

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 15 July, 1987.

Time — 1:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Madam Speaker, I beg to present the Fourth Report of the Standing Committee on Economic Development.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Your committee met on Tuesday, April 28, 1987 in Room 255 of the Legislative Building and on Tuesday, July 14, 1987 in Room 254 of the Legislative Building to consider the Annual Reports of Channel Area Loggers Ltd., Moose Lake Loggers Ltd., and the Communities Economic Development Fund.

Mr. George Kemp, President, and Mr. Gordon P. Trithart, Secretary-Treasurer, provided such information as was requested by members of the committee with respect to the financial statements and the business of Channel Area Loggers Ltd.

Mr. Clement Jones, President, and Mr. R.J. Kivisto, General Manager, provided such information as was requested by members of the committee with respect to the financial statements and the business of Moose Lake Loggers.

Ms. Barbara Bruce, Chairperson, Mr. Hugh Jones, General Manager, and Mr. Ted Chiswell, Manager of Finance, provided such information as was requested by members of the committee with respect to the financial statements and the business of the Communities Economic Development Fund.

Your committee considered the Annual Reports of Channel Area Loggers Ltd., Moose Lake Loggers Ltd., and the Communities Economic Development Fund for the fiscal year ended 31 March, 1986 and has adopted the same as presented.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Madam Speaker, I beg to report and present the First Report of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

MR. CLERK: Your committee met on Thursday, July 9 at 10:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m.; Friday, July 10 at 2:30 p.m. and 8:00 p.m.; and Monday, July 13 at 2:30 p.m. and 7:00 p.m., 1987, in Room 255 of the Legislative Building. Your committee elected Mr. C. Santos as Chairperson at the 10:00 a.m. meeting of Thursday, July 9, 1987.

Your committee heard representations on Bill No. 47 - The Human Rights Code; Code des droits de la personne, as follows:

Mr. David Swan - Private Citizen
Ms. Joyce Rankin - Lobby for the Inclusion of Sexual Orientation in the Human Rights Code
Mr. Stefan Fedorowich, Mr. Rob Samoiloff and Ms. Lynette Reid - Winnipeg Gay/Lesbian Youth
Mr. Sidney Green - Manitoba Progressive Party
Mr. Chris Vogel - Gays for Equality
Mr. Phillip Graham - Oscar Wilde Memorial Society
Mr. Rick North - Winnipeg Gay Media Collective
Dr. A.E. Millward - The Council on Homosexuality and Religion
Mr. Lyle Dick - Project LAMBDA Inc.
Mr. Nick Ternette - Urban Resource Centre Inc.
Mr. Abe Arnold and Mr. Harry Peters - Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties
Ms. Marilyn Wolovick - Manitoba Action Committee on the Status of Women
Mr. Edward Lipsett - Private Citizen
Mrs. Audrey McLennan - The United Church of Canada - The Conference of Manitoba and Northwestern Ontario
Ms. Judy Tozeland - Manitoba Association of Social Workers
Mr. David Swan - AFFIRM
Mrs. Betty Gross - Private Citizen
Mr. Horst Backe - Winnipeg Gay Community Health Centre Inc.
Ms. Mona Brown - Manitoba Association of Women and the Law
Mr. Darryl Kippen - Private Citizen
Ms. Bev Suek - Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women
Ms. Judy Balabas - Manitoba Teachers' Society
Mr. Glen Murray and Mr. Ron Harris - Village Clinic
Mr. Walter Buchko - Private Citizen
Ms. Judy Hill - Klinik Community Health Centre
Ms. Shirley Tervo - Klinik Community Health Centre
Ms. Susan Smiel - University of Winnipeg Women's Centre
Ms. Chi Emerawa - University of Winnipeg Students Association
Mr. Mark Hughes - Private Citizen
Ms. Shellyse Szakacs - University of Manitoba Women's Centre
Ms. Manuela Dias - University of Manitoba Women's Studies Association
Mr. Jake Bergen - Private Citizen

Mr. Ron MacLean - Private Citizen
Mr. Eric Anderson - Private Citizen
Mr. John Dean - Private Citizen
Mr. Davie MacLean - Private Citizen
Mrs. Ethel Beck - The Lydia Fellowship Inc. of Canada
Mr. Michael Aquin - Private Citizen
Mr. Kelly Stephens - Private Citizen
Mr. Peter Hagenlocher - Private Citizen
Mr. Rick Schmidt - Private Citizen
Ms. Kathy Hanan - Private Citizen
Mr. Ken DeLisle - Dignity Winnipeg
Mrs. Anne MacLean - Private Citizen
Mr. Jonathan Much - Private Citizen
Mr. David Neufeld - Private Citizen
Mr. Wayne Charski - Private Citizen
Mr. John Neufeld - Private Citizen
Mr. Reinhard Neufeld - Private Citizen
Ms. Rhoda Neufeld - Private Citizen
Mr. Karl Neufeld - Private Citizen
Tye and Nancy Gamey - Private Citizens
Mr. Rhéal Hébert - Private Citizen
Mrs. Terry Lion - Private Citizen
Ms. Denise Shavin - Private Citizen
Mr. Larry Licharson - Big Brothers Association of Winnipeg
Ms. Alison Norberg - Charter of Rights Coalition
Mr. Gerry Brydon - Private Citizen
Ms. Rhonda Chorney - Lesbian Phone Line
Mr. Ross Davidson - Gay Fathers of Winnipeg
Dr. Lois Beckwith - Planned Parenthood of Manitoba
Ms. Julie Enyingi - Planned Parenthood of Manitoba
Mrs. Wendy Woodcock - Real Women of Canada
Mr. Dennis Hennessey - Private Citizen
Mr. Ken McGhie - Private Citizen
Mr. Tom Cohoe - Private Citizen
Mr. George Feenstra - Private Citizen
Mr. Randy Wengel - Private Citizen
Mrs. Louise Bromley - Private Citizen
Mr. Cornie Friesen - Private Citizen
Rev. Kenneth Heppner - Pastors' Evangelical Fellowship
Mr. Joe Taylor - Private Citizen
Mr. Joseph Caulfield - Christian Council and Service
Mr. Ken DeLisle - Private Citizen
Mr. David Bloom - Private Citizen
Pastor Dan Neufeld - Glencross EMMC Church
Ms. Marietta Harms - Private Citizen
Ms. Pamela Walford - Private Citizen
Ms. Dolly MacDonald - Metropolitan Community Church of Winnipeg
Ms. Kris Purdy - Private Citizen
Mrs. Evangeline Neufeld - Private Citizen
Mrs. Keith-Louise Fulton - Private Citizen
Ms. Lieselotte Mueller - Private Citizen
Mr. Will Feldbusch - Private Citizen
Mr. Ed Plett - Private Citizen
Dr. James Romeyn - Private Citizen
Mr. Don Van Leewen - Private Citizen
Mr. Arden Boville - Private Citizen
Rev. Bob Haverluck - Private Citizen
Rev. Ken Voth - Private Citizen
Mr. Edward Tetrault - Private Citizen
Mr. Len Alexiuk - Private Citizen
Ms. Darlene Wiptenberg - Private Citizen
Mr. Ed Enns - Private Citizen
Ms. Ann Kent - Private Citizen
Ms. Margaret Reimer - Private Citizen
Mrs. Gretta Friesen - Private Citizen
Mr. Charles Quappe - Private Citizen
Mr. Lloyd Bloomer - Private Citizen
Ms. Brenda Labalu - Private Citizen
Mr. Lee McLeod - Private Citizen
Mr. Alphanne Carbone - Private Citizen
Mrs. June Fetterly-Weibe - Private Citizen
Mrs. Joy Kulik - Private Citizen
Mr. William Smith - Private Citizen
Mrs. Mary Fetterly - Private Citizen
Rev. Robin Pifer - Private Citizen
Mrs. Joy Milne - Private Citizen
Mr. Ervin Natchigall - Private Citizen
Mr. Geoff Casey - Private Citizen
Ms. Francine Bouchard - Private Citizen
Rev. John Oldham - Private Citizen
Ms. Noreen Stevens - Private Citizen
Mr. Peter Williams - Private Citizen
Mr. John Genaille - Private Citizen
Ms. Susan Taylor - Private Citizen
Ms. Debra Beauchamp - Private Citizen
Mr. John McKenzie - Private Citizen
Mr. Wes Woodcock - Private Citizen
Mr. Ray Schmidt - Private Citizen
Ms. Rozalia Bugan - Private Citizen
Rose and Paul Dubois - Private Citizens
Mr. Kell Frandsem - Private Citizen
Ms. Denise Suncan - Private Citizen
Mrs. Nancy Armstrong - Private Citizen
Mrs. Una Johnstone - Private Citizen
Mrs. Bertha Mackenzie - Private Citizen
Mr. Jake Durksen - Private Citizen
Mr. Tim O'Rourke - Private Citizen
Mr. Larry McCrady - Private Citizen
Mr. Art Cornelson - Private Citizen
Mr. Lorn Bergstresser - Private Citizen
Mr. Harry Koop - Private Citizen
Ms. Joan Miller - Private Citizen
Mr. Stuart McKelvie - Private Citizen
Mrs. Eva Kalteck - Private Citizen
Ms. Kim Gross - Private Citizen
Ms. Sally Papso - Private Citizen
Mr. Gordon Gray - Private Citizen
Ms. Marilyn Robertson - Private Citizen
Ms. Shirley Lippmann - Private Citizen
Rev. Graham Tyson - Private Citizen
Mr. Allen Smith - Private Citizen
Ms. Deborah Dworan - Private Citizen
Mr. Nick Jones - Private Citizen
Ms. Joanne Chesley - Private Citizen
Pastor Garth McGinn - Grant Memorial Baptist Church
Mrs. Gwen Parker - Manitoba Women's Institute
Pastor Lloyd Peters - Steinbach Ministerial Association
Mr. Lloyd Peters - Private Citizen
Mr. John Martens - Private Citizen
Mr. Kurt McGifford - Private Citizen
Mr. Dave Perry - Private Citizen
Ms. Mary Barton - Private Citizen
Mr. Rick Hefford - Private Citizen

Wednesday, 15 July, 1987

Dr. Tom Snowdon - Social Concerns Committee of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada - Manitoba and Northwestern Ontario
Mr. Davie MacLean - Morality in the Nation
Mr. Dave Derksen - Private Citizen
Miss Debra Esau - Private Citizen
Mr. Randy Loewen - Private Citizen
Ms. Heidi Munech - Private Citizen
Mr. Michael McDermott - Private Citizen
Pastor Ron Adrien - Winkler and District Ministerial Association
Mrs. Dora Adrien - Private Citizen
Mr. Peter Toews - Private Citizen
Mr. Abe Peters - Private Citizen
Mr. George Hildebrand - Private Citizen
Mr. Ron Epp - Private Citizen
Ms. Bonnie Kowal - Private Citizen
Mr. John McDonald - Private Citizen
Mr. Corney Hildebrandt - Private Citizen
Mr. Robert Klassen - Winkler Evangelical Mennonite Mission Church
Mr. Bob Toogood - Springs of Living Water Center
Ms. Margaret Cogill - Private Citizen
Ms. Margot Johnston - Private Citizen
Mr. Mark Fewster - Private Citizen
Mrs. Ruth Gamble - Private Citizen

Written Submissions:

Mr. Alin Senecal-Harkin - Private Citizen
Ms. Beverley Scott - Families of Gays
Ms. Doris Friesen - Private Citizen
Ms. Claire Toews - Private Citizen
Mr. Edward Lipsett - Private Citizen
Mr. John Alexander - Private Citizen
Mrs. Wendy Woodcock - Real Women of Canada, Manitoba Chapter
Mr. James Saltvold - Private Citizen
Mr. Robert Clague - Private Citizen
Mrs. J. Renton - Private Citizen
Mr. and Mrs. J. Nemez - Private Citizens
Ms. Linda Smith - Private Citizen
Mr. Ron Krahn - Private Citizen
Rev. Roy Campbell - Central Canada Baptist Conference
Mr. Glen Murray - Village Clinic
Mrs. Stella Carson - Private Citizen
Mrs. Elizabeth Grahm - Private Citizen
Mr. Tom Johnson - Private Citizen
Mrs. Jean McGinn - Private Citizen

Your committee has considered:

Bill No. 47 - The Human Rights Code; Code des droits de la personne

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: I move, seconded by the Member for Inkster, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Ashton, Baker, Bucklaschuk, Carstairs, Cowan, Desjardins, Doer, Dolin, Evans, Harapiak (Swan River), Harapiak (The Pas), Harper, Hemphill, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Maloway, Parasiuk, Pawley, Penner, Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Smith (Ellice), Smith (Osborne), Storie, Walding, Wasylcyia-Leis.

NAYS

Birt, Blake, Connery, Cummings, Derkach, Downey, Driedger, Ducharme, Enns, Ernst, Filmon, Hammond, Johnston, Kovnats, McCrae, Mercier, Mitchelson, Nordman, Oleson, Orchard, Pankratz, Rocan, Roch.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 29; Nays, 23.

MADAM SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly carried. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I beg to present the Third Report of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources.

MR. CLERK: Your committee met on Tuesday, March 24 at 10:00 a.m.; Thursday, March 26 at 10:00 a.m.; Thursday, June 25 at 10:00 a.m.; Tuesday, July 14 at 10:00 a.m.; and Tuesday, July 14 at 8:00 p.m., 1987, in Room 255 of the Legislative Building to consider the Annual Report of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ending 31 October, 1986. At the 10:00 a.m. meeting of Tuesday, July 14, your committee elected Mr. D. Scott as Chairperson.

Messrs. Robert Silver, President and General Manager, Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation; Fred Jackson, Provincial Auditor; and Rick Mayer, Director of Special Audits, provided such information as was requested by members of the committee with respect to the Annual Report and business of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation.

Your committee examined the Annual Report for the fiscal year ended 31 October, 1986 of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation and adopted the same as presented.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Thompson, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, I'd like to table the Summary of Findings and Recommendations of the Internal Review into the Infant Death of "Baby Desiree."

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Madam Speaker.

I beg leave to table the report of the Manitoba Law Reform Commission on the subject, "Periodic Payment of Damages for Personal Injury and Death."

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I beg leave to table the Actuarial Report on the Group Insurance Fund for Employees of Participating Municipalities in Manitoba, as at January 1, 1986; and I wish to table the Annual Report 1986-87, for the year ending March 31, 1987, of the Surface Rights Board.

RETURNS TO ORDERS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cooperative Development.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I'd like to table a Return to Order No. 9, on the motion of the Honourable Member for Emerson, dated March 11, 1987; and Return to Order No. 11, on the motion of the Honourable Member for Emerson, dated May 19, 1987.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES (Cont'd)

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. G. ROCH: I beg leave, Madam Speaker, to revert back to Presenting Reports. (Agreed)

Madam Speaker, I beg to present the Third Report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

MR. CLERK: Your committee met on Tuesday, July 14, 1987, at 8:00 p.m. in Room 254 of the Legislative Building. Your committee elected Mr. G. Roch as Chairperson.

Your committee heard representations on bills as follows:

Bill No. 49 - An Act to amend The Real Estate Brokers Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les courtiers en immeubles

Mr. W.G. Burns - Manitoba Real Estate Association

Bill No. 59 - An Act to amend The Mental Health Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la santé mentale

Mr. Tom Cohoe - Private Citizen

Ms. Shawn Greenberg - Legal Aid Manitoba

Mr. Tony Dalmyn - Canadian Mental Health Association (Manitoba Division)

Mr. Henry Elias - Private Citizen

Mr. Harry Peters - Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties

Dr. Marilyn McKay - Manitoba Psychiatry Association

Dr. Jay Brolund - Psychological Association of Manitoba

Dr. Jim Brown - Group of General Hospital Heads of Psychiatry

Dr. Werner W. Hunzinger - Grace Hospital Head of Psychiatry

Ms. Sharon Jorgenson - Association of Occupational Therapists of Manitoba

Ms. Denise Higgs, Private Citizen

Bill No. 70 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les écoles publiques

Mr. Art Reimer - Manitoba Teachers' Society

Bill No. 72 - An Act to amend The Child and Family Services Act (2); Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille (2)

Mr. Harry Peters - Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties

Mr. and Mrs. Lee and Agnes St. Hilaire - Victims of Child Abuse Laws

Ms. Darlene Hogue - Private Citizen

Ms. Mary Dolman - Private Citizen

Your committee has considered:

Bill No. 24 - An Act to amend The Corporations Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les corporations

Bill No. 38 - An Act to amend The Law Society Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société du Barreau

Bill No. 48 - An Act to repeal Certain Unrepealed and Unconsolidated Public General Statutes and Parts of Statutes (1871-1969); Loi abrogeant certaines lois générales d'intérêt public non abrogées et non codifiées et certaines parties de loi (1871-1969)

Bill No. 49 - An Act to amend The Real Estate Brokers Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les courtiers en immeubles

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your committee has also considered:

Bill No. 35 - An Act to amend The Child and Family Services Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille

Bill No. 37 - An Act to amend The Liquour Control Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la réglementation des alcools

Bill No. 40 - The Human Tissue Act; Loi sur les tissus humains

Bill No. 42 - An Act to amend The Construction Industry Wages Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les salaires dans l'industrie de la construction

Wednesday, 15 July, 1987

Bill No. 46 - The Charter Compliance Statute Amendment Act, 1987; Loi de 1987 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives afin d'assurer le respect de la Charte

Bill No. 59 - An Act to amend The Mental Health Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la santé mentale

Bill No. 60 - An Act to amend The Anatomy Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Anatomie

Bill No. 62 - An Act to amend The Insurance Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les assurances

Bill No. 69 - The Statute Law Amendment Act (1987); Loi de 1987 modifiant le droit statutaire

Bill No. 70 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les écoles publiques

Bill No. 72 - An Act to amend The Child and Family Services Act (2); Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille (2)

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. G. ROCH: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Riel, that the report of the committee now be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Bill No. 47 - free vote in caucus

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Premier.

In view of the fact that former Premier and former Governor-General Ed Schreyer, a former respected member of the Premier's party, has voiced his objection to the inclusion of sexual orientation in The Manitoba Human Rights Act, will the Premier now change his rigid stance and allow the members of his party in government to have a free vote, so that they can vote in accordance with their consciences and in accordance with their religious and moral convictions on this issue?

A MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I don't believe that the Leader of the Opposition should read too many thoughts of his own into the comments by Mr. Schreyer. According to the reports, Mr. Schreyer opposed excessively defined rights and privileges but understood the need to protect homosexuals from abuse, then later acknowledged he had not yet had an opportunity to read the legislation.

So, under those circumstances, I believe it to be unfair, on the part of the Leader of the Opposition, to read an interpretation into those remarks that fit into his particular partisan approach on this issue in the House.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, the Premier may not respect Mr. Schreyer's views, but I believe that there are many members . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. G. FILMON: . . . of his caucus who do understand and respect Mr. Schreyer's views on this issue. Will he now allow them to demonstrate that respect as well as their religious and moral convictions by voting against the gay rights amendment?

HON. H. PAWLEY: I want to say very clearly to the Leader of the Opposition that I respect the views of Mr. Schreyer. Members on this side respect the views of Ed Schreyer.

Regrettably, honourable members across the way for years and years have demonstrated a lack of respect for the views of Ed Schreyer and this province, so we don't have to listen to any suggestions from the Leader of the Opposition in that respect.

Madam Speaker, insofar as the second part of the question, that has been dealt with several times in this House and is a matter that is not a subject of discussion in this Chamber.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Bill No. 47 - request Premier withdraw

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, the Premier should not be dragged, once more, by the Attorney-General into an issue that is against the wishes of the vast majority of Manitobans.

