

Second Session – Forty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
Standing Committee
on
Legislative Affairs

Chairperson
Mr. Dennis Smook
Constituency of La Verendrye

Vol. LXX No. 9 - 6 p.m., Tuesday, May 23, 2017

ISSN 1708-668X

An Honourable Member: You're delaying your own government's bill.

Mr. Chairperson: Order. I've already warned members once to please, when somebody has the floor, please let that person speak.

Mr. Pedersen: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I understand the member from Wolseley's patience is getting a little thin. It's getting late in the evening for him, but that's not a problem. We're here to discuss The Efficiency Manitoba Act, and we'll continue to do that as long as necessary.

Mr. Chairperson: I have heard enough on this. I feel that this is not a point of order. It is an opinion of what is being said.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: We could continue on, but as long as people are wanting to ask questions we are on clause 1, and every member at this table is allowed to ask questions on clause 1.

Until questions stop being asked, we will continue to take questions and if not—if questions stop being asked, we will move on to consideration of the rest of the clauses.

An Honourable Member: A point of order.

Point of Order

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Fletcher, a point of order, and I hope it is a point of order.

Mr. Fletcher: When did we move to clause 1? Because I've been tabling documents before that could have occurred.

Mr. Chairperson: In order to start debate, we put—the question on clause 1 at the beginning. After I put the question, then debate can be open, and so far up until now, we've had debate on clause 1. If there's no question on the floor, we can't debate.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Okay.

Mr. Johnston, you were the last person.

Mr. Johnston: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I thought I asked a reasonable question, and I'm a member of this committee, and I thought that nobody has a monopoly on asking questions at this committee. I thought that as an elected member of the Legislature sitting at the committee, that I had every right to ask questions, and I would expect that I would get the same respect that I give other people—*[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, we can get back into debate here.

I have already made my ruling on the point of order. There's no point of order.

Mr. Schuler: Well, I would like to thank the honourable Mr. Johnston for his question, and comes from a very fine tradition of legislators—learned to appreciate his father very much. He was a great man.

I want to start by answering his question by saying we can't stop and start demand-site management. It's a long-term endeavour that over time will help defer a new costly generation. We don't want to put ourselves into another situation that we are faced with as we are with Keeyask today. So I wanted to make sure that committee members here and Manitobans understand, that demand-site management is a long-term plan. This isn't something that, oh my goodness, we're going to save, you know, half the electricity we produce in Manitoba in one day. This is a long-term plan, and by the time it gets fully into swing is when we will see increased demand taking place in Manitoba, and rather than having to build more dams, we have to be more efficient in our use.

So I wanted to get to the member's exact questions. Programs will cover all customer classifications, so it will be residential, commercial, industrial. The new corporation will develop a plan that lays out the programs and services to meet the legislative targets. Many of the programs exist today but could be expanded, so also new programs could be added.

But what we want to do is we want to allow the professionals in the new corporation to tell us the most cost-effective programs to meet the targets.

I want to put another comment to this for those of you who haven't had the time to study the legislation like I have. This isn't just about hydro electricity. In the legislation Efficiency Manitoba could also be contracted—because remember, Efficiency Manitoba will put a program together and Manitoba Hydro will contract them to do the program for them. They provide a program to Manitoba Hydro, so they're going to be like a contractor.

They can also go to the City of Winnipeg, and we know that the aqueduct coming in is only so large, and as the city grows and I know there are models already in place that say that, you know, the aqueduct eventually is going to become too small,

serious. This is going to cost a lot of people a lot of money who can't afford it. It's not going to do the environment one iota of good, and it's going to throw the employment futures of a lot of people, lot of good people, into question, and for what, so we can create a Crown corporation? We didn't run on that. That's not in the mandate letter.

Let's be accurate. As the minister says, we did not run on creating a new Crown corporation. It's not in the Throne Speech; it's not in his mandate letter. What is in the mandate letter is to consult stakeholders, to consult at committee with the colleagues. That's in the mandate letter. And, as I say, this is the first opportunity—second opportunity.

Rolling the dice—I'd like to table this—the unnecessary gamble of massive hydro election—electric expansion, Energy Security 2.0. The—No. 36, A Thread Down a Football Field: Why a west-side Manitoba transmission line is bad environmental policy, I'll table that; the Manitoba Hydro annual review, all sorts of good stuff there, but for speed I will simply table it, but with the comment that in this report the executive summary, Manitoba Hydro for achieving energy efficiency, the Canadian Energy Efficiency Alliance, whoever they are, rated Manitoba as an A in its report card.

