

Legislative
Assembly
of Ontario



Assemblée
législative
de l'Ontario

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

No. 175B

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

N° 175B

1st Session
43rd Parliament
Wednesday
30 October 2024

1^{re} session
43^e législature
Mercredi
30 octobre 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

Wednesday 30 October 2024 / Mercredi 30 octobre 2024

Affordable Energy Act, 2024, Bill 214, Mr. Lecce / Loi de 2024 sur l'énergie abordable, projet de loi 214, M. Lecce

Mr. Mike Schreiner	10077
Mr. Anthony Leardi	10078
Mr. Chris Glover	10079
Mrs. Robin Martin.....	10079
Ms. Peggy Sattler	10080
Mr. Billy Pang.....	10080
Mr. Steve Pinsonneault	10081
Mr. Chris Glover	10082
Mr. Andrew Dowie	10082
Ms. Jessica Bell.....	10082
Mr. John Jordan.....	10083
Ms. Peggy Sattler	10083
Mr. Anthony Leardi	10083
Mr. Terence Kernaghan	10083
Mr. John Fraser	10086
Mr. Anthony Leardi	10086
Mr. Sol Mamakwa.....	10086

Mr. Anthony Leardi.....	10086
Mr. John Fraser	10087
Mr. Anthony Leardi.....	10087
Mme France Gélinas	10090
Second reading debate deemed adjourned	10090

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

Consumer protection

Mr. Ernie Hardeman.....	10090
Mr. Terence Kernaghan.....	10092
Ms. Jessica Bell.....	10092
Mr. Brian Riddell	10093
Mr. Robert Bailey.....	10094
Mme France Gélinas	10094
Mrs. Robin Martin.....	10095
Mr. Ernie Hardeman.....	10095
Motion agreed to	10095

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 30 October 2024

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE
DE L'ONTARIO

Mercredi 30 octobre 2024

Report continued from volume A.

1612

AFFORDABLE ENERGY ACT, 2024

LOI DE 2024 SUR L'ÉNERGIE ABORDABLE

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

Bill 214, An Act to amend various energy statutes respecting long term energy planning, changes to the Distribution System Code and the Transmission System Code and electric vehicle charging / Projet de loi 214, Loi modifiant diverses lois sur l'énergie en ce qui a trait à la planification énergétique à long terme, aux modifications touchant les codes appelés Distribution System Code et Transmission System Code et à la recharge des véhicules électriques.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): It's now time for further debate.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: It's always an honour to rise to participate in debate, and today I'm especially excited to debate Bill 214, because I've been asking this government for a long time now to actually bring in a long-term energy plan. So it's nice to see that we have a bill in front of us that talks about maybe putting together the concept of a long-term energy plan, because it's critically important to Ontario's economy.

The last time Ontario had a long-term energy plan was in 2017. And let's be clear: When we talk about economic investment, economic competitiveness and job creation, if you have no plan, you have uncertainty and you have no investment. That's exactly what is happening in Ontario right now.

Globally, there is a boom happening, Speaker. Last year alone, there was \$1.8 trillion globally invested in the green energy transition, over \$620 billion in wind and solar alone, because they are now the lowest-cost sources of electricity generation. As a matter of fact, last year, around the world, 86% of new energy procurement for electricity was wind and solar, because they are now—new wind and solar, along with storage—the cheapest, lowest-cost sources of electricity generation.

Ontario is missing in action. We're not attracting those hundreds of billions, trillions of dollars in energy investment. As a matter of fact, this year, globally, the world is on track to investing \$2 trillion into green energy. You know how much is being invested in oil and gas? Half that.

The world is starting to leave Ontario behind, so I am pleased that we are going to, maybe, in Ontario, with this

government, start to actually have a long-term energy plan so we have the certainty to attract that global investment. Because what we've had in the past was, when this government was first elected, they cancelled 750 renewable energy contracts, costing taxpayers \$230 million. The business uncertainty that led from that meant that the US Chamber of Commerce actually wrote a letter saying that Ontario was not a safe place to invest in when it came to our energy system. We simply cannot afford that.

The next thing they did is they cancelled all the energy efficiency and conservation programs, the very programs to help people save money by saving energy. As a matter of fact, if you look at what is the lowest-cost solution to our energy needs, it's efficiency and conservation—1.6 cents a kilowatt hour equivalent when we invest in energy efficiency and conservation. I'm hoping that's part of this plan because what the government has been doing up until this point—when they cancelled all those contracts, they said, “Oh, Ontario doesn't need the power.” Now, we are in a desperate need for power, so what they have been doing is ramping up fossil gas plants.

They're telling global investors, “Don't come to Ontario to invest in the lowest-cost source of electricity because we are ramping up gas plants.” What does that mean? It means higher electricity bills for people, but it also means more climate pollution. As a matter of fact, Ontario's grid in the last six years has gotten 10% dirtier than it was when this government took office.

I appreciate the fact that the Minister of Economic Development talks about how important Ontario's clean grid is to attracting investments in electrical manufacturing, for example. I agree with the minister on that. That's why I'm so concerned that you have seen a huge increase in climate pollution from our grid. As a matter of fact, we're on track to seeing a 400% increase in climate pollution this decade alone, Speaker. Under the government's current plan, we will see an 800% increase in climate pollution over the next two decades, hurting the very kinds of investments the minister himself has talked about and undermining half—half—of the emission reductions that came from Ontario's coal phase-out.

So I'm hoping that when the government starts putting together this plan, they actually have a plan to make sure Ontario remains competitive and that our grid remains clean, because right now, under this government, we are heading in the wrong direction.

Now, I want to dig into schedule 1 of the bill. I want to start with the section that talks about the Ontario Energy Board, because the OEB is critically important as an independent body to protect consumers in this province.

I'm worried that the government is giving itself more power to direct the work of the OEB. We saw what damage the Liberals did when they did that when they were in power, and we have seen what this government has done with Bill 165 earlier this year when they overturned—took the unprecedented decision, the first time in Ontario's history, to have legislation introduced to overturn an OEB decision, which now means gas customers in this province are subsidizing the expansion of fossil gas infrastructure. And it also means that homeowners not going to enjoy the 13% savings that heat pumps provide.

The OEB, historically a pro-fossil-fuel decision-making body, said, "Do you know what? We can't afford to continue subsidizing this expansion because heat pumps are cheaper." So I'm asking the government, I sure hope you are not going to use this power to continue to overturn decisions to make energy more affordable for people. As a matter of fact, we just saw a study that came out that if you have a heat pump and you drive an electric vehicle, you save between \$500 and \$777 per month in the province of Ontario. As somebody who has a heat pump and an electric vehicle, my savings are actually even higher than that because I have solar panels on my roof that produce more electricity at a cheaper price than what I'm paying for through the grid. So you can actually exceed the \$777 a month in savings.

When it comes to power generation, there is an inherent contradiction in schedule 1 of this bill. The government says it's going to prioritize nuclear power and then, a couple of sentences later, it says it's going to have a cost-effective procurement process. So which is it? Which is it, Speaker? Because if it's cost-effective, then the lowest sources of new generation—I know I've heard some of the questions where people talk about the old cost of wind and solar. It is true, the Liberals bought high; they paid really high for wind and solar, but now this government is getting us out of wind and solar, selling low. Every investment decision I've ever made says you buy low, sell high, but right now, between the Liberals and Conservatives, we bought high and we're selling low. That makes absolutely no sense, and it completely contradicts the competitive procurement process if you're going to predetermine what source of electricity you want.

1620

Like right now, if you compare new wind and solar versus new nuclear, new nuclear is two to three times more expensive. Now I say that as somebody who recognizes that nuclear power is going to be part of Ontario's grid for many decades yet. As a matter of fact, half of our power comes from nuclear power. I don't think we should shut it down. I fully support the rebuilding of Darlington and Bruce, which is already well under way. But when we talk about new procurement, it should be a true competitive process. We shouldn't be prioritizing new nuclear when there are other forms of power generation that are cheaper. So let's just go with the competitive process and choose the cheapest, cleanest source of electricity so we can keep Ontario's electricity bills low. Also, it creates a huge opportunity for us to then be a major player in the fastest-

growing sector of the global economy. I want to attract as much of that \$2 trillion being invested globally as possible.

I'll give the government some credit. We are starting to finally attract electric vehicle manufacturing investment, something I was pushing and pushing and pushing this government to actually get on board with, instead of what they were doing, which was ripping out charging stations, removing EV chargers from the building code etc. So we're finally now starting to attract EV manufacturing and mining investment. It's a good thing.

We're missing in action—we're missing in action—on where most of the money is being invested, where most of the jobs are being created, and that is in the manufacturing and installation of wind, solar and storage. Over \$623 billion last year alone, it's going up significantly right now in 2024, and I don't understand why, when we should be in a competitive position to attract that investment, we're not. I hope that is part of the minister's long-term plan.

The minister talks about ideology versus cost. Well, I'm sorry. How can you accuse the opposition of being ideological in our energy mix when I'm just saying, go with the lowest-cost option. It seems to me to be ideological to prioritize new nuclear and ramp up fossil gas when they're more expensive. So, who is being the most ideological here? I'm going with low cost. I want low cost. Why don't we just have a competitive bid process and go with the lowest cost? If nuclear comes out lower, so be it. So be it, Speaker.

I want to close by the final schedule on electric vehicles. I'm concerned about exempting electric vehicle chargers from the Energy Consumer Protection Act. I think we want to protect consumers, Speaker. I can tell you, as an electric vehicle driver—and I'll actually give a quick shout-out to the member from Whitby, who co-sponsored a bill with me to protect electric vehicle drivers, because that's becoming increasingly important. As I travel around the province and I'm able to charge everywhere I go in Ontario, we're seeing lineups now at electric vehicle chargers because we don't have enough. So we're going to need more.

We're going to need to have the private sector and the public sector involved in expanding it, and we need to make sure that, as that expansion occurs, we have consumer protections in place. The tourism industry would not let me finish this speech without saying that one of their number one asks to me is more electric vehicle charging stations, because more and more of the people visiting them are driving electric and more and more people on boats are driving electric boats. We need the infrastructure in place to serve them.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Further questions—I should say time for questions. I recognize the member for Essex.

Mr. Anthony Leardi: I listened to the presentation from the member from Guelph, and if I heard him correctly, he suggested very strongly that low costs should govern what decision the energy procurement should take or what route energy procurement should take. He said, "Low cost,

low cost, low cost. Whatever the cost is, that's the way we should go," which sounds to me like a market-driven solution. It's just another way of saying it.

The carbon tax artificially increases the cost of certain sources of energy, which is definitely not a market-driven solution. It's not a low-cost solution. It actually artificially drives up the cost. If the member really wants a market-driven solution, he has to abandon the carbon tax. Why isn't he abandoning the carbon tax if he wants a market-driven solution?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Pollution pricing was first recommended by Conservative economists and championed by somebody like Preston Manning. I don't think Preston Manning is somebody who doesn't like markets. The reason economists and Conservatives like Preston Manning and others have supported pollution pricing is because it's a market-driven solution. It is the lowest-cost, most efficient way to reduce emissions.