In view of the fact that Mr. Schreyer has said: "In my opinion, if allowed to become too visible in society it" - meaning homosexuality - "cannot help but have a negative and detrimental effect on the younger generation," will the Premier not reconsider his intransigent stand and withdraw this legislation?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I regret that the Leader of the Opposition appears to be intent on reading something into the legislation that is not in the legislation. We all know why the Leader of the Opposition is doing that - for his own shrill partisan reasons.

I think it's regrettable that the Leader of the Opposition would clearly not stand in his place and say: I, along with most reasonable-thinking Manitobans object to any group of citizens being categorized as Class B citizens, and the rest of Manitobans being categorized as Class A citizens. All citizens in the Province of Manitoba ought to enjoy equal access to the basic elementary rights in our society; such as, the right to a cup of coffee, the right to a meal in a restaurant, the right to a job.

Bill No. 47 - free vote in caucus

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, for the Premier.

In view of the fact that Mr. Schreyer has said: "A half century ago the law might not have provided enough protection to these people, but I'm not so sure that we can't go too far in talking about all kinds of accessibly defined rights and privileges," Madam Speaker, will the Premier now admit that he is going against the wishes of the vast majority of Manitobans and allow his members to express their views, and the views of their constituents by voting against this bill?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, order please.

That question is repetitious.

Order please, order please. Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition's question is out of order. It's repetitious.

MTX - RCMP Report - tabling of

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, that's a pity.

Madam Speaker, my question is for the Attorney-General.

The Attorney-General promised, twice last week, that the report of the RCMP investigation into MTX would be available at the beginning of this week. Will he table that report now?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Madam Speaker, if I had it, I would certainly table it and my undertaking is a solemn undertaking on the record, and I will follow it. I expect to receive it either later today, or at the latest, tomorrow.

**Defamation suit against Premier -
Supreme Court appeal**

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I have another question for the Premier.

I wonder if the Premier can indicate to the House whether or not he is appealing to the Supreme Court the decision on defamation against him by the Manitoba Court of Appeal, and the legal action by Grant Russell.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is a personal matter.

MR. D. ORCHARD: What do you mean?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that the . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that the action . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . came as a result of a news conference which the Premier . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

I haven't recognized the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

I'd also like to inform the House that I'm having some trouble with the sound equipment in terms of hearing, so I'd appreciate if the honourable members would keep the background noise down until we get it repaired so I can hear the question and the answer.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Yes, Madam Speaker.

In view of the fact that the comment, which resulted in the action by Mr. Russell, took place at a news conference held in this building, Room 68B, and stated by this Premier; in view of the fact that he was sued as Premier of this province for his statements against Mr. Russell; in view of the fact that his entire legal action has been covered by the taxpayers paid insurance plan that covers him in this issue, will he now indicate whether or not it is his plan to appeal that decision on defamation against him, to the Supreme Court of Canada?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, clearly the Leader of the Opposition ought to be aware that if there's a decision made to appeal that particular judgment, there'll be the filing of appropriate documents in the appropriate public forum, in the prothonotary's office across the street. There will be a public indication at that time of intent to appeal.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, is the Premier indicating that he doesn't know whether or not he is going to appeal this decision?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition would demonstrate just a little bit of patience, he will know in the appropriate and due course - the Leader of the Opposition need not get too wrought up, but can exercise a little patience and he will know in due course.

I thank you for your concern.

**Francophone Summit - full
representation from Manitoba**

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Premier.

In September of this year in Quebec City a Francophone Summit will be held, but in the past our Provincial Government has never had a full and equal participation, preferring to send backbenchers as observers, rather than front benchers as full participants. Madam Speaker, I would ask the Premier whether in this summit Manitoba will send a full delegation, including members of the Treasury Benches, in order that we will have equal representation with our sister francophone provinces, or share our francophone provinces?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I'll take that suggestion under review.

**Francophone Summit - delegation
from Trade and Tourism**

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Madam Speaker, a supplementary question to the First Minister.

Why will this government not send a delegation from Trade and Tourism to make representation at this convention which will be attended by some 800 delegates and 41 countries?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, again, the Leader of the Liberal Party, the Member for River Heights, raises what could very well be a constructive suggestion, and I thank her for that and will take it under consideration.

Cutback of beds - plans from hospitals

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Health.

The Minister of Health has directed all of the hospitals in Manitoba that they must not have a deficit. Many of the City of Winnipeg hospitals are currently developing budgetary plans involving massive bed cutbacks to accommodate that shortfall in funding that the province and this Minister of Health have placed upon them as a financial edict.

Can the Minister of Health indicate whether he has received plans from all those hospitals regarding bed cutbacks?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Let me, first of all, correct the honourable member who knows that he's misleading the House and trying, of course, to mislead the people . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Minister of Health please rephrase his question so he is not in any way accusing any member of deliberately misleading the House.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I didn't say "deliberate," but it is!

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Health just said that the Honourable Member for Pembina knows he was misleading the House, which should be withdrawn.

The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I will withdraw the term - what did I say? - "misrepresent."

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mislead.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: "Mislead," and I'll say that I would like to answer my honourable friend who purposely is making statements that are not correct.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, my honourable friend knows that this is not because of cuts; he knows that there's more money being spent in hospitals than ever before. This afternoon . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

Is the Honourable Minister continuing with his answer?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, I'd like to.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, there has never been more money spent . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, order please. Order please!

Would the Honourable Minister of Health make it very clear that he is not accusing the Honourable Member for Pembina of deliberately misleading the House. There are many words that are synonymous with "deliberate," like "knowingly" and "purposely."

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Of course, Madam Speaker, I'd be the last one to imply motives at all. I'm just saying that he purposely did not tell the truth when he made the statement.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

A MEMBER: And that is true.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, it is not a truthful statement.- (Interjection)- When you say that there has been a cut on hospitals . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order. Order please. Order please!

May I remind the Honourable Minister of Health that we cannot, under the parliamentary procedure, accuse another member of deliberately misleading the House or making untruthful statements.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, I'll withdraw again whatever you want me to withdraw, and I'll say, Madam Speaker, that my honourable friend, because of ignorance, is making statements that are not correct in this House, and I think that this should be corrected. I think this, that is, you know me - people all over Canada, Madam Speaker, are looking at the situation and the concern and the challenge that this generation will have to keep the best health care in the world, to try to get together. Maybe you should read about the conference that took place last week or so and everybody agrees on what should be done.

It is obvious that the members out here are - oh, jeez, I nearly slipped again. These people want the public

to think that there's all kinds of cuts. And I've shown him, in introducing my budget, Madam Speaker, how fast the increase, how fast it was going up. I've also made the statement that they know is correct, that the budget for the Commission is \$1.2 billion, and if we do nothing else but what we're doing now it will be \$2 billion. This afternoon, and yesterday afternoon, we hear these people talking about the deficit, the same people who are here are talking about closing beds and so on. They are making statements that we are talking about closing beds, and there has not been any beds closed.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

May I remind the Honourable Minister that answers to questions should be brief.

Closure of beds - when decision re

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, given that under the rein of the orderly cutback of health care services under this Minister and this Premier over the last five years; given that under those circumstances more hospital beds have been closed than ever in the entire history of the Province of Manitoba; when will this Minister have the courage to tell the people of Manitoba and this Legislative Assembly how many more beds are going to be cut permanently and closed permanently in the City of Winnipeg? Why is he hiding that from the people of Manitoba, who wish to enjoy good health care?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Reform and innovation are the enemy -(Interjection)- I didn't hear you.

MADAM SPEAKER: Perhaps if the Minister wouldn't start his answer before he's recognized, he'd hear me recognize him.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I apologize for that also.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Okay now - go?

Reform and innovation are the enemy of those with a stake in the status quo who are unlikely to be moved by false political will and bureaucratic leadership. Madam Speaker, there has been more money spent on beds, on institutions, on anything. My honourable friends, do you remember the Spivak Commission, remember that? I won't imply any motives, but he just said, close everything; if it's got a door on it, close it and if it's got a hole on it, fill it; and if it's not started - and these are the people that have been talking about what they've done in the field of health. They do not want to see change.

You know, that's the biggest, dumbest, political manoeuvre they've ever made also, because if, by a miracle, if they ever come on this side, they'll be stuck with a problem; then they'll be asking for non-partisan

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, we're now down to only a few members clapping when the Minister of Health talks about bed cutbacks in the NDP Government.

Madam Speaker, this Minister is going to, obviously, hide the truth from the people of Manitoba as long as he can on the bed cutbacks.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for Pembina also should not impute motives or accuse Ministers of deliberately hiding things as long as they can.

Would the honourable member please rephrase his question?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, given that we may well finish this Session shortly and the NDP . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, didn't you ask the member to withdraw those awful things he said about me?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, I believe you asked me to rephrase my question, and I am doing exactly that if the Minister had the patience to listen and the courtesy to listen.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member with a question.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, this Minister has presided already over more bed cuts in the Province of Manitoba than any other Minister of Health in the history of this province.

Madam Speaker, when will this Minister be telling the people of Manitoba, under this wonderful sharing and caring hand-holding New Democratic Party Government, how many more beds are going to be cut? Again, Madam Speaker, I note that the Premier is clapping and laughing about the prospect of bed cuts in the Province of Manitoba.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Unfortunately, I can't accept the praise from my honourable friend. I haven't been that successful in bringing changes to the plan. This is what is needed, yes, Madam Speaker, to keep people healthy, to go to prevention more than curing, to get people in the community, to give care in the community and to close beds. If you're going to spend money for improving the diagnostics in this province, then there is no point in doing that if you don't close beds. I know this is difficult. I know that it is very easy - and I'm not accusing anybody, God forbid - but I know how easy it is to tell the people, because the people love what they have and it's very difficult to say why you're fixing it if it ain't broke.

The point is there's no problem now with this plan. It is still one of the best, if not the best plan in the world, but we have to think about it now. We will not be able to keep what we have and we are not giving the best service possible. We will improve that when the people can stay in the community, can live a life

away from an institution for years and years and years. That is what we're trying.

We might make some mistakes, but we'll work with the medical profession to try to bring capitation, to try that; to have community clinics where maybe we can have nurses giving primary care, Madam Speaker, and to improve the home care and the diagnostic equipment and so on in the hospitals and get people out of institutions as much as possible. That is the aim.

Now to say that we've closed, we haven't closed any. We have told the hospitals that they should . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We've committed a sin; we've asked the hospitals to stay within their budgets.

Removal of Min. of Health and Deputy Min.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, a question to the Premier.

Given the Premier's self-admission earlier in that long answer that he has failed in his duties as Health Minister; given that he hasn't provided community-based services in mental health; and given that he hasn't expanded the community-based services in the health care system in general, is the Premier, after this Session, planning to remove the Minister of Health and his Deputy Minister and replace both of them?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, obviously, the Member for Pembina . . .

Madam Speaker, there's lobbying on all sides of me, opposite to me, on both sides.

But, clearly, the record of the Minister of Health in this government is one that I believe is one that we all endorse; one which has ensured that there indeed be improvements to the health care system in this province; has demonstrated the need for innovative and creative new approaches insofar as health care in the Province of Manitoba; has indicated the need to emphasize home-based, community-based health care as opposed to institutional care; has emphasized the need for prevention as an alternative to sole emphasis insofar as the curing emphasis.

Madam Speaker, I am surprised at the kind of comments that we have been . . . I shouldn't say that. I'm never surprised at anything the Honourable Member for Pembina should raise in this House, but I thought that we might have expected just a little different approach today from the Member for Pembina.

Child and Family Services - implementation of planning and coordination

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Community Services arising out of

the investigative report she tabled with the House today into the infant death of Baby Desiree.

The report indicates that this baby, it was found that her ultimate placement in her aunt's home materialized by default, and that while there were four agencies involved with the aunt's family in December of 1985, there was an absence of any joint planning or coordination of their efforts to serve the family.

The Sigurdson-Reid Report tabled in this House a few months ago, Madam Speaker, indicated there was no department planning with respect to this whole area.

Can the Minister now assure us that after numerous reports and complaints and infant deaths, that her department will provide the coordination that has been sadly lacking in the system that this government brought in three or four years ago?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, we agree that the coordination among the agencies is absolutely essential, particularly when we're dealing with highly mobile families. The Child Registry is one tool, the computerized information system is another. But the requirement and the holding the agencies accountable for reporting to one another and following through on their coordination obligations is top priority. We have communicated that to them and we will be monitoring it closely.

Child abuse - risk assessment - worker not to be hired

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, the ultimate responsibility must be this Minister and her department, as it was pointed out in the Sigurdson-Reid Report. Her department was totally lacking in procedures, in policies dealing with this whole area.

Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that the report indicates that there was little evidence on the part of the assigned worker of any understanding of the impact and implications of the failure of these placements on either of the children, and that there was also a lack of action on the part of the worker to apprehend the children, and to provide a permanent plan for their care, and that he demonstrated a lack of skills and planning ability, in terms of assessing the high risk involved in the case.

Madam Speaker, we have had complaint after complaint, report after report, with respect to the need for training with the deficiencies and the whole idea of a generic social worker and the lack of resources for agencies.

Can the Minister now assure us that some steps will be taken immediately to ensure that we don't have this kind of worker, working with infants in high-risk situations in this province?

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, there are general protection standards in place, and there have been since 1978. What Reid-Sigurdson said was that they weren't refined in terms of specifics relating to abuse. But in the case of Desiree it was general protection standards that were not being followed. The worker in question, in fact, used to work under the old system.

He was one of the older workers and could reasonably have been expected to have the very skills. We do hold the agency accountable for not ensuring that there was proper supervision and permanency planning as called for under the new legislation.

With regard to the notion of generic workers, the legislation and the direction from the government has never said that there has to be a shift to generic. We really expect a flexible pattern, a mixture of people with special skills and those with generic skills.

Trainers have been hired by the government; they have developed a curriculum; it will be fully ready for use this fall. It's been developed in ongoing consultation with the agencies. In the interim, there have been extensive training sessions held with staff and with board people on the abuse issue.

Madam Speaker, it's this government who's taken the initiative to deal with the issue of child abuse. Madam Speaker, the members opposite rise to that issue, but what did they do to even identify the issue or start to build a system? Had more been done in their period of time we wouldn't have had so much to do.

Madam Speaker, we are committed to building a system capable of dealing with child abuse, and hopefully in time, preventing it.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, the government's record is clear over the past four or five years. The Minister's comments need no further rebuttal.

Child Abuse Unit - discussion of

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, I'd ask the final supplementary question to the Attorney-General.

When the Reid-Sigurdson Report was introduced, I asked him, with respect to one of the recommendations, whether he would meet with the Winnipeg City Policy and Winnipeg authorities, with regard to their recommendation to beef up the Child Abuse Unit of the Winnipeg City Police.

In view of the fact that I note that a committee of counsel has received a report recommending against the recommendation of the Reid-Sigurdson Report to beef up the child abuse unit, could the Attorney-General indicate whether he has discussed this matter with his chief of the City of Winnipeg Police Force or the mayor or other responsible councillor in that area?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, I'd like to repeat that when members opposite start talking about the government record, they operate on the innuendo and the assumption that because we're starting to tackle a problem, that we should have completely and perfectly achieved it.

Madam Speaker, for members opposite to talk that way when they didn't even identify and start to build the mechanism for dealing with this issue, I find completely hypocritical.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, this Minister has been a complete loser in that whole area. We just had

an Ombudsman Report tabled in this House yesterday condemning every aspect of her department.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. G. MERCIER: She has just used a word, Madam Speaker, that I suggest is unparliamentary and I ask that you ask her to withdraw it.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, with respect, I, in the heat of the moment, did use an unparliamentary word and I do apologize.

I do also respect the sincerity of the members, in particular this member, in dealing with this issue; but what I would like to point out is that there was no record of identifying this issue or building a system capable of dealing with it when the Opposition was in power. Therefore, I do have trouble accepting it on face value, some of the criticisms levelled at this government which has undertaken to tackle the problem.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

On the particular point of order, that particular word is listed on both sides of the list in Beauchesne, and I would caution all members to be circumspect with their accusations.

I will check Hansard to see how the particular word was used.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, I did withdraw, regardless of your finding. I do believe I overstepped in the heat of the moment.

MADAM SPEAKER: Thank you very much.

Child molestation - reduction of age of consent to 14

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. D. ROCAN: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, given that the NDP Justice critic in Ottawa, Svend Robinson, said that the federal child molestation bill discriminates on the basis of sexual orientation by making the age of consent to sexual acts to 14, except for buggery, for which the age of consent will be 18, my question to the Attorney-General, Madam Speaker: Is it the policy and/or intention of this government to reduce the age of consent for buggery to 14 years, as has been suggested by the NDP Justice critic in Ottawa?

MADAM SPEAKER: That question is not within the jurisdiction of . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. D. ROCAN: Sure it is.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: If I may be of some assistance to the Member for Turtle Mountain, I just want to make

it clear that I do not support the position of the Member for Burnaby; and with respect to the question, the Criminal Code is not within the jurisdiction of this province.

Sexual behaviour - is it policy to promote in young people

MR. D. ROCAN: A supplementary question, Madam Speaker.

Is it the policy of the government to continue to promote homosexual behaviour among Manitoba's young people?

HON. R. PENNER: Madam Speaker, this government does not promote behaviour of any particular group. In supporting the provision in The Human Rights Act against discrimination on political grounds, let it be clear that we're not promoting the Conservative Party. I want the record to make that absolutely clear. By favouring a clause prohibiting discrimination against the Conservatives, we are not promoting Conservatism.

Gay rights groups - no funding re teen-age homosexuality

MR. G. ROCAN: A final supplementary, Madam Speaker.

Will the government assure Manitobans that it will not fund gay rights groups whose efforts are directed to the promotion of teen-age homosexuality, contrary to the federal child molestation legislation?

MADAM SPEAKER: Could the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain please indicate to whom he is addressing the question?

MR. G. ROCAN: To the First Minister, Madam Speaker.

Will the First Minister assure Manitobans that it will not fund gay rights groups whose efforts are directed to the promotion of teen-age homosexuality, contrary to the federal child molestation legislation?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, we have never done what is attributed, and certainly have no intention of doing so in the future.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

Religious groups in province - legislation re religious freedom

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour, of which question I have given the Minister notice.

The Manitoba Labour Relations Act discriminates against people of certain religious faiths by forcing them

to be members of unions, which is against their religion. Yet the government wants to provide protection or special legislation for homosexuals, while at the same time discriminating against religious groups in this way.

Will the Minister be bringing in legislation in the next Session to make it so that these religious groups can enjoy religious freedom in this province?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I'm certain the honourable member did not intend to be misleading in the way he posed his question in the preamble. The Labour Relations Act does not provide for any discrimination on the basis of religious convictions.

What it does do is provide for an opting out of paying union dues where a person belongs to a religious group or has a religious conviction that is confirmed to be such that it is a requirement of that church group that the person not belong to a union, that they in effect be prohibited from belonging to a union or a like organization.

So, that is not providing for religious discrimination. What it does is provide an opportunity for someone who happens to belong to that kind of a faith, for the Labour Board after hearing the facts and if a determination of fact confirms that the person's religious belief prohibits them from belonging to a union, then they are released from that obligation. The money is paid to a charity instead of to the union.

So that is the basis of the law, and there are cases that come before the Labour Relations Board. They examine the facts. They did so in a couple of instances of cases that the honourable member referred to me. I've looked at the decisions and the decisions confirmed the facts in those cases and I believe that there is . . . - (Inaudible) . . .

