable access for our communities from across the province.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Chris Glover: The Conservative member just asked about medical travel to Toronto at Billy Bishop. There are people who are travelling down here to use medical services. But I'll tell you, the people of my riding, we don't want this airport expanded to have jets. The airport is operating as it is, and people can come down and use the medical services. In fact, it's actually better for them the way it is now because they don't have to compete with jets. Most of the people travelling for medical services are actually using prop planes.

One of the issues here is that people in Toronto do not want this airport expanded. We don't want to spend \$5 billion expanding this airport, destroying the waterfront. Would it not be better to spend that \$5 billion expanding medical services in the north so people don't have to travel to Toronto in order to get the medical services that they need?

MPP Bill Rosenberg: Thank you for that question. Coming from the north, we have such a hard time finding doctors—not from specialists, but we have that service so that we have to come to the city for that specialist service. And \$5 billion—we can build buildings, but we have to have those services. They're here. Why would we not access them? Just because we're from the north, they shouldn't be available to us down here in south? I don't think so. I think they're accessible for all Ontarians.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

MPP Stephanie Smyth: Thank you to my colleague for his comments. Talking about medical services in the north, I respect the problems you have having access to medical doctors and primary care in the north and northern regions. Again, as our other colleague here mentioned, could not those billions of dollars be spent to improve our health care system, to entice more people to go north? Maybe more than two million people might get that family doctor that they don't have already and get the primary care that they need in northern communities, rather than expanding an airport.

MPP Bill Rosenberg: Just over the last year now we've seen so much primary care, connecting our people to primary care through our health teams. I know just in Algoma riding, in Sault Ste. Marie, they're connecting up to 7,000 people to primary care. We've seen the health team in Algoma, at the North Shore network; we've seen the health team in Espanola. It's thousands of people that have been connected to primary care through this government's initiative.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

MPP Paul Vickers: Infrastructure investment supports jobs and economic growth. We see this all the time. That's the reason why our province is as strong as it is today, because of the investments that our forefathers have made in Ontario.

Billy Bishop already supports approximately 9,000 jobs and contributes \$2 billion in annual economic output. Can the member explain how this project continues to demonstrate support for Ontario workers and long-term economic growth?

MPP Bill Rosenberg: Thank you to the member right here, right in front of me, from Bruce-Grey. That's a great question, and I'd like to thank the member from Bruce-Grey. We know that modernization of Billy Bishop airport represents significant economic opportunity. It would contribute up to \$8.5 billion to Canada's GDP by 2050, and it connects millions of travellers straight to our downtown core. The port authority estimates that modernization

could generate up to \$140 billion in economic output in 25 years and, during the construction phase, 23,000 jobs.

The legislation will support well-paid jobs in aviation and tourism-related industries, while strengthening Ontario's competitiveness and connectivity. These benefits will extend well beyond Toronto and support communities across the province.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Chris Glover: The cost of expanding Billy Bishop to allow jets is \$5 billion. This money is going to be completely wasted, because we're already spending \$3 billion to expand Pearson to add capacity for another 23 million passengers. So we're going to have lots of air capacity for passengers in the city of Toronto; we don't need to expand this.

1610

But here's a proposal for the member from Algoma-Manitoulin: How about we take that \$5 billion—let's not waste it at Billy Bishop; let's use it to expand the Northern Ontario School of Medicine so that there's a site not just in Thunder Bay and in Sudbury but there's one in Sault Ste. Marie as well so that people can be trained as doctors in local communities. How about we expand Highway 69, Highway 11 so people can actually get around northern Ontario, and how about we open all of the emergency rooms that have been shut down under this Conservative government over the last eight years?

MPP Bill Rosenberg: Thank you for that question. I'm from Algoma-Manitoulin, so I know the distances. A lot of people don't know the distance here, in southern Ontario. It takes me seven hours to drive—

Mr. Chris Glover: I lived in Geraldton.

MPP Bill Rosenberg: Well, yes, but you're here now. I don't think jobs creating jobs is a waste of money, and I think that's where we're coming down to.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Further debate?

MPP Lise Vaugeois: I must say, I've heard a lot of claims made in this House about how expanding Billy Bishop airport is somehow going to help us in northern Ontario. A plus B does not equal C. A jet is not going to land in Wawa. How on earth is this facilitating travel from our region?

I hope people understand that I also hear, "the north, the north." The north is a very big place; it's not just one place. So when you talk about the Northlander making everything better for people in the north, do you know what? We have no passenger rail service in Thunder Bay. We have not had it since the Mulroney government. Do you know how we get passenger rail service? We drive four hours on a bush road up to Armstrong if we want to get rail service. There are so many claims made that have no connection to reality.

At the pre-budget hearings, we had a wonderful presentation by Tom Meilleur, who is the chair of the northern aviation committee. I want to note that the member from Kiiwetinoong explained to us this morning that the Ministry of Transportation remote airport office in

Thunder Bay walked away from the Northern Ontario Aviation Committee. It's a very, very important committee. I can tell you that Tom Meilleur, who is chair of that committee—and he also owns North Star Air—is trying very hard to get all levels of government together to actually problem-solve about the smaller airports in the north. So talk about medical access—people from Kiiwetinoong can't even get out of their communities. They can't get out of their communities in order to get access to health care. You think that Billy Bishop is going to change that? You're out of your minds. We're talking about tiny, little shoebox offices and gravel runways that are too short. They're already too short now to lift the payload when they want to take supplies out of those communities.

People are often stranded without being able to get access to medical care even in Thunder Bay. They would be going to Thunder Bay, Sudbury, Sault Ste. Marie, depending on what the condition is, or perhaps to Toronto. Assuming they can get out of their communities, the means are actually already there to get to Toronto.

Now, for those of us living on highways in different parts, it's still very difficult to get to a centre. You've got to drive in my region on Highways 11 and 17—and we've heard many times the difficulties—and you're on those highways for a long period of time.

Do you think expanding Billy Bishop airport is going to change that, is going to help with that? How about taking that \$5 billion and actually twinning those highways? How about taking some of that money to increase the safety along the Highway 11 corridor, where there's not a single passing lane?

People can't even get from their communities. Some people have to walk along Highway 11 to get to buy groceries. People die. People have died on that corridor trying to walk down the street because it is the Trans-Canada Highway.

I could also tell you about one of the grandmothers hurt on that stretch in front of Long Lake #58—19 broken bones. The insurance company is still trying to claim that it was not a catastrophic injury. That's just the kind of things that go on and affect people in a very real way.

I might add that, in our region—two head-on commercial truck collisions in the last two weeks with deaths.

This is what we're seeing all the time, and yet we hear, "Billy Bishop is going to save us in the north. Billy Bishop is going to get us health care that we don't have." It's such nonsense. I've been so disappointed to hear northern members repeating whatever has been fed to them because there's so little reality to it. It's fantasy.

Now, I'm going to read a little bit from Tom Meilleur's presentation, because I think it's important. He's talking about the 27 airports in northern Ontario that have one person staffing them. According to Tom, they need a minimum of three to run effectively, because if there's only one person and they're sick, there's no airport. There's nobody to open the airport. And again, the runways are deficient.

"These deficits have real consequences," he told the Legislature's Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs. "Medical patients stranded, essential medication delayed, food delayed, medevac flights unable to land, preventable loss of life. This is not theoretical—this is happening today in Ontario and in real communities who depend on us to keep them safe."

"Yet these lifelines are failing," Meilleur said. "All of these airports are outdated, non-compliant with current regulations and incapable of supporting future growth. This is not a new problem; it has been deteriorating for decades."

This was actually the member from Kiiwetinoong during the hearings, who said, "I don't even call them airports. I call them airstrips because they're gravel runways. That is so 1950s ... but that's the way First Nations are treated in this province."

So again, according to Meilleur, runways are too short and narrow; they're not being maintained properly; there are gaps in weather reporting; insufficient on-site services like de-icing, fuelling and emergency response; not enough general staffing; and small, outdated terminal buildings which don't have proper screening infrastructure.

