

Legislative
Assembly
of Ontario



Assemblée
législative
de l'Ontario

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

No. 21B

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

N° 21B

1st Session
44th Parliament
Tuesday
3 June 2025

1^{re} session
44^e législature
Mardi
3 juin 2025

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.

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

Tuesday 3 June 2025 / Mardi 3 juin 2025

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS / AFFAIRES D'INTÉRÊT PUBLIC ÉMANANT DES DÉPUTÉES ET DÉPUTÉS

Pension plans / Régimes de retraite

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong.....	1247
Mme Chandra Pasma.....	1249
Mr. Tom Rakocevic.....	1249
Mr. John Fraser.....	1250
Ms. Peggy Sattler.....	1251
Mr. Dave Smith.....	1251
Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong.....	1252
Vote deferred.....	1253

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE / DÉBAT SUR LA MOTION D'AJOURNEMENT

Public transit

Ms. Jennifer K. French.....	1253
Mr. Ric Bresee.....	1254

First Nations consultation

Mr. John Fraser.....	1254
Mr. Tyler Allsopp.....	1255

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 3 June 2025

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mardi 3 juin 2025

Report continued from volume A.

1800

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

PENSION PLANS RÉGIMES DE RETRAITE

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: I move that, in the opinion of the House, the government should tariff-proof workers' retirements by increasing the pension guarantee under the Pension Benefits Act to \$4,500 per month and indexing the pension benefit to inflation.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Laurie Scott): Pursuant to standing order 100, the member has 12 minutes for her presentation.

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: I rise today to introduce my motion, which asks that, in the opinion of the House, the government should tariff-proof workers' retirement by increasing the pension guarantee under the Pension Benefits Act to \$4,500 per month and indexing the pension benefit to inflation. Ultimately, the motion will amend the Pension Benefits Act to update the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund by raising its coverage and indexing it to inflation.

I want to stress that this is not going to raise taxes. The public is not paying for this motion. To my PC colleagues, the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund are plans funded over time with contributions from workers themselves and their employers. The creation of this motion—there is no financial harm that will impact the government funding, and taxpayers do not have to fund the PBGF.

This motion, at its core, this is what it's about: It's keeping promises—promises to workers who have gone to work, day in and day out, and have earned their pensions over a lifetime of work; people who have played by the rules, contributed faithfully to their retirement plans and trusted that those plans would be there for them when the time came; workers who worked so hard to make companies successful.

And yet, for far too many Ontarians, that promise has been broken. Some of us here today may recall the Sears store bankruptcy. When the company shut its doors in 2018, 18,000 retirees discovered that pension plans built with their money would not be paid out as promised. The pensions that they worked so hard for were slashed by 30%. In the end, it was the workers who kept the company running for so many years who got shortchanged. Mean-

while, top executives and banks were paid out with the remaining assets. But Sears wasn't the only one breaking its promises back in 2018.

While Ontario was in the midst of a provincial election and political winds were blowing, Doug Ford issued the following statement to Ontario pension plan members: "Improving pension security for Ontario workers is a priority for Doug Ford and the Ontario PCs. We will work with the federal government and public and private sector pensions, among other stakeholders, to review all options available to provide protection beyond the current Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund. For a year, Kathleen Wynne stood idle when it came to the Sears pensioners. Now, only in the face of an election have they agreed to retroactively apply the PGBF changes to assist them. We believe it's time the government stopped playing politics with the hopes and emotions of pensioners. We are determined to ensure that what has happened to Sears pensioners is not repeated."

So, what became of that bold promise the Premier so proudly stated during an election campaign? He took no further action.

This is not a one-off incident. I mentioned Sears, but there are other examples, like Algoma Steel, Nortel, and Canwest, where workers and retirees had their pensions and benefits cut when companies declared bankruptcy or restructured. Across Canada, more than 250,000 people have lost part or all of their pensions due to corporate bankruptcies. These aren't just numbers. These are people who are now forced to delay retirement plans, stretch fixed incomes or go back to work in their seventies, because the system has failed to protect them.

With the current economic uncertainty, it is crucial we address this issue now. Workers are scared. Threats of tariffs are putting industries and business at risk of closure, and thousands of Ontarian pensions would be jeopardized. The federal government has recognized the need for pension protection, and in April 2023, Bill C-228, the Pension Protection Act, was given royal assent. The act ensures that employee pension plans are paid in priority in the event of bankruptcy proceedings. However, the bill won't become law until April 2027, leaving workers and retirees unprotected for about two years.

Conservative colleagues will like this: It was a Conservative MP who introduced the safeguard federally, and yet there has been no action from the Conservative provincial government, who claim that they're the only government that cares for workers.

So the question is, does the recent federal Pension Protection Act fix the problem? No, but it will help. It provides

a higher priority for pension plans in bankruptcy or corporate restructuring, protecting pensions in the same manner as earned unpaid wages instead of being at the end of the line in dividing corporate assets.

This is why my motion is so timely. We need to ensure that, until Bill C-228 is legislated, we as a province have the opportunity to pass this motion and put into action promises to workers that the Premier made in 2018.

People already think politicians tell you what you want to hear when they're campaigning, and then when it's time to deliver those promises, somehow, politicians forget. Well, the NDP haven't forgotten. We're holding this government accountable for the Premier's 2018 campaign promise to workers that they would stop playing politics when it comes to workers' pensions.

The Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund is unique to Ontario. It was designed to step in when pension plans collapse and protect seniors from being left out to dry. Established in 1980, the fund offers a financial safeguard to ensure retirees don't lose everything and they are treated fairly. Ontario remains the only province, and indeed the only subnational jurisdiction in the world, with a fund like this. We have a safety net for retirees like no other, and it's something we should be proud of as a province.

But the truth is, the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund is no longer living up to its original promise. When it was first created, it guaranteed up to \$1,000 per month in pension benefits. That was a significant amount in 1980, but it was never indexed to inflation, and today, more than four decades later, the maximum monthly payout has been increased by \$500. With payments at just \$1,500, pensioners are receiving less than minimum wage. That's barely enough to get by, let alone retire with dignity.

If that \$1,000 had simply kept up with inflation, the monthly cap would now be over \$4,500, and that's exactly what this motion proposes. First, let's raise the maximum guaranteed benefit under the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund to \$4,500 per month, and second, index it to inflation so it never falls behind again.

The Liberals, led by Kathleen, instead of making things better, gutted the pension protections. One of the things they did was reducing plan funding requirements from 100% to 85%. Some plans are in perpetual poverty now, and likely will be forever. Secondly, the worst thing she did was permitting planned top-up payments to be spread over five years, to be payable in arrears, allowing plans to fall well below the 85%. One of the worst things that happened during the Liberals was permitting plan sponsors to expropriate temporary plan surpluses, with no repayment required when plans become underfunded.

Speaker, let's take a step back and consider why this matters. Remember, a pension plan is a promise. It promises a worker that for every year you contribute, you'll receive a set amount in retirement. These plans are funded over time with contributions, again, from workers themselves and their employers. Nothing in this motion says employer contributions will increase, just that the maximum will pay out.

Employer contributions are based on a formula from assessed risk. A plan's PBGF assessment is calculated based

on the funded level—for example, solvency—of the pension plan and the number of Ontario members covered under the plan. The larger the plan's solvency shortfall, the larger the PBGF assessment.

We are not proposing at this point to change the assessment rates. We're only talking about payout to individuals. And not every individual would receive the \$4,500. It depends how underfunded the pension is and what your pension amount was. The only thing we're suggesting is to change the maximum payout.

If a company goes bankrupt, pensions are often the last in line for what's left from corporate assets. When there's not enough money to go around, the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund keeps that promise to those workers.

So, the question is not whether we need the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund. We do. The question is whether we're giving it the tools to live up to the job in today's economy. Right now, we're not. And yet, it's an easy fix, because the fund is not paid for by taxpayers. It's funded entirely by premiums paid by employers and sponsor-defined benefit plans. These are private contributions in a self-sustaining fund.

1810

This would not increase the employer contribution fees or increase taxes, because the money already exists in the fund. As of March 2024, the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund had \$1.2 billion in assets. The Financial Services Regulatory Authority, which oversees the fund, has confirmed that it can meet future claims, even under stressed scenarios like the 2008 financial crisis. In other words, the money is there, the need is clear, and the only thing missing is political will.

This is about keeping promises—keeping the promise to workers that they will retire with the pensions that they earned. The Ford government needs to keep its promise to provide protection to workers' pensions. So, Speaker, can I ask this government and all the members across the way to keep their promise?

I'm going to end by thanking the people that contributed to this motion. A previous MPP, Paul Miller, introduced Bill 174 in 2014. At that time, he was asking for an increase of \$2,500, and that didn't pass. That's 10 years. Now that fund is viable, so that we can actually increase it to \$4,500. The numbers are there. The sources of financial experts and reports have said it's doable.

For an example, the presentation that I received from financial agencies was the Financial Services Regulatory Authority. They're responsible for the PBGF, and they're also responsible for PBGF annual reports. FSRA reports quarterly on the Ontario Health regulated plans.

This is why this is doable, and this is why we need to take action today. We can't keep kicking the can down the road and expecting that workers aren't protected when they go to work every day. And they have a right to their pension. Imagine if you went to the bank and all your savings were gone. You would want to be reimbursed when you have savings. You would want to be reimbursed when you have a pension plan, when the company goes bankrupt. So, Speaker, I ask the members to please consider this motion and vote to protect workers' pensions.

It's the least we can do in these tumultuous times that we're experiencing economically. Thank you for everyone's time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Brian Saunderson): Further debate?

M^{me} Chandra Pasma: Je suis heureuse d'appuyer la motion déposée par ma collègue la députée de London–Fanshawe qui vise à protéger les retraités en garantissant leurs prestations de retraite. Nous, en tant que néo-démocrates, croyons que chaque personne mérite une retraite sûre. Après avoir travaillé dur toute votre vie, vous devriez pouvoir compter sur vos prestations de retraite. Mais pendant les 15 dernières années, 250 000 Canadiens et Canadiennes ont perdu une partie ou la totalité de leurs prestations de pension, et on attend de voir ce qu'il adviendra des pensions des employés de la Baie d'Hudson, qui perdent actuellement leur emploi.