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, the point of my question, which seems to be lost on the Minister, is that the requirement he speaks of refers to a preclusion in The Labour Relations Act, and that preclusion from joining a union has to mean excommunication from your church. Is that the test that this government uses; the only way that they can claim their religious rights is that they will be excommunicated if they join a union?

What I'm asking, Madam Speaker, is that the kind of requirement - churches don't want to excommunicate their members because they're members of unions, even though, through resolutions of church bodies, the position of those churches has been stated to be against the membership in unions or, in some cases, professional associations. Is the Minister and his government willing to lose an election for homosexuals, while not acting to protect religious people belonging to a very small number of churches in this province, Madam Speaker?

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I thought that my answer was very clear. I didn't want to repeat my words, but, Madam Speaker, I know that the question of the right of individuals who belong to particular religious groups, to be able to opt out of paying union dues and then have those dues paid to charity, was a

matter that was debated in this Legislature many years ago. There was agonizing over the concerns that were legitimately put on the legislative record many years ago, and there was the fashioning of this opportunity for an alternative for those people and that law has stood the test of time. It's fair and acceptable and I don't believe that it's necessary to make any change in it.

Homosexual rights first; religious freedom second

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, a question for the First Minister.

Do homosexual rights come first and religious freedom second in this province?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I hesitate to rise to answer such a foolish question from the Member for Brandon West. I'm not going to question the motive of the Member for Brandon West, maybe others will; I will not. All I can say, Madam Speaker, is that that is one of the most patently foolish questions that I've heard asked in this Chamber, ever since I've been elected in 1969.

Seeded acreage payments - Ottawa proposals considered

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, a number of farmers in the Interlake area are currently receiving letters from Ottawa, from the Federal Minister, the Hon. Mr. Wise - I'm directing this question to the Acting Minister of Agriculture or to the First Minister - advising them of Ottawa's willingness to help them in their claim for some assistance which they lost out on. Because of the inclement weather a year ago, they didn't get in on the seeded acreage payments that were made available. I would like to ask the Acting Minister, or indeed the First Minister, whether or not this government will not give serious consideration to these proposals that are being advanced by Ottawa?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I am aware that the Minister of Agriculture has had consultation with the Interlake farmers and has indeed expressed concern that the farmers of the area were not included in the benefits of the federal program because of the unseeded acreage, but I will take the specifics of the question as notice.

HON. H. ENNS: Madam Speaker, to the same Minister.

I wonder if I could meet with him later on and give him some of these particular letters that are coming to farmers in the Interlake and have the undertaking of the Acting Minister to pass it on to the Minister of Agriculture when he returns from his conference.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Yes, I would be pleased to meet and take those letters and indeed, if it would be useful, to pass on copies to the Federal Minister of Agriculture as well.

Border-town merchants re Saskatchewan exemption

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. L. DERKACH: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Finance.

On several occasions, I have stood in the House and I have asked the Minister of Finance to address a problem that has been created as a result of the Saskatchewan exemption on taxes for clothing and retail and dry goods. This problem has created an exodus of people from the border towns along the Saskatchewan area. My question to the Minister is: Now that the Saskatchewan Budget is in, is he prepared to address the situation that has been addressed to him on so many occasions?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I've been in fairly regular contact with the President of the Border Towns Business Association to discuss ongoing issues related to the matter that the member speaks of specifically, and other matters relating to taxation differences as they once existed between Saskatchewan and Manitoba. It is my intention to meet with representatives of that association in the near future.

I would also add that I have provided to members opposite information with respect to what is taking place with respect to retail sales returns on areas in general, in terms of the retail sales sector and particularly with respect to clothing merchants.

What we have seen is not a significant change in the situation as it exists for businesses in those communities as against other businesses in rural areas. So we're going to continue monitoring and discuss that with representatives of the businesses in that area.

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY COMMITTEE CHANGES

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: I would like to announce these committee changes, Madam Speaker, in Municipal Affairs:

The Hon. W. Parasiuk for the Hon. G. Lecuyer;
The Hon. J. Cowan for the Hon. J. Plohman;
M. Dolin for the Hon. J. Storie;
J. Maloway for the Hon. B. Uruski;
The Hon. J. Bucklaschuk for D. Scott.

HOUSE BUSINESS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, there is an agreement between the Opposition and government to call Bill No. 73, standing in the name of the Member for Brandon West, for Second Reading.

SECOND READING

BILL NO. 73 - AN ACT TO CONTINUE BRANDON UNIVERSITY FOUNDATION

MR. J. McCRAE presented Bill No. 73, An Act to Continue Brandon University Foundation; Loi prorogant la Fondation de L'Université de Brandon.

MOTION presented.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, thanks to the assistance and cooperation of the Minister of Education and the Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security, I am pleased to rise to move the Second Reading of Bill 73 to continue Brandon University Foundation.

We all support the aims and objectives of the Foundation, and I think it will not take very much time of the House to garner support among honourable members on all sides of the House for the operations and for the aims and objectives of the Brandon University Foundation.

Madam Speaker, the bill would continue the Foundation and give it a slightly narrower focus in the sense that in one of the clauses of the bill, the purpose of the Foundation will be changed. Inasmuch as it presently stands, the Foundation's purpose is to promote the advancement of higher education at Brandon University, in the City of Brandon and in surrounding areas.

Madam Speaker, what the bill would do would give that part of the Foundation's reason for being more of a focus, and that would be to be more specific and to make the Foundation's activities more and more focused just toward Brandon University, which is very much needed. We all know that universities are suffering these days in terms of funding. Brandon University Foundation is there and willing to help, and I think all the people of Westman will appreciate the efforts of the Foundation and support those efforts in bringing about a better regime in which Brandon University can operate.

Madam Speaker, the other major change that is in this bill is that at dissolution, should that ever happen, of the Foundation, instead of the proceeds of the assets and property of the Foundation going to a charitable organization, it would be transferred or assigned to Brandon University.

So I would commend this bill which, Madam Speaker, will be amended in the committee, I hope, with the cooperation of honourable members, to the extent that

three members of the Board of Governors will also be part of the directorship of the Foundation, and there are a couple of minor grammatical changes to be made to the bill as well in the committee.

So, Madam Speaker, I commend this bill to honourable members on all sides of the House, and I'm sure the bill will enjoy speedy passage through this House.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

HON. L. EVANS: Madam Speaker, just briefly, I want to stand in support of the passage of Bill 73 regarding the Brandon University Foundation, and to indicate the support of the government side for this particular measure.

Back in 1980, when the Brandon University Foundation bill was first brought into this House for passage, at that time some of us in the Opposition had some concerns. I expressed my views at that time about what I perceived to be some of the weaknesses in the proposed Brandon University Foundation Act, and I'm pleased to note that this bill today goes a fair way to meeting those objections. The Member for Brandon West made reference to some of these improvements.

For instance, there's no longer any reference to lifetime members; secondly, it ensures that the Foundation's main purpose is Brandon University and not some other educational institution which could have been funded by this corporation even though it held the name of the Brandon University; and, thirdly, on dissolution, the dollars must be assigned to Brandon University under this bill and not necessarily a charitable organization, as could have happened under the existing legislation.

As the Member for Brandon West has indicated, we would like to see an amendment take place in the committee stage to section 7(1), the Board of Directors, whereby we would ensure that three members of the Board of Governors at Brandon University . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

I do hope the honourable member is not referring to specific sections on Second Reading.

HON. L. EVANS: I'm sorry, Madam Speaker.

When we go to committee, there will be some proposals for a further amendment with regard to the Board of Directors of the corporation. We hope that we can ensure that at least three members of the Brandon University Board of Governors will be on the Board of Directors.

I understand and I've discussed this with Dr. Beamish, who is now the president of the Brandon University Foundation, and he agrees with this. As a matter of fact, I understand from members of the foundation and from the university community, by by-law now, they are prepared to have three members serving. As a matter of fact, I think three members serve already. So what we're doing is actually confirming a practice that has begun. I think it's important that that be included in the legislation itself.

I would only hope, as I'm sure every member in this Legislature does, that the foundation will be successful

and get on with the business of raising money that is badly needed for various capital improvements at Brandon University.

Thank you.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, as much as possible, I try to work out the calling of the order of business in consultation with the Opposition. This is one instance when I've not been able to, but I feel it's necessary to proceed.

Would you please call Bill No. 25, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert?

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING

BILL NO. 25 - THE DISCRIMINATORY BUSINESS PRACTICES ACT

MADAM SPEAKER: Debate on Second Reading on the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 25, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.- (Interjection)-

HON. J. COWAN: No, Madam Speaker. I'm afraid we're not prepared to allow to have this matter stand at this time. We'd request that they would speak on the bill. We'd like to proceed with it today, if at all possible.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before the House then is Second Reading.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, I've explained my, and our party's, position on this bill to members opposite, privately. Our position should not be in any way interpreted as we would support any discrimination on the basis of race, creed, colour, nationality, ancestry, place of origin, sex or geographical location of the person, etc., as set out in the bill. That is not the issue, Madam Speaker. I want to make that clear.

Madam Speaker, I defy - and I've said this privately to the Attorney-General - I defy him to take this bill out on to Broadway Avenue, read Section 1(2) to anybody who walks along, who hasn't been involved with this bill, and ask them if they understand it, Madam Speaker, and he will not get one answer in the affirmative. Yet we are asked, as a Legislature, to pass this bill.

Madam Speaker, the Attorney-General, in fact, on a couple of occasions, has told me that he has required Legislative Counsel to interpret this bill for him in order to be able to understand.

The problem is this is a bill we're going to impose upon Manitobans. I really do say that we should not be imposing upon Manitobans a bill that is incomprehensible to them.

Madam Speaker, this bill has been sent out to lawyers, it's been sent out to individuals, and the public simply doesn't understand it. The Member for Kildonan may

understand it. He says he does; fine, if he does. But we're not passing bills, Madam Speaker, just for the benefit of the Member for Kildonan.- (Interjection)- Why don't you shut up for a change?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. MERCIER: The Member for Kildonan doesn't know when to keep his big mouth shut, Madam Speaker.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

Let's not cast reflections on each other in the Chamber. The question before the House is Second Reading of a particular bill. I'd appreciate if all members maintain the order and dignity of the Chamber.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert on the bill.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, a government here is to pass legislation for the people of this province. They're not here to pass legislation that only the Attorney-General and the Member for Kildonan can understand with the assistance of Legislative Counsel, or any other member can understand only with the assistance of Legislative Counsel.

Why are we asked to pass this legislation, Madam Speaker? We are asked to pass this legislation because it was their Crown corporation that discriminated. Has there been any suggestion that any Manitoba business has discriminated in the same way as their Crown corporation, on which you served as vice-chairman and which members opposite were responsible for? I haven't heard of any. I'm not suggesting they should be able to, but we're being asked to pass this bill and closure is being put upon us to speak to the bill, to deal with it today, when it's incomprehensible to the people of this province. It's brought about as a result of their Crown corporation and their actions and their responsibilities.

You're going to tell the small businesspeople of Manitoba, here's The Discriminatory Business Practices Act, which I dare say not one of them will be able to understand on their own without, no doubt, having to hire a lawyer and incur a legal bill. Madam Speaker, I just think that's wrong. And I think the Attorney-General has said this in the past, that the legislation should be simplified. It should be clearer; it should be understood. People should be able to understand it. They shouldn't have to hire a lawyer to be able to deal with it, and that's just not the case with this bill.

I'm not suggesting that this bill never be dealt with. What I would suggest to the Attorney-General is that he withdraw the bill, redraft it. What is the urgency? Nobody has expressed any urgency about passing this bill. Redraft it in simpler terms so that people can understand it and bring it back in at the next Session, but don't foist upon them this bill which they simply can't understand.

The Attorney-General has written to me after I introduced this and, I commend him, he's tried to cooperate with my concerns. We've discussed it privately, but he's indicated that he had Legislative Counsel review the bill and Legislative Counsel is satisfied that it is legally comprehensible.

Madam Speaker, it has to be more than legally comprehensible. It has to be understood by people, and that's our main concern. Again, I don't want our position to be misinterpreted. We do not support the discrimination that the bill would purport to deal with. I have discussed the bill in some detail with the Attorney-General and suggested minor amendments to various sections, but I think we should truly be trying to pass legislation in this province that's understandable by people and that's our main concern.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, because this is a bill which says "Discriminatory Business Acts," one person in business said why single business out when government is the only offender to date that we can speak of? I just want to relate to the Attorney-General that I sent this out to several lawyers and every one of them came back and said you couldn't interpret it and nobody could understand it and even they had trouble understanding it.

I sent it back out to a person who used to do some drafting - he's no longer with the government - but was a person not in the Attorney-General's Department but very familiar with drafting legislation. He had a position where he did a lot of it. The Attorney-General may know him, but I won't mention any names and I'll send him the copy of the bill that he sent me back. It said, "Dear Rollie: This is gobbledegook. You shouldn't be responsible for it, have it redrafted."

Madam Speaker, nobody can understand this type of wording: "(i) is on account of an attribute of the second person, or of a third person with whom the second person engages in business, has engaged in business, or may engage in business, and (ii) in the condition of the engaging in business of the person refusing, failing, suspending or dismissing and another person; or (b) to enter into a contract that includes a provision that one of the parties to the contract will refuse to engage in business with a second person or will refuse or fail to employ or promote or will dismiss or suspend from employment of the second person." Madam Speaker, I am . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, order please. Order please.

May I remind the honourable member that Second Reading is time to debate the principle, not to quote from specific sections of the bill.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I apologize, I didn't see you on your feet. I'm one who criticizes the other people over there, without manners, for doing that. I certainly apologize if I did so.

But I am speaking to this section of the bill, why we don't agree with it, which is absolute - as one person says - gobbledegook and can't be understood by lawyers and people who are trained to try and understand it. One lawyer said that he would wonder if it could even be enforced in this wording, regardless of what Legislative Counsel says.

Now, we have taken the trouble - and I doubt if any members opposite have - to send this out to people who may have to be dealing with it continually, to find

out what they believe this says and none of them know what it says or don't believe it's good drafting, and this government, Madam Speaker, now says that we, on this side of the House, should stand here and pass legislation that people can't understand. I believe that this government wants legislation that people won't understand, if they insist on this bill going through.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General to close debate.

HON. R. PENNER: Madam Speaker, I will readily admit that the bill is not the easiest bill to read. I will readily admit that while it is not likely that if you took any bill out to 10 people on Broadway, you're going to strike it rich and find one who understands it. It is less likely that a bill like this would be understood. I readily admit that. It's not for the lack of trying.

The difficulty is, Madam Speaker, to strike out against discriminatory business practices, particularly, in relationship to conditions that are imposed overseas or perhaps extraprovincially, and still stay within our own legislative jurisdiction. That was a difficulty.

The Member for St. Norbert, in terms of the comprehensibility of bills, and this incidentally is not something that I attribute to the Member for St. Norbert himself, will recall the difficulties that this House had over a span of about two years with The Mechanics Lien Act, because it was a very, very technical bill; and try as hard as the Member for St. Norbert - then the Attorney-General - did, and I know he tried very hard to consult and to deal with it, the bill, as produced, subsequently required a great number of amendments and later, when we assumed office, an amending bill. That sometimes happens with very technical legislation.

Madam Speaker, I want to say to the members opposite that compared to the Ontario bill upon which this is in a sense - at least in principle - modelled, this is a model of clarity. And yet the Ontario bill works. The Ontario bill works in the sense that it has led to a substantial number of businesses who have been asked to engage in discriminatory business practices registering that fact with the registrar and getting directions as to what might lawfully be done to comply with the provisions of the act, and it is our hope that that indeed will be the case.

It was said by the Member for St. Norbert that he doesn't know of - there's no suggestion that any Manitoba business discriminates. I hope he's right, but I think we won't know that till we have this kind of legislation in place and encourage people to come forward when there is discrimination.

Incidentally, let me say for the record, I don't for a moment - no one on this side of the House - suggests that there's any other reason for the opposition by the Member for St. Norbert and the Member for Sturgeon Creek. I think that they agree in principle with the principle of the bill, namely, that there should be no discrimination.

The bill seeks to deal with boycotts, and in doing so has to be able to distinguish cases where someone themselves directly discriminates in the sense of the act or where that person responds to a second person's request that they discriminate before that second person will do business with the second person or a

third person. And that's why, just even in that brief explanation, one can see that there are difficulties.

I want to say, however, to the Member for St. Norbert, and we do have two or three lawyers in our caucus - there's a couple in the Conservative caucus - we had a very considerable debate in our caucus on this bill, a debate which revealed that the people debating it understood the bill, and indeed came up with a number of suggestions. It wasn't a question of saying, okay, here's the stamp of approval; we accept your explanation. There was a vigorous debate.

Madam Speaker, I did, as the Member for St. Norbert indicated, contact Legislative Counsel when the Member for St. Norbert indicated what the cause of concern was, and the Legislative Counsel in a memo to me of July 13 said in part, "Following our conversation Friday, I've reread the above-mentioned bill. I agree that part of it is difficult to read, but that difficulty reflects the subject matter and the short time allowed for its preparation."

The subject matter is the subject matter that deals with secondary and tertiary boycotts, subject matter that has to skirt the question of provincial versus federal jurisdiction in trade matters because most of the cause of concern is dealing with overseas nations that seek to import their own particular standards.

Madam Speaker, in commending this bill to the House and asking support for Second Reading, I'm not asking them to put their stamp of approval on the drafting; there may be some difficulties. I would hope that when we look at it in committee, if there's something that we can do to add some clarity, that we will do it in committee. But I would urge that it be passed on Second Reading.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Thank you, Madam Speaker.
Would you please call Bill No. 68?

**BILL NO. 68 - AN ACT TO GOVERN THE
SUPPLY OF NATURAL GAS IN MANITOBA
AND TO AMEND
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD ACT**

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines, Bill No. 68, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. E. CONNERY: Thank you, Madam Speaker.
I want to take this opportunity to say a few words on Bill 68, the takeover of the gas company.

Madam Speaker, I want to argue in favour of sticking to the capitalist road. It is through the capitalist system, the free enterprise route, that economic progress takes place. This country, federally, is clearly marching on that road, and we're going in the right direction.

Most of the developed world, Madam Speaker, has recently been putting emphasis on the private sector role in economic life. That is true of the socialist world as well, as we see in China and Russia where they're moving more towards private enterprise. But, Madam Speaker, I am worried about the progress of this

province which seems to be bucking the trend that other countries have. We look at Margaret Thatcher being re-elected for a third term, unprecedented in this century, by privatization and the free enterprise system.

Madam Speaker, capitalism is a word loaded with emotion, with history, and with political passion. It translates into free enterprise, deregulation, and free trade, something that this government doesn't seem to understand. It is a code word for a combination of innovation, wealth, creation, risk, reward, and economic and personal freedom, not to mention intense and sustained hard work, which members opposite, Madam Speaker, are not too familiar with.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker, C. Santos in the Chair.)

The present NDP Government has shown itself to be against deregulation in its present position in the deregulation of natural gas. It is against free trade as we all have heard during this Session's debate on the resolution put forward by the Member for Kildonan, which exaggerated the negative possibilities of such an initiative. Innovation was not in their vocabulary while discussing free trade. Instead, they preferred to cling to the status quo which is, in my mind, more clearly an entry into the technical wasteland, and the loss of jobs that they were desperately wanting to avoid. We see that in this province we have -(Interjection)- Mr. Deputy Speaker, my buddy next to me is just trying to get me a little rattled, but that's okay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in this province we have with this government, some 10,000 more people unemployed than what we ever had under the Sterling Lyon era. The employment within this group is not good.