Now, if we're going to talk about the electricity sector, both nuclear and renewables are non-emitting sources, so neither one is going to be subject to carbon pricing. Even without carbon pricing, by the way, renewables are cheaper than fossil gas. When it comes to the choice between new nuclear and renewables, let's go with the lowest-cost, cleanest solution.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Question?

Mr. Chris Glover: I appreciate the remarks from the member from Guelph today. It used to be that when we had Ontario Hydro as a public utility, from the 1920s until 1995, it gave us a competitive advantage. We were paying four cents a kilowatt hour for electricity. Then the Conservative government started to break it up and sell it off. Then the Liberals sold off the final piece of what was Ontario Hydro for \$9 billion. We now pay eight to 16 cents a kilowatt hour, and we're subsidizing what used to be Ontario Hydro. It's now a private, for-profit corporation. We're subsidizing them with 6.9 billion tax dollars a year.

So now this government is looking at how we can meet the future demand for electricity. They're not looking at the lowest price in the future; they're looking at an ideologically driven decision. Why should they be making decisions based on what the lowest price is and how it gives Ontarians and our businesses a competitive advantage?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Obviously, we want affordable electricity in Ontario, full stop. That's why we'd encourage the government to move forward with a competitive bidding process for new generation. It made sense to rebuild nuclear plants we had already paid for. By the way, both of those plants came in over budget and way delayed and led to a global adjustment which jacked up our electricity prices, but now that we've paid all that off, let's not shut them down.

But moving forward, when we look at new generation, let's have a competitive process. Let's bring in the lowest-cost generation. If we're going to attract global investment to Ontario, I would say, let's go after that \$2 trillion, folks. It's \$2 trillion globally invested in the green energy tran-

sition. Let's go after it. Create better-paying jobs and lower-cost electricity at the same time.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Question.

Mrs. Robin Martin: I listened to the member from Guelph and got a little bit hot under the collar listening to some of the things he was saying because it doesn't tell the full story. The world currently gets almost four fifths of its energy from fossil fuels, just to contradict the record you were putting forward. For every megawatt of wind or solar, you have to have a megawatt of a power supply which is dispatchable behind them. It isn't inexpensive at all—certainly not the cheapest—because you have to buy two megawatts for the one you're getting from the wind when the wind happens to blow.

If you account for that reliability factor, the real costs explode. In 2022, a peer-reviewed study showed that the increase in the cost was 11 to 42 times, for example, making solar the most expensive electricity source, followed by wind. Currently, we're paying 47.4 cents per kilowatt hour for solar.

1630

It is definitely not the cheapest power source. We have to pay for it twice, for wind or solar. If we had batteries, it would cost a fortune to have those batteries. Currently, a new study showed that to achieve 100% solar and wind electricity with sufficient backup, the US would need to be able to store almost three months' worth of electricity every year—currently, it has seven minutes of battery storage—and the required battery cost would be five times the US's current GDP. Can you explain why you think that's the cheapest power sources?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: According to the Independent Electricity System Operator, according to IESO data, new solar plus storage—new solar on its own is cheaper than this, but the member's right; you have to have storage, otherwise you don't have full capacity, so I want to be really clear about the importance of it—is 10 cents a kilowatt hour for new plus storage. New alone is cheaper, but the storage is critical, so the member is absolutely right—10 cents a kilowatt hour. New onshore wind plus storage: 10.5 cents a kilowatt hour. New gas-fired peaker plants: 22.7 cents a kilowatt hour. New nuclear, not old—older nuclear is cheaper, so let's be clear, I'm not saying get rid of the older nuclear, but the estimated price for new nuclear, at its mid-point cost estimate, is 24.4 cents a kilowatt hour. That's exactly why we have to invest in storage.

I'll give the government credit: They are starting to invest in storage. That's a good thing. Let's fully utilize that storage now with low-cost, renewable power. Don't ask me; ask Bloomberg News. Ask the International Energy Association, which historically, for a hundred years, been pro-fossil fuels. They're the ones saying that wind and solar are the cheapest sources of electricity generation now. That is exactly why \$2 trillion is going into clean energy right now.

Yes, fossil fuels are more than renewables right now, but that's because we've had fossil fuels for 120 years. We've been subsidizing fossil fuels for 120 years. Renew-

ables have just been around for a little while and they are rapidly catching up.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Question?

Ms. Peggy Sattler: I appreciated the comments from the member for Guelph. As that member will recall, under the previous Liberal government we saw the dismantling of a public electricity system, the privatization of energy in this province. What happened was this massive over-expansion, lots of surplus energy that Ontario had to sell off at fire-sale prices to other jurisdictions.

Is the member concerned about the fact that this legislation that is before us removes transparency from electricity planning, politicizes electricity planning? It's almost as if this government learned nothing from the Liberals and, in fact, is going on exactly the same pathway that the Liberals followed before.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: By the way, I appreciate all the members' questions. This is a good conversation we're having today, an important one for the province of Ontario.

I think the Liberals made a huge mistake when they sold off Hydro One—a huge mistake. Now it ties our hands when it comes to bringing in things like affordable energy, efficiency and conservation programs. They made a big mistake when they sent directives to the OEB. I'm worried that in this legislation the government's going to make the same mistake. We already saw it with the bill earlier this year to overturn the OEB decision for the very first time in Ontario's history.

The bottom line is that the average person can save between \$500 and \$777 a month, each and every month, from now until well into the future, if they have a heat pump and an electric vehicle. Let's help them save that money.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): It's now time for further debate.

Mr. Billy Pang: It is my pleasure to stand up this afternoon to support Bill 214, the Affordable Energy Act. I will share my time with the member for Lambton-Kent-Middlesex.

I want to express my sincere gratitude to Minister Lecce for introducing this common-sense, forward-thinking legislation.

Our government has taken a proactive approach to our energy needs, carefully evaluating where we are and where we need to go. Ontario requires significantly more power—75% more by 2050—to support the construction of new homes, attract job-creating investments and accommodate the growing electrification of industry.

While the previous Liberal government left families in my riding of Markham-Unionville and across Ontario struggling with soaring energy bills and poorly planned energy initiatives, our government is committed to charting a more affordable future. We are focused on long-term planning that prioritizes cost reduction. Unlike the Liberals, propped up by the NDP, who put ideology over affordability with their disastrous Green Energy Act, our government has introduced the Affordable Energy Act, placing

affordability at the forefront as we strive for a sustainable future.

The broad scope of Bill 214, the Affordable Energy Act, is particularly noteworthy. This legislation introduces a range of amendments and new programs designed to benefit all Ontarians: families, farmers and businesses, whether they are in urban centres like Markham or rural communities. Our comprehensive approach ensures that no one is left behind.

If passed, the Affordable Energy Act will position our province to meet the growing energy demand we now face. We are pursuing a coordinated and integrated plan that builds on our reliable baseload energy resources, such as nuclear power, which is essential for providing stable energy for everyone. Additionally, we are making it more cost-effective to connect new homes and businesses to our energy grid. This change will ease the development process and help reduce overall energy use, ultimately putting more money into the pockets of families and businesses as we cut costs for new homes.

We are also taking important steps to support the adoption of electric vehicles—I'm driving one—facilitating a smoother transition to greener options. This is crucial for creating a sustainable future for Ontario.

While the Liberals enjoyed maintaining regulatory red tape, we are cutting it to make sure infrastructure is built faster and more efficiently. At its core, the Affordable Energy Act is about providing smart, practical solutions that benefit all of us, now and in the years to come.

It's clear that the previous government's siloed approach failed to deliver the best value for ratepayers. Gone are the days when the Independent Electricity System Operator focused solely on electricity while others handled natural gas in isolation.

Every single elected official in this Legislature needs to be singularly focused on one outcome: keeping costs down for families and businesses. This is why we are proposing updates to the planning framework under the Electricity Act, 1998. This includes repealing the outdated long-term energy plan and replacing it with an integrated energy resource plan that recognizes the connections between electricity, natural gas and other fuels. We are establishing a predictable five-year planning cycle, streamlining processes and involving key agencies, like the Independent Electricity System Operator and the Ontario Energy Board.

1640
By planning for all energy sources and aligning our energy system with housing and investment priorities, we can create a clear pathway for Ontario's energy efficiency. This proposed amendment also addresses recommendations from the Electrification and Energy Transition Panel which highlighted the need for an integrated approach to manage rising energy demand. With this legislation, we are responding to the call, ensuring long-term confidence for businesses and investors while aligning with Ontario's economic and housing priorities.

A key change in our approach is the explicit prioritization of zero-emissions nuclear generation. This historic move underscores our commitment to clean energy and

the essential role nuclear power plays in our strategy. It is crucial to recognize that nuclear energy has helped our province transition away from coal and significantly reduce emissions. The energy critic for the NDP may think otherwise, but by standing up for nuclear energy we safeguard thousands of jobs and ensure a cleaner, more sustainable energy future for Ontario.

Another critical aspect of the Affordable Energy Act is simplifying the process of connecting new developments to our energy grid. Our government is dedicated to making this process more straightforward and affordable. The current system can be slow and costly, which ultimately drives up expenses for homebuyers and businesses. By amending the Ontario Energy Board Act, we will enable more timely and cost-effective connections, alleviating the financial burden on developers and ensuring that new projects can proceed smoothly.

As the growth of electric vehicles in Ontario accelerates, we require robust public charging infrastructure. To facilitate this, we are proposing amendments that will eliminate regulatory barriers for public EV charging station owners and operators. With over one million EVs expected on Ontario roads by 2030, it is vital that charging stations are both accessible and reliable. Our government is committed to creating an environment that supports this critical infrastructure.

Lastly, we are expanding energy efficiency programs to help families and businesses save money by reducing energy consumption.

In conclusion, the proposed changes in the Affordable Energy Act are designed to lay the groundwork for a successful energy future in Ontario. Our commitment to developing an integrated energy resources plan will address the anticipated increase in energy demand and ensure that we can support a growing population while maintaining affordability.

As we move forward, we will prioritize clean energy exports and leverage our competitive advantage to become a leader in the clean energy sector.

Our government is dedicated to ensuring that Ontario remains a strong and prosperous province for future generations. I urge all members to join us in supporting the Affordable Energy Act, 2024.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Further debate?

Mr. Steve Pinsonneault: Good afternoon. It's my pleasure to rise today and speak in favour of this critical piece of legislation that will help make life affordable. A huge shout-out to Minister Lecce, who really put forward a common-sense plan that will ensure costs remain affordable for families while making sure we are expanding our grid powered by clean and reliable energy.

Speaker, many people still consider me the new guy here, but trust me, after 17 years as a municipal councillor I am no stranger to the disastrous Liberal energy policies that have impacted my community first-hand in Lambton-Kent-Middlesex. I remember when we stood up against the then Wynne Liberals who imposed wind farms on our lands, to the point where residents spent over \$233,000 out

of pocket to test water because the wind turbines forced by the Liberals in our communities made well water turbid and undrinkable. And you don't have to believe me; just read the independent reports that were released.

But, Speaker, today's legislation before us won't follow the same mistakes of the Liberals or the ideological aversions of the NDP. Because while the Liberals and the NDP might be guided by ideology, our government has a pragmatic plan to keep life affordable for Ontarians.

