

Legislative
Assembly
of Ontario



Assemblée
législative
de l'Ontario

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

No. 152B

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

N° 152B

1st Session
43rd Parliament

Thursday
25 April 2024

1^{re} session
43^e législature

Jeudi
25 avril 2024

Speaker: Honourable Ted Arnott
Clerk: Trevor Day

Président : L'honorable Ted Arnott
Greffier : Trevor Day

Hansard on the Internet

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. The address is:

<https://www.ola.org/>

Index inquiries

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7400.

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

L'adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance est :

Renseignements sur l'index

Adressez vos questions portant sur des numéros précédents du Journal des débats au personnel de l'index, qui vous fourniront des références aux pages dans l'index cumulatif, en composant le 416-325-7400.

House 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



Service linguistique et des publications parlementaires
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

Thursday 25 April 2024 / Jeudi 25 avril 2024

Get It Done Act, 2024, Bill 162, Mr. Sarkaria / Loi de 2024 pour passer à l'action, projet de loi 162, M. Sarkaria

Mr. Peter Tabuns	8781
Mme Dawn Gallagher Murphy.....	8781
Ms. Jessica Bell	8781
Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon.....	8782
Hon. Nina Tangri.....	8782
Mr. Chris Glover.....	8782
Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon.....	8782
Mr. Rudy Cuzzetto	8783
Ms. Jessica Bell.....	8784
Mr. Deepak Anand	8784
Mr. Tom Rakocevic.....	8784
Mr. Deepak Anand	8787
Ms. Jessica Bell	8787
Mr. Ric Bresee.....	8788
Mr. Chris Glover.....	8788
Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon.....	8788
Mme Dawn Gallagher Murphy.....	8789
Mr. Peter Tabuns	8789
Third reading debate deemed adjourned.....	8790

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF ONTARIO

Thursday 25 April 2024

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE
DE L'ONTARIO

Jeudi 25 avril 2024

Report continued from volume A.

1656

GET IT DONE ACT, 2024

LOI DE 2024 POUR PASSER À L'ACTION

Continuation of debate on the motion for third reading of the following bill:

Bill 162, An Act to enact the Protecting Against Carbon Taxes Act, 2024 and amend various Acts / Projet de loi 162, Loi édictant la Loi de 2024 sur la protection contre les taxes sur le carbone et modifiant diverses lois.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): Questions?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: My thanks to the member for his presentation.

I was curious about the commentary on prohibiting new tolls on highways. What is your government going to do about the existing toll on Highway 413 and the potential to pay the tolls for freight transport—

Interjection.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: It relates directly to the bill. If you're talking about affordability, there's an opportunity to take action. This is something that's missing from the bill.

Are you going to act to protect drivers by moving more trucks onto the 407 and making sure that there's room on the 401?

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: I would like to thank very much my colleague on his question, and I would like to remind him that 407 is a private company. It's not owned by the government. It's not under the oversight of the government. Comparing that, to say, "Oh, we'll cut tolls on the 407"—can I say, "Oh, Loblaws is very expensive; I'm going to distribute food for free from Loblaws as a government"? This is not acceptable.

We can do our share in building the 413, which will alleviate the load from the 401 and make it much better than the deadlock it has now.

And I remind my colleague that since I immigrated to Canada 29 years ago, there's not even one highway—it was the 401, the QEW since 29, 30 years ago.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): Further questions?

M^{me} Dawn Gallagher Murphy: I'd like to thank the member for his comments today. It was very thorough. I especially liked all the talk about transit.

Madam Speaker, we know that gridlock is not just going to disappear on its own. We have a province that's

growing with its population, and like I said, gridlock is not going to disappear, so how are we going to address it?

Speaker, I noted, again, the member talked a lot about transit. I would like to see if the member can highlight some of the initiatives in this legislation that, if passed, would help support the increase in population and prevent the gridlock.

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: Thank you very much to my colleague. I would like to thank her for the question.

It is obvious: Bill 162, if passed, is actually helping us accelerate projects like the 413, infrastructure like the Hazel McCallion. So, if you are driving, we have a highway. If you can take public transit, we want to make sure that the public transit network infrastructure supports the people. If it's convenient for me to take the GO train to downtown here, I would save myself an hour and a half each way. But because there's not enough trains the whole day, every day—support from the Milton line—I can't do that. But if it's running the whole day—I'm not saying we enforce it by taxes; I'm saying, for me, I would save myself the effort and ride the GO train and arrive here in 35 minutes to the Legislature.

1700

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): Question?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Thank you to the member for Mississauga—Erin Mills. When I'm listening to the Conservatives talk about their reluctance to bring forward a carbon tax, I think about the Conservatives' very poor climate action plan and what the Conservatives' plan is to ensure that Ontario does its part to address the climate crisis.

My question to you is, if you don't like to have a price on pollution, then what is a credible and realistic plan this government has to address the climate crisis?

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: Very good question and thank you for that question. It's very simple: You have to give the people the option. You can't keep forcing people to do things. This is not the kind of system we have here in Canada. This is not the system I like or immigrated to Canada for: "You do this, you do this, you pay this." Give the option.

If the transit is good, people will prefer to use it and they don't use their cars. That will bring down the pollution. Another thing is the EV investments we are putting in place. We will have electric cars everywhere, manufactured in Canada, supported by the Canadian system, and that will automatically make people use EV cars and that will reduce pollution. We don't have to force them to go against their will.

That's my two cents there, and that's why I support what the government is doing.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): Further questions?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: To the member next to me, I'm just wondering, do you think your housing policy of building sprawl is smart from a financial point of view, from an environmental point of view, from an infrastructure point of view, transit and logical point of view, that people want to live way out there with not the proper services and infrastructure?

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: I like the part of, from the financial point of view, from the planning point of view, from the service point of view, from the infrastructure point of view. If we kept putting all those in front of us, it's going to be like going uphill. Because we know that we have a crisis. If we kept looking the exact same traditional way, we are not going to be able to meet the needs for housing.

Maybe something wouldn't go as expected. I'm not saying that it's a bulletproof solution. It is part of the solution. We can modify as we go. Again, I would like to commend the Minister of Housing because this is the only government with four housing bills and, again, if you work too much, you'll do many mistakes. If you work less, you'll do less mistakes. If you didn't do anything, you are not going to do any mistakes, and that's what I think the other people in this Legislature would like to do.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): Further questions?

Hon. Nina Tangri: I really want to thank my colleague from Mississauga–Erin Mills for his great remarks this afternoon. He and I share ridings. I have three GO stations in my riding; he has one in his. We both know that we are unable to take public transit to come to Queen's Park because we miss the last train to go home. We've both been, for a very long time, pushing to have more hours and two-way, all-day GO Transit on the Milton line, and it's finally this government that's making that happen.