Nous avons une solution très simple qui existe déjà, Président, qui est l'expansion du Fonds de garantie des prestations de retraite. Le fonds existe pour protéger les pensions des retraités qui sont dans un plan de pension d'un seul employeur en remplaçant une partie de leurs prestations. Mais le montant n'a pas augmenté avec l'inflation. Il offre seulement 1 500 \$ par mois, tandis que le montant original du plan, s'il avait suivi l'inflation, s'élèverait aujourd'hui à 4 500 \$ par mois. Le fonds est financé par les contributions des employeurs, pas par les contribuables, et le fonds est en surplus actuellement, donc une hausse des prestations peut être mise en place sans hausser les frais.

Je demande à tous les députés d'appuyer cette motion et d'appuyer nos retraités.

Speaker, I'm very happy to support this motion that was tabled by my colleague from London–Fanshawe to ensure that we protect pensions in the province of Ontario, because everyone deserves a secure retirement. When you've worked hard your entire life, when you've earned that pension, that pension should be there for you when you retire.

A pension is actually deferred wages. It's not a gift from your employer. You have earned that pension through your work. Your employer is not allowed to withhold your wages. That's wage theft—something this government also needs to do some work on. When you don't earn your pension—that's also withholding your wages. That's income that you earned towards your retirement security.

We've seen, over the past 15 years, 250,000 Canadians lose some or all of their pension because of the bankruptcies of corporations, some of which have been through corporate greed and mismanagement, with big hedge funds clearing out all the assets, bankrupting the company, providing big bonuses to executives, but walking away with nothing for the workers who were counting on that income for their retirement security. Some of them have had to go back to work just in order to be able to live. That shouldn't be happening.

We have the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund in Ontario precisely for scenarios like this, when workers lose their pension due to bankruptcy. But the pension benefit hasn't kept pace with inflation. If it had just kept pace with

inflation since it was created, it would be up to \$4,500 a month. It's only \$1,500 a month right now. And the real shame of it is that the funds are there to increase that benefit. They're already sitting in the fund. They're just not being used.

So this motion from my colleague calls on the government to actually invest those funds in workers, who deserve that retirement security, who deserve to have a dignified income, and who deserve to have their work over a lifetime respected.

So I urge all government members to vote for this motion and to vote to support our workers, who deserve a dignified retirement in our province.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Brian Saunderson): Further debate?

Mr. Tom Rakocevic: I rise in strong support of the pensions of Ontario workers—by strengthening the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund. I want to thank the member from London–Fanshawe for tabling this important motion. And I want to thank Paul Miller for doing this work 10 years ago.

Speaker, a quarter of a million Canadians have either seen their pensions decrease or lost entirely because of corporate bankruptcies. And who are these workers? People who got into cars on early mornings, fighting traffic to come in and punch the clock. And what did they do? They worked loyally for a company. They worked hard every single day. They worked hard to put a roof over the heads of themselves and their families, to put food on the table of their families. They did everything right. And in the end, the company, for whatever reason, went bankrupt. What does that mean? That means that that worker and their family's future has been put in jeopardy. And when this happens, almost always it is the worker—and the worker's pension—that is the creditor that is considered the lowest priority. They're always the one, at the very end, left holding the bag.

In 1980, the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund was created—something unique here in Ontario and in Canada, around the world—to protect workers by making up for a shortfall, at the time, of \$1,000. Here we are, 45 years later, and the fund is now only at \$1,500. That is absolutely not keeping up with the times—and governments have not seen to modernize these payments in light of all the inflation in the time that has passed. In fact, the former government actually made it such that companies could underfund pensions by as much as 15%. This is not prudent planning for the future.

This is something that I believe all MPPs should support today. In fact, we've heard the Premier talking about what the effects of tariffs could be and what that could mean for workers, and that we should do everything possible to protect them. Well, here it is.

If these companies claim bankruptcy, leave or anything of that sort, and people lose their pensions here in the province of Ontario, \$1,500 is not going to cover it. They will see their entire futures go up in flames. So what the member from London–Fanshawe is asking for is simply to account for inflation—simply to recognize the times and

increase that amount to \$4,500. This is the right thing to do.

As we've seen with the subprime mortgage crisis that happened in the States, any time big businesses go belly under, it's the CEOs who get paid out; the shareholders get paid out. But the workers who have dedicated their entire lives, decades of their lives, loyally coming in to work hard, are always left as the last to be paid out. As I said earlier, a quarter of a million Canadians have been put in that situation.

1820

And so, today, we have a clear path. Let's support this motion. Let us strengthen the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund. Let's modernize it, let's account for all the inflation that's happened over the years, and let's protect our workers. We owe it to them. Now, above all, this is the time to do it. I hope everyone in this chamber will support this important motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Brian Saunderson): Further debate? Further debate?

Mr. John Fraser: Thank you, Speaker. Thanks for your patience. There was a little bit of a legislative chicken there for a few minutes.

I'm happy to speak to this motion. I'll begin by saying that I was working in a community office in Ottawa in 2010 when Nortel pensioners experienced a really awful thing. It's not just that their pensions were reduced; it's that their pensions weren't there. They weren't getting any money. And many of them had worked long and hard for many years. The money that they invested and the company invested on their behalf disappeared, and it created a great deal of hardship.

At the time, the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund, I think, was in for about \$500 million, but we had to backfill that—the government of the day had to backfill that with about \$400 million, of which only \$200 million came back, so that wasn't all Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund money. It was Ontario taxpayers, some of whom didn't have a pension—the vast majority of people don't have a pension—who paid for what happened with that company and, what I can say in here is, the malpractice and kind of things that happened with that.