As he said, "Most airports are staffed by one person on a full-time basis, weekdays only, despite the fact that there are 24/7 medevac operations and regular scheduled operations demands beyond a 9-to-5 job. This is unsafe, unsustainable and, quite frankly, unacceptable." And yet here we are, talking about how expanding Billy Bishop is going to make life better for people in the north.

As I say, this is a fantasy based on somebody's financial interests, but certainly not for people in northeastern or northwestern Ontario.

Interjection.

MPP Lise Vaugeois: Yes.

I've heard a lot of people from other parts of Ontario waxing poetic about how great it's going to be to fly into Toronto and visit all the great attractions in Toronto. Well, guess what? All this investment into the waterfront that has been made over years, that has made the waterfront such a fantastic tourist destination—well, you're trashing it. You have a quality of life that's actually pretty good for people living in downtown Toronto, which you want to trash by increasing pollution levels and certainly increasing noise levels.

So I want to talk about noise, and I know a fair bit about noise because I was a symphony musician in another life. I play a brass instrument—they can be very loud—and I sat in front of the trumpet section. The things I read about the volume of jets, even though they may be quieter than they were in the past—but I got most of my information from looking at the Pearson airport discussion about noise levels. It's like sitting in front of a trumpet section, which is quite painful, I can tell you. That's why we have sound baffles and we often wear ear plugs and, of course, it's limited.

1620

But if you've got 85 to 110 decibels happening—I don't care whether it's every two minutes or every 10 minutes—that has a physiological effect on people, on their bodies. Let me read some of the things.

Jet aircraft flying low overhead easily exceed 85 to 100 decibels on the ground. Over time this level of repetitive exposure can lead to noise-induced hearing loss. According to public health guidelines, chronic exposure to loud, low-altitude aircraft noise triggers the release of cortisol and adrenaline. This can increase the risk of high blood pressure, heart disease and severe anxiety.

Sleep deprivation: A jet passing every two minutes prevents deep restorative sleep. This level of disruption leads to sleep fragmentation, which has cumulative effects on cognitive function.

Health outcomes: Long-term sleep deprivation from ongoing noise can result in chronic fatigue, weakened immune systems and impaired memory consolidation.

Then, there's disrupted communication: outdoor conversations, classroom instruction and workplace meetings, constantly interrupted by the sound of jets.

Property values: Housing markets near high traffic flight paths often experience decreased property valuations and slower sales due to the desirability drop off.

Wildlife and pets: Domestic pets and local wildlife have highly sensitive hearing. Continuous jet noise can cause extreme distress, behavioural changes or even self-injuries in animals.

I've also found some things—somebody commenting on living close to the Dublin Airport says aircraft noise is harming their health. A new report estimates the human health cost at “nearly €800m,” citing issues like high blood pressure, heart problems. That's what we have constantly every two minutes. This is the reality for many living near Dublin Airport.

And we know that the pollution will increase. I find it confusing, mind-numbing, to imagine having that sound again and again and again.

What they said about Pearson is that the further away the airplane is, the less the sound is going to be, unless it's reflecting off a surface in which case you're still going to get an awful lot of noise. But the thing about Billy Bishop is that they're going to be coming in close to where everybody is living. It's not like it's somewhere further out where there's room for long runways and where people can gradually come in. They're coming in right over where people are recreating, where people are living. I can't imagine—it's like having somebody scratch the blackboard again and again and again. You know what's going to happen to your nervous system. It's going to go ballistic, and you're not going to be well. You'll want to get out of there, and it's not going to be a desirable place to go.

I really wonder, for a government that likes to talk about supporting small business, how they can justify undermining all of the small and medium-sized businesses that make their livings in that corridor near the airport. It's not just immediately in front of the airport. We know that their

planes are going to be coming in over a significant section of the waterfront.

There are certainly financial reasons—we don't have a business case for this airport. We hear a whole bunch of numbers; I have no idea where they come from. The port authority apparently has provided some. The port authority has also got an economic interest in this. I don't consider the port authority to be an unbiased advocate, but regardless, it's the port authority that has said \$5 billion, which is about \$900 per person. I really question the claim that this is not going to cost taxpayers money. P3s usually work out as public investment, private profit. It stretches credibility to imagine that this enormous project is not going to cost taxpayers.

In the meantime, we are investing at Pearson airport, and there is a \$3-billion investment there that will take far more passengers than Billy Bishop is predicted to be able to take. So why on earth are we doing this? We've invested in the train. It's a very rapid transportation from the airport into downtown Toronto, and you don't have to ruin the lives of people living in Toronto to do it.

Again, I wonder at what I see as self-interest, selfishness and fantasy, frankly, to think that people in other parts of the province think that they are going to come into Toronto and there won't be an enormous traffic jam, even though the norm now is getting to Billy Bishop is an enormous traffic jam. There is nowhere else for traffic to go.

So, I consider all of this a fantasy, and yet, this—“It's going to be so great for us. It's going to improve my life in eastern Ontario, in western Ontario, in northern Ontario.” Based on what? Seriously, based on what? As I say, we're going to have a jet landing in Wawa, we're going to have a jet landing in Longlac, and suddenly, people can get medical care faster? It's absurd, right? That will never happen.

And for heaven's sake, why not repair and modernize those airports further north? Don't forget, this government has all of these ambitions about mining in the north. Well, guess what? Some of those mines are going to be near some of those communities that have these tiny, little airports that have not been maintained for years. That's going to be a bit of a surprise, isn't it? They're not going to be landing jets there. Right now, they are having trouble landing turboprops there, but they should be able to.

The location of the airport is very small. Again, where on earth is the traffic going to go? The extended runway will take incredible amounts of engineering, and, frankly, an incredible amount to fill. And imagine the years of dump trucks bringing infill into Lake Ontario. By the way, you are going to ruin the boating use of the lake, which is significant—the leisure craft use.

And then, the plan is to expropriate everything anyway. And once they've done that, well, guess what? The school that's over there? Meh—who cares, right? The kids won't be able to learn anything; it will be too loud for them. And then, there is going to be a lot of extra real estate there and we know how the Premier loves to create opportunities for

his friends to buy prime real estate. We have seen that far too often.

It's unnecessary. It's not safe. We know that jets suck in birds, and we know that there are several bird sanctuaries out on Tommy Thompson, for example, and breeding areas. Now, we often get the impression that this government couldn't care less about wildlife, but frankly, those birds can be sucked into the engines. And at that moment, you are going to care—unless you're planning on decimating those bird colonies.

The health impacts are significant. It's an incredible waste of money. There are lots of building that can be done that would actually help people in the entire vast area of northern Ontario if the government were willing to put some of this money—and it's not even that much. I think what was needed was about \$24 million over 10 years that Tom Meilleur was asking for.

1630

And then there is the “follow the money”: The primary beneficiary is J.P. Morgan's subsidiary, Nieuport Aviation. They are not making enough money right now, and that is one of the motivations for expanding the airport. They're not happy and, heck, if we can make an American investor happier, apparently that's on the agenda for this government.

I only have a few seconds left. There is probably a lot more I can say. But if for no other reason—and there are many reasons—the sound levels, which is something I really wanted to talk about, will hurt people. They will make it extremely uncomfortable to recreate, to have dinner, to do anything, frankly, on the waterfront with that sound level over your head constantly. That's what I would like to say.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

MPP Stephanie Smyth: Thank you for the debate. I wanted to go in a little bit more, being from the north of what you speak, and the whole contention that this is just going to make huge improvements to that health care and transportation that is so desperately needed for people in north.

You've got some connections. You've heard experts speak in the field. Explain to us again how that just doesn't ring true, that expanding Billy Bishop will help the health care of the people in the north.

MPP Lise Vaugeois: Thank you very much for the question.

I have to say, I can't. It's a mystery to me because—and that's where I said, “A plus B does not equal C.” There is no way that jets will be landing in our small communities—zero possibility.

In the meantime, we could be spending money to educate more health care workers. We could be spending money to make the highways safer. We have lost at least two doctors on that highway in the time that I have lived there. We could be investing in those northern airports so that people can get out of their communities and actually access health care. We could be investing in those communities and having the health care on site in those com-

munities. There is just no connection between the claims and the lived reality in northern communities.