My question to the member is, having high employment zones, can you tell us how important it is for people to also come from Toronto to Mississauga to go to work?

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: Thank you very much to my colleague for her question. Yes, the statistics show that the amount of traffic coming to work in Mississauga is now very high, maybe as big or higher than people going from Mississauga to Toronto in the morning. But they can't use the GO train because it's one-way: nine trains going with the new one, with an extra one going this way to Toronto. So if you are living in Toronto and working at the airport—the airport is the biggest employer in Mississauga and maybe in the GTA area with numbers of employees. But they can't use the GO train because the GO train is going in the other direction. Having the train going both ways is a very big blessing to the workers, and I would like to share that. The best thing after a long day of work is to jump on the GO train, sleep for 30 minutes until you arrive in Mississauga–Erin Mills. That was amazingly appreciated but now—

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): Thank you, sir.

A quick question, quick response. The member from Spadina–Fort York.

Mr. Chris Glover: I want to thank the member from Mississauga–Erin Mills for his comments today. I want to ask a question about the 407 and the fees that are paid.

Your riding is in Mississauga. I'm sure a lot of your residents have to get on the 407 or get stuck in the traffic on the 401, and yet there's a simple solution. Your government is proposing to spend \$10 billion building the 413. Instead of doing that, the solution would be to immediately remove the trucking fees from the 407 so the trucks can move off the 401, cars could move much more quickly and then your residents would be able to avoid the tolls that the Conservatives imposed on—

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): Quick response, the member from Mississauga–Erin Mills.

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: So, who's going to pay the fees for the trucks?

Mr. Chris Glover: Pay for it through the billion dollars that you didn't charge—

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: Yes, but again, we are talking about the solution versus paying money now—

Interjection.

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: That's the hypocrisy of that solution. Now, you don't have any problem talking about putting public taxpayers' money to private companies. It's very similar to the cataracts or the hip replacements—

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): Thank you to the members. I remind the members to direct your responses to the Chair.

I recognize the member from Beaches–East York.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Good afternoon, everyone. I will be speaking about Bill 162 today, the Get It Done Act, the get it done wrong act, the get it undone act, 2024.

What I'm really tired of is this government's obsession with sprawl. Time and time again, they are told by me, by stakeholders, by constituents from both rural and urban communities that sprawl is not the answer, and it does not benefit anyone, other than the developers that these policies line the pockets of.

Bill 162 came through the committee I am luckily still a member of. Time and time again, we heard from many stakeholders from all industries and walks of life. This bill does not address the problems Ontarians are facing, and it will be disastrous for the environment.

We heard from Environmental Defence, the Motor Vehicle Retailers of Ontario, the Grand River Environmental Network, the Greater Ottawa Home Builders' Association, Ontario Home Builders' Association and many more people to look at provincial lands, which is something I have yet to hear about in this chamber. I mean, that is the lowest-hanging fruit. The easiest thing to do is to look in our own backyards. We're so worried about everyone else's backyards, but to look in our own and build on provincial lands. Let's get a map, let's get an in-

ventory and let's get shovels in the ground there. How easy is that? How logical is that?

Looking at avenues, upzoning them—we'd love for the MTSAs to be signed off on by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, but as I said this morning, we'll wait for the cows to come home before that happens. Fourplexes, building in existing neighbourhoods where the services and infrastructure are already there—a complete no-brainer. And then we also heard about the water and waste water infrastructure that is desperately needed to build these homes and how \$800 million—well, that's a start for two plans, so I guess only two municipalities in all of Ontario are going to be able to build the housing with that. We definitely need to be listening to our stakeholders, heeding their advice and moving forward.

But why does this government continue to ignore the advice of experts? They refuse to follow the advice of their own Housing Affordability Task Force, as well as this year's Blueprint for More and Better Housing, which was co-authored by former federal Conservative deputy leader Lisa Raitt.

Time and time again, we hear the same thing: Focus on new housing in cities and communities where there is existing infrastructure to cut the housing costs, speed up construction times, reduce carbon pollution and prevent catastrophic loss due to climate threats like wildfire and flooding.

1710

You would remember my private member's bill on flooding that sounded so good that you were all going to support it, but alas, it got killed.

Sprawl is not the answer. Weakening our environmental protections is not the answer, either.

Schedule 1 to Bill 162 expands the definition of "acquiring property" to include expropriation. Specifically, schedule 1 amends the act to "provide that, a reference to acquiring property or rights in property is a reference to doing so by purchase, lease, expropriation or otherwise." This amendment will provide greater certainty for expropriating authorities, such as municipalities, provincial ministries and agencies, by making it clearer that expropriation is one of the ways property can be acquired for a project before the EA process is completed—the keyword there is "before" the environmental assessment process is completed. Eek. So this could be a parcel of land that is completely impractical and unsafe for building upon because it contains wetlands or is on a flood plain—places where things should not be built—but this government doesn't want to complete the checks and balances before getting shovels in the ground. They are taking a huge and unnecessary risk by cutting this step out. Bill 162, in its current form, also provides limited details on the extent of these expanded powers and their practical implications, warranting further examination once it comes into force on royal assent. It is unclear what "or otherwise" encompasses—so that's great; they won't even outline what this will mean in practice. This is how this government sees the importance of our environment.

Let me remind the government: There is no housing on a dead planet. There are no developers on a dead planet. And there are no wallets on a dead planet. We cannot ignore the well-being of our earth.

In my committee, I tried and failed to amend this bill. I moved to vote against the first and third schedules of the bill.

We must keep our new housing developments within the boundaries set by the official plans in many cities and regions. It just makes sense. Put the housing where the people, infrastructure and communities already exist. Be bold. Be brave. No need to make more work for ourselves.

Waterloo region, Guelph, Halton region, Hamilton, Niagara region, Peterborough, region of Peel, Wellington county, Belleville and York region will all have their official plans changed by the province, through Bill 162, to open more lands for housing and development.

Did this government forget about the greenbelt scandal already? They are still under an RCMP criminal investigation on this matter. Why do they want to make the same mistakes again?

Sensitive agricultural lands must be protected. We are hearing this from farmers and environmental leaders across Ontario.

This bill will have particularly far-reaching consequences in Waterloo region, where it stands to force open urban boundaries to enable thousands of acres of farmland loss for unnecessary urban sprawl. There are particular concerns about our vulnerable water supply and how this bill encourages development on important groundwater aquifer recharge areas.