I have some experience, and it's not a hardship for me at all, but I just want to give an example. I have a UFCW pension because I was in the grocery business for about 10 years about 30 years ago. I've watched that payout diminish year over year over year because of some really bad choices that were made. It creates a lot of hardship for people—not for me in this case; I'm not complaining. It's one of those things where you have no control. You've done everything right.

What the member is putting forward is important. I think we have to increase it. I don't think there's any question to that. I might say that we have to look at some of the other factors that exist inside this as to how much we do it and how we—and I don't mean this in a way that—it's just that we have to look at the bigger picture of this. We have, I think, about 7% of Ontario pensions covered by this Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund—7% of

Ontarians are covered by this. The vast majority aren't because of the nature of the plan, of what the pension benefit guarantee funds. We normally put out about \$31 million, \$30 million a year. It's usually small pensions that get corrected. But right now, as the member said, the fund is at about \$1.3 billion. But if you take a look at the risks that are out there—90% of the funds are fine; they're over 100%. About 2% of the funds are what you would call red, 85% or less. And they total to an amount of around \$500 million, \$600 million. Then there's another 8% that are kind of in a yellow range or an orange range, and I don't know what the total of that is in terms of risk.

I think the challenge then becomes, how do we make sure that the people who are responsible for that fund are the ones that fund it? Not the people who don't have a pension. And I'm not criticizing what you're bringing forward, but I think it's a larger question that we have to ask ourselves. We did the right thing in Algoma and in Massey Ferguson way back when and in Nortel—in particular Nortel, because of what was happening and the kind of hardship that it created. It really didn't do as much as it needed to do for people, so that's why I agree with you right now that we need to increase that. But in these cases people were let off the hook, right? The people who were responsible were let off the hook, so we are asking people without pensions to contribute to help people who had them. So we have to look at that. We have to think about what that means.

Now, I take the criticism of what happened under previous governments. I do want to say that we did take FSRA and put FSRA as an outside agency of the government, which was the right thing to do. The government has said, "We're going to do something about pensions," and, literally, they haven't. In actual fact, the federal government took action with the Pension Protection Act, which would be particularly important in the case of Nortel and the case of bankruptcies where pensions are put at risk, in that pensions have a super priority when it comes to the people who are owed money out of whatever assets are left. So that's a really important change that happened.

So I think, with all due respect, protecting people's pensions—we need to do more to do that. Just simply raising the benefit guarantee without looking at how we protect taxpayers from that and making sure that people responsible, the companies and the managers, bear some responsibility in that, and asking taxpayers—I think at Nortel it ended up being, I don't know, \$200 million or \$300 million that just came right out of the treasury. So money came back. I think \$200 million came back. So I think that's a fair and legitimate question.

I'm just going to say it out this way: I'm a bit torn. I saw how we needed to have a stronger Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund for those people in Nortel and in Sears as well too, and so we have to increase that. Then I look at the problems that exist in pension funds, and the government hasn't done anything to move in the direction of actually doing what they said they were going to do, so I think we need to do both. The amount that you're suggesting is actually above the inflationary rate, if you go

back to when this fund was instituted. All that to say, I would agree with the member that we have to increase it. I'm not sure of the number.

The other thing that we have to do is we have to make sure that the laws that exist and that we have control over in this province protect pensioners and put the responsibility on those companies and those managers, because I don't think it's fair or right to ask people who don't have a pension to contribute to somebody else's bad judgment—in some cases, abuse and a lack of care for their workers and the people who supported them for so long.

So as I read the motion, I was just torn about it because I remember very clearly—I just remember people and how desperate they were. They had no money—none. So I just want to thank the member for bringing it forward and for the chance to debate and get out how I feel about this and what I think about this; and, more importantly, I think, in bringing it up, that the government do—or the Premier does what he said he was going to do to protect people's pensions. That's the point.

People on the other side, I'll be interested to hear what they have to say in debate, but that's the commitment that the Premier made, and whether you sit here or here or over there, the people who are affected by this, they don't know boundaries, they don't know constituencies. They're just people with jobs who have pensions, and now what they expected to be there for them is not there. Our government has to do more to protect pensioners. I thank the member for bringing it forward.

1830

The Acting Chair (Mr. Brian Saunderson): Further debate?

Ms. Peggy Sattler: I'm very proud to rise today in support of this motion from my colleague the MPP for London—Fanshawe. I think all of us in this Legislature know how much people in our communities are struggling. The financial pressures and the challenges of the cost of living rising is especially difficult for seniors and anyone who relies on a pension or is living on a fixed income.

In London West, about one in five residents is 65 years of age or older, and about half of those live below the poverty line. Speaker, many are retired, although we're all hearing more and more about seniors who can't afford to retire and have to continue to work. Some have been forced into retirement. They've lost their jobs through no fault of their own; maybe they were laid off or downsized or maybe their employer declared bankruptcy. Whether they retired voluntarily or not, I think we all agree that they deserve a pension that allows them to live with some security, to live with dignity, to be able to buy the groceries and pay the rent. Pension funds that are underfunded and that pay out less than was promised, or bankruptcy proceedings that have, for years, put pensioners at the back of the line can put retirees at serious financial risk.