If passed, the Affordable Energy Act will do just that because, unlike the Liberals, who planned electricity in silos simply on election cycles, this legislation will plan for Ontario's first long-term, integrated energy framework, one that will plan for the expansion of clean and reliable energy in the province, with a 25-year lens, incorporating all fuels because we know we can't prioritize this fuel over that or that fuel over this fuel. We need it all to meet the 75% demand increase the IESO is forecasting this province will see in the next 25 years.

Speaker, just imagine: At a time we didn't need power, the Liberals were selling surplus energy at a loss of \$1 billion per year. The Liberals bought power at 10 times the market price, all while nuclear fleets were generating power at six cents a kilowatt. It's why many in my riding were ecstatic to hear that our government was outright banning solar farms on prime agricultural land and specialty crop areas when they announced the largest competitive energy procurement in Ontario's history this past summer. It's because this government believes in the voices of our community. It's why Minister Lecce empowered our municipalities with decision-making authorities.

Going forward, all energy projects must receive a municipal support resolution before they move ahead with construction. That's building consensus, unlike previous governments, who built unreliable power on unwilling communities.

Secondly, if passed, this bill will cut costs to build homes in the province, because it's critical to ensure we set up a place where businesses want to invest. It should come as no surprise as to why, thanks to the hard work of Minister Fedeli, that \$45 billion dollars of EV and auto investments came to Ontario.

Let me tell you why, Speaker: Ontario's clean energy advantage. Ontario has one of the cleanest grids in the world, with almost 90% of its electricity generated coming from emission-free sources in 2023. These businesses came to Ontario because of Ontario's clean energy advantage, and that is nuclear. Nuclear makes up 60% of the baseload energy. You know, it's bold to hear the NDP talk about affordability from time to time in the House when their energy critic, the member for Toronto-Danforth, has continuously gone on record and bashed the clean, reliable and affordable energy source that is nuclear, a zero-emissions energy source that has long powered Ontario for the past 50 years.

Let me be clear: This government will continue to focus on affordability. It's why, if passed, this legislation will also have beneficial electrification that will enable energy

efficiency programs for all Ontarians, not just a select few. Because not only do we need energy, we have technologies that will allow us to also conserve energy. We'll do that by putting money into the pockets of Ontario families and businesses.

You know, Speaker, according to Ontario's system operator, we use 15% less energy than we would have otherwise without energy efficiency programs. It was this government that expanded energy efficiency programs by investing an additional \$342 million just this past year. This legislation will allow us to do more.

1650

But not only that, Speaker: If this bill passes, it will also cut the regulatory red tape that was maintained by the Liberals, which will unlock the ability for EV charging infrastructure to be built in this province. If we want to expand energy, we need to set the groundwork and make it happen, and this bill does exactly that.

Speaker, coming from a rural riding, I understand the importance of energy probably more than anyone else, as much of my riding continues to be fuelled by oil, gas and propane, among others. And because of this, the carbon tax has caused enormous difficulties to people in my riding. Today, the carbon tax accounts for 25% of my constituents' bills. And while the Liberals and NDP seem okay with that, I can definitely say that our government is not. We believe in technology, not taxation. You cannot tax your way out of climate change like the Liberals and the opposition think we can.

It's critical we support this bill—a bill that will enable affordability for families in Ontario, a bill that will expand Ontario and almost fully decarbonize the grid, a bill that will cut costs for new homeowners. This is a bill for the people, and I am proud to stand up and support this legislation, legislation I know the people of Lambton–Kent–Middlesex will appreciate, particularly after the anguish caused by the Liberals. It's critical for the province's success and economic growth. We will get it done.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): It's now time for questions.

Mr. Chris Glover: I want to thank the members from Lambton–Kent–Middlesex and from Markham–Unionville for your remarks today.

The bill is about reducing electricity costs. Part of the reason we have such exorbitant electricity costs is because of the privatization of our public sector. We had Ontario Hydro as a public utility from the 1920s until 1995 and during that period of time we were paying four cents a kilowatt hour. The former Conservative government got into power and they started breaking up and selling off Ontario Hydro. The Liberals finished it off. They sold the last piece of Ontario Hydro for \$9 billion.

We are now paying eight cents to 16 cents a kilowatt hour. And to keep the rates at that level, we are subsidizing this private, for-profit corporation, which used to be our public utility, to the tune of \$6.9 billion per year.

So, would you agree that one of the biggest mistakes that the Conservatives and the Liberals have made, as far

as electricity costs go, was the privatization of Ontario Hydro?

Mr. Billy Pang: Thank you for the question. Let us be clear: This bill is not about privatization. This bill is about efficiency, affordability, opportunity, creativity and integration.

Let's just talk about efficiency. The Affordable Energy Act will unlock the potential to put more money into the pockets of Ontario families during a time when the Liberals' carbon tax, propped up by the NDP, has increased costs for us every day.

Current legislation silos the Independent Electricity System Operator to only administer energy efficiency programs that results in electricity savings. Therefore, we are—

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Further questions?

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

Actually, I've got a question specific to the member for Lambton–Kent–Middlesex. I know how important Union Gas is to the people of your riding. A major employer, the Dawn Hub is a continental hub and it services all of North America. So the role of natural gas in the southwest is vital. With the previous phase-out proposed by the past Liberal government, and really the comments I hear about Enbridge all the time in this House, it shows that there isn't a lot of support for that industry in your riding by some of the other members here.

So I wanted to understand, if you could outline the role of natural gas not only in this bill, but also in your own community.

Mr. Steve Pinsonneault: It is very important to my riding. Enbridge supplies gas to a big part of North America. For such a small community, it has storage underneath the ground that is phenomenal. It employs a lot of people. They have really upgraded their technology. I've toured that plant a couple of times in the last three months. Everything is state of the art. They are working very efficiently. It's clean energy.

But to answer your question, it is extremely important to Lambton–Kent–Middlesex.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Question?

Ms. Jessica Bell: My question is to the member for Markham–Unionville. The government is presenting a plan on how they plan to significantly change the electricity grid and how Ontario is going to be generating new electricity. My question is pretty simple: How much is the plan going to cost and how much will Ontarians pay for electricity?

Mr. Billy Pang: Thank you for the question. Talking about money is talking about this bill. The bill, the Affordable Energy Act, is talking about affordability. When we are talking about money, this bill singularly focuses on affordability, unlike the former Liberals, who focused on ideology and skyrocketed the bills by 300%. That is money—\$1,000 a year, on average.

So this bill has integrated future energy planning and reframed it around the clear goals of affordability and

economic growth. We are also making the legislative changes to enable a pay-what-you-use policy through regulations to alleviate some of the financial burden placed on the first movers when it comes to building new distribution and transmission assets in high-growth areas where load growth materializing in the future is very likely.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Further questions?

Mr. John Jordan: Earlier, we heard from our Minister of Economic Development, Job Creation and Trade about the great economic growth that we've seen here and continue to see in Ontario. We also heard about the 75% increase in electricity demand that we're going to see in the near future.

I'm wondering if the member from Lambton–Kent–Middlesex could comment on the integrated approach that this bill has to meeting that electricity demand.

Mr. Steve Pinsonneault: We are creating a clear plan to:

- address the electricity demand that is expected to increase by 75% over the next 25 years;

- communicate a clear path to partner ministries and industry people to achieve;

- set policy direction for key sector agencies such as the Independent Electricity System Operator, IESO, and the Ontario Energy Board, OEB, which ensures systems will meet the electrification goals over the next decade and beyond;

- provide clarity and policy certainty for investors, sector participants and customers to ensure the energy sector can continue to drive economic growth;

- support an energy system which prioritizes customer choice—

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Further questions?

Ms. Peggy Sattler: My question is to the member for Lambton–Kent–Middlesex. I listened to the remarks of members across the way about this bill. From what they said and from the title of this act, the Affordable Energy Act, Ontarians might have the impression that this bill is going to deliver affordable energy to people in this province.

However, the legislation says that the minister “may” issue an integrated energy resource plan and that plan “may” consider affordability of energy, and it “may” consider availability and reliability of energy. So my question is, why does this bill make it optional for the minister to issue an energy plan when it is currently a mandatory requirement?

1700

Mr. Steve Pinsonneault: Conservation is the cheapest way to generate more power. The bill is put into place and it is our best way moving forward. We have to put a plan in place. This is a long-term plan; it covers everything that needs to happen in a long-term plan. This government is moving it forward. Industry is coming, so this plan is doing it right and it is moving everything forward.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Further questions?

Mr. Anthony Leardi: I want to ask the member for Lambton–Kent–Middlesex about his experience with solar and wind in his area. I got the impression that it was a negative experience, so I'm going to ask him about that, because, in my area of Essex county, our experience with solar and wind power is that it caused a huge, huge controversy under the Liberal government where it pitted farmer against farmer, it pitted neighbour against neighbour. What was his experience under the Liberals?

Mr. Steve Pinsonneault: Yes, it was very negative. When the Liberal provincial government came in and mandated that, they controlled where they went, who was getting them—whether you were a willing community or an unwilling community, you were getting it. It really did upset the apple cart. At the end of the day, people were—like you said, farmers against farmers. It was just a bad, bad deal right from the beginning. It was a bad experience at that time when I was on council. Right from the beginning, I didn't support those windmills coming in, knowing that it was going to cause grief in my riding.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Further debate?

Mr. Terence Kernaghan: It's an honour for me to rise today in the House to speak to Bill 214, the keeping energy affordable act. I think, across the aisle, we all recognize that Ontario's energy needs are growing. This means that now, more than ever, we need a government that keeps the focus on affordability as well as reliability and sustainability. It's particularly important as we look forward to the future and the impacts of climate change in Ontario.

Access to energy ought to be the same as housing. We need it to be as affordable and accessible as possible. It's an economic driver. It's part of our competitive advantage. It makes people want to invest in Ontario.

This bill has the potential to be a meaningful bill. Keeping energy costs low for Ontarians is something that I believe we all want. However, this bill steers us somewhat in the wrong direction in terms of transparency. I want to be clear: Electrification makes sense for the future of Ontario's energy system, but we also want transparency for Ontarians.

As my wise colleague from Toronto–Danforth, MPP Tabuns, said in his debate remarks this morning, this bill should be called the “just trust us energy bill, 2024” as it lacks publicly available evidence and transparency for Ontarians. I simply don't understand how the public is supposed to trust this government when it doesn't have a very good track record in terms of transparency.

Let's get into the bill: It's vital for a democratic government to be transparent in their decisions and allow citizens to have a say in the decision-making process, and, just as importantly, understand how those decisions are being made with their taxpayer dollars. When reading through the new legislation proposed under Bill 214, it's essential that we go in with our eyes open, making sure that the proposed legislation is grounded in transparency, grounded in evidence and that the decision-making process is clearly available for public consumption.

I want to highlight some examples of how this very government, this Conservative government, has not been

transparent. The Ontario Line is the first example that comes to mind. When the Ford government first unveiled plans for the 15.6-kilometre subway line in 2019, it pegged the cost at about \$10.9 billion and said that it would be done by 2027. However, now the estimated costs for the project stand at around \$19 billion, and it's expected to be completed only in 2031. So what was starting off at \$10.9 billion has become \$19 billion, and a completion date of 2027 has become 2031. I wondered about how that conversation went—"We're almost \$10 billion over budget, and, whoops, we're also about four years behind schedule." Good thing that Premier Ford is a big fan of Metrolinx CEO Phil Verster.