Mr. Chairperson: The member's time has expired.

An Honourable Member: I have a point of order.

Point of Order

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Fletcher, on a point of order.

Mr. Fletcher: Yes, I'd like to continue tabling these documents.

Mr. Chairperson: It's not a point of order. I have expressed my opinion earlier about using points of order for the wrong reasons, and I would ask you to refrain from doing that. You've now tabled two reports twice. I've asked you to stay on topic because we are in clause by clause, and we are on clause 1. And, even though it refers to section 4, we will get to section 4 as soon as we go through 1, 2 and 3. So I would like to remind the member what he should do.

* * *

Mr. Schuler: We heard the statement that we should be for good public policy. Well, I would put forward to committee that Bill 19, Efficiency Manitoba, is great public policy. It's better than good. And I would suggest to all members that I may not agree with everything you say and everything you do—not

looking at anybody specifically—but I am always under the impression that all members take their position here seriously. And, whether I was critic for a minister or a minister with a critic, I know they take it serious. And I appreciate members here and what they do.

I've been here for a while, and when the general public sees the kind of work that goes into this—like they say, there are two things you should never watch being made and that's sausage and legislation.

And, you know, tonight is one of those. It's one of these tough ones. You grind through it, but it is for the better of Manitoba. And I support this process fully and completely and prepared to sit here and answer the questions as they come forward.

I would like to point out to something that was said. This isn't an issue, when we talk about Keeyask and bipole, of supply versus demand. It shouldn't have been built. Keeyask shouldn't have been built simply because, at this point in time, we can't afford it.

* (22:20)

Now, we all understand Bipole III was a reliability issue—should have come down on the east side, and it was always meant to be to mitigate risk, because we've seen in the past what happens when a tower or two goes down because of a weather issue or could have been anything for that matter, and that can end up being very costly. So we understand Bipole III should have been built, should have come down the east side—would have saved us billions of dollars.

Keeyask, on the other hand—this is not a debate about supply versus demand, and I know members want to keep talking about their beliefs, but we laid out throughout the entire committee, starting right from dams built earlier, that there was a problem with the cost. And then we started with Wuskwatim and we went through Keeyask, and the kind of debt that has been incurred at Manitoba Hydro to the point where Manitoba Hydro debt is viewed by bond rating agencies—something we can't control; they're organizations we have no sway over. They tell the market what they believe our debt ranking should be. And if you don't understand what the ranking means, is—that, then, reflects on the kind of interest we can borrow money at. So, if you're the highest rating that you can get, you tend to get your money at a lower interest rate, because you're a lower risk. The lower your rating goes with bond agencies, the more

expensive your lending gets. And 1 point—a 1 per cent difference—on the magnitude of the debt we have is substantial.

So I want to make it very clear, and I know we want to keep living with those urban myths and things that were whispered to us by friends and that kind of thing, but those aren't based on fact. We want to stick to the facts when we have this debate regarding Efficiency Manitoba.

We've seen increasingly the debt growing at Manitoba Hydro where now, we have two of the largest construction projects in North America—by the time we are done, will be approximately \$11 billion. And during that whole construction period, Manitobans are borrowing not just the money to build the dam, but every year we borrow compound interest, the money to pay the interest on the money we've borrowed, and that's where the risk is.

The risk is in the next five years, and what we are saying to Manitobans, we're going to put together a system that we can delay expensive dam construction—let me rephrase that—we are going to delay very expensive hydro dam construction to allow Manitoba Hydro to build up equity in the corporation. And if it is the belief of committee members, and if it's the belief of Manitobans, that what we should do is build very expensive hydro dams, sell the power to anybody at any price at any time so that we can rush to the next hydro dam project, then we're no different than the NDP were for the last 17 years. That is not a plan; that is not responsible.

