Legislative Assembly of Ontario



Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

No. 70A

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Nº 70A

1st Session
44th Parliament

Wednesday
6 May 2026

1re session
44e législature

Mercredi
6 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:

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 :

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.

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

ISSN 1180-2987

CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Wednesday 6 May 2026 / Mercredi 6 mai 2026

ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

HST Relief Implementation Act (Residential Property Rebates), 2026, Bill 114, Mr. Bethlenfalvy / Loi de 2026 sur la mise en oeuvre de l'allégement de la TVH (remises relatives aux biens résidentiels), projet de loi 114, M. Bethlenfalvy
Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy 4289
Hon. Rob Flack 4291
Ms. Laura Smith 4294
Mr. Peter Tabuns 4297
Ms. Natalie Pierre 4297
MPP Wayne Gates 4298
Mr. Andrew Dowie 4298
Ms. Peggy Sattler 4298
Second reading debate deemed adjourned 4299

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS / DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉES ET DÉPUTÉS

Mattamy Sports Park
Mr. Sheref Sabawy 4299
Protests in Ontario
MPP Robin Lennox 4299
National Monument to Canada's Mission in Afghanistan
Mr. Stephen Blais 4299
Clark Demeester
Mr. Brian Riddell 4299
Jesse Terry
Mr. Sol Mamakwa 4300
Primary care
Hon. Laurie Scott 4300
Ottawa Charge hockey team
MPP Catherine McKenney 4300
Primary care
Ms. Natalie Pierre 4300
Health care
Mr. Lorne Coe 4301

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEUSES ET VISITEURS

Mr. Ric Bresee 4301
Hon. Graham McGregor 4301
MPP Silvia Gualtieri 4301
MPP Lisa Gretzky 4301
Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens 4301
Mme Lucille Collard 4301
MPP Paul Vickers 4301
Hon. Steve Clark 4301
Hon. Graydon Smith 4301
Mr. Lorne Coe 4301
Mr. Peter Tabuns 4301
Ms. Peggy Sattler 4301
MPP Tyler Watt 4301
MPP George Darouze 4302
Ms. Aislinn Clancy 4302
Ontario Legislature Internship Programme anniversary
Hon. Steve Clark 4302
MPP Jamie West 4302
Mme Lucille Collard 4303
Ms. Aislinn Clancy 4303
House sittings
The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly) 4303

QUESTION PERIOD / PÉRIODE DE QUESTIONS

Government jet
Ms. Marit Stiles 4303
Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy 4303
Automotive industry
Ms. Marit Stiles 4304
Hon. Victor Fedeli 4304
Government jet
Mr. John Fraser 4305
Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy 4305
Government jet
Mr. John Fraser 4306
Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy 4306
Race-based data
Mme France Gélinas 4307
Mr. Anthony Leardi 4307
Freedom of information
Mr. Adil Shamji 4307
Hon. Stephen Crawford 4308
Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy 4308
Technology sector
Mr. Sheref Sabawy 4308
Hon. Victor Fedeli 4308

Gender-based violence
MPP Lisa Gretzky....4309
Hon. Charmaine A. Williams....4309
Government jet
MPP Tyler Watt....4309
Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy....4310
Energy policies
MPP Billy Denault....4310
Hon. Sam Oosterhoff....4310
School boards
Ms. Chandra Pasma....4311
Hon. Paul Calandra....4311
Public safety
Mr. Rob Cerjanec....4311
Hon. Michael A. Tibollo....4312
Health care workers
Mr. Dave Smith....4312
Hon. Nolan Quinn....4312
Services de santé dans le Nord / Northern health services
M. Guy Bourgouin....4313
Mr. Anthony Leardi....4313

DEFERRED VOTES / VOTES DIFFÉRÉS

Putting Student Achievement First Act, 2026, Bill 101, Mr. Calandra / Loi de 2026 donnant la priorité à la réussite des élèves, projet de loi 101, M. Calandra
Third reading agreed to....4314

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEUSES ET VISITEURS

Hon. Michael Parsa....4314
Mr. Tom Rakocevic....4314
Ms. Laura Smith....4314
MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam....4314
Mr. Andrew Dowie....4315

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS / DÉPÔT DES PROJETS DE LOI

861282 Ontario Limited Act, 2026, Bill Pr51, Mr. Kanapathi
First reading agreed to....4315

PETITIONS / PÉTITIONS

Collective bargaining
MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam....4315
Collective bargaining
Ms. Chandra Pasma....4315
Collective bargaining
Ms. Jessica Bell....4316
Health care workers
MPP Catherine McKenney....4316
Collective bargaining
Mr. Mike Schreiner....4316
Education funding
MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam....4316
Social assistance
Ms. Chandra Pasma....4316
Affordable housing
MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam....4317
Education funding
Ms. Chandra Pasma....4317
Social assistance
MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam....4317
Government accountability
Ms. Chandra Pasma....4317

ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

Building Billy Bishop Airport Act, 2026, Bill 110, Mr. Sarkaria / Loi de 2026 sur la construction de l'aéroport Billy Bishop, projet de loi 110, M. Sarkaria
Mr. Mike Schreiner....4318
Ms. Jessica Bell....4319
Mme Lucille Collard....4319
Mr. Andrew Dowie....4319
Mr. Andrew Dowie....4319
Ms. Jessica Bell....4322
Mr. Rob Cerjanec....4323
Ms. Laura Smith....4323
Ms. Jessica Bell....4323
Mr. John Jordan....4324
Ms. Jessica Bell....4324
MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam....4324
Mr. Matthew Rae....4327
Ms. Jessica Bell....4327
MPP Tyler Watt....4327
Mr. Andrew Dowie....4327
Ms. Jessica Bell....4327
Mr. John Jordan....4328
Ms. Jessica Bell....4328
Mr. John Fraser....4328
Mr. Andrew Dowie....4331
Ms. Jessica Bell....4331
MPP Tyler Watt....4331
Mr. Billy Pang....4331
MPP Lise Vaugeois....4332

Ms. Sandy Shaw....4332
Mr. Sheref Sabawy....4332
MPP Lise Vaugeois....4334
Mr. Joseph Racinsky....4335
Ms. Sandy Shaw....4335
Mr. Brian Riddell....4335
Ms. Sandy Shaw....4335
Mr. Andrew Dowie....4336
Ms. Sandy Shaw....4336
Mr. Anthony Leardi....4337
Mr. Terence Kernaghan....4337
Mr. Anthony Leardi....4338
Ms. Catherine Fife....4338
Mr. Anthony Leardi....4338
Ms. Lee Fairclough....4339
Mr. Andrew Dowie....4340
Mr. Chris Glover....4340
Ms. Natalie Pierre....4340
Mr. Billy Pang....4341
Ms. Sandy Shaw....4342
MPP George Darouze....4342
Mr. Chris Glover....4342
Ms. Natalie Pierre....4343
Ms. Peggy Sattler....4344
Mr. Andrew Dowie....4344
MPP Lise Vaugeois....4344
Mr. Sol Mamakwa....4345
Mr. Andrew Dowie....4346
MPP Lise Vaugeois....4346
Mr. Matthew Rae....4346
Mme France Gélinas....4346
Mr. Matthew Rae....4347
Mrs. Karen McCrimmon....4347
Mr. Andrew Dowie....4348
Mr. Chris Glover....4348
Mr. Stephen Blais....4349
Mr. Anthony Leardi....4349
Mr. Chris Glover....4349
Mr. Stephen Blais....4349
Hon. Steve Clark....4350
Vote deferred....4351

Better Regional Governance Act, 2026, Bill 100, Mr. Flack / Loi de 2026 pour une meilleure gouvernance régionale, projet de loi 100, M. Flack

Mr. Stephen Blais....4351
Third reading debate deemed adjourned....4354

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 6 May 2026

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mercredi 6 mai 2026

The House met at 0900.

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

Prayers.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HST RELIEF IMPLEMENTATION ACT (RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY REBATES), 2026

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

Mr. Bethlenfalvy moved second reading of the following bill:

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

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

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the great Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing as well as his parliamentary assistant the member for Thornhill.

It is my privilege to rise today in support of our government's bill, the HST Relief Implementation Act (Residential Property Rebates), 2026.

Madam Speaker, Ontario is navigating a period of real and persistent economic uncertainty. Across the global economy, we continue to see the effects of trade pressures, supply chain disruptions and shifting market dynamics. Geopolitical instability, elevated costs and moderating global growth are creating uncertainty for businesses, workers and families alike. These forces are sending unpredictable shocks through economies and communities around the world, including right here at home in Ontario, in Canada.

In this environment, Madam Speaker, governments must be prepared. We must be ready to not only respond to change, but to anticipate it, even when that means preparing for more challenging economic conditions ahead. That is why our government is taking a prudent and responsible approach. We are focused on protecting Ontario's economic security while continuing to build a stronger and more resilient province. We are doing this by maintaining a competitive business environment, supporting investment and ensuring that Ontario remains one of the most attractive places in the world to live, to work and to do business.

At the same time, we recognize that families are facing real and immediate pressures, particularly when it comes to housing affordability. For many people in Ontario, the cost of entering the housing market has become increasingly prohibitive and remains one of the most significant financial barriers they face. Communities right across Ontario are asking for action, and they deserve clear, decisive leadership from their government. This legislation is part of that response.

Madam Speaker, Ontario does not operate in isolation. Across Canada, we are seeing the impacts of global uncertainty reflected in provincial economies. In recent months, our fellow provinces have announced record deficits, increases in taxes and cuts to public services, but that is not the path we have chosen here in Ontario.

Instead, our government is focused on maintaining stability, supporting growth and improving affordability. We believe that the best way to support families, individuals and businesses is to keep costs down, encourage investment and build confidence in our economy. These principles guide our decisions as we navigate uncertainty. They guide how we support Ontario families, and they guide how we position Ontario as one of the most competitive jurisdictions to do business in the G7.

Madam Speaker, housing affordability remains one of the most pressing challenges the people of Ontario are facing today. For too many families, the dream of home ownership feels increasingly out of reach. High upfront costs and constrained housing supply are making it more difficult for first-time homebuyers to enter the market. At the same time, builders are facing higher construction costs, labour shortages, financing pressures and uncertainty that can delay or stall new projects.

These challenges are interconnected. When projects are delayed, supply is constrained; when supply is constrained, prices remain elevated; and when prices remain elevated, affordability continues to erode. Breaking this cycle requires targeted, coordinated and timely action. It requires policies that support both demand and supply, and it requires governments to act with both urgency and responsibility. That is what the proposed HST Relief Implementation Act is designed to support.

Madam Speaker, the purpose of this bill is straightforward. At its core, this bill is about delivering certainty

and relief to Ontarians. It is about turning a major affordability commitment into a program that works clearly, effectively and responsibly for homebuyers, for home builders and for taxpayers—because announcing relief is only the first step; delivering it in coordination with our federal partners in a way that minimizes complexity is the real work before us.

And that is actually what this legislation is designed to do. As members know, as part of our government's 2026 budget, we announced that we would be removing the full 13% for eligible buyers of new homes valued up to $1 million, meaning that families could see up to $130,000 in relief when looking to make one of the most important decisions of their life.

But we didn't stop there, Madam Speaker. We also extended the support for new homes valued up to $1.5 million, helping more people put down roots, create stability and invest in their communities and where they want to live. Because strong communities are not just built from thin air; they're built on a resilient economy, good-paying jobs and affordable homes.

0910

This historic 13% HST tax cut is another example of how our government is taking a comprehensive approach, building an Ontario that is strong, connected and prosperous for generations to come. This is a significant measure. It lowers upfront housing costs, it supports demand, and it provides a strong incentive to build.

This proposed bill, the HST Relief Implementation Act, is part of our government's historic efforts to cut taxes and put more money back into the pockets of Ontarians. And that, Madam Speaker, is exactly what this government is doing.

Ontarians have spoken loud and clear: They want to see our government taking action on the issues that impact their lives the most—on the cost of housing, the cost of gas, the cost of transit and even the cost of doing business. Ontarians have spoken, and our government has answered. Affordability continues to be a concern, and that is exactly why our government is staying focused on delivering what people need.

We delivered savings to Ontarians when we made the gas tax cut permanent to deliver lasting, predictable relief at the pump. We delivered savings when we got rid of tolls on Highway 407 East, saving daily commuters an average of $7,200 a year to ease household costs and keep goods and people moving. And we delivered savings when we cut the small business corporate income tax rate by 30%, delivering $1.1 billion in savings to more than 375,000 small businesses. These are but a few of our many recent efforts to support Ontario families by keeping the cost of living down.

And do you know what they all have in common, Madam Speaker? The members opposite refused to support every single one of them. Today, however, I would like to extend the opportunity to my colleagues from the opposition and from the third party to join us in delivering real, tangible dollars in relief for Ontarians who are looking to make one of the single most important purchases of their lives.

A home is more than just a house. It is the future for millions of people and families across this great province. Our government is here today to introduce legislation that would help those families with up to $130,000 in savings. I hope that my colleagues across the way consider joining us in supporting this proposed legislation.

Madam Speaker, a key objective of this legislation is to ensure a seamless experience for homebuyers and builders. We have been working closely with the federal government to ensure a clear path where this relief can be delivered through a single administrator. This approach minimizes burden, it reduces complexity, and it helps mitigate risks related to fraud and duplication.

Delivering this historic 13% relief is a coordinated process that requires we work closely with our federal colleagues in Ottawa. This is a complex undertaking, but it is a necessary one, because the alternative—inaction or delay—would mean higher costs for buyers and fewer homes being built. We recognize that timing matters, but our approach has been deliberate, it has been careful, and it has been built with the well-being of Ontarians in mind as the top priority. It ensures no eligible Ontarian is left behind simply because of implementation timelines, and we are working with the federal government to expedite delivery.

This legislation not only provides clarity to people and families looking to buy a new home; it also provides clarity to the market because builders have been clear they want certainty—certainty about how relief will be delivered, certainty about eligibility timelines, certainty about their role in the process. And thanks to our work to implement this proposed legislation, our bill responds directly to those needs. It establishes the framework required to move forward.

But let me assure you that we are not doing this in isolation. This historic program is supported by ongoing engagement with industry stakeholders, including home builders and developers, to ensure that implementation is informed, practical and responsive, and we are doing so because we also recognize that this is a complex policy environment. There are additional HST relief measures in place, including existing provincial and federal rebates. That is why we're working closely with our industry partners: to make sure we get things right, to ensure fairness, to ensure consistency and ensure the program works as intended.

Madam Speaker, ultimately, this legislation supports a broader objective: It is about getting more homes built. By lowering costs and improving certainty, we are creating the conditions needed for investment and to spur new home construction.

We are supporting a housing market that can respond to demand. Early analysis indicates that the expanded 13% HST relief could support up to 8,000 additional housing starts next year, sustain up to 21,000 new construction jobs and contribute close to $3 billion—$2.7 billion, specifically—in GDP growth in Ontario, and we are helping to

ensure families across Ontario have access to the homes they need and deserve.

Madam Speaker, our government is moving with urgency. We have introduced this legislation to ensure it is implemented as quickly as possible. We are working with the federal government to advance the necessary work, and we need their support because they administer the HST. We are continuing to engage with stakeholders because we know the people of Ontario expect action, and they expect results. They deserve results.

Madam Speaker, this proposed HST Relief Implementation Act is a critical piece of legislation. It provides the authority needed to deliver the full value of the HST relief that the people of Ontario have been promised. It supports a coordinated, practical and accountable approach to implementation, and it reflects our government's commitment to making housing more affordable and to building more homes faster.

And so I call on all members of this Legislature to support the bill, the HST Relief Implementation Act (Residential Property Rebates), 2026, so that, together, we can move forward with delivering this important relief and with taking meaningful action to address the housing challenges facing our province.

In conclusion, many of us have gone through a time when we bought a home or found a place to live in Ontario, and it is our duty as elected officials in this Legislature to support everyone who has the dream of home ownership at a time when affordability is a challenge for many. This action is legislation that will help propel that vision forward, to help propel that promise to the people of Ontario, to the people who are struggling with food costs and gas costs and housing costs. This is action, Madam Speaker. It is thoughtful. It is clear. It is consistent. And I call on our federal counterparts to work with us closely so we can advance the administration of the HST as quickly and as clearly and as appropriately as possible.

I thank the members of the Legislature for their time. I'm very hopeful that the Legislature will support this important legislation on behalf of all Ontarians. This is what we get elected for in this Legislature: to move the economy, the jobs and the people of Ontario forward. That's what they expect us to do day in and day out. This piece of legislation helps enable that vision, helps enable delivering that promise to the people of Ontario. Again, I ask all members of this Legislature to support this bill.

0920

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): I recognize the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

Hon. Rob Flack: Again, it's a great honour for me to rise this morning to speak on this important relief implementation act, and I thank the Minister of Finance for his great work in helping advance this across the finish line as we debate this legislation today.

Obviously, I rise today in support of the HST Relief Implementation Act, 2026, a targeted and necessary piece of legislation that will allow our government to deliver on a clear commitment to the people of Ontario: to lower the cost of buying a new home, to get more homes built faster and to keep workers in our construction sector on the job.

The minister spoke about 21,000 jobs. What this bill does as well is it sustains: It keeps in place over 100,000 jobs that would be at risk had we not brought this legislation forward. It is a targeted measure to protect workers, as I just said, to spur home building, to get Ontario building again and bring confidence—I repeat, confidence—back to those desiring a new home in this province.

Speaker, I want to begin by grounding this debate in the reality that families, builders and communities across Ontario are facing today, because while we see the cranes on the skyline, while we see progress in many parts of the province, we also know this: It still takes too long and it costs too much to build housing in Ontario. That is the central challenge before us today, and it is a challenge that has been shaped by some events, I might add, outside of our control.

Over the past number of years, we have seen global inflation drive up the cost of materials from lumber to steel to concrete. We have seen supply chains disrupted. We've seen higher interest rates raise the cost of borrowing for both buyers and builders. And we've seen uncertainty in global markets ripple through to local construction activity. Without any doubt, the instability originating from President Trump south of the border is having a serious impact as well.

At the same time, here at home we have faced structural barriers that have slowed down the delivery of housing: lengthy approval processes, layer upon layer of fees and charges, outdated planning frameworks that do not reflect the urgency of the moment. All of these factors have combined to create a situation where projects that made sense just a few years ago are now sitting on the sidelines, unfortunately.

I have witnessed, from the first day taking this job, that people, consumers and home buyers, have hit the pause button. And Speaker, when projects sit on the sidelines, the consequences are real and are being felt. Workers are left waiting, trades are idled, supply chains slow, and, importantly, families are left wondering whether the dream of home ownership will ever be in reach. We're changing that. I have a message for those people, here and now: We are fighting every day to protect Ontario to ensure the dream of home ownership is alive and well for generations to come.

We have also heard from builders and industry stakeholders about another emerging challenge: unsold inventory—units that have been built or are near completion but are not moving at the pace they need to, projects that are struggling to reach the sales thresholds required to move to the next phase of construction. When that happens, Speaker, it has a ripple effect, because if existing inventory is not moving, new projects don't get started. It's that simple. And if new projects don't get started, the supply chain constricts even further.

That is why our government has been clear from the very start: We cannot accept the status quo when it takes

too long and it costs too much to build, and that is why we're changing these unfortunate instances.

Every act I have tabled to protect Ontario since being minister is to drive down costs and speed up approvals. Bill 17, Bill 60, and now before the Legislature Bill 98, complement each other in that respect. We cannot accept a system where good projects stall because of cost pressures that are beyond the control of builders and beyond the reach of the families who want to buy these homes, and we cannot accept a future where the next generation of Ontarians is locked out of the housing market.

That is why we have taken action, Speaker. Over the last number of years, our government has advanced a comprehensive plan to get more homes built faster. Through the Protect Ontario by Building Faster and Smarter Act, 2025, and the Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025, we have moved to streamline approvals, cut red tape and bring greater certainty and predictability to the development process. Through the Building Faster Fund, we have introduced a performance-based approach that rewards municipalities that are getting homes built. Through these historic investments, like the Municipal Housing Infrastructure Program and the Housing-Enabling Water Systems Fund, we are ensuring that pipes, roads and services needed to support growth get in place.

As I've said all along, Speaker, we need infrastructure as much as we need housing, and through targeted measures like development charge relief, we are directly lowering the upfront costs of building new homes. Every action builds upon the other to an undeniable whole. It is easier and more cost-effective to build in Ontario in recent history.

But we are not done, Speaker, and we have also been clear that more is needed to be done, because even as we make progress on approvals and as we invest in infrastructure, supporting our municipal partners, there remains a fundamental cost challenge in the market. This is where this legislation comes in. The HST Relief Implementation Act is about lowering one of the most significant costs associated with buying a new home: the harmonized sales tax. Through this initiative, delivered in partnership with the government of Canada, we are removing the full 13% HST on new homes. Homebuyers are getting a break. For homes valued at $1 million or less, that means up to $130,000 in savings. That is real money, real savings, hundreds of dollars a month saved on mortgage payments, money that can be used to build a life, to start and raise a family and move forward with your loved ones. And importantly, HST relief can count to help families qualify for a mortgage. For homes above that threshold, the relief phases down in a responsible and targeted way.

Speaker, this is one of the most significant housing affordability measures in a generation, a generational tax cut, one of the largest in Canadian history. We have heard from across all Ontario that this is a game-changer. And it is not just about helping buyers; it is about unlocking the entire housing system, the housing continuum, because when we lower the cost of buying a new home, we increase the demand for new construction. When we increase demand, we help move unsold inventory. When inventory moves, projects that were on hold can move forward. That is how we have turned stalled projects into active construction sites. That is how we turned uncertainty into confidence, and that is how we ensure that workers in our construction sector stay on the job.

Speaker, I can say without reservation it is already working. I have talked to builders. I have talked to developers throughout the province. We are seeing increased sales, serious increased sales. It's having its desired effect. What does that add up to at the very end? It adds up to affordability. I have heard from builders across Ontario units are selling—literally thousands across the province. However, this legislation adds further certainty and actions to come.

Speaker, I also want to speak to an important design feature of this legislation. It allows the HST relief to be assigned to builders upfront. That means that instead of waiting to receive a rebate after the fact, buyers can see the benefit reflected directly in the purchase of their new home. That is about making the system more practical, more immediate and more effective in getting deals done and projects moving. It is also about certainty: certainty for buyers, who are making one of the most important financial decisions of their lives, and certainty for builders, who need to know that projects will proceed.

This measure builds on the steps we have already taken. We previously moved to remove the 8% provincial portion of the HST for first-time home buyers, and we have expanded that process to include all eligible buyers for a limited period, basically one year. And now, in partnership with the feds, we are going further by removing the full 13% on eligible new homes.

Importantly, this legislation is designed to work in conjunction with our broader housing strategy. It complements our investments in infrastructure. It reinforces our efforts to streamline approvals, and it aligns with our development charge relief program—importantly, the development charge relief program—which is lowering the upfront costs that builders face when bringing new housing to market. As I think we have heard, it can cost up to 30% of a new home construction, a single-family home in the GTA. All costs—HST, land transfer taxes, development charges etc.—can be 30% of the cost of a new home. We are changing that, because we know that no single policy will solve this challenge on its own. It requires a coordinated approach—an approach that tackles costs, removes barriers and supports the people who are doing the work on the ground.

Speaker, I want to turn for a moment to the voices we are hearing from the housing sector, because this legislation is not being developed in isolation. We have heard clearly from builders that high upfront costs are a major barrier to getting projects off the ground. We have heard that unsold inventory is tying up capital and delaying new construction. And we have heard that targeted, time-limited measures can help bridge the gap and restore momentum in the market. That is exactly what this legislation is designed to do. It is targeted, it is time-

limited, and it is focused on unlocking supply and doing so now.

0930

At the same time, we believe this legislation is fair. It maintains a balanced approach by phasing out relief at higher price points. I also want to emphasize that partnership underpins this initiative. While it's a joint effort between the province of Ontario and the government of Canada, it also reflects a shared recognition that the housing challenge we face requires collaboration across all levels of government. Through this partnership, the federal government is contributing to the cost of the program, including support for the 5% portion of the HST. And together, we are delivering meaningful, immediate relief for Ontarians.

Speaker, when we talk about housing, we're not just talking about buildings; we're talking about people: the young families looking to buy their first home, the seniors looking to downsize, and those workers who want to live close to where they work. We are talking about communities that need to grow in a way that is sustainable, inclusive and prosperous. This legislation speaks directly to those aspirations. Affordability is not just about prices; it's about opportunity and it's about ensuring that hard work is rewarded. It's about making sure that Ontario remains a place where people can build a life—their life, their family's life.

Speaker, our government has been clear. We've taken a practical, results-driven approach to the housing challenge. We are not interested in theoretical debates or one-size-fits-all solutions; we are focused on what works, and we are focused on delivering results because results matter. It's results that count. We've already seen progress in this manner.

We are seeing more homes built and being approved, putting critical infrastructure in the ground, as I spoke about. With measures like these, we are working to ensure that more homes get built and get sold, because at the end of the day, Speaker, that is what really matters: not announcements, not intentions, but outcomes; homes built, homes sold—results, Speaker. It's all about results: communities strengthened, lives advanced and jobs supported. This legislation is a critical part of that effort, and it reinforces the broader work we are doing to fix a system that has not kept pace with the needs of a growing province.

Speaker, I will close with this: The housing challenge we face did not emerge overnight. We had record starts in 2022, but we've had clouds; we've had crises; we've had difficulties ever since. We're seeing change. We're seeing light on the horizon. But we understand this is not a one-all fix. It will not be solved overnight, but with each step we take, we are moving absolutely in the right direction. By speeding up approvals, cutting red tape and streamlining decision-making processes, we are creating the conditions for a stronger, more resilient housing system.

I want to situate this legislation within the broader arc of the work we have undertaken as a government because this is not, as I have said, an isolated measure. It's the next logical step in a series of deliberate actions designed to confront a system that, for too long, has been weighed down by delay, uncertainty and rising costs.

Through our previous legislation, including Bill 17, 60 and now 98, we have consistently focused on removing barriers that slow down projects and add unnecessary expense. We have taken on the approvals process, recognizing that time is not a neutral factor in housing; it's a cost driver. Every month of delays adds pressure, adds costs. Every year of uncertainty pushes projects further out of the reach of sustainability. That is why we have acted to streamline decision-making, standardize processes and ensure that when a project is ready to go, it can move forward with clarity and confidence.

At the same time, we've worked to ensure that the fundamentals are in place, that growth can happen in a way that is coordinated and sustainable. But Speaker, even with all that progress, we've been clear-eyed about the reality: There is still a gap of affordability, a gap of what it costs to build and what the market can bear. This legislation helps close that gap in a significant way. It does so in a way that is immediate, and it does so in a way that's visible and practical. It puts a tangible incentive into the market and gives buyers a reason to act within the timeline outlined in this legislation. It gives builders the confidence to proceed. And it gives the entire sector a signal that Ontario is serious about getting homes built now, not years from now.

That alignment matters, because when fiscal measures like this are paired with structural reforms, and when tax relief works alongside faster approvals, alongside infrastructure investment, alongside development charge relief, you begin to see the full picture come together. And you begin to see, in real terms, the kind of progress that Ontarians expect from all of us here in this Legislature.

It has been my pleasure to share time with the Minister of Finance. It's rare to see the Minister of Housing and the Minister of Finance sharing time on bills like this, but I'm proud to do so. This is how you create the conditions to build—the fiscal and regulatory aspects working strongly together. That is what this legislation represents: not a stand-alone fix, but a piece of a broader plan that is already delivering results and making it easier and more affordable—I emphasize, more affordable—to build in Ontario.

The HST Relief Implementation Act is one part of a cohesive whole, and I encourage all members of this House to support its passage.

Speaker, when I got this job a little over a year ago, I hit the road, and I called it my listening-and-learning tour. I've spoken to and listened to countless Ontario home builder associations throughout the province—north, south, east and west—and in doing so, I can say confidently that I heard one consistent message, and that is that we need HST relief; we need affordability back in the market. Again, it takes too long and it costs too much to build housing in Ontario.

I want to thank the Ontario Home Builders' Association, BILD, ResCon, and all their local affiliates for the support they've given me in helping navigate this import-

ant issue. Working closely with the Minister of Finance and the Premier, I believe we've put together a really solid plan—how we thought we could move the needle in terms of new construction starts, what new home sales would be. It really has been a collaborative effort.

And I've listened to homebuyers. You've heard me tell the story time and time again—I remember, when I was first put into cabinet, I met a young lady in Toronto who was serving my wife and I at a restaurant. I started asking her about her housing situation, and she teared up because she felt she would never be able to own her own home. It was compelling. It was sad. It was motivating. I think about her often, and I think about her as we bring this legislation forth here today.

Again, I want to thank the Premier, who I believe has done an outstanding job in negotiating with the federal government to get this across the finish line. Honest to goodness, folks, it was his leadership that brought it across the finish line—no ifs, ands or buts.

I also want to take a moment to say that I was proudly honoured yesterday, becoming a new grandfather of two baby twin girls. I couldn't help but think, when I was holding them on the weekend, knowing we were going to be debating Bill 98, Bill 100, and now this HST—I'm not sure what the number is, but whatever this numbered bill is. Holding them, I remember thinking, "I wonder what you're going to need to do with respect to housing in the future." It was telling, and it puts it in perspective quite quickly. It was interesting. What is their housing future going to look like?

All of us, I think, in this chamber, or at least most of us—I'll speak for myself—never lost the hope of owning our own home.

I've told the story of when I bought my first house in Guelph for $54,000, and I had $16,000 as a down payment. Interest rates were 19%, I might add, so it was a little daunting when I signed the purchase and sale agreement. Nonetheless, I could make the payments. I was making a little over $30,000 a year. I had a company car at the time, as I was with our company, travelling across southwestern Ontario. I remember the payments. I remember working hard. I could afford to buy that house—$54,000. Today, that house in Guelph is valued at a million dollars, or was—close to a million dollars.

When you think of the income you need to have to sustain a mortgage, with a basic down payment, it's just unattainable, and it's wrong—it's generationally wrong.

So what we're trying to do, step by step, bit by bit, legislative piece by legislative piece—it may not be all exciting, but little by little, cost by cost, we're lowering the time it takes and the cost it takes to get shovels in the ground and build affordably. HST is part of that massive need to lower costs and bring affordability back to the table.

0940

I would just end by saying I hope everyone can support this bill, obviously. I think it is generational in its purpose, in its intended consequence. Ultimately, I'll end by just saying I really do believe we have an honour, a duty, a responsibility and an accountability to keep the dream of home ownership alive and well for generations to come. I hope when everyone else gets to be a grandfather or grandmother or whatever it may be in this Legislature, that thought will stick with you as we build this province and protect this province one day at a time, one person at a time, one family at a time.

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

Ms. Laura Smith: I want to thank both the ministers for providing such fantastic remarks. I want to thank, actually, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing for sharing the picture of his granddaughters. It's quite heartwarming, and I appreciate the connection that we have, especially when we can talk candidly about our hopes and our dreams for the future.

It is a privilege to rise today in this House to speak in support of Bill 114, the HST Relief Implementation Act. I want to begin by once again thanking the Minister of Finance for his remarks and for outlining our government's broader approach on affordability and what we are doing and working on to advance through this bill. I would also like to thank, of course, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing for his leadership and for the critical role he plays in continuing to make Ontario the best place to live.

Today, I would like to focus my remarks on one of the most urgent challenges facing people across our province: housing affordability and supply. At its core, Speaker, this bill is about providing greater clarity and certainty for homebuyers and builders, and that clarity and certainty is desperately needed.

The proposed HST Relief Implementation Act forms part of our government's plan to protect Ontario—a plan focused on strengthening our economy, supporting families and addressing the affordability challenges people across this province are facing.

Ontario's economy does not operate in isolation. Global uncertainty, trade disruptions and rising costs are affecting jurisdictions everywhere. Yet Ontario continues to meet these challenges head-on with responsible, prudent plans focused on long-term resilience. Part of our plan includes more homes for more people at a price they can afford, but we recognize that making housing more affordable is a complex challenge.

Housing affordability cannot be tackled without careful consideration and planning. The supply and price of homes in any economy is the result of complex factors. So increasing home affordability is a structural challenge that requires careful solutions. That's why our government is focused not only on helping buyers, but on speeding up construction and increasing housing supply so that affordability can be sustained over time.

By providing enhanced HST relief on new homes, we are lowering upfront costs for the families of Ontario. At the same time, we are providing clarity and certainty to the building and construction industry so they can move forward with projects that are ready to proceed with greater confidence. This certainty matters, because across

Ontario, housing affordability remains one of the most pressing challenges facing individuals and families. We hear the concerns in every community. We hear it from the young professionals who are working so hard, but they're unsure if home ownership is still within reach. We hear it from Ontario families who are trying to find a home that meets their needs closer to work, closer to school and closer to the family and community supports they rely upon. And we hear the concerns from builders who are ready to build but are facing rising costs, delays and uncertainty. While this bill focuses on delivering immediate relief for homebuyers, it also provides much-needed certainty and clarity for the building industry.

Our government is also taking broader action to address the underlying drivers of housing affordability. For example, through the Transit-Oriented Communities Program, Ontario is advancing mixed-use developments around 17 subway and GO stations in Toronto and the surrounding region. This is important because these projects have the potential to deliver approximately 292,000 new homes, including affordable options, while connecting people to jobs, connecting people to schools and public transit, which helps reduce both housing and transportation costs for those families.

Speaker, people are looking for answers, they're looking for action and they're looking for certainty. That's what the proposed HST Relief Implementation Act delivers. The measures are clear, and the practical steps are there to help lower costs, support home ownership and get more homes built.

Before I turn to the details of this bill, I want to acknowledge the strong support we have heard from our stakeholders across the housing sector, following the announcement of our government's broader housing and affordability measures in the 2026 budget. I, too, have heard from so many of the developers, and it's positive—it is positive—just in the last few days. Part of my riding includes a portion of Vaughan, and we are a building industry in that area. I've had first-hand information from the builders, who have been exceptionally excited about this, and the numbers are good; the initial numbers are good. I'm going to just highlight some of the strong support we've heard from our stakeholders across the housing sector following this announcement of our government's broader housing and affordability measures in the 2026 budget.

The Ontario Home Builders' Association CEO Scott Andison said, "We welcome the Ontario government's 2026 budget, including the HST relief on new homes and its significant infrastructure commitment. Aligning these investments with housing-enabling infrastructure will be key to supporting new supply across the province."

Similarly, in the Greater Ottawa Home Builders' Association, executive director Jason Burggraaf said, after the budget was released, "Along with the HST relief announced yesterday, the capital infrastructure plan will relieve cost pressures on housing-enabling infrastructure and growth. We're also heartened to see a desire by the province to again partner with the federal government to lower development charges for new housing, which is a critical step to further improve housing affordability."

Speaker, these organizations represent the people who are building homes in our province. They understand the realities on the ground, and they understand that if we want to improve affordability, we must act on both cost and supply. The proposed HST Relief Implementation Act is the next step in supporting the implementation of the full 13% HST relief on new homes valued up to $1 million, as announced in March. If passed, this relief would provide up to $130,000 for eligible buyers, and for new homes valued between $1 million and $1.5 million, that maximum relief of $130,000 would be maintained. And for homes valued above $1.5 million, that relief would decrease proportionately to a maximum of $24,000 for homes valued at $1.85 million and above.

This is targeted support. It is designed to focus relief where it will have greatest impact, and it reflects a balanced and responsible approach. And let me be clear about what this means for people. For a family looking to purchase a new home, this relief would make a meaningful and significant difference: a difference in reducing upfront costs, a difference in improving affordability and a difference in turning the dream of home ownership into a reality.

One of the biggest barriers to entering the housing market is the cost at the point of purchase, and by reducing that cost, we are helping to take that next step. We're helping them move forward with confidence, and we are helping to ensure that people in Ontario have a path to home ownership.

0950

But affordability is only one part of that equation. We must also address supply, because without enough homes, affordability will continue to be a challenge. That is why the proposed HST Relief Implementation Act is also about creating the conditions to build more homes. By providing clarity and certainty to our builders, we are helping to move these projects forward, we're helping to reduce hesitation and delay, we're helping to ensure that more homes are built faster, and we're helping to get shovels in the ground faster.

As the Minister of Finance noted, the impact of this measure is significant. The expanded 13% HST relief could stimulate an additional 8,000 housing starts in Ontario next year. It could support 21,000 jobs, and it could boost Ontario's GDP growth by up to $2.7 billion. I should also add that this is going to sustain 100,000 jobs, which is important, especially for the people in Vaughan. You know what? This means more than homes. It's more jobs and a stronger economy.