It leads perfectly to my second example of where this government is skirting transparency: the Eglinton Cross-town. Speaker, do you know when this line will open? It seems to be a state secret. It's hidden—it's much like the mandate letters; it's like the campaign documents. There's no transparency for the public.

A third example of this Conservative government lacking transparency? You guessed it: the greenbelt. When the Premier was first elected, he promised not to touch the greenbelt. And then, what did he do? There was a secret video saying he was going to open it up. And then, he re-promised that he wouldn't touch the greenbelt. And then, in government, we saw the attempt to remove land from the greenbelt, all to benefit insiders of this government. And there's the little matter right now, as I'm sure all members are aware, of the RCMP investigation that this government is still under. And the fact that the RCMP is investigating in the first place, well, that just screams transparency, doesn't it? It screams, "Just trust us with our energy plans."

The last and the most recent example is the Premier's fantasy \$100-billion tunnel. He claimed that the government would only do it with a feasibility study on the tunnel, but they stated they will build it anyway. Once again, where is the evidence? Where is the transparency? Engaging in a feasibility study after the promise? That makes very little logical sense.

As we get back to Bill 214—building capacity in the energy sector is important. However, we need to make sure that we're not overbuilding and that these decisions are grounded in evidence.

For a government that consistently and constantly blames the previous government, despite being in their second mandate—we hear this every single day in question period—the government is sure doing a good job of following that Liberal lead. The government's vision document imagines investments into the sector that would serve both the demands of Ontario's decarbonized economy but could also make Ontario an energy superpower. This is a concern because we should all recall that 15 years ago the Liberal government similarly proposed a massive expansion of energy with the dream of green energy jobs and profitable green energy exports. The jobs never came, the hydro bills skyrocketed, and for over a decade the government has been exporting unneeded surplus energy into neighbouring jurisdictions at massive losses, costing

ratepayers and taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

Recent history clearly shows us that this government needs to think carefully about how much capacity they want to build. This, of course, begs the question, how much money does it cost to build capacity? And the answer by this Conservative government is along the lines of, "We don't know. We haven't costed it ourselves."

In a report published by the Independent Electricity System Operator, the IESO, there's a price tag of about \$400 billion on decarbonizing Ontario's electricity system. However, the government hasn't released their own numbers on how much it will cost taxpayers to decarbonize Ontario's electricity system. I have so many questions about costs that have not been addressed by the minister and by this bill.

The Conservative government spends about \$7.3 billion on electricity subsidies per year, and I don't see a plan for that number to be addressed by this bill.

According to a 2023 CBC article, "The Ford government has spent more taxpayer money subsidizing hydro bills than it has spent on long-term care. In the four budgets since 2019, a cumulative total of \$23.6 billion has been devoted to electricity cost relief programs, \$2 billion more than budgeted for long-term care in the same time period." Let's think about that for a minute: More has been spent to subsidize electricity than care for seniors.

1710

Ontario's former independent Financial Accountability Officer, Peter Weltman, says that this electricity subsidy policy encourages hydro customers to consume more electricity. He said, "Because most of the cost of the subsidy is to subsidize consumption, what ends up happening is those folks in the higher income brackets end up getting a bigger subsidy because they tend to consume more electricity...."

According to a report by the Financial Accountability Office, roughly \$600 million worth of electricity price rebates goes to households in the top 20% of earnings. So my question to the government, then, is, where is the plan to address this disparity? Instead of that money going to the wealthy earners in Ontario, that money would be better spent in health care or in education.

Another question would be, why is the minister talking about exporting surplus energy while at the same time claiming that Ontario is facing an energy shortage that leaves him no choice but to procure new gas plants?

A further question that springs to mind is, why does this bill state that the minister "may" put forward an affordability plan and not require him to put one forward? Why do we see the inclusion of weasel words within this legislation? It seems strangely ironic that this bill has the word "affordable" in the title.

I want to next talk about energy poverty and how this government is not addressing the needs of marginalized communities being affected by energy poverty. I want to give a shout-out to the Canadian Environmental Law Association, who teamed up with former staff from the Advocacy Centre for Tenants Ontario to write a paper on

energy justice and poverty. I encourage members of the government to read this paper, and I'm going to quote it extensively in the next part of my speech.

“Energy poverty’ is the disproportionate burden of electricity, natural gas and other utility costs on low-income households which reduce the funds available for food, clothing, medicine and other basic necessities. Inability to pay utilities is second only to inability to pay rent as a reason for homelessness. The alleviation of energy poverty is central to the concepts of energy justice, climate justice and democracy.... Services like electricity are integral to several rights including the right to an adequate standard of living, which incorporates the right to adequate housing, the right to health and even the right to life. In rural areas, access to safe water and sanitation can be dependent upon electricity access.

“In Ontario, low-income households are disproportionately single parents, new immigrants, racialized communities, people living with accessibility challenges and seniors....

“Total home costs become unaffordable if they exceed 30% of total income. Utility costs should not exceed 20% of shelter costs.” So if we do the math: “Therefore, energy costs become unaffordable for low-income consumers if they exceed 6% of total household income. A central element of the energy poverty pyramid is therefore that low-income consumers should not pay more than 6% to 8% of their total household income on energy. This element of an energy poverty strategy requires programs to make ongoing energy bill payments affordable for lower-income families and focuses on preventing a crisis rather than reacting to one.”

The paper concludes, “The Ontario experience makes clear the ongoing need to advocate loudly and often on energy poverty issues to ensure decision-makers take low-income people into account. These impacts are often unanticipated or unmeasured until the consequences become tragically obvious.” It’s a matter of being proactive, preventative, looking forward and, rather than reacting with a more expensive solution, prevent the problem in the first place.

This bill does not take into account issues of energy poverty. However, this government does continue to subsidize the hydro bills of top-earning households in Ontario. We all recognize that Ontario’s power needs are growing; there’s no question about that fact. We also don’t dispute that there’s a need for an energy plan. However, this plan needs to be transparent, based on consultation with experts and consulted with workers. Ontario can and was a leader in the energy sector.

I think back to Ontario Hydro and how it was created. It was a system that was well designed. It was designed by a Conservative government. It was designed to provide low-cost energy for the needs of the population as well as the needs of business. It was a system that was so well designed that it used to be studied by the Harvard Business School. Between the 1920s and 1995, it was effective. It was so much cheaper. I believe it was my friend from

Spadina–Fort York who has rightly pointed out that it was four cents per kilowatt hour.

But when the Conservatives got in, they broke it up into crown corporations responsible for the transmission as well as the generation. They made a huge, huge mess of it—a mess that was further exacerbated by the Liberal government, which privatized, sold off and destroyed a once-proud institution in this province, so much so, that we now spend, rather than that four cents per kilowatt hour, eight to 16 cents per kilowatt hour. That’s only because there’s a \$7.3-billion subsidy per year.

As I look towards concluding my remarks on Bill 214, I want to end with that vision: an Ontario with a low-carbon energy system, an Ontario where the government does not spend between \$15 billion to \$20 billion a year importing gas and oil, but where this money comes back into our economy, resulting in a much more robust Ontario. By eliminating the import of oil and gas, we would be reinvigorating the economy and bringing hundreds of skilled, high-paying jobs back to Ontario. This vision of Ontario includes an energy plan that is based on evidence, a plan that is transparent, where the public is able to question the evidence that the government says it is operating upon. This vision can become a reality. With the right energy plan, grounded in evidence and transparency, and with the expertise of workers in the energy sector, we can ensure that our province has the energy we need for a thriving economy and the low-carbon future ahead of us.

This bill itself, broken into three schedules—we have some concerns with it as the official opposition. It includes language that the government would even know is not strong. It includes weasel words: Rather than having “shall,” they include words such as “may.” It’s almost like they have a backdoor, opt-out clause for some of the things they pretend to put forward within this bill. It’s not clear whether, in this legislation, the minister is going to issue more than one plan or even just one plan. It’s not clear whether the plan is going to be long-term in scope.

1720

Schedule 1, if you look at it, makes some incremental changes. It may reduce the amount of information provided to the public as part of the energy planning process, and it may reduce the availability of the public to participate in the development of energy plans. For a government that uses words such as “accountability” and “transparency”—this is antithetical to those words.

It’s good that the IESO and the ministry have been given a specific mandate to promote electrification and facilitate energy efficiency measures aimed at reducing emissions in Ontario.

Schedule 1 refers to the role of natural gas. Proper energy plans should consider how to reduce the role of natural gas in the clean energy economy. It’s odd to see that natural gas is listed alongside non-emitting technologies.

What is also a concern is that climate change is something that shows up nowhere within Bill 214. It seems a very strange ideological omission.

Local utilities are stating that they face regulatory barriers that limit their ability to invest in certain technol-

ogies that are aimed at preparing global distribution systems for electrification. It's really not clear how Bill 214 would address this.

So, as we look at Bill 214, it's yet another piece of legislation which is concerning. There are portions of it which are supportable, but I would not say, in the balance of legislation, that this is a bill that promotes accountability, promotes transparency and promotes participation of the public. I hope that this government will consult and will consult properly on this bill to fill some of the gaps they have created.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Questions?

Mr. John Fraser: I listened intently to the member's debate.

Hydro has been like this big football we kick around here for about a hundred years.

One thing I'd like to point out that I think is important to understand is, in 2003, there was a \$39-billion stranded debt—that was all of us, because we subsidized hydro prices as industrial policy. You have to pay that debt. You can't just put it on the credit card. We all know that, right? And then, you've got to replace wires, you've got to replace poles, you've got to look for new sources of energy, and doing that costs money. But more importantly, to the member's debate, you need a plan.

So what I'm trying to figure out with Bill 214 is whether it's a plan for a plan or a concept of a plan. Can the member please explain that to me?

Mr. Terence Kernaghan: That's an excellent question from my friend from Ottawa South.

We take a look at this legislation, and it seems to be concepts of a plan.

The current act will require the IESO to publish a technical report on the adequacy as well as the reliability of electricity resources prior to launching consultations on the energy plan.

Bill 214 requires only that the minister consider technical reports as required by regulations—it publishes reports at some point. The minister will publish other information, "such as key data and cost projections," but only if the minister determines that this information should be publicly available.

So in the interests of being accountable and transparent, I wouldn't say that this bill is effective when there are these opt-out clauses built within this legislation itself for this government to be accountable, to be transparent, and to be up front with the public.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Questions?

Mr. Anthony Leardi: In the member's comments, it sounded like he had a very negative opinion of subsidizing energy costs of any type. I thought that I heard him say—and he'll correct me if I'm wrong—that subsidizing energy costs encouraged people to overuse energy and perhaps even to waste energy, and I thought that I heard him say that subsidizing energy costs causes us to choose the wrong type of energy. For example, massively subsidizing solar panels and wind turbines, such as under the so-called Green Energy Act promoted by the Liberals, caused inefficient systems to be put up.

I wanted to ask the member: Why is he so against subsidizing energy costs?

Mr. Terence Kernaghan: Thank you to the member opposite for the question. I will not stand here in this place and defend the failed policies of the Liberal government, which ended up prioritizing large corporations for green energy. Unfortunately, it gave green energy a very bad name. That's disserving, because I think as we move towards a low-carbon future, we need to think about the impact on the public, we need to think about the cost-benefit analysis of these investments, and we need to make sure that these are reaching the consumers which are at the heart of this.