Wealth creation is another word that Manitoba's present government is a stranger to. They don't understand wealth creation. None of them have gone out on their own and created their own wealth. They've all - well, there's one or two that have created a little, and I see the Member for Lac du Bonnet is here. As a farmer, I know he has personally taken a lot of risks and worked hard, but the rest of them - the Minister of Labour is waving his hand, but he hasn't taken any risks or worked all that hard either.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, earlier this Session, they were accused of - and it's true - being a stranger to the truth. By listening to the replies from members opposite, we know that this is a fact. Mr. Deputy Speaker, deficit creation is much easier to achieve, it seems, and it's much easier to live with in the short term, especially if the government is short-sighted, and this government is sure short-sighted. They have policies that distort the economic process and bring only illusionary short-term benefits to the recipients.

Will the government decide to protect all of us in its decision to buy ICG and wind up projecting us into disaster, as we have seen in MTX, MPIC, Workers Compensation? We look at Manfor and the millions that are lost there annually. Mr. Deputy Speaker, they'll look at Manfor and say, well, on an operating basis, we aren't doing too badly, but when you look at the over 250 million that Manitoba has invested in Manfor and we are paying interest on that money, the losses in that operation are very significant.

The government has been bragging about their involvement in these areas, and I quote from the

Government of Manitoba handout called, "Manitoba's Natural Gas Policy," and I quote, "Energy security at a fair price," which states, "that the creation of a new public utility called the Manitoba Consumers' Gas Corporation, is consistent with Manitoba's long tradition of providing essential service through publicly-owned enterprises."

Our hydro, telephone and automobile insurance rates are among the lowest in North America. Now I'm not against publicly-owned essential services, but what worries me is the current NDP's management of these corporations. They only tell the public what they want the public to know. They hide the real cost to the consumer of these utilities in Manitoba. Mr. Deputy Speaker, they'll go so far to hide the facts that we have shredding going on of vital ministerial documents that just inadvertently were shredded. If you kind of tell the people of Manitoba that that's a fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they're not going to buy that.

The rates are what the public sees on their monthly bills. What about the real cost to consumers? We know that the government, in hydro, is absorbing a large part of the cost to Hydro. They brag about how low hydro rates are and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Manitoba's hydro rates are reasonably low, but at the rate this government is going, a 9.7 percent increase this year, we know that these rates aren't going to remain low and it's one of the items that we have to lure industry to this province and create the jobs that we sorely need for the sum - I think it's around 38,000 or 40,000 unemployed in Manitoba at this point.

Who's going to pay for the MTX deficit of approximately \$30 million? The massive reinsurance losses at MPIC, currently under investigation, are rumoured to be \$58 million. What about the losses in Workers Compensation? We know that this government, one time before, wrote off some of the debt of Workers Comp, will they do it again? Who knows what will happen to our utility rates when Limestone is completed and the sales of power do not cover the costs of their debt incurred for the construction?

I tell you that the Manitoba taxpayers will be picking up the costs in the long run through increased payroll taxes, personal income taxes, licences, sales tax and any other way the government can increase their revenue. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we saw this year, increases in taxes and fees of some 400 million and we're not seeing much of a deficit reduction, and if we see another boost in the interest payments that we saw this year of something in the area of \$70 million, then we're not even going to see a deficit reduction from their projected and we're still going to have incurred those high taxes.

When Limestone is fully operational, will this government be happy to sell any overproduction at reduced rates to Americans? If they are without sales to cover the costs, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe they will take what sales they can get. We know that they've been going to Ontario to make up for sales that they didn't get down in the States.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, members opposite don't know what it's like to be in a buyer's market, because none of these people have been in business except the Member for Lac du Bonnet. The Member for the Interlake, of course, is under with his turkey quota, has got his profit built in. Yet the Member for Transcona,

in his recent appearance in Winnipeg today, chastised the Alberta Government for selling the overproduction of natural gas to the United States in a similar fashion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we could be caught with that position because of the Limestone capacity of 1,200 megawatts of power; we have only sold five. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is of concern to me is that the Minister in charge told us prior to the election that contracts were in place to sell a lot more power. He didn't tell the public that they had an understanding and that understanding fell through. He led us to believe that those sales were firm, and that they would be there when Limestone was in the process of putting out power.

On that same program, the Member for Transcona accused the West of deregulating because they thought it would bring up the price of natural gas. When the price went down instead, and Alberta put in artificial floors, they were accused of tampering and being clearly in the wrong.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think what we'll end up doing is the very thing that Alberta is doing with their natural gas. Manitoba will be selling hydro cheap to the Americans or to Ontario. Why don't they sell that same hydro cheap to Manitobans? Why aren't we bringing in companies to use that hydro right here in Manitoba? We could have had Alcan if it wasn't being for the fumbling and bumbling of the members opposite, a company that was prepared to invest their own money to build the generating plant, to produce aluminum, and to create a whole raft of jobs right here in Manitoba. But no, they fudged that deal. What do we see? We see us exporting power cheaper to the United States so that they can turn around and compete against us in our product market.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Session, during debates on Bill No. 14, An Act to Amend the Milk Prices Review Act, members opposite argued that there should be artificial floors for the price of milk. Now I feel that milk is as much an essential as the utilities are. I would also guess that more than 30 percent of our provincial population drinks milk. Only 30 percent of Manitobans use natural gas, and this is according to NDP statistics.

They argue the long term, but that is only if the prices rise significantly. What if the prices go down? Where will the fair price the government is promising be then? If they sign contracts now and the price goes down lower, are they going to want to break those contracts? Well, they shake their heads over there, Chip and Dale, but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they want to break existing contracts.

Deregulation will not produce total fairness overnight. Just as the proponents of free trade for a free trade realize that changes in some sectors should be phased in over 10-year periods. For those who work in the embattled industries like mining, forest products and energy, the lustre of private enterprise may be dimmed by the bottom-line difficulties they are now experiencing.

The attractions of an economic system that would be free of risk are a lure. But risk-free environments are also reward-free. Systems that aim to level off the downsides also flatten out the upsides. We, of the Conservative mind, see competition and the risks and rewards it entails as a morally neutral mechanism, capable of being used by and for the benefit of moral people. But it is seen as harmful by the immoral and the irresponsible, the members opposite.- (Interjection)- You agree with me, do you, Harvey?

MR. H. SMITH: You're sick.

MR. E. CONNERY: Sick.

I quote: "The capitalist or free trade enterprise system is often accused of creating inequality. It certainly is necessary for any country, capitalist or not, to create enough wealth so that everyone can have an adequate share, adequate for survival in the maintenance of human dignity. The most any political system can do is assure equality, equality of opportunity. Capitalism does this better than any other economic system because it is better at encouraging both economic and personal freedom."

Socialism - I guess you could refer to Winston Churchill when he said that capitalism was the unequal distributor of wealth, but socialism was the equal distributor of poverty. Mr. Deputy Speaker, these people opposite I think would like to see that, except for themselves, as we saw in the actions of the Energy Minister who took advantage of a tax scam that was described by the Member for Rossmere as legalized theft.

So when we talk about a sharing group of people, we can see that their concerns, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are for themselves, not for the people of Manitoba.

Compassion comes from the heart, not the mouth, and we see a lot of mouth talk from the other side on compassion, but when it comes down to the real thing, we don't see it, as we saw in the contributions of the First Minister for a year of something like \$185 that he donated to charity, from the Minister who is expounding that his government are the people who are worried about individuals.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in my second Session as a member of the Opposition Party, I have become more intensely aware of the privileges I have of being a member of a party which encourages its members to use their personal freedoms and allows them to vote as their own conscience dictates.

We have seen a little bit of that from the opposite side of the floor, and as we see in Bill 47, where the members opposite are not allowed to vote on a bill that is talking about human rights, of all things, a human rights bill, and the Attorney-General tells them they've got to vote the way the Attorney-General sees fit.

Dramatic action is indeed needed to dispel the growing awareness of the people of Manitoba that the NDP is not doing a very good job of standing up for Manitobans. Mr. Deputy Speaker, why do we see the large influx of people, especially from Saskatchewan, to very important positions within this government? What is wrong with Manitobans filling Manitoba jobs? Why do we have to import people from other jurisdictions? Why do we have to import defeated candidates from other provinces who have no place, or people who worked for the government and then that government was defeated and they are hired by this government in Manitoba?

A MEMBER: Too bad.

MR. E. CONNERY: Oh, too bad. Well, I don't think it's too bad; I think it's tragic.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was speaking to a person at our local fair who was up at Limestone and on the

crew that he was in, and out of 18 people working at Limestone, one was a Manitoban. The rest were from all other provinces, mostly Alberta, and a large number from B.C. Hired out of the union halls, they come here, they get an address and then they are Manitobans, but they are not Manitobans. They came here expressly to work on Limestone, so a lot of the job creation that we have seen has gone to people from other provinces and we are paying dearly for it.

I believe the apple-polishers of this government thought that they could garner enough support for their takeover of ICG if they put out their opinion polls and if they led the populous to believe that this takeover would reduce the natural gas bills and would not cost the taxpayer anything in future, and also by promising ICG workers that they could keep their jobs.

A MEMBER: You're going to lose a lot of votes, Ed.

MR. E. CONNERY: The member opposite says we'll lose a lot of votes from this position. Well, I think the proof of the pudding will be in the eating when people see that, yes, indeed, their gas prices maybe are not in the long run going to be cheaper. I'm sure this government will ensure that there is some short-term cheaper natural gas up until the next election; and then of course, as we saw after this election, the roof fell in on this government and we're starting to see the scandals and the misuse of public money which has taken place under this administration.

I do not believe that's the kind of promises that have held much credibility, and I think we can go back to one of the most major ones was Jean Drapeau promised the taxpayers of Montreal that Expo '67 would pay for itself and that a deficit from hosting this affair would be just as impossible as a man's ability to bear a child.

Well, we know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what happened at Expo; and we know that the stadium there went to seven times it's original estimated cost, seven times. So when this government says that it's guaranteed, there is no guarantee.

Since I've defended capitalism, Mr. Deputy Speaker, free enterprise, free trade, deregulation and personal freedoms, I would like to include some interesting observations of the problems inherent in the public sector. These observations were made by a Dr. Madson Peary (phonetic) in a speech this spring in Vancouver during a conference hosted by the National Citizens' Coalition and the Fraser Institute. His speech was on, "Why is the Public Sector No Good?" He says, first of all, it is always undercapitalized, because (a) competing claims from health, education and social services. The money that they do get goes to payment of wages for union employees who have big demands and are very powerful and not concerned that their employers could go bankrupt. It is always too expensive because, (b) it doesn't have to compete, it's normally protected by a monopoly; and, in (c) the public sector is always inefficient because there is no incentive to keep it lean and streamlined; and (d) the public sector is unresponsive because it doesn't need to supply what the customers want. Rather they are responsive to the needs of the producer, for example, the public utility whose main function is not to supply a service needed by the consumer, but rather to provide jobs to the workers in that industry.

I'm sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we can point to many Crown corporations which display all of these weaknesses in Manitoba. For example, Limestone's main reason for being seems to be for the jobs that it is supplying Manitobans.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we see the unemployment rate in Manitoba is going up. The change from May to June went from, I think, 6.9 percent to 7.7 percent. So while they are borrowing money to create jobs at Limestone, we are still seeing our unemployment rate go up at a time when we also lost people out of the workforce. We have a smaller workforce and a higher unemployment rate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we were traditionally two to two-and-a-half points behind the national average, where now we are just, I think, 1.1 or 1.2 points below the national average, and the national unemployment rate has dropped - not a lot but dropped - but Manitoba's unemployment rate has gone up significantly. So spending this horrendous amount of money to look good in the public's eye and to create jobs is not working out for Manitoba. The bubble has now got cracks in it and it is starting to break.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, ICG already was under contract to supply gas to Manitoba, as was TransCanada Pipelines. The ICG agreement for the price of gas is for a two-year period, expiring in October 1988. The contract with TransCanada Pipelines is sealed until 1995. In a document called, "Manitoba's Natural Gas Policy: Energy Security at a Fair Price," put out with a covering letter from the Premier of Manitoba, it is noted that there are some constraints in the system that make it impossible to get a fair deal. Is the term "constraints" now a euphemism for contract?

This government has a good record of euphemisms. Debts are unfunded liabilities when they are part of an MPIC statement of account. Cutbacks are called consolidations in the Department of Culture and Heritage. Government "for sales" of corporations are politely called initiatives. In future, doing a Pawley or doing a Parasiuk could be a polite way of saying, breaking a contract, breaking your word. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't think members opposite have any difficulty in breaking a contract or breaking their word.

To polish their image, this government is willing to by-pass existing contracts, spending massive amounts of money at a time when the political debt is at a perilous height, instead of waiting a few months to renegotiate prices, to renegotiate, to legislate and to deal with Alberta and the suppliers of gas to get Manitobans a better deal than what they're getting now, because the deal that they're getting now isn't, everybody recognizes, a good deal, but we should be working at negotiation and not breaking one's word and one's contract.

This government has recently put into great public profile the need for sanctity in the tendering of contracts during the CF-18 award but, when they are asked to live under a contract during deregulation, the sanctity of that contract is suddenly dispensable if it impinges negatively upon the government's image.

This government bent tendering norms when it asked Dominion Bridge to retender on the water gates for Limestone, again breaking the rules of honesty and integrity. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what happens when a company sells out to another company and they want to break the union contract?

You can hear the screams and hollers of anguish from this government all across the country. Then it is not right to break contracts, and we've seen that. We've seen where they didn't want to sell to companies because they were of a different union. So we see this government doing one thing on one side and doing the opposite on another, trying to be honest and they're not.

The First Minister made a statement on natural gas when this was first initiated. He said, lower energy costs mean stronger businesses and more jobs. The NDP government could do more for business by removing some of the restrictive labour legislation, by removing the 2.25 percent now payroll tax, the land transfer tax, the capital tax, hydro up 9.7 percent. Some of these things are more detrimental to business than cheaper gas.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, cheaper gas will not accrue to all Manitobans unless they go on a spending binge more expensive than Limestone because only 30 percent of Manitobans have access to cheaper gas.

I'm a large user of natural gas; so when I'm arguing this point, maybe I'm saying I should be paying more money. But rural Manitobans, to a large degree, will not have access to this gas if it is cheaper. So the rural people will, once again, not benefit from huge and horrendous deficits that this government is going into.

The Minister says: "Making fair price energy alternatives available to more parts of Manitoba would help build up the economy." But I just said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that about 60 percent or 70 percent of Manitobans will not have access to that cheaper gas. "Bringing fair prices to Manitoba families," he adds "would put more money back into the pockets of ordinary Manitobans." Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, no question that the people of Manitoba need more money put back into their pockets, because this government has just come through with the largest tax grab of all time. The working people have just found out this month what a 2 percent flat tax on their gross income really is. They're not very pleased because it's hurting badly, and it's hurting business.

The Minister also said: "Manitoba consumers are at risk and are vulnerable to future price shocks without any ceiling in place." But this government is not consistent with its argument to the need of artificial ceilings and floors on prices.

Manitoba claims that different prices for different consumers, i.e., residential core versus industrial is discriminatory, also prices to Americans versus prices to Canadians. Yet, before the investigation into the prices of natural gas this spring, Manitoba's motive fuel tax was only imposed to core users, residential. A resulting order of the investigation is that all the customers, not just core customers, be subject to the motive fuel tax.

An article in the Winnipeg Free Press with, "Nat. NDP gas takeover angers Alberta and energy industry," and it said: "Pawley is right. Manitoba is paying more for gas, but it's his own government's fault." This is not my quote, this is from a reporter. "A couple of years ago, Manitoba imposed a hefty tax used on the compressor stations within Manitoba, and this tax collects about \$10 million a year," a sneaky, unfair tax that breaks the spirit of constitutional prohibition against taxing resources in transit through a province to another

province. It's not supposed to be done, but this government did it to collect taxes, to collect money, and people in Ontario have to pay more because of those taxes. This is not supposed to be done, but this government does it. They don't look at what is right and what is proper. They just do it.

"It will ensure Manitobans have long-term security of supply at a fair price," and this Rick Hyndman, Director of Economic Planning for Alberta's Energy Department, says the Manitoba Government's agreements for natural gas are for excess supplies, not protected reserves. If they are telling people they are going to have to have gas at \$2, in the long term, they are not telling the truth.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to come to a conclusion of the few minutes that I've taken, but it comes as no surprise to me or any other Manitoban that the Pawley administration is desperately trying to create a positive image after two Sessions which largely discredit their ability to manage the affairs of government.

Also very damaging bills have been put forward this Session, such as Bill 47 and Bill 61. It shows that the government morals are at an all-time low. These positions have helped the government to attempt to sell to the public the need for it to act in such an irresponsible manner towards those Manitobans it is elected to serve.

It is under the Minister of Mines - who I don't think anybody in this province could ever believe his statements again after all the things that he has said to us. He says that this government has a good record of running Crown corporations. Flying in the face of what has been going on, he says they've got a good record. Mr. Deputy Speaker, how ridiculous. This Minister says that we're going to do a good deal on this and nobody will now or forever more listen to the integrity or the honesty that this Minister tries to put forward.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'll just be a few minutes.

Three particular points were raised in this last speech that I do think have to be answered because it's such patent nonsense. Talking about the issue of the floor prices, which the member speaking before me compared to milk prices, suggested that somehow we insisted on a floor, I want to tell the House and the people of Manitoba that we never had any problem with the regulated system we had before. The Government of Manitoba never complained about the fact that we were paying above world price. We had no problem with that.

We had a world in which we were regulated until October of 1986. The Government of Alberta and Brian Mulroney decided free enterprise was going to come along after October of 1986. We're going to have free world prices and, lo and behold, October of '86 comes and this wonderful company, ICG, which the Member for Portage says is such a great company, wound up, after deregulation, paying the same price for gas that they had paid before. They didn't do any negotiating.

Although Alberta was selling gas to the United States of America at \$1.80, \$1.75 at MCF, we were paying \$3 and we were saying that's wrong. We were saying not only is it wrong; we were saying there is no contract in existence. You can go to any lawyer, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Any lawyer in this country will tell you that on page 1 of contracts it says that if there is no price, there is no contract.

When Brian Mulroney determined that there would be deregulation, the price was eliminated from the contract TCPL had with ICG. Up until October of 1986, the price was set on these long-term contracts by the National Energy Board. So ICG could enter into a contract with TransCanada Pipelines for a 15-year, 20-year, 25-year agreement for the delivery of natural gas to Winnipeg at a price to be determined by the National Energy Board. That was a contract which was in existence until October of 1986.

When Brian Mulroney deregulated and said now it's up to you people to negotiate the price, there were no legally binding contracts. Quite different from the proposal the Member for Portage put about a company carrying on obligations regardless of who the shareholder is with respect to a trade union, whether it's a legally binding agreement in terms of successor rights.

This government would not break a legally binding contract. The fact of the matter is, there were no legally binding contracts on October 31 of 1986. That is the legal opinion we have got from across this country from the best lawyers in this country. There is no question TCPL and ICG ought to have negotiated a price which was at world levels.

We still have no problem with floor and ceiling prices, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We still have no problem with the notion of a regulated price. But if we're going to be in a deregulated world, then we're not going to be in a world where we have a floor, when prices are below what their friends in Alberta would like to charge, but no ceiling. We're not going to play that kind of a game.

The Member for Portage is simply standing up for Alberta rather than standing up for Manitoba when he suggests that we should be happy to pay Alberta higher prices than Alberta charges American customers. Therein lies point two, the suggestion that somehow we sell to the United States at lower prices than in Canada.

I would suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that people like the Member for Portage inform themselves with respect to our pricing, because we are not, we would not, No. 1; but secondly, we're not allowed to sell hydro-electric power to the United States at a price below the rate we would sell that hydro-electric power in Canada.