Thank you for the question—

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: I would like to thank our colleague from the opposition. I have been listening to all your debate, and before I ask my question, I would like to mention something, just for the record. I know more than 10-plus doctors or pharmacists who are locum, who are using Billy Bishop airport to go to the northern areas of Ontario every week. Not every month; every week.

If we are saying that there is no relation, I can prove the relation to you, and I can prove that all those locum doctors who are easy to move from Toronto to any northern small village or small community are going to get less.

My question, is what is the alternative? And why are you attacking the whole idea when we didn't touch yet—

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Response.

MPP Lise Vaugeois: It's an interesting question, because frankly those locums are already coming to the region; they already have that capacity to do it. And if they really want to be faster, they can take the jet from Pearson and also get to Thunder Bay. You'll save 20 minutes but—personally, it takes longer to get to Pearson, but whatever. They are already doing that. Expanding Billy Bishop does nothing to improve or change that situation.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

M^{me} France Gélinas: We have mentioned a number of times—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Can you keep it down, please? I am trying to do questions and response.

M^{me} France Gélinas: We have mentioned a number of times that there are 27 gravel runways in northern Ontario where, at some points, you can't land. In other airports, they come and check the airports every four hours; they are stripped to make sure you can land. In northern Ontario, you often can't because there's a pothole and it won't be fixed until the next day.

Do you think that the government has a role to play to make sure that the gravel airstrips in northern Ontario are better maintained and paved? This is 2026, not 1955, and we should be able to land on paved highway. Do you see this as helping northern Ontario more than building Billy Bishop?

MPP Lise Vaugeois: Thank you to the member from Nickel Belt. Yes, those airports need to be brought up to standard so that they are reliable. I don't know if members realize that we don't even have reliable weather service at those airports, so they may not be able to tell what's going on. And, yes, there is only one person working there. There is nobody to do maintenance if that one person can't do it. Again, potholes, gravel, runways that are too short right now to be able to carry anything when they're leaving the community—it's very dodgy.

And you know what? The province manages those airports. The province is actually 100% responsible for those airports. It's pretty shocking, actually. I understand that the minister didn't know that a few months ago. It's really shocking that there is no investment going into those airports and that there are these fallacious arguments about what Billy Bishop is going to do for health care in the north.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Billy Pang: From time to time, the opposition has voted against infrastructure investments that strengthen Ontario's economy, improve connectivity and support long-term growth. This legislation is about keeping Ontario competitive at a time when jurisdictions around the world are investing in modern infrastructure to attract jobs and businesses. This project could support approximately 23,000 construction jobs, generate up to \$140 billion in economic output over 25 years, increase competition, and give travellers more choices and more affordable options.

Speaker, through you, I ask the member opposite, do they believe the creation of thousands of good-paying jobs and strengthening Ontario's economy is reckless? Or are they simply opposed to building the infrastructure our government and our province needs?

MPP Lise Vaugeois: It is redundant infrastructure, I believe, in Toronto, but I can tell you where we need infrastructure: Highway 11, Highway 17, Highway 69, 27 airports in Kiiwetinoong and northern Ontario. That is where we need infrastructure funding. And guess what? That would produce a lot of jobs.

So I do not accept the argument that suddenly there's going to be all this economic growth. We already have the infrastructure here, and we are already investing in expanding Pearson airport. That airport is fully capable of taking any size airplane, so why would we ruin the lives of people who live in Toronto who—with the entire city council of Toronto—have said, "No. What are you doing? Why are you taking away our right to actually decide what's going to happen in our own community?"

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Chris Glover: I want to thank the member from Thunder Bay for speaking up today. This is an absolutely ridiculous waste of money. This government is proposing to waste \$5 billion expanding the Billy Bishop airport, putting jets on the waterfront, having jets land or take off every 2.5 minutes 200 metres from an elementary school. On what planet is that possibly safe?

What we would propose is: Let's take that \$5 billion; let's invest it in the north. My suggestions—I'll ask the member from Thunder Bay if these are good suggestions: Let's pave the runways at the 19 airports in northern Ontario that have gravel runways—

Ms. Sandy Shaw: It's 27.

Mr. Chris Glover: It's 27 gravel runways.

Let's twin Highway 69. Let's expand Highway 11 to make them safer. Let's expand the services of the Northern Ontario School of Medicine so you're actually training

local doctors to stay in the north, so that you can provide medical services in the north—it's nice to expand the hospitals. Is that not a better use of the \$5 billion?

1640

MPP Lise Vaugeois: Thank you to the member for that question. Clearly, it is a better use of the money. It's a more logical use of the money. And to the suggestions you made about creating more spaces in the northern medical school—I would also like to be thinking about infrastructure within northern communities themselves, within First Nations communities where it is often very difficult to even get access to a nurse, so that needs to be part of that plan as well.

But there are infinitely better ways of spending \$5 billion to develop really important infrastructure for the people of Ontario. It's beyond me why this has become—

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Response.

Mr. Chris Glover: They just don't like northern Ontario—

MPP Lise Vaugeois: No, and they don't like Toronto either. They don't like Torontonians.

Interjections.

MPP Lise Vaugeois: And they're perfectly happy to bring extreme noise levels—

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Further debate?

MPP Stephanie Smyth: I rise today to stand up and speak against Bill 110—I know that's a shock—the so-called Building Billy Bishop Airport Act, which I might rename "the downtown Toronto land grab act" myself.

I would like to begin by reading an email sent to me by one of my constituents in Toronto—St. Paul's. This is from Abby who sent it to me earlier this week. She says:

"Dear Stephanie, I hope this email finds you irate and ready to fight. I'm totally opposed to the expansion of Billy Bishop airport—the air and noise pollution from jets in our city aside, the traffic this will cause plus the disturbance to the island's ecosystem and habitants hasn't been thoroughly considered. We need not clutter the city with smog and screeching jets just because it's going to make a few rich people richer. Any time" the Premier is "pushing through expansions as quickly as possible, you know they're wrong-headed and"—I won't say the word; I'll just say it begins with a C and ends with "orrupt"—

Interjections.

MPP Stephanie Smyth: I knew you'd get that.

"Why not slow down, consider the long-term impacts? Why on earth are we pushing forward," Abby goes on to say, "a costly and unnecessary expansion in the core of the city to benefit J.P. Morgan? I implore you to advocate for the dismissal of this proposed expansion."

Those are some really strong words from a constituent of mine, and words that match the feelings of nearly everyone you run into in Toronto these days who isn't currently sitting across from me or beside me on the PC benches.

This debate isn't about whether Billy Bishop airport has value; we know it does. Billy Bishop plays an important role in our transportation network. It serves travellers, it

supports jobs and it contributes to Toronto's economy already—no question—and that isn't the question. The question before us is not whether the airport should exist; the question is whether this government should be giving itself sweeping powers to seize municipal lands, override local decision-making, sideline public consultation and push forward a multi-billion-dollar expansion project without a transparent business case, without environmental clarity and without the consent of the people most affected? On that question, Madam Speaker, this bill fails badly.

At its core, Bill 110 is not really about airports. We've heard that many times. It is about power. This legislation allows the province to unilaterally take control of lands owned by the city of Toronto. It removes the city from the tripartite agreement, and it bars the city from making decisions about its own waterfront lands. It even retroactively voids transactions and shields the government from liability, and that is extraordinary. The government can dress this up in the language of modernization, competitiveness, economics and serving the north, but whatever way you want to look at it, this is a massive centralization of authority at Queen's Park.

Ontarians have seen this pattern before. This government increasingly treats municipalities not as partners, but as obstacles to be overruled wherever convenient and whenever convenient. Local planning is ignored. Community consultation is treated as optional. Environmental concerns become an afterthought.

Madam Speaker, there is another aspect of this proposal that deserves far more scrutiny in this House, and that is who ultimately stands to benefit financially from this expansion. Ontarians are being told that this project is about economic development and protecting Canadian competitiveness, yet significant financial interests connected to Billy Bishop airport are tied to large international investment firms, including major American bank interests. That means a project requiring sweeping provincial powers, massive public infrastructure changes and potentially billions in public risk could ultimately generate substantial profits that flow outside of Ontario and outside of Canada, at a time when this government constantly speaks about protecting Ontario jobs and defending Canadian economic interests.

