1 2	
3	
4	Excerpts from Ontario Hansard, June 20, 2000, September 27, 2000, and October 2, 2000
5	
6	H 1 20 I 2000
7 8	Hansard, 20 June 2000
9	1350
10	ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD AMENDMENT ACT, 2000
l1 l2	Mr Wilson moved first reading of the following bill:
13 14 15	Bill 100, An Act to promote efficiency in the municipal electricity sector and to protect consumers from unjustified rate increases.
16 17	<b>The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):</b> Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?
18 19	All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."
20 21	All those opposed will please say "nay."
22	In my opinion, the ayes have it. Carried.
24 25	The minister for a short statement.
26	Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Energy, Science and Technology): Mr Speaker, I'll make a
27	statement during ministerial statements.
28	
29 30	•••
30 31	1400
32	STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES
33	MUNICIPAL ELECTRICITY EFFICIENCY
34	Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Energy, Science and Technology): Today I introduced
35	legislation to promote efficiency in the municipal electricity sector and to protect consumers
36	from unjustified rate increases. Two years ago I introduced the Energy Competition Act,
37	legislation this House passed to ensure Ontarians a safe, reliable supply of electricity at the
38	lowest possible cost. Then, as now, we identified three elements which must work together to
39	ensure we reach our goals: first is competition in generation; second is debt reduction and, third,

As a government, we've introduced competition in generation. This is spelled out in a plan which requires Hydro's successor company, Ontario Power Generation, to reduce its current dominant 

we need fair and stable distribution rates.

position in the generation market to 35% over the next 10 years. We've also introduced a debt retirement plan to reduce and eliminate Ontario Hydro's legacy of debt and liabilities.

But to bring the complete package of benefits to electricity customers, our partners, Ontario's municipalities and their local electric utilities, must share with us the responsibility of making decisions in the best interests of those we are elected to serve. Electricity customers have no choice but to use municipal utilities' wires. They are a monopoly, and operating a monopoly is a privilege. Therefore, it is only right that municipal utilities should deliver electricity at fair and reasonable prices. All local distribution rates are subject to review and approval by the Ontario Energy Board. That is why less than two weeks ago, I directed the Ontario Energy Board to make customer protection its first priority when deciding rate applications. I further directed the Ontario Energy Board to ask municipalities to justify their rate applications before a decision is rendered.

I remind municipalities that two years ago, when we were drafting the Energy Competition Act, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario and the Municipal Electrical Association urged the government not to force amalgamations and mergers in the electricity distribution sector. These same municipalities promised us that if we gave them the tools and incentives, they would do the right thing for customers and move to rationalize their distribution systems, find efficiencies, and ensure the lowest possible price.

Our legislation gave municipalities the tools they requested. The act clarified, for the first time, that municipalities own their electricity utilities. Local councils are the shareholders. We expect the municipalities to act responsibly. Some of them have. But, unfortunately, some municipalities have filed with the Ontario Energy Board for significant increases in local distribution rates, some by as much as 72%. This is being done without regard for the people who have already paid for their utilities, Ontario's electricity customers.

There are more than 250 municipal electric utilities in Ontario, 10 times more than in the rest of Canada combined. Between them, they have more than \$1 billion in cash and investments. Customers have already put more than enough money into the electricity system to shield them against any short-term transitional and regulatory costs brought on by electricity restructuring. As I have said many times, municipalities must earn their rate of return by squeezing efficiencies in their operations, not by squeezing customers. We cannot afford to lose the many positive benefits of electricity competition.

Let me be unequivocal. Municipalities have been given a tremendous opportunity. They can manage their utilities effectively, create innovative partnerships, merge with other utilities, whatever method they choose to maximize the benefit to their electricity customers. We have tried to work with municipalities and their utilities to make sure they understand and follow the intent of the Energy Competition Act. We have listened to their needs and provided the tools they requested. We urged that they not take advantage of consumers, and we have warned them that if they did not change their ways, legislation would be forthcoming to ensure they put customers first. Our pleas and warnings have gone unheeded. Now the time has come to act.