We've said we must become far more efficient in the way that we use our electricity. There is far too much consumption per capita in Manitoba as compared to any other jurisdiction in the world. So Efficiency Manitoba does that, and it is important that we start Efficiency Manitoba now. You don't start an efficiency program like Efficiency Manitoba a year when all of a sudden you realize that you're short on electricity. You start it and you build it into a culture. And I would suggest to committee and to Manitobans, we have to change the way we view our electricity. We have to change the culture of the way we consume our electricity. We've got to be far, far more improved stewards of that what we have and that includes our environment, that includes water, that includes our air and that includes our electricity. It is, I would suggest to committee, and I've said this before, it is a far better natural resource to have than

oil. In fact, I would suggest that other jurisdictions look at us with green envy because it is such a good resource. However, we can't squander it the way it's been done in the last 17 years, to just build at any and all cost, and then say, well, what we should do is tell people, you know, consume it at any irresponsible level that you want just so that, you know, we're getting money coming in and then all of a sudden we have to build another dam, and we continue this cycle, and we're not going to get anywhere as a province.

If we truly want this to be an asset for Manitoba, then, folks, it's time we treat it as such. We treat it with the respect it deserves. We treat it for what it should be for Manitoba. We can't keep the cycle of further pushing Manitoba Hydro in debt and keep building dams because we are so irresponsible with our consumption. Let us be an efficient, an effective and dynamic and outstanding Manitoba and allow Manitoba Hydro to start building equity because the day is going to come when, yes, we will have to build another hydro dam.

But wouldn't it be amazing if Manitoba Hydro could build the next hydro dam with a lot of its own equity in place? Wouldn't that be just remarkable? Why can't that be a goal of this Legislature? Why isn't that something that we look towards? That's what we should be doing. Let's be far more efficient. Let's be far more effective and build the system, build the culture, based on Efficiency Manitoba, that allows Manitoba to become the jewel in the crown of Manitoba and for Manitobans. That's our goal.

Ms. Klassen: I just wanted to put on the record, the minister keeps saying that the Bipole III should have gone down the east side. As the MLA for the majority of the east-side communities, that is not something that was ever actually ascertained. A lot of the people that I met with on the east side were opposed to the bipole coming down the east side, and so I just want that to be put on the record that if that's an option coming forward, if there's a bipole IV or bipole V, whatever, in the future, proper consultation must take place, and the community members as well as the leaders, both, should be invited to the table, going forward, should that come up again. Thank you.

Mr. Schuler: Well, I thank the member for that statement. We always appreciate her input very much. We do know that many of her communities, the majority of her communities, if not all of them, were in support of the line going down the east side.

Now, unfortunately, that was not an alternative that was ever allowed by the NDP government by Manitoba Hydro. In fact, they directed Manitoba Hydro that they could put the hydro—the bipole line anywhere they wanted as long as it went down the west route. And they even went so far as tell the Public Utilities Board they could look at anything at Manitoba Hydro, anything they wanted, except for the bipole line. And that was the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Selinger) as premier of Manitoba who did that.

And that's unfortunate because we should've left it up to the professionals, the individuals who know about electricity, who know about where hydro lines should be sited, and we should've gotten their advice. It could've gone to the Public Utilities Board, and who knows what the outcome would've been? However, the NDP wanted to make sure that before they asked the question, they had already written the answer.

* (22:30)

So I would say to the member, I do appreciate she knows her community, but I just want to make sure it's on the record that a lot of her constituency was in support of it going down on the east side. Insofar as reliability goes, it would have been the right place to go.

In fact, a lot of the set-asides had already been done. This was something that had been contemplated already during Duff Roblin's time. A lot of easements had already been negotiated. I would point out to the member that—I don't know if she knows this, but Riel Converter Station is in God's country, commonly known as the RM of Springfield. And it was put there because the bipole line would come down on the east side and would come at-connect into Riel. And that's why it had always—that's why Riel was built. It's just south of Dugald. I don't know if the member knows that. It's just—it hugs along the floodway south of Dugald. It's quite the construction project. But it always was intended to be there so that the line would come down the east side, would be converted at Riel, and then it would go wherever it was needed.

So a lot of work had been done, a lot of set-asides had been already put in place. Easements had been taken care of and, all of a sudden, the NDP and former member—the current member for St. Boniface, the former premier, decided to direct Hydro that they had—could put it anywhere, as long as it was on the west side and made sure the Public

Utilities Board never had an opportunity to look into the Bipole III. In fact, they were forbidden from looking at it. It wasn't even part of—they were not allowed to. And that is very unfortunate because that has cost Manitobans billions of dollars. And it was—it's a mistake.