While the proposed HST Relief Implementation Act focuses on affordability through targeted HST relief, it's also important to recognize that affordability cannot be solved without increasing housing supply. That's why our government is taking broader and sustained action to support housing construction across Ontario. We know that in order to improve affordability over the long term, we must build more homes, more supply, more options and more certainty for the home builders. That's why

we're investing in the conditions that make home construction possible.

Through the Municipal Housing Infrastructure Program, we're helping municipalities build the critical infrastructure needed to support new housing development. This includes roads, water systems and waste water capacity. Since its launch in 2024, this program has helped enable approximately 800,000 new homes across Ontario.

We're also supporting innovative approaches to housing construction, including modular housing. We're supporting innovation in how these homes are built, for example, through modular construction partnerships with Habitat for Humanity, who were at the Legislature just a few days ago. In the area of Toronto and Ottawa, our government is learning how homes can be delivered faster at a lower cost and at scale. These pilot projects are informing future approaches that will help us build more homes sooner, without compromising quality or safety.

Our government is partnering with the city of Toronto and Habitat for Humanity in the GTA to build 33 modular homes—this is in Toronto—in a six-storey condominium at 355 Coxwell Avenue. We're also working with the city of Ottawa and Habitat for Humanity Greater Ottawa to deliver 33 modular townhomes at 40 Beechcliffe Street. These projects are helping us understand how we can build faster, how we can reduce costs and how we can scale new approaches across Ontario.

I'd also like to take a moment, now that we're on the conversation of modular homes, to talk about an important project that the minister and I actually visited. It's a collaborative construction project called Project Tiny Hope, and it provides homes. It's a construction project of modular homes that I visited. This is truly a special project, a provincial and federal combined investment of over $2.4 million through the Canada-Ontario Community Housing Initiative, also known as COCHI, to help build 40 new supportive housing units in St. Thomas. The modular homes are near public transit, a library, child care and stores, and the project is managed by the YMCA, which also provides support services to the residents. I was there to see some of the first homes built. We were there. The residents were about to move in. I should also mention that this housing prioritized our most vulnerable, including seniors, and women and children fleeing violence, some of our most vulnerable citizens. It was a very good day when we saw our partners come together.

We're also investing directly in infrastructure that enables housing growth and protects communities, and through the Housing-Enabling Water System Fund and the Housing-Enabling Core Servicing Stream, our government is supporting critical infrastructure, such as water, waste water and stormwater systems. Since its launch, this program has supported 120 projects across 127 municipalities and First Nations communities. To further support this work, our government is increasing funding by $700 million, bringing the total funding to $875 million. This investment helps ensure that growing communities are not held back by infrastructure constraints.

I would be remiss if I didn't once again talk about my riding of Thornhill, and I would like to give you a practical example of how that fund helps communities get built.

In my riding of Thornhill, we have an area called the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre, a new and growing emerging community. Our government invested $35 million through this fund to enable the construction of new homes. It will enable over 20,000 housing units in my riding of Thornhill on the investment of water management. This investment was crucial in accommodating our growing population.

When you talk about building a home, you cannot simply just walk out into a field, lay down some sticks and you've got a home. There are hookups involved. There are electricity and water that have to be in existence. That $35 million through that fund was crucial in accommodating our growing population. I was proud to stand with the acting Minister of Infrastructure—it was a very, very cold day as we broke ground for that truly important work.

Taken together, these measures reflect a clear approach. We're not only supporting affordability through tax relief; we're also supporting the supply of housing through infrastructure, innovation and partnerships. If we want housing to be more affordable, we simply need more homes. Our government is working closely with the federal government to ensure timely implementation. We're focused on minimizing complexity, and we're focused on ensuring that homebuyers can access the relief they're entitled to. Even as implementation work continues, eligible buyers who meet the criteria and purchase within the defined time frame will be able to apply for the relief once applications are open.

Speaker, the proposed HST Relief Implementation Act builds on a strong foundation. Ontario already provides HST relief through the provincial New Housing Rebate and the new Residential Rental Property Rebate. We also have a rebate for first-time homebuyers, and we are continuing to take action to support purpose-built rental housing.

At the same time, we're making historic investments to support housing growth. Through the $4-billion Municipal Housing Infrastructure Program, through the $1.2-billion Building Faster Fund and through a suite of measures to help municipalities get homes built faster, Speaker, this bill is part of that broader effort. It complements our existing actions, and it strengthens our overall approach to housing.

Over time, development charges and other upfront costs have added significantly to the price of a new home. They've added pressures for homebuyers across Ontario, and these pressures are making it harder for families to get into the market in the first place.

The minister was talking earlier about his first home, and I have a very sweet story to tell as well. I walked into my first home—I was actually seven months pregnant with my child. I was thinking to myself that I want to be able to pass on that job of providing a home for my child. I want to make it affordable for them to have that opportunity. I was very cognitive when I walked into that

house, literally carrying that child seven months in my stomach, realizing, hoping that she's having this opportunity. That's part of this work we're doing here today.

1000

This bill is part of a broader effort. The pressures are making it harder for families to get into the market, and that's why we need to continue to improve housing affordability by taking action from all angles. That includes looking at ways to reduce upfront costs. It means providing targeted relief, like providing enhanced HST relief of up to the full 13% of the HST on new homes. It also means helping to streamline the process to get more homes built faster.

Speaker, our government is taking practical, coordinated action to increase supply and make housing more attainable for the people of Ontario. At the end of the day, this is about people. It's about helping a young person buy their first home. It's about helping families find a place to grow, and it's about ensuring that Ontario remains a place where people can build their future.

The proposed HST implementation act reflects our commitment to lowering costs, to supporting home ownership and to building more homes for the people of Ontario. Speaker, we know there's more work to do. By providing enhanced HST relief on new homes, we are lowering the upfront cost for families of Ontario. And at the same time, we are providing clarity and certainty to the building and construction industry so they can move forward with projects that are ready to proceed with greater confidence.

This certainty matters, because across Ontario housing affordability remains one of the most pressing challenges facing individuals and families. We hear the concern in every community. We hear it from the young professional; we hear it from the Ontario family, who are trying to find a home that meets their needs: closer to work, closer to school and closer to the family and community supports that they rely upon. And we hear the concern from the builders who are ready to build, but they're facing rising costs and delays and uncertainty.

So this is an important step. This is a practical step. Protecting Ontario means protecting the ability of people to build a life right here in Ontario, including that child that was in my stomach so many years ago as I walked into that new home. This bill ensures Ontario has the statutory authority to deliver the enhanced HST relief efficiently, responsibly and in a way that supports both homebuyers and increased housing supply.

You know, we've talked about the first house that somebody purchases, and I know a number of people have shared stories. I recall feeling that weight. It's the most important and substantive purchase that most people make, that a family can make in their lifetime. And this legislation protects the dream of home ownership. And this bill supports that homeowner and that builder and, I should add, preserves so many jobs in the home-building industry—100,000 jobs—and provides so many others.

The details of this bill may be technical, but the fact remains, and the direction is clear. I'm truly hoping that everyone in this House will support this bill. Think back to your first home and think about the excitement that you had. We want to be able to pass that dream to those children who are here and the ones that are coming ahead of us, including the minister's two beautiful new grandchildren.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: I appreciate the speeches that have been made this morning. This government has been in power since 2018. It has had numerous failures with regard to getting homes built. In fact, in 2025, we had the steepest decline in Canada for new home construction.

Can the speakers tell us how much of this failure of theirs will be made up by this initiative?

Hon. Rob Flack: Well, Speaker, I think we all know that we are in a housing crisis. The record starts in 2022; they continue to decline. I won't get into all the reasons why, but again, I want to emphasize that step by step, bill by bill, we're taking the necessary measures to lower the time it takes and the cost it takes to build a house.

This measure, the HST measure, I think will add significant new starts, new builds, new sales. I can say we are well over north of 1,000 new sales—I'm going to get updated numbers later today—since we introduced the legislation. It's having its impact. It's continuing to have its impact. One major home builder has had 500 new sales themselves alone. I talked to many home builders in my home riding and around the London area. Some have seen an extra eight, 10, 12, 16 new home sales where they would have seen very few, if any.

Again, this is going to be a measured approach. We're going to measure it weekly, monthly to see what the outcomes will be, but it's a good question. We'll continue to measure the response, measure the reaction. I'm convinced we're going to see thousands upon thousands of new home sales because of this effort.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Ms. Natalie Pierre: Good morning. Thank you to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and the parliamentary assistant for their remarks and their focus and attention on delivering savings for Ontario residents.

Last weekend, I was at an event in my riding of Burlington, and I was approached by a young man who asked me to relay his thanks to our government. The week previous, he and his partner bought their first home, a brand new home, because of the HST rebate. So we know that this legislation works and will help purchasers of new homes.

Could the minister please share what impact this legislation, if passed, will have on jobs and the economy—not just on purchasers of new homes but, in general, the other impacts that perhaps we haven't spoken about?

Hon. Rob Flack: Those stories are heartwarming for sure. I've heard many myself. I have one in my riding, in Dorchester where we live, where a new home—because they could qualify for a mortgage. They couldn't before. Now they can, and they bought their first home. I've never

seen bigger smiles in my life. They're great stories, and I'm sure there will be thousands more throughout the province.

As much as selling this notion, working with the Minister of Finance and the Premier—yes, it's going to get new homes built, new home sales started. But the big economic driver in this decision is protecting the jobs that already exist. Yes, there will be new jobs, but there are over 100,000 jobs—skilled trade, good-paying, sustainable jobs—that will be protected, that were in jeopardy had we not done this piece of legislation. Add to it the DC-relief program coming forward with $8.8 billion—it's a game-changer. It's important that we did it, and thank you for your story.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

MPP Wayne Gates: Housing: Everybody needs it; we all understand that. Twelve years ago, when I got here, I didn't even know what the word "encampment" was.

When we're talking about the HST break, I understand what the reasoning is. But the real issue started in 2019, when your government decided to take rent controls away from new builds. That's what started the crisis. And now, today in Niagara, they're asking for three, four, five and six months' rent in advance to get a place to rent for a young family with one or two children. It's a mistake.

So my question to you is clear: Will you bring back real rent controls, including new builds, because that's where the crisis started in housing? Will you do that, stop renovictions, and make sure we start building real affordable housing for young families in the province of Ontario?

Ms. Laura Smith: I want to thank the member opposite for his comments. I'm surprised that the member opposite didn't talk about this, but we removed the HST from purpose-built rentals, which was a huge benefit to those vulnerable individuals. Our government is actually protecting Ontario tenants by implementing historic reforms so everybody has a place to call home. We've removed the HST on qualifying new purpose-built rentals.

Last year, we also saw a historic surge in rental housing, with starts over 25,000. It was a surge. We had lots of new housing in the rental area. This is the highest level of rental starts we've ever had. So the plan is working, Madam Speaker. Through 2025 and 2026, rents have continued to fall in the cities and towns across Ontario, especially right here in Toronto.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Andrew Dowie: I want to thank the ministers and parliamentary assistant for their remarks.

One issue that I have seen in my community has been the ability to fund growth-related infrastructure. I saw with the agreement with the federal government that there is going to be an incentivization for municipalities to reduce their development charges to be able to access some of the funding in support of these housing rebates. Those development charges are used for growth-related infrastructure, so I'm hoping the minister can elaborate a bit as to how the Premier's commitment to working with municipalities to eliminate development charges is going to go ahead.

1010

Hon. Rob Flack: Thank you for the great work the member for Windsor–Tecumseh is doing for his residents and throughout this province.

The HST rebate, or reduction program, is a game-changer, but equally so, it is an $8.8-billion deal we negotiated with the federal government. All 444 municipalities—those that levy DCs and those that don't—will be able to qualify for funding out of this program over 10 years.

The details will be announced by the end of this month, I hope, or early June. But here's the deal: You reduce your DCs, you put an application in, and you can qualify for some serious dollars to put infrastructure in the ground.

Again, as I said in my remarks and in my answers, the biggest issue facing home building is, yes, affordability, but municipalities need infrastructure and need it fast. We are putting record amounts of money into that, whether it's the $4 billion already announced, plus the $8.8 billion—and billions more to come. It's crucial. And we're making those investments. Why? Because we have a strong economy able to make those investments and generate that income to make those absolutely important DC reductions and DC supports.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Ms. Peggy Sattler: My question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Last week, I attended the 40th anniversary of Zerin Place Seniors Apartments, which is a non-profit affordable housing complex that has been providing high-quality homes for London seniors for four decades. It really shows the value of investing in non-market homes; the community infrastructure that is created to benefit people for many years into the future.

I want to ask the minister, when can we expect to see this government start to invest in non-market homes to provide housing for people who are some of the most vulnerable in Ontario?

Hon. Rob Flack: Thank you to the member from London West for that question. I would answer simply by saying we currently do in a very significant way. When you take a look at the support we give through the National Housing Strategy along with the federal government, we do support many of those initiatives.

More, obviously, can be done. One of the things members will notice in Bill 98 is that we are eliminating development charges on publicly owned retirement homes, again bringing affordability back to those who need it most: our seniors. We will continue to make such investments as time goes on.

Lowering the cost of construction is important, but making affordable rents is just as important. And to piggyback onto the member from Thornhill's response earlier, we are seeing rents in this province become lower by the day because there's supply on the market. We're going to continue along that pathway. Why, Speaker? Because it's working.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): We are now moving into members' statements.

Second reading debate deemed adjourned.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

MATTAMY SPORTS PARK

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: We know that community spaces and recreational activities are important. All Ontarians—kids, young or old—need outdoor spaces where they can be active, make friends and play their favourite sport.

That's why I was happy to attend the grand opening of Mattamy Sports Park at the Churchill Meadows Community Centre in my riding of Mississauga–Erin Mills. The new outdoor park includes a multi-use trail, picnic spaces and facilities for many sports, including field hockey and tennis.

One of the most exciting features of the park is the new cricket pitch. These facilities will be very useful because cricket is a growing sport in Mississauga and Ontario.

In fact, cricket is actually not a new sport. Cricket has a long history in Ontario and Canada. In 1867, Sir John A. Macdonald declared Canada's first national sport to be cricket.

I'm always happy to join players and support the diversity of Ontario's athletics and sports.

Last month, the Premier visited Mississauga city hall to congratulate over 100 students who had played on their school cricket teams. And just last week, I was honoured to attend a Brampton Super League Cricket awards ceremony.

I send my best wishes to all the cricketers in Ontario this summer. Enjoy the game.

PROTESTS IN ONTARIO

MPP Robin Lennox: Speaker, there are times when it is difficult to find something to be inspired by inside of this House. But lately I've been finding more and more inspiration coming from outside of this place.

Over the past few months, we've seen a movement building among Ontarians who are demanding better from this government. Last month, we saw over 5,000 Ontarians show up to protest in 55 different towns and cities to say that enough is enough. They showed up for public health care, for environmental protection, for affordable housing and to demand an honest and accountable government.

Each person may have had a different reason for showing up, but together they found a common cause: demanding a movement for better governance.

I would like to thank every single person who showed up to one of those actions. You paying attention and showing up is this government's greatest fear. Your courage is contagious, and the unrelenting belief that a brighter future is possible is the exact kind of resistance that we need right now.

So I would like to say solidarity to you, my friends. We in the Ontario NDP stand with you, and we'll see you on the streets.

NATIONAL MONUMENT TO CANADA'S MISSION IN AFGHANISTAN

Mr. Stephen Blais: Earlier this week, I had the honour of attending the ground-breaking ceremony for our National Monument to Canada's Mission in Afghanistan. I was especially proud to attend with my brother, Major James Blais, who served and fought for our country over there.

For many Canadians, the mission in Afghanistan is part of our national history. It was a story on the nightly news. But in Orléans, it's deeply personal. Our community is home to one of the largest concentrations of active armed forces members, veterans and military families anywhere in the country. In fact, people often affectionately refer to Orléans as "CFB Orléans."

But behind that nickname is something real. It reflects service, it reflects sacrifice and it reflects the families who know what it means when a loved one puts on the uniform and answers the call of duty.

The monument being built in our nation's capital will stand as a permanent reminder of the 40,000 Canadians who served in Afghanistan, including the 158 members of the Canadian Armed Forces and the seven Canadian civilians who lost their lives. It will honour soldiers, diplomats, aid workers, journalists, public servants and families whose lives were forever changed by that mission.

And for veterans in communities like Orléans, it sends an important message: Your service mattered. Your sacrifice will not be forgotten. While politicians and governments don't always get things right when you are away or once you come home, please know that your country remains forever grateful.

Applause.

CLARK DEMEESTER

Mr. Brian Riddell: Good morning, Speaker. Today is a very special day. I get the honour of speaking about an incredible young man from my riding. Clark Demeester is in the gallery with his parents, Scott and Samantha, sisters Hannah and Charlotte and his grandparents Michael and Jayne.

Clark did something truly inspiring: He collected 500 books for the Children's Book Bank, and he's only seven years old. Karly-Lynne from the book bank is also here in the gallery to extend thanks to Clark. He received the North Star Award from his Scout troop in North Dumfries, which is the highest honour a Scout can receive.

1020

I could not help but continue this wave of positivity by recognizing him in this House today. We are facing very difficult times, but Clark is a beacon of hope in a world that continuously tests our willingness and ability to help

others. I encourage everyone to share this story in hopes that we can inspire others to go forward. I will be presenting Clark with a certificate and a medal on the grand staircase after question period, and I welcome all members of the Legislature to stop by and say hello to this incredible young man.

The future of our province is looking very bright in the hands of people like Clark.

JESSE TERRY

Mr. Sol Mamakwa: ᒥᓂᑫᐦᑐᓴ. It's a good morning.

I want to congratulate Jesse Terry, of Lac Seul First Nation, who was named 2026 Iditarod rookie of the year. In March, Jesse took the Iditarod Trail Sled Dog Race, known as the Last Great Race on Earth. It is a gruelling 1,000-mile journey across Alaska that goes through frozen rivers, mountain passes and high winds. Jesse recorded the fastest rookie time, completing the race in just 10 days, 13 hours, 36 minutes and three seconds—14th overall.

That result did not happen by chance, but it reflects years of dedication and hard work, starting when Jesse was 11 years old. Since then, Jesse has raised and trained a team of 30 dogs and even built his own sleds. It is clear that for him mushing is more than just a sport; it's about respect for animals, for the land and for the ways of life.

Jesse, from Kiiwetinoong, we are very proud of you. As a musher based in Sioux Lookout, he carries northern strength and Anishinaabe representation onto one of the biggest stages in dog-sled racing. He's also a reminder that the north does not follow; it leads. Congratulations. Meegwetch.

PRIMARY CARE

Hon. Laurie Scott: I rise today to announce important health news from Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock. Our government is making decisive investments to strengthen our community and connect more residents to primary care. We are delivering over $1.8 million to the City of Kawartha Lakes Family Health Team, connecting over 5,000 residents to reliable ongoing care. In Brock township, more than $2.47 million is being invested in the Brock Community Health Centre, helping another 5,600 residents access primary care. Seniors will get the support they need, parents will feel more confident in their children's care, and rural residents will access health services closer to home.

In a region as large and rural as Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock, access to quality care is vital. These investments close gaps, making the system more local and dependable.

Meaningful health care access is not just about connecting patients; it also ensures the next generation of providers is prepared to help. Just yesterday, our government announced the expansion of the Ontario Learn and Stay Grant to Trent University and Fleming College. Through this $14-million expansion, our government will help ease students' financial burdens in nursing, paramedicine and lab technology programs by covering tuition, books and expenses when they commit to serving Ontario communities that need them.

This is more than an investment; it's a commitment to the well-being of our region and for generations to come. Together, we are building a stronger, healthier community where every resident can rely on high-quality, accessible health care.

OTTAWA CHARGE HOCKEY TEAM

MPP Catherine McKenney: I rise today to celebrate something that Ottawa does exceptionally well: show up for our awesome women's hockey team. The Ottawa Charge are back in the PWHL playoffs, and Ottawa is electric.

This is a team that has grit built into their hockey DNA. Last season, they fought their way to the Walter Cup finals. This season, they clinched their playoff spot with a dramatic 3-0 shutout in the final regular season game. And now they are in a tight, thrilling semifinal series against the Boston Fleet, tied 1-1, with game 3 coming home to Ottawa this Friday night.

Speaker, these players are the best in the world. Goaltender Gwyneth Philips; captain and scoring leader Jocelyne Larocque, a defender and Team Canada legend logging the most ice time on this team, night after night—these are women who compete at the Olympics and then come home and compete for Ottawa. We could not be luckier, and we could not be prouder. And we show up for them—the fans, the noise, the girl pride.

The Ottawa Charge are bigger than hockey. They show us what happens when women's sport is taken seriously, when we invest in it, celebrate it, and pack the building.

I know that all of Ottawa will be cheering them on this Friday.

Go Charge!

PRIMARY CARE

Ms. Natalie Pierre: I'm pleased to rise today to share some great news for the people of Burlington.

Last week, alongside my seatmate the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health and MPP for Essex, we announced the opening of the first community health centre in Halton region. Through our government's primary care action plan, this more-than-$2-million investment will connect thousands of people in my community of Burlington with a primary care practitioner and will bring together a team of health care professionals under one roof, making it easier for people to access the care they need closer to home. For many Burlington residents, the community health centre will make a real and meaningful difference in their day-to-day lives. It means more timely access to care, better coordination of services, and improved health outcomes.

I want to thank the team at Support House, along with the Burlington Ontario Health Team, for their leadership and dedication. Their work is helping to build a more

connected, compassionate health care system for our community. Together, we are taking important steps to ensure that people in Burlington and across Ontario—including in Haliburton, Kawartha Lakes and Brock—can access high-quality health care closer to home for years to come.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Lorne Coe: I'm pleased to report that Lakeridge Health in the region of Durham has launched a women's health collective. This program will include more opportunities for Durham women to connect with health care professionals, while breaking down barriers and transforming how women's health is approached. By providing educational sessions on a wide variety of health topics, the women's health collective aims to move our health care system forward and promote real change for Durham women.

I want to congratulate the president and CEO of Lakeridge Health, Cynthia Davis, for her and her team's ongoing commitment to women's health with the launch of the women's health collective. Through their dedicated work, Lakeridge Health will see to it that women in Whitby and across other parts of the region of Durham receive dependable and lifelong care when and where they need it.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Mr. Ric Bresee: I'm very pleased today to welcome to this House, from Hastings Highlands, the entire council: Mayor Tony Fitzgerald; Deputy Mayor Tammy Davis; councillors Nancy Matheson, Tracy Hagar, Joan Nieman, Keith Buck, Roger Davis; and CAO David Stewart. Welcome to Queen's Park, guys. I really appreciate you being here.

Hon. Graham McGregor: It's my pleasure to welcome the team from Golden Age Village for the Elderly here to Queen's Park. Golden Age Village is building an almost-done building, the first-ever Vietnamese long-term-care home in Ontario history. They're doing it in my favourite city: Brampton, Ontario.

I'd like to welcome Van-Hoa Duong, Minh-Chau Duong, Thanh-Nha Thi Nguyen, Quynh Huynh, Quang Quang Nguyen, Anh Tu Chau, Dung Phuong Le, Duy Van Pham, Kim Noi Vuong, Trinh Thi Tuyet Lu, Minh Thi Hong Ho, and Giao Ho. Welcome to Queen's Park.

1030

MPP Silvia Gualtieri: I am proud to welcome the Ontario Association of Fire Chiefs. I welcome OAFC president and fire chief Jeremy Parkin, OAFC board members and dedicated fire chief officers here to Queen's Park to advocate for fire and life safety for all Ontarians, but especially to my hometown deputy chief, Samuel Williams.

MPP Lisa Gretzky: I would like to welcome Windsor Fire Chief Jamie Waffle here today, and also numerous members of Unifor who are here for an IPV awareness and advocacy day. To spare people time, I will not read the entire list, but I do want to give a special mention to Tracy Ramsey, who's the national women's director; Samia Hashi, who's the Ontario regional director; and to the Windsor folks: Sue McKinnon, Manny Cardoso and Jodi Nesbitt. Welcome to Queen's Park.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: I want to welcome St. Catharines Fire Chief Dave Upper and Deputy Fire Chief Andrea DeJong to the Legislature this evening. Please join me in congratulating Chief Upper for completing 35 dedicated years in fire service. Congratulations on such an incredible accomplishment. Thank you for your courage and leadership. Welcome to your House.

M^me^ Lucille Collard: I'd like to welcome the Ontario Association of Landscape Architects. They hosted the breakfast this morning. Welcome to your House.

MPP Paul Vickers: I'd like to welcome three chiefs to the House: Jack Burt from Bruce Peninsula, Courtney Allen from King City and Ryan Murrell from Muskoka. Thank you for helping protect us and save us.

Hon. Steve Clark: I just want to take this opportunity to say that today's page captain is our page from Leeds–Grenville–Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, Azaad Sekhon. I want members to look under the clock to meet his grandparents Lucille and Sukhdev Sekhon and his dad, Danny Sekhon. Welcome to Queen's Park.

Hon. Graydon Smith: I want to welcome some fire chiefs from my riding of Parry Sound–Muskoka here with the Ontario Association of Fire Chiefs today: Chief Chad Dowell from Georgian Bay, Chief Gary Monahan from Huntsville, Chief Jeremy Alldred-Hughes from Lake of Bays, Chief Kevin Plested from Bracebridge, Chief Ryan Murrell from Muskoka Lakes and Chief Jared Cayley from Gravenhurst. Welcome to Queen's Park.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I would like to welcome Chief Mark Pankhurst of the Whitby Fire and Emergency Services as well as Chief Aaron Burridge, Ajax Fire and Emergency Services. Welcome to Queen's Park.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: I would like to welcome Lewis Waring from my riding, who's visiting today. Yes, the stories are true.

Ms. Peggy Sattler: For introductions today, I want to welcome all of the Unifor members who are here for IPV advocacy. A special welcome to Unifor Local 302 from London and to London West constituent Shinade Allder, who is Unifor's Ontario regional council chair.

I also want to welcome two scientists who are joining us today for Science Meets Parliament, Dr. Katelyn Esmonde from London West, who is a Western University professor, and Dr. Maxwell Smith.

And finally, I want to welcome Vicky Pearson from Community Living London and the amazing New Vision Advocates.

MPP Tyler Watt: I'd like to give a shout out to David Hill, the awesome city councillor from Barrhaven, and Russell Ullyatt.

I'd also like to introduce the Science Meets Parliament group at the Legislature. A special welcome to Homa Pour, Chris Caputo, Matt McTaggart, Wendi Zhou, Zainab

Taleb, Cecile Jugroot, Mehrdad Hariri and Effie Pereira. Welcome to your House.

MPP George Darouze: I would like to welcome my friend and colleague Councillor David Hill from the city of Ottawa to Queen's Park today, the councillor for Barrhaven West, alongside his office staff, Russell Ullyatt. The councillor is a great representative for his community and our city, and I look forward to meeting with him today. Thank you, and welcome to your House.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): I'm going to extend it one little bit for Kitchener Centre.

Ms. Aislinn Clancy: Thank you, Speaker. Today is Community Living Day at Queen's Park, and I'd like to welcome, from my riding, Al Mills, executive director of Extend-A-Family; Ann Bilodeau, the ED of KW Habilitation; and Julie Thompson, director of OASIS. Welcome to your House.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): To our guests who are with us today, it's my fault if your name was not mentioned. I usually have a hard cut-off time of five minutes, but your members can come back to the House at 1 o'clock and introduce you then.

ONTARIO LEGISLATURE INTERNSHIP PROGRAMME ANNIVERSARY

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

Hon. Steve Clark: Speaker, if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent for members to wear the OLIP pin in the House and make statements celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Ontario Legislature Internship Programme, with two minutes for the government, two minutes for the official opposition, two minutes for the third party and two minutes for the independent members as a group.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): The government House leader is seeking unanimous consent to allow members to wear OLIP pins in the House and make statements celebrating 50 years of the Ontario Legislature Internship Program, with two minutes for the government, two minutes for the official opposition, two minutes for the third party and two minutes for the independent members. Agreed? Agreed.

I recognize the government House leader.

Hon. Steve Clark: It's a great honour and a privilege for me, on behalf of the government, to rise in the House and recognize and celebrate the 50th anniversary of one of the Ontario Legislature's most impactful initiatives, the Ontario Legislature Internship Programme.

For five decades, the OLIP program has given us highly qualified interns and given them the opportunity to step inside our Legislature and experience first-hand how our democracy works. But more than that, it gives these emerging leaders the chance to participate in it in a very meaningful way.

What makes the OLIP program so unique is its non-partisan structure. Interns have the opportunity to work with members of provincial Parliament both from the government and the opposition side, and, Speaker, I have to say, in a time where political polarization reaches a number of houses around the world, our OLIP program is a symbol of collaboration, of mutual respect and a shared commitment we all have to public service.

Through those 10 months in the program, our interns gain invaluable experience and insight into our provincial political process.

The impact of the program really extends far beyond our Legislature. The OLIP alumni have established themselves in a variety of positions, in government, business, journalism, law and academic life.

Speaker, I know each of us could speak of their participation in the program. I'm proud to say that I've participated—wait a minute; it's not "participated." I've been selected six times for the OLIP program. I think that's very interesting, because a lot of people don't know that we don't interview the interns; they interview us. It's their choice, for us, on how we participate. I've had six incredibly bright interns who have really rewarded not just themselves but myself with this experience.

I want to take this opportunity, Speaker, to recognize the leadership behind the program. OLIP academic director Peter Constantinou's guidance and commitment has really helped shape this OLIP program into one of the most—

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

MPP Jamie West: It's my absolute honour to speak about OLIP's 50th anniversary on behalf of the Ontario NDP and our leader, Marit Stiles.

I want to say, I also had OLIP interns, and just how refreshing and helpful it is as a new MPP to have people like Braelyn and Lindsey and Alex and Giulia—who is hiding over there and doesn't want to be noticed. We all love our interns.

The government House leader had mentioned how it's non-partisan. The government whip now—Giulia is working in his office. Yesterday we were joking about how I sat beside her with a sign saying "Team Sudbury."

But one of the reasons is because of the quality, the excellence, the integrity—just to get into the intern program, the bar is so high that we know that we're going to be served in an excellent way.

The reality is, we're lucky to have interns. We're lucky to be part of the program, and we compete. They interview us, which is a whole different method than anyone who's been in co-op, and we're trying to show and sell ourselves to the interns.

Many of our interns end up working in our offices. Astrid Krueger and Jad El Tal are both working in our leader's office. I have a list: Alia Mufti, Sayyidah Jaffer, Karissa Singh, Emily Trudeau, Bridget Carter-Whitney, Sharon Lee, Dan O'Brien, Steffi Burgi, Taylor Pizzirusso, Razan Akiba, Misha Apel, Ritika Gupta and Chris Charlton, who actually went on to become an MP for the New Democratic Party.

I want to remind everybody, in the remaining time that we have, that the 50th anniversary will be in the main

lobby. It's important to go down, show your support and love for the interns that we all care about.

1040

I want to thank the OLIP program and all the interns on behalf of myself and my party, but really, on behalf of all of us. We're so lucky to have you as interns.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): I recognize the member for Ottawa–Vanier.

Mme Lucille Collard: It's really a pleasure to rise to recognize the remarkable Ontario Legislature Internship Programme. For 50 years, the OLIP program has provided recent university graduates with a unique opportunity to peek behind the curtain and see the inner workings of the Ontario Legislature. These exceptional interns have the opportunity to join the office of one MPP from the governing party and one MPP from the opposition parties—a unique experience that allows them to consider perspectives from both sides of the aisle. As someone who values cross-party collaboration and mutual respect in our debates, I cannot overstate the importance of such an experience.

I was lucky enough to have had three different interns over the years, one of whom is David Nightingale, who later became my EA and is now our caucus' very esteemed director of legislative affairs.

I know the valuable contribution these interns make to our offices. They bring diverse perspectives and an incredible drive to learn. They are talented, reliable and effective. And I know that all of our caucus members have benefited from their professionalism over time, with a lot of gratitude.

I want to thank the leadership of OLIP for their commitment to the program and all the support they provide to the interns each year.

And to all the interns who have participated in this wonderful program over the past 50 years: Thank you for the many contributions you have made to this Legislature and the impressive legacy you have left behind. I look forward to seeing many of you at the reception tonight.

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

Ms. Aislinn Clancy: I'm proud to rise today to welcome past and present OLIP interns back to Queen's Park. Today, we celebrate all that you've contributed in the past 50 years of this program. The OLIP program has offered bright young minds like yours immeasurable opportunities to gain hands-on experience and contribute to our democratic process. I'm sure this is a life-changing experience that you'll remember for years, but just know that it's memorable for us too. We've been so grateful to benefit from your kind hearts, your open minds, and your sharp intellects. You've made a big impact on our teams, and we learn so much from you.

To former OLIP interns: Thanks for all you've done to contribute to making Ontario a better place.

And to current and future OLIP interns: We know that you'll do great things. You might be sitting here or moving mountains outside of this place.

The Greens have been lucky to have several interns in our time here who have made a major impact on our office. Each intern has become an essential part of our team, and it's always hard to see them go.

On behalf of Mike and myself, I would like to give a special shout-out to Elizabeth, Dia, Evan, and Alex.

I also want to thank the Canadian Political Science Association and the OLIP legislative coordinators, Nick and Tanzima, for administering an amazing, once-in-a-lifetime opportunity and giving these young people an experience of a lifetime.

To the OLIP program: Happy 50th, and here's to 50 more awesome years.

HOUSE SITTINGS

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): I beg to inform the House that the Clerk has received written notices from the government House leader indicating that temporary changes in the weekly meeting schedule of the House are required, and therefore, pursuant to standing order 9(h), the House shall commence at 9 a.m. on Monday, May 11, 2026, for the proceeding orders of the day, and pursuant to standing order 9(g), the afternoon routine on Wednesday, May 13, 2026, shall commence at 1 p.m.

QUESTION PERIOD

GOVERNMENT JET

Ms. Marit Stiles: This question is for the Premier.

Not too long ago, this Premier indulged himself in quite a shopping spree—a $30-million shopping spree for a private luxury jet. Now he swears he returned it. He says, "Just trust me."

Premier, what we would like to know is, how can we trust you? The people of Ontario don't trust you. Will you release the receipts?

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

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: Madam Speaker, what the people of Ontario trust is that this Premier and this government are going to build this economy, create the conditions for good jobs—a million more jobs in this province.

Every single day, the Premier and everyone on this side of the floor and the group over there are fighting to create good-paying jobs for the people of Ontario.

Let's just think about the budget that the folks over there didn't vote for and what we had in the budget for Windsor. Well, let's talk about Windsor. Expanding Highway 3—did they vote for that? No, they did not. How about the next-door battery plant, supporting 2,500 jobs? Those are real jobs, Madam Speaker. How about the QEW Garden City Skyway bridge twinning project, so important for the region? Did they support that, member from Windsor? No. The members from Windsor say no.

This government is building the economy, building jobs, supporting regions like Windsor. They did not support it. This side of the House did.

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

Ms. Marit Stiles: Building one private luxury jet at a time doesn't seem like a plan to me. And I get it. I get it: The Premier, this government, they want us to all just move on. But you cannot brush this off and pretend like it never happened, Speaker—$30 million.

The truth is that this is and has always been about priorities. Some 700,000 Ontarians are looking for work right now. They can't find a job, and the only time that this Premier ever talks about the economy is when he's in a jam.

I would like to ask again: While he is failing at protecting Ontario, can the Premier at least release these receipts?

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: I think the Leader of the Opposition mentioned jobs. Didn't I just mention the 2,500 jobs in Windsor that they did not support in the budget?

Let's keep going. Let's talk about Hamilton. Let's talk about the great—

Interjection.

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: Niagara—oh, Niagara is trying of jump ahead of Hamilton here. Hold on, cowboy, we're starting with Hamilton over here: $18 million for medical isotope production at the McMaster nuclear reactor—$18 million. Thank you, Minister of Colleges and Universities. Where were you when we were talking about that?

The Hamilton Health Sciences hospital renovation, health care, investing $64 billion in building hospitals and renovating hospitals: Did you vote for that? The answer is no.

How about—here we go—completing the West Lincoln Memorial Hospital? Here we go. They didn't vote for it. This side did. We're building on—

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

Ms. Marit Stiles: Speaker, there is a cloud hanging over this government. Hiding the receipts is not creating new jobs, buying a luxury jet is not bringing gas prices down, and the people of Ontario deserve to know how this government is spending their hard-earned tax dollars.

Now, look, I've got to admit I don't have a lot of experience with returning private luxury jets, but the other day I was at Canadian Tire returning some light bulbs, got a receipt—it's probably in the bottom of my bag somewhere. So all we're asking is, show us the receipts.