Why does this government continue to threaten Ontario's water quality and safety? Do I need to remind you about Walkerton? We should have learned from that awful tragedy, but here we are once again—Groundhog Day.

First, they threaten to halt free well water testing by cutting funds to Public Health Ontario, and now they want to develop important groundwater aquifer recharge areas.

Having access to safe and clean water is a human right. No person in Ontario should have this jeopardized.

We don't have much prime agricultural land left in Ontario. This government is not going to protect it. They're not going to think hard before converting it to other uses. Once it is gone, it is gone. We can't decide in a few decades, "Hey, we actually need that prime farmland back to feed Ontarians," and try to reverse it, like every other policy you've been reversing thus far in this term and before. Nope, no foresight here. No foresight anywhere with this government. It's baffling. Sorry, Ontario. That's what you got.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): Questions?

Mr. Rudy Cuzzetto: I want to thank the member from Beaches–East York for her debate here today. I like her support for building around transit. I want to thank her for agreeing that we should build around transit and around transit communities, like on corridors like the Lakeshore corridor.

So I want to know if she supports her new leader when she opposed 17 out of the 19 projects to build around transit

in Mississauga–Lakeshore and across the city of Mississauga, as well as reducing the 16,000 units in Lakeview to 8,000 units and removing the 1,600 affordable homes that were going to be built there. Do you support the former mayor of Mississauga who now is your leader, who is against building density around transit?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Thank you very much to the member from Mississauga–Lakeshore. I absolutely support building around transit, including MTSAs, but I am waiting, waiting, waiting for your Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to sign off on those. Do you know what the hold up is? I have 7,200 units going around my major mobility hub, Main and Danforth, and we are waiting for the MTSAs to be signed off on. Do you know what the hold up is? I would ask you that, and I hope you can respond to me.

But when you're building around transit areas, which I'm all for—I used to live in Japan, so I'll tell you, they know how to get it done, get the shovels in the ground—it also includes building schools and the other services while you're doing it.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): Further questions?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Thank you to the member for Beaches–East York for your presentation. I'm pleased that you highlighted the failure of this government to move forward on allowing increased density near transit stations. The city of Toronto has put forward over 104 requests to the Ontario government to allow for increased density near transit stations, as well as a requirement for developers to build some affordable homes in these new, big purpose-built rentals and condos. And every time, this government has said no.

What would you like to see this government do to increase density in areas already zoned for development? And I'd like it if you can touch on the affordable housing piece, because this government doesn't ever touch on the affordable housing piece.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Thank you very much to my colleague. That's a great question, and I know you are a “yes in my backyard,” YIMBY representative, especially in your neighbourhood.

This government is not focused on building where existing infrastructure is, so along avenues. Just build them up, European-style, eight to 10 storeys as of right. Just be bold and brave and do that. And when you have land like Metrolinx had at 8 Dawes Road, don't have a provincial agency sell it off without having one ounce of affordable housing in the sale. That is your own agency. Can you not control them?

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): Quick question, quick response.

Mr. Deepak Anand: I really want to say thank you to the member opposite. When she was saying today becomes history tomorrow, so we cannot recover that back, it's something that I want to talk about.

The people of Mississauga–Malton and Ontarians are right now going through an affordability crisis. When you talk about the affordability crisis, you talk about the gas

prices. When you talk about the gas prices, we talk about the carbon tax. I know we don't have much time, so I want to give the member opposite the opportunity to let us know, if you really believe in the people of Ontario, if you really believe in the residents of your community, are you going to work against the carbon tax and support this government?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Thank you very much to the member from Mississauga–Malton. What I want you to do is be honest with Ontarians as to the reason we have a carbon tax, and that is because your government cancelled the cap and trade. So why don't you put that out on billboards? When the Leafs are playing, why don't you put those ads up there? Go, Leafs, go! Put up the ads and the true story: We have a carbon tax because your government cancelled cap and trade, period.

1720

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): Further debate?

Mr. Tom Rakocevic: It's always an honour to rise in this House. I want to commiserate with government members, because I know how difficult it is to be an MPP in this government. I talk to the members in the hallways sometimes, outside of here. Maybe you bump into them at the grocery store. They always tell you how hard it is, because their job isn't easy.

But I do want to commend them on one thing, and that is that I don't think there's ever been a government with such individually courageous members—seriously, courageous. And why are they courageous? Because it's not easy to say sorry. It's not easy, when you make mistakes, to have to take them back on the legislative network, where millions are watching right now. It's not easy to take it back.

I can see the Clerks' table were happy with that one. It's not easy to take it back on our big, major news networks.

And they've had to say a lot of sorry. We've spent a good two years of sorry: Sorry, people of Ontario, for Bill 124. Sorry, people of Ontario, for Bill 28. Sorry to the people of Ontario for Bill 35. Sorry to the people of Ontario for Bill 39. Sorry again to the people of Ontario for Bill 112. Ontario, sorry for Bill 136. Ontario, Bill 150, sorry about that too. And then to have to take them all back—do you know what it's like? Do you ever watch the fans watching a tennis game, where the ball goes like this and it's back and forth? It's kind of like that.

And then we get legislation where they're taking something back and then reimplementing it. How hard must that be for the government members, to have to get up and do that? I know in the last session of the Legislature, it was very difficult for them as well, because the critiques and the criticisms just kept building and building. Who here was part of the last session of government, where we were here in the middle of the night, debating making it illegal to criticize the government? Machiavelli, wherever he is, must have looked at that and thought, “Wow.” I mean, the fact that that wasn't in *The Prince*—you guys are creating things that even he would be proud of.

We spend so much time taking stuff back. In two years—now, this is a government of efficiency, because they've taken about two years of sorry and they condensed it into a solid month of legislative time of taking stuff back. And why? I mean, with the Premier's office staff being so big, you've got to make-work projects, right? You've got to keep them busy. They're making more than everybody in this chamber, and you've got to keep them busy to call for and command those big salaries, to continue to take stuff back.

Now, we sit here, and it's hard: Imagine getting up with a straight face and talking about taking off tolls on the 412 and the 418, and ignoring the 407. I mean, here's another highway. It's in the 400s and I've talked about it before. You don't want to talk about the 407 and I don't blame you.

And in truth? You have learned. One of the greatest things—and I mean that sarcastically—was the lease of 99 years. And so, this government looked and they said, “99-year leases for things that the public own? Bad idea.” So in the Ontario Place bill, it's not 99 years; it's 95 now.

Mr. Guy Bourgoïn: They learned.

Miss Monique Taylor: An improvement.

Mr. Tom Rakocevic: It's an improvement. They are slow learners, but it has come down from 99 to 95.