It's fair to ask, then, why this government appears so willing to override Toronto's local authority and hand over control of valuable waterfront lands for a project where powerful foreign financial actors may be among the primary beneficiaries. It's fair to question why our slogan-hat-touting Premier, who loves to say "Canada is not for sale, folks," seems so keen on lining the pockets of American banks at the expense of Ontarians.

If taxpayers are expected to shoulder the risks through infrastructure costs, through environmental impacts, through congestion and potential liabilities, then Ontarians sure deserve clear transparency about who stands to profit from the rewards, because right now it increasingly feels as though local communities are being asked to absorb all

of the disruption, while well-connected international investors collect the upside.

Speaker, Toronto's waterfront is not some empty parcel waiting for the Premier's next announcement. It is one of the most important public spaces in the country. It is the product of decades of really careful planning, revitalization efforts, environmental remediation and community input. What this bill effectively does is hand the Premier extraordinary control over the entire island and surrounding waterfront lands tied to Billy Bishop airport. It's not just about the runways; through sweeping expropriation powers and the removal of municipal authority, this government is positioning itself to absolutely dictate the future of Toronto's most valuable public asset, with remarkably little local oversight.

Ontarians should also know that there are significant private financial interests standing to benefit from this expansion—as mentioned, the American investment banks with major holdings connected to the airport's ownership structure. So while the local residents are asked to absorb the disruption, the noise, the congestion and the environmental risks, powerful outside financial actors could absolutely ultimately be the ones profiting most from this project. That raises some really serious questions about just whose interest this legislation is really designed to serve.

Now the government wants to disrupt all of that to chase a vague promise of economic growth that has not been independently proven. Throughout committee hearings, opposition members repeatedly asked a simple question: Where is the business case? We heard our finance critic say it again this morning: Where is the independent economic analysis? Where is the transparent methodology behind the government's claims?

And guess what? We didn't get any answers. We got slogans. We heard numbers thrown around: \$8.5 billion in annual economic impact, tens of thousands of jobs, increased tourism. But when experts and journalists began looking closer, the numbers quickly started to fall apart. Experts cited in reporting on this proposal pointed out that much of the traffic may really just be shifting away from Pearson airport, if at all, rather than creating an entirely new batch of economic activity.

1650

So what exactly are we accomplishing here? Are we truly generating billions in new economic value? Or are we simply redistributing passengers from one airport to another, possibly, while saddling taxpayers with enormous costs and the city with enormous disruption? Because we now know that this expansion could cost between \$4 billion and \$5 billion. Madam Speaker, \$5 billion—it's like it's pocket change to this government.

And this is happening at a time when Ontarians are struggling with affordability, struggling with access to health care, struggling with housing, struggling with overcrowded transit and struggling with schools in disrepair. The government is telling us there's never enough money for nurses, never enough money for family doctors, never enough money for mental health supports, but, suddenly,

there could be billions available for runway expansion into Toronto harbour.

Ontarians deserve to know exactly who will pay for this project. Will the taxpayers subsidize it? Will the province assume the risk if the costs spiral out of control? Will local infrastructure upgrades be downloaded onto the city? Again, we don't know because this government has not provided the details.

That uncertainty matters because large infrastructure projects under this government have not exactly inspired public confidence. Ontarians have watched costs balloon before. They've watched announcements arrive long before the plans, and they've watched governments promise the moon, only to leave taxpayers holding the bill.

There are serious practical concerns here as well. Billy Bishop airport currently works precisely because it is relatively small and specialized. It's a boutique airport. It serves a niche role. Expanding it to accommodate jets fundamentally changes the character of the airport and the blessed surrounding waterfront. What happens to the increased noise for the nearby residents? What happens to marine traffic in the harbour? What happens to waterfront revitalization plans? What happens to congestion downtown—oh my gosh. What happens to environmental protections? Those aren't minor questions.

When you think about infrastructure, how many of you fly into Billy Bishop every week? I know lots of you do, coming from your communities. You know how wonderful it is getting out of Billy Bishop and then catching an Uber or something to get anywhere in, hopefully, under a half hour—nearly impossible. It is absolutely mind-boggling to think that you could expand that airport without doing something to deal with the infrastructure—what might that mean?—which we're not being told at all.

I think about the development that this government has allowed near transit stops in this city. In my riding, Toronto–St. Paul's, a massive development is set to go up at Yonge and St Clair, a 40-plus-storey building—zero infrastructure. There are no schools to support all these developments, no roads. Oh my gosh, the traffic is just mind-boggling.

So we're looking at this. These are not minor questions here with Billy Bishop, yet this legislation gives the government sweeping authority before those questions are properly answered, and that is just backwards.

In a functioning democracy, governments do the analysis first and seek the power second. This government wants the power first and the scrutiny later, or secret decisions first—like the jet, maybe—and then, “Oops! Sorry, not sorry, folks” about that.

Speaker, one of the most troubling aspects of this bill is in section 8, which effectively shields the crown from legal consequences arising from its actions under the act. It extinguishes causes of action; it bars proceedings; it limits remedies. It even explicitly states that these actions do not constitute expropriation. Think about that for a moment: The government is granting itself the authority to take control of municipal lands while simultaneously insulating itself from many forms of accountability. So if

this proposal is truly so incredibly beneficial, why does the government feel the need to shield itself so aggressively from legal challenge? Confidence in public policy should come from transparency and evidence and not from limiting recourse.

I think that a lot of Ontarians are starting to catch on now. They're seeing this broader pattern, this government increasingly governing through force rather than collaboration, overriding municipalities—and for some reason, Toronto lives rent-free in this Premier's head all the time. It weakens oversight, centralizes authority and then it asks Ontarians to just simply trust that everything is going to work out. But that trust has to be earned, especially when billions of dollars and the future of Toronto's waterfront are at stake.

But you know, Madam Speaker, Ontario Liberals do believe in economic growth. We believe in infrastructure. And we believe in modern transportation networks. But we also believe that growth has to be responsible, it has to be evidence-based and it has to be transparent and collaborative. That means working with municipalities, not steamrolling them. It means conducting rigorous environmental assessments before expansion plans move forward. It means publishing independent economic analysis so the public can judge the merits for themselves. And, moreover, it just respects the people who actually live in and use those communities.

Right now, this bill does none of those things. Instead, Bill 110 is asking Ontarians to sign essentially a blank cheque for a project without knowing the full cost, without knowing the full impacts, without knowing whether the economic promises are even real. That isn't good governance, that is not accountability and it is certainly not how we should be making decisions about one of the most important public waterfronts in Canada.

Furthermore, as a native Torontonians, who represents a midtown riding, growing up in this city and all the issues that we've seen over the years—as a journalist for 30-plus of those—I never heard a hue and cry from people to say, “Please expand Billy Bishop so that jets can land there. Please, please make it a noisier waterfront. Please take away the gorgeous environment. Please, please make Billy Bishop so big we have all the jets we could possibly want every two minutes coming in, bringing in people from God knows where”—which is fine.

But no, this is not the priority that we're seeing right now. It's, “Please, in my role right now, help us with affordability. Help my kids have hope that one day, they might be able to own a home. Help me with ODSP. Can you please maybe double it so I can get away from a food bank? Can you help me find a job?” It's not, “Please expand Billy Bishop and spend billions of dollars”—allegedly—“on something that we just don't hear the hue and cry for.”

And might we remind everybody, Pearson airport is undergoing a massive expansion called LIFT, which they've been planning for years: addressing stakeholders, dealing with absolutely any possible issue they could think of that might come up before launching. This is what it

looks like when you do proper consultation, proper governance. This is what it's about when you consult communities. That's how you do it.

I have to wonder, if I haven't had that hue and cry begging for the expansion of Billy Bishop airport, why is this suddenly such an important bill that you table in a really—I was going to say “hardly any days” that we sit. I'm trying to find the word. We don't sit for that long in this House, but Bill 110 sure was a priority to get rushed through. I have to connect “private jet” with “airport.” That's the only thing I can think of, because it's not working for the north. You've heard from the experts in the north.