The National Energy Board, when it looked at the Minneapolis contract, said very specifically, they were quite satisfied that contract will charge more for hydro-electric power to U.S. industrial consumers than to Canadian industrial consumers.

If the member is referring to interruptible power, then he should understand that interruptible power is at an entirely different rate; it's an entirely different commodity from regular power over a period of years. We sell interruptible gas here as well at quite different rates from gas where people are entitled to it at any time of day, night or year. That's only sensible. Because

if you have interruptible power, you need another source of energy supply for whatever you're doing.

Another example is, just recently, the National Energy Board refused an export permit to the Province of Quebec, because they hadn't first determined whether there was somebody in Canada who needed that hydro at that price. When we did our arrangement with the U.S., before we went to the National Energy Board, we went to Ontario and we went to Saskatchewan. We offered not only the same deal - a better deal to Canadians. Not like Alberta, we offered a better deal to Canadians. They didn't need the hydro-electric power, but we were able to show to the National Energy Board that this, indeed, was power that was surplus to our needs.

So in all of those areas, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Member for Portage la Prairie, has again, as is his wont, misled the House. I wouldn't suggest that he's done it deliberately. I have come to the conclusion that he just doesn't know any better. He's a know-nothing who would prefer not to know the facts so he can get up and make these ridiculous charges that have no bearing in fact, and somehow he'll probably even go ahead and send that silly speech out to his constituents. I just hope that he sends the next page along.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's always interesting to enter a debate after the former Finance Minister of the first four years of the disastrous Pawley administration.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we don't expect this Minister, now that he's been removed from Finance, necessarily to tell us all the factual information. He never did as Finance Minister and he probably never will. It may be a congenital disorder he has, but he tried to tell us today that we don't sell power to the United States for less money than we sell to Manitobans, and we certainly do. We do it every single day of the week. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's the impression he tried to leave with the people of Manitoba and every single day, every hour of the day, we sell power to the United States for less money than what we will sell it to Manitoba consumers. That is the legacy of the Schreyer administration. - (Interjection) - The Minister from his seat is bold enough to say, "You're a liar." Well, you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it takes one to know one and I'm looking at one of the finest congenital ones I've ever seen in my life.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is the whole debate we're having on energy in Manitoba right now because this former Minister of Finance doesn't understand energy policy for Manitoba, and they are entering into a \$185 million investment - or whatever it's going to be - without understanding energy policy for the citizens of Manitoba, and that is the serious detriment of this legislation in this bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let's deal for just a few minutes with some of the basic facts we have before us on this legislation. No. 1, what government is proposing it? It's this current administration, and particularly what Minister? This is the Minister of Energy and Mines, who promised us with the creation of ManOil, a corporation

that was going to make sufficient profits, so that no Manitoban would lose his home, his farm or his business due to high business rates. That same Manitoba energy corporation, created by the same Minister proposing to take over the gas company, has never earned a net nickel of income since its creation. It has been a constant drag on the finances of the people of Manitoba. Manitobans have been paying tax money to support it; No. 1 failure of that Minister of Energy and Mines.

This Minister of Energy and Mines, during the last provincial election, announced a number of power sales to United States. They do not exist, Mr. Deputy Speaker? This Minister of Energy and Mines is proposing the ICG takeover was the same Minister of Energy and Mines who blew the Western Power Grid in 1981-82, the Alcan smelter and the potash mine. And what are we going after now under this Minister of Energy and Mines who is saying that he can take over ICG and make the people of Manitoba money? Were proposing a joint venture with who? The Communist Chinese. That's better than with an American multinational in the perverted philosophical bent that the NDP are on, particularly this new group, this after-the-Schreyer legacy group that have no moral principles founding them.

The power that we were going to sell to our neighbouring provinces in Western Canada is now going down to the States at less money than we would have received from the western provinces, so that at the end of the NSP power deal, which I remind you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is 12 short years, we will then revert to interruptible power sales with the surplus capacity we've created in Limestone, and they will buy it at lower prices than Manitobans, as they are right now, but the Western Power Grid, which that Minister of Energy and Mines blew, would have seen us with a paid-for power station in Limestone at the end of 35 years.

The Alcan Smelter, well, he simply wasn't able to negotiate that one for Manitobans. So the record of the Minister is indeed in question, and serious question. The record of the government - how many times do we have to repeat the record of this government and the management and administration of Crown corporations? It is abysmal.

We have established for Manitobans beyond any doubt that these people are the most incompetent managers of business affairs in the history of the province. Losses, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in monopoly auto insurance corporations because of the management, the interference, the direct control by an NDP Government on Autopac has caused it to lose \$19 million last year.

That's the record of this government in Crown corporations and that's not a Crown corporation, it's in a competitive environment. When they're in a competitive environment, they lose \$37 million in Autopac in the reinsurance business.

The record doesn't need repeating. They ventured to Saudi Arabia and lost \$28 million in a competitive business. These people cannot run a business. I don't need to tell you how in five short years, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this NDP administration used another Crown corporation, the Workers Compensation Board, to buy the votes of the working people of Manitoba through an effort of spending - well, taking the corporation, the WCB, from a \$36 million surplus five years ago to a

\$184 million deficit. They blew \$210 million in a political vote-getting wrongful administration of the Workers Compensation Board simply to buy votes.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is the bottom line and the nub of this Inter-City Gas takeover. This is not designed to benefit the people of Manitoba. This is designed, hopefully - hoped for by the NDP - to benefit their political future in the next election and I will establish for you how they hope to do it.

First of all, in this Session right now, we are being asked, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to pass a Capital Supply Bill which authorizes \$175 million of expenditure. What for? To buy the assets of Inter-City Gas. Do we know what sort of business plan is in place by these incredibly good business managers to justify that expenditure? Have we ever seen a business plan? No, we have not. Does one exist? I can't say, but I'll simply tell you, I doubt if one exists. If one existed, would they not table it in justifying the request for us to give them authority to borrow \$175 million, a simple request? You know what the answer is. Well we can't do that because that would interfere with our negotiations to purchase; negotiations which they're not going to conclude until after this Session so that we are not in this forum to directly question them on the voracity of their purchase. They're going to deliberately hold it off until after this Session ends.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if tabling it before they concluded the negotiations would jeopardize the business negotiations, then why, last Friday, did the Minister of Energy and Mines stand up and table an independent evaluation report? Surely that must have jeopardized their negotiations; that made public a certain amount of negotiating strategy, but they didn't hesitate to do that because they believed it was possibly to their political advantage to table an independent report, evaluating the assets, but they won't give us the business plan so we can examine it, prior to giving approval to \$175 million of Capital Authority.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I simply want to refer honourable members, former members of the ERIC committee, to the strategic planning document for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation from September, 1985. That planning document examined, in detail, the corporation's - MPIC's - entry into three new areas: life insurance; entertaining business, expanding business outside of Manitoba; and the financial centre concept, the one-stop shopping financial centre concept.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in this report, which took over two years to prepare, there is a detailed analysis of what will happen in the life insurance business; there is a business plan. This business plan lays out a 10-year projected cash flow. At the end of 10 years in the life insurance business, the government has still lost \$3 million by entering it. I suspect that influenced their decision not to go into it. Where is the business plan that this House should look at which shows a 10-year projection of revenues and potential profits from this expropriated Crown corporation? Why can we not see that, so that we know whether these people are making the correct decision?

We won't see it, either because it doesn't exist or when it is produced it will clearly show that either the benefits they promised to Winnipeg consumers are not there or that they cannot run the corporation at a profit

without raising the prices. It's going to be one of the two, because why else would they be afraid to table? And the precedent is there; they have undertaken extensive research into Crown corporation expansion and they decided not to go on the basis of those figures.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are many quotes in here that are of interest, quotes which the Minister of Finance will not provide to my colleague, the critic from Morris. You put reference to Department of Finance 10-year financial projections in this report, something the Minister of Finance says he doesn't have, but they're referenced in here.

He won't give those to us because in the report - and I'll just read him some of the things in here that the Minister would probably not want anybody else to know, because I think it's important and I hate to digress from the debate. But the plan to enter whole life insurance, and this is an NDP group of Cabinet Ministers who have this in front of them, developed by their hirelings in the Crown corps, the plan assumes low economic growth in the province. Now isn't that a great contrast from what we've been told by this group over here, that the future is really bright in Manitoba? But their own strategic planning document says that the plan assumes low economic growth in the province. There are no obvious signs of an impending upswing in the private or public sector.

That's the kind of facts that they based a decision not to go into life insurance on, that the provincial economy would not expand, even at the national rate. That's the kind of information they have privately that they won't share with the people of Manitoba. That's probably the information they have for ICG.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the topic of ICG and the takeover, we have a government that has political motives to take over ICG. They want it as an electoral tool in the next election, and I will paint for you a scenario of how I think they will use it. They will go through litigation with Alberta - this is their hope - over an extended period of time over the price of gas at the Alberta border. Pending that litigation, they will send out consumer bills to Winnipeg residents at an assumed price that's lower and show Manitoba consumers in Winnipeg that they're saving money by the nationalization of this gas company.

Meanwhile, the price is not fixed because they're going through the courts. That could last two, three, four years. In the meantime, they get by an election window and they will have hopefully, in the NDP long-term philosophy, bought the next election. After the court decision comes down, the next provincial election will be over, and if they've lost and they have to pay more for the gas, so what! The Manitoba consumers of natural gas will pay after the fact. But meanwhile, they will have shown artificially low prices and hopefully, in their long-term planning, won the next election. That's the deceit behind this whole ICG takeover, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the other partner in this is ICG. What is ICG's response to this nationalization? One would expect a private sector company facing nationalization by a government to be kicking and screaming, but ICG is doing no such thing. That begs the question: Why is ICG not concerned? It's almost as if the government said to ICG, so help me, I'll expropriate you. And ICG has said to the government,

so expropriate me, I'll help you, because they're laying down. They're the silent partner in this rip-off of the Manitoba taxpayer. One would have to ask why? They've got a monopoly distribution. They can, with their operation, show a profit. Why are they laying back and allowing this government to take them over?

Well, I suggest to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's because they want to take their money, the shareholders of ICG want to take their money and get the hell out of Manitoba, because the business climate created by an NDP administration for the last five years is so devastatingly bad that other jurisdictions welcome their investment and welcome the profits that they would make by that investment and welcome the jobs that ICG investment in Alberta, Saskatchewan, B.C., Ontario will create. But in Manitoba, there is no such welcome future with an NDP Government.

That's why ICG is saying, so expropriate me, I'll help you; that's why. They do not want to remain in this province. I wonder how many other private sector firms would line up for a sweetheart deal like this master negotiator, the Minister of Energy and Mines, is now attempting to complete or already has completed with ICG, other businesses whose assets are worthless as long as there's an NDP Government in Manitoba with their record of taxation, business law, etc. etc.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the other day when my colleague, the Member for Lakeside, was asking questions about the ICG takeover and what their purchase of assets some three years ago or two and a half years ago, what the assets were worth when they took over the assets, I believe, of Norcen, the Minister had no answer that he would give to this House. When I say that, I don't say the Minister had no answer. I believe he knows the answer, but it's not convenient for him to tell the people of Manitoba that ICG stands to profit on assets they just purchased three years ago in their negotiations with this government, and profit handsomely. The Minister had the greatest amount of recollection about 1956 and about 1920, and all sorts of recollections of Crown corporation creations in years past, but he couldn't tell us anything about an event that happened two and a half years ago with a company that he's negotiating on behalf of the government and people of Manitoba to purchase.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did some research or I had some research done about Crown corporations in Manitoba. The one I want to deal with is Manitoba Hydro because that's the other energy Crown corporation. Now the Manitoba Hydro is a corporation that's primarily Winnipeg Hydro and the rest of rural Manitoba, with few exceptions, had no electric service. A Liberal Government in 1944, as we approached the end of the war, made a decision. It was the Garson Government. They developed a list of priorities to create employment, to develop the province in the post-war period.

In 1944, on the 14th of March, I have a Tribune article which says, "Rural electrification tops Garson's list." In the first group, rural electrification was at the top of the list. They were contemplating, as a government, expansion and nationalization of the energy corporation, Winnipeg Hydro. But in doing so, they made a commitment to put electricity to every home in Manitoba. Rural electrification was a priority.

In 1945, on the 22nd of March, the headline says, "Campbell outlines electrification plan." That's former

Premier Douglas Campbell as Minister of Agriculture. And the article says: "No. 1 on the list of post-war plans for Manitoba is rural electrification," the Honourable D. L. Campbell, Minister of Agriculture, told the Junior Section, Manitoba Liberal Progressive Association, Tuesday evening."

A further article from the 5th of April in 1945 indicates how they're going to do it. That article in 1945 says: "Farm power trial is planned for this year. A trial area involving 1,000 farm installations for rural electrification is likely to be started this year," the Honourable D.L. Campbell told the Legislature Wednesday in outlining the post-war plans of the Department of Agriculture."

They were planning to give electricity to all Manitobans when they established their new Crown corporation. Mr. Deputy Speaker, furthermore on the ninth month, September 7, 1945, the article said: "The speed-up in Manitobans' rural electrification program to have electric power service installations in nearly all its farm homes within seven years was announced in the Legislature Thursday by Minister of Agriculture, the Honourable D.L. Campbell." Within seven years, they're going to have rural electrification in every farm home in Manitoba, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That was a Crown corporation to deliver energy to all Manitobans.

Here is the really blockbuster headline in my opinion. This is from the 12th of April, 1948, where the headline in the Winnipeg Tribune says: "The House votes \$8 million to rural power - 50 towns will get lines. In the Legislature Friday, \$8,175,000 was voted for rural electrification extensions in 1948." That's the amount of money they spent in 1948 alone.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this amount was more than half the money asked for in the \$14,872,054 Capital Supply Bill, the biggest ever introduced at a Legislative Session. The House voted the money in less than 20 minutes, because all sides of the House supported the rural electrification as promised by the government. Every home would have electricity. That was what was being proposed when a government of vision created the Crown corporation, Manitoba Hydro. "The rest of the \$8.175 million is for improvements and new installations for power distribution on facilities either built or all ready to be built this year." Advances to the Manitoba Power Commission for new construction, extension and additions to the works of the commission, including farm electrification - \$8.175 million.

In 1949, after this program had been undertaken in 1948, on the 12th of February, it says: "The use of hydro is growing at a rate of 56 percent faster than projected. The number of customers being served at March 31, 1948 was 40,069, an increase during that year of 6,309 new customers or 19 percent over 1947. They were increasing the number of rural customers availing themselves of Manitoba Hydro by 20 percent per year in those days.

That was a commitment to take an energy Crown corporation, namely Manitoba Hydro, and provide that energy to every Manitoban. What do we have with this parochial group of losers in government now? They want to take over the gas corporation, but is there the accompanying commitment in this House that every Manitoban, as a stakeholder, a shareholder in that new Crown corporation will have gas service within seven years as was committed by the Garson government under the guidance of the Hon. D.L. Campbell, Minister

of Agriculture? No, absolutely not, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They do not make any such commitment. Do you know why, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Because they haven't got the political courage to do it.

Do you want to know why, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Because if they made a commitment to extend natural gas to every farm home in Manitoba, they would be going to the consumers of the City of Winnipeg and they would be saying to those consumers of the City of Winnipeg, who they have promised a \$150 alleged reduction in their bill, they would be saying to them, "We're sorry; we believe that all people of Manitoba should have natural gas from the new Crown corporation, and you're going to have to pay \$150 more per year to finance the expansion to every Manitoban." But this is a gutless-wonder government. They will not make that commitment, because they know Manitobans will not pay for it like they did in 1948. So what are we left with, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with this new Crown corporation?

We are left with a privileged group of Manitobans who currently are served by natural gas under the ICG system and that includes some towns. It's interesting to note the extent of information the caucus members of the NDP have, but the lack of information the Minister sponsoring this bill has in terms of developing a business plan, to show us the customer base, to show us the projection of revenue.

I refer to the speech by the Member for Elmwood yesterday. He went through a list of constituencies and he had named and numbered the customers for the gas company. He said, in Pembina constituency, there were 2,171 users - and he had those figures for other constituencies.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, they've got that information with the Member for Elmwood, but they haven't got a business plan that they can table for the people of Manitoba to decide whether it's a good economic investment. I say, balderdash, absolute balderdash! They are hiding the information again from the people of Manitoba on this takeover.

But I don't want to dwell on how much these people do not give Manitobans information, because it's legion. We still are waiting for The Freedom of Information Act, and we'll probably wait for another year and a half.

What is important is that, as this government uses the newly created Crown corporation to buy votes in the next election - I'll make a prediction. They may go to my colleague, the Member for Springfield, and they'll maybe go to a couple of communities where it's not economic to put in natural gas and they will make the election commitment, you will have natural gas if you vote NDP. That would be their effort to win Springfield. They will do the same thing in the Roblin-Russell constituency and they will -(Interjection)- and the Member for Elmwood said it exactly. He said, not in Pembina.

That is what he said from his seat, because he knows very well there isn't a vote in a carload south of the No. 1 Highway in Manitoba. He has exactly made the point that I'm about to make, that they will only attempt to buy the votes in seats they think they can win. The rest of Manitobans will pay the bill. They will use the new Crown corporations to pick and choose seats they can win. They will not care about the economics of

extending the gas service to those communities, as long as they can buy some votes and win the next election. That's the whole purpose of this bill.

What is the outcome of that for those unfortunate Manitobans in the small towns in southern Manitoba, southern rural Manitoba? What is the outcome for the businesses in those towns, the homeowners, and indeed the farmers? Those farmers, businesses and homeowners in the small towns will have to rely on Manitoba Hydro as their energy source.

What happens to Manitoba Hydro where this government for years has been promoting electric space heat as a method of consuming surplus electric energy? When they, through crass political purposes, move natural gas into towns and constituencies they think they can buy the votes in the next election in, when they do that, they remove customers from Manitoba Hydro. As they remove those customers, the expenses stay exactly the same, so the remaining customers who are captive to the Hydro system will pay massively increased Hydro rates for the privilege of the politicization of natural gas distribution, compliments of the NDP.

That is what will happen, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That is what will happen. Where are those people who will pay the costs, and how do they vote? They are in Southern Manitoba and they vote Progressive Conservative. That's who are the people who will pay for this nationalization and they will have absolutely no benefit for the extension of natural gas to their towns, their homes, their businesses and their farms, because the NDP couldn't buy a vote in a carload in Southern Manitoba with a carrot of natural gas extension. But they will use it in the areas they think they can glean and buy some votes. That's why this bill is wrong.

This is not a public utility that is being created. A public utility was created in 1945 to 1948 by the Garson Liberal Progressive Government, where they made the commitment that every farm would have electricity and they did. But this government doesn't have the courage to do that because it would cost the very voters they're attempting to buy additional money to do it.

A MEMBER: Balderdash.

MR. D. ORCHARD: So what we've got - well, now my honourable friend, the Member for Radisson, the man who gave us a \$185 million deficit in WCB, uses his brilliant economic recall to say, "balderdash." This is the man who couldn't even remember he took out a loan for a tax scam. This is the guy who can't remember he borrowed money to participate in a tax scam, along with his soul mate, the Member for Transcona, who couldn't remember, conveniently, during the election that he ripped the taxpayers of Manitoba off for over \$50,000 in tax dollars that didn't go to support hospital beds and services to the people of Manitoba; and what the members of his family ripped off as well from the taxpayers of Manitoba, we don't know. We don't know.

HON. W. PARASIUK: A point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There's a point of order being raised.