If you look at Bipole III and the other two lines, there are some locations—they are fairly close. They are in the same weather system. We hope that someday we don't regret the fact that Bipole I and II and Bipole III in some instances are pretty close to each other. And the member has seen maps and will know that. And let's hope that a weather pattern doesn't cut through there and cause havoc on Manitobans, because this isn't like San Francisco where, you know, if you don't have electricity, it means you don't get your latte that day. I mean, electricity is incredibly important in the winter here in Manitoba. We must have our homes heated simply because of severity of our climate. So it is important that Bipole I and II and III are protected.

So I—again, the government of the day, the member for St. Boniface, former premier, should have done the right thing: he should have sent it to the Public Utilities Board and he should have allowed Manitoba Hydro to look at all alternatives and put them forward, which he disallowed. That will be viewed, again, as another one of those colossal mistakes in the history of this province. At least we should have had the ability to have that discussion.

So I thank the member for her comments, and one of the things we're allowed to do in this building is disagree—disagree respectfully, but I disagree with the member. Actually, I think many, many communities on the east side would have embraced the bipole line going down on the east side.

Thank you.

Mr. Fletcher: Again, my comments are going to be focused on the clause that we're discussing, which is the purpose, and referring to section 4.

Mr. Chair, I don't see that there's a great urgency to go through the—at midnight, we all know what happens. You—it all goes through, right? So why the hurry? Please, let's be patient; get whatever we need to do onto the table, and—especially in light that we haven't allowed people to present or anything. So I just want to get stuff on the record.

And, Mr. Chair, if I could also ask a procedural question—perhaps you can answer after my

comment—if the links to all these materials that I'm provided could be part of the record or part of the Hansard or whatever this committee does to allow people to have access to information. Because if, on one hand we can't—you know, there's been criticism that I printed off too much and that I could have used the links. But, on the other hand, I don't know how that would work in this committee because I'm not on that computer. Some other people may be, or their iPad. But right now, this is a paper world, and as far as Amazon goes, I'm not sure if he's talking about Amazon.com or the rainforest, I'm not sure which one. I think the rainforest is more valuable, but the stocks may prove that wrong, I'm not sure. Anyway, I'd like to table—oh, and by the way, the minister, on Bipole III, is correct, in my view, and as I said way back in '07 or whenever, '06, when this all started, but that's not what we're talking about tonight. And we're also not talking about building more. In fact, if it was up to me, I think we should look—we should have, but we can't now, ceasing the construction, but that train has left, both the dam and the bipole, at least investigate it, but that train has left the station. I get it. So let's focus on the bill.

I'd like to table, Mr. Chair, Manitoba Hydro 2017-2018 and 2018-19 general rate applications. It's six pages. This is the electric operations, the Manitoba Hydro '16 to '20 outlook and projected rate increases. What I would like people to take from this is, if this is correct and this is just a rate application, we're dealing with significant increases in hydro rates, the supply, the demand for Manitoba Hydro, even going out to 2027, on this page, is, I would say flat, and this is really, really scary, actually. Mr.—so I would like to table this document.

The next document I would like to share with the committee—oh, and this is a really good one. I'm really, really glad I found it and printed it. This is the latest information, May 12th, 2017. So I would be surprised if anyone at this committee has seen this, and it would be much better if everyone could read this material before passing this legislation, as this is critical, but here we are. This is a tab to Manitoba Hydro's 2017-18, 2018-19 general rate application. And here they do their key messages and compelling reasons for a rate increase, which—wow, I really wish I had time to go through this, but that's tab 2 of the latest off the Public Utilities Board website, www.publicutilitiesboardmanitoba.com or something to that effect. Just google it, for the record. So I'd like to table this piece, and I have three pieces, three of these copies, as your original request, Mr. Chair.

I—and I, like the minister said, I'm just a newbie here, so please bear with me. Can I go to the next document, please? The—I'd like to submit the letter of application from the Crown corporation to the Public Utilities Board requesting it to increase electricity rates, and it's four pages.

* (22:40)

Again, it's—if you care about your electricity rates, it's probably worth the read. And, as the minister has pointed out, our financial situation limits the options, but, nevertheless, I think it's an interesting read, specifically because this is dated May 5th, 2017, and you may ask, well, what is the reply to this.

You'll be pleased to know I have it—I have it right here, and I'm just about to retrieve it, and if it doesn't come in this batch, it will, eventually. I just want to thank my aide here for helping with all this paper, and my apologies to any boreal forest or Amazon forest, but this is important.

Okay. This letter is dated May 12th, 2017. It's the reply regarding Manitoba Hydro 2017-18, 2018-19 General Rate Application, and outlines the various tabs and, again, I'd like to highlight tab 7 because that deals with demand-side management, but it's a really good overview of what is in the rate application for a public utilities board, and if I printed it all out, I think it would have been over 1,500 pages, so, perhaps even though that was above my budget for this project, so I'd like to table this document.

The next document I'd like to table will no doubtedly support what I am saying, dealing with the excess of supply, and Mr. Chair, you've given me the warning, so I would like to let you reflect on the 20 seconds that are left and when that—at the next opportunity, I would like to continue tabling these documents, and please allow me to do it. Think of the trees. Thank you.

Mr. Schuler: The member raises the rate application and what we have in front of us is the NDP bipole-Keeyask levy, and basically, this is a rate increase that has a direct correlation to incredibly poor decision making by the NDP government, and the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Selinger) who used to be the former premier. The rate increases do not mitigate risk. They only help to insulate the risk. We have to be very careful that should there be a severe weather incident, Manitoba Hydro could again financially be at great risk.

We saw drought in 2003 when Manitoba Hydro, at that time, was still making \$400 million, and after the drought, Manitoba Hydro lost some \$400 million. It was a turnaround of \$800 million.

Today, Manitoba Hydro is making \$50 million. Now I know, in some quarters, they think \$50 million insofar as their own family budget, and they think that's like winning a lottery, but for a company the size of Manitoba Hydro, \$50 million is a very, very small amount of money. If we had another drought and the corporation would lose \$800 million, the loss would then be in the range of \$750 million. That would seriously hurt the bottom line of Manitoba Hydro. So, every time it rains, I say a prayer of thanks because one of the things that we can't handle right now is a drought.

So that the rate increase that we're asking for right now is only to insulate; it's not to mitigate the risk. We have to stop putting Manitobans at risk like this, and at some point in time we're going to have to get beyond the fact that the NDP got us into this mess. And that's what Bill 19 is all about.

In fact, I would like to read from the NFAT—I don't know if members have had the opportunity—and it directly relates to Bill 19 and what we're discussing here in section 1. And this is directly from the NFAT: DSM is the reduction of energy consumption through targeted energy efficiency and demand initiatives. DSM is a powerful tool, as it can defer the need for new generation and has the potential to be as economic, if not more economic, than new generation.

For consumers, demand-side management is attractive as it can lower their total consumption of energy, which mitigates the impact of higher rates. Consumers who fully avail themselves of DSM measures have the potential to lower their total energy bill even as rates increase.

Manitoba Hydro prepares a 3-year DSM plan called Power Smart Plan on an annual basis in consultation with the Province of Manitoba as required by The Energy Savings Act. Through DSM, Manitoba Hydro expects to offset 86 per cent of the anticipated load growth to 2017.

Now, in 2014, Manitoba Hydro also prepared a 15-year supplementary plan. In that plan, Manitoba Hydro expects to offset 66 per cent of anticipated load growth to '28-29, saving approximately 1,136 megawatts of capacity.

To place this in perspective, the capacity savings in supplementary plan amount to more than 80 per cent of the net system capacity addition from the proposed Conawapa Project. Similarly, the annual dependable energy savings from the Power Smart Plan exceed 85 per cent of the dependable energy output from the proposed Conawapa Project. To achieve these electricity savings, Manitoba Hydro budgets \$822 million, which is less than 8 per cent of the \$10.7 billion cost of building Conawapa.

While The Energy Savings Act requires consultation with respect to Manitoba Hydro, the Province of Manitoba does not currently set mandatory DSM targets.

Manitoba Hydro treats DSM as a reduction in load forecast demand, rather than as an alternative resource to meet demand projections. This approach was criticized by an independent expert and several Interveners. In their view, DSM should have the same status as generation sources, and be evaluated as such for planning purposes. The panel shares that view. And thus Bill 19.