1700

Help us figure it out. Just let us see the full picture, at least. I hope, Madam Speaker, that this government withdraws this bill, releases the evidence, conducts the studies, engages meaningfully with the city of Toronto and the waterfront communities, and returns with a plan that is grounded in transparency and public trust.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Ms. Laura Smith: Thank you to the member opposite. I enjoyed listening to her comments. I grew up south of Steeles, which I guess makes me a Torontonion as well, and this is very near and dear to me. Planning for the future is important. She brought up some significant points, but one of the things that I appreciate is the fact that the GTA, the Toronto area, is going to accelerate by an estimated 20.5 million people by 2025.

Given the population growth and given that planning is important, what actually risks development and long-term growth disruption is keeping Billy Bishop bound by an agreement that prevents coordinated planning. So coordinating a plan to do this at the right time is necessary, and involving the partners. I'm wondering if she wants to talk about that.

MPP Stephanie Smyth: Thank you for your question. I think coordinated planning is great if everybody has all the information. I think that's the thing, is that you can't trust what's happening right now, because the information isn't there.

This right now, what we're talking about, is essentially a land grab. We don't know anything more about it. We know that the effort takes away any potential coordination from the city of Toronto in the tripartite agreement. You can plan. Find a way to make it happen so everybody is on a level playing field and knows and has all the information. Hopefully you can come to some kind of solution. With the growth, Madam Speaker, in the GTA, over 28 million more people are going to be able to land at Pearson soon.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Chris Glover: I appreciate the member for criticizing this idea. It's an absolutely ludicrous waste of money and the destruction of the waterfront, if this government and the federal Liberal government get together and expand the Billy Bishop airport to allow jets there.

Premier Ford said when he announced this that the federal government is on board. The federal government is in charge of regulating airports. Nothing can happen at this airport without the federal Liberal government's say-so. So will you commit to canvassing your federal Liberal MPs and the federal Liberal Prime Minister to say to stop the expansion of this airport, to stop Doug Ford from his ridiculous plans to destroy the waterfront?

MPP Stephanie Smyth: I think we need to canvass the mayor of Toronto first and foremost.

Also, I don't even know what to believe as truth right now, because quite frankly, when the Premier said he sold the private jet and it would cost nothing to the taxpayer, suddenly we've got a \$200,000 bill. So I want to see all the cards on the table. Sure, I want to hear the truth from everyone. Then we'll make a decision. We have no truth. Right now, the truth is, this is a land grab that is not consulting the people of Toronto, full stop.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Ms. Aislinn Clancy: From my understanding, the people who stand to benefit most at this moment are J.P. Morgan Asset Management, an American company. Why do you think Ontario is spending taxpayer dollars to help an American asset management corporation?

MPP Stephanie Smyth: Thank you for the question. It's mind-boggling. This goes against everything, as I said, about our slogan-cap-wearing Premier, about protecting Ontario—Captain Canada.

Again, we need the transparency and the truth. That is the problem, but we have a clue. The clues are all there, and we're always told, “Follow the money.”

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: I'm very happy to hear the member opposite talking about sitting in the airport you are flying from and thinking about how easily you are accessing that and getting out. Then you are talking about how there's no proof that this expansion to the airport will help the economy. Look at the Pearson airport. The Pearson airport is the biggest employer in Mississauga, in Peel region. The biggest income to Peel region is coming from the Pearson airport. It's obvious that the airport will bring economy. It will bring jobs. It will bring travellers and tourism and stuff like that.

I don't know what the obsession is about destroying what we have. The discussions around the Billy Bishop airport before the bill were about, are we going to renew it or are we going to get rid of it in the city and every aspect about removing that airport or, before, removing the Gardiner. We need to build more infrastructure.

My question for you: You don't see the economic value of that airport even as it is today, and instead of demolishing—

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Response?

MPP Stephanie Smyth: Of course we see the economic value. We're not saying shut it down. This is about using the space for what it is. You're comparing it to Pearson

airport. Pearson airport employs over 55,000 people. It's the size of about 10 Canada's Wonderlands. It's massive. Is that what you want down on the waterfront?

We are talking about keeping Billy Bishop as is, the boutique-type style airport, to respect and protect and make the best use of it, with the consultation of the people of Toronto.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Thank you to my colleague for her great words today. At committee, when we discussed Bill 110 the other day and people came down to give testimony, we heard from the waterfront secretariat. We first heard from the minister, who was talking about the consultation and how this government prides itself on consultation. Then I asked the waterfront secretariat when she had heard about this ungodly proposal. I jokingly said, "Did you wake up one day and open up the paper and read it in the paper?" And that is exactly—the city of Toronto found out about this in the media.

Do you think that that is a good way for any government to carry on relationships, partnerships, with another level of government and to respect them?

MPP Stephanie Smyth: That's the whole problem here: consultation and everybody having prior knowledge. It's a pattern with this government to act first and apologize after if it just doesn't go the way they envisioned.

We're seeing that with the blue licence plates, now that we're getting more information on that, the documents coming out about how they were so sure everybody should have these blue licence plates, despite the opposition from police forces right across the province. "Gotta have them, gotta have them, gotta have them." They got them, and everybody—police—said, "No, it's a debacle." But they just did it anyway, even with consultation. That's kind of frightening. The bare minimum is what we're asking for, that kind of consultation.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Adil Shamji: I listened very carefully to the member for Mississauga—Erin Mills talk about the future economic value of Billy Bishop. Well, if he read the legislation then he would know that Billy Bishop airport is being snatched from the city of Toronto for so-called fair market value. But the legislation explicitly says that that fair market value cannot consider the future economic value of Billy Bishop airport.

To my good friend, the member for Toronto—St. Paul's: Why should the city of Toronto be forced to accept a bad deal from this government and that Premier?

MPP Stephanie Smyth: It's appalling, as I mentioned in my debate. They're shielding themselves as much as they possibly can. The people of Toronto are being hurt. This is absolutely not a benefit to anyone, I can imagine, but someone with maybe a private jet, who doesn't have it anymore.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question? I recognize the member for Spadina—Fort York. Quick.

1710

Mr. Chris Glover: Prime Minister Carney has been on the fence about this. He says it's an "interesting" proposition, the expansion of Billy Bishop to allow jets.

Prime Minister Carney has the power to say there's not going to be jets. In 2015, Marc Garneau, then the minister of transportation, got elected and he said that there were going to be no jets and the proposal for jets at that time stopped.

Will the Prime Minister stand up for the people of Toronto and say there will not be jets at Billy Bishop airport?

MPP Stephanie Smyth: I was going to say that that's a great question when you're in federal Parliament, you know?

We all want to hear all the information we possibly can, most importantly from the government of Ontario about exactly what the plan is.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Further debate?

Ms. Aislinn Clancy: I'm honoured to rise today and represent the people of Kitchener Centre in this debate and represent my party.

I guess the people outside of Toronto are asking: Who asked for this? I think it adds to a long laundry list of vanity projects in Toronto that people in Toronto don't want.

Sometimes, I feel like the Premier is out with his friends—I don't know if he's golfing or having a beer—and they're just like, "Hey, wouldn't it be great?" and then an idea pops up, and all of a sudden, we see the wheels in motion.

I think what concerns me—I studied business. I have a degree, a bachelor of business administration, and I learned that we do business plans. We do SWOT analysis. We do good process to see what the advantages are to this kind of investment, this infrastructure project. I don't see that in this project.

In fact, I see a lot of threats and risks and consequences. I think one of my main concerns is that we'll be losing 14,000 non-market, market and affordable homes. All levels of government have already invested \$1.4 billion into housing that will now be blocked because it could be in the flight path of these jets.

We keep talking about Buy Ontario, and this is an airport that's owned by an American asset management corporation. I keep questioning why we're investing money in a way that helps Americans. They are threatening us right now. They're bringing tariffs upon our economies and doing harm to our people and our citizens, so why would we spend taxpayer dollars in a way that bails out a bank, of all things, bails out an American bank?