I'll tell you what tenants in my community are asking for. They're saying, “Do you know what's missing?” It's not rent control, right? It's a high-priced massage in the downtown Toronto area. That is what the tenants, I'm sure, are telling all of you, right? Let's take Ontario Place, where we have taken all of our memories as a child, brought schools down there, and let's get them pedicures. Let's bring busloads of kids down to Ontario Place, cut down a forest so they can get a good pedicure. That is what people are asking.

So they're going to cut it all down, and they're going to get that. And what they're going to do, and this is going to be part of that great legacy, a legacy of “sorry” and “I'm taking stuff back”—as in turning Toronto into a premiere spa destination on planet Earth. I think that is what is going to be part of the legacy. And I get it. It's something, right? I don't know if it's really what—it's certainly not what people are asking for. It is so difficult.

They want to talk about cutting taxes, okay. I know, another thing that's really difficult is that every day you have to say the words “carbon tax” a thousand times. I know that that's not easy. But each and every one of you, I commend you. You do it every single time. Literally half of the question period, from this government, like nothing else is happening, is to ask carbon tax questions.

And that's great. Do one. We all see it. The media is here; they see you say it. You want to drape it in front of Queen's Park? Great. We've been on board with your carbon tax stuff. But to literally spend every iota of time in this place talking with the same thing. You run into a government member in the hallway and that's all they want to talk about too. You're washing your hands? “Carbon tax.” That's the conversation. Okay, okay, I get it. I heard it for 30 minutes during question period. I get it.

But what I don't understand is that, in 2022, they got rid of cap and trade, and they brought in something else that does the same thing. It puts a price on industry for carbon. They don't want to talk about that. And of course, they change it to something else, like the go, Leafs, go act or something, or orange juice is great for breakfast, to obfuscate everything that happens in this place.

But they're still doing it. And if you listen to Conservative rationale and business sense, they'll tell you, “Oh, my God, when they do that, the price goes up on the user,” but somehow—they don't want to talk about it in this instance because it comes from them—it's not going to happen.

They want to talk about taxes. They're going to reduce the taxes. They're going to reduce the taxes. But do you know what they do? They let the industry gouge people. So you're not going to pay in some taxes, but hey, if you're an auto insurance company, let it rip. Let them do whatever the heck they want. In fact, literally everything is written by these industries—Enbridge, right?

Again, we discussed this not long ago. They couldn't convince their shareholders to take on certain things, so they went to the OEB. The OEB says, “No, no, no, no. Do you know what? That's too risky. Forget it.” You can't get them to phone you—imagine calling a minister, how tough it is to get a meeting—but if Enbridge calls—like I've said before, there was a special phone call. Literally, within hours, on the second, they're reversing decisions, everything else: “Consumer protection shouldn't be anything that boards should be considering.” It's mind-numbing, right?

What ends up happening is, they will constantly go to bat for industry, let them do anything, and then you'll pay in different ways. Front-end consumers will pay in different ways.

Okay, groceries: This is one thing I love, and this is so hard for the government members to have to do. They'll talk about carbon tax, a federal issue, but if you want to talk about groceries and stuff like that—no, no. They'll talk about some stuff, but not other stuff.

Let's talk about auto theft, okay? This is an issue that goes far beyond individual police, who are literally doing everything they can to try to stop this scourge, this plague of auto theft that's happening. Now, in the province of Quebec, they have taken tough actions and protocols to try to stop that. So do you know what's happening? Criminals from Quebec: You're importing them here to steal cars from Ontario. And what do we get year after year from government? Well, they just re-announce money that they say is going into law enforcement.

So what do the feds offer? “Okay, we're going to do a summit about car theft.” Now, what are the Conservatives, who are the toughest on crime if you ask them, willing to do about this issue? I don't know. I really—

Miss Monique Taylor: Helicopters.

Mr. Tom Rakocevic: A helicopter.

Interjection: Several, several.

Mr. Tom Rakocevic: Several, a fleet of—no, really, not even a fleet. Literally, the way technology is going

right now, it has probably never been easier for a thief to steal a car—seriously. And so, when we talk about, “Well, why don’t you work with manufacturers, do something about it”—I mean, this is one of the only things that I can agree with the auto insurance industry on, is trying to compel auto manufacturers to really sell cars, to the best of their ability, that make it very difficult to steal; it’s literally crickets. They don’t want to talk about this. I don’t get it.

1730

Did anyone here see that Marketplace episode where a vehicle was stolen from a person’s driveway? They tracked it to a rail yard. They said, “It’s in that crate,” and because of jurisdictional issues, they couldn’t get the vehicle out. Imagine how mind-numbing and frustrating that is. And it still happens.

I spoke earlier today to a person who was home-invaded. A guy came into his home with a hammer, took his keys, tracked the car to a certain place, loaded it into a container, and now the car is gone.

Some 80% of these vehicles are ending up in other countries. So all you’ve got to do is control the ports of exit. Why isn’t this government doing anything about it? I don’t get it.

I know high-level police officers—

Mr. Anthony Leardi: Because ports are a federal issue, and your buddies in Ottawa won’t do anything about it.

Mr. Tom Rakocevic: Oh, here we go. Why don’t you put pressure on your Conservative federal buddies to do something about it? They won’t.

Interjections.

Mr. Tom Rakocevic: This is the best thing about it: They believe that there’s literally nothing this government can do about auto theft here, as a provincial government.

Interjection.

Mr. Tom Rakocevic: Really? The police are asking for help. Maybe you’re not giving them enough help. They’re saying, “Eighty per cent of these cars are going out of the country. Help us do something about it.” Nothing. Absolutely nothing. Just 30 minutes of carbon tax questions in the morning and answering literally nothing else, and that’s it—then, another month of time spent here retracting legislation on stuff that will probably come back at a later time.

Health care: This is something that I love—Tory math. I remember, in the last session, they wanted to talk about bringing mathematics back to school. Fabulous. I studied the sciences. Great. Let’s do math. What will the Tory legacy be on health care? Literally, nothing but privatization. So here’s the Tory math—and this was part of your sorry Bill 124; that was the first sorry that I read out for you there—“Well, do you know what? Let’s not respect and properly pay our nurses and our health care workers. Let’s drive them to leave hospitals in droves.”

Hon. Nina Tangri: Point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): Point of order.

Hon. Nina Tangri: We’re debating the Get It Done Act, and he’s talking about something completely unrelated.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): I’ll remind the member to talk about the bill in front of you. Thank you.

