



## *Questions for PC Leadership Candidates*

[Monte.mcnaughton.lkm@gmail.com](mailto:Monte.mcnaughton.lkm@gmail.com)

Monte McNaughton

[peter@ontariofirst.ca](mailto:peter@ontariofirst.ca)

Vic Fideli

[christine@christineelliott.ca](mailto:christine@christineelliott.ca)

[campaign@christineelliott.ca](mailto:campaign@christineelliott.ca)

Christine Elliott

[boyle.mp@gmail.com](mailto:boyle.mp@gmail.com)

c.c. [jessica@teampaybook.ca](mailto:jessica@teampaybook.ca)

Lisa MacLeod

[info@votepatrickbrown.ca](mailto:info@votepatrickbrown.ca)

c.c. [media@votepatrickbrown.ca](mailto:media@votepatrickbrown.ca)

Patrick Brown

*(Messages sent individually, not bulk)*

**Alphabetical: Patrick Brown, Christine Elliott, Vic  
Fideli, Lisa MacLeod, Monte McNaughton,**

1. How have you personally responded to the suffering and losses of victims of wind in Ontario? (Meetings, attending protests, speeches, phone calls, emails, lobbying for change, etc.)
2. Please provide a brief assessment of what you feel is happening to the ENVIRONMENT of Ontario with the onslaught of industrial wind (water, air, wildlife, land).
3. What is your understanding of the costs of wind and solar subsidies and subsequent job losses, to the economy of Ontario?
4. If elected leader of the PC party, with which independent experts on energy and the economy do you feel it would be useful to engage and consult? Why?
5. What is your plan for the Green Energy and Economy Act of 2009? Would you “reform” or repeal it?
6. What general statement can you offer in particular about wind power in the province and how you will mitigate the effects? Will you include restitution for victims? Will you include terminating “odious debts” contracts as they are unreasonable, and falsely premised? Will you require that offending turbines be dismantled?
7. There is underway a general global re-evaluation of “renewable” energy policies. Are you aware of the turnaround of so called “green” policies, mandated targets, that have caused economic hardship,

even ruin, and joblessness? Are you aware of various countries withdrawing subsidies, and re-writing the rules with respect to “mandated” renewables?

8. What is the nearest Industrial Wind Factory, or electrical substation, to your own home or cottage?
9. Any other clarification or comments that you wish.

If you wish, you may offer us a general statement that includes most of the questions of this survey.

Please reply by: Monday, January 26<sup>th</sup>, 2015.

Reply to: [kodaisl@rogers.com](mailto:kodaisl@rogers.com)

*Thank you very kindly for your participation.*

*Sherri Lange and Lorrie Gillis on behalf of*

*NA-PAW, GLWT, TWA, OWR, OWA, ORWTWG, and  
Save the Eagles International*

*(North American Platform Against Wind Power, Great Lakes Wind Truth, Toronto Wind Action, Ontario Wind Resistance, Ontario Wind Action, Ontario Regional Wind Turbine Working Group, and Save the Eagles International)*

## A FEW RESOURCES

<http://www.abqjournal.com/386666/news/gasping-for-air.html>

[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/09/business/energy-environment/renewable-energy-in-spain-is-taking-a-beating.html?pagewanted=all&\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/09/business/energy-environment/renewable-energy-in-spain-is-taking-a-beating.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0)

(From Misery to Ruin)

<http://smithvilleturbinesoppositionparty.ca/news/wind-power-does-not-ever-replace-coal-it-never-has-and-never-will/>

<http://www.na-paw.org/na-paw-statement-p.php>

<http://www.na-paw.org/Lange-140811.php>

<http://business.financialpost.com/2011/05/16/ontarios-power-trip-the-failure-of-the-green-energy-act/>

<http://business.financialpost.com/2013/05/01/ontarios-green-disaster/>

Ontario's green disaster (See article below)



Matthew Sherwood/The Canadian Press

What seems to have annoyed Ontario Energy Minister Bob Chiarelli is that we did something the government should have done long ago: assess the costs and benefits of Ontario's radical, go-it-alone green energy scheme.

***The province could soon top North America in electricity costs***

In 2009 the Ontario government passed the Green Energy Act (GEA), with the aim of increasing the province's use of renewable energy such as wind and solar power, biofuels, and small-scale hydro. The centerpiece of the Act is a schedule of subsidized electricity purchase contracts – called Feed-in-Tariffs – that provide long-term guarantees of above-market rates for power generated by those renewables.