Those who've spoken to this motion so far have all talked about what happened to Sears pensioners when Sears Canada declared bankruptcy. These people had worked hard for their company for decades, but they had to fight tooth and nail to get the severance and benefits they were owed, and some ended up with a pension that

was 30% less of what they had earned. Of course, it's not just Sears; some 250,000 workers across Canada have lost some or all of their pensions in corporate bankruptcies.

The motion that is before us today could make a real difference for retirees in London and for those across the province. The government should listen to this. It will allow the government to actually make good on a promise that had been made by the Premier back in 2018 to make sure that what happened to Sears employees would not happen again. Workers who have spent their entire lives, their working lives, building our province should not have to worry about whether their pensions will be protected. As we look south of the border and we see the very real threat of Trump's tariffs to our economy, this is especially urgent to make sure that there is security for pensioners and seniors in our province.

The beauty of this motion is that it refers to a program that is already in place: the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund. There is a surplus in that fund of \$1.2 billion. All the motion asks for is that the fund be updated, that the surplus be used to increase the pension payouts. We have heard from the member for London—Fanshawe that in the 45 years that the fund was established, the pension payout has increased by only \$500. It is below the minimum wage—not even remotely close to a living wage.

So please, Speaker, I urge everyone in this Legislature to support this motion.

The Acting Chair (Mr. Brian Saunderson): Further debate?

Mr. Dave Smith: I actually do want to thank the member from London—Fanshawe for bringing this forward. I think there's an expression—I won't say this one because there is a bad word in it—but there's another expression that doesn't use the same type of language: Good intentions can sometimes lead to outcomes that weren't foreseen or desired and can actually be harmful. I'm going to point out something not related to this, but I do think it gets the point across.

We've all heard about Asian carp and it being an invasive species now and some of the damage that it's done. Asian carp was actually introduced as a way to control algae blooms. It was an interesting concept to do it; the intent was noble on it. But we've seen some of the destruction that's happened now because of Asian carp.

We've taken a different approach to tariff-proofing than what the member opposite has suggested. One of the things that she said in her speech was that there wasn't going to be any impact on it. But as she pointed out, it's funded by the pension funds, which get their money from the pensioners or the workers at the time. It would actually require a significant increase from the pension funds, and it would put some of those pensions actually insolvent. We would require them then to close and have access to the fund. It would cause a lot of other problems by doing that. So, I think it was a noble thought that was put into it but the implementation side of it has a lot of ramifications.

She also pointed out, and so has the leader of the Liberal Party, that Ontario is the only province that has this backstop. That's why the federal government came up with what they came up with, to create a backstop then that was

Canada-wide. It's not going to be in place for a couple of years. Ontario still is the only one that has it.

The approach that we've taken, though, to tariff-proof is to tariff-proof the industries and tariff-proof those companies so that we don't find ourselves in a place where those companies would be insolvent and would close. What we've done is we've done investments specifically into workers: \$2.5 billion in the Skills Development Fund. That's all about giving an opportunity for someone who may have been affected because of tariffs to find employment in another area, or it's also a way that a company can upskill some of their existing employees to put the company in a more competitive position so that it's more tariff-proofed.

We're also supporting businesses with cuts to the WSIB premiums. There's \$4 billion in WSIB premiums that have been reduced, without reducing any of the benefits to any of the workers for it. We've made industry more competitive so that we're making them more tariff-proof.

We have almost \$30 billion in the current budget, the 2025 budget, to offer for tariff supports for companies and for workers. When you look at what we've been doing, everything that we've been doing as a government has been trying to build up those companies, to build up the economy so that we're not finding ourselves in positions where those companies are found in a spot where they're not going to be solvent.

We also believe that if employees are concerned about this, this is something that they should then be negotiating into, because it's also possible for a fund to create another type of a backstop themselves. If this is something that the employees believe that they should be doing, then they have an opportunity as part of their collective bargaining approach to do it and create something within their own company for it that gives them that. Those are the types of things that we think we should be doing on it. We should be supporting companies so that they don't find themselves in a position where they're insolvent, and when you look at what the budget is, we have done a lot of things in there to tariff-proof.

We're offering significant amounts of funding across the board in all industries to make sure that they're supported in different ways. Actually, when you look at what our plan has been—and we've talked about our plan for a significant period of time, even prior to the last election—a large number of unions actually endorsed what our plan is, and we're just furthering that. What we're doing is we're investing in business. We're investing in workers. We're investing in the industries that are here in Ontario to make sure that they are tariff-proofed.

And the best way to tariff-proof someone's pension is to tariff-proof the company, so that the company does not find itself in a position where it becomes insolvent. That's the approach that we're taking on it, because we know there aren't negative, unintended consequences in making sure that the environment for business to succeed and thrive is a good environment, and allowing businesses, then, giving them the tools that they need to be successful, means that we're tariff-proofing all of the pensions for those employees—because, as the member opposite has pointed out, it's

when a company becomes insolvent, it's when a company closes its doors, that the pension then becomes at jeopardy. **1840**

If we put the conditions in place by supporting businesses and continuing to support businesses, they're not going to find themselves in that position, and we believe that is a stronger approach then to ensure that the things that we're doing are good for the economy in Ontario, are good for business to succeed in Ontario, are good for workers to succeed in Ontario, and if we do that, the pensions themselves are tariff-proofed.

