

RE: Facts Still Matter in Ontario

From: "Forgione, Andrew (OPO)" <andrew.forgione@ontario.ca>
To: "McPhail, Blane (OPO)" <blane.mcphail@ontario.ca>, "Killorn, Bill (OPO)" <bill.killorn@ontario.ca>
Date: Fri, 16 Dec 2016 13:19:43 -0500

Good afternoon,

Another day, another round of false statements from Patrick Brown. This time, he was speaking on AM 1310. Facts matter in Ontario and Brown needs to be honest when he speaks to Ontarians.

He said : *"there is no [electricity price] relief coming"*

Fact: Wrong. Starting January 1st, we're permanently rebating the provincial portion of the HST to reduce bills by 8%, and cutting delivery charges for the most rural customers even further for a total savings of 20%. We removed the Debt Retirement Charge, saving the average family \$70 / year. We signed an agreement with Quebec that will help make electricity here more affordable, clean, and reliable, and save about \$70 million in electricity costs. Reduced Feed-In-Tariff prices through annual price reviews, saving ratepayers at least \$1.9 B. These are just a few examples – perhaps Patrick Brown should promote these programs and policy changes instead of spend his time spreading false information.

He said: *"the PST rebate is less than the premier's energy rebate which is now removed"*

Fact: This doesn't make sense. Removing the Debt Retirement Charge saved the average family \$65/year (4%, or \$5.42/month). The new HST rebate will save an average of \$130/year (8%, or \$11/month). The Ontario Clean Energy Benefit for these same customers would have been, on average, \$162.50 (10%, or \$13.54/month). Net, these customers are still seeing \$32.50 in additional savings under the new set of programs without even factoring other initiatives, like the Ontario Electricity Support Program, that thousands of families qualify for.

This means that starting January 1st, families will be saving more than before.

He said : *" We give electricity at a loss almost daily to Michigan and Pennsylvania, Ohio and New York"*

Fact: Considering the net benefit to Ontario ratepayers, it's curious as to why Patrick Brown continues to rail against this practice. Even his Conservative colleagues know better. When the Member for Simcoe-Grey was Energy Minister in 2001, he called these exports "pure profit." He even went further, noting that "if we can make money on surplus power in the United States, we're damn well going to do that."

The last time the provincial Conservatives were in power, they spent \$900 million importing electricity over two years just to keep the lights on. When we came into office, we inherited their dirty, unreliable electricity system and cleaned it up. Now, thanks to those necessary investments, Ontario families and businesses know the lights will go on and stay on when they need them to. Given our position of strength in terms, Ontario is a net exporter now, benefitting ratepayers to the tune of \$230 million last year (as estimated by the Independent Electricity System Operator).

He said: *"Losing control of hydro one means we're going to lose future control over rate*

increases”

Fact: This is absolutely not true. Energy rates will continue to be set by the independent Ontario Energy Board, which has a mandate to protect ratepayers . Broadening the ownership in Hydro One has resulted in an improved, more customer focused company, increased value for taxpayers, and billions unlocked for much needed infrastructure investments

He said: *“There was an exit clause in the Samsung deal where they could’ve got out of \$1.5 billion of surplus electricity”*

Fact: We renegotiated the Green Energy Investment Agreement with Samsung, reducing contract costs by \$3.7 billion.

He said: *“ The cap-and-trade proposed by Kathleen Wynne means that the government gets \$2 billion more a year in revenue”*

Fact: Every dollar generated through cap and trade will be deposited in a dedicated account and reinvested into green projects like transit, electric vehicle incentives and housing retrofits that fight climate change. This means every dollar goes back into helping families and businesses successfully make the transition to a low-carbon economy.

Frankly, it’s a little surprising to hear the Conservatives come out against a plan that will reduce greenhouse gas pollution at the lowest cost for families and businesses. Third-party experts EnviroEconomics have confirmed this, showing that the Liberal plan is both cost effective and best at reducing emissions, unlike the Conservative scheme which would cost families and businesses more. This same study showed the PC approach could cost households up to \$50 more per month, as opposed to \$13 under the Liberal plan, just to get the same carbon reductions.

Our aim to meet our GHG targets at the cheapest price possible for people and the economy. Our plan does this – Patrick Brown’s scheme doesn’t come close.