I just don't see the numbers. A lot of skeptics have said that the projections on how this airport will be used do not make any sense, that the figures that have been used to talk about how much benefit will happen—\$8.5 billion is the estimated benefit, but skeptics and experts in the field say that that number seems like it's made up, that it's not based in reality.

I worry about the loss in tourism. We hear every day in this place about how investing in tourism has an extra benefit—return on investment. Here we are spending billions of dollars on waterfront improvements, but now, if you have stinky water and noisy air, nobody's going to want to spend time on the island or on the lakeshore.

I know my riding is right next to our regional airport, and when I knock on doors near where the airport is, people want to sell their houses. They're going to lose money on their homes, and people don't want expansions of that airport because it affects their well-being. It affects their productivity, their ability to sleep, the values of homes in that area.

We know that Chicago ripped out their island airport because it is a bad idea. I know the Premier lived in Chicago. I'm unsure why he doesn't talk to the folks who were involved in ripping out the airport in Chicago and ask them why they ripped out their island airport, and why he's expanding ours.

It feels like a passion project and sometimes I worry that the Premier is using our taxpayer dollars as a piggy bank, because it seems like reckless spending in a way that doesn't add value and benefit to the people of Toronto and this province.

There are massive environmental costs to this. Air travel is the worst thing any of us could do in this place—the worst. In fact, one flight is the equivalent of driving your car for a year. So as people get more comfortable using private jets and flying around town, they say that air travel will make up 30% of our carbon budget in the coming years if demand continues to increase on the pace that it's increasing right now.

Air travel is not a thing that we should be expanding if we have any shred of decency and care about the well-being of our children, because our world is burning down and this will add air pollution. That is just a fact. The people in Spadina–Fort York in the vicinity of that airport will have higher rates of asthma—mark my words—and lung disease.

We should not be expanding air travel. I'm completely against expanding air travel because it is a death sentence for our planet and having a livable planet. We're already past the point of no return. The tipping points have happened; 1.5 degrees has happened. We're looking at worse and worse. Doubling down on air travel is a terrible idea if you care about clean air and a livable planet for our kids. What can I say? That's not even to mention the ecosystems and water quality.

I have friends who swim in Lake Ontario every day. We've already decided, as a government, to dump raw sewage into the lake—which boggles my mind—but now we're going to pollute it even more by building a kilometre of landfill. To expand the island, it will be a kilometre of landfill, and it will affect the circulation of the lake. Now, we're going to have a multi-billion-dollar spa on the lakeshore, surrounded by sludge. I don't know if any of you have been to a lakeshore that doesn't have good water circulation—it's sludge; it smells bad. Not only is it going to sound terrible, maybe give us asthma—I mean, people

might be there for the day, so they might not get asthma; only the people living near it will get asthma—but we're going to send people to the lakeshore and hope they have a wonderful time while it smells like garbage. It's going to smell like sludge because we're affecting the circulation of the water, and circulation of water cleans water. Definitely, the water of Lake Ontario in Toronto will be gross and disgusting, and it will affect the water quality.

When it comes to health consequences, there is a lot to be said for microparticles that come from aircraft. I know I'll probably bore people—I know people are already kind of bored, but these air particles are really important. It says that the UFP levels will spike to upwards of 100,000 particles per cubic metre. The World Health Organization considers high UFPs as 20,000 particles, so we're talking five times what they already consider to be high. This is just going to have a major negative impact on the people who live in this area.

And you know what? You know how the Premier makes comments about people who are homeless and that he's going to give out a judge's address so that he can put the tents in their backyards. Everybody in this place, if they decide to expand that airport, should have an airport in their backyard if you think that that's how we're going to make decisions, because I disagree with affecting and making the quality of life for people who live in this area harmful and negative.

I know I'm a bit of a delicate flower, and I like my sleep. I feel for the people who live near the lakeshore, and there are probably more people who live near the lakeshore than 50% of the ridings in this building because it's so densely populated. We're affecting millions and millions of people and their ability to enjoy their lives. If you talk to anybody who lives near an airport, they will tell you that they want to move as fast as they can because they can't relax with that kind of noise in their neighbourhood.

Honestly, I usually try to say thank you. I usually try to find something nice about legislation, but when it comes to doubling down on wasteful expansions of airports, there is just no rationalization.

Actually, the only other thing I can say that's negative is that I hear that Pearson is expanding. Are we starting to compete with our own airports and create this division? This market plan, just like the convention centre, where is the evidence? I appreciate that the Premier is a businessman, but he inherited his parents' business. He did not go to school for this, and there's no evidence to support his hare-brained ideas on what is economically viable. Just like this airport expansion has no valid rationale and a business plan, the convention centre has no rationale and a business plan. There's no market for convention centres.

This is how we're spending taxpayer dollars. We could be alleviating poverty. We could be reducing class sizes. We could be taking care of our most vulnerable. Instead, we're shovelling buckets and using taxpayer dollars like a piggy bank for the Premier's vanity projects in Toronto that even the people of Toronto do not want.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

and I asked who the mom is. It was one of my cousins from Wunnumin Lake, so that was very interesting.

We're supposed to land at Billy Bishop airport. We're supposed to land at Billy Bishop, and one of the things that happened is that we got diverted to Pearson.

An ambulance arrives to the plane; the chaperone and the student leave. So I thought, "Okay, does that mean I have to take the UP train? Does that mean I have to take Uber, taxi?" No. The captain says, "We're going to fly to Billy Bishop now." It was a seven-minute flight to Billy Bishop. I got here in time for question period. I think I arrived here at 10 o'clock, leaving Thunder Bay at 6 a.m. That's the type of travel that we need.

One of the things I hear as well is how it's going to benefit the north. I don't agree with that. It's just outrageous for me to hear, "Try it. It's going to improve health care."

Also, Speaker, I just want to say that I'm going to be sharing my time with the member from London North Centre. I'll have about five more minutes, so I'll be doing that.

I know one of the things I always talk about is the 27. I had a question today on airports, on Billy Bishop. There are 27 gravel airstrips in Kiiwetinoong, and I think they're 3,500 feet in length. The infrastructure, the buildings, the runways themselves need to be modernized. The people in Kiiwetinoong—we need to start upgrading these airports, not Billy Bishop, because we are people too.

1730

I had an opportunity last week to come down and listen to the Minister of Transportation when he presented to the Standing Committee on Heritage, Infrastructure and Cultural Policy. I know that during the first hour of the committee, the Minister of Transportation defended the changes his government is making to Billy Bishop airport in Bill 110. The minister spoke about, again, what I just talked about: the connectivity to the north, opportunities in developing the Ring of Fire and bringing more tourism to that area that is "hard to get to without—in some circumstances—air travel being a possibility."

That's the thing. Those of us who live in the north know that allowing jets to land at Billy Bishop airport will not increase connectivity with our communities. It doesn't make sense. It is outrageous. There are only a few airports in the north where jets can even land. But I know this much: They cannot land in any of the fly-in First Nations because of the size of the runways that we have.

I remember, during the hearings, we also heard from the mayor of Marathon, Rick Dumas, who pointed out that jets can't land at Marathon's airport either. Funnily enough, Mr. Dumas is also the president of the Northwestern Ontario Municipal Association and spoke in support of expanding Billy Bishop airport.

Mr. Dumas described Billy Bishop as an "essential piece of infrastructure for Ontario," and went on to describe why he thought it would be great for the north, including First Nations. The position of that mayor of Marathon to the committee was not representative of the feelings, not representative of the priorities, of everyone

living in northern Ontario. Some people even told me that they found Mr. Dumas's presentation condescending.

I think both the Minister of Transportation and Mayor Dumas used northern health care needs as a reason to invest more in southern infrastructure. I know, I travel the north all the time; there's many of us that live in the north. This is almost offensive, because what we hear is, "Let's make Billy Bishop bigger instead of improving health care access in the north." So it is clear that this is not the solution to build up the 27 airports with gravel runways that are in the First Nations in northern Ontario.

I'm going to pass my time to the member from London North Centre. Meegwetch.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): I recognize the member for London North Centre.