The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: The Member for Pembina might make comments about me, which I'll take within the Legislature, but I would appreciate his not making comments from a position of ignorance about any members of my family, especially my mother. He doesn't know the circumstances there. He doesn't know what she has contributed to charity, which would astound him, and I'd ask him to withdraw that type of guttersnipe comment.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the Minister is sensitive about the kind of tax advice he provided to himself and his family, that's his problem. That is absolutely his problem.

HON. W. PARASIUK: A point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I asked him about that once, as a member of the Legislature. He can crawl around where he wants. There will be ways to deal with him.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't know whether it's within the parliamentary procedure for a member to stand up and apparently threaten another member. If that's what the Minister was doing, stand up and make your threat.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Deputy Speaker, gutter politics, as practised by the Member for Pembina, get their just reward in due course.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I thank the Minister for withdrawing that threat.

HON. W. PARASIUK: I didn't withdraw anything.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I thank the Minister for withdrawing that threat, and if he wants to talk about gutter politics - what about the time you wheeled the people up in the wheelchair in the election? You didn't care about them two months before when you knew their problem. It wasn't politically opportune. You're the sleazy, guttersniping politician from Transcona, not anyone else, and don't ever forget it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before that diversion from the so-sensitive Minister for Transcona who doesn't like to have his tax scams mentioned to the people of Manitoba, let me get back to the issue at heart here.

This is the Minister who has not yet delivered on any of his promises, not yet. He hasn't delivered on any of the profits. He hasn't delivered one nickel of net revenue on any undertaking that he has yet brought before this House and he is asking the people of Manitoba, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to accept, without the tabling of a business plan, this alleged savings of \$150 per family in the City of Winnipeg. If he has those figures, table the business plan that shows them. Why do you not have the courage to table this obvious, glowing report?

Well, you know, I can't answer that for the Minister of Energy and Mines, other than maybe it doesn't exist, or it exists as a figment of his imagination.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I will guarantee the people of Manitoba with the passage of this bill is that captive Manitobans who will not have the alternative energy source of gas, as provided by our Crown corporation to be established, will pay ever higher rates for electricity because of this nationalization because they will be captive to the energy source of Manitoba Hydro electricity. They will not have an option.

They will be the ones who pay for this takeover and, as I reiterate again, the vast majority of those people are in my constituency, in the constituency of the Member for La Verendrye, in the constituency of the Member for Morris, Rhineland, and I can go on and on and on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that a proper initiative of any government that purports to represent all of the people of Manitoba? I say, no, it isn't, and that is the failing of this legislation; that is the failing of this Minister; that is the failing of the whole political philosophy of the NDP right now. They only undertake actions which they believe will help to win the next provincial election, and this nationalization of ICG, this trumped-up case that they've made before the Public Utilities Board and the hype with which they went in it are trumped up, trumped-up hype, designed simply, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to win the next election.

Politics is fair in this Chamber. Politics is always fair in this Chamber - but, unfortunately, NDP politics cost Manitobans who don't vote for them untold millions and millions and billions; and most of those people who are paying the shots for the political adventurism and the political opportunism of this NDP Government are from Conservative constituencies in Southern Manitoba and the agricultural community.

Let me tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no area of the province which can afford less, that can ill-afford any more cost foisted on them by this government that has so mismanaged all affairs of the government from current account spending, to taxation, to Crown corporations; because the farm community, although they could benefit from the extension of natural gas to keep their production costs down, will never see that economic advantage from this Crown corporation. But yet they will pay on the farms and in the towns, and the businesses in those towns, for the privilege of the City of Winnipeg and other privileged towns who happen to be in the political gunsights of this party. They will pay for that privilege to those citizens through ever-rising hydro rates. That's what will happen, and that's why I cannot support this adventurism, because it is discrimination against rural Southern Manitoba of the worst kind.

We have a bill in here that presumably is supposed to eliminate discrimination, but yet you've got this bill in here which is going to bring in economic discrimination to my constituents. I cannot support that, they cannot support that, and any reasonable thinking Manitoban cannot support that, because if there's one thing that I think Manitobans are, it's they're fair-minded and this they do not recognize as a fair-minded Crown corporation in the delivery of energy.

Manitobans, I reiterate, during the time of the Garson Government, during the time of the Hon. D.L. Campbell, understood what a fair-minded government, with the future enrichment of all citizens, had in mind when they created the Crown corporation, which is now Manitoba

Hydro, with the goal and the scope of extending electric service to every farm in Manitoba. Manitobans were fair-minded enough to accept that then because it was reasonable. It was not overly costly; it was something they believed they could afford. Manitobans overwhelmingly supported that because the \$8 million bill in 1948 was passed in this Chamber in 20 minutes. That's the kind of support we had because there was a fair commitment to all Manitobans.

Under this NDP proposal of another energy Crown corporation, there is no such fairness to Manitobans. There are winners and losers with this bill. The losers are the people who will never see natural gas. The winners are temporary winners in that they will have their votes attempted to be bought by an NDP Government desperate for re-election two years from now and, after that point in time, all Manitobans will be losers because this Crown corporation will not have any magic formula to be run better than MPIC with \$59 million of losses this year, than MTS with \$27 million of losses, and I could go on and on and on.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a bill of economic discrimination against southern rural Manitoba. It is a bill of political opportunism by a group in government wherein the elected caucus has little or no say in the future plans of the party. It is a behind-the-scene gang of left-wing thinkers that devised the next scheme to win the next election and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, quite frankly, they think they can do it with this bill.

But I believe the fair-minded nature of Manitobans will recognize this for the deliberate vote-getting policy that it is, and Manitobans will remember the horrendous legacy of mismanagement by the NDP in every single Crown corporation they touched and they will not support this adventurism into nationalizing Inter-City Gas. If they supported it, we would have tabled in this House the public opinion poll taken by the government, if Manitobans supported it, but that isn't even been tabled, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have a bill that I will oppose, because I speak for my constituents in opposing it. I speak for them because they recognize it for the political ruse it is, for the opportunity to further pillage their pocketbooks in Southern Manitoba. They recognize that, I recognize that, and fair-minded Manitobans will not support an NDP Government with such an obvious bill of economic discrimination as we see in Bill 68.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. L. DERKACH: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I rise this afternoon to put a few comments on the record with regard to Bill 68. In speaking to this bill, I would like to say at the outset that I will be opposing this piece of legislation, although I am one of the fortunate people who does have natural gas coming through my constituency and serving several communities within the constituency.

I suppose, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I were to take a poll in my constituency and ask a very convoluted question, I guess I could get the answer that I would like, and I suppose that's the way this particular

government did their particular poll on whether or not they should enter the natural gas business.

No one can argue, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the desire and the premise that lower gas prices are desirable. Excessive prices for any utility is not a desirable aspect, whether it's hydro, or whether it's telephone, or whether it's natural gas. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have seen what has been happening to our hydro prices and the cost of heating our homes with hydro or the cost of running our farms with hydro over the last few years. Even today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are communities, there are pockets within our province which do not have the luxury of hydro within this province.

Hydro, in Manitoba, should be relatively inexpensive, especially in view of the fact that the resource is there. It doesn't have to be mined; you don't have to dig a hole to get it. You simply have to harness it, provide it transmission lines, and Manitobans have that great resource in this province, and therefore we should enjoy very low prices in terms of this form of energy.

In the Winnipeg Free Press, sometime ago, I was one of the MLA's who was mentioned who might be supporting this bill and might have some problems with the fact that we would oppose this piece of legislation. Well, let me state, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I have no problem in opposing this particular piece of legislation not because of its basic premise, but because of the kind of track record that this government has had in relation to Crown corporations.

We don't have to take a look too deeply to see what kind of losses have been incurred in the various Crown corporations. We simply have to take a look at the track record with regard to the Manitoba Telephone System, MTX. Let's take a look at the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, and no matter what Crown corporation we look at, which this government is involved in, which this government has under its control, we find that there are horrendous losses. Thank God that the Liquor Control Commission has a built-in guarantee for profit and they are very easily able to generate profit; that is one corporation which is not losing horrendous amounts of money.

A MEMBER: If 90 percent was tax, how can you lose?

MR. L. DERKACH: That's right, with a 90 percent tax, how can you lose money? Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have heard this Minister of Energy and Mines stand up before the House and say to the people of Manitoba that they will guarantee lower gas prices to the people of this province. Well, in the short term, that's a given.

We know at the present time that gas prices are dropping. We know that when the contracts are renewed, at the end of October of this year, or in October of this year, that there will be a reduction in natural gas prices. So whether this government takes over the utility, whether this government becomes the owner of Inter-City Gas, is not going to mean anything different; gas prices are going to drop in the immediate future.

But I think what Manitobans should be more concerned about is the long-term effect of this gas takeover. What is the long-term effect going to be and what is this corporation going to look like five years down the road? If we were to take a look at the track

record of this government of how it is handled or mishandled its Crown corporations, we would see very quickly that the projection does not look very good.

If this Minister, who tells Manitobans that he will save them \$50 million a year, was so sure that the long-term effect would be so positive, then why doesn't he table the business plan for the takeover of this corporation? Where is the business plan? Why doesn't he show it to the House? Why doesn't he show it to the people of Manitoba what their long-term intention is?

We had the Premier stand up in this House yesterday and he made his speech on Bill 68, but he said something that was somewhat contradictory to what the Minister of Mines said, because the Premier said that, yes, we were going to provide natural gas to all Manitobans. The Minister of Mines said we will provide natural gas wherever feasible. Now it will be interesting to see how the Premier is going to live up to the promise that he made again. But knowing the kinds of promises this Premier has made in the past, we know that he should be suspect.

I simply point to the promise that he made with regard to education and the amount of funding that this government was going to contribute to the public school financing aspect. He committed 90 percent. Now he is saying that's only a speculation; he only can hope that they will provide that.

If you take a look at any feasibility study that's been done in an attempt or in a wish to provide natural gas to some of the communities that don't have it - and I only point to the small town of Souris in Western Manitoba where a feasibility study was done to see whether it would be economical to provide natural gas to that community - it was found that they would need four facilities the size of their hospital in order for it to be economically viable to have natural gas in that particular town. So how is this government going to save Manitoba taxpayers \$50 million in the first year and also provide natural gas services to the entire province?

I think the Premier was correct yesterday when he said, yes, it is going to cost those users of natural gas now some money to extend those services to the other communities within this province. But I don't think that it's even going to be feasible to do that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I don't think it's feasible to provide Manitoba, as a whole, with natural gas.

As I said before, no one can argue with the premise that people should be paying excessive prices for utilities such as hydro, telephone, natural gas, or whatever, but on the other hand I think we have to be realistic. I think we have to take a look at the resources of this province and see whether or not some of the promises that are being made, or some of the ideas, are practical. This Minister of Energy and Mines has not indicated how he is going to go about providing the services to the parts of this province that don't have it. I would like to know what kind of a business plan he has in place that is going to see natural gas provided to all of my constituency. If he's going to provide it to all of my constituency, I'm sure that my neighbouring constituencies are going to want to see his business plan for how he intends to provide natural gas to their communities as well. But he has not tabled this information.

We simply have a government who is rushing to take public ownership of a utility. We don't hear very much complaining from the utility, of course. We have read why there isn't very much opposition from that utility for this government taking it over, because they are going to go smiling all the way to the bank, and I'm sure that's the case.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what could this province do with that \$185 million that it is going to borrow to take over this corporation? What kinds of services could be provided to the people of this province if this government were not to venture into this activity? And once it does venture into this activity, we know by its track record that this corporation could very easily be in a deficit position in the next few years. Where is it going to get the money? It will have to reach into the taxpayers' pockets again. Many of those taxpayers don't have natural gas today, won't have natural gas in five years, but nevertheless they will have to pay the cost.

For example, how am I, as a farmer, going to benefit from a natural gas takeover? Is this Minister going to guarantee that I, as a farmer, will have the availability of natural gas at my farm? Or is he going to now reduce my hydro costs because I have to heat my house on my farm with hydro? Or is he going to suggest that there also be a takeover of the propane aspect so that I can get cheaper prices in terms of propane? How am I, as a farmer, going to benefit from a natural gas takeover? Yet, as a taxpayer, my dollars are going into this particular corporation. What about the rest of the farmers of this province? How are they going to benefit?

A few years ago - I happen to live about a mile-and-a-half away from a natural gas line - a few years ago, a few of us farmers got together and said, perhaps we could tap into this natural gas line, because it would make a lot of sense for us to be able to dry our grain with natural gas, heat our homes with natural gas, and have the availability of that particular form of energy on our farms. Well, there was a bit of a feasibility study done as to what it would cost to install the line into our yards and how much we would have to pay for this installation. It became apparent very quickly that it was not economically viable for us to tap into that resource even though it was a mile-and-a-half away.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the prospect of seeing natural gas come into each and every home in this province is very remote. It's not going to happen within the foreseeable future. Until this Minister is prepared to bring forth a business plan, until he is prepared to explain to the people of this province how he intends to save every homeowner \$150 in energy costs and, at the same time, expand the natural gas services to the province, we cannot support this bill.

I submit, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in conclusion, that the intent of this government in taking over this corporation, is simply a political one. Yes, gas prices will drop in the near future. We will see an election campaign run as the Minister of Agriculture said - yes, we will make this an election issue, yes, we will tell Manitobans that we have lowered gas prices for the province.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

But if we were to tell Manitobans in a poll that this government has abused its function in terms of the way it has run Crown corporations, I wonder how many

Manitobans would want this government to take over the natural gas industry.

So, Madam Speaker, in conclusion, I simply say that this government has no intention to save money for Manitobans. Its only intention is one of political gain for itself.

Thank you very much.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: May I direct the attention of honourable members to the loge to my right, where we have visiting with us this afternoon, Mr. Glen Clark, MLA for Vancouver East.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you to our Legislature this afternoon.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING (Cont'd)

BILL NO. 68 - AN ACT TO GOVERN THE SUPPLY OF NATURAL GAS IN MANITOBA AND TO AMEND THE PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD ACT

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I also feel compelled to speak on Bill No. 68. I realize that most of the points that I would like to cover have also been covered by the Member for Roblin-Russell and also the Member for Pembina. I think they individually itemized the issues over their concern and a lot of those were the ones that I was going to raise as well.

But my question that I would like to raise to the Minister in charge would be: Did not the Public Utilities Board - is that not a board that is appointed by the Government of the Day? Is that not a board that has approved all of the rates? Is that not a board that demands a certain number of years of adequate gas for the Province of Manitoba? Is this not the board that has approved the rates we're being charged in the Province of Manitoba? And I believe it is, Madam Speaker, why are they not on trial, if we as Manitobans are being charged an unfair rate of gas at the present time?

Madam Speaker, the Minister states that we will have \$50 million worth of savings. Madam Speaker, \$50 million of savings, and to just bring that figure out in this House, \$50 million of savings as to what? If he cannot indicate to us even at the present time what the cost of this company is going to be, what the cost will be to the Province of Manitoba, how can you then state that there will be X number of dollars of savings? Madam Speaker, that's another question that I toy with.

I hear, when it comes to the financial aspect of any one of the members in government getting up and speaking on it, it is a fiasco. They've talked about \$50 million savings but they don't know what the company will cost. So I believe also that we're going to see with this Inter-City Gas something that we're realizing with Hydro today. We're realizing Hydro today where the Province of Manitoba has to pick up foreign currency

on our hydro bills. That's not charged to the Limestone project; that's charged on our hydro bill today.

We're already spending 52 cents of every dollar on interest on that hydro bill, but what I want to bring out in respect to Hydro is, our surplus hydro, our cheap hydro is being exported at a very reduced rate. So who's getting the benefit? The United States of America, these capitalists so to speak that this government is so against, these multinational corporations that this government says, they are getting now that cheap hydro.

Madam Speaker, that should be the heating for the areas where natural gas would not be able to supply. I believe if this government comes up with gas, once they nationalize gas in the Province of Manitoba, it should be heating for all at the same cost. For instance, 1,000 BTU's, whether it is electricity, whether it is propane, whatever form of heating, it should be the same rate. Then you are talking of nationalizing something and equal to all in the Province of Manitoba.

What this government is trying to do - I think the Member for Roblin-Russell indicated very clearly - is buying votes, Madam Speaker. Where have we seen a business plan? Which private company will buy another company of whatever nature without a business plan of some nature? But we're talking of a savings, Madam Speaker. The saving is supposed to be \$50 million, but we don't have a business plan. It has been put on the record by almost every member on my side of the House in respect to MTX, MPIC, it's been a disaster all the way through. The former Minister of Finance has brought this province into a deficit. The present Minister, he's stating publicly now already that their spending is out of control.

I've got to relate to the Minister of Health. I can't help but mention something about that as well, Madam Speaker. He was in Steinbach a number of years ago and we were discussing finances. And what's happening to the health today, he indicated at that time - I don't know whether he will remember, but I was on the board; that's four years ago - and he said, "Are there any suggestions that anybody has on this board because it's just a matter of time, what's happening today," he indicated at that time.

I said, yes, we need to have a surcharge or a user fee, not when the person is sick, no, then the province should pick it up - but the misuse of the system. Do you know what the Minister of Health at that time indicated? Really, basically, he was in favour of it, but his party wasn't.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. H. PANKRATZ: That was four years ago.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: On a point of order, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health on a point of order.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, at no time did I say that I was in favour of the utilization fee. I said that we needed something. I remember distinctly at that time I did say, like I said a few months ago and

it wasn't understood, that you had to prioritize, and I do say that you have coinsurance. You have it now. You have coinsurance in personal care homes, you have coinsurance in Pharmacare; but the point is, for essential services, we've never believed in utilization or deterrent fees.

MADAM SPEAKER: A dispute over the facts is not a point of order.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Well, a dispute over the facts is not necessarily a point of order, and I think we've heard Beauchesne - in my second year here, I must have heard that 150 times.

Madam Speaker, I'm sure maybe even the minutes of the Bethesda Hospital Board would, if they are in detail, record this as well. It would be recorded on them as well. Madam Speaker, I don't know how the Minister of Health exactly felt about this at the time. I believe that our system has a misuse in it, and that's basically what I'm trying to point out.

Now whether on a technicality, whether I misunderstood the Minister of Health, that's possible. I will not go that far as to state that the Minister of Health - maybe I did wrongly interpret his statements he did make, but that's at least what I gathered from them.

Madam Speaker, it just proves that the system, unless there's a control of some way, the misuse of it will step in. We see it in our health services today. We see beds closing all around. Why were they then built, Madam Speaker? There must have been, at one point in time, a plan that all these health beds were needed, that this was a need. We have the increasing population, so do we not need the beds? Do we not need the health care? Now we're closing it. I can't understand.

There must have been a study of the day on the record - and I'm not trying to be critical of the Minister of Health. I'm trying to say, there must have been a study of the day, whether it's 10 years ago, 15 years ago, or 5 years ago, that demanded these beds be built. So were we wasting money at the time, at that time? How does our medical system, how did it function?

My problem that I have here with this today, what this government needs to do - they don't have a business plan of purchasing Inter-City Gas. They are not producing a business plan of how many more beds will be closed. I've been sitting here and listening to the critic in Health ask the questions: How many more? Which beds are next? Madam Speaker, we cannot get anywhere with that whatsoever.

Madam Speaker, if you take over something of the nature of Inter-City Gas to supply the cheapest rate for the people in the Province of Manitoba, then it should not matter what source of heating you are going to be using. We should all be paying basically an equal rate, whether it's the rural farmers, and I think the Member for Lakeside brought that out very well in his speech. He pointed out exactly that it should be equal for all, and that's basically what a socialistic government of this nature should be trying to do.