Perhaps the member was not paying attention, but it was a Conservative government that made an entire mess of the electricity system in the mid-1990s, a system that used to be studied by Harvard Business School for its efficiency and for how well designed it was. It's a pity that it has become the way it has and that it actually has to be subsidized at this point.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Questions?

Mr. Sol Mamakwa: Meegwetch. I remember 1982 in Kingfisher Lake reserve; that's when we got our hydro. Before that, we had no hydro. There was an independent power authority. Then, 1994 is when Ontario Hydro came in and upgraded our electricity system using diesel generators. That's when we got, actually, running water in my home First Nation: It was 1994. Back in November 2022, I was able to go to Kingfisher and be part of the grid.

Again, I was up north just recently, over the weekend. There are still First Nations that are utilizing diesel generators. Power outages are very long: You know, the last 35 to—

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Question?

Mr. Sol Mamakwa: On this bill, do you see anything that will help First Nations in northern Ontario with the energy crisis, the infrastructure crisis that they have?

Mr. Terence Kernaghan: I'd like to thank my friend from Kiiwetinoong for an excellent question. It is entirely disturbing. It should just make all of us take pause when we hear such words: that you had to wait until 1982 for things such as clean water, and even later for electrification.

The government of Ontario has not worked as partners with Indigenous peoples, not in an incredibly long time, despite lip service and despite pretending. It's distressing to think that anywhere here in Canada, people still lack clean drinking water. There are communities that are very near to my riding of London North Centre, an entirely urban riding, which have been under boil-water advisories for decades.

It is a crisis of political will. It's because governments have chosen not to invest. They've decided to point the fingers at another level of government rather than getting people what they need, which is clean water and affordable electricity.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Further questions?

Mr. Anthony Leardi: Last question: It seemed to me that there are some members of the NDP caucus who are

saying that the subsidization of energy costs might lead to climate change. I heard the member from Hamilton West–Ancaster–Dundas being concerned about climate change, and the member from St. Paul's being concerned about climate change and the member from Toronto Centre being concerned about climate change, and I am concerned about climate change.

I'm wondering if the member who spoke is also concerned about climate change. Does he worry one way or another about whether or not subsidizing energy cost might contribute to climate change? I'm just asking him that question.

Mr. Terence Kernaghan: I'd like to thank the member from Essex for the question. He's cited number of different members and their comments. I certainly could not speak to the comments of those members. I think at the heart of this bill we're seeing further politici—politicization of the energy system. It's late in the day; apparently I can't enunciate as well as I did earlier, this morning.

1730

What concerns me is the politici—politicization—oh my God, I still can't say it—policies from previous governments. It's deeply concerning. This bill cuts out the independent regulator. I think that takes us to a future where energy policies are less transparent and they're less evidence-based. I think we all need to have an active role in addressing the climate crisis that we are currently under. It is—

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Further questions?

Mr. John Fraser: Well, I would argue that eliminating coal, which was a big part of hydro's plan—it was the biggest greenhouse gas emission in North America in the last two decades. It's interesting that we say we're getting political about hydro. Hydro's been probably the most political thing in this province since Adam Beck. We used to call it the Ontario Senate, right? Because when a government person or staffer person left, they would end up at Ontario Hydro. I'm talking 30, 40—well, maybe not 30, 40 years ago, but a while ago.

I guess the thing is, how do we get to a plan that kind of goes beyond all of us? Because, to be frank, everybody's made a mess in hydro. I would challenge anybody to tell me that their party or a government didn't.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Back to the member for a final response.

Mr. Terence Kernaghan: It's been disturbing to see this government overrule the Ontario Energy Board with some of their actions. We need to ask the questions: Why does the government need the power to impose changes to the distribution system code? Why is it needing to bypass the Ontario Energy Board? Why does the government need to exempt EV charging from the Energy Consumer Protection Act? Why is it trying to remove the oversight of the Ontario Energy Board? It has a specific mandate to protect consumers. Why is this government trying to bypass all of these things to protect people, to keep costs down, to make sure the people in the north aren't being exploited?

It's deeply concerning that this government is trying to remove checks and balances. It does make me ask the question why: Who benefits and why do they need to make these changes?

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Further debate?

Mr. Anthony Leardi: The first thing I want to do in this evening's discussion is thank my fellow MPP from Mississauga–Malton for being kind enough to surrender his time to me. We had originally planned that we would share time, and he was kind enough to allow me to take the entire allotted time.

This evening's debate is about Bill 214, which is the Affordable Energy Act. As always, I intend to preface my remarks by a very brief story, which I promise is going to be very enjoyable. As I typically do, this story is going to be directly related to the topic of debate this evening. As usual, you will probably have to wait till the end of the story to fully appreciate the entire impact of the story.

As members of this chamber already knew, I grew up on the 2nd Concession of Anderdon township.

Interjection.

Mr. Anthony Leardi: Thank you very much

As a young person, I enjoyed riding my bike up and down the 2nd Concession. If I went up the north side of the 2nd Concession, I would pass all the neighbours I knew. I would pass the Roberts family and the Barnwell family. I would pass the Specht family, and I would pass the DeLucas and the Cervis. When I got to the corner, past the Rosatis, there was another family of Cervis who lived right on the corner. That was the corner of the 2nd Concession at Middle Side Road.

As a youth, at that corner, there was always a farm at the corner of 2nd Concession and Middle Side Road. That farm always grew wheat, corn and soybeans. That's mostly what we grow in Essex county: wheat, corn and soybeans.

Mrs. Robin Martin: Very important crops.

Mr. Anthony Leardi: Yes, they are. In fact, we produce so much wheat, corn and soybeans that we have something called the South Essex Grain Ltd. It's a collaboration between Agris Co-operative, the Drouillard family and Great Lakes Grain. They recently announced the grand opening of a brand new, state-of-the-art grain elevator right in McGregor, Ontario—which is in my riding, a beautiful little village. It's a state-of-the-art grain elevator, and I want to congratulate them on that fantastic achievement.

Now, this brand new grain elevator has a receiving capacity of 30,000 bushels per hour. It also has separate weigh scales for weighing grain; there's one scale for inbound traffic and another scale for outbound traffic. That should give you some idea of the massive production capacity of grain in Essex county, because we contribute significantly to what is Ontario's balance of trade in the agribusiness and agri-food industry. At present, Ontario exports approximately \$26 billion worth of food exports, and Ontario—specifically, Essex county—contributes to that wonderful balance of trade.

When I was riding my bike up and down the 2nd Concession of Anderdon township, none of that troubled me, because I did not know anything about agribusiness or about balance of trade. If I rode my bike past the Middle Side Road and continued up the 2nd Concession, I would go as far as the mushroom farm, because I knew the family who owned the mushroom farm, and that was the Berberis family. Even though their last name ended with a vowel, I knew they weren't Italian. They were actually Albanian, and I knew that because I went to school with Geraldine Berberis. That was the daughter in that family, and we went to school together at Anderdon Public School, which was the best school in all of Canada.

So I got to the Berberis' house, which was where the mushroom farm was. I wouldn't go any further because I didn't know any families past the mushroom farm. I didn't know any families past the Berberis house. That's probably one of the reasons why I never got to the end of the 2nd Concession, and I never got to River Canard and I never got to meet Jackie Magri: because she lived in River Canard, beyond the Berberis' house. And so it was many years—it wasn't until I was 25 years old that I met Jackie Magri. That was a very fortunate incident because, eventually, that's the girl I married.

After I left Anderdon Public School, but before I married Jackie, the Liberals passed something called the Green Energy Act. That was in 2009—excuse me; I have to correct myself: I actually married Jackie before 2009. We are young, but we're not that young. The Green Energy Act massively, massively subsidized the installation of solar panels by massively paying and overpaying for electricity produced by solar panels. Of course, that's the only way you could put up solar panels: by massively and ridiculously paying over market cost for the electricity they produced.

But if that weren't galling enough, the Liberals' so-called Green Energy Act actually prohibited municipalities from passing any bylaws that would protect agricultural land from the installation of solar panels. So if you wanted to install solar panels on agricultural land, there was absolutely nothing the municipality could do about it. So under the Liberal's so-called Green Energy Act, that beautiful farm at the corner of 2nd Concession and Middle Side Road, which was producing all that grain and contributing to the balance of trade in the province of Ontario, disappeared, and what took its place was a massive solar panel installation.

Let me tell you, Madam Speaker, that solar panel installation is not green. You know why? Because you can't just plant solar panels in the ground like grain and they don't sprout up like corn.

1740

When you put up a solar panel, you need to anchor it in something, and that anchor is called cement. According to the Scientific American, cement is one of the most energy-intensive products on the planet. The chemical reactions involved produce even more carbon dioxide as a by-product. Making one kilogram of cement sends one kilogram of CO₂ into the atmosphere. Worldwide every

year cement and concrete produce as much as 9% of all CO₂ emissions.

What the Liberals did under the so-called Green Energy Act is, they took agricultural land, then they poured cement into it, sending CO₂ into the atmosphere, and then they stuck solar panels into it which couldn't even produce market-value electricity but had to be massively subsidized out of the pockets of the taxpayers of Ontario. Then they called it "green," and the NDP voted for it. I don't like the Liberal definition of "green."

Here are the differences between the disastrous Liberal energy policy and the Ford government's energy policy. First of all, the Liberal energy policy took away municipal power and forced energy projects on non-consenting municipalities. By contrast, the Ford government energy policy protects municipalities and requires energy project developers to receive municipal support resolutions to guarantee local support and consent for new projects. That's a big difference.

Another difference is that the Liberal energy policy allowed concrete installations and solar panels to be mounted on prime agricultural land. However, the Ford government's energy policy prohibits all projects in specialty crop areas and prohibits ground-mounted solar in prime agricultural areas.

The third major difference between the Liberal energy policy and the Ford government's energy policy is that the Liberal policy did nothing for northern Ontario, whereas the Ford energy policy incentivizes northern Ontario projects and projects that avoid prime agricultural areas, along with unlocking crown lands for renewable energy.

Another major difference between the Liberal energy plan and the PC energy plan is that the Liberal plan did nothing for Indigenous communities. The Ford energy plan incentivizes economic opportunities for projects with Indigenous partners.

Another difference between the Liberal plan—the Liberal plan chewed up agricultural land and the Ford energy plan requires an agricultural impact assessment for any project on all prime agricultural areas.

Those are five major differences.

Speaker, the farm at the corner of the 2nd Concession and Middle Side Road in Anderdon township is gone now, but the Specht family is still there, the Rosatis are still there, the Cervis are still there and I'm still there. I live right around the corner, across the railroad tracks. There's nothing that I can do to bring back that farm at the corner of the 2nd Concession and Middle Side Road, but I can make sure that Ontario has clean, reliable and affordable energy. I can vote for that.

I can make sure that solar panels don't get installed with concrete on prime agricultural land. I can vote for that. I can share Ontario's growing wealth with northern communities and Indigenous communities. I can vote for that. I can vote for energy which is green and affordable at the same time. I can certainly vote for that.