Mr. Terence Kernaghan: I rise today to speak against Bill 110, the Building Billy Bishop Airport Act, 2026. Let me be clear: This is public land. It belongs to the people of Ontario, not any government of the day to reassign, reshape or restrict without full transparency, accountability, and consent. Public land carries public responsibility, and with that responsibility comes a duty to act carefully, openly and with the public interest. Bill 110 does not meet that standard.

Every household in Ontario is being forced to pay \$900 for the Billy Bishop airport—\$900. I can think of so many other uses and so many families who would much rather use that for food, to spend on their children, to literally do anything else than to have it taken by this Conservative government and their cabal of wealthy liberal elites benefiting J.P. Morgan Asset Management.

In London, more than 2,300 people are homeless right now, Speaker. There are at least 75 active encampments. Front line workers are doing everything they can to keep people alive. Yesterday, I asked this government to find a mere \$1.3 million to continue to save people's lives in London and keep the House of Hope open, a program to keep people off of the streets and out of encampments. The minister crowed about overall funding—funding that is clearly not meeting the needs of people, that much is clear.

Yet here we are debating whether or not Conservatives should reach deep into every family in Ontario's pockets, taking \$900 for the Billy Bishop airport. This government can find billions for airport deals. They can find millions for the Premier's luxury jet. They can funnel public money into projects backed by wealthy insiders and corporate interests.

But when it comes to supporting vulnerable people and keeping them housed, suddenly there's no money. The cupboard is bare. That, Speaker, is a moral failure. If this government doesn't see the good sense in keeping House of Hope operational, they will literally be wasting investments that have already been made.

House of Hope is not some abstract budget line. It is about people: human beings, mothers, sons, daughters, veterans, people struggling with mental health, addiction, trauma and impossible housing costs. Shutting this program down doesn't make homelessness disappear. It will force more people into tents, more people into emergency

rooms, more people into shelters and out onto our streets. It will cost more. It will hurt more. And people will die.

The question is not about whether the money exists. The question is who this government believes is worth saving. This is not fiscal responsibility. It is reckless mismanagement of taxpayer money. Every dollar spent ignoring homelessness today becomes a far greater cost tomorrow in policing, emergency health care, shelters and crisis response. This government talks endlessly about being responsible, but there's nothing responsible about abandoning people while taxpayers' money is being squandered on irresponsible spending and political luxuries.

The priority right now is not building Billy Bishop airport while families in my riding and across Ontario are skipping meals, seniors are choosing between rent and medication, and young people have lost hope of ever owning a home. People do not want their money wasted on luxury spending while their neighbours freeze, starve and sleep outside. Right now, this government is showing Ontarians that there's always money for waste, but never enough money to help ordinary people.

What concerns me the most about this government is it's not just this bill in isolation, but it's the pattern we are increasingly seeing across Ontario, where vulnerable people continue to be left behind, including in my own riding of London North Centre, with cuts not only affecting the House of Hope, but also Carepoint and the life-saving services they provide.

Carepoint is not a luxury. It's not an extra. It is a life-line. Carepoint meets people where they are with compassion, health care, harm reduction and support that keeps people alive long enough to access treatment, housing and stability. When someone else has nowhere else to turn, Carepoint is there for them. When people are struggling with addiction, homelessness, trauma or mental health challenges, Carepoint treats them with dignity instead of judgment. That work matters. It saves lives.

Ontarians deserve a government that understands that investing in front-line care is not wasteful spending. It is one of the smartest and most compassionate investments that we can make because the true measure of a government is not how it treats the wealthy or the well connected, but how it treats people when they're at their most vulnerable. Let's invest in people, in housing and addiction treatment instead of spending billions on expanding an airport that most Ontarians will never use or benefit from.

1740

Time and time again, legislation is brought forward that expands the scope of government authority, reduces transparency and centralizes decision-making power. Each time, it arrives with limited consultation and very little warning. Increasingly, residents in Toronto and in my own riding feel they are being confronted with major decisions after the fact, rather than being meaningfully included in them.

That matters, Speaker, because public trust is not built through surprise. It is built through transparency—transparency in word and in action—through consultation and

through respect for this Legislature and the communities that we are honoured to represent.

Bill 110 gives the provincial government sweeping authority over the city of Toronto lands connected to Billy Bishop airport, as well as large portions of the Toronto Islands and surrounding waterfront. Most importantly, it goes far beyond what would be required for any clearly defined or properly explained project. What is being proposed is broad, open-ended and unprecedented in its scope over municipal public land.

At the same time, there is no complete business case before us. There is no publicly released cost estimate. There is no confirmed federal agreement to reopen or amend the tripartite framework governing the airport and there is no full explanation of the long-term impacts. Yet this government is proceeding as though those questions will be answered later when, in fact, they should be addressed first. This is so completely and utterly wrong.

Experts in municipal law and planning have already raised concerns. Ontario has a clear and established system under the Expropriations Act, designed to ensure fairness, transparency and independent review when public land is taken. Bill 110 just marches on past that framework. It allows government to determine compensation unilaterally, imposes costs on the city of Toronto and significantly limits meaningful legal challenge. That is a serious departure from long-standing safeguards that are there for a reason.

We need to be honest, Speaker, about the scale of what is being affected. This is not just airport infrastructure. This legislation captures large portions of the Toronto Islands, including parks, cultural spaces and community areas that people rely on every day. It includes Hanlan's Point, Centreville, parts of Ward's Island, Little Norway Park and Bathurst Quay Common. These are not abstract assets on a map. They are lived-in, public spaces that define Toronto's waterfront and belong to the public.

People are already paying attention. Residents are raising concerns about access to public space, environmental impacts and the future of their communities. In my own riding, constituents have written to me directly asking us to intervene. They're not asking for confrontation. They're asking for accountability. They're asking why decisions of this magnitude are being made without meaningful public input.

Neighbourhood associations closest to the airport have raised additional concerns about safety, noise and congestion. They're also concerned about the lack of democratic process surrounding these expansion discussions. These are the communities most directly affected, and their message has been consistent: Proceed with caution and proceed transparently.

At the same time, we're seeing a range of stakeholder reactions. Some organizations, including the Toronto Port Authority and private operators associated with the airport, have expressed support for expanding its potential. Business groups such as the Toronto Region Board of Trade have also voiced support for modernization and growth.

Other groups, including waterfront and community organizations, have raised serious objections, particularly to expansion that would fundamentally change how the waterfront is used. Many of these groups have accepted the airport's existing operations, but they're incredibly clear in their opposition to changes that would significantly alter public land use and access.

So there's not one single voice here; there's a wide range of perspectives. What is missing is a full, transparent, public process that allows these perspectives to be properly weighed with complete information.

I will end where I began, Speaker. I strongly believe that public land must remain public, that decisions must be transparent and that communities must be meaningfully consulted before irreversible changes are made.

What we are seeing from this government is not consultation. It is not transparency and it is not accountability.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: It was great to hear from both members on Bill 110—my colleagues to the right of me, but also the left.

I have a question for the member from London North Centre. Do you think that with a massive infrastructure project proposal that—bare minimum—you would have a business case with that?

Mr. Terence Kernaghan: I would like to thank the member for Beaches–East York for an excellent question. With any expenditure of this magnitude, one would expect that there would be a business case to rely upon. You would expect that they would be able to have a proof of concept.

Instead, it clearly shows that this government is really trying to enrich a few people, because there is not really a business case; there is an elite case for this where they're trying to help their friends. I mean, we saw that the carve-up of the greenbelt was to help the Premier turn his millionaire friends into billionaires. It was using public assets in order to fill the pockets of connected people while taking from the pockets of everyday Ontarians.

As I said, Billy Bishop airport will cost every single Ontarian \$900, and that is morally, ethically and fiscally wrong.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Billy Pang: After decades serving in a community, I learned how to oppose. When you move fast, you're not kind because you're not waiting for those who are slow. When you wait, you have no momentum. When you take the left or the right, you are too extreme. When you take the middle, you have no stance. When you fly high, you're not down to earth. When you're down to earth, you have no character. So you can always find some ways to say I'm against whatever, but—

Interjections.