 I have today introduced an act to promote efficiency in the municipal electricity sector and to protect consumers from unjustified rate increases, which, if passed by members of this Legislature, would prohibit municipalities from taking windfall profits out of their local electrical utilities and using these profits to justify rate hikes. This legislation will give the Ontario Energy Board powers to disallow rate increases attributable either to assets or to financing transactions and costs where money does not stay in the electricity system.

It's unfortunate that some municipalities have kept electricity assets like surplus lands and working cash balances, and it's unfortunate that other municipal electric utilities have refinanced, taken out loans and turned the proceeds over to their municipal owners. Our proposed legislation will put a stop to this creative bookkeeping and ensure these windfalls are not used to justify rate increases.

 If the legislation is passed, the Ontario Energy Board will have the power to review and ask for detailed financial data. Assets withheld from utilities will not be allowed as justification for rate increases. After all, the ratepayers paid for their electricity systems and we believe the money should stay in those systems.

I'm sure everyone agrees that consumer protection and the lowest possible distribution rates should be our goal. That is what this amendment will do and I hope to have the support of this House to formalize this consumer protection as soon as possible.

## Hansard, 27 September 2000

25 ...

**1540** 

29 ...

## **COST OF ELECTRICAL POWER**

**Mr Doug Galt (Northumberland):** My question is for the Minister of Energy, Science and Technology. Representatives from various electric utilities in my riding have approached me with concerns about Bill 100, the Ontario Energy Board Amendment Act. There is a perception that the intent of our government in introducing this bill is to have Hydro One take over most of Ontario's utility services and leave only a few other mega-utilities. They believe that this will not create better service for the consumer but, rather, create a more powerful Hydro One. If this is true, I can understand the opposing arguments. Could you please clarify the purpose of this bill and correct any misconceptions?

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Energy, Science and Technology): Bill 100, which is An Act to promote efficiency in the municipal electricity sector and protect consumers from unjustified rate increases, was introduced in this Legislature in response to OEB procedures of this year. This past May, the 25 large municipal utilities were asked to file with the Ontario Energy Board their rate applications. What we found after we tallied up the numbers is that the average price of electricity for municipal ratepayers would go up about 17% in those 25 municipalities, like

Toronto and like Mississauga. Since municipalities are responsible for a small portion of the bill-they're responsible for the wires portion, what we call the monopoly portion of the bill-that meant that most of those municipalities, on average, were asking for a 72% increase in the portion of the bill that they were responsible for.

Obviously consumers needed protection until the Ontario Energy Board, for the first time, is able to bring in performance-based regulation and put a lid on these large increases. In the meantime, I would ask members to support Bill 100.

**Mr Galt:** I realize that the purpose is to place the consumer first and to create a level playing field. However, with Hydro One's ability to earn a rate of return on acquired assets and its ability to write off interest on acquisitions, will this have any effect on how rates will be established down the road and give Hydro One a definite advantage over the other utilities?

**Hon Mr Wilson:** I remind members that when I was appointed minister some three years ago, we had 303 municipal electrical utilities. That's several times more than the rest of Canada combined. Quebec has 12 utilities; most of the provinces have one or two.

Today we still have over 250 municipal electrical utilities. Bill 100 and the directive we sent to the Ontario Energy Board try to encourage those municipalities, along with the tax exemption, to become efficient, to amalgamate and to pass those savings on to customers. Remember, they're given a monopoly business. This has nothing to do with the competitive side of the generation business of this province.

With respect to Hydro One, it is treated under the law the same as Toronto or Mississauga or any other large utility. It has the exact same rules and the exact same set-up. In fact, if Toronto and Mississauga or Toronto and any other utility would get together, they would be larger than Hydro One. We need our 257 municipal utilities to get together and become larger than Hydro One. It's a regulated monopoly. The Ontario Energy Board, on behalf of consumers, will determine those monopoly rates in the future, regardless of the size and regardless of ownership.

## Hansard, 2 October 2000

34 ..

**1450** 37

38 ..

## **ENERGY COMPETITION**

Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke): My question is to the Minister of Energy and it concerns electricity policy. Minister, you continually say that the Harris government is interested in and supportive of competition in its electricity policy, yet in terms of the retailing of electricity we are seeing across the province the re-monopolization of Ontario Hydro. Thanks to the unfair advantages that your government has given to your company, Ontario Hydro, now called Hydro One, Hydro One is going around the province of Ontario, in

small and large centres, buying up local utilities, and we're told by outside experts that in many cases they are paying premium prices for these purchases.