Mr. Tom Rakocevic: Speaker, what’s good for the goose is good for the gander. I sat here and listened to government members talk about, literally, the Maple Leafs, the chandeliers in this room—patiently listening, even applauding at times. And then what do I get? “We don’t want to hear it. It’s embarrassing for us.” Okay. I get it. It’s embarrassing for you. I understand. You’re embarrassed. It’s fine. I get it.

You want to get it done. Let’s help you get it done in terms of fixing health care. Stop privatizing it. You’re paying \$30, \$40 an hour for a nurse—“No, we’re not going to raise those salaries.” All right. So now these hospitals are forced to go to private clinics that charge \$100 an hour for this.

Mr. Deepak Anand: Madam Speaker, point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): Point of order.

Mr. Deepak Anand: Madam Speaker, we love listening to this member. We will encourage this member—this is the Get It Done Act, so let’s talk about getting it done, and let’s get it done with your speech.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): I caution the member to discuss the bill in front of you.

Interjections.

Mr. Tom Rakocevic: Really. All right.

Honestly, they hold the fort—repeating it. I can’t take the conversations in the hallways about carbon tax. We voted with you on it. You want to talk about the carbon pricing.

There’s stuff in here about saving. The Photo Card Act—let’s just take something at random within a schedule here. So, imagine, here is a government, when it comes to licensing and it comes to the licences on vehicles that created a plate—now, you can’t make this up—that can’t be seen in the rain, can’t be seen in the dark—it’s like a Dr. Seuss book, really—can’t be seen in the day. These vehicles are driving around, and they want to get it done. Well, all right. Why aren’t they listening—the law-and-order party, if you listen to them—and actually removing some of these plates that have been listed? Border agencies, police officers, are saying, “We can’t read these plates. It’s a challenge for us.” “No, but we’ll do some other stuff when it comes to photo ID.”

Another thing: They want to make it easy to expropriate. I mean, I thought Conservatives were all libertarians—“Let’s respect people’s property”—but no. When it comes to people’s private property, especially farms, when the government wants your land, they’re coming. They’re coming after that land.

And the funny thing is, a fact was put out there: Conservatives actually held government decades ago, more than a generation ago—guys, be proud of yourselves, but you can’t really take responsibility for this. Your forebears held government here for, like, 42 years straight, but those same people—it’s like the parents or grandparents—if they were looking at some of the stuff that gets done by

this government, they'd be spinning like a lathe in their graves. Seriously, it's unbelievable.

The Conservatives are responsible for bringing in conservation authorities. In fact, in the last session of government—since we're talking about the Environmental Assessment Act and other things, where they're just going to make it easy for this government to come and take away your stuff and expropriate no questions asked—well, their forebears, their grandparents, actually made it such that we, of course, had conservation authorities, because the Conservatives at that time thought, "Hey, maybe we should protect food. We should be protecting waterways. We should be protecting all that stuff." No. What does schedule 1 do? Make it easy. Let's just expropriate. We don't want to hear environmental assessments. Why? Because who cares about the environment, right? It continues to go on and on and on. It's always the same thing.

Again, I said it: The 407—imagine, the 412, the 418. That's part of this: "Hey, we don't want tolls. We don't want them." But the 407—you can't even get them to answer a question. I get it, because it's embarrassing. How do you answer the fact that you're not willing to take the toll off the 407? I don't know. Somehow, in their universe, I think they just don't want to address it. And again, it could be PTSD from the decision made by the government in the late 1990s. They don't want to touch it. They don't want to talk about it, because it's tough. It's demoralizing, and I understand that. I get it. But just do it. Just take the toll off. You've been bragging about this. Please, why don't you do that?

Auto insurance: People want to talk about the people in Brampton, right? "We're going to build the 413. We're going to build the 413." I can bet you any money that every Brampton member, at least once a week, is getting a phone call or an email about auto insurance, but when it comes to getting it done, auto insurance isn't going to be that. What about that? If you want to get it done—it's in the title. It really gives a lot of leverage for us to talk about things, because there are a lot of things you need to get done. Why aren't you willing to take any kind of action on auto insurance and postal code discrimination? Really, I just don't get it.

The Premier's own riding pays some of the highest rates of auto insurance, and my riding. Scarborough—you've got lots of Scarborough members. I know you Brampton members are all proud that you have your seats there, but you're getting these questions. Again, I told you, and I started with this, because I like these government members—they're all nice people—but it can't be easy to not be able to do anything about auto insurance. Why? Because these companies write the policies for these guys, and certainly the last thing they're going to do is affect their own bottom line and sky-high profit margins.

So look, there's so much more to get done. As I started, I commiserate with you. I know it's not easy. It's not easy to follow what's going on when the \$10 million of staffers surrounding the leadership hand you pieces of paper to read out here and it's like, "Oh, God. We're removing that again? Wait, are we keeping it? Are we not keeping it?

What are we doing?" I get you need those make-work projects to keep these very well-doing individuals and staffers going. But look, if you want to fix housing for tenants, bring in rent control. You know it's the right thing to do. Do it. They're asking you. The tenants are asking you.

There's so much more. Don't privatize health care. The last thing I want to leave you with is a phone call that was really hard to see. A person who couldn't get a diagnostic test in a hospital was sent to private clinic, and you know what they were told? "You either get your test in a year or pay us \$5,000 and we'll get it to you next week." This is part of the Tory legacy. This is going to be part of the legacy as you move forward.

1740

Don't make this part of your legacy. Don't have people that are waiting for key diagnostics and being forced to have to pay out of pocket. If you want to get it done, fix health care. There are real problems facing us. I believe in you, I like you and I know: If you want to stand up to leadership, there's so much more you could be doing for the people of Ontario.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): Questions?

Mr. Deepak Anand: Madam Speaker, the member from the opposite side loves to complain that our Get It Done Act is performative politics. Let's look at what it is actually doing: We're lowering the costs facing families, with moves such as licence plate renewals, reducing red tape, moving Ontario forward.

This government is cutting red tape to build the infrastructure and housing that Ontario needs today. To do this, we have to cut the decades of red tape installed by Liberals and their party, NDP.

So my question, Madam Speaker, is very, very simple. I would like to ask the member if you agree that we should be cutting more red tape and prioritizing transit projects to get it built fast, or we should do the opposite, what you want us to do?

Mr. Tom Rakocevic: I mean, it's an easy response. Of course we want to see transit get built. I don't trust this government, though, with scissors, because sometimes, the red tape they cut leads to yellow tape. And that is an unfortunate reality, because, you know what, we need to ensure that we are protecting people. We need to be protecting consumers.