I've spent a lot of time extolling the virtues of the Ford energy plan and criticizing the disastrous decisions of the Liberal so-called green energy plan, but I can't say any-

thing about the energy plan put forward by the NDP because they don't have one.

Now seems like an appropriate time to take a pause. I've said this before: We don't spend enough time recognizing the achievements of other members in this chamber. We all have public achievements, but we have achievements apart from that. Tonight, I want to specifically recognize the member from Mississauga—Erin Mills, who's listening intently to my speech. I want to recognize the member for Mississauga—Erin Mills because he recently completed something very special. He completed a certification which I would guess probably nobody else in this chamber has. It's a very special certification; he's become a master certificate holder. He is now certified—he's got a piece of paper that says it—as a master shawarma preparer. I want to congratulate him for that. Let's give him a round of applause.

Applause.

Mr. John Yakabuski: That's a transferable skilled trade.

Mr. Anthony Leardi: I know. For some of us who eat a lot of shawarma, that's important. That's important to me, and I want to congratulate him for that. It's a culinary expertise. I think that's super, and I just wanted to make that little diversion.

Now I'll get back to the topic of our debate for this evening, which is energy. I wanted to observe a couple of things. I guess I'm going to say that perhaps the former Liberal government had it much easier than the present Ford government because of energy. I mean, the fact of the matter is, the Liberals killed so many jobs in Ontario and businesses fled the province of Ontario. That energy demand under the Liberal government just wasn't there. It actually decreased; right? When you're killing jobs and chasing businesses out of the province of Ontario, the demand for energy goes down, so you really don't need an energy plan. Or perhaps the Liberal energy plan was to kill all the jobs in Ontario and chase away all the business, thereby reducing the demand for energy. Maybe that was their plan.

But you'd have to ask them. I wasn't there. I was much too young at that time. That was too long ago. I'm too young to remember all that, so I have to rely on the research that other people do. I want to thank Sarkis Kidanian and Kennan Benjamins for all the research that they've done to assist me in putting this together, because, as I said, I'm much too young to remember what the Liberals did. But I have their research.

In 2004, the Liberals managed to kill approximately 40,000 jobs in Ontario; in 2005, they managed to kill about 60,000; in 2006, they killed another 50,000; in 2007, they killed another 60,000; in 2008, they killed about 100,000 manufacturing jobs. And 2008 became a very important date in my area in the greater Essex county area, because the Liberals were doing such a good job killing businesses in the province of Ontario that GM closed the transmission plant in Windsor in 2008. That's where my father-in-law, Tony Magri, used to work. He was retired at the time. He got lucky.

In 2009, the Liberals managed to kill a few more jobs. In 2010, they actually managed to reverse their record. They actually created a few manufacturing jobs. Unfortunately, in 2010, GM also closed its manufacturing plant in Windsor and now there is no trace of General Motors in Windsor whatsoever. That was unfortunate for the Liberals, and also for my community. In 2010, the Liberals managed to create approximately 10,000 jobs, but then they went back to their record of reducing energy demand by killing approximately 20,000 jobs in 2012 and killed a few more in 2013 until the trend finally ended.

The reason why I go through those statistics is to demonstrate that when you kill jobs and when you kill manufacturing, the demand for energy tends to go down. But what's happening under the Ford government is, we're creating so many jobs and the demand for energy is so great that we have to actually implement an Affordable Energy Act, which is what we're discussing tonight, because we have to build all the energy in order to fuel all these amazing businesses that are coming to the province of Ontario.

1750

Just last night, I spoke to an industrialist who does something amazing. He takes old cars and he takes the non-renewable parts out of the car—he drains the engine of oil—and then he takes the steel parts of the car and he puts them in a big crusher, and he actually melts the steel and reuses the steel. It's a beautiful recycling business in an amazingly great industry for the province of Ontario. It's actually taking old steel and making new steel. What I actually learned was that steel is one of the most recycled products in all of the world. Of course, in order to do this, you need a lot of energy. When you attract a fantastic business like that to the province of Ontario, you need a lot of energy. This particular business needs as much electricity as the city of Whitby might use in a day; this business will use the equivalent amount of electricity in a single hour. Of course, it takes a lot of power to melt steel, and it takes a lot of electricity to create that heat to melt the steel. What a wonderful business. He takes old cars and fashions them into steel bars, and the steel bars are then transported into another industry which then turns them into steel sheets, and the steel sheets are sent all around the world in a manufacturing process to make new steel products which, in their turn, can be used and also recycled after their lifespan is finished. What a wonderful industry. It's right here in the province of Ontario.

That's one of the reasons why we need an Affordable Energy Act—because of the massive, massive demand for energy that all these fantastic businesses are creating.

That's in stark contrast to what the Liberals did, which I described a moment ago, which was to chase jobs and to chase businesses out of Ontario, thereby driving down the demand for energy. I know the Liberals are listening intently to what I say because it was part of their plan. I'm sure that they will think about what I've said, and perhaps they'll have some response for me tomorrow. I don't know if this debate is going to continue on tomorrow, but we'll see what happens.

I did not find anything within the NDP materials with regard to what they propose to do to fuel all these amazing businesses that are opening up in the province of Ontario. But I know we have a plan to fuel Ontario and to power Ontario's growth. I'm proud to support that plan.

I'm happy to continue this debate a little longer.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): It's now time for questions.

M^{me} France Gélinas: Schedule 3 of the bill talks about the EV charging. Why do you think it was included in the bill—that the government needs to exempt EV charging stations from the Energy Consumer Protection Act as well as the oversight of the Ontario Energy Board, which has a statutory mandate to protect the interests of consumers? Aren't you afraid that if you leave it to the private sector to put up EV charging stations and there is no oversight, they will charge just as much to charge the battery of your electric vehicle as it costs to fill your car with gas? Why are you taking away consumer protection in this bill?

Mr. Anthony Leardi: That's a great question. I appreciate la députée de Nickel Belt and everything that she does in this House.

We're proposing to make amendments to the Energy Consumer Protection Act and to other acts to reduce regulatory barriers for public electric vehicle charging station owners and operators to support the expansion of EV charging infrastructure. This change in regulation would ensure that EV charging station owners and operators are not subject to additional licensing requirements.

It will also ensure that they have the flexibility to choose their preferred billing model for their customers using their charging stations, including volume-based billing, which has recently been enabled by Measurement Canada. That's an important thing to do because we want people to have choice in this sector and we want people to have a choice of how they want to receive their bills. Perhaps even we don't want people to be locked into a government-dictated program. It's about choice.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): I have to inform the House that, pursuant to standing order 50(c), I'm now required to interrupt the proceedings and announce that there have been six and a half hours of debate on the motion for second reading of this bill. This debate will therefore be deemed adjourned unless the government House leader directs the debate to continue.

Mr. Steve Clark: Please adjourn the debate.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): The debate is adjourned.

Second reading debate deemed adjourned.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Orders of the day?

Mr. Steve Clark: Speaker, if you seek it, you will find there is unanimous consent to see the clock at 6.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Is there unanimous consent to see the clock at 6? Agreed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Mr. Ernie Hardeman: I move that, in the opinion of this House, the government of Ontario should conduct a comprehensive review of practices in the funeral, burial and cremation services sector to ensure they prioritize protecting vulnerable families in their time of bereavement, promote freedom of choice in access to third-party sellers, and determine if the current rules and framework under the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002, are fair and achieve the highest level of consumer protection.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Pursuant to standing order 100, the member has 12 minutes for his presentation.

Mr. Ernie Hardeman: It's an honour to bring forward this motion to the House. It's about a very important issue that we all end up dealing with at some point in our lives: Ontario's funeral, burial and cremation services sector.

Our government takes consumer protection very seriously, and consumer protections in the bereavement sector are especially important. That's because when you have to make decisions about honouring departed loved ones, we are at one of the most vulnerable points in our lives. This is a situation where people can be easily taken advantage of and be pressured to buy beyond their means. It's also a situation where people might not know that they've been taken advantage of until after the fact. That's why the government has the duty to ensure that there are strong consumer protections in the bereavement sector before any purchases are made—not only that, but Ontarians expect it.

Now, first, I would like to talk a little bit about the current legislation and the framework governing the bereavement sector. Historically in Ontario, funeral services, cemetery services and monument services were all separate. In 2002, the Minister of Consumer and Business Services at the time, Tim Hudak, introduced the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act. The legislation allowed what are called "combination cemeteries." These are facilities that offered a combination of funerals, cemetery and monument services, allowing people to have the convenience of making their bereavement arrangements all in one place, if they prefer.

There was also the recognition that allowing these combinations in Ontario would lead to tied selling. Now, tied selling is a very unfair practice. It's when consumers are pressured or forced to purchase a certain product on the condition that they also purchase some other product from the seller. This could be applied through extra fees that do not reflect direct costs or by refusing to accept third-party products, just to name a few.

Because of this, Mr. Hudak put forward very strong consumer protections in the legislation to ensure that these combinations could not use their potential monopoly to stop families from having the freedom to choose a third-

party seller, if that's what they wished. I'm going to quote from Mr. Hudak, who said in 2002 during the original debate: "If the consumer wants to buy a grave marker from a shop of great reputation that has supplied the family for generations or shop for one that offers a better price or quality, he or she would be able to do just that."

1800

He said he wanted to stop situations "where somebody who is buying a service is told they can only buy the gravestone from a particular site, and if they don't buy the gravestone from that site, there's an additional administrative fee put on top."

After it passed, Mr. Hudak was asked in question period how it would improve consumer protection in the sector. He responded by saying that, when implemented, the legislation would "attack tied selling, a reprehensible practice that limits consumer options." All this is to say tied selling should be strictly prohibited in Ontario's bereavement sector.

So why then did I introduce this motion? Well, last year, I met with the people from the independent monument sector—and some of them are in the audience here tonight—and with my constituents, and they brought to my attention that tied selling still occurs in Ontario's bereavement sector. The current framework is not achieving the level of consumer protection that Ontarians expect. Monument makers sell their products as a whole, including installation, so the installation fee is included in the price that they charge. However, the independent monument builder showed me bylaws from combinations that say that the combination is the only one allowed to install all monuments, no matter if they are from the combination or from a third party. The issue is that the combination then charges the high installation fee of \$560 or more to families because they have that monopoly over who installs monuments in their cemetery—that on top of the \$100 administrative fee that they charge for third-party monuments as well. This was supposed to be prohibited.

Here's another example of tied selling: They showed me a receipt for \$1,070 for a foundation from a combination. However, the combination forces families to buy the foundation from them exclusively. Now, a third-party foundation maker that the monument builders work with sells that same product for \$504. This is over double the price, and the grieving families have no choice but to pay it because the combination refuses to accept third-party foundations. It hurts vulnerable families because it definitely isn't a direct cost. As I said before, this is simply unfair and does not allow people to have the full knowledge or choice of what they can buy for the services for their loved one.

A small funeral home owner in my riding told me of another area where consumers aren't being adequately protected: exclusive dealing. It's another very unfair practice. It's when sellers limit the rights of people to choose who they want to deal with. In other words, the seller forces the consumer to deal with them exclusively.