Manitoba Hydro dramatically increased its projected DSM savings in the course of the NFAT Review. The Panel is uncertain that these projections can be achieved by Manitoba Hydro. However, this risk is mitigated by the Panel's recommendation to proceed with a 2019 in-service date for the Keeyask Project, which will provide sufficient energy and capacity to meet needs if projected savings do not fully materialize.

Manitoba Hydro's DSM targets appear to be overly aggressive in the short term, and overly conservative in the long term. While incremental DSM savings are projected to be significant in the first few years of the plan, they ultimately tail off. Other jurisdictions have reported that achieving sustainable annual incremental targets of 1.2-1.5 per cent of forecast load is possible.

Manitoba Hydro, formerly a leader in DSM initiatives, has been surpassed by a number of other jurisdictions. Jurisdictions that are DSM leaders have separated DSM-delivery entities with clear targets and accountability measures to achieve such targets.

The Panel concludes there is an inherent conflict in Manitoba Hydro, being both a seller of electricity and a purveyor of energy efficiency measures. A separate external regulated entity is required to develop the implement energy efficiency measures and monitor their effectiveness. Such an entity

should be subject to regular external audits to confirm DSM savings.

Examples of similar arrangements exist in—

An Honourable Member: A point of order.

* (22:50)

Point of Order

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Fletcher, on a point of order.

Mr. Fletcher: Are we all going to read the documents that we're submitting, because if we are, I would like to ask for additional time at 12 o'clock.

Mr. Chairperson: It's the prerogative of the members to read if they want.

It's not a point of order. I rule it not a point of order.

* * *

Mr. Schuler: A separate externally regulated entity is required to develop and implement energy efficiency measures and monitor their effectiveness. Such an entity should be subject to regular external audits to confirm DSM savings.

Examples of similar arrangements exist in other North American jurisdictions. The electricity savings delivered through an independent, arm's-length entity would constitute an additional resource available to Manitoba Hydro to meet energy needs.

I felt it very important that the committee hear this. This is the document that the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Selinger), the former premier, based his decision to support DSM. That was while he still supported it; now, he evidently may or may not support it. It is what the discussion has been about. It is what convinced our party and has convinced us all the way through that we should be doing.

Of course, there's a much fuller document dealing with demand-side management, but I don't think the committee would give me enough time to read the entire document. This is like an executive summary, and I felt it was very important, because it certainly lays out the rationale of why we've begun this. And we've spent all evening talking about all the different risks.

I know the committee is convinced, and we're probably ready to move on and support this dynamic piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairperson: Are there any other questions on clause 1?

An Honourable Member: Yes.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Fletcher.

Mr. Fletcher: I thank the minister for reading that document. I will table my documents out of respect for the committee, and I hope to also be able to introduce all the documents before time runs out, and rest assured, Mr. Chair, I will do that.

The—what we just described is actually correct. We are, at Manitoba Hydro, very susceptible to drought. That's part of—that's a big risk, and we've been fortunate that 15 out of the last 17 years have been over the average rainfall, but that will change and that makes what—when you bring that into the equation, that is the case against decide—demand-side management, because with a drought, with the excess supply, we still don't achieve anything, because there's always going to be a next—more supply, particularly if you go five years out. The likelihood of a drought in the next five years—not so sure; over the next 20 years, probably. But supply far exceeds demand.

As far as the—and I am pleased, therefore, Mr. Chair, to table Manitoba Hydro's 2017-18, '18-19 general application, appendix 5.4—not to be mixed up with appendix 5.5. This was April, 2017.

This is—again I have three copies and I encourage people to go to page 38 in this as it—and as it describes the demand-side management. Now, as you get deeper into it, you can see, no matter where you are at the—in this debate, that there are huge advantages to co-ordinating demand-side management with the usage of energy, which Hydro does. So, at peak demand, you could use some of these measures to reduce demand—when there's excess supply, maybe not. And there are ways to do this through the rates, through monitoring. But, to do it as two separate corporations competing against each other, like, it just doesn't make any sense.

To do demand-side management properly, you need to have a integrated approach with the supplier in a monopoly situation, and that's the same for gas. And that's common sense, because in a monopoly, there's—the incentive is to work together, right, because in a monopoly, they are there to serve the shareholders, which is the people of Manitoba. So demand-side management and supply-side management and producers and GHGs, they all come together, and we're a unique situation in Manitoba, if that is your goal, to deal with it within Manitoba Hydro.