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: The only cloud is the NDP trying to find their way in the fog. They can't seem to find their way on the economic highway to prosperity, Madam Speaker.

Well, let's go north. Let's go to Thunder Bay. Where's Thunder Bay? They're right there, working hard back there. Some $62 million in Geraldton's Main Street rehab project, the gateway to the Ring of Fire—do you not support the Ring of Fire and building infrastructure in the North?

The Minister of Indigenous Affairs is working overtime every single day to get the Webequie agreement to unlock economic development and speed up construction, with shovels in the ground starting this spring.

Hon. Greg Rickford: Hundreds of jobs.

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: Hundreds of jobs, says the Minister of Indigenous Affairs.

How about the $400 million for the Ontario Community Infrastructure Fund, helping over 390 municipalities, many in the North? That is what Ontario building is about.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Ms. Marit Stiles: You want to talk about jobs? Let's talk about jobs. This question is to the Premier.

Speaker, this Premier loves to distract from his many scandals and mishaps by talking about how focused he is on protecting Ontario. Well, not only are 700,000 Ontarians out of work right now, but last night, we learned that Honda is planning to halt their EV production plant in Alliston. A multi-billion-dollar project set to create over a thousand jobs now looks like it's going to be gone—no checks, no balances.

Can the Premier tell us what, if any, strings were attached to the $2.5 billion that he promised to Honda for that project?

1050

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): The Minister of Economic Development.

Hon. Victor Fedeli: The short answer is there's no money that has been released to Honda whatsoever—period.

But when we came to office in 2018, we faced a real choice: Do we continue down the path of the Liberals and the NDP and get Ontario out of manufacturing, or do we protect the 100,000 men and women who were working in the auto sector? We chose to protect those jobs and support an auto sector that has become a global powerhouse. Honda has a 40-year legacy of producing vehicles here in Ontario. Their 11 millionth vehicle just rolled off the assembly line in Alliston. They have told us they're here to stay.

The 4,200 men and women—we've always said to those 4,200 men and women that the auto companies know the products they need to produce best. We will always be here to support whatever products they want to create.

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

Ms. Marit Stiles: It doesn't seem to be working very well, Premier.

I'm going to go back to the Premier. This government was so busy trying to hide their egregious cover-up tactics in that budget that they forgot what budgets are actually supposed to do, which is deliver a plan for the future of this province. Almost a year ago, the Premier promised that he was going to hold Honda to account when they first threatened to pause—that was the last time they did that—

and now Honda is threatening again the whole future of Ontario's auto sector.

So I want to know what the Premier's plan is to stop good auto jobs from leaving this province.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Minister of Economic Development.

Hon. Victor Fedeli: Let's look at what's actually happening in the auto sector, because we're seeing resilience in the face of global uncertainty. Look at General Motors, just a couple of weeks ago, a $691-million investment to build the next generation of the V8 engines in St. Catharines; Toyota, a $1.1-billion investment in January to build the new RAV4 hybrid right here in Ontario. Stellantis brought back a third shift, 1,700 jobs in Windsor. That's the first time since 2020 that they've had a third shift. Ford is making a multi-billion-dollar investment in Oakville that will open later this year.

So while the opposition does not support those investments, auto companies know that Ontario is the place to build vehicles in the world.

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

Ms. Marit Stiles: Speaker, we have heard all of this before. This is what this government said when we asked about the Stellantis jobs. Some 3,000 leaving Brampton—that's 30,000 spinoff jobs. CAMI jobs in Ingersoll—and they had no solutions for Diageo workers in Amherstburg either in manufacturing. All those jobs are gone now. So the Premier clearly has no plan to stop jobs—good jobs—from leaving in this province. He loves to be invited to shiny announcements, to do the photo ops, to pat himself on the back, to gift himself a private luxury jet, but when jobs are at risk, he is nowhere to be found.

So I want to know again what conditions, if any, are attached to this deal with Honda, and what is this Premier going to do to fight for those jobs?

Hon. Victor Fedeli: We're in close contact with all of our auto manufacturing contacts, including Honda, and again, I repeat, no money has been released whatsoever.

Global automakers continue to face the challenges from the US tariffs, but they know that Ontario is integral to their success. That's why we've seen Toyota with a $1.1-billion investment, or General Motors with an almost $700-million investment, or Ford with a multi-billion-dollar investment to retool Oakville.

So while automakers readjust to the market conditions, several Ontario plants are in the process of ramping up. Whether it be Honda or any other automaker, we're committed to working with them to bring more good-paying jobs to the people of Ontario.

GOVERNMENT JET

Mr. John Fraser: My question is for the President of the Treasury Board. So here we go again; let's try once more to get the President of the Treasury Board to give us the details of the Premier's purchase of the luxury private jet.

Yesterday, after question period, the Premier gave a very unclear answer to the media as to the status of his luxury private jet. So my question is really simple: At this moment, who actually owns the Premier's luxury private jet?

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

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: The House leader has been clear. The President of the Treasury Board has been clear. The Minister of Finance—

Interjections.

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: No, I was at a press conference. The President of the Treasury Board responded to the questions from the media. I've responded to the questions from the media. We've all been clear. I was standing beside the Premier yet again yesterday, and he was crystal clear.

You know who's not accepting clearness? It's those folks. They can't take a straight answer. That is the answer, Madam Speaker. We've been clear; we've been on the record. But we're moving forward to build the economy, build good paying jobs, build infrastructure in this province. It's about time that the member of the independent party gets with it, gets with the program.

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

Mr. John Fraser: I would like to hear from the President of the Treasury Board, not the Premier's copilot. We need an answer, okay?

Here's what the Premier had to say after question period. This is what he said, and listen closely: "We did a clean 'giveback' to Bombardier, if you want to call it that, and anything that is extra—and maybe there's nothing extra—we'll make it transparent." And, "Again, we will make it transparent as we get the transfer done," declining to say when he was going to make it public.

We just want a simple answer: Who owns the darn plane, President of the Treasury Board?

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: We criss-cross this province, and one thing we keep hearing about is that our economy is at risk. We're not an island here in Ontario, folks. Breaking news: We're not an island; we're part of a global economy. There are challenges in the global economy.

We just tabled a budget that we all just voted for. While the member from Ottawa talks about that, let's talk about the things in the budget for Ottawa that the member opposite did not vote for. The new deal with the city of Ottawa for $543 million—he didn't vote for it and he's in Ottawa. Madam Speaker, the Ottawa Hospital civic centre—more money for building that and renovating the hospital there; he didn't vote for it. Let's talk about expanding Highway 17 from two lanes to four lanes. Guess what? The member from Ottawa Centre did not vote and support Ottawa. That was in the budget—

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

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): I have not recognized you.

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Order.

I recognize the leader of the third party.

Mr. John Fraser: The Premier and this government are tired, out of touch and losing it. The President of the Treasury Board is supposed to guard the treasury—the taxpayers' money—and apparently, she's not doing a great job of that right now. And just so all of you on the front bench don't get comfortable, you're all the ones who said to the Premier, including his copilot, "Yes, you can have a luxury private jet," while there are families in my riding who are struggling to put food on the table.

In every one of your ridings, there are thousands of people looking for work, out of a job, but it was okay to spend $29 million on the Premier's luxury private jet.

A simple question to the President of the Treasury Board, one more time—this is beginning to feel like Keel Digital Solutions and the forensic audit. It's déjà vu all over again. Will the President of the Treasury Board—

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

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: You've got a time limit there.

Madam Speaker, the member opposite raised that the people in his riding are struggling. Then I ask the question: When we put forward the $8 million for the Alexander Community Centre, thanks to this great Minister of Sport, did the member from Ottawa support it in his own community? The answer is no.

How about the new interchange at Highway 416 so more people can move, renovations there? Madam Speaker, this member from Ottawa did not support that. But wait, there's more: funding to revitalize the downtown centre, including the new Ottawa Police Service hub in the Rideau Centre.

1100

We've all been there, Madam Speaker. We all see that. We're stepping forward, helping the people of Ottawa, helping them with their bills, helping them with infrastructure, helping them with health care, and helping them with a new sports recreation centre thanks to this Minister of Sport.

GOVERNMENT JET

Mr. John Fraser: Back to the President of Treasury Board: I'm going to try one more time. I think we're up to—I don't know; is this like the 10th attempt?

We learned in November 2018, barely six months in, that the Premier really loved luxury private jets on the public dime. In November 2018, the Premier chartered a luxury jet from Chartright Air Group for a northern fundraising tour for him and his entourage. He tried to do it on the taxpayer dime, got caught, and the PC party had to pay $29,000 for that three-day trip.

Now, eight years later, their Premier is trying to do the same thing again: another luxury private jet, sliding it by. But it's not $29,000 this time; it's $29 million.

Will the President of the Treasury Board, for this $29-million luxury jet, just give us one detail?

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

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: Speaker, here's the one detail that I can give: Not one member from Ottawa, whether it's the member from Ottawa South, the member from Ottawa Centre—none of those MPPs from Ottawa supported the budget and all the funding that I just mentioned for the people of Ottawa. So look inward.

But you know what? If you don't want to support the people of Ottawa, why don't we talk about the good people of Durham? And maybe you can support them.

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

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: How about the refurbishment of the Pickering nuclear station that will create up to 28,000 new jobs? You have that opportunity.

How about the 18,000 jobs in Darlington to support that community and building these small modular reactors?

How about, in the great riding of Whitby, this member's great support for the constituency there for the new Charles H. Best addition for type 2 diabetes? Way to go.

And by the way, let's not stop there. You have the opportunity to support and vote for the extension of the GO train from Oshawa to Bowmanville. Will you join us—

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

Interjections.

Mr. John Fraser: Oh, my God; they don't want me to talk.

Speaker, this is the 11th time I'm asking this question. I'll try it this time again.

Here's what the Globe and Mail had to say from that article on November 23, 2018. You can check it out: "The Globe asked" Mr. Ford "for documentation showing that the Ontario PC Party paid for the trip, and when they agreed to do so, and if the Premier will be travelling on" a private jet "in the future"—little did they know.

"Mr. Ford's office did not provide an invoice or documentation"—sound familiar?—"as to when the PC Party paid, and would only say this was the first time Mr. Ford used a chartered plane since the ... election." That was six months in, right?

Can the President of the Treasury Board just tell us something, anything?

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: The member opposite can go around in circles all day long and chase his tail, because that's what he's doing. He's going around in circles. We've seen that before.

But let's talk about what we're doing: building Ontario. Do you know, Madam Speaker, we have the lowest debt-to-GDP since 2012, in over 14 years? And do you know what happened in that time? When they were in government, they increased taxes, so you'd think they'd increase the revenues and get the credit rating upgrade. Madam Speaker, they got downgraded—credit rating downgrades—while they were in power, which raised borrowing costs, which means there's less money for

health care, less money for education, less money for social services.

Thanks to the good work of all the people here on the Conservative side, we have lowered the debt burden, lowered the deficit, got two credit rating upgrades and lowered the borrowing costs for all the people of Ontario.

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

Mr. John Fraser: By the co-pilot's rationale, there's $29 million less for really important things like kids with special education or wait times in hospitals, so I love his argument.

This is the 12th time I'm asking the President of the Treasury Board to simply give us an answer—just stand up—because she signed the check. It happened at Treasury Board. It's $29 million.

There is a principle of ministerial accountability. So can we have one detail, a simple detail, a simple answer to any question you want to answer, President, as to the details of the Premier's purchase of a luxury private jet for him and his entourage?

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: Madam Speaker, I just have that image of going around and around in circles chasing their tails, so keep going there.

But this gives me an opportunity for another thing mentioned in the budget: the $25 million for Hastings Highlands to rebuild Highway 62, which is great for jobs and great for tourism in the great area—thank you to the great member from that area—and especially, this will help the forestry industry.

Madam Speaker, while we're at it, in the budget, we had a record investment in health care: $101 billion in health care; $43 billion for education; $22 billion dollars for social services—big investments for the people of Ontario. The party opposite had a chance to support the budget; had a chance to support health care, education and social services in this province; had a chance to support the people of Ontario, and you know what they said? They said, "No, thanks. We'll just go around in circles."

RACE-BASED DATA

M^me^ France Gélinas: Members of the Black Women's Institute for Health are here in the gallery. In November, they released their report, Voices Unheard: Healthcare Barriers and Lived Experience of Black Women in Canada. Their 2,000-person survey documents the racism in our health care system and how it affects the health and lives of Black people.

Collecting race-based data is the first step if we want to make things better. Will the Minister of Health mandate the collection of race-based data in our health care system?

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

Mr. Anthony Leardi: It is, of course, reasonable for people of various communities in Ontario to expect a health care system that responds to their specific needs. In fact, our government already has a Black Health Plan, which is including a Black health and social services hub, which is an integrated hub. That was a $25-million investment. It is the first of its kind, and it offers a range of targeted programs and activities in primary care, in mental health and addictions, and social services. The lessons learned at this hub and the programs developed through this hub then can be shared with the entire province of Ontario, helping members of the Black community and other communities as well.

These are the investments we are making in our health care system to serve the communities of Ontario.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): The member for Nickel Belt.

M^me^ France Gélinas: The Voices Unheard report is a call to action. It is Black people telling us how to make the system better.

Yesterday, my colleagues and I introduced the Black Health Equity Act. This bill takes the recommendations from the report—developed by Black people for Black people—and put them into law. The first step to solve the racism problem is to collect the data, but we must also act and take the steps needed to address health inequity affecting Black communities.

I'm hoping that every MPP in this House wants equitable, culturally safe and anti-racist health care, so will the minister listen to the 2,000 testimonies and pass the Black Health Equity Act?

Mr. Anthony Leardi: Various communities in the province of Ontario do have specific health care concerns which are specific to their community, and that's why our government specifically responds to those health care concerns. With regard to the Black community, we have a Black Health Plan. As mentioned previously, that includes an integrated Black health and social services hub. It also includes various services and other programs.

1110

One of those is a specific program which targets sickle cell, and it includes a pre-screening program that is specific for sickle cell and is provided for newborn children across Ontario. That includes 12 specific clinics dedicated to sickle cell. This is the type of program that we offer under the Black Health Plan, responding to the specific health needs of various communities.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Mr. Adil Shamji: Madam Speaker, I can tell that the Premier loves his critical minerals, because the irony with him is astonishing. The man is so unbelievably out of touch. This is a guy who ordered Ontario's public servants back to work while working from home himself—a guy who gutted student assistance and then accepted a free degree. This is a man who promised to end the gravy train by buying a gravy plane.

But of all the most outrageous and ironic things that this Premier has done, it's been to claim that he would lead the most transparent government in our history and then dismantle freedom of information.

The Premier says he's a man of the people, but every action he takes reveals that he thinks he's above the people.

We can't even get the receipts for his gravy plane. Why does the Premier act like he's accountable to no one?

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

Hon. Stephen Crawford: The Premier is accountable to the people of Ontario, and that's why he puts his phone number out to the people of Ontario: so that they can connect with him, so he can get feedback. I've never seen a Premier or a leader anywhere, quite frankly, in the Western world that has done that. So I think we can appreciate that.

Going back to the FOI: The legislation we brought in in the budget bill was legislation that was long overdue—40 years before it had been adapted or changed.

In fact, I'm sure the members opposite understand that accountability is still the same. The Auditor General still has the same oversight; so does the Integrity Commissioner. There's no difference: 95% of what was FOI-able is still FOI-able, and all decisions made by government are still fully accountable, Speaker.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): The member for Don Valley East.

Mr. Adil Shamji: It's been eight long years of this very tired Premier, and he is so obviously out of touch.

Ontarians are struggling to put food on the table, but he's too busy rubbing shoulders at private dinners and private clubs, trying to get himself a private plane. He's like a terrible movie that's been dubbed badly, because his words and his actions simply don't line up. He promised he'd protect Ontario and then mistakenly released 150 prisoners while running up our debt to over half a trillion dollars and shopping for a jet.

Now that Ontarians are seeing through his elitism and his polling is crashing, he's revving up his propaganda with over $100 million in self-promotional ads while crushing criticism by eliminating freedom of information.

If he's as accountable as he says he is, will he prove it by sharing the receipts today of the luxury jet he bought and sold last week?

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

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: I think I heard the member opposite talk about protecting Ontario. Do you know who's protecting Ontario? The great firefighters that we have in the Legislature. They are the people protecting Ontario.

So Madam Speaker, clearly—

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): The member for Ajax has been warned. The member for Don Valley East has been warned.

Continue.

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: We're showing the people of Ontario that we may disagree about some things, but we agree on the great firefighters and the first responders who keep us safe and protect us in our communities—

Interjection.

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

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: Let's talk about the great Attorney General and Solicitor General. In the budget: $7.4 billion—a record amount to invest, protecting our communities, making families feel safe. And these folks are going to continue doing that in their jobs.

TECHNOLOGY SECTOR

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: My question is for the Minister of Economic Development, Job Creation and Trade. As artificial intelligence continues to reshape our economy, the global race to attract investment is only intensifying. Companies are searching for jurisdictions that offer not just talent but the full ecosystem, from research and infrastructure to commercialization and scale.

Speaker, Ontario is stepping up. Whether it is in tech, life sciences or advanced manufacturing, we are proving time and time again that we can compete with the best in the world when it comes to attracting AI-driven investments and innovation.

Can the minister tell this House about Ontario's plan to continue attracting and scaling AI investment across these critical sectors?

Hon. Victor Fedeli: On Monday, alongside Premier Ford, we announced Sanofi's $294-million investment in their AI centre of excellence right here in Toronto. This investment will create 50 new high-paying jobs while enabling Sanofi to leverage Ontario's AI expertise as they drive forward their life-saving innovations.

This is a testament to two areas of expertise for Ontario: life sciences and AI. It's why we've been able to secure over $6 billion in life science business in the province and $10 billion in new AI investments. Companies know that our talent pipeline is second to none. We have 94,000 STEM grads every year, and businesses know this is the best place to invest and expand.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Back to the member for Mississauga–Erin Mills.

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: Thank you, Minister, for the response.

Ontario is not only a leader in AI, but also in semiconductors. As one of the world's most critical technologies, our government has been laser-focused on building semiconductor capacity here in Ontario, reducing reliance on foreign jurisdictions and securing our place in the global supply chain.

Semiconductors power everything we rely on, from automobiles and defence systems to the smartphones in our pockets. That's why it is essential that Ontario continue to double down on this sector, from AI to defence to emerging areas like opto computing.

Speaker, can the minister further explain Ontario's role in the global semiconductor supply chain?

Hon. Victor Fedeli: Yesterday we had the opportunity to speak to a worldwide audience at the CHIPS North summit in Ottawa. We highlighted Ontario's critical role in the semiconductor supply chain. From defence to AI to dual-use technologies, semiconductors are foundational to our economy and the global race to secure the supply

chains has never been more competitive. But Ontario is already delivering real results. Look at our recent announcements in Kanata: Marvell Technology, $238 million, 350 new jobs; Ranovus, a $100-million investment, 125 new jobs.

From research and design to commercialization, Ontario is marking its place in the global semiconductor supply chain. That's how we strengthen our economic resilience and reduce reliance on foreign supply chains.

GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE

MPP Lisa Gretzky: To the Premier: We're joined today by Unifor members who represent workers in many sectors across Ontario who have experienced gender-based and intimate partner violence at home and in the workplace. They are calling on this Conservative government to call IPV what it is: an epidemic. Survivors, service providers, police and 112 municipalities across Ontario have declared IPV an epidemic.

A provincial declaration is not merely symbolic; it compels the government to address the health and social impacts of the crisis, leading to increased funding for education, intervention, prevention and community-based supports.

Why is this Premier refusing to follow the evidence and implement the first recommendation from the Renfrew county coroner's inquest by declaring IPV an epidemic?

1120

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

Hon. Charmaine A. Williams: Since we signed the national action plan in 2023—and all provinces signed that national action plan—we released Ontario-STANDS, Ontario's strategy to end gender-based violence in our province. We've been crystal clear that we want to commit to making concrete and tangible steps to making sure that women are safe in Ontario.

On November 5, we recognized intimate partner violence as endemic. By calling intimate partner violence endemic, we recognize the difficult, critical work that still needs to be done to address the root causes. We have committed $1.4 billion to the strategies. We're not going to stop making sure that we are investing in the programs and the supports to help keep women safe, because no women should be subject to violence in this province.

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

MPP Lisa Gretzky: Conservative governments in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick declared IPV an epidemic after we, the NDP, brought forward the Intimate Partner Violence Epidemic Act here in Ontario. This government can deny it, but IPV is an epidemic, and there's an urgent need to declare that. The Premier and his cabinet secretly spent $30 million on a private jet for the Premier, and yet women and children experiencing IPV face no available shelter beds, inaccessible transitional or affordable housing and no financial support to help them flee the violence.

My question is this: Will the Premier explain why spending nearly $30 million on his private jet was more important than investing that money into protecting and saving the lives of women and children in this province?

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Back to the associate minister for a response.

Hon. Charmaine A. Williams: Well, if the member from Windsor West had actually participated in the committee for the bill that she moved, she would have learned of the hundreds of millions of dollars that we committed to addressing and ending intimate partner violence in this province. We had, just last year—which they voted against—

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Order. Order.

Hon. Charmaine A. Williams: —invested over $27 million on shelter beds across the province. More than 100 organizations received—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): The member for Windsor West has been warned.

Hon. Charmaine A. Williams: Madam Speaker, this is not something we should be arguing about. We all agree that intimate partner violence is a devastating curse in our province. We have to work on it together, and if the member opposite would support—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): The member for Hamilton West–Ancaster–Dundas has been warned.

Hon. Charmaine A. Williams: —the work and the report that was released, then she would realize, and all of them would know, that we are not going to stop making sure women are safe in this province. We are not going to stop addressing and talking about the violence that women face. We are going to invest and make sure women are safe in this province.

GOVERNMENT JET

MPP Tyler Watt: My question is for the Premier. Here's a quote for you: "We will bring accountability, transparency and integrity back to the taxpayers of Ontario." That was this Premier in 2018. Yet after eight long years, this out-of-touch Conservative government is more interested in protecting the Premier and enabling his selfish behaviour, like spending taxpayer dollars on a $29-million luxury private jet.

This Premier could have spent that money on the school repair backlog, retaining nurses and education workers or actually doing something to address the cost-of-living crisis that we're all facing, but, no, he decided he wanted a new toy so he could jet off to the United States in luxury. It has been four weeks since this Premier bought his gravy plane, and yet not one single receipt of purchase and return has been provided.

Speaker, through you to the Premier: How much was the jet sold back for, and how much did this ultimately cost Ontario taxpayers?

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

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: Madam Speaker, another member from Ottawa, from Nepean, and another member from Ottawa who didn't support one penny for the citizens of Ottawa—here we go again.

The member from Nepean likes to talk about health care. The $101-billion funding for the health sector, a record in the province, up from $92 billion—did the member from Nepean vote for that? No, he didn't support health care in his own riding.

How about the HST cut that we worked on with Ottawa—a different type of Ottawa—the federal government that joined forces to cut the HST by 13% to make home ownership more affordable for those dreaming of home ownership, boosting the construction industry by 21,000 jobs and the economy by almost $3 billion? Did that member vote for that?

Interjections: No.

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: I rest my case, Madam Speaker.

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

MPP Tyler Watt: Yet another non-answer, and I'm getting dizzy from all the spinning that the finance minister is doing.

You can't return items back to the store without providing a receipt. This isn't like returning a package to Amazon. Ontarians want to see the purchase contract, the conditions, and how much this is going to cost, how much money we are going to lose as a result of this nonsense of a purchase.

You already had a plane but said, "What's one more? The Premier wants a luxury one." He's using the taxpayer dollars as his own personal piggy bank, and it's disgusting.

Speaker, through you to the Premier: Will this Premier show us the receipts on how much this gravy plane ended up costing Ontario taxpayers? Yes or no?

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: The Premier has been clear. The minister of the Treasury Board has been clear. The House leader has been clear. And I've gone many times in this House, in front of the media to answer the question. They just don't like the answer they're getting.

But what they should be listening to, Madam Speaker, is—

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Order.

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: —the investments that we're making in the province of Ontario.

I mentioned a few places. Let's talk about another region. Let's go out of Ottawa, because it's clear they're not voting to support the people of Ottawa. Let's go to Waterloo and Kitchener. Should we, members? We've got some great members from that region.

When we put in the budget Highway 7 between Kitchener and Guelph—the funding for that—did they support that? No, they did not. The $10 million for Grand River Hospital and St. Mary's General Hospital—did they vote for that?

Interjections.

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: Did the members from Kitchener, Waterloo and Cambridge vote for that?

Interjections.

Hon. Peter Bethlenfalvy: Madam Speaker, because they support the citizens in their communities, building health care, building schools, building long-term care—

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): I recognize the member for Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke.

ENERGY POLICIES

MPP Billy Denault: My question is for the Associate Minister of Energy-Intensive Industries. Ontario's energy consumption is projected to increase significantly in the coming years. While the opposition would rather punish Ontario's businesses by increasing their taxes, we know that our foundational industries need relief now more than ever.

As we head into the summer months, it is critical that we protect Ontario's industries and workers with affordable and reliable electricity rates.

Through you, Speaker: Can the associate minister tell the House how our government is protecting our electricity supply and preparing for a surge in summer demand?

Hon. Sam Oosterhoff: I want to thank the member for Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke for his advocacy for job creators in his riding and his strong support for energy security measures that we're taking here. He really is a champion for his community.

I have to say he's right; on a morning like this, it might not feel like the heat of summer is coming, but it is coming, and we know that will create pressure, as well, on our grid.

It's why I was pleased to be in the beautiful riding of Stoney Creek just a few weeks ago, sharing news about a new program: the Peak Performance Program, which will help put money back into the pockets of businesses and encourage them to reduce demand at peak periods—it could be tens of thousands of dollars going back into these businesses as they curb some of their HVAC use on those peak days, during the peak periods.

What that means, of course, is that you don't need to build out some of the more costly generation resources that you would otherwise have to build to meet demand, and you continue to supply an affordable, reliable grid across the province.

I appreciate his question. I'll speak more about this program in the supplementary.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Back to the member for Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke.

MPP Billy Denault: Thank you to the associate minister for his response. The people of Ontario do not want to see a repeat of the damage caused to our energy sector by the Liberals, which drove 300,000 manufacturing jobs out of our province.

Now, with tariffs and ongoing global economic uncertainty adding pressure on industry, we must ensure that Ontario remains the most affordable place to run a business.

Our government has made historic investments in our energy system, including cost- and energy-saving programs for industries and businesses.

Speaker, can the associate minister share details about how our energy-efficiency measures are helping businesses save money and putting more money back into the pockets of Ontarians?

Hon. Sam Oosterhoff: The member is absolutely right: We saw under the Liberal government an energy grid that was driven by ideology. Under our government and under the leadership of Premier Ford, we are driven by affordability, and it's a clear contrast.

1130

This program speaks to that contrast, because it will provide at least $20 for every kilowatt hour, up to 500 kilowatt hours, that are aggregated across the demand of a business, and it can provide tens of thousands of dollars in operational relief for those businesses. But it also provides support for the grid as a whole, which means, of course, that ratepayers don't have to pay for some of that expensive new generation that would otherwise have to be produced.

Again, it's affordability that supports ratepayers. It's affordability that supports businesses, job creators in our riding, and it also ensures that we have that reliability, that we know, when we're heading into some of the hottest seasons in the year and the coldest months, that we're going to have a grid that is stable, that is reliable, that is there for today and for many years to come.

I want to thank the member for his question.

SCHOOL BOARDS

Ms. Chandra Pasma: The Minister of Education claims he had to appoint a supervisor to prevent 60 teachers from being laid off in Peel, then his supervisor turned around and fired 331 teachers. As if that's not bad enough, the names of all the high school teachers losing their jobs got emailed to every single secondary school teacher in the board. This is what happens when you put someone in charge whose sole qualification is that they used to work for the Conservatives: cuts and incompetence.

Will the Minister of Education apologize to these teachers and fire his supervisor?

Hon. Paul Calandra: Truly, it's unbelievable, right? Let's unpack that for a second: What the trustees wanted to do was fire teachers in the middle of the year, pull them from the classroom, put new teachers in the middle of the classroom. We stepped in and said, "No, you're not going to disrupt students in the middle of their year. That's not going to happen under our watch."

Now, the suggestion that the supervisor released these names and made it public is absolutely incredulous to me.

If the member opposite is wanting to suggest that I fire the person that actually did it—I wonder if she would stand in her place and confirm that if I say who actually did it, she would like me to fire that person.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Back to the member for Ottawa West–Nepean.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: The buck stops with the supervisor, and it is the minister who appointed the supervisor, so the buck stops with the minister—

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): Order. Order.

I recognize the member for Ottawa West–Nepean.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: The buck stops with the supervisor, and it is the minister who hired the supervisor, so the buck stops with the minister.

When our kids are in large classes without adequate support, no one in our schools should be losing their jobs. These cuts are deeply harmful to our kids, and they're deeply painful for the people who care for them every day and are now losing their jobs. In these circumstances to have your privacy violated as well is completely unacceptable.

Will the minister fire his unqualified appointee and restore accountability by reinstating democratically elected trustees?

Hon. Paul Calandra: Will I restore trustees across the province of Ontario in the eight supervised boards, those that were going on trips, those that were spending more time fighting each other, suing each other than putting money back into the classroom? No, Madam Speaker.

The member didn't answer the question though, did she? She wants me to fire the person that inadvertently apparently released these names. If the member wants me to fire that person, let her get up in her place and say, "Minister, hold the person responsible who released those names." What the supervisor did was inform the Information and Privacy Commissioner of the breach. That's what the supervisor has done.

What the supervisors across the province are doing is putting more money back into the classroom, restoring confidence in education systems that had fallen off the rails. We have students in partially demolished schools. They want to restore those trustees—not going to happen. We have students who were being put in the middle of fights between teachers and school boards. We're not putting that system back in place. We're putting back a system that focuses on students, parents and teachers and academic achievement, full stop. They can support—

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

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Rob Cerjanec: My question is for the Premier. This government talks a tough game on crime and keeping criminals behind bars while letting them walk out the front door. When we look back at the history, we're seeing reannouncement after reannouncement of building new jails instead of actually getting it done.

The reality is that this government hasn't ensured the necessary jail capacity exists to house people awaiting trial, while they blame the federal government day in and day out. This government has slow-walked projects, including the Thunder Bay correctional facility that was first announced by a Liberal government in 2017.

Speaker, why has this government taken so long to start building the jail capacity necessary to keep our communities safe?

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

Hon. Michael A. Tibollo: Thank you to the member opposite for the question. Madam Speaker, our government takes public safety extremely seriously. The public knows that this government is acting to protect the people of the province of Ontario and keep our communities safe. What that means is that we are investing in increasing capacity in our jails. What we're doing is ensuring that we have that capacity built and that the capacity is used for the individuals that need to be in those places.

As our population has kept growing, this government has made those investments and continues to make them, unlike the previous Liberal government, which shut down seven jails, eviscerating capacity across the system. That record stands for itself.

Under the leadership of Premier Ford, we've sounded the alarm and we began delivering correctional reforms. Our investment of over $3 billion to build capacity—

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

Mr. Rob Cerjanec: The public is concerned, and the facts speak for themselves. When we do look at the past history, you saw a Liberal government that modernized facilities, closed some jails and replaced that bed capacity with new, modern facilities that this government is stacking three high. The Premier said he wants to stack them 10 high—

Interjection.

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

The Minister of Natural Resources has been warned.

Back to the member for Ajax.

Mr. Rob Cerjanec: In 2017, the previous Liberal government announced Thunder Bay. We saw in 2019 that the PC government reaffirmed its commitment, and construction was finally announced in 2022. Or how about Brockville correctional complex, announced in 2020? It took six years for the government to announce next steps—again, no date when construction is going to be taking place.

After eight long years, this government hasn't built the jails or invested in addressing the root causes of crime, and instead the Premier and this government blame everyone else. Speaker, whether it's criminals walking out the front door or building new jails, is the Solicitor General asleep at the switch?

Hon. Michael A. Tibollo: Once again, let's talk a little bit about the Liberal legacy and what they've left the province of Ontario:

—in 2014, Chatham-Kent jail and the Don jail closed;

—2012, Brantford jail, closed;

—2011, Owen Sound jail and Walkerton jail, closed;

—2004, Renfrew jail closed;

—2003, Burtch correctional was closed.

Madam Speaker, I don't—

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: We didn't buy a jet.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): I apologize. Does the member for Beaches–East York want to be expelled, or will the member come to order?

You may continue.

Hon. Michael A. Tibollo: Madam Speaker, our government is serious about building capacity in the system. What does that mean? Investing $3 billion to build more jails, expand capacity. Why? Because we want to keep Ontario safe.

New modular builds in Kenora and Thunder Bay, a brand-new complex in Thunder Bay and the expansion of the Quinte Detention Centre: We implemented these and many other projects to make sure there's enough space for both inmates and staff to stay safe. We're bringing more than 1,400 beds online to ensure that the capacity is there to look after the people that have to be looked after by incarcerating them.

HEALTH CARE WORKERS

Mr. Dave Smith: My question is for the Minister of Colleges, Universities, Research Excellence and Security—who actually has some fantastic shoes, too.

Building on a strong, resilient health care system starts with training the next generation of workers right here in Ontario. From nurses to paramedics to medical lab technicians, our colleges and universities are preparing a highly skilled workforce to meet the needs of communities across our province.

Time and time again, our government has made targeted investments to expand training opportunities and support students who choose to study and work in the regions that need them the most.

1140

Can the minister explain how these investments, particularly in programs like the Ontario Learn and Stay Grant, are strengthening our health care workforce and ensuring families can access care close to home?

Hon. Nolan Quinn: Thank you to that member for the thoughtful question. I think he just wanted me to mention his beautiful Trent shoes that he had on yesterday.

Our government knows, in order to protect and strengthen health care across Ontario, that we need to invest directly into the students who will deliver the care. That's why we took action through the Ontario Learn and Stay Grant. Since its launch less than three years ago, we invested over $175 million to support 13,000 students in health care programs right across the whole province, covering the cost of books, tuition and other expenses in exchange for students to stay in the community that they trained in.

Under the leadership of our Premier, we're continuing to build on that success. We're investing an additional $14 million to expand the programming at both Trent University and at Fleming College for nursing students. This expansion will support nearly 1,500 students every single year, completing their education at no cost to the student while strengthening health care capacity all across eastern Ontario.

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

Mr. Dave Smith: Thank you to the minister for that response. Expanding access to nursing and medical education is critical in strengthening our health care system and ensuring families can get the care they need. Our government has recently made historic investments to increase seats in high-demand health care programs and train more front-line health care professionals in every corner of our province. This will not only support students, but it will also address workforce shortages and help build a more resilient health care system for the future.

Can the minister outline how these broader investments in post-secondary education are expanding nursing and medical school seats, and what that means for improving access to care across all of Ontario?

Hon. Nolan Quinn: Thank you again to that member for that important question. Our government understands that if we want to strengthen Ontario's health care system, we need to start by training more nurses, doctors and front-line professionals right here at home. That's why we've made historic investments in our post-secondary sector to expand capacity in high-demand health care programs.

Just last year, we invested $56 million to train 2,200 more nurses across the province by 2027, getting more skilled professionals into our hospitals and communities faster. We also opened the first brand-new medical school in Ontario in over 20 years, creating 200 new doctor training seats in its first year alone. And as part of our historic $6.4-billion funding model, we're investing another $1.7 billion to add 70,000 more seats in key economy-driving programs, including nursing, medicine and other critical health care fields.

These investments are more than about the numbers. They're about ensuring people in every corner of this province—

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): I recognize the member from Mushkegowuk–James Bay.

SERVICES DE SANTÉ DANS LE NORD

NORTHERN HEALTH SERVICES

M. Guy Bourgouin: Ma question est au premier ministre.

Suite à l'obtention d'une référence envoyée par un médecin de famille, les gens du Nord attendent quatre à six mois pour un rendez-vous de « MRI ». Même dans les cas les plus sévères, comme une déchirure de ligaments, les gens attendent aussi longtemps, de peine et misère, pour ensuite conduire des centaines de kilomètres pour ces rendez-vous à Timmins. L'Hôpital Sensenbrenner demande à avoir une « MRI » pour répondre aux besoins de la communauté régionale.

Au premier ministre : peut-il s'engager aujourd'hui à permettre aux patients du Nord d'avoir accès à des soins équitables dans leur communauté et de financer la « MRI »?

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

Mr. Anthony Leardi: Je remercie le député pour la question.