In the bereavement sector, they told me that some combination cemeteries are not recognizing limited power

of attorney that is designated to an independent monument builder to act on bereaved families' behalf with matters regarding the monument. Families might do this because they're feeling pressured and would like to withdraw from dealing with the staff or because they live far away from the cemetery and doing this is a more convenient option. Currently, he's told that the cemetery can request to speak with the bereaved family in person only, where they then aggressively push their monument product. This doesn't allow people to deal with the operator that they feel most comfortable with or give them a convenient option if they live far away. It doesn't put the bereaved family first.

Overall, this showed me that the people are being taken advantage of at a time when they are extremely vulnerable. That's exactly what Mr. Hudak wanted to stop in Ontario. But if that was the original intent, why are these practices still happening? It's because it took an unusual 10 years for the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act to come into force after it was passed in 2002. During that time, the previous Liberal government watered it down a lot, the consumer protection in the legislation, by developing ineffective regulations. If we're hearing complaints and it was a watered-down framework, then why would we not review to make sure that this does not continue? We can see that tied selling and other unfair practices are exactly what the original version of the bill was trying to stop. Why would we not want to make sure that the act lives up to its original intent when it comes to consumer protection?

That's why I introduced this motion. The Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery should conduct a comprehensive review of the practices of the bereavement sector to make sure that the grieving families are put first. That was the original intent and is also what Ontarians expect when it comes to consumer protection.

Just a few years ago, the Auditor General did an audit of the bereavement sector, and she found that the current consumer protection measures are "weak" in Ontario—her words. In the report, she said that the best way to protect transparency and choice is through comparative shopping. If people are not satisfied by the product or price that the combination offers, they can look elsewhere.

If tied selling and exclusive dealings are allowed to happen, combinations can use their monopoly power to effectively stop comparison shopping. Having said that, the Auditor General's report did not focus on tied selling or exclusive dealing; it was on the availability of price lists. I think that was an oversight because even with widely available price lists, grieving families can't truly comparison shop if unreasonable barriers continue to be put in place if they choose to purchase from a third-party seller.

With the rising cost of living, bereavement services are expensive enough. I don't believe that grieving families during one of the most vulnerable times in their lives should be taken advantage of with fees that do not reflect direct costs just because they want to buy a monument from a maker that they are most comfortable with. I don't think they should be forced to buy a foundation from a

particular supplier either, and I don't think that cemeteries should be allowed to engage in exclusive dealing to refusing to recognize limited power of attorney.

Again, that's why we should conduct a comprehensive review of the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act. The current framework is obviously not properly protecting Ontarians.

Most operators in the bereavement sector hold themselves to the highest standards of ethics and want to make sure that grieving families honour their loved ones in the way they see fit; however, we have to make sure that they're also protected from the handful of bad actors that are out there, because honouring a loved one is one of the biggest decisions that people make in their lives. Because most people don't know they've been had until after the fact, we need to make sure that families are protected before they make that purchase.

We will do just that if this motion is passed. With the review, we will ensure that we are protecting grieving families from unfair practices like tied selling and exclusive dealing; that they have the freedom of choice to purchase products and services from the operator of their choosing; and that Ontario has some of the strongest consumer protection measures for the bereavement sector in North America. That's what Ontarians expect from their government; that's what I want to give them.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Further debate?

Mr. Terence Kernaghan: I'd like to thank my friend the member from Oxford for bringing this forward. As we debate this legislation in this House today, I think of people going through the tremendous grief. While one could possibly expect that it would happen, they can never know what it is to go through it until they're in the midst of it. I think of people going through that grief and how they would agree to almost anything to support and to honour and to respect the person that they loved so much in their last moments on this earth.

As we look towards reviewing the practices in the funeral, burial and cremation services sector, I want to thank Joe O'Neil from O'Neil Funeral Home in London for speaking with me earlier about some of the issues that the bereavement sector is facing. For instance, one example is that the federal CPP death benefit used to be \$3,600, and it was indexed to inflation. However, it was changed a number of years ago to \$2,500 and has not changed in a number of years.

In the city of London, deaths have been declining post-pandemic. In 2022, the city of London reported 4,881 deaths; in 2023, there were 4,728; and in 2024, until the end of July, the city has reported 2,663 deaths. When low-income folks pass away and they don't have the means to pay for a funeral, municipalities have to give money to funeral homes to put on a funeral. And while the deaths in London have been decreasing, the number of funerals being paid for by the city are going up astronomically. Until the end of July 2024, 30% or 306 deaths were paid for by the city, but the city has not increased funding for those funerals in 14 years.

1810

The London Free Press had coverage on this issue, showing that funeral homes are essentially subsidizing the cost of these types of funerals because the city isn't giving them enough funding. And that money needs to flow from the province.

I can quote Joe as saying, "Not everybody (in the industry) is providing full services at that rate because they can't afford to. With what the city is paying us, we're actually losing money."

In Windsor, 100% of funeral homes are corporately owned. Corporations will often push people into these pre-paid arrangements, where a \$10,000 funeral will actually cost the person purchasing it \$18,000. It makes me think of those extended warranties that people will often purchase for electronic equipment and end up spending far more than they ought to and should.

That's why a comprehensive review of the bereavement sector is something that we support within the official opposition.

Brett Denning, a director for the Ontario Funeral Service Association, said, "It gets more difficult each year where funeral homes are expected to essentially subsidize these funerals. What we like to see across the entire province for the folks who don't have the funds is to have the ability to have a respectful disposition."

Clearly, there's a trend here across the province of Ontario, and there need to be more options available. I think of all the family-owned funeral homes that are becoming fewer and fewer and fewer year after year because of the massive influx of all of these corporate actors.

I don't have enough time to get into it, but there are a few further issues in the bereavement sector. There's the issue of abandoned bodies. There are storage issues. No new storage for bodies has been created by the city of London for over 30 years. A further issue is, as I said, that there are not many small funeral homes left in Ontario; they're being bought out by conglomerates that have more predatory approaches. A 2020 report by the Auditor General found that grieving families in Ontario often face numerous pressure tactics and misleading information from these corporate funeral homes.

I want to end my remarks by saying that the death of a loved one or a family member is always an incredibly emotional and incredibly difficult time, and people should not be taken advantage of in their time of grief.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Further debate?

Ms. Jessica Bell: I am proud to be speaking to this bill that has been introduced by the MPP for Oxford. To summarize, this bill calls for a comprehensive review of practices in the funeral, burial and cremation services sector to ensure they prioritize protecting vulnerable families in their time of bereavement, promote freedom of choice and access to third-party sellers, and determine if the current rules and framework under the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002, are fair and achieve the highest level of consumer protection. This call touches on some very serious issues.

In Ontario, we plan for birth, life, work and play, but we are hearing from experts that we do not plan for death at all. We are also hearing from cities, especially Toronto, that we are running out of burial space, which is a concern because it means that loved ones in our region are competing for a diminished supply of cemetery plots.

What we are also seeing is that the funeral services industry and the burial industry is changing very fast. We are seeing a move away from family, mom-and-pop businesses that provide funeral services to a rise in big corporations offering for-profit funeral services where companies work extremely hard to make the most amount of money from grieving families. And what we see is, like when we introduce money into the health care system, it means that people who are in very vulnerable situations can get squeezed. We're seeing that in the long-term-care-homes sector as well: When you bring for-profit practices into the long-term-care-homes sector, vulnerable people get squeezed. I am also concerned that the rise of corporatization within the burial sector and the funeral services sector is also leading to people getting squeezed.

The Auditor General did an investigation into the bereavement industry and found that costs are going up a lot, especially for burial plots. When they used mystery shoppers, they saw companies engaging in unnecessary pressure. They're talking to families that are grieving, that have lost a loved one, and some of these companies are engaging in unnecessary pressure and providing misleading information in half of all the operations that these mystery shoppers visited. That's what the Auditor General found. That is not great.

I want to give a shout-out to Margot Boyd and Pamela Taylor and the residents of Moore Park who here today to express some of their concerns with a particular organization called Mount Pleasant Cemetery. Thank you so much for being here.

I want to draw my attention to Mount Pleasant just for a little bit here. The reason why this is so important is because Mount Pleasant and what is happening with the Mount Pleasant Group of cemeteries is an example of this corporatization of the sector and how it is impacting people.

When we look at Mount Pleasant Cemetery, we are seeing a situation where Mount Pleasant is now a private company that is operating on public land, including on a cemetery in Moore Park and Mount Pleasant in my riding. We are seeing that the public has next to no say on what Mount Pleasant Cemetery does, how much they charge for services or even when they close the gates at night and limit what is essentially a public park in this area on public land, limiting when residents can go in and go out.

What is also concerning is that the board and the staff are essentially unaccountable. They have over \$1.2 billion in assets which are growing rapidly and there is no public oversight. I think that is a concern. When the residents of Moore Park reached out to me to raise this concern, I thought, "Well, let's introduce a bill to address this issue so that we can move a for-profit, private corporation operating on public land—and move it over so that there

is public oversight." When we move it over so that there's public oversight, it means the interests of bereaved families and the costs they pay become a priority—less about corporate profits and more about providing services to people in a very hard time in their lives.

I'm going to be handing this bill over to the member for Oxford for him to take a look at it. When this government was in opposition, there were MPPs that supported the move to properly regulate Mount Pleasant cemeteries, and I urge this government to look at this issue in a very serious light.

We do support this motion. Thank you to the member for Oxford for bringing it up. I think we need not just a review, but we need actual change and legislation passed.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Further debate?

Mr. Brian Riddell: Good evening, colleagues. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss an issue that is important to many of the people who live in our ridings to ensure that Ontario's bereavement industry best supports families navigating loss.

As you know, when the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act was introduced 20 years ago, it aimed to balance choice and protections for consumers with fair rules enabling competition. Over the last two decades, we have received important feedback which suggests that some gaps have emerged between the original intention of the legislation and real-world experiences, particularly for independent service providers and grieving families.

Through my discussions with stakeholders like the Ontario Monument Builders Association, I've learned of concerns with certain administrative practices that may inadvertently limit open choice and competition in ways that are incompatible with the spirit of the legislation. Issues raised include unnecessary access fees charged to independent monument artists seeking to serve families, as well as restricted scheduling practices and a lack of clarity around the ownership of structures at some combination cemeteries.

While facilities that offer a range of services make sense, the feedback we received suggests there are many unintentional barriers that limit choices or impact small businesses. We want families facing tough decisions to be able to consider all options without any interference from outside.

1820

As a parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Public and Business Service Delivery and Procurement, I am glad to see that the Bereavement Authority of Ontario has provided a process for addressing complaints and is having ongoing consultations on industry standards. While regulation can be complex, with proper oversight, I believe we can make steady improvements to protect consumers and support a fair marketplace.

As elected officials, we have a responsibility to regularly assess whether policies are fully achievable in their goals and are beneficial to the people of Ontario. Unfortunately, while the Liberals were in power, the bereavement sector was not given the attention it truly deserved. And you can see there's so many Liberals here tonight.

For those reasons, I am calling on my colleagues across party lines to support conducting a comprehensive examination of Ontario's bereavement industry practices and regulations, with participation from all impacted stakeholders. A balanced review can help spot gaps between current roles and the original goals of offering choice, transparency and fair access to services during tough times. By listening to feedback from consumers and industry experts, we can make sure that our policies support both families and independent service providers in the years to come.