Mr. Billy Pang: Through you, Madam Speaker, I ask the members opposite why they keep opposing investment that helps Ontario compete, grow and succeed?

Mr. Terence Kernaghan: I thank the member from Markham–Unionville for, I suppose, a question that is full of more bluster, rhetoric and empty words from this government. They are really abandoning proper legislative processes that we have in place here in this great House for a reason.

Consultation and the idea of taking a bill around the province of Ontario is something that is lost upon this government because they don't want to hear from anyone who is affected by this. They don't want to hear the perspectives of people who are concerned or have any thoughts about this whatsoever. They already had their mind made up before this. They had their mind made up before they bought the Premier a luxury \$30-million plane. We heard words and claims from the government that that wasn't going to cost the people of Ontario anything, he was going to get the same price back, but we know it cost \$200,000.

I wish the government would be more clear that they're costing every Ontario household \$900 for this airport expansion.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

MPP Lise Vaugeois: Thank you to the member from London North Centre. We've seen in many of these acts a lot of effort going into the government protecting itself from legal challenges. Remember the Ontario Place bill where, if the government is guilty of malfeasance, it doesn't matter? There are 28 pages of protection from legal challenges in the new education act, with zero reference to special-needs children, notably—and then putting a chokehold on the freedom of information act.

Do you think we will ever get a true accounting of how they came up with this project and, if it proceeds, what it actually costs?

Mr. Terence Kernaghan: I'd like to thank my friend from Thunder Bay–Superior North for an excellent question. We see this government always manipulating and changing the goalposts. They're continually trying to move themselves away from any sort of accountability.

One thing I will recall quite directly is how during the pandemic the army was called upon to rescue individuals in these large, for-profit care homes, where they found people crying out for help, people crying out for water, people just starving for any attention whatsoever. The army, who was called in to rescue these people, suffered from PTSD as a result of what they saw, and yet the government protected themselves from legal accountability for all the deaths that happened, protected those long-term care for-profit owner-operators and then somehow decided, in their wisdom, that they're going to reward the worst of the worst with yet more people to look after.

This is a culture of zero consequences. The government apparently wants to give themselves all a ribbon and also nominate themselves for King's Counsel at the same time.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Ms. Laura Smith: Through you, Speaker, I should add that our province is committed to helping those who find themselves in unfortunate situations, which is why we've made the largest investment in homelessness prevention in Ontario's history: \$529 million to open 27 Homelessness and Addiction Recovery Treatment Hubs, HART hubs, which will include 560 supporting units.

1750

To that point, I'm going to say planning is important. Given there's going to be 20.5 million people in the GTA in 2051, and growth and planning for the future is so important—like we did with the HART hubs, I would add—is the member against making sure that we make a coordinated plan as harbour activity and demand continues to grow?

I ask the member opposite if they are opposing a plan to ensure boat or marine traffic and airport operations can coexist in one of the busiest ports in the city?

Mr. Terence Kernaghan: I thank the member for Thornhill for the question, and I'd like to thank her for mentioning HART hubs.

I would like to indicate to that member: This government promised that the HART hub in London would open on April 1, and 209 days went by and you did not sign the cheque. You did not send the money. You gave no excuse why. You continually blustered with government announcements about all the other things that were happening across the province of Ontario, but there was zero accountability for that.

It finally opened late in October, only because I went to the media and started questioning this government, asking why you were sitting on your wallets and why you were not honouring the promise that you made. Sixty beds sat empty for that entire time—recovery beds that this province desperately needs.

What I would say is, every time you talk about your homelessness funding, look outside. There are homeless people across this province. You are not doing nearly enough. You removed rent control. You have not kept up with shelter funding. You are not paying the workers who are caring for these people nearly enough. There's not even a living wage. So don't dare tell me about all the historic investments you've made, because you are not doing enough.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Ms. Peggy Sattler: I want to thank my colleague the member for London North Centre for his remarks and also his determined advocacy to keep the House of Hope open in London. He referenced that in his speech, and he talked about some of the wasteful spending that we have seen from this government.

In the case of the Billy Bishop airport expansion, we're looking at a cost of up to \$5 billion for a project that no one in the city of Toronto seems to want. The mayor certainly is not embracing this. Torontonians are not embracing it. The government is saying that people from the north need to use this airport so they can access health care.

I wondered if the member would like to expand on other wasteful projects, where money is being wasted by this government that could go to address issues like homelessness in London?

Mr. Terence Kernaghan: I'd like to thank my friend from London West for an excellent question. You need look no further than the waterfront. I'm surprised that we don't see a Trumpian renaming of this entire area as "Fordland," because this government took money from every single Ontario household—they took \$400—and gifted it to a financially questionable Austrian spa who lied about their assets and what they had to bring to the table in order for this investment to come through. This was Therme.

But we also saw this government moving the Ontario Science Centre for a reason which was utterly false. They said that the roof panels were going to collapse, even though those are in many, many other schools in Ontario. In fact, the architect, Raymond Moriyama, was going to fix the roof panels for free.

Make me the business case where you actually want to move something. But instead, you're moving it from a place that's going to be repaired for free. Make that make sense. But you cannot make fiscal sense—

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Further debate? I recognize the member for Beaches–East York.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. It's always so grand to see you in that chair, representing the good people of Scarborough.

As always, I am thrilled to stand up in this beautiful chamber every day, including tonight, to represent the fine people of beautiful Beaches–East York who sent me here.

Speaker, I'm honoured to stand, as I said, in this House today on behalf of everyone, including Ontarians. Because make no mistake, as we've heard from previous speakers, Bill 110 is not a specific Toronto bill; it's going to affect all Ontarians. And we are here. We represent our constituencies, but we also represent all Ontarians. Let's remember that.

It's always been about creating a greater space for this government's friends to fly at Billy Bishop, a place for CEOs and the 1% to expand their playground, and this government's mixed-up mandate of serving their donors and friends rather than the people of Ontario.

Certainly, this is an airport that requires a set of prescribed and limited expansions for safety measures. This is what scares me. Safety measures need to be done at the Billy Bishop island airport. We talked about it at committee, and we've talked about it in the House: the RESA, the runway end safety area. We know the airport in its current form is not running to safety standards. I'm not denying that; they do need to be done. But it's like once this government gets a little peek at something, their eyeballs just pop off their foreheads like they're kids in a candy store and they see a bigger prize, which is this massive expansion, trying to shoehorn a major airport into this tiny island space.

It's integral to reveal how we got here, to an unsafe runway, because I think it has a lot of eerie similarities to where this government is going. As I mentioned, Billy Bishop is quite literally shoehorned on a tiny island; an island with homes, schools, beaches, parks that are massively affected by the airport. Also, boating clubs are there as well and, namely, the school that necessitates school buses to drive across the runway. In what world is it normal to have a school bus full of children traverse a runway on an active airport? Put up your hands if you would feel safe with your kids on that bus going across the runway, going to school.

This airport, shoved into a tight island, was never supposed to accommodate commercial jets. It violated the noise levels and safety guidelines. These planes are too heavy for the runway, quite literally sinking into the asphalt in the summer, which I will touch on more later. They do not have enough room to taxi or take off properly.

Yet somewhere down the line, someone said, "To heck with the rules, we know better"—seems to be a mantra with this government—and they chose profit over public safety, community needs and long-term well-being. What came of this was an overburdened island, never-ending traffic, an unsafe runway and now retroactive billions of dollars in repairs that will cost all of Ontario.

This should have served as a massive bright light flashing, basically a caution sign. Instead, this government just saw a green light: "Let's go. Let's get our hot little hands in there, on that prime waterfront land in the fourth-largest city in North America. Why not?" You're doing other things on the waterfront that are very questionable too, we know. For this government, these bad practices are basically their blueprint.

Let's look at the details of the Billy Bishop plan, even though there's not really a 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 of more metres of buoys and guide lights extending into the water, repair hangars, new custom facilities if flight paths are added, exclusionary zones and more. It's complicated; it's not just a wave of the wand to make our wish happen—

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): We're now going to move on to orders of the day.

Third 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)	Kiwiwinoong	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	