Our government has in fact invested in approximately 40 or more new MRIs across the province of Ontario. But in addition to that, with respect to servicing northern Ontario, we have invested more in northern Ontario medical services and training doctors for northern Ontario than any other government.

Let me give you one example: By 2028, the Northern Ontario School of Medicine University is expected to have 108 undergraduate spaces and 123 postgraduate positions, because we know that when we train doctors in northern Ontario, they have a tendency to stay in northern Ontario.

DEFERRED VOTES

PUTTING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT FIRST ACT, 2026

LOI DE 2026 DONNANT LA PRIORITÉ À LA RÉUSSITE DES ÉLÈVES

Deferred vote on the motion that the question now be put on the motion for third reading of the following bill:

Bill 101, An Act to amend various Acts in respect of education and child care / Projet de loi 101, Loi modifiant diverses lois relatives à l'éducation et à la garde d'enfants.

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

The division bells rang from 1145 to 1150.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): On May 4, 2026, Mr. Calandra moved third reading of Bill 101, An Act to amend various Acts in respect of education and child care.

On May 5, 2026, Mr. Clark moved that the question be now put.

All those in favour of Mr. Clark's motion will please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

Ayes

Allsopp, Tyler	Gallagher Murphy, Dawn	Pirie, George
Anand, Deepak	Gualtieri, Silvia	Quinn, Nolan
Bethlenfalvy, Peter	Hamid, Zee	Racinsky, Joseph
Bouma, Will	Hardeman, Ernie	Rae, Matthew
Bresee, Ric	Harris, Mike	Rickford, Greg
Calandra, Paul	Holland, Kevin	Riddell, Brian
Cho, Raymond Sung Joon	Jordan, John	Rosenberg, Bill
Ciriello, Monica	Kanapathi, Logan	Sabawy, Sheref
Clark, Steve	Khanjin, Andrea	Sarkaria, Prabmeet Singh
Coe, Lorne	Kusendova-Bashta, Natalia	Saunderson, Brian
Cooper, Michelle	Leardi, Anthony	Smith, Dave
Crawford, Stephen	Lecce, Stephen	Smith, David

Cuzzetto, Rudy
Darouze, George
Denault, Billy
Dixon, Jess
Dowie, Andrew
Downey, Doug
Fedeli, Victor
Firin, Mohamed
Flack, Rob
Lumsden, Neil
McCarthy, Todd J.
McGregor, Graham
Mulroney, Caroline
Oosterhoff, Sam
Pang, Billy
Parsa, Michael
Pierre, Natalie
Pinsonneault, Steve
Smith, Graydon
Smith, Laura
Tangri, Nina
Thanigasalam, Vijay
Thompson, Lisa M.
Tibollo, Michael A.
Triantafilopoulos, Effie J.
Vickers, Paul
Williams, Charmaine A.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): All those opposed to Mr. Clark's motion will please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

Nays

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

The Clerk of the Assembly (Mr. Trevor Day): The ayes are 63; the nays are 40.

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

Mr. Calandra has moved third reading of Bill 101, An Act to amend various Acts in respect of education and child care.

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

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

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

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Call in the members. This is a five-minute bell.

The division bells rang from 1154 to 1155.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): On May 4, 2026, Mr. Calandra moved third reading of Bill 101, An Act to amend various Acts in respect of education and child care.

All those in favour of the motion will please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

Ayes

Allsopp, Tyler
Anand, Deepak
Bethlenfalvy, Peter
Bouma, Will
Bresee, Ric
Calandra, Paul
Cho, Raymond Sung Joon
Ciriello, Monica
Clark, Steve
Coe, Lorne
Cooper, Michelle
Crawford, Stephen
Cuzzetto, Rudy
Darouze, George
Gallagher Murphy, Dawn
Gualtieri, Silvia
Hamid, Zee
Hardeman, Ernie
Harris, Mike
Holland, Kevin
Jordan, John
Kanapathi, Logan
Khanjin, Andrea
Kusendova-Bashta, Natalia
Leardi, Anthony
Lecce, Stephen
Lumsden, Neil
McCarthy, Todd J.
Pirie, George
Quinn, Nolan
Racinsky, Joseph
Rae, Matthew
Rickford, Greg
Riddell, Brian
Rosenberg, Bill
Sabawy, Sheref
Sarkaria, Prabmeet Singh
Saunderson, Brian
Smith, Dave
Smith, David
Smith, Graydon
Smith, Laura
Denault, Billy
Dixon, Jess
Dowie, Andrew
Downey, Doug
Fedeli, Victor
Firin, Mohamed
Flack, Rob
McGregor, Graham
Mulroney, Caroline
Oosterhoff, Sam
Pang, Billy
Parsa, Michael
Pierre, Natalie
Pinsonneault, Steve
Tangri, Nina
Thanigasalam, Vijay
Thompson, Lisa M.
Tibollo, Michael A.
Triantafilopoulos, Effie J.
Vickers, Paul
Williams, Charmaine A.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): All those opposed to the motion will please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

Nays

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

The Clerk of the Assembly (Mr. Trevor Day): The ayes are 63; the nays are 40.

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

Be it resolved that the bill do now pass and be entitled as in the motion.

Third reading agreed to.

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): There being no further business, this House stands in recess until 1 p.m.

The House recessed from 1158 to 1300.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Hon. Michael Parsa: Madam Speaker, May is Community Living Month, and I would like to welcome to the House my friends Rob, Niko and many others here in the gallery from the Council of Community Living, and Brad Saunders from Community Living Toronto, Chris Beesley from Community Living Ontario, and many others that are visiting us from Community Living locations right across our province. Welcome to Queen's Park. I look forward to seeing you at the reception later.

Mr. Tom Rakocevic: I'm proud to welcome Kamelah Blair, Toronto chapter president of the Congress of Black Women of Canada and founder of Royalty Helping Hands. Welcome to Queen's Park.

Ms. Laura Smith: It's a very great honour to welcome the chief of Vaughan fire and rescue, Mr. Andrew Zvanitajs, or Chief Andy, as we know him in Vaughan. Welcome.

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: This morning we didn't get through the entire list, but I wanted to take a moment now. There were a number of advocates as well as members

from Unifor that were today for their lobby day on intimate partner violence, making it declared as an epidemic. In the chamber were Saira Chhibber, Kat Leonard, Tricia Wilson, Ashley Petrie, Jensen Williams, Gina Smoke, Melissa Palermo, Samia Hashi, Shinade Allder, Maria Chinelli, Brooke Hooykaas, Natalie Fleming, Sharon Frewen, Frank Mosey, Emily Coulter, Jolayne Goguen, Ramon Souto, Melissa Wood, Sarah-Kai Antanaitis, Taylor Francis-Grant, Janice Neville, Michelle Flewin, Sandra Donald and Nicole Cayer.

I also want to lend my voice of welcome to the Ontario Association of Landscape Architects. Of course, they had their reception this morning, but they're also sponsoring the OLIP reception this evening, and I want to in particular point out Aaron Hirota, the president; Aina Budrevics; as well as Glenn O'Connor, who's the chair of policy.

And a very special welcome to Tina Conlon of the Conlon family from Toronto Centre. They were all here this morning.

Mr. Andrew Dowie: I want to wish a warm welcome to Dwayne Milley of Karis Disability Services. Welcome to Queen's Park.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

861282 ONTARIO LIMITED ACT, 2026

Mr. Kanapathi moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr51, An Act to revive 861282 Ontario Limited.

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

First reading agreed to.

PETITIONS

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: I'm very proud to rise this afternoon to present a petition that has been collected by the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation. They've been working really hard to get in front of a particular issue that is going to potentially land in this building. Given our past history, I think it will.

The petition is entitled, "End the Use of the Notwithstanding Clause in Labour Disputes." The petition is calling on the Legislative Assembly to ensure that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, as entrenched in the Constitution Act of 1982, ensures that all rights and freedoms should not be limited unless demonstrably justified in a free, democratic society.

We know that the majority of the OSSTF/FEESO collective agreements expire at the end of August 2026, so just a mere few weeks away. A number of our university bargain units are already in bargaining or they will begin very soon.

The use of the "notwithstanding" clause is to impose settlements or undermine collective bargaining rights and it is a direct attack on the fundamental democratic and labour rights of workers.

This government, in 2022, used section 33 of the charter to impose contracts on education workers through Bill 28 and restrict political advocacy by unions. We've seen this happen as well in other provinces such as Alberta, when, in 2025, they invoked section 33 to pass their Bill 2, the Back to School Act, forcing an end to a teachers strike, imposing a rejected contract and stripping educators of their charter rights. The Alberta Teachers' Association then launched a constitutional challenge, calling this a gross abuse of power that threatens the rule of law. We know that a fight is coming here once again in Ontario.

I would happily support this petition. I want to thank the OSSTF for all their hard work. We know that it's very important for us to support all the workers in our schools and to make sure that our students are supported in every possible way.

I'll be happy to sign this petition and to return this to the centre table with wonderful page Evalyn.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Thank you to OSSTF, who collected these signatures from teachers, education workers, parents and supporters from around the province.

We know that the Charter of Rights and Freedoms enshrines rights that are beyond the partisan fray. It's a statement that, no matter what party we come from, no matter what ideology we come from, we all respect these rights. Yet we've seen governments, including this Conservative government, recently use the "notwithstanding" clause to take away rights to free and fair collective bargaining from workers.

There is a real concern that they are going to try to use that again, especially given the repeated disrespect that the Minister of Education has recently shown teachers and education workers. That shouldn't be happening, not only because free and fair collective bargaining is a charter-protected right, but because teachers and education workers are standing up for important issues in the classroom, like class sizes and safety, which this government refuses to address.

Therefore, the petitioners are calling on the Legislative Assembly to ensure that the right of free and fair collective bargaining is protected and that we end the use of the "notwithstanding" clause in labour disputes. This is a more urgent issue than ever, given that the Attorney General just intervened in a case brought by the Quebec government, saying that they should be able to override fundamental rights and freedoms. I hope that the Legislative Assembly will agree that that is wrong, and that we should respect fundamental rights and freedoms in this province.

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

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Ms. Jessica Bell: This is a petition called, "End the Use of the Notwithstanding Clause in Labour Disputes." It's a petition gathered by teachers, parents, students and supporters of the school system who are very concerned about the Ontario government's previous use of the "notwithstanding" clause to override collective bargaining, which is a right that is enshrined in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

This is very important right now because teachers are set to bargain again and one of the core things we expect will be in the bargaining process is a demand to reduce class sizes in order to truly improve student learning outcomes.

1310

This is a petition that I support. I will be affixing my signature to it and giving it to page Jason.

HEALTH CARE WORKERS

MPP Catherine McKenney: I am tabling the following petition to stop privatization and support staffing ratios, from the Ontario Nurses' Association.

This petition calls on the Ontario government to mandate safe staffing ratios for nurses and health care professionals across the health care system. Current understaffing leads to burnout and unsafe working conditions, forcing nurses and health care professionals to leave and pursue other jobs.

I'm proud to support this petition. It's time that Ontario joins other provinces and mandates safe staffing ratios for nurses and health care professionals. I will send this down with page Ashmi.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I have a petition signed by hundreds of people in my riding and from across the province collected by the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation to end the use of the "notwithstanding" clause in labour disputes. The petition does note that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms—it's entrenched in the Constitution—ensures that rights and freedoms should not be limited, especially in a just and free democratic society.

We know that bargaining for educators will take place this year. We know that in 2022, the Conservative government in Ontario used the "notwithstanding" clause to try to take away the charter rights of the lowest-paid education workers. It's a concern that parents, students and teachers have because they would like to see more investments in our classrooms that support our students and educators.

So they're asking the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to not use the "notwithstanding" clause in order to permit violations of workers' rights and freedoms. The petition is saying that labour disputes should not be decided using the "notwithstanding" clause because it violates employees' rights to a free and fair collective bargaining process.

I fully support this petition, Speaker, and will ask page Alyson to bring it to the table.

EDUCATION FUNDING

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: I really appreciate the time to present this petition that was organized and collected—the signatures were collected by the Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario. They're petitioning the Ontario Legislative Assembly to reduce class sizes in our public elementary schools:

"Whereas the $6.35 billion that has been cut from public education since 2018 has resulted in larger class sizes, more violence and inadequate special education and mental health supports for students; and

"Whereas larger class sizes negatively impact the quality of education, reduce access to teaching resources, and significantly diminish teacher-student interactions, which are detrimental to students who need additional support; and

"Whereas the vast majority of parents, students, and educators support smaller class sizes and want the best education possible for students...;"

The undersigned "petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to commit to making the necessary investments in public education to lower class sizes, increase student supports, and ensure students have the schools they need."

I will be proud to sign this petition and to return it to the centre table with page Sienna.

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I'm pleased to rise to table a petition entitled "To Raise Social Assistance Rates." I want to say thank you to the always tireless advocate Sally Palmer for her work in collecting these signatures.

We know that we're living through a cost-of-living crisis right now. So many people around the province are struggling to afford rent and to pay for groceries.

Nobody is struggling more than people who are living on Ontario's very inadequate social assistance rates, which are far, far below the Market Basket Measure poverty line; far, far below what it costs to actually cover rent and ensure that people have access to food. Even though the government indexed ODSP to inflation, they did it so far below the poverty line that people are struggling to make ends meet.

We saw both from the Basic Income Pilot in Ontario and from the CERB program that when people have access to a stable income, then they can stabilize their lives. They can actually afford decent housing. They can afford food. That helps them get back on their feet, in some cases to go back to school, in other cases to find employment. What the government is doing is completely counterproductive.

The petitioners are calling on the Legislative Assembly to double social assistance rates for Ontario Works and ODSP.

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

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: This petition is entitled Affordable Housing Now.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas for families throughout much of Ontario, owning a home they can afford remains a dream, while renting is painfully expensive;

"Whereas consecutive Conservative and Liberal governments have sat idle, while housing costs have spiralled out of control, speculators have made fortunes, and too many families had to put their hopes on hold;

"Whereas every Ontarian should have access to safe, affordable housing. Whether a family wants to rent or own; live in a house, an apartment, a condominium or a co-op, they should have all the affordable options" before them;

Therefore, the undersigned "petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to:

"—immediately prioritize the repair of Ontario's social housing stock;

"—commit to building new affordable homes;

"—crack down on housing speculators; and

"—make rentals more affordable through rent controls and updated legislation."

I could not endorse this petition even more than I already do. It's one of the most important issues facing families in Ontario.

I'll be happy to sign this petition and send this back to the table with page Aneet.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I'm pleased to rise to table a petition on behalf of my constituents in Ottawa West–Nepean entitled "Repeal Bill 33."

We know that, over the past eight years, the Conservative government has taken more than $6.3 billion out of our education system, which is affecting every single part of our children's education. They are in larger class sizes with fewer supports in the classroom. They are not receiving the mental health or special education supports that they need. They are in crumbling schools.

Yet what Bill 33 did was concentrate power in the hands of the Minister of Education, who has been the one who has implemented these funding cuts. He's already used that power to appoint supervisors to eight school boards, and what we've seen those supervisors do is implement even more funding cuts.

The supervisor in Ottawa, Bob Plamondon, has closed special education classes. We learned just today that he's cutting 180 jobs. That's teachers, education workers and principals who will be gone from our schools at a time when kids need more support, not less.

There are no guardrails or accountability for the minister exercising this unchecked power in the bill. It takes away accountability and transparency from our education system.

So the petitioners are calling on the Legislative Assembly to "call on the government to repeal Bill 33, fund our education system properly, respect local democracy, and stop playing political games with the well-being of our children."

I could not support this petition any more. I will add my name to the petition and send it to the table with page Alyson.

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: Once again, I'm proud to rise in this House to speak on behalf of the good people of Toronto Centre and to present this petition that was organized and collected by the hard-working professor, Dr. Sally Palmer. This petition is not new to the assembly, but we should be reminded about the content and the mission of this petition, and we will be daily until this becomes a reality.

The petition is entitled "Raise Social Assistance Rates" in Ontario.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Ontario social assistance rates are well below Canada's official Market Basket Measure poverty line and far from adequate to cover the rising costs of food and rent:" only "$733 for individuals on OW and $1,408 for ODSP;

"Whereas an open letter to the Premier and two cabinet ministers, signed by over 230 organizations, recommends that social assistance rates be doubled for both Ontario Works and Ontario Disability Support Program;"

Recognizing that "small increases to ODSP have still left many citizens below the poverty line, both they and those receiving the frozen ... rates are struggling to survive at a time of alarming inflation;"

Therefore, the undersigned citizens of Ontario "petition this Legislative Assembly to double social assistance rates for OW and ODSP."

I will very proudly sign this petition and send it back to the table with page Sienna.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I am pleased to rise to table a petition on behalf of the residents of Ottawa West–Nepean entitled Repeal Bill 5.

1320

Bill 5 was rammed through by the government without respect for the Legislature and for the rights of people to come and share their perspectives with the government, which is interesting, because Bill 5 gives the government an end run around democracy, allowing them to create special economic zones where provincial and municipal rules just don't apply.

We can already see what ends the Premier wants to use this law to, given that he's using it for the expansion of the

Billy Bishop airport, which makes no economic sense for the city of Toronto but would have allowed the Premier to lend his private luxury jet in downtown Toronto.

We also know that Bill 5 includes other very harmful provisions overriding First Nations' rights regarding consultation and treaty rights. It also causes problems for protection of protected species in Ontario, which is very important for biodiversity. The government is overlooking real solutions to the challenges that we're facing in Ontario.

So my constituents are calling for the repeal of Bill 5. I wholeheartedly endorse this petition, will add my name to it and send it to the table with page Kieran.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

BUILDING BILLY BISHOP AIRPORT ACT, 2026

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

Resuming the debate adjourned on May 5, 2026, on the motion for second reading of the 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): Further debate?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: It's an honour to rise today to debate government Bill 110, the government's bill to expropriate broad chunks of land on the Toronto Islands and to expand the Billy Bishop airport runway to allow private jets to be landed there.

Speaker, as I travel around the province, people tell me they're outraged by this government's obsession with wasting money on things in Toronto that people in Toronto don't even want: things like the tunnel under the 401, the luxury mega spa on the Toronto waterfront, the fantasy island for a new Toronto convention centre, and now the expropriation of Toronto Islands and expansion of the island airport.

Partly they're outraged because they look at their communities and they see people struggling to be able to put food on the table and a roof over their head. They see emergency departments closing and overcrowded classrooms in their schools. They see rural communities struggling to keep roads and bridges open and in a state of good repair. And they're saying, "Why do you need a private jet to be landed on Toronto's Billy Bishop airport?" Specially now when we learn that the expansion of the airport may result in the loss of 30,000 homes on the Toronto waterfront when we're facing the worst housing affordability crisis in the province's history.

It's bad enough that the Premier says no to legalizing multiplexes and mid-rises so we can quickly build homes. It's bad enough that the Premier says no to having the government get back in to funding non-profit co-ops, social housing, so we can actually start building homes that people can afford, but to now have the Premier say no to 30,000 homes on Toronto's waterfront so he can land a luxury private jet at Billy Bishop airport makes absolutely no sense. We need to build homes, Speaker, not expand airport runways.

We've also learned that the company that runs the island airport is owned by J.P. Morgan, one of the largest banks in the world. So, I just have to ask the Premier, why is the government prioritizing the profits of American bankers over building homes that people can afford on Toronto's waterfront? I want the Premier to explain to a whole generation of young people who are saying, "I don't know if I'll ever be able to own a home," or minimum-wage workers when there's no community in the province that can afford average monthly rent or in a situation where an unprecedented number of people, 85,000 people, are experiencing homelessness in Ontario, and the Premier is saying no to 30,000 homes so he can land a private jet at Billy Bishop airport. It makes no sense for the Premier to be working for American bankers and not working to build homes that people in Ontario can afford.

Let's be clear: Billy Bishop airport is losing money. When Nieuport Aviation bought Billy Bishop back in 2015, they paid $750 million for it. Two years later, they sued Porter because Porter wasn't generating enough business for them to make a profit. Now, the Premier wants to bail out the bankers and not build homes that people can afford, not invest in rural communities, because they're going to spend billions in downtown Toronto.

And they're going to do it in a way that's actually going to destroy what people love about Billy Bishop airport and Toronto's waterfront. They want to increase passenger travel out of Billy Bishop by five times. You know what that means, Speaker? Five times more gridlock and congestion on the waterfront, five times more passenger lines and delays at Billy Bishop airport, five times more noise and air pollution destroying quality of life on Toronto's waterfront. For what? To bail out a bunch of American bankers for an investment they made that's not making money? That makes absolutely no sense.

Now, I know the government says that it has a business case, or at least Nieuport has a business case. But it's a joke. They're basically trying to say that, even though 95% of air travellers in Toronto fly out of Pearson, somehow increasing the size of the airport is going to lead to an economic contribution half of what Pearson makes. That makes just absolutely no sense. Who does these kinds of numbers? I don't know. I'm a numbers guy. These numbers make no sense.

But I tell you what's not a joke is the damage that this is going to do on the waterfront. As a matter of fact, the environmental assessment that was done back in 2017 showed that expanding the island airport would damage local businesses operating on the waterfront. It would make the water not navigable on the waterfront because of all the disruptions from jet engines. Actually, it's going to

put birds at risk because it's in a migratory flight path—all to bail out bankers.

I think we should prioritize building homes that people can afford, supporting local businesses, before we bail out American bankers. That's why I oppose this bill, Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Thank you to the member for Guelph for expressing and speaking about your concern with the expansion of the Billy Bishop airport.

I'll tell you where I am a little bit confused. I am a little bit confused about where the Ontario Liberals stand on this issue and where Mark Carney stands on this issue. What I hear from the Prime Minister is that he is interested, and he finds this project interesting. I'm already getting constituents in my riding expressing some buyer's remorse for supporting a Prime Minister who is clearly not standing up for the people of Toronto.

My question to you is, do you also think it's disappointing that the Liberal government is failing to stand up for the people of Toronto on this issue?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I appreciate the member's question. You know what I'm calling on? I'm calling on the Prime Minister to oppose this project. I'm calling on the Premier to reverse himself and get rid of this bill. And I'm calling on the mayor of Toronto to say no to this project. We need all three levels of government to be opposed to this project.

I don't support the Premier bailing out bankers from the US to bring jets to Billy Bishop airport. Let's have all parties in this House come together to tell the Prime Minister, tell the Premier and tell the mayor to oppose this project.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

M^me^ Lucille Collard: Thank you to the member for Guelph for speaking points which were, actually, really on point. It's pretty clear, and we've been saying we don't see the benefit of this project that's going to cost so much money to the detriment of the environment.

I fly from Billy Bishop quite regularly, and I don't trust that bringing jets will actually improve the service, because the weather is actually a detriment to frequent flying.

1330

What would be given up if we go ahead with the project, if the government decides to not listen to anybody and decides to go forward? What would be lost on the lakefront of the island?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: First of all, if the Premier is going to continue to try to bail out American bankers and have a spot to land a private luxury jet, we're going to see Billy Bishop and the Toronto waterfront destroyed.

What people like about the airport is they can get in and out of it easily. That will be gone. We'll have five times more gridlock, five times more noise and air pollution, five times longer passenger lines and wait times and backlogs at the airport.

It's going to hurt local businesses. Can you imagine, Speaker, what's going to happen when we have a Jays game, hopefully a Leafs and Raptors playoff game in the spring, when people are coming down to this ridiculous luxury spa on the waterfront and they're trying to get in and out of Billy Bishop? It's going to be a traffic nightmare. Is that really what this government wants to create on the Toronto waterfront?

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Andrew Dowie: I want to thank the member from Guelph for his comments. I know Billy Bishop has been really the hub that I've used to get to northern Ontario. I've noticed, especially in the pandemic, tourism in northern Ontario has certainly been struggling, especially with fewer Americans crossing the border. Now, with the changes to the border in Quetico, particularly the boundary waters, it's going to have fewer Americans coming through.

It's important for domestic tourism that we promote tourism in northern Ontario. If we do not improve our connections to northern Ontario, as this proposal will do, how else can we help the people of northern Ontario if not through bringing more tourists to the north?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I appreciate the member's question. Why don't we invest in airports in northern Ontario to support people going to the north? Why don't we invest in highway expansion in northern Ontario to make the roads safer and more convenient and reliable for people to go to the north? Why don't we not destroy what everybody loves about Billy Bishop airport?

Yes, I flew to Thunder Bay for the Northwestern Ontario Municipal Association meetings out of Billy Bishop airport. It was a great connection. I don't want that great connection destroyed by more gridlock, longer lines, more delays and a less convenient place to fly out of.

Why does the government want to destroy what people like about Billy Bishop airport and make life less livable on Toronto's—

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

Mr. Andrew Dowie: I want to say thank you to the member for Guelph for his response to my question.

I'm really pleased to rise today in support of Bill 110, the Building Billy Bishop Airport Act, 2026. We're at a time where our province is facing real economic uncertainty. We need a clear plan to protect jobs, strengthen supply chains and truly remain competitive in an increasingly challenging global environment.

I want to highlight our reliance on our continental trade. That's under threat right now, so every opportunity that we have to strengthen that trade, to add opportunities to be closer to allies, is a good thing.

Transportation infrastructure is not just optional. It's not optional; it's foundational. Because when infrastructure is constrained, costs will rise, productivity will slow and communities like mine will lose out on opportunity. It's truly why, Speaker, this legislation matters.

Bill 110 is about ensuring Ontario's transportation system can meet the realities of the growth we're experi-

encing and the demand. And not just the demand—I've been speaking about the economy and I think that's the primary reason for this bill, but it's also about families. Because there are communities like mine that young people have to leave to find the career of their dreams, and that means coming to big cities like Toronto. By having opportunities to travel and for families to visit without a burden of time, it's transformational for families.

This bill supports the long-term modernization and expansion of Billy Bishop Toronto City Airport. It's really an important and underutilized part of Ontario's transportation network and has the potential to play a much larger role in our province's future and help the various regions that are a couple hours' drive—or many hours' drive away from feeling more connected to the provincial capital and the decisions that we make here at Queen's Park. And so while Billy Bishop is located in Toronto, it really is not just a Toronto issue; it's a pan-Ontario issue.

It matters to the people that I represent in Windsor–Tecumseh. My riding is home to the Windsor International Airport; most of the flights go to Billy Bishop. We've had a lot of contraction in flights. Really, Porter is the last bastion of travel for many, and we wonder how much that will continue to survive, because we are just feeling the pressure and it's disconnecting our community from so many others.

We're not alone. There are many smaller and outlying communities across the province who rely on a functioning air network for work, for family, for health care—getting to those essential procedures and economic opportunity.

So, as I mentioned, my riding is home to Windsor International Airport. It's a vital gateway that connects Windsor-Essex to the rest of Ontario and beyond. For the most part, the flights do go to Billy Bishop. We have had flights elsewhere. We do have a couple of vacation destinations. But, primarily, Billy Bishop is that destination, so it's vital for our airport that that market be sustained and grown, so that we can maintain our own airport. I know we're not alone, because the strength of Toronto's airport system directly affects the cost, convenience and connectivity of the entire Ontario market.

So, Speaker, let me outline clearly what Bill 110 does. It establishes a framework that will allow the province to assume the city of Toronto's responsibilities that exist under the agreement governing Billy Bishop airport and to acquire the required city-owned lands in exchange for a fair compensation. It creates a structured, rules-based process that's grounded in market value, supported by independent appraisal and binding arbitration. That matters because it ensures that clarity, predictability and fairness will exist as this project moves forward. It also provides certainty for long-term planning, because major infrastructure projects do not move forward responsibly when the authority is unclear.

And, you know what? We all have our families at home. Sometimes we don't get along, but we all have to live under the same roof. And that's okay. We love our family. We don't always have to have the same opinion. But when it comes to contracts, undoubtably that exists, but there has to be a dispute resolution mechanism. Right now, we have an agreement where timelines get to be uncertain, rules are inconsistent. This bill provides the pathway that defines what to do so that planning can proceed in an orderly way.

Because the goal is straightforward: to support the long-term modernization and expansion of Billy Bishop airport. It's to meet future demand, to reduce the pressure that I know Toronto Pearson International Airport is going through. It's amazing when you fly and you're not from Toronto and you see the volume of planes landing at Pearson. You wonder how many more they can handle. It's constant over the 427. So, relief has been contemplated for decades. We had a proposed airport out in Buttonville and over in the what's now the Rouge National Urban Park. That day was forecast when Pearson would run out of capacity.

So, Speaker, why is this necessary? Well, for those reasons, but also because Ontario is growing and growing quickly. The greater Golden Horseshoe is really one of the fastest-growing regions in North America, and we're expecting to add millions more residents in the coming decades. We've had millions join just in the last couple of decades. It's really strange to see how much it is concentrated here; I say "strange" in the best possible way. Down our way, we haven't seen the pace of growth that you've seen here in the GTA.

And you see the pressure on the highways, the roads, the trains and, certainly, air travel. We know that population growth drives increased travel demand. That means good things for our economy: We'll build more cars. We'll build more Pacificas down in Windsor, for example, and sell more. And it will sustain jobs and sustain the economy when we have these transportation options. But it also allows people to live in communities like mine, come into where the centre of commerce exists today, but still have a quality of life that's second to none. It means business travel, tourism, and movement of people and goods.

Today, Billy Bishop serves millions of passengers every year and connects Toronto to more than 20 cities across Canada and the United States. I've seen routes that have gone to many, many points. I think we provide, actually, good service out of Billy Bishop airport. It is certainly a nice experience for the most part—not necessarily when there is a flight delay or a cancellation, which does happen from time to time with some or our airlines—but we know it can do more. With modernization, Billy Bishop has the potential to serve millions more passengers annually, support tens of thousands of jobs and contribute billions more into the economy, because expanded capacity will generate substantial economic output, strengthen tourism and attract key investment to the province of Ontario.

1340

This is not simply about just the airport and the immediacy of the airport; it's about building infrastructure that supports a modern and growing economy and doing so in

a way that benefits not just the airport itself but all regions that rely on the airport.

Speaker, I need to focus on that broader impact, particularly the regional and outlying communities, because airports do not operate in isolation. There needs to be a departure and an arrival. They operate as part of a network, and strengthening one key part of that network, the hub, strengthens the system as a whole. Modernization truly strengthens that hub connectivity, because air travel is fundamentally a network business. A regional airport serves smaller markets, the airports in the north that were cited in the debate. They need a place to fly to, or else their residents will not have an opportunity to enjoy those services, and sometimes they're life-saving services. We need to rely on connections through larger hubs. When a hub has more capacity, more routes and more frequency, it creates more opportunities for passengers to connect onward. Billy Bishop plays that role today. It's a key hub for carriers like Porter Airlines, connecting passengers through downtown Toronto to destinations across North America.

Speaker, modernizing a hub doesn't just add seats. It multiplies the options, increases the number of reliable connection combinations. For us in Windsor-Essex, we're down to one flight a day. Now, if you had the economy of scale of larger planes where more passengers could contribute to the cost of the flight, that means you could actually have an economic case for more accessible travel, and you could visit your family members more often and pay less doing so.

It improves the schedules. It reduces the connection penalty that discourages travellers from flying regional routes, and I do it every week. I don't fly back home; I take the train, because the train is a way that I actually can get home that day. There aren't enough flights to Windsor to allow me to see my wife, and I want to see my wife at the end of the Thursday night. But I don't get to get home until 1 in the morning, because it just doesn't meet the flight schedule. If I had an ability to go home and see my wife at a reasonable hour, my quality of life—it's exceptional today. More time with my wife is always something that I am grateful for.

Expanding that hub increases the number of possible connections, improves route viability and makes it more attractive for airlines to serve smaller communities. For us in Windsor-Essex county, that matters directly, because we know that a Billy Bishop that is stronger means reliable service options and better experience overall for travellers. You're spending time in the airport terminal itself. It's not overwhelming; it's calming. There are services, and your chances are good you're going to see somebody you know and have the opportunity to have a good conversation. It strengthens the business case for maintaining and expanding regional routes. Those routes are supported not just by local demand but by the ability to connect in that larger network.

It also strengthens the value proposition of flying from regional airports. There may be differences of opinion on that. Should we promote air travel, or should we promote other ways? I said I take the train. I do enjoy the train. I just wish it didn't take as long as it did and could keep to a scheduled time. But a 45-minute flight saves time versus a four-to-five-to-six-hour ride. It saves time, reduces stress and improves productivity for business travellers.

Think of a small business. Their employee is out of commission, trying to make a sale. This is the only place they can come to, and a 45-minute travel time is a lot different for their bottom line than a five-to-six-hour travel time.

Speaker, I've mentioned the human side to this. Too many young people from Windsor-Essex had to leave our region to pursue education, careers and opportunities in larger centres. To survive, they've had to put long distance between themselves and their families. That's a reality that families in my community know and understand all too well. Stronger, more accessible air connections close that distance. They make it easier for families to stay connected, for young people to return home more often, for mom and dad, and brothers and sisters to do likewise, and allow parents and grandparents too to remain part of their lives—not just once-a-year sight, but you could go fairly often. Connectivity is not a purely economic conversation; it is quality-of-life-driven. It's about making it easier for Ontarians to stay close to the people who matter most.

Second, Speaker, modernization improves system resilience and access because air travel is essential infrastructure, particularly for northern and remote communities.

I'll reference back home again. We've got Detroit Metro Airport just about a 45-minute drive from my home, and it has direct flights to more Canadian destinations than we do to Windsor, actually. Everything we do goes through Toronto. It seems peculiar that we have a system in place where it's easier to travel to another country with air travel than it is to our own province.

This project will connect people to specialized health care, to education, to employment, to government services. It supports medical transport, including air ambulance and medical transfer flights that rely on a strong and reliable aviation network. Because when our system has more capacity and more flexibility, it becomes more resilient. It can absorb disruptions, manage demand and continue to serve communities that depend on it. We know that a more capable Billy Bishop strengthens that resilience. It adds capacity to the system.

You know what? Yes, a runway expansion and this modernization will lead to more flights. That leads to more options, leads to more visits to friends and family. It leads to better connectivity to health care. These are good things. It helps ensure that Ontario's air network can continue to serve all regions effectively, especially when other parts of the system are under pressure.

Third, Speaker, modernization increases competition and affordability because more room for more routes means more carriers. More competition improves choice, enhances service quality, puts down-pressure on fares and also puts down-pressure on the need to cram into a specific

scheduled time. We want higher frequency for public transit. You want your bus to come more often, not less. You're more likely to use it. If we want to get cars off the road and we want to have more common transportation, this is a tool to do it.

I understand that that planes have their own climate impact, but if you are trading cars on the road for a larger plane that can have more passengers, there is a benefit there. It's a balanced benefit, but there is a benefit. I understand the arguments against; don't get me wrong.

For family, students and small business, that matters. That time matters. That affordability matters. Lower costs and better options make travel more accessible. It's a good thing. It supports tourism, enables business travel and helps ensure that Ontario remains an attractive place to live, work and invest.

Speaker, I need to be direct about the viability of the external airport because the expansion of the hub means that regional routes become more stable. They feed into the larger network. It's been true historically for Canadian aviation museums—I love the aviation museum, so that's a slip of the tongue—Canadian aviation networks and remains true today.

A well-functioning hub-and-spoke system with Billy Bishop at the centre of it allows smaller airports to offer access to a far wider range of destinations, even when they cannot sustain direct routes on their own. In other words, you don't need every community to have a direct flight to every destination; you need dependable service into a hub with strong onward connectivity keeping us together as Ontarians.

So, strengthening Billy Bishop can improve the business case for service from outlying airports, the ones that have lost their scheduled service. This is an opportunity for them to get it back. It makes regional routes more useful to travellers more often.

Speaker, about economic growth, we know that this project has the potential to generate significant economic activity, supporting construction jobs, creating long-term employment, attracting investment and strengthening Ontario's tourism sector to welcome more visitors directly into Toronto's downtown core, support business travel and enhance Ontario's position as a global destination for investment and opportunity.

I will dive into our local debate that we have: Who is the home team? Is it the Toronto Maple Leafs and the Jays, or is it the Detroit Red Wings and Tigers? And so, right now, it's a lot more accessible for me to go to a Tigers game when I'm not sitting in the Legislature—not that I have been to a Blue Jays game since I've been elected. But you know what, that connectivity does keep us closer and it gives that opportunity for more Ontarians to come and support the great things that happen here in the city of Toronto. And, likewise, to allow Torontonians to experience some of the regions that are a bit out of reach for a day trip—the travel is four-hours-plus.

1350

I would love for every Torontonian to come to Windsor and Essex county. We've got a lot to see. There's really no more awe-inspiring sight than seeing the NextStar plant in its glory as you land into Windsor International Airport, and now seeing the new Gordie Howe International Bridge in the distance—truly a civil engineering landmark.