The GEA may have been well-intended but a recent Fraser Institute analysis, called The Environmental and Economic Consequences of Ontario's Green Energy Act, demonstrates that

it is driving up Ontario's energy costs and poses a threat to economic competitiveness for the manufacturing and mining sectors. What little environmental benefit it is expected to generate could have been achieved at a fraction of the cost. Unless the province changes course, the GEA will saddle Ontarians with needlessly high energy costs for decades to come.

As our study demonstrates, the GEA will soon put the province at or near the top of North American electricity costs. Already the GEA has caused major price increases for large energy consumers, and analysts in both the government and the private sector anticipate additional hikes of 40% to 50% over the next few years. We estimate that the manufacturing and mining sectors will be hard hit, with energy cost increases reducing returns to investment by between 13% and 29%.

All this pain will do little to improve air quality. Ontario's air pollution levels were already at or below clean air standards and were continuing to decline prior to the introduction of the GEA. And in a classic case of the law of unintended consequences, the GEA poses a risk of increasing air pollution levels. Wind power requires natural gas as a backup. If the province continues adding wind and gas power at a time when there is a surplus of generating capacity, it may render one of Ontario's base load nuclear plants superfluous. Taking a nuclear plant offline and replacing it with gas would leave us with higher overall emissions.

Ontario's pursuit of windpower was particularly ill-considered because provincial demand tends to be out of phase with wind patterns. In Ontario, 80% of wind-power generation occurs when demand is so low that the entire output is surplus and must be dumped on the export market at a substantial loss. The province's Auditor General estimates that Ontario has already lost close to \$2-billion on surplus wind exports: Figures from the electricity grid operator also show the ongoing losses are \$200-million annually. The wind grid is also inherently inefficient due to seasonal variability. Seven megawatts of installed wind energy capacity are needed to provide a year-round replacement for one megawatt of conventional power.

All of this pain could have been avoided. A 2005 report commissioned by the government showed that if the province simply continued with an ongoing retrofit of its existing power

generation stations, all of the claimed environmental benefits of the GEA could have been secured at one-tenth the cost. Sadly, that report was kept confidential and subsequently ignored.

What about the 50,000 “green” jobs that the Ontario government promised? Alas, they were illusory: The government now admits that its claim was not based on any formal analysis, that most of these jobs would be temporary, and that the estimate didn’t account for the jobs that would be killed by escalating electricity costs under the GEA.

The province is trying to ease the burden on selected industry groups through subsidy programs but this only transfer the costs onto taxpayers, who then have insult added to injury: higher energy costs at home and the obligation to offset the pain of high energy costs for favored industry groups.

Ontario’s Energy Minister Bob Chiarelli responded by dismissing our report out of hand. “The Fraser Institute report recommends that we go back to coal,” he retorted. “They claim that coal is clean.”

This response is completely inadequate. Ontario, having already lost a quarter of a million manufacturing jobs in the past decade, is throwing away its longstanding competitive advantage in electricity prices for the sake of minuscule environmental benefits that could have been achieved in other ways at a fraction of the cost. Our information about the air pollution consequences of various energy strategies are not pulled out of thin air; we use the same data the government itself uses.

More to the point, the Minister’s response is disconnected from reality. Ontario has always used coal for at least some of its electricity. So do many Canadian provinces, most U.S. states, most of Europe, China and all the other jurisdictions our exporters compete against. Even Germany, which Ontario claims to be copying in its green energy strategy, opened two new coal-fired power plants last year, will open six more this year, and plans six more after that. Ontario is ready to price our manufacturing sector out of business based on an ideologically-driven energy strategy at odds with all our major trading partners.

The 2005 report never examined or recommended the wind- and solar-power option Mr. Chiarelli's government actually pursued, nor did the government do any cost-benefit analysis of the GEA prior to implementing it, an omission sharply criticized by the Ontario Auditor General.

What seems to have annoyed Mr. Chiarelli is that we did something the government should have done long ago: assess the costs and benefits of Ontario's radical, go-it-alone green energy scheme. Had the government done so, Ontario might have avoided the disaster we are now in.

*Ross R. McKittrick is a Professor of Economics at the University of Guelph, a Senior Fellow at the Fraser Institute and author of Environmental and Economic Consequences of Ontario's Green Energy Act. Kenneth P. Green is Senior Director, Energy and Natural Resources at the Fraser Institute.*