My question to you today, on behalf of the electricity consumers, is, why are we seeing the remonopolization of Ontario Hydro Retail, and how is it possible that this re-monopolization is occurring under your noses, which tell us we're about to get competition?

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Energy, Science and Technology): The honourable member has a couple of concepts mixed up. The retailing of electricity has nothing to do with the monopoly wires businesses that Hydro One is going around and buying up. Under law, those have to be two separate entities, and no cross-subsidization is allowed between retailing-by the way, there's lots of competition emerging in retailing of electricity.

We have over 40 applications before the Ontario Energy Board; 26 of those, I believe, have been approved to date. That's 40 more companies in the business than when the old Ontario Hydro was a full monopoly wires business, monopoly generating business and monopoly retailing business, and had 93% of the Ontario market. That's all been divided into separate companies. There's no cross-subsidization between them.

 Hydro One, by the way, in the monopoly business, which is not competitive, just the wiresthere's only one wire in front of your house. We don't run six wires across the field as if there was some competition in electrons; there isn't. There's one wire. Just like the CRTC, along with the federal government, controls Bell Canada's wires, the OEB is regulating Hydro One and municipalities who have been given the privilege of running monopoly wires businesses.

Mr Conway: Bullfeathers. Every day the Globe and Mail has another story. Today-

Interjection.

**Mr Conway:** Last week she said she couldn't hear.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Stop the clock. Members will know that this member is usually quiet during this. He does not usually heckle people. He would appreciate the same courtesy.

I understand that sometimes when members get up who have heckled other people in the past, it is almost fair game. This is a member who is usually very quiet.

Supplementary?

**Mr Conway:** Every day the papers contain ads: today, a big ad from the energy board that your company, Hydro One, is out buying the distribution assets of the utility in Lanark Highlands. They've already got 42 either in place or about to be purchased.

We are seeing the re-monopolization of Ontario Hydro at a cost that is going to be considerable to the ratepayers. Just a few weeks ago the Canadian bond rating agency put out a bulletin saying, "Yes, Bill 100 is very good news for Hydro One." What's going on here? My colleague

from Brant tells me, as other members are saying, that orderly restructuring of electricity distribution in their communities-Brant county is a good example-is being completely frustrated by your company. Ontario Hydro is out there skewing the works in their favour, and they can do so because your government, through Bill 35 and Bill 100, has given them an unfair advantage, and they are taking it at full sail.

By the way, we are apparently about to be told that your company is soon going to announce the takeover of some of the big utilities in 905, Brampton being the one I'm hearing about. So the question remains, you talk competition, but your company, the company you control, the company where you have a big vested interest, is out re-monopolizing the distribution system of much of this province. How is that happening, and why is that happening?

Hon Mr Wilson: I am astounded by the lack of facts from a former energy minister.

The distribution business in this province is a monopoly. They are wires. Just like Bell has telephone wires that are a monopoly, the federal government and the CRTC make sure that AT&T, Sprint and other companies can put their phone calls on those wires. But those wires are a monopoly, and the rates of return are controlled by a public interest body, in this case called the Ontario Energy Board. For the first time, by the way, consumers will be protected in the distribution wires business in this province.

Hydro One is a generic name for 25 different companies that are under there. If you read the ad the honourable member refers to, I think it's probably Hydro One Networks. By the way, Hydro One Networks buys back distribution systems-again, it's a monopoly; the rate of return is controlled by the Ontario Energy Board to protect consumers. I'm told that if all 70 of their applications actually went through, they would become approximately as large as they were in terms of the rural distribution system they owned in the old days under Ontario Hydro before the NDP introduced Bill 86 and started to sell-

The Speaker: Answer.

**Hon Mr Wilson:** -those distribution assets at below-market value, stealing assets from the old Ontario Hydro and giving them to municipalities. They'll have approximately 1.2 million customers when they're done, just like they did in the old days. So it's not a re-monopolization-

**The Speaker:** The minister's time is up.

**1500**