We know that—

Interjections.

Mr. Andrew Dowie: Yes, thank you.

And tourists who land in Toronto also visit places like Niagara. They visit southwestern Ontario. They travel to festivals, sporting events, culinary destinations and attractions. It really provides that ability for us to experience ourselves. Ontario is a big province. A stronger hub, paired with a strong provincial transportation network, supports all that, because this government understands that infrastructure is a system. We're investing in highways, roads, bridges, transit, regional rail, building a connected network that moves people and goods efficiently across Ontario.

We know that air travel is a critical part of that system because we need reliable ways to get to meetings, workplaces, communities and destinations all across our province. I've toured with SCOFEA for the last number of years; Speaker, you joined as well. Just to see the beautiful parts of our province—travel to those places could be game-changing for them. They're beautiful landscapes, but no one knows about them and they're out of reach. Air travel makes those destinations possible. Investments in airports go hand in hand with investments in transportation and transit networks, but also in local economic development.

We know that engagement is crucial; we know that due diligence is crucial and transparency is crucial. So this will be part of the undertaking that's being proposed to engage and ensure that there's infrastructure that's built on trust.

The alternative is to fall behind and to accept capacity constraints, higher costs and missed opportunities. Speaker, we can't afford that. We truly need infrastructure that keeps pace. We need a transportation system that supports growth, connects regions and strengthens our competitiveness.

This is a province-wide, important asset. And the absence of Billy Bishop and of viability for Billy Bishop has long-standing impacts that will be felt in all regions of Ontario. So, Speaker, we need to take action. Bill 110 is part of that action, and I'm very happy to support it today.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Ms. Jessica Bell: My question is to the member for Windsor–Tecumseh.

It's interesting hearing the member opposite talk about how this will be an economic boon and will increase air traffic when at the very same time we have Pearson airport undergoing a very large expansion in order to serve 65 million passengers a year for the GTHA, which is more than enough to deal with the increased demand in air traffic. It doesn't even make sense.

But my question to you is the issue around affordable housing and housing. The Conservative government—you're well behind on your housing targets, and what is

happening on the waterfront right now is we've redeveloped the Don and there are plans to build thousands and thousands and thousands of homes, including affordable homes, right near the Toronto island airport. And that development is in jeopardy now because of the expansion of the Billy Bishop airport.

Can you convince me: Why would it be a good idea to expand Billy Bishop—

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Response?

Mr. Andrew Dowie: I want to thank the member from University–Rosedale for her question.

Speaker, we know that airports are an economic driver, one way or another. We're having a lot of development at our local airport, for example, that's adding to the property tax base, helping to support services for families all across the city and the region. So, in terms of a balanced approach, economic development arising from an airport is a key part of that. We know that there's a significant economic opportunity for the city of Toronto and for Ontario as a whole, with $8.5 billion estimated to be brought into our GDP by 2050. The Toronto Port Authority had done some research and estimated up to $140 billion in economic output over 25 years and 23,000 construction jobs alone.

The Toronto Port Authority is made up of local individuals who understand the importance of the asset. They live here too, and they're—

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Rob Cerjanec: A question to the member from Windsor–Tecumseh: I'm wondering what the member thinks about unilateral expropriations, or land grabs, as opposed to engaging in consultation and discussion in order to find the best solution, in particular when it comes to expanding the island airport.

Mr. Andrew Dowie: I want to thank the member from Ajax for his question. Actually, this legislation enables the consultation. Obviously, there's a vision being articulated, but this is the beginning of the consultation process and having a thorough understanding of the implications to all parties as to what this means.

But it is important to identify the vision, identify where the vision can be improved and to take action. Because Ontario, as we've seen—as I've seen in my lifetime—has been through periods of stagnation due to indecision and lack of understanding of the implications of making a decision. We need to make decisions for the betterment of not only our economy but our families that live here. That is why I'm happy to support this legislation, with the consultation to come.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Ms. Laura Smith: Through you, Madam Speaker: The member talked about choice. I think he said there was only one flight in Windsor-Essex leaving and how that was so restrictive. I know that that can be problematic when you've got an economy. I know Windsor-Essex has a tourism sector. It's got a great arts community. I'm wondering how the member could speak to the additional investments and ensure that we're building the infrastructure needed for long-term growth in this particular example.

Mr. Andrew Dowie: I definitely see benefits for my region. There's no question about it. Someone who lives here in the downtown or in areas proximate to the downtown who would use Billy Bishop—having regularly scheduled flights down to the southwest is going to give that opportunity for a weekend trip getaway, see our beautiful wineries, see Point Pelee National Park and see the different assets that we have. We could very much use that tourism economy. We've got a lot of things to show that few get to see because we're a fair distance away.

So, I see nothing but great things for our region as a result of providing this choice of aviation options in the GTA. Pearson has a significant footprint, has a lot of congestion added as it is, especially because it's the international hub. But Billy Bishop can greatly serve the Ontario region and Ontario airports and ensure that we're well served.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Ms. Jessica Bell: This is a question to the member for Windsor–Tecumseh. The questions that I'm getting from constituents are about the cost. How much is the provincial government looking at spending on this Billy Bishop airport expansion, and who is going to be paying for it? That's my question.

The reason why I think that is an important question is that we're hearing members on our side and other sides talk about how airports in northern areas are crumbling and not getting maintenance requests accepted, but at the same time those taxpayers are going to be paying for this Billy Bishop airport expansion that the people of Toronto don't even want.

So my question, again, is, how much are taxpayers going to pay for the Billy Bishop airport expansion, even though Toronto members are not even asking for it and don't even want it?

Mr. Andrew Dowie: I want to thank the member from University–Rosedale for her question. Ultimately, as noted in my remarks, there would be some negotiation on the acquisition cost between the city of Toronto. Ultimately, land and sale discussions are rarely negotiated in public. They certainly weren't at the municipal level when I was there.

1400

We know that in terms of numbers, $140 billion estimated economic output for the airport modernization over 25 years, two million passengers that are served annually at Billy Bishop—so obviously there's utilization of Billy Bishop—$900 million is the contribution to the GDP each year, and $1.8 billion in economic output each year. So we know that this is a pretty important economic asset for the people of Toronto, with the opportunity to provide even further revenues for the property tax base, for our sales taxes and for Ontarians as a whole. So it's a good project.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. John Jordan: We all know that we're in a global economy. When we look at manufacturing alone, Ontario has North America's third-largest number of manufacturing jobs: 800,000 manufacturing jobs, 20,000 firms. Many of those firms, their head offices are here in Toronto.

As we work to reduce red tape—and we've been very successful on that path—and make it more attractive for companies to come to Ontario and work in Ontario, can the member tell us how Billy Bishop airport, the expansion, will help make it easier, more viable and more affordable to come to Ontario?

Mr. Andrew Dowie: I certainly want to thank the member from Lanark–Frontenac–Kingston for his question. He brought up memories of my dad. He was an insurance adjuster, and he turned down a promotion because it required relocation to Toronto. We would have had to move here, and he didn't want to move away from family. So he gave up his career prospects to stay in the Windsor area.

Having increased connectivity means in today's world, that kind of decision isn't necessary because with improved transportation connections, he could come in a couple of days a week and divide his time between locations. So I see opportunity—opportunity and then some—for families to grow, for other regions to benefit, but for Toronto to benefit from the economic output that those workers coming in would use, spending money in the economy.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question? I recognize the member for University–Rosedale—very quick.

Ms. Jessica Bell: This is, again, a question to the member for Windsor–Tecumseh. I hear the member talk about economic benefit. The expansion of the Billy Bishop airport, we know for sure, is going to benefit the owners. And the owners are JPMorganChase, a US company. We also know that the people that will not benefit will be the tourism industry and small businesses who are saying—

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Response?

Mr. Andrew Dowie: PortsToronto owns the airport. They may not operate it, but they own it. The ownership is public through the port authority and so the benefits certainly are going to the public.

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

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: It's always a pleasure and an honour to rise in this House to speak on behalf of the people of Toronto Centre. I think I'm going to stretch that out a little bit. I'm going speak for a lot more than just the people in my riding but for a lot of Torontonians who would love to fill this chamber and to tell this government directly that they're going in the opposite direction, and certainly in the wrong direction, when it comes to Bill 110, entitled Building Billy Bishop Airport Act.

I have had the distinct experience of working with Premier Ford when he was a rookie councillor at city council. He was a bit of an outlier on council. He would be floating these ideas without ever talking to anybody, then he would announce them as if they were happening for real. Things that rookie city councillor Ford used to propose would include building a Ferris wheel on the waterfront, building a monorail on the waterfront, building a mega mall on the waterfront. City council would take none of it seriously because we knew that he didn't bring any credibilityto the debate.

So I find it very interesting coming here, to this chamber and to this House, in 2023, about how every member of the Conservative government would take the rookie councillor, now Premier, so seriously whenever an idea pops into his head. Whether it's the destruction of Ontario Place, letting the science centre close or tunnelling under the 401, there seems to be no independent thought or analysis on why these things would come forward without a shred of evidence. Decisions are made without any facts, simply because the boss told you so.

If I were to sum up what this Conservative government is about, and if someone were to ask me what I see, I would tell them to take a look at this bill, Bill 110. It has all the trademarks of a rookie-councillor, Ford-government back-room deal: the misuse of emergency powers of the provincial government to escape accountability, the Premier acting in cosplay to play the mayor of Toronto—and if he wants to scribble all over Toronto's harbourfront and waterfront, I would invite him to come to my desk. I'm going to give him a copy of this colouring book that I created for him so he can channel all his creative energy into colouring this waterfront colouring book, as opposed to scribbling all over our waterfront.

The back-of-napkin plans that have no feasibility, no budget, no credibility whatsoever are taken so seriously. They're forwarded here in the form of legislation, and we have to waste our time on these debates. It is so insulting to the residents of Toronto to have a Premier who overreaches all the time—overrides their council, overrides neighbourhoods and overrides their rights as citizens of this city and this province—and to continually be ignored. There's no spending oversight for a bunch of folks who talk about being fiscal conservatives and fiscally responsible people. There are no environmental assessments here. It merely is another bright, shiny idea coming from a Premier who wants to enrich his friends and ignore Ontarians.

There's a lack of clarity for me, as someone who has been an active user of the waterfront and someone who has been on city council for 12 years, who has debated the waterfront debate on the merits of its case with feasibility reports, as well as many other documentations before us, other than a short bill. I find it very confusing, and perhaps it's largely because it's designed that way: to befog all of us, to speak in platitudes as opposed to the facts. What you're proposing is extremely expensive, it's going to be an environmental disaster, and we are not even acknowledging that. In Toronto, our city, we have moved away from industrial uses on the waterfront, and it's taken decades of master planning to do so.

I want to say that the federal Liberals could put a stop to all this madness right now. They have an 80% stake in this whole discussion around the island airport. There are three signatures to the tripartite agreement: the Toronto Port Authority, Transport Canada and the city of Toronto. The city of Toronto has already told you what they think; they want you to leave their waterfront alone. This province couldn't do anything without the federal government stepping in to say, "You can have Toronto's waterfront, and do as you please." With one single phone call, the Prime Minister could put a stop to this nonsense.

I encourage and even challenge my Liberal caucus—there's only one member here, but to call your MP, my friend, and ask the Prime Minister to express himself as clearly as possible—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): I'm going to ask the members to keep their voices down. It's a little bit too early. We've got a long way to go.

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

But essentially, this whole debate would be moot if we heard from the federal Liberals about what they intend to do, what their true intentions are. So, to the Prime Minister: We're waiting to hear from you as clearly as possible, and we urge you to speak up now. Because if you can't stand up to this Premier, how can we trust you to stand up for us on the world stage?

I'm going to give you 12 reasons why we can not and should not expand the Billy Bishop airport.

1410

Number 1: The airport is simply too small. It's the smallest airport in Canada at only 210 acres. The next smallest North American airport that handles jets is in San Diego, and that's sitting at 630 acres. The Premier is seizing all of the Toronto Islands and much of Little Norway Park—which now you've backpedaled on because you've heard from the public pressure—will only enable some clearcutting of trees, all of this to accommodate what you think is going to be 10 million additional passengers. That's reason number 1.

Reason number 2 why you should not expand the Billy Bishop airport is that traffic would become a nightmare. If you think it's bad to get through Toronto now, what do you think a 450% increase in traffic will do? Anyone taking the Porter shuttle already knows it takes about 20 minutes from Union Station to Billy Bishop airport during rush hour traffic. I can get to Pearson from Union in about 25 minutes.

You are going to choke off Toronto's downtown, our central business district and our waterfront, with 10 million passengers running through what is ultimately a dead-end street. Where Queen's Quay and Bathurst Street meet, this tiny little stub that taxis and you travel along is called Eireann Quay. It is essentially a cul-de-sac. I challenge you to show me the traffic management plan that will tell me that you won't need more land. You're not going to get there any faster, and we know that.

The third reason why you should not expand the airport is that on Monday, May 11, in exactly five days, Pearson international airport is breaking ground to expand terminals 1 and 3. They are moving from 47 million passengers to 70 million passengers. The reality is that aviation future in Toronto does not need an expansion of the Billy Bishop airport. They're adding more taxi stands for the planes, more lanes, more slots, more gates. It is already designed and costed. And I'm going to venture out that perhaps a few of the cabinet ministers might even be there for the groundbreaking. So, it's simply not necessary.

Fourth reason: Runway extensions will close off most of the harbour to boats and create a stagnant swamp to the west of the airport. You can say goodbye to the western channel, Trillium Park, East Island, West Island, the amphitheatre and Ontario Place. That new luxury spa is going to watch jets fly by every two and a half minutes.

You will also need about 600 meters to about 1.2 kilometres of additional airport lighting. This will cut across the marine exclusion zones that will be absolutely necessary to accommodate jets. The boats, the sailors, our canoeists, our kayakers—none of them will be able to cross anymore. You're essentially even blocking off Hanlan's Point ferry.

This Conservative government has failed to consider the economic impact of what a smelly, loud waterfront with no views will do to attract visitors. You failed to account for the economic impact of essentially closing down our harbour.

Five: Hanlan's Point. It's a critical a site for queer and trans history, as well as a current gathering place for many in our community. The same will go for Centre Island, Far Enough Farm, Ward's Island, Olympic Island. It's all there, and it is a beautiful national and, I would say, natural treasure. We all have memories of visiting those islands. It was my first experience here in Canada of what is expansive green space as a poor immigrant kid. The ferry was my very first boat ride in this country. Don't destroy that.

It's not safe, this expansion of the airport. The Billy Bishop island airport today does not meet Transport Canada's safety standards TP 1247. The current airport operates under many exemptions from safety standards. The standards specify a primary hazard zone that includes all of the waterfront buildings, the Toronto Islands, Tommy Thompson Park and the mouth of the Don River, which has recently been re-naturalized. Transport Canada says that wildlife refuges are a high risk, and an unacceptable land use, if within the prime hazard zone if an airport is expanded, due to the risk of bird strikes.

In 2009, we saw an Airbus A320 strike a flock of Canada geese shortly after their takeoff from LaGuardia, resulting in a dual engine failure. The plane landed in the Hudson River and that incident was captured around the world. It was even depicted in the movie called "Sully."

A turboprop plane, landing every 20 minutes now, reverting to a jet taking off every two to three minutes, is going to vastly increase the risk of bird strikes. How many other accidents and incidents are going to take place because of your poor planning? Birds tend to bounce off

those turboprop planes, but they get sucked into jet engines.

This is a description of what will happen if the waterfront is destroyed. You will not see picnic areas. They will be turned into nothing more than industrial wasteland.

There are health impacts to consider. A 2017 environmental assessment from the Toronto Port Authority notes that sound levels could result in hypertension and ischemic heart disease, and they identified increased risks of respiratory illness, as well as increased risks of cardiopulmonary disease and lung cancer. That's directly from the port authority's environmental assessment.

Reason number 8: There are two elementary schools there and countless recreational areas where children will be affected. The noise from jets flying out every two and a half minutes will disrupt learning. Those children especially sensitive to poor air quality will see a higher outbreak of asthma.

Reason number 9: It's a waste of public money. Taxpayers have already invested billions of dollars to develop Toronto's waterfront into Canada's number one tourist destination, with over 28 million visitors. It is also currently home to over 100,000 families. If these assets are ruined, there will be a massive knockdown on economic and social effects to the downtown, the waterfront and the island businesses. We also know that there will be a significant reduction of the quality of life. You just have to ask those who live right now across from the Billy Bishop island airport and they will tell you that things have not been getting better; it has gotten worse. If the government had a business case they could be proud of—if you are so darned proud of your financial largesse, well, show us your business plan now. Convince us as opposed to hide from us. Show everybody that you've got the receipts.

Reason number 10: It would be a disaster for wildlife, particularly the migratory birds that use the Leslie Street Spit and the islands as stopover places. These stopovers divert the birds from our downtown, dramatically reducing the number of birds that hit buildings. This will save their lives and also reduce the issues we are experiencing in downtown. If you've ever walked in the downtown corridor and wondered why there was a dead bird in front of you in the financial district, they probably struck a building, which is why Toronto has been so aggressive in adapting green building standards, which you've just gutted. Birds are crucial to our ecosystem, and we must protect them to preserve our food webs, our pollinator habitats and more.

Reason number 11: Follow the money. The main beneficiary is J.P. Morgan's subsidiary Nieuport Aviation. In 2015, Nieuport Aviation bought the Billy Bishop airport terminal from Porter Airlines for $750 million. Two years later, they want to court. They had to sue Porter to recover up to $130 million, and they won for unpaid passenger terminal fees and charges accrued during COVID, as well as costs and damages. Since the pandemic, passenger traffic at Billy Bishop airport is down by one third. You're only moving 1.7 million passengers compared to what Pearson is projected to move at 70 million passengers. They're losing money. They've lost 800,000 passengers and they can't reclaim it six years later, after the pandemic. So, why would you ask Ontarians to underwrite the profits of a big American bank?

1420

Reason 12: The expansion of Billy Bishop airport is going to bring with it many, many jets. We know that. But the flight paths, which I have quite a bit of experience in, are going to reduce the height of buildings, in particular in the Port Lands, which has approved over 30,000 new units of housing. The modelling that we have done means that those high-rise buildings are going to see a 15-to 20-storey cut in the height of their buildings. It just so happens that, out of the 30,000 new homes approved on the Port Lands, which has been a 10-year plan, it's going to see that reduced by maybe about 10,000 units. So why would we in the city of Toronto and Ontario, facing a housing crisis, not build those extra 10,000 homes? Ten thousand families can move into them, and you're suggesting that we don't do it—in the middle of the biggest housing crisis that this province has seen?

I'm sure I'll come up with a few more reasons on why Billy Bishop airport can't be expanded and should not be expanded. If I get a chance to debate this again, I will bring up probably another 12 more reasons. But those are the ones I can think of right now.

The Ontario government's arguments are simply false. We have now seen that this government has said that Billy Bishop airport is going to support this business-travel environment. Let me bring you back to a time when I was at city council, when they told us that we needed to allow jets on Billy Bishop airport because we were going to expand the business-traveller class. Well, interestingly enough, where do people fly out of Billy Bishop in their flip-flops? It just so happens that they're flying to Miami, Orlando, Fort Lauderdale, West Palm Beach, Palm Springs, Fort Myers, Tampa. They're recreational flyers. They're going on vacation at the convenience of our waterfront.

So no one is buying that the international business traveller needs to fly out of the Billy Bishop airport. We don't; we get to Pearson. Flights are not going to be cheaper, as we know. If I go to a website right now and determine which flight is cheaper if I need to fly out of Billy Bishop or Pearson, I find that they're comparable.

We have now seen this government not be truthful when it comes to the facts. They are determined to do what they want to do, and it really is perplexing to me and all my residents why they're insisting on this very expensive, very acrimonious proposition, one that will put our waterfront at risk, that will permanently alter it forever and, dare I say, destroy it.

I cannot stand by, not even for a moment, without giving it my full-hearted, full-bodied resistance at every twist and turn. There's no way you're building that airport and—

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Matthew Rae: Thank you to my colleague from Toronto Centre for her remarks.

This afternoon, Speaker, I know she mentioned the tripart agreement, and she encouraged the member from Nepean to call the Prime Minister in that aspect. But I was wondering if the member from Toronto Centre has talked to her good friend Olivia Chow, Speaker, and whether she supports this expansion—whether she's called the mayor's office.

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: The mayor's record, I think, is very clear and evident for anyone who has observed her political history. She has never supported jets over the waterfront. She recently held a press conference at Little Norway Park, stood with the entire community behind her as she stood by and spoke forcefully in favour of ensuring that Toronto lands remain in Toronto controls.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Ms. Jessica Bell: This is a question for the member for Toronto Centre. When I was listening to your speech, what struck me is this question around who benefits.

So who benefits from the expansion of Billy Bishop airport, and who is harmed with the expansion of Billy Bishop airport? Can you explain?

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: Thank you very much to the member from University–Rosedale for that question. I think who benefits would be the owners of the terminal, those who are profiting from the terminal access. I think it's important to know that there is probably going to be a need to build a new terminal. You couldn't fly 10 million people out of that tiny little terminal. You've all flown out of there.

I think who is going to be harmed is going to be the people of Toronto, the businesses of Toronto on the waterfront, who are all going to see an environmental degradation of their cherished natural green space.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

MPP Tyler Watt: When we talk about the Billy Bishop expansion, I just start to think about all these things that this government is doing with Toronto: "We want the convention centre in the middle of Lake Ontario, moving Ontario Place, the mega private spa, the fantasy tunnel under the 401"—I'm sure I'm forgetting many examples here, but, man, this Premier is obsessed with Toronto.

Anyway, my question to my colleague from Toronto Centre: Why is this government more focused on forcing jets onto Toronto's waterfront rather than investing in our schools and transit and housing and health care, which communities are actually asking for?

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: Thank you. The short answer is that the Premier is out of touch, out of ideas and out of fuel—out of gas? Out of energy. I'm trying to borrow some lines from the Liberal Party here.

Like, what can we tell you? No one asked for this. I've spoken to a lot of people who work in aviation, and they told me that they didn't even know about this, so what a big surprise that this is now coming.

Somebody has lobbied this Premier. Maybe it's all his trips going down south to meet with US banks and US companies. Maybe they met with J.P. Morgan, the Chase bank; I don't know. But somebody has planted this idea, and he's decided to run with it, and the rest of us are now just reading about it in the news.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Andrew Dowie: I want to thank the member for Toronto Centre for her remarks.

I struggle a bit with how this deal is being characterized. I say that because it's the Toronto Port Authority that has put forward the modernization plan; it isn't Nieuport or the operator. It's the Toronto Port Authority, which is federally controlled, and they've asked the province to be involved. They're proposing to spend—I believe it's $5 billion on the modernization project, which would be self-funded. So, given that it's the federally run Toronto Port Authority making the proposal, how is this impression being left that it's being initiated by the private sector when it's coming from the federal government?

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: Thank you for your question. I would like to see the documentation. I would like to learn about when those meetings took place, when the federal government met with the Premier and your cabinet to ask for this. I think that all members of the public deserve to know when the conversation was initiated, who was there and how the legislation was drafted: who drafted it, who provided the input. We would all want to know. So if you have that information, we want you to share it.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): The member for University–Rosedale.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Speaking of the Liberal government, it does seem that the approval for Billy Bishop airport is going to require the provincial government's support and also the federal government's support. And there are a lot of people right now who are very concerned that Prime Minister Carney, even though he got a lot of the progressive vote in downtown Toronto, is turning around and ignoring them at a time when we need the Prime Minister to stand up. So for those people who are really concerned about the Billy Bishop expansion, what do you recommend they do?

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: Thank you for that question. I took with great interest when former Liberal Finance Minister Greg Sorbara wrote his letter, I guess, to the Prime Minister, saying that he was absolutely, number one, aghast—I think he was appalled—by the silence of the Toronto federal Liberal caucus on this issue. I think that he's probably not the only prominent Liberal that is ringing the Prime Minister at this moment. I know that for many people in my community who are Liberal voters—we are friends, but they are Liberals—they can't believe why it is that the Liberal government is enabling this Premier and this cabinet to do what they're doing. We want to hear from the federal government; we all need to hear from Prime Minister Carney. Does he support this? If he does, then stand by his decision and stand by the Premier.

1430

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. John Jordan: One of the fundamental differences I find between this government and the opposition is language. We use the words "investment," "return" and "jobs," and the opposition uses the words "spending" and "cost" with no consideration for "return."

This project represents 23,000 construction jobs. It represents $140 billion in economic output over the next 25 years. Does the member not feel that that is good for not only Toronto but for Ontario?

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: You know, interestingly, I spent 16 years in the real estate and financial sector, and I'm all about the ROI. What I don't have is a business case in front of me. I don't have a feasibility report. I don't have an environmental assessment. I've got nothing other than your bill. If the government is so confident, then bring us all the documentation you want. What I don't understand is why you can't stand by your own claims.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Ms. Jessica Bell: When I was listening to your speech, member for Toronto Centre, you talked about what was happening with the development at the mouth of the Don River—how a plan has been made and agreed to with the city of Toronto, the provincial government and the federal government to redevelop that land and build thousands of new homes, including affordable homes, so we can meet our housing needs. And now we hear that some of this plan is under threat because you can't build all these homes and very tall condos next to a major industrial airport expansion.

Can you summarize for us what's at risk when it comes to housing if this project proceeds?

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: Yes, I can. Thank you very much for that question. The Toronto Port Lands is comprised of 1,200 acres of land. The naturalization of the Don River cost $1.2 billion and the return on investment for the three orders of government that made equal amounts of investments is to build a vibrant mixed-use community, which is comprised of, right now, approved 30,000 units of housing. If the runway expansions continue—the Billy Bishop airport's flying jets—then those units will be reduced by 10,000 homes. That means we're left with 20,000 homes—and potentially a few more, I'm not sure, but early modelling shows us that we're losing 10,000 new units of housing.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Further debate? I recognize the member for Ottawa South.

Mr. John Fraser: Thank you very much, Speaker, and—

Interjections.

Mr. John Fraser: Thank you very much. I'm here till Thursday; try the veal.

I'm going to be pleased to speak about this bill. I'm not going to support it, but I do want to thank the Minister of Transportation for bringing it forward, because it just creates another opportunity to talk about the Premier's penchant for luxury private jets and how we got to where we are—a little bit more about that later. I'm sure that there are people in the room who are going to want to hear more about luxury private jets, how we actually ended up buying one here in Ontario and whether we still own one or not.

This is enabling legislation. It's enabling the Premier to do whatever he wants, wherever he wants, with whoever he wants. That's all it's doing. Bill 5 was the precursor enabling legislation to enable the Premier, which is to say, we can create a special economic zone where the rules just don't exist. So, where's the first place that they use it? The Toronto waterfront.

I was sort of joking the other day when I was talking about that old series—it's old, it's 16 years old; I didn't realize how old it was until somebody told me when I mentioned it—Boardwalk Empire and this fixation on the waterfront. I compared what we see here as Ford-walk Empire, with all the stuff that's happening in Ontario right now—with 7.8% of Ontarians being unemployed; with people having a hard time just putting food on the table; when the government is making it harder for students to get a post-secondary education, driving them and their families further into debt.

The Premier is fixated on the waterfront. Now, it's nothing new. He's got a luxury spa—sole sourced—and we're going to spend a billion dollars on enabling—more enabling—that luxury spa that the Premier wants on the waterfront.

But what are we doing with public money? Well, we're going to spend about a billion dollars for infrastructure, but part of that is going to be for the "Garage Mahal," which the Premier is going to build on the waterfront. What a wonderful idea. What a vision. Imagine if he had been in Chicago, what it would look like. And he wants to put a giant billboard there, so he can put big "Protect Ontario" advertisements, when the only thing that's happening here in question period, in this bill, is protecting the Premier.

Mr. John Vanthof: Changing the jingle to Leaving on a Jet Plane.

Mr. John Fraser: "Leaving on a Jet Plane"—that's so good. I thank the member from Timiskaming for his able assistance. We can get up and dream up some jingles.

But this whole waterfront thing—I feel like we're in Jersey. We're in Jersey and the boss wants to take over the waterfront. He's building himself a spa and a garage. There's an airport, so he has got to seize control of that airport. He can't let the city have control of that.

Hon. Paul Calandra: Italian again.

Mr. John Fraser: No, nothing about that. If you check Boardwalk Empire, I think Thompson is a Scottish name.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: It's Irish.

Mr. John Fraser: It's an Irish name. Thompson is an Irish name. But you can do whatever you want.

Interjection.

Mr. John Fraser: Well, it's true. He wants to take over the waterfront. That's what the theme of that show is. I'm sorry if it hurts.

But why, when there are thousands and thousands of people looking for work, out of a job, does the whole front bench here say to the Premier, "You can have a luxury private jet and an airport too"—not thinking about all those people who are out of work, not thinking about all those people who are having a hard time putting food on the table or paying rent? It's crazy.

When we ask questions, we don't get answers. The Premier bought a luxury private jet. We should be able to see the invoice. We should know who approved it. We should know what the business case is. We should know the details about it—not just us, but you should know as well too. When I ask these questions every day, when I talk about it, I look across to the other side and I see people looking down. I see the look in people's eyes when I talk about the luxury private jet or Billy Bishop airport when, in their riding, there are thousands of people looking for work. It's not right. The Premier needs to come clean on this, on this bill.

My colleague to the right of me here from—oh, my gosh.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Say his name.

Mr. John Fraser: No, I don't want to do that.

Interjection.

Mr. John Fraser: Kiiwetinoong—thank you. I knew it; I just couldn't remember.

He said, "You know, there are all these airports in the north and they're not safe." They're not safe. They don't have enough staff. They don't have enough people. Those airports are really critical for those communities in the north—really critical. Why are we chasing Billy Bishop airport? Why aren't we fixing those airports? I bet you $29 million would do a lot of good at those airports in the north.

But instead, today, we're here debating a bill about taking over Billy Bishop airport. Why? Because the Premier wanted his own luxury private jet. That was the most important thing to him. Now, he doesn't feel he has to tell us anything. Nobody can get their story straight, if I can even get a story out of somebody.

1440

I asked 12 times in question period today. An answer, a simple answer to simple questions: Can you give us who actually owns the jet right now? Can you show us the receipts? Actually, my last question was to the President of the Treasury Board, who signed off, who has responsibility to protect people's money. I said, "Can you say anything? Give us a detail. Something. Repeat something we already know."

Interjection: What did she say?

Mr. John Fraser: Nothing. Not a response.

And it sounded a lot like—I don't know if you remember before Christmas, but you know, Keel Digital Solutions? There's another minister who's interested in that right now. That's another interesting story that's going to come back. I know it's in front of the courts, but I don't know how you can keep giving people money when you know they're actually trying to take advantage of you. That's what happened there. But I asked the President of the Treasury Board at that time two dozen times about that forensic audit—two dozen times—before I got one answer to one question, and that was it.

I hope I don't have to go two dozen times to the President of the Treasury Board to get a simple answer that Ontarians deserve to know. The people who serve you coffee in the morning, they pay taxes. The person who takes care of your mom or dad in a long-term-care home, they pay taxes. Seniors on a fixed income, they pay taxes. It's their money. It's not ours. It's not the Premier's. It's their money. And they're not getting the answers they deserve. And when your taxi driver is talking to you about luxury jets, or your barber is talking to you about luxury jets or freedom of information, you know that people are worried about it. You know that people are thinking about it.

I know I'm going to get some questions at the end of this, and what I would really like to hear is somebody on the other side justify this, when airports in the north aren't safe for communities that depend on them for health care, for their economy. If we had $29 million, we didn't need to get the Premier a luxury private jet. He already had access to one. He already had a jet.

So, Billy Bishop: This isn't about economic development. It's not about making things better. This is the Premier wanted a luxury private jet. He already has access to a jet, wanted a luxury private jet. We bought him one. He said he sold it, but it's not clear whether or not that has actually happened, because he was unclear when he answered. The President of the Treasury Board can't answer. It's almost three weeks later, and we have no answers.

Now, I did bring something up this morning. In November of 2018, the Premier had his first chartered luxury jet fiasco, which was that he flew up north to do some announcements, but it was actually a PC Party fundraising tour. He was trying to put it on the public dime, make the taxpayer pay for it, and then he got caught. And the PC party paid for it, $29,000, but then refused to give the receipts. Sound familiar? Didn't say when it happened, wouldn't give any details, wouldn't disclose. And then said, "But it was the first six months of government. It was the first time that the Premier had flown on a private luxury jet." Little did we all know that eight years later it wouldn't be $29,000; it would be $29 million for the luxury private jet. And we can't get an answer—no answers.

It's not just the front bench, with the exception of the government House leader, but there's a few people in the back rows who all said yes to the Premier and his luxury private jet: "It's okay, you can have it. People in my riding don't have work, but you can get your luxury jet, Premier. There are kids in school, and they have exceptional needs and they're not being met, but you go ahead and get your luxury private jet, Premier. There are kids now that can't afford to go to post-secondary education, to college and university, but it's okay, Premier. You can have your luxury private jet." That's what happened.

And the reason I keep asking the President of the Treasury Board is that she signed the cheque. She signed the cheque. And the interesting thing is, not one person has stood up and done what the Premier has done. I don't know if I want to give the Premier credit for this, but this is what he's done: He said, literally, "I should have this private luxury jet. I believe I deserve it. I believe I had all the right reasons. I'm sorry that I told you the wrong way." It's kind of like me saying to my wife, Linda, "Linda, I'm sorry I didn't tell you about that golf weekend until I got home." Right? Even if you bring some flowers, folks, that ain't going to work. Trust me. It won't work. I've never done that. I have forgotten to tell her things, but I haven't gone on a golf weekend or a fishing weekend or a skiing weekend and then arrived afterwards and said, "I'm really sorry that I didn't tell you. It wasn't that I went away; it's that I didn't tell you." It's like, come on. Come on. Who's buying this stuff, really? No, no, I would be in deep trouble. I would be in really deep trouble.

Look, I know people are uncomfortable when I talk about the Premier's luxury private jet, but we're not going to stop talking about it over here, because we want you to be uncomfortable. You should be uncomfortable. You should have been uncomfortable when it came up. Somebody should have said, "Whoa, just a second here. What do you think regular folk are going to think about this? What about taxi drivers? What about the people in the north whose airport is not working for them? What about people who don't have a family doctor?" Or, "Premier, don't you think we should be doing this? It's not a good look." Forget the ethical and moral reasons for not doing it. At the very least, did somebody say it's not a good look? Or does it not matter that it's not a good look, that the perception is bad? Because, yes, you got a majority. You've got three more years, so maybe the thinking is, "Hey, we can do whatever the heck we want. We can do whatever we want. We've got three years to cover it over. People will forget."

And like the Premier and his co-pilot, the Minister of Finance, say, "Let's just move on. Everybody is moving on. Let's just move on from this." But you know what? You say move on, and then after the jet, you go to get the Premier an airport. Now, he still has a plane, an OPP plane. It will be able to land there. It can land in Muskoka too, which is where the other jet could have landed as well, too—no, it will, once they extend the runway. That's what they're going to do.

Interjection.

Mr. John Fraser: Well, that's what it is.

So, buying the luxury private jet was wrong. We all know it. Everybody knows it. And the only person who doesn't know it is the Premier. And we can tell—

Interjection.

Mr. John Fraser: No, no, because the Premier has essentially said, "I should have had the jet. I'm hard done by. I'm the most scrutinized politician in the country. I answer more telephone calls than any politician in the world." We have heard him say that. "Anybody—look at my phone. There are 9,000 messages." It's like, that's good service. You've got 9,000 messages? That's great service.

If the Premier said, "Look, I was wrong. The plane is going back. It was a bad idea. I take full responsibility"—and you know what? It's not what he did. "And you know what? The jet is going back. This is who we got it from. This is who we're selling it to. This is what the details were. I was wrong." Kind of like what he did with the greenbelt—which now makes me wonder whether he really felt he was wrong for doing that because of the way that he's responding right now.

So, you've got a choice, right? Either you start feeling uncomfortable over there with what's going on, the luxury private jet and Billy Bishop airport—either you start feeling uncomfortable and start asking questions and start putting some pressure to make sure that Ontarians get answers and let people know that you don't think it's right, because—you know, folks, I know you know that it's wrong. Because most of you are pretty reasonable people, and I think reasonable people, when they look at this, will go, "This is just not right." It's not right to be spending $29 million on an extravagance when people are hurting.

1450

I wouldn't want to say that I would think that any of you who I see in front of me right now would do that. I don't think you would. But why are we enabling this behaviour? Why are we letting this happen? Because what happens is, people lose confidence in government. Then they lose confidence in all of us, because as politicians we spend so much time talking about each other and how bad we are, right?