With a commitment to evidence-based improvements and stronger accountability, we can build greater trust and confidence in end-of-life options across the province of Ontario. It is my sincere hope that through respectful discussion and collaborative problem-solving, we can work to refine bereavement standards and practices to uphold both business integrity and human dignity during the time of loss.

I thank you in advance for your thoughtful consideration and commitment to reducing the administrative burden on this precious industry.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Further debate?

Mr. Robert Bailey: It's a pleasure to rise today in the Legislature and make my comments to motion 117, tabled by my esteemed colleague from Oxford.

As mentioned, motion 117 reads: "In the opinion of this House, the government of Ontario should conduct a comprehensive review of practices in the funeral, burial and cremation services sector to ensure they prioritize protecting vulnerable families in their time of bereavement, promote freedom of choice in access to third-party sellers, and determine if the current rules and framework under the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002 are fair and achieve the highest level of consumer protection."

Madam Speaker, I think this is a very well-reasoned and timely motion by the member from Oxford which I am prepared to support, and I believe all members of this House should also support it with their vote. As we all know, the member for Oxford has been an outstanding member to the constituents of his riding and in this Legislature for over 29 years now. With such an impressive record, the member's career biography at the Legislature has become too long for me to dive into during the time I have allotted.

However, one of the primary benefits of the member's three decades of service is the impressive institutional knowledge of this place, and the legislation that has been passed, that the member carries with him. The member, in fact, is one of only two members, I believe, who was present for the original introduction and debate of the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002, by the former honourable member from Erie-Lincoln, and later, Niagara-West Glanbrook, the honourable Tim Hudak.

I think that's important. The member has a rock-solid understanding of what the intent of the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act was always meant to be. Like I said, this is important to remember when considering your support for this motion.

The member has seen the way things have evolved over the last 20 years, while also hearing from some very important stakeholders in this sector that are trying to improve upon this act. I also believe that this motion, calling for a thorough review of this important legislation, is something that fits perfectly with the outstanding work that the Ford government and the Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery have committed to doing over the last six years, and that's putting consumers first.

As a former PA to that ministry, I can attest to the quality of staff at that ministry, and the thoroughness of the work they do on behalf of Ontario residents. There's no doubt in my mind that they would be able to launch a review in short order, if required. It may be needed in this case. I think all those in the Legislature can say we've been through, or have heard first-hand, many of these challenges facing families when dealing with the loss of a loved one.

In addition to all the emotions that one goes through, sometimes unexpectedly, there's also a tremendous amount of decision-making that needs to take place in a short amount of time for families. I think I'm running out of time.

I think this is something that, collectively, as members of the Legislature, we can say we are going to set about right away to address, through that comprehensive review of the bereavement industry and, if necessary, updates to the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act. I will be supporting this motion, and I look forward to the remainder of the debate.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Further debate?

M^{me} France Gélinas: I'm happy to say that we will also be supporting motion 117 from our colleague from Oxford. The thrust of this motion is that he wants to bring consumer protection. This is something that the NDP will always support.

We all know that in the funeral business you deal with people in their times of grief. You deal with people at a time when they are very vulnerable. You are not at your best when you have to go to a funeral home because you've lost a loved one. Unfortunately, over the years, there have been corporations that have taken advantage of the fact that people are in a moment of weakness. They do this so that they can maximize their profit.

To look at the funeral business through a view of consumer protection I think is way overdue. We haven't looked at this in 25 years. Things have changed dramatically in 25 years. But I will say something that has stayed the same. In Sudbury we have a co-op funeral home. It was the very first co-op funeral home that was established in Canada. We're checking, but I think it is throughout the world also.

The very first one was in Sudbury. It was put together by a *caisse populaire* and the French Catholic church Ste. Anne. It has since changed to welcome people of every faith and every language, but it is still a co-op. You become a member by paying \$25 and you are a member for life. They have a board of directors, they review their

prices, and they now have—actually, for quite a while—in 1969 they opened up a site in Chelmsford, which is my riding, and in 1994 they also opened up a site in Hanmer, which is also in my riding.

I would say, when you do your review, invite those people in. They have seen the predatory practices of other funeral homes, and they will bring the best practice as to how you protect consumers in their time of grief.

I look forward to this committee doing its work.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): Further debate?

Mrs. Robin Martin: I'm delighted to rise in support of this motion. This government, under the leadership of Premier Ford, takes matters of consumer protection very, very seriously and we will never stop taking action to protect Ontarians.

Unlike the Liberals, supported by the NDP, who ignored consumer protection in this province for more than 15 years, this government has followed through on their promise to provide Ontarians with the protections they need and deserve.

With the Better for Consumers, Better for Businesses Act, we delivered on our promise to keep Ontarians safe. We have now unanimously passed the Homeowner Protection Act, 2024, which banned the use of NOSIs—*notices of security interest*—saving countless Ontarians from losing their homes in scams. As I said, we are stepping forward with a dynamic, modern marketplace and making sure the legislation fits that marketplace.

Under the leadership of Premier Ford, our province is rapidly growing and evolving. Ontarians deserve enhanced protections that align with new marketplace innovations, new business practices and changing consumer behaviours. These pieces of legislation are one example of this government's commitment to building a safer, fairer and stronger economy for future generations.

But this motion today is about ensuring consumer protection in the bereavement sector. In this sector, you could argue—and I think many of the members have spoken to this—that consumer protection is even more important, perhaps most important. Individuals making bereavement arrangements for their families and loved ones are often, maybe almost always, at an extremely vulnerable point in their lives. They're sometimes in shock, they're bereft and they're often really unable to think clearly and focus on details. As my colleague for Sarnia-Lambton said, there are a lot of decisions to be made at a time when they're maybe least able to make those decisions.

Not only have I experienced this personally, but I've had friends who have gone through this, family members, neighbours and other constituents who I've spoken with about these challenges. I've heard accounts from these people about their interactions with the sector—unfortunately, not all of them positive—and sometimes how, at these times, during the discussions, the consumer of the bereavement services was confused. They were confused by what they were being told—as I said, unable to focus. Sometimes they felt they may have been signed up for

services that they didn't realize they'd signed up for and that maybe they didn't prefer to have, ultimately, but it was all a blur at the time.

As my colleague the MPP for Oxford has noted, the Liberals delayed implementation of the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act for almost 10 years, from 2002 until 2012, and weakened consumer protection through ineffective regulation in this sector.

I agree with this motion and want to support it, because, as MPP Hardeman has proposed, I think we really do need at this point a comprehensive review of practices in the funeral, burial and cremation services sector so that we can ensure that they prioritize protecting vulnerable family members, vulnerable people in the time of their bereavement; so that, as the motion says, they promote freedom of choice and access to third-party sellers; and finally, so that we all ensure that the current rules and framework that we have under the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002, thanks to our friend and former leader, Tim Hudak, are fair and achieve the highest possible level of consumer protection.

As I said, I agree that it's important to ensure that that act is meeting its original intent, that it's protecting consumer, ensuring that those in the sector are appropriately dealing with people in the state that they find themselves at a time of bereavement. There's no place for sharp practice in this sector; we've got to make sure that everybody is treated with respect, especially at this most difficult time.

I hope everyone will support MPP Hardeman's motion.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): The member now has two minutes to reply.

Mr. Ernie Hardeman: First of all, I'd like to thank the members of the audience from the monument organization that are here to hear the debate this evening. I also want to thank the members from Cambridge, Sarnia-Lambton, Eglinton-Lawrence, London North Centre, University-Rosedale and Nickel Belt for their kind words and what, I would say, sounds like support for this bill.

I do believe, as was mentioned, that we need to do a comprehensive review of the bereavement sector and come back here and improve the consumer protection for that last stage in our lives. Maybe we can get it done before any of us need it again.

With that, I do want to say thank you to everyone, and we look forward to the next step in the process.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): The time provided for private members' public business has now expired.

Mr. Hardeman has moved private member's notice of motion number 117. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried. Congratulations.

Motion agreed to.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Donna Skelly): All matters relating to private members' public business having been completed, this House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. on Thursday, October 31, 2024.

The House adjourned at 1834.

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
Allsopp, Tyler (PC)	Bay of Quinte / Baie de Quinte	
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
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
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 Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Troisième Vice-Présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Crawford, Hon. / L'hon. Stephen (PC)	Oakville	Associate Minister of Mines / Ministre associé des Mines
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 Education / Ministre de l'Éducation
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	Minister of Agriculture, Food and Agribusiness / Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et de l'Agroentreprise
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 (IND)	Carleton	
Glover, Chris (NDP)	Spadina—Fort York	
Gretzky, Lisa (NDP)	Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest	
Grewal, Hardeep Singh (PC)	Brampton East / Brampton-Est	
Hamid, Zee (PC)	Milton	
Hardeman, Ernie (PC)	Oxford	
Harden, Joel (NDP)	Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	
Harris, Hon. / L'hon. Mike (PC)	Kitchener—Conestoga	Minister of Red Tape Reduction / Ministre de la Réduction des formalités administratives
Hazell, Andrea (LIB)	Scarborough—Guildwood	
Hogarth, Christine (PC)	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	
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	
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, Hon. / L'hon. Trevor (PC)	Chatham-Kent—Leamington	Associate Minister of Emergency Preparedness and Response / Ministre associé de la Protection civile et de l'Intervention en cas d'urgence
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
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 Electrification / Ministre de l'Énergie et de l'Électrification
Lumsden, Hon. / L'hon. Neil (PC)	Hamilton East—Stoney Creek / Hamilton-Est—Stoney Creek	Minister of Sport / Ministre 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 and Procurement / Ministre des Services au public et aux entreprises et de l'Approvisionnement
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	Associate Minister of Auto Theft and Bail Reform / Ministre associé de la Lutte contre le vol d'automobiles et de la Réforme relative aux mises en liberté sous caution
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, Hon. / L'hon. Sam (PC)	Niagara West / Niagara-Ouest	Associate Minister of Energy-Intensive Industries / Ministre associé des Industries à forte consommation d'énergie
Pang, Billy (PC)	Markham—Unionville	
Parsa, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (PC)	Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill	Minister of Children, Community and Social Services / Ministre des Services à l'enfance et des Services sociaux et communautaires
Pasma, Chandra (NDP)	Ottawa West—Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest—Nepean	
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 Deputy Government Whip / Whip adjointe du gouvernement
Pierre, Natalie (PC)	Burlington	
Pinsonneault, Steve (PC)	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	
Pirie, Hon. / L'hon. George (PC)	Timmins	Minister of Mines / Ministre des Mines
Quinn, Hon. / L'hon. Nolan (PC)	Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry	Minister of Colleges and Universities / Ministre des Collèges et Universités
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 Indigenous Affairs and First Nations Economic Reconciliation / Ministre des Affaires autochtones et de la Réconciliation économique avec les Premières Nations Minister of Northern Development / Ministre du Développement du Nord
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 / Ministre des Richesses naturelles
Smith, Laura (PC)	Thornhill	
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
Taylor, Monique (NDP)	Hamilton Mountain / Hamilton-Mountain	
Thanigasalam, Hon. / L'hon. Vijay (PC)	Scarborough—Rouge Park	Associate Minister of Housing / Ministre associé du Logement

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
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 Minister of Mental Health and Addictions / Ministre associé délégué à la Santé mentale et à 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
Vaugeois, 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	