If we change the focus, though, and we want to do what the member opposite has put forward, the unintended consequences of closing some of those pensions because they can't afford the premiums, then, that they would have to pay into that fund to make sure that there's enough money in that fund to pay out in the event that they close, would create more havoc, more uncertainty and actually put those workers, those retirees, in a worse position, and that is the thing that we absolutely want to avoid.

So, we'll continue taking the approach that we've taken. We'll continue to invest in business. We'll continue to invest in workers. We'll continue to ensure that Ontario's economy is tariff-proofed. We'll continue to find ways to break down barriers for interprovincial trade so that Ontario's economy is working with all other provinces and territories. We've heard from economists that this has the potential of increasing the GDP for the country by \$200 billion by breaking down those barriers. That makes us more tariff-proof. That puts companies in a position where they can succeed. That puts our economy in a position where it has the opportunity to grow. And we know that as the economy is growing, that's good for workers, and we know that when it's good for workers and good for business, it's good for those pensioners, as well.

I do think that it was a very, very noble intent that the member had, but I don't think that she looked at all of the unintended consequences of doing it and where there could be significant negatives for it. I'm happy to continue having further conversations on it, on how we can work together to support people, how we can work together to build Ontario's economy, how we can work together to tariff-proof all of the industries in Ontario—and that's good for everyone.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Brian Saunderson): Further debate? Further debate? Further debate?

The member from London—Fanshawe has two minutes for her reply.

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: I want to thank all my colleagues who spoke to the motion, but in particular, Humber River—Black Creek, Ottawa West—Nepean and London West.

I also want to thank Cliff Jenkins. He's very passionate about making these adjustments to the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund, and he is one of the experts that we were listening to, as well as the reports that came from FSRA—and the impacts are known, because they're identified in every actuarial evaluation. Actuaries are required to report on the impacts of possible 1% reductions in interest rates so that these things don't get out of control.

The other thing that I want to point out is there are things that happened under the Liberals that really made things worse, and those things have really impacted the fact of this, the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund. I've mentioned it earlier, but one of the worst things: It was permitting plan sponsors to expropriate temporary plan surpluses, with no repayment required if and when the plans become underfunded. There are two others, but that in particular is the really contentious one.

This is an opportunity that we have. If this motion is passed, we can take the opportunity to look into it, as the member across the way said—other various ways. But even the ask about indexing this fund, that should be a basic thing that we all require for this to happen because if that actually occurred, we wouldn't be here right now. And the fund has a \$1.2-billion surplus right now. That would actually protect the retirees. It doesn't mean every retiree, under bankruptcy, would get that amount; it's the pension was at that amount. It doesn't say everybody gets it.

I just want to thank everyone, and I want to specifically take one more minute to put a shout-out to my daughter, Jacqueline. She is one of the biggest supporters that I have. She watches me every day, and I want to say thank you, honey, for reaching out to me and making me feel so good about today.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Brian Saunderson): The time provided for private members' public business has expired.

Ms. Armstrong has moved private member's notice of motion number 5. 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 motion will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

A recorded vote being requested, it will be deferred until the next instance of deferred votes.

Vote deferred.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Brian Saunderson): Pursuant to standing order 36, the question that this House do now adjourn is deemed to have been made.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

PUBLIC TRANSIT

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Brian Saunderson): The member for Oshawa has given notice of dissatisfaction with the answer to a question given by the Minister of Transportation. The member has up to five minutes to debate the matter and a minister or parliamentary assistant may reply for up to five minutes.

The member from Oshawa.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: Thank you, Speaker. Last week, as the Ontario NDP shadow minister for infrastructure and transportation, I asked the Premier to hold Metrolinx to account and I demanded answers about the problems plaguing transit projects across the province.

Metrolinx is an agency that is supposed to deliver massive transportation infrastructure and services, but project after

project is plagued by delays, problems, cost overruns and secrets. When people ask questions about these multi-million-dollar projects that are literally going off the rails, Metrolinx chooses to keep people in the dark and refuses to give answers or timelines. Why is Metrolinx allowed to keep the public in the dark with impunity?

With over 100 vice-presidents and a new CEO, you'd imagine Metrolinx would have had a meeting in the past six months with its board, but no. With stalled projects, cancelled contracts and reportedly tens of millions paid to Deutsche Bahn to end their contract, you'd think Metrolinx would have something to say, or even that the government would want to know what's going on. Bizarrely, they are still being defended by this minister and Premier. Why?

The massive GO expansion P3 project has collapsed, and while it sounds like it is the operations component that has collapsed, we don't know. We have asked what's going on, but Metrolinx isn't saying, and they seemingly don't have to.

In a Star article from May 27, "Metrolinx Quietly Drops Deutsche Bahn, Aecon from Multi-Billion-Dollar GO Expansion Project," the spokesperson for Metrolinx would "not answer questions about how much the contract with Deutsche Bahn and Aecon was worth or how much had already been paid out."

We are getting the runaround from people whose duty it is to be accountable to the public. It is this government that appoints the members to the Metrolinx board of directors, and that board hasn't met in over six months. It's not doing its job, and that is not acceptable.

Let's talk about the Eglinton Crosstown LRT. Today, the Premier confirmed a September opening date for the half-decade delayed Eglinton Crosstown LRT and he said, "Thank God. That's all I've got to say about that...." Well, thanking God should not be our transit strategy. We should be able to get answers from Metrolinx.