But if you ask me a simple question like, "Should we be building more transit," of course we should be building more transit. We should be listening to transit experts and others when it gets built and we shouldn't be making these decisions solely on political ones, which is what they're so wont to do often, when you see the greenbelt and everything else that's happened in the last couple of years.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): Further questions?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Thank you to the member for Humber River–Black Creek. It's always good to have you speak on a Thursday afternoon. It's always entertaining. I always enjoy it. I stop looking at my phone, I sit down and I just listen, so thank you very much for that.

When we're talking about Get It Done, I'd like to know, what do the residents in your riding want done? What would they like this government to do to make their lives more affordable and better?

Mr. Tom Rakocevic: We're in the midst of an affordability crisis. We are, and I think we can all attest to that. And we all have different ways of addressing it, but really, what we're hearing from my constituents is that they're having a tough time paying their groceries. The rent in Toronto is \$2,500. Some people are paying \$3,000. They really want protections as tenants. They want to see the costs of many things coming down, but they want to see a government that's willing to go to bat for them, especially when they're getting gouged.

In places like mine, where we pay some of the highest auto insurance rates not just in the country but across the entire continent, there are so many different things that are affecting our residents, and there's so much more that this government could be doing to help them.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): Further questions?

Mr. Ric Bresee: First of all, I want to echo the previous question's comments that it was very entertaining to listen to the speaker for, I'm going to say, about 19 minutes and 15 seconds of his 20 minutes, because that was the period in which he was very sarcastic, and I think the word "performative" actually echoes that perfectly—highly rhetorical. The last 45 seconds, they were very serious, and I appreciate those comments as well.

We may have differences of opinions, we may have differences of philosophies, but I want to break it down to something very, very simple: We saw, a few weeks ago, the gas price suddenly jumped from, ballpark, a buck 60, a buck 65, to a buck 80, and our residents are suffering for that. We know that this government has lowered the gas tax by 10.7 cents.

My question, through the Speaker, is: Do you really want to charge that extra 10 cents, and do you want your residents having to pay that extra 10 cents and get that gas price up to a buck 90 or better?

Mr. Tom Rakocevic: First of all, I appreciate the compliments—I mean, the half compliments in some of it, I guess. But the member is always listening astutely, no matter who's speaking here, so I do appreciate it, and I know he does his research.

Look, we all know that paying for things really is tough, and New Democrats have supported measures in terms of that around carbon taxation and other things as well. What I said for, as you say—it wasn't 19 minutes of it but certainly a lot was: Okay, we get it about the carbon tax; we're facing other problems too. So, great, do you want to talk about it? Sure. But the tenants in my community and yours need relief, and taking credit for the fact that we're paying some of the highest rent costs—so now, what, there's a couple of more units being built as part of supply? This is going to take a decade to fix.

This government has the opportunity to do the right thing: Cap these multi-residential rent costs. It's out of control. We need rent control in this province. So if you

want to help your residents and my residents, keep doing what you're doing with that, but you've got a lot more things you've got to do.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): Further questions?

Mr. Chris Glover: The member from Humber River–Black Creek, I've got to say, is one of the most entertaining speakers in the House by far. So let's give him a round of applause, guys, because on a Thursday afternoon, we all needed that.

You mentioned the private sector is often gouging us. The insurance companies are gouging us. The grocery stores are making record profits while people can't afford food. The oil companies are gouging us. Enbridge has actually got this government to subsidize their expansion with our tax dollars. Therme has got us giving them a billion dollars. At the same time, this government is undermining and privatizing our education and our health care systems so that those also can be turned over to private, for-profit corporations.

What do you think is going to happen to affordability when health care and education are privatized by this government?

Mr. Tom Rakocevic: The government members continue to try to reduce all of the affordability crisis down to one thing, and that's just the carbon tax. They're trying to really shine the light on one thing and forget about literally everything else. Forget about the fact that our constituents are going to private clinics and being told, "If you don't want to wait, you need to pay thousands of dollars." They're trying to get us to forget about the fact that rent—because if they're going to take credit for some things, then take credit for all of it. Under their watch, rent has never, ever been so high and unaffordable for so many people. And this situation is only going to get worse if they don't take action against industry and stop letting industry write their policies for them.

You want to say that you're for the little guy; I know your leader says it, always with gusto. But walk the walk. Don't just talk the talk.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): Further questions?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: To the member for Humber River–Black Creek: I wish I saw this side of you at city hall, but I didn't. So I'm thrilled to be here with you, because, yes, you're entertaining, but you're very informative and logical, so I appreciate that.

Now, do you think that—I'm hearing from farmers, from business owners, from industry that they need stability, reliability, predictability with policies and regulations. Do you feel that they can rely or have faith in this government for those things?

Mr. Tom Rakocevic: Well, I don't want to get too cynical, but—

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Please do.

Mr. Tom Rakocevic: I've said it before: This government is really led by what I believe—and no offence to the individual members, who I have high and great respect for and I believe are good people. But the government is really

led by PR individuals and special interests. So if those special interests can get to the lead—I'm not going to describe how they probably are able to get their way with this government; I'm sure you could do the math. We've all done the analysis. That's really the only stability for those people out there. But everybody else, we're all riding by the seat of our pants in Ontario, not knowing what the next thing is they're going to have to retract, what they're going to have to say sorry for or what else is going to start costing more under their watch.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): Question?

M^{me} Dawn Gallagher Murphy: This government is cutting red tape to build the infrastructure and housing that Ontario needs today. To do that, we have to actually cut decades of red tape that was installed by the Liberal and NDP government. And may I add that Liberals have been reduced to independent status due to this mismanagement. And, I would say, they will be staying there, Madam Speaker.

I would like to ask the member from Humber River–Black Creek if he agrees that we should be cutting more red tape and prioritizing transit projects so it can get built faster?

1750

Mr. Tom Rakocevic: I feel like it's déjà vu. That was actually the first question that I was asked—right off a paper. No, I respect that some red tape needs to be cut, but I don't trust this government ever with scissors. All right? And yes, I agree that we need to build more transit. Don't make the decisions on where to do it political. Build it where it needs to be done.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): Further debate?

Interjections.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: I can tell from the sounds of wild enthusiasm on the government benches that everyone is looking forward to at least 10 more minutes of debate on this critical bill.

I have to say—and it's unfortunate that I have to say right off the top, Speaker—I can't replicate the wonderful work done by my colleague from Humber River–Black Creek. Amazing stuff late on a Thursday; I don't know where you pull it from in your soul, but it's there—and my other colleague from Timiskaming, who did a wonderful job. I just hope that many people this evening put on that tape, watch those two speeches and enjoy their Friday night. For the rest of you, I am not going to get anywhere close to what they did, so relax, check your email, have a good afternoon.