You've got to do the right thing sometimes. I'm not saying that you have to do it here, out in front. You do have to have solidarity in parties. But I hope to God that when you're inside the cabinet room and inside the caucus room, somebody is saying, "How the heck did this happen?"

The Premier is not infallible. He's not a king. He doesn't offer decrees. This is a decree: "I am taking this land. I am taking this airport. I will compensate you, but I'm taking this. It's mine now." That's what kings do. Kings say, "I want this luxury private jet. Put it on the credit card. And those folks down there—yeah, I know they've got problems. I know they're hurting. I know they're hungry. I know they need things that I'm supposed to give them that they're not getting, but I want this luxury private jet. And then I want this airport for my luxury private jet."

Now, if that doesn't make you feel uncomfortable, I would be surprised. If you're not feeling uncomfortable right now, I don't think that's a good thing. What I would implore you to do is not to support this bill and, on the inside, start asking some tough questions. When did the Premier lose his way? I thought he was for the people. He's lost his way and somebody has to have the courage to tell him that.

Anyway, that's it for me. Thanks.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Questions?

Mr. Andrew Dowie: I want to thank the member from Ottawa South for his remarks. I will admit to being a bit confused by them. A few weeks ago I had the opportunity to sit with Senator Sandra Pupatello at an event and she was effusive in her praise for—

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Pursuant to standing order 50(c), I am now required to interrupt the proceedings and announce that there have been six and a half hours of debate on the motion for second reading of this bill. This debate will therefore be deemed adjourned unless the government House leader directs the debate to continue.

Hon. Steve Clark: Please continue the debate.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Andrew Dowie: As I was saying, Senator Pupatello was effusive in her praise for the decision of the province to help the port authority in its modernization plan, which they expect to spend $5 billion in self-funded assets to realize.

The federal government appoints the members of the port authority, and they're the ones behind the modernization plan, so to give all the credit to the Premier for this—I guess I'm surprised by it. It's not our plan as a government. It's the federal government's plan, and we have a federal Liberal government, so I'm curious, in the opinion of the member from Ottawa South, why he these comments aren't being directed to the federal government.

Mr. John Fraser: You guys are expropriating land not just for the airport, but you're trying to take over the waterfront. That's what is going on. Like I said, it's like Jersey.

Hon. Steve Clark: "Joisey."

Mr. John Fraser: "Joisey," yes. The head of the family is saying, "We gotta have the waterfront, because I gotta land my plane. So get it done. House leader, here is Bill 110; get it done."

I'm surprised they let you go past six and a half hours. But thank you very much for the—oh, by the way, I know Sandra quite well. We don't always agree, which is not unusual. I saw her a couple of weeks ago. She didn't happen to mention that to me, though.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Speaking of courage, you are the leader of the Ontario Liberal Party—interim leader, third time running. Congratulations. My question to you is, what are you saying to the leader of the federal Liberals, Carney, to convince him to stand up for the people of the city of Toronto and say no to the Billy Bishop airport expansion?

Mr. John Fraser: I've called my colleagues in Ottawa, and I've expressed that to them.

Here's the thing I would like to say: One thing I notice the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier have in common is that they like to write letters to the Prime Minister. Writing a letter to the Prime Minister is different from debating it in here and actually stopping the thing that is—right now, the biggest problem is the grab of the waterfront, this decree of the king which says, "I am taking this land. That's not yours anymore." I am watching the mayor of Toronto. I know she's concerned about that, but she doesn't talk a lot about the airport, and I think she's—

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Speak through the Chair.

Mr. John Fraser: Thank you, Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

MPP Tyler Watt: Thank you to my colleague from Ottawa South for that great debate.

You mentioned something about priorities and coincidences. There have been a lot of coincidences from this government. The backyard fundraiser for the wedding—whatever you call it—

Interjection.

MPP Tyler Watt: Stag and doe; thank you.

And then the greenbelt opened up right after that. It's pretty amazing how that happened.

Here, we learn about the Premier's $29-million luxury private jet, and then suddenly we're debating a bill on expanding Billy Bishop airport. It's just another coincidence.

My question to my colleague is, can you explain why this government seems so determined to push ahead with expanding Billy Bishop and taking over Toronto land instead of focusing on real issues that people are talking about at the doors?

Mr. John Fraser: Thanks for the tough question.

Speaker, it's all about taking over the waterfront. That's what it's all about. The Premier is obsessed with the waterfront. Meanwhile, in northern Ontario, airports don't work. Which one do you think is more important right now? It's the airports in the north—my colleague from Kiiwetinoong put it very well the other day—and that should be of concern to all of us.

We're fixated on this—and I guess it's enabling legislation. I don't think this is what a lot of people came here to do. It's not helping people.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Billy Pang: Did you hear what the member said earlier? Whenever the government says we are building something, they are always negating it. When we are building a highway, they will ask, "Why build a highway? Why not a subway?" When we build a highway and a subway, they ask, "Why don't we build a school?" When we build a highway, a subway and a school, they ask, "Why not this? Why not that?" This is their attitude. From time to time, the opposition has voted against all the infrastructure investments that strengthen Ontario's economy, improve connectivity and support long-term growth. They go against it.

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.

Speaker, through you, to the member opposite: Why do they keep opposing investments to help Ontario compete, grow and succeed?

Mr. John Fraser: Two quick answers on the infrastructure is—Ottawa Civic hospital. In 2016, they got their first planning grant. It's 2026. Do you know what we have? We have a gigantic parking garage—same thing, right?—on Dow's Lake, and we have a huge hole where a park used to be. And do you know what we heard last week? It won't be until late into the 2030s until we have a hospital. That's 20 years. You've been in power for eight years. It's all talk.

What the member from Kiiwetinoong said is, "The airports where I live are the more important airports than Billy Bishop." So why aren't you doing anything about them, and why did you spend $29 million on a luxury jet when you could have fixed some of those airports? That's what I'm trying to say.

1500

I'm not against investment; I'm against misplaced priorities.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

MPP Lise Vaugeois: To the member, thank you very much for your comments.

We spent a very long time talking about the greenbelt, and that bill ultimately had to be rescinded. We heard the same talking points for the better part of a year with no factual evidence—but the same talking points. Then, when it went away, it was kind of quiet for a while.

Do you remember when the "notwithstanding" clause was going to be used against educators? Everybody stood up and cheered, but when that was rescinded—very quiet. And, again, no evidence.

So, what I'm looking for here is, have you seen anything other than talking points? We hear lots of numbers, but have you seen anything in writing that is actually a cost-benefit analysis of this project?

Mr. John Fraser: No, I haven't. I don't think any of us have. But, like most things with the Premier, he does things before he has actually hammered out the details. That's why we have 10 pieces of legislation to address the housing crisis—10 pieces of legislation, often pieces of legislation that are correcting things that went wrong in the other legislation.

Look, Billy Bishop airport is not the right thing to do. But what it is going to do, and you don't all realize it, is we're going to keep talking about jets, and the luxury private jet is a symbol of a government that's in decline and decay when it can't defend itself about not addressing the priorities of everyday Ontarians.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: In the short time we have left, I would just like to say that, in the city of Hamilton, we are struggling with homelessness, we are struggling with youth violence, guns on our streets. You said that this jet is a symbol of this government's priorities, or the Premier's priorities. How can we go back to our ridings, how can they go back to their ridings and justify this when we are seeing such untold trouble and untold suffering in our ridings?

Mr. John Fraser: The jet and the airport should make everybody uncomfortable over there; it makes all of us uncomfortable here. I wouldn't sell it—I wouldn't want to have to sell it.

Look, they can't even keep criminals behind bars. We found that out last week through an FOI that we probably won't get to do again because of what the government has done to FOIs, which should also make them uncomfortable.

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

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: I have been preparing my notes to talk about the Billy Bishop bill, but I'm very tempted to just list a few questions for my colleague from Ottawa South. When we talk about existing airports, which might have cost billions of dollars to be put in place, it's always very easy to say "demolish." I see he's upset about the hospital, which might take until 2030 to get built, but demolishing an existing project is much easier. It might take six months and we can demolish it.

People talk about demolishing the Gardiner Expressway, for example. Did anybody who discussed that drive on the Gardiner in the morning and can imagine what it's going to look like if the Gardiner is not there? How the drive will be to downtown if the Gardiner wasn't there? "No, but let's talk about it. Let's remove it all. We don't need all those cars. Take the subway." I don't understand where the guts come to demolishing existing projects, existing buildings, existing airports.

When we talk about an airport, which is a lifeline for many, many industries, verticals, either downtown or even in Mississauga—because I'm from Mississauga–Erin Mills and Mississauga actually hosts Pearson airport, the biggest airport in Canada, and we know first-hand what an airport means for the city, for the businesses in the city, for all of the ecosystem. GTAA is the biggest employer of the number of employees or number of people working in that area, in the whole province. I think some 30,000 people work in that airport area. When we talk about Billy Bishop, we are talking about many industries which are depending on Billy Bishop as their lifeline.

We know this importance of airports; I'm talking about generally. Airports are the first place where new immigrants land in Canada, when they arrive with nothing but bags in their hands. Airports are also the place where parents say goodbye to their children who are undertaking adventure or getting education in another country. The airport is a place where Ontarians go when they take vacations, visit family or travel the world, and the airport is a place where tourists experience Canada for the first time and learn more about what we have to offer.

Speaker, the airport is an important place. An airport provides opportunities for surrounding neighbourhoods, provides jobs, strengthens the economic community, attracts tourists, businesses, professionals and newcomers. Today, we are here to discuss the Billy Bishop airport because we know that airports are important and they bring significant benefits to the local community and the province as a whole. Airports are not only important, but

we also know that airports are more than just an ordinary transportation tool, like a bus shelter or train station. It is an economic hub connecting people, goods, services and communities.

No one knows this better than the residents of Mississauga because our city is home to Canada's largest airport: Toronto Pearson. Approximately 45% of Canada's air cargo and over 45 million passengers pass through Pearson airport each year—each year. By some estimates, the one airport added over $19.6 billion to the GDP. The result is many businesses, jobs and entire industries that flourish in Mississauga, Brampton and Etobicoke because of the airport. Tens of thousands of people directly and indirectly benefit from employment. This includes people employed by the Greater Toronto Airports Authority directly or by businesses tied to the airport.

Tourism and hospitality are significantly boosted by the airport. Toronto is a world-class city for businesses, conferences, tourists and travellers. Most of those travellers arrive in Mississauga at Pearson airport before travelling to Toronto for their meetings or conferences, going to downtown Toronto.

Mississauga is a gateway and a door to Toronto's tourism and hospitality sector. There is, therefore, a huge return on investment from airports as they enhance other sectors of economy. Our hospitality sector in Mississauga benefits significantly from the airport. This includes hotels, restaurants, taxis, ride-sharing and car rentals, and many other businesses. With over 400,000 Ontarians employed by the hospitality sector, this is a critical industry for our province.

Speaker, the Premier has previously mentioned supporting the modernization of Toronto's convention industry to attract more investments and more conventions. The modernization of the Billy Bishop airport directly complements any future new convention centre, allowing higher volumes, greater convenience and more competition for incoming travellers. These projects would be a great boost to the hospitality sector in Ontario. By providing a seamless travel experience, we would be positioning Ontario as the premier destination for global events, corporate headquarters and international conventions.

1510

People already fly from New York, Montreal and Vancouver to visit Toronto for work or leisure. Toronto Pearson is highly beneficial for attracting tourism, but we can continue to increase Ontario's capacity for tourism, hospitality and professional travel by expanding Billy Bishop airport.

Additionally, many small businesses in other sectors rely heavily on the airport, even if they are not directly part of this industry. For example, many people may have heard about Ridgeway Plaza in my riding of Mississauga–Erin Mills. At Ridgeway, we have lots of diversity, ethnicities, foods, cultures and different communities. We have many businesses with international culture and ethnic specialities, such as restaurants that import fresh fruits, grocers with unique cultural products or spices that can only be found on other continents. These businesses rely on the airport for daily imports.

Consumers travel from all around the GTA to purchase specialty products in Mississauga. As a result of importing these products with air transport, consumers in the city are able to enjoy specialties from all around the world. Thanks to hard work from small business owners in Mississauga, Ontarians can have a little taste of international cultures. This is an advantage of living in a diverse, multicultural community.

For example, last week, I attended the kickoff event for Carassauga. Carassauga is the Mississauga festival of cultures—an opportunity for us to experience each other's unique cultural heritage, food and traditions. The festival will take place at locations throughout the city on May 23 and 24. This festival will show the multiculturalism of our province and a shared sense of respect for diverse cultures.

The airport, therefore, has a very meaningful economic and cultural impact on the entire community. Mississauga is proud to be an airport city. Our economy and our culture are shaped by the existence of the airport in our city. Airports are hugely beneficial to the local area and the entire community.

Speaker, Billy Bishop, like Toronto Pearson, is a critical part of Ontario's transportation infrastructure. Located at the central location along Toronto's waterfront, Billy Bishop has a perfect opportunity to bring more economic, tourism, business and cultural value directly to Ontario's largest city. This opportunity is abundant, but there is room for improvement.

At just two million passengers per year, Billy Bishop is still a relatively small airport. The island airport doesn't have the capacity to handle the demand of a world-class city like Toronto. In fact, throughout Ontario, there are over 900 airports, but only a very small number are capable of handling large-scale international travel.

Most air travel is restricted to a very few airports. People living or working in the greater Toronto area deserve more options for air travel. And over the next quarter century, the greater Golden Horseshoe is projected to grow by nearly 25%, so demand is continuing to increase. Ontario needs more airports, greater capacity and more competition.

That's why the Ontario government is stepping in to help unlock its next phase of growth. The Building Billy Bishop Airport Act would, if passed, support the long-term modernization and expansion of Toronto's Billy Bishop airport. The expanded Billy Bishop with more capacity will relieve pressure on Pearson, increase competition and create good-paying jobs. We are building a stronger, more competitive Ontario with infrastructure needed for the future.

Also, I think there is a very good security point in having two airports. For any reason, if the greater airport of Pearson airport is not capable of receiving airplanes or the full capacity of airplanes, we can have another place to land airplanes.

Speaker, the legislation that we are proposing today would give the Ontario government the mandate and

authority to be a participant in the expansion of Billy Bishop airport. An existing agreement already exists with the federal government and the Toronto Port Authority. If this bill is passed, Ontario would join that agreement by taking over the city of Toronto's role.

This is not a land grab. Everyone affected will be fairly compensated. The government will work with the city to ensure a smooth transition.

To be clear, the expansion of Billy Bishop airport is fully supported by the most important stakeholder, the Toronto Port Authority. Toronto Port Authority has a comprehensive plan to expand the airport, and we look forward to partnering with them to deliver these benefits to Ontario.

No government has pushed more on infrastructure projects than ours. This government's investing nearly $100 billion in transportation infrastructure to get people and goods moving. Whether it's roads, bridges, highways, LRT, subways, bus routes or just filling potholes, our government is investing in every type of transportation. Our investments are ensuring that Ontarians can move around easily, comfortably and at an affordable price.

For example, in Mississauga, we are building important transit like the Hazel McCallion LRT at Hurontario Street. Our government promised that we would build this LRT and we are delivering on our promises. The LRT will connect residents of Mississauga and Brampton to important transit connections, including GO Transit, Mississauga Transitway and Brampton Transit. Ontario has also committed to supporting an additional expansion of the LRT, including the downtown Mississauga loop and the Brampton tunnel. We look forward to seeing the Hazel McCallion LRT coming into action soon.

Our government also committed to building two-way, all-day GO train service for the Milton line. Many residents of Erin Mills take the Milton line GO train every day. It is an important rail network. The commitment to two-way, all-day GO is part of our massive expansion of GO Transit through GO 2.0.

Earlier this year, as part of the $8.8-billion Canada-Ontario Partnership to Build, the federal-provincial governments announced that they are working collaboratively to increase passenger service along freight-owned corridors across the greater Golden Horseshoe region.

We know that new infrastructure can be a marathon, not a sprint. That's all the more reason why we are starting to build now so that Ontarians can benefit from these projects in the future.

We are also building Highway 413, which will connect Mississauga to Brampton and Vaughan. Last summer, we awarded the contracts for construction on the 413, so work is under way. We also announced an expansion of Highway 410 to allow easier connections to this new highway.

Once complete, Highway 413 will allow drivers to bypass the busiest section of highway in North America. Many drivers will save on their commutes thanks to the Highway 413. More goods and more people will be moving faster.

1520

Again, Billy Bishop is one of the many transportation infrastructure projects that this government is working on. This will benefit Ontarians and support our economy. Through this airport modernization project alone, Billy Bishop could generate up to $140 billion of economic output over 25 years. The modernization project is also expected to support up to 23,000 jobs in Ontario's construction sector alone.

By strengthening the waterfront airport, we will ensure it can compete with world-class cities around the globe while driving growth across the city and the province. Many people will benefit from the convenience of this airport. Over 10 million annual passenger trips could be taken through Billy Bishop, up from two million currently.

At an estimated cost of just $5 billion, primarily funded through third-party financing, this modernization project is a good deal. An important point to remember is that this project will be primarily funded by the private sector. Partners are ready and willing to work with the Toronto Port Authority to get this project off the ground. While the government will be an active partner, owner and beneficiary, taxpayers will not be on the hook for most of the cost. Ontario will benefit from the economic impacts of the airport for decades to come.

Speaker, in conclusion, the benefits of Billy Bishop's modernization and expansion are clear. Our city and province already benefit substantially from Toronto Pearson airport, and we want to expand these benefits further. With the newly modernized island airport, Ontarians will continue to benefit from increased capacity and competition.

The airport will bring substantial direct and indirect economic benefits to the GDP and jobs. Many more people will be able to conveniently travel to Toronto. Whether it is for work, tourism, immigration or to visit family, we want more people to come visit Ontario, spend their money here, spend more time in Toronto.

Speaker, I am very excited to see the modernization of Billy Bishop airport once it is completed. This will greatly benefit Ontarians. It will make life easier for people who think to come to Toronto for conventions or for conferences.

I'm happy to see our government continue taking action to protect Ontario by building transportation infrastructure.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

MPP Lise Vaugeois: I hear a lot of numbers coming from the other side, a lot of talking points. We've heard these numbers repeated several times. But I'm wondering, where is the business case? Can you please provide us with the documentation, a cost-benefit analysis for this project that shows exactly what it's costing and the number of jobs that will be lost in Toronto as a result of expanding Billy Bishop and completely destroying the waterfront?

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: I just don't understand the logic behind losing jobs because the airport is expanding. Currently, the airport is doing 200 million travellers a year,

with X amount of jobs—I don't know the exact number. Now, expanded to make 10 million passengers—do you expect jobs needed to go down or up?

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Joseph Racinsky: Speaker, through you, I want to thank the member for his comments this afternoon. He is a strong advocate for good-paying jobs in his community of Mississauga, and I really want to thank him for highlighting all the great work that our government is doing to create jobs across the province.

Based on the debate I've heard over the last couple of days, it's clear that the Liberal Party doesn't care about creating good-paying jobs. I should have known that since they chased 300,000 manufacturing jobs, propped up by the NDP, when they were in government.

I think Billy Bishop employs nearly 9,000 people today. Can you please explain why it's so important to have this expansion to create more jobs here in Toronto?

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: Thank you very much to my colleague on the other side who has just got it exactly correct. We need to create jobs. Airports are hubs for business, cargo, travellers, tourism, hospitality, conventions, conferences, business. All those just come across through the airport, beside the airport, in the airport, around the airport.

We can talk about an example of that: Mississauga. I just said 45% of the air cargo of Canada comes through Pearson airport, which means a lot of jobs, lots of cargo, transportation, trucks, workers, businesses. So you are making all the logic I'm trying to talk about. Thank you.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I have to say, I never expected that we'd be spending so much time in this House talking about the Premier's $30-million luxury jet and now the companion piece, which will be essentially a private airport on Toronto's beloved island.

To the member for Mississauga–Erin Mills, I know in Hamilton people are outraged because they can see exactly where $30 million could be spent in their community to improve things: youth violence, guns in our streets, hospitals that have people waiting in hallways and closets to be treated.

My question to you: Do you think that the people of Mississauga–Erin Mills would be happy to hear that you're spending $30 million on a jet, or would they have other priorities, other things where they think your government should be spending to help your constituents?

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: Thank you very much. I'm trying to follow your logic. Do you think that Mississaugans, if they said, "We're going to spend $30 million to create terminal 4," the people from Mississauga would say, "No, no, no, we don't want terminal 4"? The businesses would say, "No, we don't want another terminal"? They would be very happy, jumping up and down, because that's creating more jobs, more business.

As my colleague said earlier, we talk about highways; you jump into hospitals. We talk about hospitals; you jump into schools. Are we chasing, like cat and mouse?

We are saying this is a vertical, different than the other vertical. We have a hospital in Mississauga coming for $8 billion—the biggest hospital in the country coming to Mississauga.

If we want to build another terminal—if there is a chance to build another terminal, I'll be the first one to support it.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Brian Riddell: When I think of mining industries and I think of Toronto as one of the biggest, if not the largest, business centre in Canada, I look at other centres like Chicago, Detroit, New York—they all have a smaller airport that major companies can jet into.

So my question to the member from Erin Mills is, they're going to want effective transportation to get in and out; time is money. Could you please talk about that a little bit, how this is going to help industry and jobs and create more jobs in Ontario?

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: There is a special vertical in hospitality called "conferences" where—there are conferences that attract all the real estate developers, or all the IT sector, or all manufacturing, aerospace manufacturing, whatever. When a big conference like that is choosing a city, they have to look into everything. Do they have enough hotels to cover for that? Do they have enough restaurants? Do they have easy-in, easy-out transportation the closest to the location? Do they have entertainment around the location where they can spend some extra time team-building? Those are all elements of—

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Response.

1530

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: So when we make a route easy in, easy out, direct, without any delays, closest to the conference, that's definitely helping that sector.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I want to go back to the member from Mississauga–Erin Mills because I honestly don't think your constituents would be happy to hear that you're pleased to spend $30 million when they have other priorities, and I don't think anybody is buying that the money's going to start to fall from the sky as soon as planes land from the sky, and they especially don't believe it because you have presented absolutely no business case; it's insane. You guys are spending money like drunken sailors on the Premier's luxury list of the things he wants, his want list, and you provide no evidence, no backup and no excuse as to why this is happening.

So it's not just you, and with all due respect, I think all of the MPPs across the way and certainly the cabinet ministers need to give their heads a shake. Why are they tucking in behind the Premier when they should show some courage and stand up for their constituents?

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Response?

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: Well, I like the sentence from my colleague about—the money will come from the sky when the planes land from the sky. Actually, do you know how many people work around as one airplane lands at the airport? Having one airplane a day landing in an airport, how many jobs is that? There's the land workers. There's security workers. There is cleanup services and catering services. There are flight attendants. There is land traffic, air traffic. Do you see how many jobs because one plane lands in an airport? Imagine if you multiply that, let's say, by 20 per day, how many people would be working.

So yes, when an airplane is coming down, there is money coming down in jobs and services.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Andrew Dowie: I want to thank the member for his remarks.

So, knowing that we're going to be growing by about four million people in the Golden Horseshoe in the next couple of years, I was hoping to ask the member what his experience has been in Mississauga with the foresight that had been put in by those who built terminals 1 and 3 and retired terminal 2 at Pearson airport to accommodate the traffic today, and what would Mississauga look like if those improvements hadn't been done a few years ago?

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: Absolutely. I don't think the growth rate for Mississauga or the GTA would be the same if this airport wasn't there with that capacity.

Again, I would like to ask a question about the airport. If there is an airport which takes you straight into Toronto—have you ever tried to travel one time and then you have bad weather and they transfer you to Montreal to land, and then you have to take land transport versus you have another airport where you can route some airplanes to there—

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

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I just have to say here, as the official opposition NDP, we try so hard to get this government to do the right thing to help the people of the province of Ontario. They seem to be completely blind to the fact that people are suffering in the province of Ontario. Instead, they seem to be completely consumed with protecting the king, with providing the king an airplane. I think Elvis Presley had an airplane as well. You know, we try, but they seem unwilling in any way to do the right thing and help the people.

Instead of that, we are consumed here talking about the Premier's $30-million luxury jet, whether he's returned it or not—we don't know. Now we're talking about building an airport on Toronto Island, Billy Bishop airport, which can only be seen as a companion piece to the Premier's shiny bauble of a luxury jet so that it will essentially be a private jet—pardon me, a private airport for the Premier to land his jet.

I have to say that, like a king, he's decreed that we're just going to take land away from Toronto. We're going to allow jets to land at Toronto Island airport, no environmental assessment, no business case, no concern at all, just "Get me what I want," or he'll stomp his foot.

Speaking of stomping his foot, when the Premier was forced to return the jet, I have never seen anything so unseemly from a leader anywhere, even south of the boarder. His "woe is me" whinging about having to return his jet was unbelievable. I kept thinking, you know what? Rather than a jet, maybe we should order the guy a wambulance, because that's all he was doing, moaning and crying, when what's happening Ontario is actually not very funny. I can't believe this is what we're talking about.

In the eight minutes that I have, I think I'm going to try and show that this government's priorities are all completely up the Premier's business—let's just say that—rather than the people of the province of Ontario. I'm going to share with you—we've been saying all the reasons why that this airport and this luxury jet are the wrong thing to do. Let me give you seven reasons, and those seven reasons, in fact, are the seven times that a young man, a 16-year-old man, was shot in Hamilton by a 14-year-old with a gun. That's what's happening in Hamilton. I know that that kind of violence is happening in all of your communities across the province. Speaker, I know that you are no stranger to gun violence when it comes to Scarborough.

Let me just give you a survey of the headlines that we have seen in the Hamilton Spectator from the last week. One headline: "Syrian Family That Fled Violence Mourns Loss of Teen Son Killed in a Mall Shooting." As I said, that was Nabil Askafe, a 16-year-old who was at Jackson Square, and who was shot seven times by a 14-year-old with a gun. It's unimaginable. Then we had his funeral: "Family, Friends Say a Final Goodbye to Teen Killed in Jackson Square"—and this is when it said the gun was fired at least seven times in the fatal shooting.

Speaker, this is not the only incident of violence among our youth. You've seen it in Scarborough; we're seeing it in Hamilton. In the last little while, we had a 16-year-old who was fatally shot inside of his car. We had a 16-year-old who was killed when he was stabbed by his 22-year-old cousin. We had a 17-year-old who was killed while his brother and uncle were hurt in a shooting. We had a 19-year-old who was killed and his friend shot in a shooting in the parking lot outside a Tim Hortons. I mean, it goes on and on, Speaker, and that is just Tuesday's headline.

I would also say, on Thursday, our chief, Chief Bergen, and Mayor Horwath—who are doing their best to address this gun violence, these tragedies that are happening in our street—have called for leaders to gather after that shooting, and they are looking for resources. They would gladly take the $30 million that the Premier spent on a plane and deploy it in Hamilton to address this unbelievable wave of violence. They were quite clear that the province has a role to play. I mean, the community has a role to play, youth organizations and the school board, but the province is absent when it comes to addressing this kind of epidemic when it comes to violence. Instead, as I said, Speaker, here we are talking about the Premier's jet.

And then on Saturday, again, it continues: another teen killed in a gunfire exchange in a high-rise. The teen was shot in what detectives called and the homicide unit described as an exchange of gunfire around 6 p.m. inside a unit of a Main Street West apartment building.

I have to say that this shooting occurred—there was a vigil to honour the young man that was killed, Nabil Askafe. The vigil was the same night. As people were dispersing from the vigil to mourn his loss—it was the same night, shortly thereafter, when there was a young man named Talon Williams-Parkin who was killed in a shooting inside his Main Street West high-rise.

Here's what's happening in the real world. These are the kinds of things that we are facing in Hamilton. I don't know if the Conservative MPPs live in magical places where all of their youth-serving agencies are fully funded, where they don't see guns on the street, where they haven't had incidents of violence. Good for you, but guess what? Those of us who represent real ridings, like Hamilton West–Ancaster–Dundas in Hamilton, are seeing this kind of violence. It is disturbing for families that lose young ones. I've heard so many people, including family members—it is shocking how easily it could have been anyone's child that was going to a mall after school and that was shot seven times.

1540

But what are we talking about today? The Premier's luxury private jet, and his personal petulance when it comes to not getting what he wants. The Premier's obsession with getting what he wants, the Premier's obsession with Toronto, his obsession with power, in contrast to what real people are seeing, is completely despicable. We need a Premier that leads; we need a Premier with compassion. We don't need a Premier who, essentially, is so self-absorbed, he doesn't see the irony of flying down in a private jet to be bestowed a free degree when they have just cut OSAP for students that have to pay to get a degree.

So, great, we've got the doctor Premier flying around in his private jet. But we have students that go to McMaster, that go to Mohawk in Hamilton, and they cannot afford tuition. They can't get a job. They can't get a decent place to live. And what are we here debating, Speaker? The Premier's dream, his vision—

Mr. Chris Glover: His wet—I mean, jet dreams.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: His wet dream? I can't say that.

Mr. Chris Glover: His jet dreams.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: His jet dreams—whoops—his jet dreams that include, let's just say, taking over all the island. We've heard about a Ferris wheel. We have heard about building an island out there so they could put a convention centre.

You know what? Great—you have vision. Take that vision, take that power, take that money and do your job. Take care of the basics. Make sure young people in this province have a future, have a job, have a place to live and aren't being gunned down on our streets because you don't do your job.

I just visited an organization—there are many in my riding—called Routes. They provide a fully volunteer-funded program to divert kids from gang involvement, to divert young men from getting involved in gambling addictions, which is happening all the time in this province. Our young men particularly are caught in gambling addictions and there is no help for them. Those programs aren't funded. Give them $30 million to fund those programs, to get our young people off their gambling addiction where they're ruining families and they're ruining their futures.

Let me end by saying to this government, to the MPPs sitting across from me, to the cabinet ministers who cannot be comfortable with this: For the love of God, stop obsessing with Toronto. Stop spending our taxpayer dollars like drunken sailors on your next round. And for heaven's sake, stop licking the Premier's boots. Grow a spine, do your job and help the young people in the province of Ontario.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Anthony Leardi: I'm going to quote from the NDP "defund the police" policy, which can be found simply by googling "NDP defund the police." It says the following: "We cannot and should not simply dismiss the call to defund the police. This is a conversation that is long overdue."

That comes directly from the NDP "defund the police" policy. In view of the fact that the NDP want to defund the police, and the PC Party is the party that is actually funding the police, why should anybody take what the member from Hamilton West–Ancaster–Dundas recently said in her speech?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I would just start by saying I don't know if putting a 14-year-old in jail is the answer to the problems we're facing. What I would say to this government is, you are defunding the police. You have closed two detachments that I know of in Northern Ontario, Gogama and—what is the other one, France?

M^me^ France Gélinas: Foleyet.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Joliet. You've closed those.

M^me^ France Gélinas: Foleyet.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Foleyet; Joliet is Quebec. I know, in Kiiwetinoong, they're waiting for a police detachment there. It is you who are closing these OPP detachments.

What I would like to hear from this government is how you think that the people of Hamilton, who have an excellent chief, an excellent police force that works for the community—they themselves, the police themselves, are saying, "We can't do this all by ourselves. We need the government to step up and support the excellent community organizations that are helping us make sure that kids are safe and that guns get off our streets."

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Terence Kernaghan: I would like to thank my colleague from Hamilton West–Ancaster–Dundas. We see a government that is entirely obsessed with Toronto, a Premier who had wanted to be the mayor of Toronto and who is now effectively acting as the de facto one.

I wanted to ask: Why should taxpayers in your riding of Hamilton West–Ancaster–Dundas be on the hook for this Premier's obsession with Toronto's waterfront? Are there some priorities that you would rather see this funding be directed towards?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Where do I start with the priorities that are listed? I just have to say, with the Premier's obsession in Toronto—in Hamilton, I have to say, "Tiger-Cats, Oskee Wee Wee!" We don't really want to hear what's going on in Toronto when it comes to the Argos, right, Neil?

But what I do want to say is that the Premier does not seem to understand that this is a big province. He certainly understands that when he needs a plane to potentially fly him around. He wants to fly over it, but he doesn't want to drive through it, to see truly how people are suffering. This idea, the Premier acting like a king who wants to fly 30,000 feet above the problems in the province of Ontario, is something that Hamiltonians find completely unacceptable. And I don't know if you've been to Hamilton, but you know what? We don't suffer fools gladly in Hamilton; I'll just say that.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Anthony Leardi: The member from Ancaster-Dundas was waving around a newspaper and waxing self-righteous over the murder and death of a 14-year-old, but the NDP literally has a written "defund the police" policy. It's written right in black and white, and it says, "We cannot and should not simply dismiss the call to defund the police." It says, "This is a conversation that is long overdue."

I say that it is contrary for the member to wave around a newspaper article complaining about the death of a teenager and then simultaneously call for defunding the police. Will she reject the "defund the police" NDP policy?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I have to share that when I attended the funeral at the mosque for Nabil, it was an unbelievable scene to see the family weeping and the absolute agony of his mother and his brother. One of his brothers was there when he was shot.

The police officers that were in attendance there, out of respect, also shared with me that they need more resources, not only for themselves, but for the community. They can't do it themselves. They cannot be marching up and down Jackson Square, when what we should be doing is providing safe places with caring adults that will show young people a different path. That's what the police department is asking.

That's what Chief Bergen was talking about to me and that's what we support. A government that needs to stop spending $30 million on the Premier's wish list and put it—we'll take it, put it—

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

Ms. Catherine Fife: Listen, my colleague really has made a compelling case here for the government to do the right thing: Look at the options, look at where you are investing and not investing, and look at the return on investment for the people of Ontario.

She made a very good point around how this Premier is so obsessed with the waterfront here in Toronto that it's blinding him to all of the issues—wilful blindness, I may say—to all of the issues that we know are playing themselves out in this community, like access to justice; right? I mean, just as a byline, Lydia's Law here—the Attorney General accused me of victim-trolling when I was here at the behest of survivors in this House on Monday. That kind of disrespect and gaslighting is so dangerous to our democracy.

1550

To my friend and colleague, where do you see this province going if this man remains the Premier of Ontario?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Well, what I see is a Premier that is just going for broke. Honestly, it's like he's just said, "Okay, boys, back up the truck. Let me see what I can get out of the province of Ontario." I don't see a Premier fixated with justice in this province. I don't see a Premier fixated with even coming to work in the Legislature. I don't see a Premier that has any idea that the lack of access to justice for women and girls in this province should be a shame on all of our ridings.

I also want to say, why does the Premier not step up and show leadership when it comes to some of the decisions? When it comes to the lack of funding for violence-against-women initiatives, why don't we hear him in front of a mike explaining that and complaining about that? Instead, it's about all the things that he wants and nothing to do with anybody in this province but himself.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Anthony Leardi: The member did it again. She's waxing self-righteous over there about this law-and-justice issue, and yet she ignores the fact that we have an Ontario-STANDS fund, specifically earmarked to assist women and protect them from violence. And yet, she continues to cling to the defund-the-police policy. Anybody can read the Ontario NDP "defund the police" policy simply by Googling "Ontario NDP defund the police." It will bring you right to this policy which says, "We cannot and should not simply dismiss the call to defund police." That's NDP—it's right there. You just Google, "NDP defund the police" and you find this document.

Will the member reject the NDP "defund the police" policy? Will she reject it?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Speaker, let me end by saying my extreme disappointment to have to stand here and instead of talk of what my riding needs, what the people of Hamilton West–Ancaster–Dundas need, I have to talk about the many, many reasons why building an airport on the Toronto Islands that will cost billions and billions and billions of dollars is a bad idea.

We shouldn't have to be saying that. It should be the government that shouldn't even bring this here. Or they should say, "We're going to spend $30 million on the Premier's jet, but we'll give you $30 million to support community organizations." Or "You know what we're

going to do? We're going to put on our big-boy pants and we're going to declare violence against women, gender-based violence in this province an epidemic." Do that like every province has, except for Premier Ford's government.

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

Ms. Lee Fairclough: I'm pleased to rise today to speak against Bill 110, the Building Billy Bishop Airport Act, 2026. This Conservative government established an alarming pattern: using its majority to centralize power, override local governance and trample democratic conventions, all while doing its best to conceal what it is doing, and demonstrating reckless disregard for the financial and social costs imposed on people of Ontario today and for generations to come. Through this bill, the Ontario Conservative government will seize city of Toronto land, including the Toronto Islands and community spaces, without the consent or meaningful input of anyone, Speaker.