Further to this hot tip from the Premier, he said that Metrolinx is expected to hand over the new Line 5 to the TTC. But guess what? The TTC has reportedly said they "don't have any updated timelines at this time." Besides an update in November to a software design flaw that impacted the line's signalling system, no other details have been provided on why the line has been delayed. How's that for transparency?

Let's talk about Boxfish. Reported on May 30 in the Star, "Metrolinx has ended its relationship with the transit consulting firm that has worked on the long-delayed Eglinton Crosstown and Finch West LRTs, as well as the problem-plagued Ottawa LRT."

"Two sources ... confirmed that the provincial transit agency will no longer be working with Boxfish and its owner, Brian Guest."

Speaker, three years ago the NDP demanded an investigation into Boxfish after the Star reported that Metrolinx gave a contract to Boxfish while Boxfish CEO Brian Guest was a Metrolinx VP as an embedded private consultant, and the Minister of Transportation at the time promised to investigate. Well, because of an FOI, we found out the ministry said, "No records exist."

The NDP asked about it, the minister insisted there had been an internal investigation “and determined that the consultancy work that was being provided by Boxfish needed to come to an end—which it did—at Metrolinx.” There is no evidence that an investigation occurred, and it doesn’t appear that Metrolinx ended its relationship with Boxfish after all.

1850

But here we are again, guessing what the heck is going on at Metrolinx—and there are so many Metrolinx projects that communities want to know about. Can Metrolinx tell us about the East Harbour station? I think the last time we saw it in the budget, it was \$300 million. But how are things going? It’s a service station with some bridge work, concrete, track work. The original plans were quite impressive; I understand it’s been downgraded. But it is one station. I’ve heard that the cost has ballooned to over a billion dollars for one station. What is going on?

From the recent article, “Mimico Residents Vow to Keep Pressure on Metrolinx to Make Local GO Station Accessible,” quote, “Residents gathered near the Mimico GO station to demand that Metrolinx begin work as soon as possible. A Metrolinx representative told residents at the demonstration that the Ontario government has awarded a contract to begin the design phase of planned accessibility upgrades at the station.

“There is no start date for construction.”

The president of the Mimico Residents’ Association has said, “The community is very frustrated. Patience has run out. It’s been a decade of a lack of accessibility and multiple failed promises by Metrolinx.”

The black box that is Metrolinx needs to get cracked open. The Premier should not be okay. We need answers and accessibility—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Brian Saunderson): The member from Hastings–Lennox and Addington.

Mr. Ric Bresee: This House is very aware that this government is delivering the largest expansion to public transit in Canadian history. Under the leadership of Premier Ford, we are building a world-class transit system. I want to repeat that: a world-class system. With that, we will not compromise when it comes to ensuring that our contractors meet Ontario’s very high quality and safety standards.

Metrolinx worked very closely with their contractor; however, that contractor did not meet key milestones needed to ensure a smooth and safe transition. As a result, Metrolinx made the decision to end their contract with that contractor. We know that Alstom will continue to support operations and maintenance for GO Transit and UP Express, and there will be no impacts to service. Commuters will continue to rely on safe, on-time and dependable travel as we work toward a long-term solution that delivers value for the taxpayers and the best, safest experience for riders.

I do understand that the NDP wants to make this political. Speaker, it’s actually quite simple. We took action when a contractor failed to meet its obligations. That’s not a black box; that’s leadership. Ontarians expect their government to stand up for their hard-earned tax dollars, and that is exactly what has happened here. Our contractors are held accountable, and if they don’t meet their commitment to

the people of Ontario, if they don’t meet their commitments under these contracts, we take action.

I know that the member cares deeply about transit in this province, and I’m grateful for her advocacy. It’s an important part of the process here in this Legislature. I know that she wants to see transit in her community, such as two-way, all-day GO, and ensure—I know that she wants to ensure—that taxpayers’ dollars are spent wisely.

We’re actually on the same page. That’s why Metrolinx ended their contract: because the contractor failed to meet the critical milestones. That’s all. We took action when a contractor failed to meet their obligations. Once again, that’s the leadership that Ontarians expect from this government, and that’s what we’re providing. We will continue to stand up for their hard-earned dollars, we will continue to ensure that the biggest transit expansion in North American history will continue and will provide amazing service that all Ontarians deserve.

FIRST NATIONS CONSULTATION

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Brian Saunderson): The member for Ottawa South has given notice of dissatisfaction with the answer to a question given by the Minister of Economic Development, Job Creation and Trade. The member has up to five minutes to debate the matter, and the minister or parliamentary assistant may reply for up to five minutes.

Mr. John Fraser: It’s great to have another opportunity to speak about Bill 5 because I don’t think I’ve had as many as I would like to have to implore, to ask—I’ll even say beg—the government just to kill Bill 5. Take the summer and get it right: Talk to First Nations; go up north; go to those places that are going to be special economic zones.

The chiefs and elders and many other people were out on the front lawn yesterday in a peaceful protest, and they were sending us a very clear message. That message is, “You need to listen to us. You need to consult us. We are stewards, the original stewards of the land. You need to respect truth and reconciliation.” That’s what they were saying on the front lawn.