As many of my colleagues have said before me, so I'm not breaking new ground, this isn't exactly a bill that will get much done, and anyone who has had a chance to look at it will realize that in terms of things that are really pressing when you go door to door, like fixing the health care system or dealing with the housing crisis or just making life affordable, if this bill is passed—and let's face it. The government has enough numbers. They'll get it passed. It's just not going to address those issues.

In fact, I was out canvassing last night on Pape Avenue in my riding, and when we came to the door, a very nice

woman in her thirties, friendly, just said, “I can't talk to you. I'm just too stressed. Why is it that I can't buy eggs at a reasonable price anymore? I just can't deal with this.” And the simple reality is that those concerns about cost of living, those concerns about trying to stay afloat in a situation where housing costs are through the roof, where grocery prices are through the roof—this bill is not going to get it done. It's simply not going to get it done.

One of the interesting items was the idea of putting forward a carbon tax referendum. I've been around this place. I've seen a few changes of government. I know that a referendum in a bill like this today will be irrelevant to the next government that comes along. They just pass a bill saying, “Nah, we're not going to have a referendum,” and life will roll on. So it's more for a slogan or for a logo or a meme or a funny video with a minister holding up a big vote card, something like that. It's not actually going to do anything. But I'm sure the members who were speaking in favour of it were very happy with it.

One of the most significant parts of this bill is schedule 3, which restores certain ministerial changes to municipal official plans that were enacted during the greenbelt corruption scandal. My sense is that what's getting done is that the government fell into an abyss with the greenbelt scandal. They're dealing with the RCMP investigating them. On a regular basis, there are dribs and drabs of leaks about who said what to whom and when—most recently, this week, the Trillium talking about whether or not senior people connected to the government, to the Premier, actually knew things and had relationships that were never revealed in the investigation carried out by the Integrity Commissioner.

This is a scandal that continues to eat away at the government. And what we're seeing with this bill—and I think we see here and there with what's happening with farmers in Wilmot—is that the government was pushed back on the greenbelt but, frankly, is doing its best underground, behind the scenes, to restore the grab of vital lands through means that they couldn't do as overtly as they tried to before.

We have a government that, I think it's fair to say, does a lot of flailing around, does a lot of backtracking. My colleague spoke to that earlier. I'm not going to repeat all of it, although I have to say that my colleague from Spadina–Fort York did a really good summary of things that were brought forward and had to be walked back when it was realized that there were substantial problems. It seems to be a fairly common event in this Legislature with this government, that the government acts long before they've thought about what needs to be done, long before anyone has looked at the reports from senior bureaucrats saying, “Hey, you're going to burn your hands doing this.” That doesn't seem to be a consideration.

Bill 124 had to be rolled back, the unconstitutional wage caps. I have to say, I was here in the Legislature in 2008, 2009, when Laurel Broten was the Minister of Education. She brought in Bill 115, attacking the salaries for education workers. I would get up and I would say to the minister: “You know what you're doing is unconstitu-

tional, right? This is not going to stand up in court.” She went on at length about how, frankly, it was totally constitutional. Her lawyers would not stake their first-born child on it, but they were pretty confident they were going to win. You can smell stuff that’s not constitutional. So Bill 124 went down the same road as the Liberals had gone down before.

Bill 39, the Duffins Rouge Agricultural Preserve Repeal Act: Who on earth in the Premier’s office—maybe it was the Premier—said, “Hey, we can get away with this. Let’s do this one”? Hands got burned; they had to roll it back.

Bill 136, reversing the greenbelt changes: Let’s face it. Again, this is a government that looks at an opportunity for a friend to make a fortune, and they take that opportunity, and later—not with their hand in the cookie jar but their whole arm in the cookie jar, the cookie jar consuming their armpit—has to pull back, realizing that they’re in trouble. So I expect that while the government is not engaged in doing things that they’ll regret and have to roll back later, they are engaged in doing things that are of no consequence.

The whole question of tolls and preventing tolls or prohibiting tolls on new roads: Again, the next government that comes in can just pass a bill saying, “Meh. That doesn’t matter to me.” There’s no constitutional structure that’s going to prevent that from happening. It really is just for show.

But the government didn’t actually take advantage of the contract it has with Highway 407 to require payment of \$1 billion because of underuse of that road. I don’t know

why suddenly the government was so generous. Why was it that a foreign company that at this point controls the 407 was told, “Hey, what’s \$1 billion between friends? You hold on to that money. We’re fine”? That \$1 billion could have been very useful in terms of actually redirecting freight trucks off the 401 this year, this month, and allowing people who for a variety of reasons really have to drive the 401—to give them a chance to drive in a way that was more relaxing and far less dangerous. So the government’s generosity in that case was certainly something that came back to bite drivers and others who depend on getting through the major highways in this province.

I would say, Speaker, that when you miss out on an opportunity to actually charge for revenue that you’re entitled to have and miss out on opportunity to actually make life better for people on a daily basis, you’re not getting it done. Well, you’re getting something done, but it’s not for the people of this province. You’re getting something—

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): My apologies to the member. That went by really quick.

Third reading debate deemed adjourned.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Patrice Barnes): It being 6 p.m., it is now time for private members’ public business. There being no business designated, pursuant to standing order 100(e), this House stands adjourned until Monday, May 6, 2024, at 10:15.

Thank you again to all our wonderful pages for being the best this past two weeks. All the very best as you go forward and do amazing things.

The House adjourned at 1800.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenante-gouverneure: Hon. / L'hon. Edith Dumont, OOnt
Speaker / Président de l'Assemblée législative: Hon. / L'hon. Ted Arnott
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
Anand, Deepak (PC)	Mississauga—Malton	
Andrew, Jill (NDP)	Toronto—St. Paul's	
Armstrong, Teresa J. (NDP)	London—Fanshawe	
Arnott, Hon. / L'hon. Ted (PC)	Wellington—Halton Hills	Speaker / Président de l'Assemblée législative
Babikian, Aris (PC)	Scarborough—Agincourt	
Bailey, Robert (PC)	Sarnia—Lambton	
Barnes, Patrice (PC)	Ajax	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième Vice-Présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Begum, Doly (NDP)	Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjointe de l'opposition officielle
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	
Brady, Bobbi Ann (IND)	Haldimand—Norfolk	
Bresee, Ric (PC)	Hastings—Lennox and Addington	
Burch, Jeff (NDP)	Niagara Centre / Niagara-Centre	
Byers, Rick (PC)	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	
Calandra, Hon. / L'hon. Paul (PC)	Markham—Stouffville	Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire du gouvernement Minister of Legislative Affairs / Ministre des Affaires législatives
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 Long-Term Care / Ministre des Soins de longue durée
Clancy, Aislinn (GRN)	Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre	
Clark, Steve (PC)	Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes / Leeds— Grenville—Thousand Islands et Rideau Lakes	
Coe, Lorne (PC)	Whitby	
Collard, Lucille (LIB)	Ottawa—Vanier	Third Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Troisième Vice-Présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Crawford, Stephen (PC)	Oakville	
Cuzzetto, Rudy (PC)	Mississauga—Lakeshore	
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 Colleges and Universities / Ministre des Collèges et Universités
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
Fife, Catherine (NDP)	Waterloo	