The Premier is obsessed with Toronto and its waterfront. In fact, a couple weeks ago, I tabled a motion that requested that the government stop planning or investing in a new Toronto convention centre, also to be on the waterfront, until emergency room department wait times are under four hours. It's about priorities. Visiting Sarnia, Windsor, Thunder Bay or Picton just this last weekend, I hear the same message: Why is he so obsessed with being the mayor of Toronto?

His government's approach to effectively seize the Toronto Islands carries serious implications for all of Ontario.

I've received many emails from my constituents of Etobicoke–Lakeshore who want to know if this legislation is tied to the recent purchase of the private jet for the Premier's travel. The timing is just uncanny. They're concerned that there has been no consultation, and they wonder why the Premier believes he has a mandate to unilaterally impose such a dramatic change. He called an election just last year. This wasn't on the table as part of that election.

Over decades, democratically elected municipal governments and community volunteers on and off the islands have carefully planned and managed the Toronto Islands. For some, it's their home. For others, like the thousands of people who head to the Toronto Islands every summer, it's an affordable and accessible space to get relief from the summer heat and gather with friends and family. Not everyone has a cottage by the lake or the means to escape the city. It is a jewel of this city.

In addition to Bill 110, the Premier has announced that his government intends to declare Billy Bishop airport a special economic zone—the first use of a tool that became law under Bill 5 last spring.

On this side of the House, we opposed Bill 5 because it did not respect Indigenous rights, and because we knew with certainty that special economic zones would be weaponized exactly as they are being used here: to override elected governments, override environmental laws and bend communities to the will of a Premier who has demonstrated on many occasions that he does not believe that the rules should apply to him. Bill 5 created special economic zones, which are geographic areas designated by the Ontario government within which the province has granted itself or its hand-picked proponents the power to override any provincial law or municipal law—any law—labour law, environmental law, zoning law. Laws put in place to protect people and communities can be swept aside at the government's discretion, with no criteria and no process for either the designation of zones or the selection of proponents who will benefit from them.

Speaker, you may recall that the Premier largely justified Bill 5 as necessary to accelerate development of northern Ontario's Ring of Fire and access to critical minerals. The bill was introduced by the Ministry of Energy and Mines and, rightly, was strongly opposed by First Nations for trampling their rights. In his leadoff remarks at second reading, the minister argued, "Harnessing Ontario's critical mineral wealth is essential to our future prosperity." That was the rationale Ontarians were given for the creation of special economic zones.

One might reasonably ask, what do the Toronto Islands and Little Norway Park have to do with critical minerals? The answer, of course, is nothing. There's always a bait and switch with this government. There's always a secret agenda.

As a member of the public accounts committee, this very much reminds me of the Auditor General's damning report on Ontario Place, another waterfront vanity project of the Premier's. I recall the words of the Auditor General—that the Ontario Place process was neither fair, transparent or accountable. The details of the report were quite shocking. Rules were not followed. High-ranking political staff met with some proponents during the call-for-development process. There were no social or environmental frameworks considered. And the estimated costs ballooned.

The estimated costs of moving the Ontario Science Centre alone went from $1 billion to $1.4 billion, with overall costs increased by $1.8 billion.

Rather than course-correct, they made a new law that creates special economic zones and allows the Premier and his government to circumvent the laws.

Last spring, I received hundreds of emails and calls to stop Bill 5. In fact, the outcry is only rivaled by recent opposition to the Premier's new freedom-of-information retroactive secrecy laws and his purchase of a private jet.

Let me contrast what is happening here with Billy Bishop airport and this Toronto Islands land grab with what the Minister of Economic Development, Job Creation and Trade told this Legislature when arguing in favour of special economic zones. The minister said special economic zones were "all about cutting unnecessary red tape, not cutting corners," and that they would be "designated judiciously, with transparent criteria," not created across the entire province, but used selectively "to streamline permitting" and "get those projects that are critical to Ontario under way faster."

1600

No one could characterize the province unilaterally removing the city of Toronto from a tripartite agreement at Billy Bishop airport and imposing a land grab on the largest city in the country, without public debate or consultation, as judicious or transparent.

The government opposed court orders it disliked by dramatically rewriting freedom-of-information laws. It created special economic zones to avoid the very rules designed over years to give investors confidence that Ontario is a place where they will be treated fairly and to give the public confidence that their rights will be protected. The precedent being set here is dangerous: democracy weakened, power concentrated and a clear signal sent to communities, investors and institutions alike that rules and local decision-making can be overridden at will whenever it suits the Premier.

In a surprise to very few, the Premier said recently that taxpayers will likely have to fund his designs on Billy Bishop airport. Once again, families looking for reliable access to health care, seniors' care, mental health care, supportive housing, affordable housing, supports for special education, reasonable class sizes or opportunities for post-secondary education are told that times are tough. There's no money in the budget. Yet there's endless amounts of money to be found for a 401 fantasy tunnel, Ontario Place, Beer Store buyouts and now this project.

Here is the truth and what my constituents are telling me: Airports are not provincial matters. They need the Premier to do his job—not the mayor's job, the one that Ontarians elected him to do. Focus on communities across this province, rural and urban, the north. Focus on issues that matter to them: groceries, housing and jobs.

Instead of focusing on these costly projects that the provincial government has no business in, the province needs to get back to basics and focus on the jobs that Ontarians are relying on them to deliver.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Andrew Dowie: I want to thank the member from Etobicoke–Lakeshore for her remarks. I've got some more questions—the questions that I had for the member from Ottawa South earlier.

The modernization plan for Billy Bishop airport is being led by PortsToronto, a federally incorporated body. Its chair is the now senator, Sandra Pupatello, who was effusive in her praise for the modernization plan and provincial government's support for it, and it's going to be self-funded. My question is, if this is not a good thing, why is the federal government on board with it?

Ms. Lee Fairclough: Thank you for your question. I think that what the Premier has focused on here has been jets. I kind of wonder if maybe he's just looking for a place for that private jet.

Then, when you look at the plan that the government is advancing here, this is about the Toronto Islands. This is about much more than just an airport. I think that what we are seeing is the use of a set of powers here for the Premier to do probably what he's always wanted to do dating back to the days that he was mayor, and I think that people in the province and people in Toronto and people in Etobicoke–Lakeshore are just getting tired of the same old story, the same old way that choices are being made around the use of provincial funds.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Chris Glover: I want to thank the member from Etobicoke–Lakeshore for her comments today.

To the member from Etobicoke–Lakeshore: Do you think it is a good idea to expand the Billy Bishop airport? It's Canada's smallest airport, 210 acres. It's sandwiched between high-rises on the one side and the islands and wildlife refuge, which have a lot of birds—and one of the biggest dangers facing jets is the intake of birds, which could destroy the engines, which is what happened in the Miracle on the Hudson. It's in the most congested part of the busiest city in Canada, and this government wants to spend billions of dollars to expand an airport that is already not in compliance with Transport Canada's safety regulations.

Do the people of Etobicoke–Lakeshore want the government to spend billions of dollars to expand Billy Bishop, or would they rather see that money go to hospitals, schools, colleges, universities?

Ms. Lee Fairclough: Yes, thank you for the question.

As I've said in my remarks today, I think that the people of this province and certainly the people of Etobicoke–Lakeshore are just getting really tired by these surprise priorities of this government. There was no discussion of this during the election. The proposed land grab is much broader than just talking about the airport. We certainly want an airport that meets safety requirements, I would say that.

More importantly, I think that people are just looking for us to think about all the other problems people are facing. I mean, hallway health care has only gotten worse, hasn't it? Answer: "Let's just stop measuring it and we'll pretend it goes away." It's not the way it works.

I would say that people in Etobicoke–Lakeshore are looking for a Premier and a government that's going to get back to the priorities of a provincial government.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Ms. Natalie Pierre: Thank you to the member opposite for her remarks.

This legislation, if passed, would support long-term modernization and expansion, helping to meet future demand in southern Ontario, specifically the Toronto area, including my riding of Burlington—reducing pressure at Pearson airport, encouraging cheaper flights, bringing in new jobs—new construction jobs, jobs in the tourism industry, jobs in sport, jobs in the entertainment industry.

So I guess my question for the member opposite: If you are talking about supporting growth and good-paying jobs here in Toronto, will you be supporting this expansion?

Ms. Lee Fairclough: Thank you for the question. I think if the member is asking if I'll be supporting the bill, I won't.

Again, I think that all of this has come about at an uncanny time when we find out that the Premier wanted his own jet and at a time when there was any discussion about the redevelopments needed at the airport or on the island to allow for jets and making a big deal of that. It just feels, I think, that the public is starting to see through it all.

Now, you can rationalize it that way, but this was not what people voted for.

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

Mr. Billy Pang: Speaker, I'm pleased to rise today in support of the Building Billy Bishop Airport Act, 2026.

At a time when our economy is facing uncertainty from global pressures, including tariffs that continue to affect Ontario workers, businesses and supply chains, it is more important than ever that we take practical, forward-looking steps to strengthen our economy here at home. This means not reacting to challenges after they arrive but preparing for them in advance. It means building resilience into our systems and it means making sure Ontario remains competitive, connected and ready for growth.

This is why we must build—build the infrastructure, build the opportunity—and we must build a more connected, resilient and competitive Ontario.

Under the leadership of Premier Ford, our government is making historic investments of nearly $100 billion in highways, roads, bridges and transit across the province. These investments strengthen every part of our transportation network so that it can meet the demands of a growing province and a growing economy.

Speaker, Billy Bishop airport is already a vital part of Ontario's transportation network. Today, it serves approximately two million passengers each year and provides direct connections to more than 20 cities across Canada and the United States. It plays an important role in supporting travel, tourism and business activities right here in the heart of downtown Toronto. It also contributes significantly to Ontario's economy, generating close to $900 million in GDP and $1.8 billion in total economic output annually.

1610

Speaker, we also know that Ontario is growing. The greater Toronto area continues to expand at a rapid pace and communities like Markham–Unionville are growing right along with it. Families are choosing to build their future in our communities, businesses are investing and expanding and new opportunities are being created every day. Ontario's population is expected to reach 20.5 million by 2051. That kind of growth is a success story, but it also comes with real pressure on our infrastructure, particularly transportation. If we do not plan ahead, we risk congestion, inefficiency and missed economic opportunity. This is why planning matters.

It's not just about numbers; it's about ensuring Ontario is ready for the future we are already moving into. This is about ensuring that we have infrastructure in place today to support the needs of tomorrow: a growing population, a growing economy and an increasingly competitive global environment.

By supporting the long-term modernization and expansion of Billy Bishop airport, we are taking a practical and necessary step forward, increasing capacity, improving the passenger experience and creating more travel options for Ontarians.

For families and businesses in York region, including Markham–Unionville, reliable transportation is not optional; it is essential. Residents in my community travel frequently for work, for education and to stay connected with family across Canada and around the world. Many are entrepreneurs, professionals and students who depend on an efficient transportation network to succeed. Whether this is a small business owner travelling to meet clients, a student flying home during the holidays or a family staying connected across provinces, access to convenient and affordable air travel makes a real difference in people's lives.

Expanding access to more travel options will help reduce costs, save time and improve convenience for Ontarians. It will also help reduce pressure on other major airports, improving efficiency across the entire system. When our transportation network works better, everything works better: our economy, our community and our quality of life.

Speaker, this legislation is about more than just travel; it's about jobs, it's about economic growth and it's about ensuring Ontario remains competitive in the rapidly changing global economy.

An expanded and modernized Billy Bishop airport has potential to support up to 23,000 jobs in Ontario's construction sector alone, alongside thousands more in aviation, tourism and related industries. These are good-paying jobs that support family, strengthen communities and contribute to long-term economic stability. They create opportunities for skilled tradespeople, for young people entering the workforce and for workers looking to build meaningful careers here in Ontario.

We also know that infrastructure investment like this creates ripple effects that extend far beyond the project itself. When we invest in transportation, we support small businesses that rely on mobility and access. We attract investment from companies that value connectivity. We create opportunities in sectors like technology, logistics and tourism. And we build communities that are more connected, vibrant and resilient.

Improved access to air travel can help local businesses expand into new markets, attract international partners and grow their operations, it can bring visitors to Ontario, supporting our tourism and hospitality sectors, and it can reinforce our position as a global destination for business, education and innovation.

At the same time, it is essential that we move forward in a responsible and balanced way. This includes working closely with our partners at all levels of government. It includes respecting environmental considerations and ensuring that development is sustainable, and it includes meaningful engagement with Indigenous communities as part of the planning and decision-making process. These are not optional considerations; these are essential to

building infrastructure the right way: thoughtfully, responsibly and with a long-term perspective.

Speaker, our government has made it clear that we focus on delivering results for the people of Ontario. We are making historic investments in highways, in public transit, in regional transportation networks, and we are strengthening connections between communities. We are building an integrated transportation system that supports people no matter how they choose to travel.

This legislation fits directly into that broader vision. Air travel does not exist in isolation; it connects with our roads, our transit systems and our regional rail networks. Together, these investments create a transportation system that is more efficient, more reliable and more responsive to the needs of Ontarians.

For communities like Markham–Unionville, this means better access to opportunity. This means stronger connection to jobs, education and markets. It means more convenient travel options for families and businesses. It means a higher quality of life for residents.

Speaker, at the end of the day, this legislation is about being proactive. It's about recognizing the challenges ahead and taking action now to address them. It's about ensuring that Ontario is not just keeping up but leading. It's about vision; it's also about action. Our government is acting in a forward-looking way so that people can see real results and have confidence that we are planning for the future.

The status quo may feel comfortable, but over time, it will become a barrier to progress. If we wait until our infrastructure is overwhelmed, we risk falling behind. This is why we are taking action now before those challenges become crises. It's an opportunity to build a stronger, more connected Ontario for generations to come.

This legislation reflects our commitment to growth, to opportunity and to build a future that works for everyone. For these reasons, I'm proud to support the Building Billy Bishop Airport Act, 2026.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I just want to put some context into this government's "spend, spend, spend with other people's money" priorities. So let's be clear: This government owes $500 billion in debt. To put that in context, there are eight billion people on the planet, but we owe $500 billion. That is a lot of money.

This government comes forward with another hare-baked plan that only seems to serve the Premier's interest, and they have no business plan. They can talk about what it's going to do and how it's going to do all this, but just talking don't make it so.

So my question is, why is this government so easily spending our money when we have such a huge, huge, half-a-trillion-dollar debt? At the same time, building on Billy Bishop airport, building on the Toronto Islands is again another waste of money when the taxpayers have already spent so much money investing in that. So what's the deal over there? How could you be—

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Response?

Mr. Billy Pang: I think the member forgets that when they supported the previous government, the stronger infrastructure built was structural deficit. Now, our government, we are building the future, and that's why when we look at this legislation, I see a government that is focused on keeping Ontario competitive at a time of global economic uncertainty.

In my community and across the province, businesses are looking for reliable infrastructure, strong connections and opportunity to grow. Billy Bishop plays a critical role in connecting Ontario to key markets and supporting economic activities, and this legislation is about positioning Ontario for the future by enabling modernization at Billy Bishop. We are unlocking a multi-billion-dollar infrastructure opportunity that support jobs, tourism and business.

1620

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Before I go to the next question, I want to inform the House that the warnings are still carrying on throughout the end of today from this morning's session.

I recognize the member for Carleton.

MPP George Darouze: I understand that, while this legislation provides the framework, there is still detail work to be done through regulation and due diligence. Can my colleague from Markham explain how this phased approach ensures we get both speed and thoroughness in delivering this project?

Mr. Billy Pang: Thank you for the question. This legislation establishes the authority to move forward, while the regulations allow us to finalize the technical details based on thorough due diligence. This ensures we are making informed decisions on land, valuation and implementation, while still keeping the overall process moving forward efficiently.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Chris Glover: Next week, the governments—several governments—are going to be groundbreaking an expansion at Pearson airport. It will be going from able to handle 47 million passengers to 70 million passengers. And yet, this government wants to spend billions of dollars expanding Canada's smallest airport at Billy Bishop, in the middle of the most congested city in Canada. Why would you waste money on Billy Bishop when we're already expanding the capacity at Pearson?

Mr. Billy Pang: Thank you for the question. When the member opposite talks about federal government, we have federal alignment on this project. A project of this scale often requires coordination across multiple levels of government, and we are working closely with our federal partners, including Transport Canada, to ensure alignment on this project. This collaboration is critical to delivering a successful outcome and ensuring all requirements are met.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Further debate? I recognize the member for Cambridge.

Mr. Brian Riddell: To the member: The Liberals left—

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Is this new debate or a question? We're moving on to further debate.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): The member is not in her seat.

I recognize the member for Burlington.

Interjections.

Ms. Natalie Pierre: Thank you.

I rise today in support of this important legislation—legislation that reflects our government's commitment to building the infrastructure Ontario needs not just for today, but for decades to come.

At the heart of this bill is a clear and practical objective: to support the long-term modernization and expansion of Billy Bishop airport, one of Ontario's most important and, frankly, underutilized transportation assets.

Billy Bishop is not just another airport. It's a vital hub for regional travel, a key piece of our transportation network and an essential service provider, particularly through its role supporting critical medical transport services. Every year, thousands of patients rely on timely access to care made possible through flights departing from this airport. That alone underscores the importance to our province. But beyond that, Billy Bishop airport is also Ontario's third-busiest airport, serving approximately three million passengers every year. It plays a growing role in connecting communities across the province. And yet, despite its central location and strategic value, it has not reached its full potential.

That's why our government is stepping in. Through this legislation, we are proposing to assume the city of Toronto's responsibilities in the tripartite agreement that governs the airport. We're also moving to take ownership of city-owned lands within the airport footprint, ensuring fair compensation in the process. This bill is about leadership. It's about ensuring that a critical piece of infrastructure is positioned to meet the needs of a growing province and a rapidly evolving economy.

Speaker, the greater Golden Horseshoe is one of the fastest-growing regions in North America. We're expecting millions more people over the coming decades—nearly a 25% increase in population. With that growth comes increased demand: demand for travel, demand for trade, demand for tourism and demand for connectivity. And we must be ready.

We need to plan ahead with purpose and with clarity, because expanding Billy Bishop airport will help us meet that demand. It will reduce pressure on Pearson international airport. It will provide more options for travellers, and it will also improve reliability and convenience for passengers. It will introduce greater competition into the market, something that we know can help bring costs down and make flying more accessible for families. And that matters. It matters for families trying to visit loved ones. It matters for businesses trying to grow and connect to new markets by supporting long-term economic confidence across regions. And it matters for communities across Ontario that rely on strong transportation links to thrive.

But this project is more than just about travel. It's about economic growth. Our analysis shows that expanding and modernizing Billy Bishop airport could generate up to $140 billion in economic output over the next 25 years. That includes the creation of good-paying jobs in aviation, in tourism, in construction and across the broader supply chain. These are the kinds of jobs that support families. These are the kinds of investments that strengthen communities. And these are the kinds of opportunities that help build a more resilient Ontario economy.

Speaker, this is also about connectivity. An expanded Billy Bishop airport will strengthen both regional and international connections, making it easier for people to travel to and from Ontario. It will support our tourism sector by bringing more visitors to our province and it will help businesses compete on a global stage by improving access to key markets. This ensures Ontario stays connected and competitive internationally. This is how we grow our economy, and this is how we will attract investment. And it's also how we will ensure that Ontario remains competitive, not just within Canada but across the G7. It's about keeping pace with global growth and demand.

I want to be clear: This expansion will not come at the expense of safety or environmental responsibility. Our government is committed to maintaining robust safety and environmental protections every step of the way.

We also recognize the importance of meaningful engagement. That is why we have undertaken consultations with impacted First Nations. Their voices matter, and their input is an important part of moving this project forward responsibly. We remain committed to respectful and meaningful engagement.

Speaker, major infrastructure projects in this country can take far too long to get built. And when projects are delayed, costs go up, opportunities are lost and communities are left waiting. We cannot afford that, not when our population is growing, and not when our economy is evolving, and not when global competition is intensifying.

Speaker, this initiative is part of a broader plan—a plan to protect Ontario and make our province one of the most competitive places to invest and do business in the G7, a plan to build a more self-reliant and resilient economy. We are investing in infrastructure. We are also planning for long-term economic resilience and cutting unnecessary barriers. We're also making strategic decisions to position Ontario for long-term success. And this project reflects all of those priorities. It is forward-looking, it is practical and it is necessary.

I also want to acknowledge the importance of collaboration in making this project a reality. We welcome the federal government's support through the Canada-Ontario partnership. We look forward to continuing to work with the port authority of Toronto, with municipal partners and with Indigenous communities to deliver this project in a way that benefits all Ontarians, because projects of this scale and importance require partnership. They require

coordination, and they require a shared commitment to the public good.

1630

Speaker, at its core, this bill is about unlocking potential: the potential of a key transportation hub, the potential of our growing economy and the potential of Ontario itself. We have an opportunity here to modernize, to expand and to build something that will serve our province for generations, and we should take it, because standing still is not an option—not when demand is rising, not when infrastructure is aging and not when the future is calling for bold, decisive action.

This legislation answers that call. It ensures that Billy Bishop airport can play a larger role in our transportation system, supporting economic growth and the creation of good jobs. It strengthens Ontario's position as a leader in innovation, investment and connectivity, and supports sustained growth across key sectors.

I'm proud to speak in support of this bill and encourage all members of this House to do the same. But I would be remiss if I did not also emphasize what this project represents beyond infrastructure and economic metrics alone. It's about ensuring that Ontario remains prepared for the realities of tomorrow, whether that means supporting population growth, responding to shifting global markets or strengthening our domestic supply chains.

Reliable modern transportation and infrastructure is not a luxury; it's a necessity for a province that wants to lead. This expansion positions Ontario to better withstand external pressures while continuing to grow internally. It reflects a government that is not waiting for challenges to arise, but one that is planning ahead, thoughtfully and strategically.

By making these investments today, we are laying the groundwork for stronger communities, a more connected province and an economy that can adapt and succeed in an increasingly competitive world. That's the kind of leadership Ontario expects and that's exactly what this bill delivers.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Ms. Peggy Sattler: Thank you to the member for Burlington for her remarks.

She mentioned the tripartite agreement that governs Billy Bishop airport. She will certainly be aware, I think, that—to my knowledge—the federal government has not yet green-lighted this project to go ahead. The land on which the airport is located is mostly owned by the federal government. It is federally regulated and yet there is no federal support, as I said, to my knowledge, for the reopening of the tripartite agreement.

Can the member provide evidence that the federal Liberal government is going to be supporting the reopening of the agreement and the introduction of jets at Billy Bishop airport?

Ms. Natalie Pierre: Thank you for the question.

Ontario will continue to work closely with the federal government throughout the due diligence phase to ensure the modernization proposal is aligned with shared objectives and in accordance with the associated timelines.

In addition, the province is engaged in discussion with other partners, including Transport Canada and the Toronto Port Authority, to understand the scope and implications of the airport's modernization plan. Engagement will continue with these partners as work progresses.

I'd also like to add that the Ministry of Transportation has held early engagement sessions with the city of Toronto and city officials, and we will also continue to work with the city to explore our provincial role in the Billy Bishop airport and develop a mutually beneficial approach.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Andrew Dowie: I want to thank the member from Burlington for her remarks.

Just to build on the question from the member from London West: We know that the Toronto Port Authority is federally appointed and has proposed the $5-billion modernization plan. So, given the federally considered direction for the modernization plan—and currently that does include jets, but it's not being proposed at this stage; that's not part of what the province is looking at—can you elaborate on the next steps that you see coming for the tripartite agreement?

Ms. Natalie Pierre: Yes, thank you to my colleague from Windsor–Tecumseh for his comments earlier today. One of the things that stayed with me in the remarks that he delivered earlier was around the regional connectivity for remote communities, and so I wanted to touch on part of that in terms of next steps.

We know that regional connectivity is a critical part of Ontario's transportation network, especially for northern and remote communities that depend on air travel year-round. Part of this modernization plan and long-term planning—this legislation will help preserve and strengthen those connections. That means better access to health care.

Recently, we know, Toronto General Hospital, part of the University Health Network, was named the number two hospital in the world. The ability for remote communities and for northern communities to come into the downtown area and to have access to the University Health Network health care services that are provided there is crucial and an important part of our health care system.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

MPP Lise Vaugeois: Thank you to the member from Burlington for your comments. But I must say, I'm distressed at this idea that expanding Billy Bishop airport is going to resolve the problems with the remote airports in First Nations communities that have these little, tiny shacks on them. They're open from 9 to 5. The runways are gravel.

We heard very clearly in the pre-budget consultations how critical it is to actually build infrastructure at those remote airports, which has absolutely nothing to do with what's happening at Bill Bishop. Frankly, we already have

services that do bring people from the north, when they can get on the flights.

Can you show me, in the plan, how this connects to serving those First Nations communities?

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): A quick response.

Ms. Natalie Pierre: Thank you for that question. As I mentioned, our population continues to grow. I know in the last couple of years, we've had an increase of two million people here in the province of Ontario, and projections are telling us that we expect the population of Ontario to close in on—

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

Mr. Sol Mamakwa: ᒥᕐᓄ᙮ ᑲᐸᑭᑎᓂᔑᓱᐣ ᐅᒪ ᐸᑭ ᑎᑲᑭᑐᓴᐣ ᐁᐦᑎ ᐁᐅᑭᐊᓴᒥᑕᒪᐊᑲ᙮ ᐁᐦᑎ ᑭᐁᐦᑎᓄᔪ ᑲᑲᐯᔑᐊᐦᐨ ᐊᓂᔑᓂᓂᐊᐦᔪ ᑲᐦᓂᐣ ᑕᓀᑭᔑᑲ ᐃᔑᔪᓄᐣ ᐅᒪ ᕀᓂᐣ ᑭᔪᓂᔑᓂᒧᐣ ᕀᐦᓂᔑᓂᒧᐣ ᕀᑭᔑᒥᓂᓀᐣ ᕀᐁ᙮ ᑭᔪᓂᔑᓂᒧᐣ ᐁᑲ᙮ ᐊᐦᑐᓂᐣᑕᐣ ᕀᐁ᙮ ᐸᑭ ᑲᕀᐅᐊᔪᐣ.

It is an honour to be able to speak on behalf of the people of Kiiwetinoong. It's not too long ago, about two years ago now, since I've been allowed to speak my language. One of the things I'm still waiting for is to have simultaneous translation into English, so I can begin to speak my language that has been forbidden for a long time.

I rise today to be able to speak on Bill 110, the Building Billy Bishop Airport Act. I'd like to thank this government for putting forward this bill. I say that because this government actually runs 29 airports in northern Ontario. I don't know if I can even actually call them airports, because they're actually gravel runways and I know you cannot land a jet on these airports. I would like to thank this government for reminding us, reminding the people in the north that it is unacceptable for the province of Ontario to pour millions of dollars into Toronto's waterfront, while they continue to strategically underfund air transportation in northern Ontario. I want to thank the government for that, for reminding us that they do not care.

I remember when I first got elected in 2018 and I remember being on this floor. When we got elected in 2018, I remember running into the transportation minister downstairs in the cafeteria. He says, "Hey Sol, I just got briefed from my file. I just learned that we run 29 airports in northern Ontario." And there was a reminder that the government does not understand they actually run these 29 airports—gravel runways.

1640

In the north, northerners are all too used to being ignored by this government. Never has the difference been so obvious, especially with this bill, Bill 110, because there are already airports that they need to fix, not just Billy Bishop. I know this much. When we talk about these gravel runways—remember, these are gravel runways that are 3,500 feet in length. These airports, these gravel airstrips, are not a luxury, but they are key infrastructure that First Nations rely on to meet the basic needs of their community members.

When I talk about this strategic underfunding—I used to say "chronic underfunding," because it's one of the things that governments do. It's not just the provincial government, but it's also the federal government. We're not supposed to rise as people. We are not supposed to rise as nations. When you continue to not fund, or strategically underfund, First Nations, we are not able to rise as people. When you underfund northern airports and the gravel runways, it's an inequity issue. It's a safety issue.

I'm going to cut to the chase: This bill is another power grab by the Premier and this government. I join my colleagues in the opposition in opposing it. I hear a lot of talk about how First Nations will be a part of this big project, or big development, of this airport. While the Premier focuses so much on money and attention to the unnecessary expansion of the Billy Bishop airport, as I've said before, people across the north rely on provincially operated airports, gravel runways, to travel for basic needs such as medical appointments. Most people don't know that the province of Ontario, as I said before, operates 29 of these gravel runways in the north. Almost all of these airports, airstrips, are in First Nations which can only be accessed by air most of the year.

Ontario started supporting these airports' construction in 1968 under the remote-airport construction program. But there is no long-term capital program that supports safety upgrades for these airports, these aging gravel runways. Having gravel runways in the province of Ontario is a thing that is from the 1950s; this is 2026. And I know that they are still operating these under the standards published in 1993. For fly-in First Nations, the northern airports—gravel runways—are lifelines, essential to meet the needs of community members.

There's so much to say about northern airports, not so much about Billy Bishop. I didn't even have a chance to speak about important issues, the areas that need attention at our northern airports, like de-icing, fuelling, security screening, automated weather observation stations and so many more.

Going back to Billy Bishop airport and briefly speaking about Bill 5, last spring we saw this government table Bill 5, a bill that has major impacts on First Nations' inherent and treaty rights, environmental protections, the enforcement of countless other laws in Ontario. Instead of listening to the concerns thousands of Ontarians shared, this government rushed Bill 5 through the legislative process as quickly as possible.

I know that here in Toronto the Premier has said that Billy Bishop airport will be declared a special economic zone. This should be a concern for people in Ontario. It shows that this government has no respect for the laws of the province and the municipalities that are passed related to labour standards, environmental protection, and First Nations and treaty rights.

I have said this many times and I will continue to say it: It's time to for the government to listen to the people of Ontario and move forward with us.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Andrew Dowie: I want to thank the member opposite for his remarks. He brings a great perspective of the experience in northern Ontario, particularly in the communities that most of us have never had the chance to go to. As part of my work at SCOFEA, I had the chance to visit a number of the northern airports, and I can certainly say that the ones that I went to were quite a bit different than what we get to experience.

I'm wondering if the member opposite could elaborate as to not just—I know the gravel runways, but what other issues do your constituents see with the condition of the provincial airports?

Mr. Sol Mamakwa: Meegwetch. I know I speak about upgrades to runways. It would have many benefits. It would allow larger aircraft to take off and land, but also reduce the cost of each shipment, making access more reliable and safe. That should be a wake-up call for the Premier and the Minister of Transportation. It is time for the government to stop leaving the north behind and invest in northern air transportation.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

MPP Lise Vaugeois: I will note how difficult it is to hear Conservative members always talking about partnerships with First Nations, when everyone in the Conservative caucus voted for Bill 5, a very egregious, hostile bill towards First Nations.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Unconstitutional.

MPP Lise Vaugeois: Yes, an unconstitutional bill. But my question for the member from Kiiwetinoong actually comes out of the pre-budget hearings and Tom Meilleur, who spoke on behalf of the needs for the northern airports. He says, "These deficits have real consequences: medical patients stranded, essential medication delayed, food delayed, medevac flights unable to land, preventable loss of life."

1650

So I wondered if you could elaborate on the human cost of these failed airports.

Mr. Sol Mamakwa: Meegwetch to the member for the question.

I will say this: No one in Ontario should fear that an aircraft will not arrive, because that happens when you deal with weather, when you don't have the proper instrumentation at these airports. Especially during an evacuation, especially during a medevac, transportation should not be an option—you know, where you don't have an option other than a fixed-wing aircraft.

Promises have been made to the First Nations many times that improvements are coming. But yet nothing is coming. So, the responsibility is in our hands. The need for a strong commitment to improving safety and service levels is right now of the utmost importance.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Matthew Rae: I thank my colleague for his remarks this afternoon on this important piece of legislation. I know he talked at length about his riding in northern Ontario and the need for infrastructure investments. And I know our government does have a massive infrastructure program—over $70 billion across Ontario, not just in Toronto. But unfortunately, members of the opposition have consistently voted against these infrastructure investments.

Today, we're debating a piece of legislation that is an infrastructure investment in Toronto. I don't represent a riding in Toronto, but it will have impacts on all of Ontario and Canada.

I would just ask the member, through you, Speaker, across the way, why they continue to vote against infrastructure investments in northern Ontario.

Mr. Sol Mamakwa: Meegwetch for the question.

I know we get asked that a lot from the government. You guys have a majority government, right? And there is always legislation that is put forth—there are pieces that we can support, but there are other pieces of that bill that we cannot. Also, sometimes, we refer to them as poison pills.

The government keeps on throwing those types of questions to the opposition because—again, it's not that we're opposed to it, that we have to oppose the bill, but there are pieces in there that do not reflect the needs of the people that we represent.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

M^me^ France Gélinas: Does the member think that making those million-dollar changes to Billy Bishop is going to do anything to help the people of northern Ontario? There are no flights from Billy Bishop to Sudbury. There are no flights from Billy Bishop to North Bay. There are no flights.

Increasing the amount of flights would help, but making the highway longer so that a jet can land at Billy Bishop—do you think that anybody in northern Ontario will benefit from those taxpayer investments in Toronto? Is there anything in that bill at all that would help fix the 29 airstrips that belong to the province that are not maintained—neither is the winter maintenance of those strips, neither is the opportunity to de-ice your plane if you land there in the winter. Does anything help the north?

Mr. Sol Mamakwa: I think one of the things about modernizing airports, modern airports—it's not enough to make the system equitable. Even building, fixing up the Billy Bishop airport does not change things.

I know flights up north are so expensive. I encourage everyone to check websites for the northern airlines and see the cost of travelling to the fly-in First Nations to Sioux Lookout or Thunder Bay on Wasaya Airways. You can't find a flight from Kasabonika Lake First Nation to Thunder Bay for under $1,300.

I think it's really important that you actually wake up and look at the north. I know the government talks about how they're working with First Nations where, in fact, you do not work with First Nations.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Matthew Rae: Thank you to my colleague, again, for his remarks this afternoon and for his deputation on this important piece of legislation. I know I touched on, in my previous question, the infrastructure component that our government is making and the infrastructure investment in Billy Bishop airport—the potential, if this bill is passed.

What really strikes me in this piece of legislation is the amount of jobs that will be created in expanding this airport, but also the jobs that will be created across Ontario. Plenty of suppliers—not just located, obviously, in Toronto—will help with this expansion, Speaker.

I was wondering if the member across the way can explain to this House why he will not support these good-paying union jobs.

Mr. Sol Mamakwa: Meegwetch to the member across the way. Just imagine how many jobs you would be able to create if you upgraded and standardized the 29 airports that the province of Ontario runs. Because, as I said before, the northern airports are not viewed as critical infrastructure.

I think rather than building up Billy Bishop airport, why do we not upgrade the 29 airports that the current government runs? They've been running in operation since 1968. I remember, in my home community of Kingfisher Lake, landing there the first time in December 1987.

I think it's time to upgrade these airports as well in the north, not just Billy Bishop.

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

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: It's hard to believe that I'm actually rising here to address a multi-billion-dollar luxury dream project that this government is proposing.

Every day, Ontarians are struggling to put food on the table, find affordable housing, find a family doctor, make ends meet, and this government—what does it do when all of this is happening? It buys a $29-million luxury jet. It builds a billion-dollar luxury spa. It invests in a multi-billion-dollar airport so that rich friends can fly closer to downtown so they can use the spa. What a remarkable coincidence. The Premier wants to buy himself a plane and land it downtown. What's next? A ballroom at Queen's Park?

The government is trying to explain the expansion as an investment in our future. The government says that if it doesn't spend billions of dollars to expand Billy Bishop airport, we will lose investment in our province.

Let's think about that for a second. The premise that we're being asked to believe is that investors won't invest in the province of Ontario if they have to land at Pearson instead of Billy Bishop. Visitors won't come to Toronto if they have to land at Pearson instead of Billy Bishop. Does anyone actually believe that?

This isn't about investment. This isn't about jobs. This is about an entitled Premier wanting to land his private jet as close as possible as he can to the office, and I think the people of Ontario are able to see through all the smoke and mirrors.

Let's talk about the proposed boondoggle. Listen, before you write a law on a multi-billion-dollar project, you would think that the government would conduct a geotechnical review, an engineering feasibility study, maybe even get a cost estimate.

1700

It is important to know that today, the Billy Bishop airport does not comply with Transport Canada safety standards; it's on a tight leash of another year. It needs to fix things already.

I'm going to talk a little bit about RESA. RESA stands for runway end safety area. Every runway in the world has an area at the end of the runway that's used as a safety buffer for planes that either land short of the runway or land long and skid off the end of the runway.

At Billy Bishop airport today, the runway has insufficient runway end safety areas, and Transport Canada has given them until July 2027 to correct the deficiencies. As the aviation safety and security regulator, Transport Canada continues to monitor progress of this important safety requirement at Billy Bishop Toronto City Airport.