The Premier’s response earlier this week was, “Don’t miss out; don’t fall behind.” That message, I said earlier today, is like saying to First Nations and to everybody about Bill 5, “We know what’s best. We know what’s best for you. I can basically eliminate the rule of law in certain places”—and by that I mean the laws that exist here in Ontario—“and I’m going to do that because I’m going to do what’s good for you.”

As I said earlier today, First Nations for centuries have heard governments say, “We know what’s good for you. Here’s a place where you can live; it’s good for you. We’re going to educate your children in residential schools because it’s good for you.” With all the harm and tragedy that First Nations have heard connected to that approach, that attitude, which is, “We know what’s good for you,” is it any wonder that they’re upset? That doesn’t seem to be resonating with the government. It doesn’t seem to be connecting.

The only acknowledgement of First Nations in a bill that's going to drastically affect them, the places where they live, and as stewards of the land, came as amendments at the last minute. One of the amendments was to the preamble.

Now, for those listening at home—the two or three of them that might be there—amending a preamble is nothing; it's symbolic. It really doesn't have any weight in law. If you're trying to create a symbol in a piece of legislation, you'd think you'd do it when you started, not at the end. You'd think you would acknowledge the fact that you have a partner in First Nations, that you have a responsibility to First Nations, that you have a duty to consult, that you have a duty to respect truth and reconciliation, which isn't even a decade old.

My point this morning was to try to get the government to understand that you just can't run over people's rights. The idea that the Premier or a minister of the day can just say, "In Timiskaming, the employment safeties—the ESA doesn't matter. Labour standards don't matter. Clean water law doesn't matter"—all sorts of laws that we've put forward here to protect people, to protect the earth, to protect people's rights—and this law says, "We don't need to respect those laws if I make a decision that we're not going to have them here." That's like the power of a sovereign. That's like the power of a king. That's not democracy. That's what we see going on south of the border. So don't be surprised when First Nations and other people are upset with Bill 5.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Brian Saunderson): The member for Bay of Quinte.

Mr. Tyler Allsopp: I rise this evening to underscore the need to pass Bill 5 and unlock the economic opportunities it holds for Ontario. At a time when the world is more uncertain than ever, when US protectionism is here and competition for investment is fierce, we cannot afford to stand still. We cannot let outdated processes and endless delays hold our province back. Make no mistake about it, we are facing a once-in-a-generation threat from south of our border. President Trump has been clear that he wants our jobs, he wants our industry, and we were clear with the people of Ontario in the last election that we would not stand for it, and that is why they have sent us back here for a historic third mandate. The message was, "Protect Ontario," the mandate is, "Protect Ontario," and these measures are designed to do exactly that: to protect the people of Ontario.

While the NDP and Liberals file amendment after amendment to stall progress, we are focused on delivering real results for the people of Ontario. They didn't send us here to play games. They sent us here to get things done.

This is the time for building, and Ontario has what it takes, the natural resources, the skilled workforce and the

determination to lead in mining, in energy and industrial development. The choice is clear. We can either build an economy that's ready to compete or let bureaucracy and red tape smother our potential.

Let's be honest. If it were up to the Liberals and the NDP, it would take 15 years to get shovels in the ground for every single project. That's not acceptable to us. It's not acceptable to the Liberal Prime Minister and it's not acceptable to the NDP Premiers in British Columbia and in Manitoba because they understand that we are in a global race for investment.

What we want is simple: an economy that builds resilience from within and protects itself from external threats, such as those coming from President Trump. The only way to do that is to move fast, stay competitive and keep those jobs here in Ontario.

Let me put this into perspective. According to the Ontario architects' association, delays in site plan approvals are costing our economy \$3.5 billion every single year. That's \$3.5 billion in missed opportunities because we're stuck in processes that are supposed to take 60 days but are dragging out for 23 months and more.

In the coming years, the competition to land job-creating investments will be unlike anything we have ever seen. If we keep moving at the old pace, we won't even make the short list for companies looking to expand, not with states and provinces across North America slashing timelines, streamlining approvals and rolling out the red carpet for investment. We need to move faster, and that's exactly what Bill 5 allows us to do.

Since taking office, our government has helped create nearly one million new jobs—that includes 164,000 jobs just last year alone and 55,000 jobs in the first two months of this year. These aren't just numbers, Mr. Speaker, they're paycheques, they're careers and they're futures built right here in Ontario for the people of Ontario. That's not talk. That's results.

Bill 5 is the next step in delivering on the mandate the people of Ontario gave us to create jobs, cut red tape and unlock our province's full economic potential and to protect the people of Ontario. If we don't act, someone else will, and they'll take our jobs, our investment and our future with them. We won't let that happen.

Bill 5 is about saying yes: to big projects, to good jobs and to a united Ontario that leads, not lags. Thank you very much.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Brian Saunderson): There being no further matters to debate, pursuant to standing order 36(c), I deem the motion to adjourn to be carried.

This House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow morning.

The House adjourned at 1904.

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	
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	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, 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	

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
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	
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, 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	

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
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	
Mulroney, Hon. / L'hon. Caroline (PC)	York—Simcoe	President of the Treasury Board / Présidente du Conseil du Trésor
Oosterhoff, Hon. / L'hon. Sam (PC)	Niagara West / Niagara-Ouest	Minister of Francophone Affairs / Ministre des Affaires francophones 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 (PC)	Sault Ste. Marie	
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, 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

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
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
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	