But I sometimes wonder, Madam Speaker, if this gas takeover is just another ploy to divert the public and

even this House from the fiasco that they are in. Madam Speaker, it is unbelievable, coming from a rural area, seeing how things are run at a local level, and then seeing here how the Finance Minister and all the other Ministers basically have no control over their spending or their losses, what they are doing in that respect.

We have the Minister of Energy and Mines, he invests money in CRTC. Why? To evade the tax dollars that their own government put on, Madam Speaker. Here again, it's quite obvious what they have intentions of doing. The general public shall pick up the cost and areas naturally, like the Member for Pembina indicated, south of No. 1 will be levied like most others which are, in a lot of respects, not getting the services.

Madam Speaker, in respect to this gas takeover, not one person has called me to say he was in favour of this. I have had dozens and dozens and dozens of calls in respect to Bill 47. Madam Speaker, is not a government elected for the people, to do the wishes of the people? I fail to realize how this government, in their wisdom, will try to bulldoze through a bill like Bill No. 47 -(Interjection)- Well you're another one.

The Member for Radisson is speaking up again with all his wisdom, you know. You didn't even remember that you borrowed \$20,000 to invest in the CRTC, so you're the last one who should speak out about anything in finances, Madam Speaker. Anybody who doesn't know when he borrows \$20,000 doesn't deserve . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please!

May I remind the honourable member that he's to address his remarks through the Chair and he should not cast aspersions on other members of the House?

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye on Bill No. 68.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I think then his comments should have been addressed through the Chair as well, Madam Speaker. I agree with you that my comments should be addressed through this Chair, but I would not be prepared to make those comments through the Chair which I made to him directly.- (Interjection)- Madam Speaker, I believe you should question the Member for Radisson in his comments he's making. I think, if not, then he should be removed from this Legislature. I don't agree that you're allowing him to interrupt me in my speech.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye is the member who has the floor to debate Bill 68. It was the Honourable Member for La Verendrye I was listening to.- (Interjection)- Is the honourable member raising a point of order? If he is, there is a proper procedure to do that, not to criticize the Chair.

Is the Honourable Member for La Verendrye continuing to debate on the bill?

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I'm prepared to make my comments as to Bill 68. I was, by no means, referring to your decisions or anything of that nature. My comments were addressed

straight to the Member for Radisson and his comments. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I believe that if a government of -(Interjection)- Well, Madam Speaker, I can't resist when members opposite make some comments. I realize that the Minister of Industry and Technology feels very uncomfortable when all of his church delegates have basically been out here opposing his decision on Bill 47, so we have to excuse him for the time being. He still hasn't had the guts to put on record his decision, Madam Speaker, and I think . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

May I remind the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, on page 107 of *Beauchesne*, in the list, the term "has not got the guts" is unparliamentary.

If other honourable members want to carry on private conversations, may I suggest they do so elsewhere?

Order please.

Could we proceed with the debate in an orderly fashion and, if other members want to have private conversations, they can do so elsewhere.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Madam Speaker, if I used an unparliamentary word like "guts" in referring to the Minister of Industry and Technology, I should maybe use intestines because he must have a lot of them as well. So I'll definitely change that if that's in order, Madam Speaker.

I'm really over my time already, but I'm just wondering, when I see what this government is trying to do in their having not control over the corporations that they are already in control of - they don't know the spending of it, it's like a train going down the track with no conductor - I'm wondering, Madam Speaker, what will be next. Will this government want to control the press? Madam Speaker, I hear so much talk from opposite that the press had misquoted them and misquoted them and misquoted them. Will they try to control the press next? What will they have to do? Will gun control be next, Madam Speaker?

I believe, like my previous comments were, if this government would like to take over the gas purchase, I believe we as Opposition members should have the right to have a business plan in place, which the Minister in charge should have to produce. I believe if then we would be able to study it, there are aspects of it that possibly members on this side could see that could be favourable to the Province of Manitoba, to the ratepayers of Manitoba. But me, representing a constituency like La Verendrye where a small portion of us are receiving Inter-City Gas, I feel that the rural area, the small hamlets, those areas should be equally serviced. This is basically why I voice my opinion on this in respect to Bill 68. I would like to see this government come out and say how will we service the rest of the province that is not entitled to receiving this gas at the present, and being able to equalize what basically a socialistic government should be trying to do.

With those few comments, thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I rise today, Madam Speaker, to speak against Bill 68. I really don't have any qualms about the ideology of government operating a gas service or not operating a gas service. I'm absolutely against it, particularly because of my background, and I do support private enterprise, Madam Speaker. The Honourable Minister who proposed this bill -(Interjection)- and I know that he's paying attention over there - Madam Speaker, because I would like him to be aware of all the remarks that I'm going to be making.

I must apologize, Madam Speaker, wherein the Minister and I have been onside on many, many occasions, particularly when it comes to energy and the Province of Manitoba. We both agree, and we have for a great amount of years about the future of the Province of Manitoba being in energy, be it electrical energy, be it hydrogen energy, or any other form of energy. We have supported, he and I, the promotion of electrical energy through the promotion of Manitoba Hydro. We now appear to be parting the ways. I really feel very badly about it because I am a very understanding person.

You know, the Legislature is like a game of chess, Madam Speaker, wherein you make a move and there is a countermove, and you plan possibly 10 or 12 - the good chess players plan 10 or 12 - moves in advance. I think that the move to purchase this gas company and make it into a Crown corporation is a very short-sighted move on the behalf of the Province of Manitoba, the government of the Province of Manitoba, wherein there is no going back. I can't understand the move. I'm not imputing any reasons for it to happen, Madam Speaker, but I would think that with an election coming up and the poor showing that the New Democratic Party Government has shown up until now, that they're looking for any kind of a . . .

A MEMBER: You've lost more ground than we have since the election.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I'm just suggesting that I'll rattle his chain when I want him to speak, Madam Speaker.

But what we're really getting down to is that the New Democratic Party Government are looking to enhance their position, and they think that by promoting the purchase of Inter-City Gas and having Inter-City Gas become a Crown corporation that this will enhance their position with the voters of the Province of Manitoba. It might do so. Madam Speaker, it just might do so; it might do so. We do have natural gas in Niakwa. I'm not concerned about that. But what we are doing, if we're going to promote natural gas, we are going to take away from the development of hydro - Manitoba Hydro. You just can't have it both ways.

I've been accused of saying that I can have it both ways, but you can't have it both ways. You cannot promote the use of natural gas and also promote the use of Manitoba Hydro, because one or the other has to suffer, Madam Speaker. One or the other has to suffer.

I suggest right now that with the purchase of Inter-City Gas that Manitoba Hydro will suffer. We are looking,

and we should be promoting the extension of Manitoba Hydro, particularly in communities that could use electrical energy for heating. If you're going to fight one with the other, then the one that will suffer will be Manitoba Hydro. I can't see any other reason for the purchase of natural gas, of the company for natural gas. Are you going to have both companies? You're competing for the same market, or at least I would hope that they'd be competing for the same market, Madam Speaker, wherein we would develop Manitoba Hydro, either through hydrogen power, so that we can be heating remote communities, heating areas that could be heated with electrical energy. But we will be competing with this natural gas heating.

I think that we should be promoting the development, the orderly development of Manitoba Hydro. We've just gone through Limestone, and I would hope that with all of the benefits of Limestone, Madam Speaker, wherein Limestone was developed and provided employment for people of the North. But I think and I suggest, Madam Speaker, that with the purchase of natural gas and the natural gas company that Manitoba Hydro will suffer and any development somewhere in the future, wherein we would be using electrical energy to heat our homes, will have to be curtailed, will have to be slowed down.

I predict, Madam Speaker, that the advancement and the development of Conawapa will suffer because of this development. It'll be a lack of employment in the North to the Manitoba Natives.

Am I saying something wrong, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: No, the honourable member is not saying anything wrong; but it is 5:00 p.m., and I have not been given any instructions about Private Members' Hour.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Madam Speaker, I believe just after the conclusion of question period, at Orders of the Day, that the Government House Leader indicated that there was leave by members on both sides to forego Private Members' Hour.

MADAM SPEAKER: Fine.

The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, am I limited to time?

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member has 34 minutes left.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Okay. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I've kind of lost my train of thought, but I'll try to get back to it, wherein I'm condemning the purchase of Inter-City Gas and promoting the expansion of Manitoba Hydro. I'd like to get back to that.

If we have it where we have to make a choice, and I believe that we do have to make a choice, whether we're going to develop one or the other, I say let's develop Manitoba Hydro to the point where our destiny will be in our own hands.

With Manitoba Hydro, the destiny of the Province of Manitoba is in our hands, in the actual development

and the source of that electricity. We have our water supply and we have all of the systems for generating electricity wherein, when we talk about purchasing a company out of Manitoba, the natural gas company that comes out of Alberta, we have to go cap-in-hand every time that there's a problem and say to the Province of Alberta, please, Sir, can I have more? Do you remember the story, can I have some more gruel or more soup? Please, Sir, will you allow me to negotiate for some of your natural gas?

Madam Speaker, I think that we've got to be firm. We've got to be able to stand on our own feet and say it is our electrical energy and we can do whatever we want with it, even sell it to the United States.

Madam Speaker, when I say that we don't have the strength to negotiate so that Manitoba Hydro can supply us with electrical energy, let us look at the Town of Churchill. Churchill just had electrical energy supplied to them just in March of this year and I supported it; I supported it all the way, absolutely. I think it wasn't an economical thing - but it was a thing for the development of the North and I supported it - because there's no way we'll ever get back the cost of supplying electrical energy into Churchill. But there are many other good things about it, the development of Churchill. Churchill is a site of about 1,200 people at this time, and we should be supplying electrical energy for the heating of Churchill, not just for their electrical needs, but for their heating needs. But, Madam Speaker, I have spoken to people in Churchill, and even though they now have electrical energy into Churchill, they're not about to convert to electrical energy for heating, so we are not promoting it in the manner in which I say we should be promoting it.

We should be promoting electrical energy through Manitoba Hydro. We spoke about it 10 years ago; we had a 25-year plan. We're 15 years from the time that we first started discussing it and the Minister had made statements about the development of hydrogen power which could replace gas power through natural gas, but I've heard nothing about the development of hydrogen power. Madam Speaker, that's what we should be doing, developing our own electrical power, our own hydrogen power, rather than looking to enhance the Province of Alberta by buying gas from them and supplying it to Manitoba at a cheaper rate.

If we're looking to supply heating power to the Province of Manitoba, let's supply it through Manitoba Hydro and let's reduce the rate so we can supply it at a better rate than what is being supplied now.

Madam Speaker, I really didn't want to get into any great detail. I know that I'm over-extending my time past five o'clock, but the development of Manitoba Hydro is in jeopardy with the purchase of this company, and I warn the government right now that Manitoba Hydro is in jeopardy because of the short-sightedness of this government in looking into supplying natural gas to the people of the Province of Manitoba, rather than reducing the price of electrical energy, supplying electrical energy for the safety and comfort of the people in the Province of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, with those few words, I would just say I think we're making a big mistake by entering into an agreement to purchase Inter-City Gas. I think we're making a big mistake by encouraging the supply of natural gas to all of the people of the Province of

Manitoba. I think we should be encouraging Manitoba Hydro to expand and I think that with Manitoba Hydro expanding we should be trying to push out the competition and supply Manitoba electrical energy at a competitive rate.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I take a great deal of pleasure rising to speak to this act, An Act to Govern the Supply of Natural Gas in Manitoba and to amend The Public Utilities Board Act.

Probably this bill is one of the easier bills for me to speak to in this Session because, quite frankly, Madam Speaker, I have little problem being able to express my thoughts and my concerns about an act that would create yet another Crown corporation in this province, a province that recently has had a very sorry rate of problems with the Crown corporations that we presently have in place.

Frankly, I have a great deal of concern that we now see the government prepared to put forward an act wanting to enshrine another Crown corporation for the delivery of natural gas within our province. I have almost no hesitation in saying that the government has chosen the wrong vehicle to deal with the situation of natural gas pricing within this province.

Madam Speaker, I oppose this legislation. I oppose it strongly for the reasons that I have stated, plus I also want to express, on behalf of the constituents who have spoken to me, their very grave concerns about where our province is headed and where we are going when we consider buying a natural gas distribution system.

Madam Speaker, I think the government, and I think the Minister, very sadly missed the mark when they tried to identify the problem that they feel is presently within the pricing of natural gas in this province and in this country. If the government chose to become involved in the pricing of natural gas, there are other vehicles that they could have used, other than the physical purchase and physical operation of a gas distribution system.

They could have very easily, I believe, become the broker and attempted to become involved in the price through that system. It seems to me, Madam Speaker, that what we have done is create a potential monster within the Crown corporations of this province. The reason that I say that, Madam Speaker, is that the government has taken the opportunity to use this as a political vehicle.

As other members before me have said, there's little doubt that we will probably see a temporary change in the gas price in this province, but I'm just cynical enough to suggest that price change, no doubt of a downward direction, will not last, because governments, and particularly governments of a socialist persuasion, will attempt to use this Crown corporation as a vehicle to do other things with the pricing structure within the corporation. The reason I feel very confident in making that charge is that already, within days of the announcement, we started to see the propaganada flow and where do they start?

They start with the elderly in our province, the list of seniors in this province was kicked into place in the computers of the back rooms of our government and they started to turn out the information according to "Howard, the happy car dealer." Now we have a four-page publication telling the government side of the story. How will the new gas policy be implemented? Why has Manitoba acted now? What is Manitoba's natural gas policy? What will the new policy mean for savings? What are the benefits to natural gas consumers?

All of these being sent to the people who very often are on a fixed income; people who have every right to be concerned about their natural gas costs, about the cost of housing, about the cost of food, but that is very typical of the way this government has approached their policies and their formulation of policy. They have targeted on groups that they believe are susceptible to their particular brand of handholding.

This information is sent out from the same department that didn't want to carry through with the Western Power Grid; the same Minister, I believe, certainly the same party and many members of the same administration, who deliberately set out, it seems, to cause the Western Power Grid agreement to self-destruct. How did they accomplish that? Because they went after Saskatchewan for a deal that Saskatchewan considered exorbitant. They would not stand behind the negotiations that had occurred up to that point. I see the Minister has scurried off, so he's probably out at his office right now, digging out his concerns regarding the Alcan.

Madam Speaker, I have no doubt that the Minister is busy and I wouldn't want to impute motives. I simply am stating . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The honourable member well knows that he's not to refer to the presence or the absence of a member.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I'm sorry, Madam Speaker. I withdraw that comment. I certainly wouldn't want to indicate anything that might not be 100 percent correct. But, Madam Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that the Minister is, at this very moment, digging up the information that was used during the Conservative years to try and promote the Alcan project.

Well, Madam Speaker, what did the Opposition to the government of that day do? They had a screaming-meemie. They didn't want that kind of information to be distributed, and they made sure when they came to government that Alcan wasn't going to be able to follow through on the negotiations that had been held up to that point. But what did they do themselves, now that they have an opportunity when they're in government? They don't even wait to be able to show the facts and figures to the people of Manitoba. They have theoretical figures in this publication which they are holding out to the people of Manitoba and saying, this is what could be your savings. This is why we have acted in this manner.- (Interjection)- Well, the members from the Opposition (sic) backbench say, "They're informing the public."

The public debate, the public information that needs to be distributed is: What are the costs of buying a distribution system? What are the costs to the public

of operating a distribution system? Unless this government has been misleading us, they have no intention of telling us what they are paying at this point. They don't know what they are paying at this point. They don't know what their cost of operation's going to be, but they're publishing misinformation to the people of this province, telling the people all sorts of airy-fairy stories about how the natural gas distribution system in Manitoba is, all of a sudden, going to put almost free gas in the households of every person in this province. That's the attitude that is portrayed in these types of -(Interjection)- Well, the Member for Ellice is getting quite exercised, but all you have to do is read this type of propaganda. There's no differentiation made about the fact that the gas is distributed not to the total population of this province but to a concentrated area.

The Member for Pembina got a reaction on the other side somewhat like sticking a broom handle in a bee's nest, when he mentioned that these "entrepreneurs" on the other side might be politically motivated because they know darn well that the Conservative areas of this province won't have the access to the type of savings they're talking about.

Madam Speaker, if they don't like that mailer that went out from the Premier of this province, I wonder how they like this one. This was a letter from the office of the Premier. Again, it went to the seniors. Now, do you wonder why I think this is a cynical, cynical operation that this government is embarking on? There's absolutely no question in my mind or in the minds of the majority of my constituents.

Their comments to me are, "My God, are we getting another Crown corporation?" I think that remark in itself sums up the feeling of an enormous number of Manitobans.

Madam Speaker, I suppose there's one advantage to what we're seeing here today and to the type of legislation we've seen this government bring down, because the active socialists in this government have finally come out of the closet. They are now an active socialist government and they are going to show the people of this province, by golly, what a socialist does. That's their attitude. They're going to give it to us whether we want it or not because that's not the government that the people of this province elected. They elected a pale chameleon and now they're finding out the chameleon is changing his colours.

That's what's wrong with this type of legislation, because the people in this province don't trust this kind of a government to run another Crown corporation.-(Interjection)- Well, the members opposite say we'll see you in a couple of years.

I hope they go to the polls with the kind of legislation that we have seen this year, call an election on the basis of Bill 47, call an election on the basis of this bill. You'll find that you'll be wiped out in rural Manitoba. The Member for Swan River must be darned uncomfortable at nights. The Member for Swan River is very uncomfortable with his colleagues, but where is the opportunity for a free vote for him? Where is it?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I can tell that the members opposite have either a hearing problem or a problem with comprehension.

Madam Speaker, I predict that the costs to the very large users of natural gas in this province, and I will use a specific example, Simplot in Brandon, an enormous consumer of natural gas, a consumer of natural gas that was able to take advantage of the deregulation that was brought in under federal changes in 1986. Those costs to Simplot directly reflect to the agricultural community.

I'd be interested to know why the Premier of this province would not tell Simplot what the projected savings for them would be if this bill were brought in. I wonder, is this government dedicated to making sure under their new system that those large producers will be able to achieve the discounts they presently have under deregulation.

Before someone over there jumps up and starts screaming about protection for the large companies, the large users and those terrible capitalists, let me remind you that it's people like myself - the farmers of this province - who pay the cost of that gas that Simplot uses. Because, they will use that gas on a cost-plus basis when they sell the fertilizer. The cost of fertilizer dropped this year, thank goodness, due to a series of several reasons, as I understand the situation. But one of those reasons is that the price of gas has been lower to that major consumer, not to mention, however, that there's a product trading between the producer in this province and the producers in the other provinces so that they can bring their product in or swap products.

You know, because Manitoba has the payroll tax, we have capital tax, we are probably responsible for increasing the cost of fertilizer to all the farmers of Western Canada. Because, through the trading of commodities between the various producers, they know that Manitoba can't go as low as the producers to the west and there's an identifiable amount in the cost to the consumer, i.e., the farmer. So let us be very careful what we are embarking on with this type of legislation.

The Government of the Day, if I understand the tax structure correctly, could be getting as much as 20 percent of the \$12 million that they hoped to put into the education tax rebate in the agricultural community. They could be getting as much as 20 percent of that \$12 million of the industry that I just talked about, one of the major, major users of natural gas.

I mentioned a few minutes ago about the power at Western Power Grid. Frankly, I find it quite ironic that we are now so upset in this province, according to the government, that the Government of the Day is upset that natural gas is being marketed across the border at a price less than what it can be sold for in Manitoba; I wonder what other energy commodity that reminds you of - it reminds you of our hydro. But we decided not to consummate the Western Power Grid and we are now going to be selling our surplus across the line.

I'm afraid, Madam Speaker, that when this government ripped and roared about the inequity of the natural gas systems that they see, they forgot to look at the historical costs that are associated with this industry. They chose, as far as I'm concerned, the wrong instrument to try and help the people of this province. They're buying a company that has been in operation for some time and I don't think that they know - in fact I would challenge them to show if they know - what the real costs of maintenance they may be facing

with a depreciated system that they are becoming involved with.

Finances is only part of it, because Manitoba Hydro is a perfect example of a public utility that expanded in very quick order when we decided to electrify so much more of Manitoba and that infrastructure then all became aged within a very short period of time and as the demands changed, then their overhead has changed dramatically as well, not to mention the overhead that's being built in now with the construction of Limestone.

But I would challenge this Minister and this government to show that they have any understanding of the future operational costs of the infrastructure, that they may not understand what they're getting into. They certainly haven't indicated to this point in the debate, to my knowledge, that they have a real understanding of what they may be getting into in terms of overhead and costs of operation.

I can tell you, Madam Speaker, that I am very cynical about the motives for this bill, and I want to tell you that I'm increasingly cynical when I look at an editorial from the Premier's home riding. In the last sentence of that editorial, which is entitled, "Divide and Conquer," but really refers to Big Brother watching, it says: "Any government that is afraid to stand before a public meeting of the citizens and defend their position and listen, whether for or against, is indeed a government not of the people but a government of the government, and this is indeed scary."

For the hometown boy, that's pretty harsh criticism, Madam Speaker, and I tell you that probably sums up very well why I'm concerned about an additional Crown corporation being created in this province, because that is another example, I believe, of what we are seeing, is a government that is governing to form a self-perpetuating government. Whether the political authorities change or not, the bureaucratic infrastructure will continue to grow and flourish and feed on itself. John Q. Public out there, who is being told that he is No. 1 - he's probably No. 1 all right. He's No. 1 when it comes to paying the bills.

I don't think that this legislation over the next six years, Madam Speaker, will come anywhere near proving its worth to the citizens of Manitoba, and I very, very strenuously oppose this legislation.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

ICG became part of my life when I was four years old. ICG, as it then was, was Plains Western Gas, a subsidiary of Great Northern Gas. My family at that time lived in the Town of Westlock, Alberta. My father needed work and found work with Plains Western Gas, in those days as a labourer. That was in 1952.

A couple of years ago, my father retired from Plains Western Gas. That was over 30 years later and, in the space of those years, perhaps by osmosis, I did find out a few things about the gas industry, about running a system, building a system and some of the things to do with the feasibility and the costs involved.

After Westlock, my father became the manager of the office in Morinville, Alberta and then, from there,

to Hanna, Alberta, and from there to Fort St. John, British Columbia. After about three years in Fort St. John, my father was the victim of an industrial accident and was burned rather badly at a gas regulation station. After his recovery from those burns, we found ourselves living in the beautiful Province of Manitoba, and my father was elevated to the position of supervisor for the Manitoba Division of Plains Western Gas. This was in 1957.

During the years following 1957, there was a great amount of development of the gas system in the Province of Manitoba. The rural development of the system in Southern Manitoba was carried out by Plains Western Gas under my father's supervision as by that time he was the Superintendent of Operations, Maintenance and Construction. Some of the people working with my father used those initials and called him, "Oh My Christ," which was something we laughed about often at home.

The point of my telling you all this, Madam Speaker, is to tell you that extension of gas facilities into certain areas, decisions about that extension were made on the basis of cost and on the basis of return. As a matter of fact, Inter-City Gas now does feasibility studies in various communities throughout the province every so often, every three or four years. We don't have gas in some communities because it's not cost-effective to do that. If it's not cost-effective for ICG, Madam Speaker, it would not be cost-effective for the Government of Manitoba as the new owner of ICG or as the owner of Manitoba Consumers' Gas Company.

So if it's not cost-effective to extend facilities to certain rural communities and the government finds some good political reason to move ahead with the construction of facilities to extend gas to certain areas, then that will be done, but it will be done at a loss. So the loss will be picked up by people like my constituents, Madam Speaker, the people of Brandon West and the people of Brandon East, the people of Winnipeg, Portage, Winkler, Morden, Morris, St. James, Letellier, Emerson, all those places where gas service exists now. If it will not be done that way, it will be done through other methods, such as increased taxation.

Just to go back to my own experience with ICG, my oldest brother has worked for many years for ICG as well. I remember, as youngster, having the opportunity to go to work with my older brother and be with him on the machines that were digging the trenches to build the pipelines in various places in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. When I became a little older, I had the opportunity to work for a contracting company which did work for ICG. It was a St. Boniface company called Inspiration. I worked as a labourer as my father had done before.

So I did learn that a lot of work goes into the construction of the infrastructure that is involved with the distribution of gas. I learned about the costs involved as well. So from that background, I have a real fear about the promises the government has made and will make in the future about extension of services to more communities in our province. I also have concerns about the cost of gas as a result of the government's promises about extension of services.

You see, we have a Public Utilities Board in this province, a Public Utilities Board put into place by Sir

Rodmond P. Roblin, Progressive Conservative or Conservative Premier of Manitoba in the early part of this decade. That Public Utilities Board was and still is, I suggest, one of the most effective means of controlling the supply and the cost of utilities in our province. This government, by taking the position it is now, is saying that, throughout the last half of the life of this province, the Public Utilities Board has not been doing a good enough job.

Well the fact is I don't believe this government when it says it's going to do a better job. If I did, I might not have so much trouble with this bill. As a matter of philosophy, I suppose, I would say philosophically that, in a situation where we're not dealing with a monopoly, the government shouldn't be involved. But my philosophical position about takeovers is not a black-and-white kind of thing. I support the ownership by the government of the hydro facilities in this province, and I support the ownership of the Telephone System by this province. After all, as a Conservative, I have to be reminded that it was Sir Rodmond P. Roblin, Madam Speaker, who was involved in the nationalization of the telephone company.

David Orlikow tells us about that often when he speaks in Ottawa. He seems to speak with some pride about the achievements of Sir Rodmond P. Roblin, and I don't blame him. But the point is it goes beyond a philosophy when we're talking about public utilities. It goes beyond that. It really bothers me that a public utility as important as heating fuel, should be used as a political tool for a political party, which happens to be in office at the present time. That is the wrong reason, to be doing things like this.

For this government to pick a fight with ICG and TransCanada Pipelines, a year or so ago, with a motive fuel tax, and other moves that this government has made, Madam Speaker, is a very artificial thing. It's an artificial way and creating artificial reasons for moving in and taking over an important utility like this.

On the basis of that kind of shallow, almost cheap politics, Madam Speaker, it's hard for me to support a move by this government to do what it is doing. I speak on behalf of the residents of Brandon. I'm concerned, Madam Speaker, about what the residents of Brandon are going to have to pay some day when this government decides that, well, perhaps the Town of Swan River should have gas service; never mind other communities, but the Town of Swan River should have gas service. What is the extension of that service to that community going to cost the users of these facilities and of this product?

In my community of Brandon - sure, I can speak also for the people of Winnipeg, for the people of Portage, for the people of St. Jean, Letellier, Emerson, Morris, Winkler, Carman, all those places that do have gas service because those are the people who are going to pay. We can accept the short-term promises that are being given on paper.

My friend and colleague, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, referred to some of the propaganda the government is putting out, and preying on the elderly of this province and telling them that we're going to save you \$50 million. Well, they're going to do it; I have no doubt that they're going to do it. I believe them when they say they're going to do it. But I don't think they say how long they're going to do it for. That's

where I'm concerned, because the market is going to have a lot to do with the cost of gas.

If the people that the government is trying to appeal to are going to continue to enjoy guaranteed prices, low prices, it may be there'll have to be subsidies. The government is broke. The government will be broke for a good, long time, Madam Speaker. I don't know where the money is going to come from to provide those subsidies.

At first, I thought well, the government won't be able to extend natural gas, won't be able to because the money won't be there. I still believe that, but I believe they will if there's a good political reason to do so. This bothers me a lot because I think that's a misuse of the public trust. I really do feel that way. I think there's been enough of this artificial kind of mentality on the part of governments, not only in Manitoba but elsewhere. There's been enough of that kind of mentality, Madam Speaker.

It upsets me that a government which does enjoy some support, as our party does, among elderly people and disadvantaged people, a government that enjoys that support should manipulate and fool around with the feelings and the trust of people, by using that kind of thrust as an excuse for a government takeover, when what it will be used for in the future is strictly a political tool.

Madam Speaker, there is an infrastructure this government has had nothing to do with building except by way of regulation through the Public Utilities Board. Is this government in any way associated or attached, or does it have any understanding of the integrity of that infrastructure?

I'll tell you about my Dad again. He can go almost anywhere in this province, and if there's a gas leak, call my Dad, because he can come and put his foot on where the line is. He doesn't need any technical equipment because he was there when that line was put in. I was in a lot of the backyards and back lanes of the City of Brandon putting in service lines too.

Does the government understand what the distribution system is all about? I don't pretend to know all about it and I don't. But what I do know tells me that the people opposite know even less, and that concerns me, because: Will they have a respect for the maintenance of the infrastructure we have? In the Minister's calculations when he was deciding whether to do this, did he take into account costs of maintaining the facilities that we have?

The Minister nods his head. I'm glad. What are the costs? Has he told us? Will he tell us before we're asked to -(Interjection)- Madam Speaker, it sounds like the Minister has that information and will be able to share it with us. That kind of information is important and where the money's going to come from - all that kind of information.

But what I've been hearing from my colleagues, and what I've been reading in the paper is that we've been given precious little information on which to make an intelligent decision on whether we should be supporting this move or not.

As it sits right now, with the record of the government - with the record of many governments, not just this one but certainly this one, too - with the record of inability to operate Crown corporations in commercial sectors or even in monopoly sectors, with that bad

record of Hydro, MTX, Workers Compensation, MPIC, McKenzie Seeds - million dollar losses every year - Flyer Industries, Manfor and ManOil, almost everything the government touches does not turn to gold; it turns into a liability for the tax-paying people of this province.

In light of that, that's reason enough for anyone to sit up and say: Well, why should we sign a blank cheque for this government in the absence of the kind of information that we've been asking for?

The point is, Madam Speaker, I am far from a believer in the ability of this government to manage the facilities that it is planning to take over. I have a very deep concern on the part of the Simplot Chemical Company in the City of Brandon. The Minister has been notified by the Chamber of Commerce on behalf of that company, and did the Minister respond?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, I contacted them. I was going to meet with them. They said they couldn't meet this week. They said they'd meet . . . - (Inaudible)-

MR. J. McCRAE: Perhaps the Minister will be good enough to let me know what his response was before I'm asked to support this bill, because that's important. Simplot is probably the biggest single user of natural gas in this whole province, Madam Speaker. Simplot employs 250 people, which is a very, very important - the largest private sector employer in my community.

The Honourable Minister of Education has asked me many times: Will you stand up for your constituents in Brandon? Madam Speaker, that's what I'm doing today. I'm standing up for my constituents whose livelihoods depend on the Simplot Chemical Company and who pay their gas bill every month.

I have reason to believe that in the medium-to-longer term - never mind the next couple of years - because I have a tendency to believe that come Hell or high water, this government is going to make sure gas costs are kept down, at least until after the next election. But the people of my community are going to be stuck later on because they already have gas facilities.

Madam Speaker, there are a number of issues that I could be raising in regard to this, certainly one of them being that hydro and gas are very different facilities, different utilities in our province. We are dealing with a monopoly situation at Hydro and a monopoly situation at Telephones, but not a monopoly situation here in regard to gas, in terms of kinds of heating fuels.

When there are other forms of fuel available, will all Manitobans be treated properly? Perhaps the word monopoly was the wrong one for me to use in this context, but what I am saying is: Manitobans have a number of different sources of energy. That's the point I'm getting at, Madam Speaker, and I really wonder about why it is that the government is getting involved with this if they can't tell us that within so many years Manitoba will be gasified as it has been electrified. I don't think it can do that, certainly not with the resources at its disposal now. It's broke. Due to bad management, the government is broke, Madam Speaker, and so there is no reason for us to be particularly hopeful about the future of our relationship of ICG in the hands of the government.

So, Madam Speaker, without the kinds of assurances we need from the government, without that open and

forthcoming way of dealing with the situation as the Government House Leader refers to so often about being open and forthcoming, the Premier of our province has said that he will not sign a blank cheque regarding free trade and I don't blame him for that. I say that we're headed in the right direction to try to get a freer relationship in that regard, but why is it that the Premier and his colleagues would ask me to sign for them a blank cheque to take over Plains Western or ICG at this time, when they really don't know themselves what the future holds, or what their own plans will be, or which Manitobans will benefit, and at the expense of which other Manitobans?

On that basis, Madam Speaker, I would invite honourable members to speak against the principle of this bill because the principle is wrong, No. 1, because they haven't met the tests that are required for a government takeover in this industry; and No. 2, they should vote against this bill because the record of the government is so bad in terms of dealing with anything having to do with commercial or government holdings.

I'm not in favour of this bill and I invite other honourable members to join with me in defeating the bill.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, just a few brief remarks with respect to this bill.

This bill really, when it comes down to it, Madam Speaker, comes down to the proposition as to whether or not the people of Manitoba have trust and confidence in this government to undertake this very considerable obligation for the people of Manitoba. Madam Speaker, based on the record of this government, there is absolutely no way that I, nor a vast majority of members on this side, can see their way clear to voting in favour of this bill and putting this government in charge of such a huge undertaking. When we look at that side of the House we have to ask ourselves who is going to be in charge of this project? Who is going to be involved in making the decisions with respect to this project?

Madam Speaker, is it going to be the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board, when we learned this week, intervened in a decision to give a former NDP member of this Legislature a grant that was not recommended by the MDC? We have seen too much of that kind of decision-making process by this government, Madam Speaker. If someone who, and a government, that is prepared to go along with decisions like that, going to undertake the operation of the gas company, will the gas company be operated in a prudent businesslike manner when decisions are made like that, Madam Speaker? Or will the Minister of Labour, the former Minister responsible for the Telephone System, be involved in the decision-making process when we know what happened with MTX, when we know they they have lost some \$27 million for the people of Manitoba because he didn't ask the right questions, even though there was basic information put forward to him by the Member for Pembina as to questions that should have been asked and he never asked them, and the taxpayers lost some \$27 million, Madam Speaker?

Or is it to be the Minister of Community Services, or the former Minister of Community Services, now the Minister of Employment Services and Security, who both have been involved in Community Services, who implemented a whole reorganization in that area, and which this Legislature, in a day of debate at the last Session of this Legislature, had to ask for a major investigation and report on that whole operation?

And there were some 75 or 80 major recommendations made to the Minister and to this Legislature for improvements in the system that they brought in, which they said was going to be a vast improvement on the existing system, and we have seen what happens, and we saw again today in a report filed in this Legislature what has happened as a result of the decision-making process of this government.

Or is it to be the now Government House Leader, the former Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board? Is he to be involved in the decision-making process?

And now when we see another major investigation and report tabled into this House as to the operation of the Workers Compensation Board, when he took responsibility for that operation, fired the whole board, appointed his own partisan board, fired all of the senior management and made significant changes in the process which has now gone out of control with some 180 unfunded liability, Madam Speaker. Is he to be part of the decision-making process to whom we are supposed to entrust the management of a new gas company? Madam Speaker, it becomes very, very difficult to do that.

Is it to be the Attorney-General who now on two major instances has introduced legislation into this House and persuaded that caucus to support it, that has severely divided the people of Manitoba and in which, on both issues, well over 80 percent of the population have been opposed to - the French language constitutional amendment and now on Bill 47 with the inclusion of sexual orientation? Is someone who is so ideological in his approach to government going to be entrusted with part of the decision-making process involving a new gas company? I would say no, Madam Speaker.

This is the same Minister who has refused once again to the people of Winnipeg Beach and the 25,000-30,000 residents of that area their concern over the closing of the RCMP detachment, over a mere, in terms of the total overall budget, \$72,000, Madam Speaker.

Is it to be the Minister of Finance or the former Minister of Finance, both of whom have been involved in financial mismanagement in this province for the last five or six years, and especially when we see tabled in the Legislature this very week the Fourth Quarterly Report for the last fiscal year that shows another huge increase in the deficit for that year over what was estimated and another \$560 million in debt; when we see this government that has acted so poorly in their whole financial mismanagement of the province that the credit rating of the province has been reduced some three times, when the net debt per capita has risen from some \$4,000 per capita to \$9,000 per capita - or \$9,500 per capita - when taxes have been increased to the upper limit in every possible range?

The Minister tabled the tax comparison tables in the Legislature earlier this week which showed that this

government has absolutely no room to manoeuvre in any of those categories, Madam Speaker. Are we to entrust to the Minister responsible for MPIC part of the decision-making authority to undertake this massive program for Manitobans when it is clear - and he has admitted to this House and to committees of this House - that he made a very political decision a few years ago in order to ensure that certain information was not included in the annual report prior to the election?

Madam Speaker, these are the Ministers whom we are asked to give authority to take over this massive undertaking. I sympathize, Madam Speaker, with the views of the Member for Lakeside, his concern over that area and the possibility that perhaps it should be considered as a public monopoly, Madam Speaker. But simply put, I'm of the view that we cannot entrust to this government the management of another significant Crown corporation.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines to close debate.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, with the time allotted me, I'll close debate. I will close debate before 6:00 p.m.

I wanted to just basically put a couple of points on the record, namely that I've tried to listen very carefully to the number of Conservative members who have spoken on this bill. What I've heard is a cacophony of positions put forward by the Conservative Caucus.

They have taken many different positions. Some of them have taken the position that this is a natural public utility, it should be in the public domain and it should be discussed in terms of public interest here in the Legislature where public interest is discussed. It is then a vehicle to look at a whole set of public policy considerations, including extension. That basically is the position put forward by the Energy critic for the Conservative Party, the Member for Lakeside.

We've had a number of his colleagues who got up and said they are completely and totally against natural gas being in the public domain. In fact, they stretched their arguments by saying, basically, they are against public ownership of enterprise. They make a big a speech in favour of private enterprise, which then makes one wonder whether in fact they really would want to sell off Manitoba Hydro or Manitoba Telephones or Autopac, because you can't take those types of positions against natural gas and not extend through to the other utilities. So we've had that cacophony of positions put forward.

On the one hand you have, I say, a red Tory position of the Member for Lakeside and, on the other hand, you have the extreme purple position put forward by Thatcherite Conservatives who are his colleagues. That's quite a departure from the historical roots of the Conservative Party in Canada, it's quite a departure from the historical roots of the Conservative Party in Manitoba, and that, I think, provides interesting fodder for political debate in the future, both here and elsewhere.

The one thing that very few people on the other side have commented on though is the fact that presently in the present system of private ownership, in the

Wednesday, 15 July, 1987

present system of a privately-owned transportation system, namely TransCanada Pipelines, privately owned distributors or producers, privately-owned marketing agency - the Western Marketing Agency - the people of Manitoba have been ripped off to the tune of \$50 million.

I've heard no one get up and say that the system isn't working. All these apologists have been getting up there saying this system is satisfactory to us. It's not satisfactory to the New Democratic Party Government. We believe there is a better way. We have searched out that better way, and it is our intention to move with this integrated policy to bring about lower prices, security in the future, a look at distribution to

determine feasibility of it over a 6, 12, 18-month period. This would be a good opportunity for public input. We can have something in the public domain to pursue the public interest for the best deal for consumers for natural gas.

With that, Madam Speaker, I am finished and I close debate on this bill.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The hour being 6:00 p.m., the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow. (Thursday)