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Flack, Hon. / L'hon. Rob (PC)	Elgin—Middlesex—London	Associate Minister of Housing / Ministre associé du Logement
Ford, Hon. / L'hon. Doug (PC)	Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord	Leader, Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti progressiste-conservateur de l'Ontario
		Premier / Premier ministre
		Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / Ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales
Ford, Hon. / L'hon. Michael D. (PC)	York South—Weston / York-Sud—Weston	Minister of Citizenship and Multiculturalism / Ministre des Affaires civiques et du Multiculturalisme
Fraser, John (LIB)	Ottawa South / Ottawa-Sud	
French, Jennifer K. (NDP)	Oshawa	
Gallagher Murphy, Dawn (PC)	Newmarket—Aurora	
Gates, Wayne (NDP)	Niagara Falls	
Gélinas, France (NDP)	Nickel Belt	
Ghamari, Goldie (PC)	Carleton	
Glover, Chris (NDP)	Spadina—Fort York	
Gretzky, Lisa (NDP)	Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest	
Grewal, Hardeep Singh (PC)	Brampton East / Brampton-Est	
Hardeman, Ernie (PC)	Oxford	
Harden, Joel (NDP)	Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	
Harris, Mike (PC)	Kitchener—Conestoga	
Hazell, Andrea (LIB)	Scarborough—Guildwood	
Hogarth, Christine (PC)	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	
Holland, Kevin (PC)	Thunder Bay—Atikokan	
Hsu, Ted (LIB)	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les Îles	
Jama, Sarah (IND)	Hamilton Centre / Hamilton-Centre	
Jones, Hon. / L'hon. Sylvia (PC)	Dufferin—Caledon	Minister of Health / Ministre de la Santé
		Deputy Premier / Vice-première ministre
Jones, Trevor (PC)	Chatham-Kent—Leamington	Deputy Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint du gouvernement
Jordan, John (PC)	Lanark—Frontenac—Kingston	
Kanapathi, Logan (PC)	Markham—Thornhill	
Karpoche, Bhutla (NDP)	Parkdale—High Park	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Première Vice-Présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Ke, Vincent (IND)	Don Valley North / Don Valley-Nord	
Kernaghan, Terence (NDP)	London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord	Deputy Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint de l'opposition officielle
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 the Environment, Conservation and Parks / Ministre de l'Environnement, de la Protection de la nature et des Parcs
		Deputy Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjointe du gouvernement
Kusendova-Bashta, Natalia (PC)	Mississauga Centre / Mississauga-Centre	
Leardi, Anthony (PC)	Essex	
Lecce, Hon. / L'hon. Stephen (PC)	King—Vaughan	Minister of Education / Ministre de l'Éducation
Lumsden, Hon. / L'hon. Neil (PC)	Hamilton East—Stoney Creek / Hamilton-Est—Stoney Creek	Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport / Ministre du Tourisme, de la Culture et du Sport
MacLeod, Lisa (PC)	Nepean	
Mamakwa, Sol (NDP)	Kiiwetinoong	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjoint de l'opposition officielle
Mantha, Michael (IND)	Algoma—Manitoulin	
Martin, Robin (PC)	Eglinton—Lawrence	
McCarthy, Hon. / L'hon. Todd J. (PC)	Durham	Minister of Public and Business Service Delivery / Ministre des Services au public et aux entreprises
McCrimmon, Karen (LIB)	Kanata—Carleton	
McGregor, Graham (PC)	Brampton North / Brampton-Nord	
McMahon, Mary-Margaret (LIB)	Beaches—East York	
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, Sam (PC)	Niagara West / Niagara-Ouest	
Pang, Billy (PC)	Markham—Unionville	

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
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	
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	
Pirie, Hon. / L'hon. George (PC)	Timmins	Minister of Mines / Ministre des Mines
Quinn, Nolan (PC)	Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry	
Rae, Matthew (PC)	Perth—Wellington	
Rakocevic, Tom (NDP)	Humber River—Black Creek	
Rasheed, Kaleed (IND)	Mississauga East—Cooksville / Mississauga-Est—Cooksville	
Rickford, Hon. / L'hon. Greg (PC)	Kenora—Rainy River	Minister of Northern Development / Ministre du Développement du Nord Minister of Indigenous Affairs / Ministre des Affaires autochtones
Riddell, Brian (PC)	Cambridge	
Romano, Ross (PC)	Sault Ste. Marie	
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, 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, Donna (PC)	Flamborough—Glanbrook	Deputy Speaker / Vice-Présidente Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Présidente du Comité plénier 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	Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry / Ministre des Richesses naturelles et des Forêts
Smith, Laura (PC)	Thornhill	
Smith, Hon. / L'hon. Todd (PC)	Bay of Quinte / Baie de Quinte	Minister of Energy / Ministre de l'Énergie
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 déléguée aux Petites Entreprises
Taylor, Monique (NDP)	Hamilton Mountain / Hamilton-Mountain	
Thanigasalam, Hon. / L'hon Vijay (PC)	Scarborough—Rouge Park	Associate Minister of Transportation / Ministre associé des Transports
Thompson, Hon. / L'hon. Lisa M. (PC)	Huron—Bruce	Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
Tibollo, Hon. / L'hon. Michael A. (PC)	Vaughan—Woodbridge	Associate Minister of Mental Health and Addictions / Ministre associé délégué au dossier de la Santé mentale et de la Lutte contre les dépendances
Triantafilopoulos, Effie J. (PC)	Oakville North—Burlington / Oakville-Nord—Burlington	
Vanthof, John (NDP)	Timiskaming—Cochrane	Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire de l'opposition officielle

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Vaugcois, Lise (NDP)	Thunder Bay—Superior North / Thunder Bay—Supérieur-Nord	
Wai, Daisy (PC)	Richmond Hill	
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	
Yakabuski, John (PC)	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	
Vacant	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	
Vacant	Milton	