So let's dig a little deeper: What would be involved in having jet traffic at the island airport?

First and foremost—and this should not take anybody by surprise—jets land and take off at higher speeds and weights than turboprops, so runway excursions can involve more kinetic energy. That raises the importance of longer safety areas, pavement strength—that's an issue that will come up here again—arresting systems, and emergency access.

Airport ground management is also a significant issue. Billy Bishop is an island airport with water at both ends of the runway. Transport Canada specifically says that compliance is more complex because of its geography and operating environment. Any emergency involving an overrun or overshoot or undershoot or rejected takeoff or water-adjacent accident has less forgiving terrain than at a large inland airport.

It should also come as no surprise that more flights or jet operations would increase coordination demands in already busy Toronto airspace, especially with Pearson so nearby.

Larger aircraft or more passengers mean higher rescue and firefighting demands—more equipment, faster access to runway ends, water rescue, fuel-fire capability, mass-evacuation planning.

What would it take to change the airport to be able to take jets? A longer runway. Runways are expensive. You would have to extend the runway on both ends. And to do this, technically, you would need to build artificial land into Lake Ontario. You would need to install retaining walls, deep-water foundations, armouring and reinforcement against waves and ice. You would need to reconfigure taxiways, lighting systems, navigation aids.

So what is the issue when it comes to Billy Bishop, and why did the 2015 report suggest that this was not a good idea? Because there are so many considerations, and this would be such a complex project to undertake.

Jets require steeper climb gradients to clear downtown buildings, and there is extremely limited room for missed approaches and emergency manoeuvres. Can you imagine a jet making a crosswind landing on approach and having to climb out, on a missed approach, over apartment buildings and businesses on the waterfront? And what about during snow or fog events? The safety risk is significantly heightened, and there's absolutely no room for error.

We must keep in mind that jets produce much stronger exhaust forces than turboprops; that's why they call it jet blast. There would need to be so many engineering fixes to protect runway surfaces, nearby infrastructure, boat traffic, waterfront stability, businesses. These are strong considerations that would need to be addressed.

Speaker, I know a little bit about flight safety and why we all should be concerned about the direction of this government. There is a reason why the Billy Bishop airport has not been expanded to date. Quite simply, it is unsafe to do that without extraordinary expenditure. And I've listened to this government's arguments as if Pearson is a world away. It's a 25-minute train ride—a 25-minute train ride and we're going to invest, what, $5 billion in bringing Billy Bishop airport up to speed? That makes no sense, Speaker. And my fear is, with the arrogance of this government, they won't listen to experts, they won't listen to safety specialists, they won't listen to flight safety authorities. But maybe that's not what this is all about. Maybe it is really about having the Premier being able to land his luxury jet close to downtown.

But, before we go any further, there are a few questions we need answers to. (1) Why would you put legislation forward before you have done any feasibility studies—nothing. (2) How much is this going to cost us? Estimates are from $2 billion to $6 billion, but, given this government's recent record—the Ontario Line was supposed to cost $11 billion; now it's going to cost $27 billion, which is two and a half times the original cost—I don't really have confidence in their numbers.

Who is going to benefit? Do you know who owns the terminal? J.P. Morgan. So will Ontario be paying taxpayers' money to upgrade an airport so J.P. Morgan can make a profit? Is that what this is all about? This whole project makes absolutely no sense on so many different levels. There is something else at play, whether that's a convention centre or a casino; I don't know.

Will the Premier tell the people of Ontario that it's more important to land a luxury jet downtown than it is to put food on the table or find health care or education or housing?

So, in summary: We don't know what it's going to cost. We have no feasibility studies. We don't know who's going to benefit. They are not the priorities of the people of Ontario, and having a luxury jet landing downtown is a luxury dream project. We don't have money for it.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Andrew Dowie: I listened intently to the remarks from the member from Kanata–Carleton. I would like to ask the question—and I've asked this a few times—as to, when it comes to the technical components of the modernization proposal, why they're being directed to the provincial government, given that it's the Toronto Port Authority that is spending the $5 billion, and seven of the nine board members of the Toronto Port Authority are federally appointed and the port authority is federally regulated. When it's being spoken of as if the province is doing this work, when it's the port authority doing the work—the province is assisting in getting the lands prepared. We have a part to play—that's why this legislation is here—but the work that's being described is not being undertaken by the province.

So my question to the member opposite is, why is she directing her questions here instead of to the federal government?

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: Because that is a proposal; that is the Toronto Port Authority's proposal. But that doesn't mean it's been funded at the federal level. It has to be approved and it's not been approved. You're putting this motion forward to confiscate the Toronto Islands—I mean, that's putting the cart before the horse. You need to actually come up with a plan, come up with the cost, and then you might be able to convince people that this is worth doing.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Chris Glover: I want to thank the member for the comments and, actually, I'm going to follow up with that question.

This is an absolutely ridiculous idea: to expand the smallest airport in Canada in the most congested part of the city—of Canada—when they're already going to be expanding Pearson to accommodate another 23 million passengers a year.

So my question is: The federal Liberal government agency, the Toronto Port Authority, with seven of its nine board members appointed by the federal government is the advocate behind this. They are the ones that are pushing for this to take place. Why is the federal Liberal government advocating for the takeover and expansion and jets on the waterfront that will absolutely destroy the Toronto waterfront?

1710

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: I would expect better.

Mr. Chris Glover: It's a federal Liberal agency.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: I would expect better. There is a proposal out there, yes. Every single port authority has an upgrading proposal for the federal government—every single one.

This is the Toronto Port Authority. It doesn't mean it has been approved. It does not mean it's been approved or authorized. It's just the work of the Toronto Port Authority. All the Prime Minister has said about this is, "Oh, that's interesting." That's all we've gotten out of the Prime Minister. So just because someone has put something forward, it doesn't mean it's been approved or funded, and in this case it hasn't.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Stephen Blais: Thank you to my colleague, who is of course a pilot herself, for her debate on Billy Bishop.

The government wants to know why you're asking questions and why we're debating it. We're doing that because they put a bill in front of the Legislature.

The NDP wants to know why the NDP mayor of Toronto isn't doing anything and why the Liberal government is proposing this, and wants to know who to get in touch with. Well, the Prime Minister's email address is pm@pm.gc.ca.

Given that the government doesn't know why they're putting legislation forward and the NDP doesn't know how to reach the federal government, can you perhaps give us another minute of understanding as to why this is a bad idea?

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: I think it comes down to how this will be a very complex, complicated problem to address, and it's going to cost a lot of money. Is this where we want to spend $5 billion of our effort, when people in Ontario can't put food on the table, get health care, get education or find a home? It's not the priority.

And then the other thing is, there are so many technical requirements here. The past studies have explained them all quite clearly: why you need a safety zone around an airport and why this particular plan would make so many businesses on Toronto's waterfront illegal if they were going to do it by Transport Canada's standards. This is going to hurt Toronto; it's not going to help it.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Anthony Leardi: I don't purport to be any kind of expert at all, and I'm certainly not an expert in airports. But I was looking at the master plan of the Toronto airport, the Billy Bishop airport, and it seems to me that the master plan clearly states that the airport is surrounded on three sides by water.

It also seems to me if you're surrounded by three sides by water, like Essex county, building heights sometimes become irrelevant when it comes to planes, especially if you're surrounded on three sides by a lake. If you've got lake on one side, lake on the other side, lake on the other side, then your flight path becomes really clear, it seems to me.

Can we all agree that we should take a look at this master plan and determine whether or not—it seems to me building heights might not apply.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: The most critical phase, the most dangerous phase, when it comes to aviation really is the landing. Because you're at lower speeds and you're at lower altitudes, you have less controllability on the aircraft. It doesn't respond as well at lower speeds.

So what happens if you lose an engine? Everything in aviation is about redundancy. We need two engines, especially on a commercial aircraft. If you can lose one, you can still operate with just one engine, but you won't have the same control. Jets that have two engines on the back of the aircraft have even less control.

The turboprop is your friend. If you're going to have a problem with an engine—if you're going to lose an engine on takeoff and landing—you've got way more flexibility, way more agility. Jets don't have that same agility, and that's why it's dangerous.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Chris Glover: I'll go back to my last line of questioning. The Toronto Port Authority is dominated by federal appointees, and the Toronto Port Authority has put forward this proposal to expand the airport to allow jets to land there.

The member has suggested that the Toronto Port Authority has not gotten federal approval or even authorization for this. This doesn't seem logical to me, that the Toronto Port Authority is entering into negotiations with the provincial government, but they haven't even consulted with the federal government.

My question is: Prime Minister Carney could stop this whole boondoggle by just announcing that they will not renegotiate the tripartite agreement that manages the airport and they will not allow jets at the Billy Bishop airport. Will you ask Prime Minister Carney to do just that?

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: And here's where it gets interesting: The mayor of Toronto could do the same thing. The mayor of Toronto could do exactly the same thing. All three of them have to agree—all three of them.

So if she doesn't agree, it doesn't happen. If she doesn't agree, it doesn't happen. So why do you need the Prime Minister to say no when, as a member of the tripartite, her saying no should be enough?

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Question?

Mr. Stephen Blais: I know New Democrats are preoccupied with how to get in touch with the Prime Minister. Again, I've given them the Prime Minister's email address. If he comes to Nepean, I'm sure he might have coffee with you, if you ask nicely over email.

The other option available to New Democrats, of course, is to call up their friend and former deputy leader of the New Democratic Party who is now a member of the federal Liberal majority government. I presume you still have Doly's phone number. I think you should give Doly a call and ask her to put in a good word for you and the NDP members from Toronto.

But given that the NDP seem to have forgotten Doly's phone number, given that the NDP don't know how to look up the Prime Minister's email address, I would ask my colleague from Kanata if she can again explain why this is a bad idea.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: Here it is: There were previous studies done that actually show how dangerous this idea is. Nothing has changed in 10 years. It's still as dangerous as it was 10 years ago.

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

I recognize the government House leader.

Hon. Steve Clark: Good evening, Speaker. Thanks so much for recognizing me. I really appreciate the opportunity. It's nice to see you in the Chair.

It's nice to join the debate of Bill 110, but I have to tell you that I listened very intently—that's the word we all use when we talk about debate—with the little back and forth. I just found it was so very interesting to hear people reference the NDP mayor of Toronto, the Liberal Prime Minister of Canada and the Conservative Premier of Ontario.

You know, it reminded me of something. When I was a kid, I remember there was this Abbott and Costello skit called "Who's on first, What's on second, I Don't Know's on third," and it almost seemed that I saw that between the New Democrats and the Liberals in the last debate.

I know the leader of the third party has just arrived and he was invoking—

Mr. John Fraser: The jet—the electric jet.

Hon. Steve Clark: No, you were talking about a boardwalk show from, like, 2010.

Mr. John Fraser: From 2010 to 2014.

Hon. Steve Clark: We all make different references.

So, in terms of Bill 110, Billy Bishop, I want to take this opportunity first to congratulate the Honourable Prabmeet Sarkaria for tabling this bill. I was here in the House when he did his leadoff. I look forward to the ministry going to committee, going to public hearings and ultimately coming back for third reading, because it's a long project.

When you do a big project, it doesn't matter whether it's in the city of Toronto with their mayor or it's a federal project with our Prime Minister or it's a project led by the Premier, modernization and big projects sometimes take a long time and sometimes they're intricate. Sometimes they have a number of moving parts, but at the end of the day, it all comes down to motive.

I think the minister did really good job talking about the importance of Billy Bishop airport, talking about the importance of modernization, the fact that there's an opportunity for growth. I normally shy away from those types of bills, you know, because I'm just a simple country boy from eastern Ontario. I don't know the big-city ways of maybe some of my colleagues across the way.

1720

In fact, if I was going to talk about an airport, normally I might talk about the Tackaberry international airport in Brockville and about the opportunities for expansion and growth. I think my NDP friend across the way, given some of his comments earlier, might actually support a rural expansion in a small riding. It might provide great economic opportunity. It might have more people visiting eastern Ontario. Well, if you take that approach in eastern Ontario, I think you have to take that approach in a big city like Toronto.

When I hear the opportunities for modernization, the fact that there is an opportunity to grow tourism, to grow business, to have a downtown airport—you know, I've flown into the airport. Like some of the Ottawa Liberals, I have used the Porter service from the Ottawa International Airport to the island. When I first came here, I was fascinated with the island, the airport, the ferry—before the tunnel took place, I would take the ferry. And as someone who represents a riding that has the iconic Thousand Islands and the UNESCO world heritage site, the Rideau Canal, it was nice. I found it very relaxing to take a flight from Ottawa to the island and take the ferry. It felt like I was back home on the St. Lawrence as I came in from the island airport into the terminal.

But what we're talking about is an opportunity. It's an opportunity to grow traffic at Billy Bishop. It gives us a very unique opportunity as a destination. And I really do believe that Minister Sarkaria and the Premier, when they've made those types of announcements—and despite some of the comments from the official opposition to the third party about Prime Minister Carney, I think deep, deep down, Prime Minister Carney, like Premier Ford, understands that there's wonderful opportunity—opportunity for modernization, opportunity for expansion.

Yes, there are lots of moving parts with the city and the federal government and the port authority. But ultimately, at the end of the day, I think Ontario has a responsibility to look at these big projects and to move them forward for that opportunity, and this bill does exactly what it says it's going to do.

We recognize that our population is growing. We recognize that Ontario's population by 2051 will have over 20.5 million people. We also know, especially this summer with big events like FIFA, that there are going to be a lot of people coming here. And I think when you look at the long-term benefits of expanding Billy Bishop, the fact that it is such an integral part—and there are so many stakeholders in the city of Toronto that are in favour of this, business and other individuals, non-profits, who literally believe very strongly that there is—

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Name one.

Interjection: Name three.

Hon. Steve Clark: The members in committee are going to hear from those people. They're going to hear those voices when it gets to committee where they talk about why we need to support this project and why we need to talk about it.

Yes, it is complex. Yes, it is big. Yes, there are municipal contributions. There are federal contributions to this. But at the end of the day, it's our provincial government that needs to move this forward and ensure that it happens, in a way.

Bill 110, if it's the wish of the Legislature to pass this bill—is it over? Is this the last we're going to talk about Billy Bishop? Absolutely not. This is a big project. There's lots of opportunity for us to move forward. But again, it has to get to committee.

And I think at this point, Speaker, we have had a lot of debate. I've made a commitment as House leader that we were going to ensure that we use the maximum amount of time for debate at second reading. I made a commitment to the official opposition and the third party that this bill would go to committee, that we would allow voices to be heard, and then we would bring it back and allow that third reading debate to take place in a natural way—ultimately, let you, Speaker, decide whether we should vote on this. But the next step is committee.

And with that, Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity, in regard to Bill 110, to move that the question now be put.

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): The government House leader has moved that the question be now put. I am satisfied that there has been sufficient debate to allow this question to be put to the House.

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

All those in favour of the motion that the question be now put, please say "aye."

All those opposed to the motion that the question be now put, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

Vote deferred.

BETTER REGIONAL GOVERNANCE ACT, 2026

LOI DE 2026 POUR UNE MEILLEURE GOUVERNANCE RÉGIONALE

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

Bill 100, An Act to amend the Municipal Act, 2001 and the Municipal Elections Act, 1996 / Projet de loi 100, Loi modifiant la Loi de 2001 sur les municipalités et la Loi de 1996 sur les élections municipales.

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

Mr. Stephen Blais: I'm rising this evening to debate Bill 100, the so-called Better Regional Governance Act. I'd like to begin with this: This bill is not really about regional governance; it's about better provincial control over municipal decision-making. That is the real purpose of this legislation. When you strip away the title, when you strip away the press releases, when you strip away the talking points, what this bill actually does is concentrate more power in the hands of the provincial government and weaken local democratic accountability.

Nowhere is that more obvious than in the government's decision to create an appointed regional chair with strong powers; not elected, not chosen by the people, but appointed—appointed by cabinet, appointed by the minister, appointed behind closed doors—and then handed extraordinary powers over local governments, over local budgets, local staffing, local priorities and local planning decisions. That's not modernization; that is centralization. And the government, frankly, knows it.

Mr. Speaker, the bill gives the minister the power to appoint the heads of regional councils and then use regulations to give them the same strong-mayor powers. Now, we heard this government defend strong-mayor powers before. Many in this place were opposed to those powers when they were first created. But at least mayors are elected. At least they go before the public. At least they put their names on a ballot. This bill goes much further, because mayors can be fired by the people and appointed regional chairs cannot. This government wants to hand strong-mayor powers to people who never receive a single vote from the public.

I think we should pause for a moment and really think about what that means, because regional governments are not small organizations. These are not advisory committees. These are not ceremonial bodies. Regional governments oversee billions and billions of dollars in spending. They make decisions that shape how communities grow. They oversee public health decisions; paramedic services; water and waste water systems; regional roads; housing; public transit; often long-term care; and, in many communities, police services.

Under this legislation, one provincially appointed individual could exercise extraordinary authority over nearly all of it, not because residents voted for them, not because they campaigned on a platform, not because they earned a democratic mandate, but because cabinet selected them, because they tickled the Premier's fancy. That should concern every member of this place. Local government is supposed to derive its legitimacy from the people, not from the Premier's office.

Mr. Speaker, let's remember what these strong powers actually include. These powers allow one individual to propose budgets, to veto bylaws, to hire and fire senior municipal staff, to restructure the committee process, to direct the administration, to advance provincial priorities over local priorities and effectively pass measures with support from only one third of council.

1730

That is an astonishing concentration of power. What makes that even more remarkable is that the government originally justified those powers as a temporary and targeted tool to accelerate housing construction. That was their argument. We were told that these powers were about building homes faster, but this bill goes far, far beyond housing. At the regional level, these powers affect almost every major function of government: water, transit, roads, public health, administration, governance, taxation, regional planning, hiring and, of course, budgeting those billions of dollars. That is not a scalpel; that is a sledgehammer.

Frankly, the government heard this from committee. Committee witnesses recognized this immediately. The mayor of Whitby, Elizabeth Roy, told committee, "These powers are too significant to confer by council" and therefore "must be granted directly by voters," and she was absolutely right.

The government's own logic collapses under scrutiny. As I've said, strong-mayor powers were justified by the government because the mayor would have a democratic mandate from across the municipality. I have to ask the question: If democratic legitimacy matters for mayors, why does it suddenly not matter for regional chairs? Why? Because this government does not actually care about democratic legitimacy. It cares about political control. That's what this bill is about.

The scale of this change is enormous. Mayor Roy pointed out that the affected regional governments collectively serve approximately 5.6 million Ontarians—roughly one third of the province's population—and account for approximately 15% to 20% of all property tax dollars raised in Ontario. Think about that very carefully: one third of Ontario's population, billions and billions of public dollars, and this government wants to direct appointment powers to a single individual, a single person to lead these governments almost unilaterally.

Mr. Speaker, that should trouble you and should trouble people regardless of party affiliation, because governments change, Premiers change, political parties change, but precedent remains. And once governments normalize appointed local leadership with sweeping executive authority, where does it stop? Today, it's appointed regional chairs. Tomorrow, is it appointed mayors of our lower-tier cities and municipalities? Is it appointed transit boards? Do we really want an unelected, appointed board from downtown Toronto making decisions about transit in Ottawa or Waterloo or Windsor or, frankly, anywhere else? What about appointed infrastructure czars, appointed local executives empowered to override councils in the name of efficiency?

The principle matters and the irony here is remarkable, because Conservatives once spoke endlessly about local autonomy. The Canadian Conservative view of local autonomy used to emphasize decentralization. Conservatives used to argue that power should reside at the level of government closest to the people. Now, they want cabinet in downtown Toronto appointing regional leaders across Ontario. They want ministerial regulations overriding local democratic structures. They want the province deciding who governs our cities and towns.

That is not conservatism; that's centralization. And it fits into a much broader pattern under this current Conservative government: more ministerial zoning, more cabinet override powers, more regulations replacing public process, more concentration of authority in the executive and more decisions made behind closed doors.

Over and over again, this government's answer to complexity is simple: Centralize more power. But centralized power isn't always better government. Sometimes, it's simply less accountable government. Sometimes, it means fewer voices around the table. Sometimes, it means less transparency. Sometimes, it means decisions made by people who never had to earn the trust of the public in the first place. And, Mr. Speaker, that concern came up repeatedly at committee.

At committee, Nina Deeb warned that the bill allows regulations made "in the sole opinion of the minister" to prevail over the legislation itself. Think about that language: "in the sole opinion of the minister." That is extraordinary language in democratic legislation. Nina Deeb warned that the bill creates "the optics of partisan appointments and undermines the public's trust." And again, she was right. Ontarians understand exactly what's happening here.

Mr. Speaker, at committee, I asked her whether she was surprised to see former Conservative candidates and political insiders lined up out the door to testify in favour of this legislation. Her answer: "No, I'm not surprised." And in explaining her lack of surprise, she specifically pointed to Niagara, where a failed Conservative candidate was appointed regional chair. He had a very successful tenure, as I understand it. And of course, he isn't the only one.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is the concern: The bill creates the conditions for a pipeline of patronage, and people can sense it. The committee process itself told the story. The government, in its wisdom, assembled a parade of insiders, political allies, Conservative connected municipal figures, senior members of the Conservative Party executive—people already aligned politically with the government. They arranged for all those people to come and speak in favour of their flawed legislation. I know it's shocking that Conservatives would try to stack the deck, but that is exactly what happened. They all came to testify in support of the Conservative power grab.

Meanwhile, municipal experts, elected councillors and mayors, and community voices raised profound concerns about democratic accountability and the concentration of power. And when the government members on committee chose to look up from scrolling on their cellphones, what did we hear from this government in response? Essentially, "Trust us. Trust cabinet. Trust our appointments. Trust the minister. Trust the regulations. Please, trust the insiders. You can trust us. We only appoint good people." But, Mr. Speaker, local democracy is not supposed to operate on blind trust; it is supposed to operate on accountability and, in my view of democracy, accountability begins with elections.

1740

Mr. Speaker, another revealing part of this debate is the government's treatment of the consultation itself. Again, Nina Deeb pointed out that this was the second government bill sent to meaningful committee hearings in over a year—only the second bill sent for committee hearings in over a year. And she warned that despite consultations on previous legislation, the government rarely accepts meaningful amendments. I think everyone in this House who sits on committee and who proposes amendments understands that the government rarely agrees.

And we've seen the government operate this way. We've seen the government operate this way with Bill 9: municipal accountability legislation, years in the making; province-wide advocacy; municipal leaders across Ontario demanding—begging for, pleading for—accountability reform. The committee reviewing Bill 9 travelled extensively. Witnesses appeared from communities across Ontario. Tens of thousands of taxpayer dollars were spent on hearings, on travel, on staffing, on consultations, on hotel stays, on hospitality.

And after all of that—after all of that testimony, after all the speeches about listening, after all the promises about collaboration, after all of that money spent—the government accepted almost no meaningful amendments.

And even now, Bill 9 still waits to return to the Legislature for third reading. Some 198 days have passed since the committee reported the bill to the Legislature, 345 days since Bill 9 was first introduced, and for the last 198 days, it's been crickets from the government.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, to hide documents from the people, to change freedom of information laws, it took the government 29 days—no consultations, no committee hearings or oversight, and a midnight sitting to ram it through the Legislature. That's 29 days to pass laws to let the government keep more secrets from the public; 345 days, and counting, to protect women from harassment by elected officials at city halls across Ontario. That, Mr. Speaker, is why public cynicism is growing.

Too often under this government, consultations feel less like genuine engagement and more like political theatre. The decisions have already been made behind closed doors. The outcome is already written, and committee becomes little more than an expensive exercise in pretending the government cares what the public actually has to say, and we've seen that with this legislation, with Bill 100.

Of course, regional governments are not perfect—no government is. But the answer to imperfect democracy is not less democracy. The answer to a disagreement cannot be and should not be centralization. The answer to complexity is not simply concentrating more authority in fewer and fewer hands.

And nowhere was the hypocrisy more obvious than in the testimony from Niagara region. Some of the government's own supportive witnesses came to committee, speaking the language of fiscal restraint, taxpayer protection and government efficiency—talk that could not be backed up by their own political records. Mayor Jim Diodati spoke about rising costs and ballooning debt. Mayor Frank Campion spoke about efficiency and cost savings. And Councillor Tony Baldinelli arrived as yet another fiscal conservative pretender, suddenly warning about taxpayer value, after years sitting around the regional council table. But talk is cheap, and their decisions are very expensive to the people of Niagara.

Let's look at their record.

Since the 2022 municipal election, the regional portion of property taxes in Niagara has risen by 32.7% on a compounded basis. That's about $656 more per year on the regional portion of the property tax bill alone.

And in addition to massive tax increases proposed by these Conservative municipal insiders for the residents of the region of Niagara, the council of the region of Niagara is also piling on mountains of debt. Niagara region currently carries roughly $358 million in debt—that's equal to just about 62 cents for every dollar raised through the region's annual levy-supported operating budget. Think about that mountain of debt.

Mayor Diodati, Mayor Campion and Regional Councillor Baldinelli, all Conservative insiders, sat at the regional council table that approved those increases. Last year's budget? Not a single "no" vote—not a single "no" vote for massive tax increases, not a single "no" vote for adding to a mountain of debt, from these fiscally conservative municipal leaders.

In the city of Niagara Falls, under Mayor Diodati's administration, the municipal portion of property taxes has increased by roughly 23% in the same period of time; in the city of Welland, under Mayor Campion's administration, the municipal portion has increased by 16% since the last municipal election. Those are not modest increases. Those are massive, astronomically huge increases, made even more difficult by the affordability crisis facing our province, made worse by this provincial Conservative government.

Since 2022, Niagara taxpayers have been hit from every direction—the region, Niagara Falls, Welland—with compounded property tax increases year after year after year after year. And after years of voting for those massive tax increases, after years of approving larger and larger budgets, after years and years of borrowing huge sums of money leading to mountains of debt, those same Conservative politicians arrived at Queen's Park, presenting themselves as champions of fiscal restraint and taxpayer protection.

1750

Mr. Speaker, that takes a hell of a lot of nerve, because fiscal responsibility isn't something you rediscover after the vote is over. Fiscal responsibility isn't a press release, and it surely can't be a slogan. It shouldn't be something politicians suddenly begin talking about after taxpayers have already been handed the bill they've printed.

But you have to ask yourself, Mr. Speaker—certainly I have to ask myself this—should we really expect anything different from these faux Conservatives in Niagara? They have the ultimate faux Conservatives here at Queen's Park to look up to. Faux Conservatives who promised a middle-class tax cut and have failed to deliver for eight years. Faux Conservatives who railed against budget deficits and have added over $136 billion to Ontario's debt.

In eight years of governing, Mr. Speaker, this faux Conservative government has actually accumulated almost 30% of all of Ontario's debt. Eight years represents 5% of Ontario's history; eight years of Conservative mismanagement represents 30% of Ontario's debt. No government has spent more, no government has borrowed more and no government has collected more in taxes than this faux Conservative government in Ontario. Are we better off? Are hospital wait times shorter? Are classrooms smaller? Are there fewer potholes or less congestion on our roads?

Mr. Speaker, I'm not surprised that the pretenders from Niagara came to committee to espouse the virtues and principles of sound financial management and Conservative budgeting. Because after years and years of overspending and overborrowing, that is exactly what their faux Conservative mentors here at Queen's Park do each and every day. They have role models to look up to, and the faux Conservatives in Niagara are mirroring almost exactly the faux Conservatives here at Queen's Park.

But beyond the hypocrisy over the finances, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most revealing exchange of the entire commit-

tee came during questions to Mayor Frank Campion. Now, let's recall, he is a previous, defeated Conservative candidate and, remarkably, he endorsed Premier Ford in the last election. When he was asked what proposals he made to reduce spending in Niagara or Welland, when he was asked what he proposed to keep taxes low, when he was asked why he voted for massive tax increases and growing debt, Mayor Campion suggested that opposition to those increases would have merely been symbolic—Mayor Campion of Welland.

The city of Welland, with a population of just under 56,000 people, had approximately $97 million in debt at the end of 2025. That's $1,700 of debt for every resident in Welland. But the mayor thought that voting for spending restraint and less debt would only be symbolic. That is what faux Conservative hypocrisy looks like, Madam Speaker.

That's not all. Mayor Campion was then asked about the new appointed regional chair position that is created by this bill with—

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): I'm going to ask the member to withdraw.

Mr. Stephen Blais: I withdraw.

Mayor Campion was asked about the new appointed regional chair position and strong powers created by this bill, and his answer, Madam Speaker, was remarkable. When I asked him if he intended to seek re-election as the mayor of Welland—it's not a tough question; registration for municipal elections began last week—his answer was, "My preference would be probably to assist as the chair of the region."

News flash: Conservative insider with faux Conservative financial credentials not wanting to face the public in election but rather to be appointed as the puppet chair in the new regional government in Niagara. A mayor who defended years of tax increases, a mayor who defended a mountain of debt, a mayor who suggested that fighting harder for fiscal restraint would have been merely symbolic, a mayor who argued deeper reform would have taken too long is a mayor openly expressing interest in an appointed super position rather than returning to face the voters for re-election. He wants what is virtually the sole authority to make budget decisions for Niagara region with a population of over 500,000 people.

But despite that desire, that hunger for power to be appointed by his Conservative friends at Queen's Park, he can't stand by the courage of his convictions and vote against big spending, vote against big borrowing and vote against a bigger and bigger mountain of debt, because that vote would have only been symbolic, Madam Speaker. That is the entire danger of this bill wrapped into a single exchange.

Bill 100 creates a political culture where power is no longer earned, power is no longer derived from taxpayers—power is given by the Premier in downtown Toronto; it's granted from above. Madam Speaker, where power comes from changes incentives. It changes accountability structures. It changes who politicians ultimately answer to.

Principles are not supposed to disappear simply when things become difficult. Fiscal restraint is not supposed to vanish because reform takes time. The courage to stand up for taxpayers is not supposed to evaporate because "no" might be unpopular. That is the whole point of principles. They matter most when they're hardest to implement. And these are the people under consideration for this new chair position with strong powers in Niagara.

If fiscal responsibility in their eyes or in the eyes of the government only exists after the vote is over, then it's not a principle; it's a slogan. Madam Speaker, in Ontario, it's a slogan faux Conservatives have mastered.

We can never forget that elections matter. Democracy is supposed to require politicians to go back to the people and justify their decisions, but this legislation moves in entirely the opposite direction. This legislation moves towards appointed power; towards insulation; towards government-by-insider-class, government that is less accountable, with fewer mandates—

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): It is now time for private members' public business.

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)	Kiiwetinoong	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjoint de l'opposition officielle
McCarthy, Hon. / L'hon. Todd J. (PC)	Durham	Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks / Ministre de l'Environnement, de la Protection de la nature et des Parcs
McCrimmon, Karen (LIB)	Kanata—Carleton	
McGregor, Hon. / L'hon. Graham (PC)	Brampton North / Brampton-Nord	Minister of Citizenship and Multiculturalism / Ministre des Affaires civiques et du Multiculturalisme
McKenney, Catherine (NDP)	Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	
McMahon, Mary-Margaret (LIB)	Beaches—East York	

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Mulroney, Hon. / L'hon. Caroline (PC)	York—Simcoe	President of the Treasury Board / Présidente du Conseil du Trésor Minister of Francophone Affairs / Ministre des Affaires francophones
Oosterhoff, Hon. / L'hon. Sam (PC)	Niagara West / Niagara-Ouest	Associate Minister of Energy-Intensive Industries / Ministre associé des Industries à forte consommation d'énergie
Pang, Billy (PC)	Markham—Unionville	
Parsa, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (PC)	Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill	Minister of Children, Community and Social Services / Ministre des Services à l'enfance et des Services sociaux et communautaires
Pasma, Chandra (NDP)	Ottawa West—Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest—Nepean	Deputy House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjointe de l'opposition officielle
Piccini, Hon. / L'hon. David (PC)	Northumberland—Peterborough South / Northumberland—Peterborough-Sud	Minister of Labour, Immigration, Training and Skills Development / Ministre du Travail, de l'Immigration, de la Formation et du Développement des compétences
Pierre, Natalie (PC)	Burlington	
Pinsonneault, Steve (PC)	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	
Pirie, Hon. / L'hon. George (PC)	Timmins	Minister of Northern Economic Development and Growth / Ministre du Développement et de la croissance économique du Nord
Quinn, Hon. / L'hon. Nolan (PC)	Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry	Minister of Colleges, Universities, Research Excellence and Security / Ministre des Collèges et Universités, de l'Excellence en recherche et de la Sécurité
Racinsky, Joseph (PC)	Wellington—Halton Hills	
Rae, Matthew (PC)	Perth—Wellington	
Rakocevic, Tom (NDP)	Humber River—Black Creek	
Rickford, Hon. / L'hon. Greg (PC)	Kenora—Rainy River	Minister of Indigenous Affairs and First Nations Economic Reconciliation / Ministre des Affaires autochtones et de la Réconciliation économique avec les Premières Nations Minister Responsible for Ring of Fire Economic and Community Partnerships / Ministre responsable des Partenariats économiques et communautaires pour le développement du Cercle de feu
Riddell, Brian (PC)	Cambridge	
Rosenberg, Bill (PC)	Algoma—Manitoulin	
Sabawy, Sheref (PC)	Mississauga—Erin Mills	
Sandhu, Amarjot (PC)	Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest	
Sarkaria, Hon. / L'hon. Prabmeet Singh (PC)	Brampton South / Brampton-Sud	Minister of Transportation / Ministre des Transports
Sarrazin, Stéphane (PC)	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	
Sattler, Peggy (NDP)	London West / London-Ouest	
Saunderson, Brian (PC)	Simcoe—Grey	
Schreiner, Mike (GRN)	Guelph	
Scott, Chris (IND)	Sault Ste. Marie	
Scott, Hon. / L'hon. Laurie (PC)	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock	
Shamji, Adil (LIB)	Don Valley East / Don Valley-Est	
Shaw, Sandy (NDP)	Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas / Hamilton-Ouest—Ancaster—Dundas	
Skelly, Hon. / L'hon. Donna (PC)	Flamborough—Glanbrook	Speaker / Présidente de l'Assemblée législative
Smith, Dave (PC)	Peterborough—Kawartha	
Smith, David (PC)	Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre	
Smith, Hon. / L'hon. Graydon (PC)	Parry Sound—Muskoka	Associate Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre associé des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Smith, Laura (PC)	Thornhill	
Smyth, Stephanie (LIB)	Toronto—St. Paul's	
Stevens, Jennifer (Jennie) (NDP)	St. Catharines	
Stiles, Marit (NDP)	Davenport	Leader, Official Opposition / Chef de l'opposition officielle Leader, New Democratic Party of Ontario / Chef du Nouveau Parti démocratique de l'Ontario
Surma, Hon. / L'hon. Kinga (PC)	Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre	Minister of Infrastructure / Ministre de l'Infrastructure
Tabuns, Peter (NDP)	Toronto—Danforth	
Tangri, Hon. / L'hon. Nina (PC)	Mississauga—Streetsville	Associate Minister of Small Business / Ministre associée des Petites Entreprises
Thanigasalam, Hon. / L'hon. Vijay (PC)	Scarborough—Rouge Park	Associate Minister of Mental Health and Addictions / Ministre associé délégué à la Santé mentale et à la Lutte contre les dépendances
Thompson, Hon. / L'hon. Lisa M. (PC)	Huron—Bruce	Minister of Rural Affairs / Ministre des Affaires rurales

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Tibollo, Hon. / L'hon. Michael A. (PC)	Vaughan—Woodbridge	Associate Attorney General / Procureur général associé
Triantafilopoulos, Effie J. (PC)	Oakville North—Burlington / Oakville-Nord—Burlington	Deputy Speaker / Vice-Présidente Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Tsao, Jonathan (LIB)	Don Valley North / Don Valley-Nord	
Vanthof, John (NDP)	Timiskaming—Cochrane	Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire de l'opposition officielle
Vaugeois, Lise (NDP)	Thunder Bay—Superior North / Thunder Bay—Supérieur-Nord	
Vickers, Paul (PC)	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	
Wai, Daisy (PC)	Richmond Hill	
Watt, Tyler (LIB)	Nepean	
West, Jamie (NDP)	Sudbury	
Williams, Hon. / L'hon. Charmaine A. (PC)	Brampton Centre / Brampton-Centre	Associate Minister of Women's Social and Economic Opportunity / Ministre associée des Perspectives sociales et économiques pour les femmes
Wong-Tam, Kristyn (NDP)	Toronto Centre / Toronto-Centre	
Vacant	Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest	