

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8 p.m., Tuesday, February 17, 1976
THRONE SPEECH DE BATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. Five minutes.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When we adjourned for the supper hour, I was commenting on the land hearings that we held last year, and impressions I received from the position that the - well I would say the shabby position that the Opposition took at these hearings. But be that as it may, I think we will leave the position of the Conservative Party to the people of Manitoba to decide whether they had the right position or whether we had the right position.

I want to in the few remaining minutes that I have, I would like to comment on the branch line rail abandonment, in particular in my constituency, and would like to inform the House, Mr. Speaker, that if the CNR has its way, that there will no longer be any branch lines in my constituency, it will all have been removed. If indeed they have their way, there will not be a mile, there will not be a half a mile, there will not be a yard, there will not be an inch; all that will remain is the main line passing through McCreary and Laurier, those are the only two areas in my constituency that will be served by railroad. And it was my --(Interjection)-- CNR, yes. Well, you do and I do.

It was my intention, Mr. Speaker, to present a brief when the Hall Commission sat at Dauphin, but unfortunately I was on the land hearings and I believe we were at Thompson the night, the day or the afternoon that they sat in hearing at Dauphin, so I was unable to make a presentation at that particular time. There may be other opportunities at a later date, I am not sure, but I wanted to get this down on the record that my absence there from the hearing was not because I didn't want to be there but because I was unable to be there.

There are certainly serious ramifications if the last branch line is removed from the constituency. Some may argue with this - maybe truckers may say, well the sooner they take the branch lines out, the better it will be for us. And I say that this may not be the case, it may well be that if the last remaining branch lines are removed, that there will be certainly pressure from other truckers to come in and compete for the service; and the service will be at a greater cost because of course the public has to look after the roads which are not - well #20 to Winnipegosis is not that bad of a road, that's a pretty good PR road. They probably have to be upgraded if the branch line to Winnipegosis is removed, and the road to Rorketon which is the end of the rail going north to Ste. Rose, the road there would certainly have to be upgraded at a considerable cost to the people of Manitoba to accommodate a heavier and more traffic on that particular road.

There is another aspect too that we should take into consideration, with the removal of this branch line, is that with the diminishing supplies of fossil fuels, there may be a time when even trucking, transportation by truck will have to be curtailed. I feel that it would be better for all the people of Manitoba if we may save at least some of these branch lines, in particular, at least if we can't save the schedule of the trains going into these particular areas, if we can at least save the road-bed in case we have to return at a later date, some time in the future, to put back rail service to these communities, in the event, and I think we should give this serious consideration, that with the diminishing fossil fuels, that we may have to revert to other forms of transportation. So with those comments, Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. J. R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again it is my privilege to be in this Chamber, and may I congratulate you on your appointment again as Speaker for this Session. We have our differences, I guess, amongst Parties over the years, you have always adjudicated, I think, as you saw the particular instances, and in most cases we have all been very well satisfied.

I would like to congratulate the mover, the Honourable Member for Wellington, a nice, quiet, homesy sort of a moving. He gave us a lesson on the Bible and Icelandic culture and a little bit of socialism thrown in.

The Member for Churchill --(Interjection)-- yes, we have one of those people in our midst and we have considerable amount of trouble keeping him straight also. The Honourable Member for Churchill, I also would like to offer my congratulations in the seconding.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. FERGUSON cont'd)

I would also like to extend greetings to our two new members, one from Wolseley, one from Crescentwood, two very fine young fellows, and I'm sure will put themselves well and represent their constituents very well.

Now getting back to the Throne Speech as it affects my area, there are some things that I would like to touch on, and some that I think our Acting Leader has already taken a pretty good stand on and presented a very lucid view as far as our side of the House is concerned. Inflation seems to be one of the issues that seems to be troubling everyone today, it definitely is foremost in everybody's mind. We especially, in the agricultural industry, are faced with I expect probably as much or more than anyone, to the degree that we are kind of the third Party. We do not have the option of raising our wages or fighting back, then when we find that the price of our equipment is doubled in two years, we get into major units like tractors, combines, bills, etc. that are going from \$20,000 - 40,000 in a two-year period, why it does cause some cause for alarm. What the answer to this will be, I don't know.

The Honourable Member from Portage this afternoon kind of threw the book at us a little bit for what we hadn't done, but I would suggest that his far left friends in the east of this great Dominion have probably more to blame than anyone in the country for it, and they also have to a degree or to most degrees hid their head in the sand and have made no effort to do anything about it until it came time when the Finance Minister accepted it, resigned, and then the Prime Minister did make a very weak move. The Premier here has signified the intent of this government to try to back up the guidelines, I think it will be a very difficult task. I think it has already been pointed out and acted upon, that the major unions have no intention of accepting guidelines. I think even in this province up to this degree, we have been forced to settle over the allotted percentage. We understand that the Liquor Control boys got above the guidelines and I expect that possibly the hospital workers did also. So if one group goes, I expect it will be quite a chain reaction. The speech --(Interjection)-- I beg your pardon? Well, the farmers would be only too happy to accept the ten percent guideline this year.

Getting back to the Throne Speech and the announced program of the large house building program by the government, supposedly the largest in history, this of course we will not argue with until such time as we see whether or not it will come to pass or whether it is just another Throne Speech promise. One of the things I would like to bring out though, when we are talking about building in the province, is that in many of the tenders that are let out on senior citizens' homes, buildings to this extent, that the bid bond and the bail bond are just a little bit too prohibitive for some of the smaller contractors. Many of the smaller operators would certainly be only too happy to bid on the construction of these units but, as I say, the size of the contract is a little too big for them and I would like to see possibly if these could be broken down into smaller units that I'm sure that some of these bidders would be in it, and I've been assured by many that their contracts could be lower than what the larger ones are.

Hydro is something that is at the foremost of all of our minds today. The Honourable our Acting Leader, I feel is possibly one of the experts on Hydro in this House. His information is always clear, concise and very factual, and watching the faces of the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Resources the other day, I don't think that what was going through their minds was really contentious with what the Acting Leader was saying. It's now coming home in the rural - and all over the province - what a 40 percent increase in one jump means, what a 20 percent increase in rates means, plus the fact that we possibly are going to have another rate increase. The revelation the other day that one dollar out of every three of our revenue is being spent on Hydro development, kind of shakes us a wee bit. I think that the Cass-Beggs program, the crash program that the government were talked into accepting, has been a complete mess as far as the Province of Manitoba is concerned. --(Interjection)-- I understand it reasonably well, Mr. Premier. Yes, I think I do. --(Interjection)-- It was explained to you very capably by the Acting Leader the other day. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. FERGUSON: However, Mr. Speaker, as I say, start looking at the bills that are coming in; the fact that the province has blown probably \$300 million, not in

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. FERGUSON cont'd) construction but in lateness of getting the construction under way - possibly it had to come at some time, the Lake Winnipeg regulation probably is something that was thrown in as an afterthought by Mr. Cass-Beggs.

In getting on to farming, the Member from Ste. Rose, my neighbour, went on at great length about the problems in his constituency this Fall. They are very real. My constituency to a great degree suffered the same damages as his did. It wasn't quite as extensive, it didn't take in quite as big an area, but it was a complete mess.

Getting back to the program of the Minister of Agriculture to alleviate, they certainly are appreciated. The Feed Assistance Program is one I think that was instigated by Premier Campbell. It is something that has certainly been needed and will certainly go towards helping keep the cattle herds of the province together.

Again we are faced with the Mineral Acreage Tax Act. I just received another letter in the mail today, I think this is the third one I've received this year. As I recall back in the days when this bill was going through the House, the then Minister of Finance, the Member for St. Johns, said that the individual . . . this wasn't a tax on the individual, this was just a . . . As a matter of fact, to quote him, I believe he said in Hansard July 6th, 1972, "the tax will be on mineral rights held by corporations, not by individuals, and internal studies made by the government has shown that about three quarters of the mineral rights, some 9.1 million acres are held by individuals, it is not proposed to tax those at all." Well, this is okay, any one that basically I guess is not corporations are excepted that are speculating or one thing or another. I don't think there's any argument here. But I think that there is an argument to the degree that the costs of going through this exercise that - as I say, this is the third one, I understand that if this one isn't filled out, that then you get the registered one, the pink letter, that says that the rights will then revert to the state. I haven't seen them but I've heard that they exist. Now I think that this is a very unfair tax, to the degree that a farmer retiring, moving to town, if his son takes over the farm, the farm is still held in the father's name, that a Mineral Acreage Tax has to be paid or else it is forfeited to the Crown. I know in my own particular constituency that I've had many complaints from widows - the first bill they seem to receive is from the undertaker, the second one seems to be from the Finance Department asking about their mineral rights. It's very distressing to these people. In most cases the only advice you can give them is pay your \$16.00 or forfeit to the Crown. And I don't think that the tax is performing the duty that possibly the Finance Minister indicated it would, it's more or less a takeover, and it just follows in socialist policy that this is the way they go about doing things.

The land purchase. The Member for Ste. Rose dwelled at great length about the boom and bust of the cattle cycle, he claimed that he had 1,000 acres and wasn't able to feed himself and his wife. I would suggest that possibly the Member for Ste. Rose change his occupation, try something that's a bit more profitable.

Now when we come to the total concept of the beef plan, it just reminds you of a farmer that goes out to bale with a very temperamental baler and it doesn't work, and the next time he goes out and it's a beautiful sunshiny day and he decides, well gosh, the thing is working perfectly so I'll take it apart and see what made it work. And the end result of this beef program has just been about that. We started out with a 7.7 million operation - no, I guess we didn't, we went back further than that, we'll go back to the forgivable loans - and this was at the time that the bureaucrats had said that . . .

--(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose state his matter of privilege.

MR. ADAM: Yes. The Honourable Member for Gladstone made a statement just a moment ago which I did not make. Perhaps he didn't hear me correctly, but when I was talking about the thousand-acre farm that I had, I said I was having a very hard time to make my living. I didn't say that I couldn't make my living.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: I possibly heard that wrong, Mr. Speaker. We'll check it in Hansard, if I'm wrong why I'll certainly apologize to the Member from St. Rose.

However, getting back to the original concept of the bureaucrats' 1980 prediction that we wouldn't have enough red beef in the province, was the program brought in

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. FERGUSON cont'd) whereby at the end of five years if you have the same amount of cattle the interest loan was forgiven. This extended the life of a lot of animals that had no business being in the business, brought a whole new raft of people into the business that were not familiar with it. They were not long getting into trouble, the money was easy to come by, and unfortunately many of them got in beyond their depths, didn't know what they were doing and got their fingers burnt. Consequently, we now are faced with the second phase, 7.7 million dollars, which guarantees \$100 capital. And here we find that all in good intention the Minister went along with this, but here again is bureaucrats' bungling. At the end of the year many of those cattle went back into the stockyard, back into the feed lots, etc. at a lot less than the \$100 that was originally advanced. We are now in the third stage, which is the \$18.5 million program. Now I believe that here again the Minister has a motive behind it, as a matter of fact he has two. The first is that he does want to help the farmers; the second is that he, along with taking over the mineral rights and the lease program on land, will be controlling many young farmers, and I think he has caught them in a position whereby they are more or less forced to accept this program. I feel that many will become serfs of the state by this program, by the two of them together. There's no way that they will ever bail themselves out, and I'm quite sure that the stay option is certainly going to come to pass because they'll certainly have no alternative.

Now I think that the Minister has, as I said, an ulterior motive. The second is, that he is definitely out for a Livestock Marketing Board, he's hoping that he can control enough of the producers that he can swing the vote. He's probably going to go a little further, he's probably going to go into the packinghouse business rather than the Crocus Food business . . .

A MEMBER: Don't give him any ideas.

MR. FERGUSON: I don't have to give him ideas, the ideas are there. It just depends whether or not he thinks the time has come to push them.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that that takes care of the cattle business. There is only one cure for that and that is going to be that we'll have to eat our way out of it. The United States basically sets the trend, what our market is going to be. I believe in a free flow of cattle between Canada and the United States, and I think that we'll find that they will, through the free market system, will be in far better shape than we will, an awful lot quicker than we will. Some of their good fortune, I think, will probably rub off on us.

Strikes in essential services, I believe, are something that we can no longer tolerate. We in Canada have gained the unenviable position of being second to Italy in lost hours through strikes. I have no particular hangup with the people that are involved in the unions. If they feel that this is their method of putting forth their views, that's fine, but whether or not they are as sincere as they let on, or whether the rank and file are controlling the union, is something else here again. I think the postal strike was one that was controlled by the top end, and I'm quite sure that had the rank and file been given the opportunity it would have been back to work much quicker.

I see in last night's paper where the trade patterns are going against us, we have a 795 million deficit in our trade, and I think that this according to statistics is the worst figure that we've ever had. And it's not hard to figure why we would have a trade deficit. We have a carry-over in our grains through strikes last year that is very prohibitive in just one particular type of grain, rapeseed. I think we are carrying about a 72 million bushel carry-over where a normal is about 40. Last year rape was worth about \$9 a bushel, so you're looking at about \$270 million that we lost.

So there's just no way that we can do anything. I might add that the Minister of Agriculture didn't do very much towards trying to get the rail workers back to work.

A MEMBER: He never said a word.

MR. FERGUSON: He never said a word, he sat there happily smiling at us when we asked questions, so consequently I expect that he felt that he was accepting his responsibilities, but this we doubt very much.

We're going to have to come at a different method of settling strikes, I think this is quite common knowledge. I think that maybe profit sharing is the answer, there's quite a discussion along these lines now. Then I think that if a worker produces he's

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. FERGUSON cont'd) paid, if he doesn't produce he isn't paid, and the result is of course a considerable incentive to go ahead and produce. But here again we're back into a position where our Minister of Agriculture is trying to get everybody subservient to himself and to the bureaucrats through his land policies, through his cattle policies. He's trying to get the farmers of this province in the position where they are in Russia whereby they will shut their machines down and go and work their garden and growing just about as much in that as they are out in the fields. And this of course doesn't quite agree with what the Member for Ste. Rose said, but I think if he reads on a little bit farther - I haven't visited Russia or Cuba, but I find that from what you can read that this is what you find out.

A MEMBER: No, there are no strikes there.

MR. FERGUSON: No, there are no strikes there, that's for sure.

I see highway construction and Autopac are grouped together. I'd like to, just for the record, read a little bit of the information that was on the front page of the - I believe it's the Free Press or the Tribune - the Tribune, I guess, it is from Mr. Vic Grant, and it's to do with the 1971 Introduction of Autopac and just some of the quotations that were made, where Premier Ed Schreyer said that compulsory government auto insurance will be cheaper and more humane. This was in January of 1971. In March of 1971, Premier Ed Schreyer said that the public auto insurance scheme will result in immediate savings of 15 percent to all Manitoba motorists. March 1971, Ed Schreyer said that if the people of Manitoba give compulsory auto insurance scheme one year to work they won't want to give it up. In 1971 again Premier Ed Schreyer said that, "Under Manitoba Government's Autopac rates, Autopac rates should not go up for three years." Again in 1971, this is the good year, Premier Ed Schreyer revealed that automobile premiums under the Autopac scheme were deliberately inflated by five to eight percent so rates could remain at the current level for two or three years," another goodie. In 1972 Premier Ed Schreyer said that Autopac will end its first year of operation with a moderate surplus. 1973 - "Autopac rates will increase by approximately 10 to 15 percent next year because of an unexpected 30 percent increase in damage claims." 1974 - "Autopac announced a deficit of 10.1 million." Quite a change in two years. January 3, 1975 - "Manitobans will pay 14 to 19½ percent more for basic compulsory automobile insurance in 1975." Things are changing fast. Then in 1975 again, "Senior Autopac official admitted that 30 percent of Manitoba's motorists will pay between 21 and 75 percent more for basic coverage this year." And here's the 1976, it's just about as rosy as the rest of them, it's moving right along "Autopac popping up cost taxpayer - 51 million." --(Interjection)-- Alberta must be the other.

So I wonder what would have happened, Mr. Speaker, had the Government gone ahead, introduced compulsory automobile insurance, but had they also - or not compulsory, had they introduced their brand of insurance plus the fact that they've gone along with the line companies, I wonder if we would have been this much in debt, I wonder if we'd have wasted this much money, I wonder if we'd have had that \$51 million to put into our road system and what it would have done there. --(Interjection)-- Well, as by way of explanation, Mr. Speaker, we can go out to B.C., out to British Columbia where they had a Public Insurance Corporation, operated for two years, ran up a debt of \$181 million. Mind you, it came under scrutiny possibly a little quicker than the one in Manitoba has, due to the fact that the people of B.C. woke up to the fact of what was happening to their province. They turfed out the government that were in power, and we'll see what happens now. It will be an example possibly to the people of Canada whether or not the private insurers can come back in. It's also going to make them put their money where their mouth is if they do. --(Interjection)-- For your perusal, Mr. Minister.

Education is covered very ably by our . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. FERGUSON: . . . leader. The remarks of the Deputy Minister, of course, leave us all wondering a little bit of what the calibre of education is coming to. We are coming to a position whereby we do not have any particular standards as we knew them when we went to school. They're doing away with the inspector system, they're doing away with departmental exams which have been gone for many years, of course. I do

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. FERGUSON cont'd) feel that we still owe something to the children, to teach them reading and writing and arithmetic. I don't think that they're going to learn everything from calculators and from TV. I think that possibly when they get out in the business world they may find it a little embarrassing at times not to be able to write, possibly compose a sentence. I think that this is something that has been neglected in their schools.

The mention of clean environment in the Throne Speech I'm in complete agreement with. I think the decision to put the management back into the municipal level and to the people involved is good. I think, along the line, that government has been taking an unfair advantage of the business community through their various Crown corporations - McKenzie Seeds would be one, whereby any seed distributed by the province has not been put up for tender; it is a must, mandatory that it comes from McKenzie Seed.

General insurance on Crown buildings is another that's mandatory, it must be bought from the general insurance. And I think that we're finding that it's pretty expensive to be keeping the Manitoba Development Corporation and their little junkets going. The Minister of Mines and Resources has closed down Saunders Aircraft, that's going to save the province and the taxpayers a considerable amount of money. Flyer Coach, probably the next place to be closed down will be it.

A MEMBER: You might like that but it won't happen.

MR. FERGUSON: No, I don't particularly say that I would like it, Mr. Premier. No. No, I don't. I don't feel that the socialist system proves itself in business, and to prove it I can read a little excerpt from this little bible that had a problem keeping itself alive too due to our federal fellows, it's called the Readers Digest. It's just a little indication of what's going on in Britain where a Socialist Government has been in power, Britain offers a model study in how to bring ruin to a once vigorous nation. Just to use a few quotations: "In Britain's case, it was an all-encompassing welfare program, including a free medical program, subsidized housing, subsidized food, subsidized transportation. This becomes a vicious circle. Today the ordinary income tax, it's 50 percent, around 15,000. No one escapes, those in the strong labour unions..." --(Interjection)-- No, when I'm finished, Mr. Premier. "No one escapes, those in strong labour unions who can demand wage increases of 30 percent or more, and they have the illusion at first of keeping up. They rarely do, because they enter new tax brackets, and because this happened last spring the government raises its taxation rates on certain items to offset wage increases. The hourly wage earner gains little in working hard, so he doesn't. Meanwhile the middle class is being effectively destroyed, not only by the inflation and steeply progressive taxes but the confiscatory taxes whenever capital is transferred, by inheritance or otherwise, and the threat of an outright wealth tax, the latter would not be a tax on what you can earn or spend but a capital levy on what you have left, if anything."

I do want to go to the front page of the book and tell you what's happening in Alberta. --(Interjection)-- That's been pretty good too.

"Canada's fast developing province has virtually full employment, land buyers are flocking in, farmers are selling their high priced wheat to Russia and China." There's a bit of mention of oil here too. "Income taxes have been slashed a whopping 28 percent, taken 100,000 residents off the tax rolls, and Alberta has continued to pay no provincial sales tax or gift tax. Well, they're very fortunate, Mr. Premier, very fortunate.

However, Mr. Speaker, I feel that is about all I have to say at this time. I have tried to point out - thank you, Honourable Member for Elmwood - that our social system is not working. I think that the people that have been involved with it are beginning to realize that you can't kill incentive, you can't go along with the handout programs all the time without keeping a little bit of the will to work and a little bit of pride in the people - all we have to do is take a look at New Zealand, Australia, British Columbia, probably Saskatchewan and Manitoba next time around, and I think that we will get this country back on an incentive basis, back on the rails again, back where people are working, have a pride in the job they're doing, rather than in what they can get into quarrels about - government confrontation. I think that is all that I have to say now, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister on a question.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I understand the Honourable Member's agreed to one question. I would like to ask him if he is in favor of the retention of the Crow's Nest Pass rates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, if we get enough money for our grain, I could care less whether the Crow's Nest Pass rates are there or not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: May I ask, Mr. Speaker, I mean at today's rates, at today's grain prices, is he in favor of the retention of the Crow's Nest Pass rates?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, to answer the Premier's question, we'll go back to last year when our rape was worth \$9.00 a bushel, where flax was worth \$12.00 a bushel, where wheat was worth \$5.00 a bushel, and we couldn't deliver a bushel. Now if we were guaranteed that our grain will move, guaranteed --(Interjection)-- All right, we'll run the trains if we have to, providing somebody will let us, as long as it can be moved out of here and loaded on the ships, we'll go along with an increase on the Crow's Nest Pass rates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture have a question as well?

MR. USKIW: Yes. I just wanted to know whether the Member for Gladstone would clarify his remarks with respect to 51 million dollars which he alluded to, and I tried to get the gist of that and it escaped me, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Well I would suggest that the Minister of Agriculture needs the Business Report from the Winnipeg Free Press of Friday, January 16th.

MR. USKIW: I would then like to ask the Member for Gladstone whether he concurs in that particular report.

MR. GREEN: And will he state it outside the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Will the Honourable Member state that .51 million dollars was transferred from the government to Autopac outside of the House and waive parliamentary privilege?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I am reading an article that is in the Free Press, that is what I am quoting from, if the Minister of Mines and Resources has an argument about that, let him argue with the paper.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to congratulate you again on this term, and I will assure you there will be no trouble from me, cause no one respects decorum of the House more than I.

I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Throne Speech, one who took us to heaven and one who took us a little bit to hell, but he did a good job; also the Sergeant-at-Arms, I hope the mace doesn't get heavier for him. I would like to congratulate the two new members, although I feel sorry they are on the losing side, but I hope you enjoy it.

You know, when I speak here in this House, Mr. Speaker, I take a terrific beating. No one hates to speak more than I. I have been under tension in sports, I would rather crawl in the ring with a middle-weight or a light-weight than speak, but I have to do it, and I will do it. When I speak in this House, I very seldom have anyone from my own area, but tonight I have my son here with me (Hear hear) and I wish he was down here in my place cause he is much more articulate than I.

Well if we get on with the speech, Mr. Speaker, and listen to these speakers formally, I won't name names and so on, but you tell me and the northern members that nothing has happened in the North. Let me take you back to 1970 in the Northern Task Force. We went from every small community two, three weeks, listened to their problems, some real, some imaginary, some great, some small. I see a vast

(MR. BARROW cont'd) difference now, Mr. Speaker, with TV services, communications, housing, but the most important thing that we did in the North was give them local self government. We believe, we strongly believe that people in the North are firmly capable of governing themselves. We have seen the slow but sure downfall of the L.D. system, which I hated, despised from the time I came in contact with it. And the administrator who was appointed to run your affairs has been thrown out, and one place going for incorporation is Snow Lake. My Minister and my colleague, the Attorney-General, gave a speech and it was a good speech, but the thing that appealed to me and made me conscious of my role in this government, he said, and I'll quote him: "Wait for it." He said to those people in Snow Lake, a full hall: "I don't know your problems in the North, govern yourselves, and I will help you," - a breakthrough in all governments previous to this 1969.

I would say that some of the things we have done, and I could go at great lengths - Cranberry Portage, for instance. We have a . . . in Cranberry Portage, we have a big input into that. We have put water and sewer in there, in our plants in the midst of agriculture, what they had given us hope for. When I said in 1969 they'd work on their behalf, they laughed at me. It has never been done and won't be done, they had given up; today it's there, that's in Cranberry Portage.

Snow Lake said we'll never get a road in here, there's too few people, two thousand people will never get on the main road - today that road is built; the best road in Northern Manitoba from 391 into Snow Lake, 20 miles, the best road in the north is built.

I could go on and on and on in my area, Mr. Speaker, but I don't want to overdo it. --(Interjection)-- No, no. Other advantages too numerous to mention. But this government was best exemplified by a speech by the Mayor of Flin Flon. It was the opening of a swimming pool when we had put in \$118,000 on the work forgivable basis, and knowing those sons-a-guns in Flin Flon it would be certainly forgivable, plus a \$20,000 grant. Now at this opening, I was invited, and the top executive . . . was there, Hal McKenzie, both there, and the Mayor . . . I spoke very lightly. I said I was for swimming, I love swimming, my Dad loves swimming. In my home town, there wasn't much to do so swimming was a fad, and every day he would take me two miles up the lake, my brother and I, and throw us off the end of the boat and swim two miles back to shore. That was hard, but the hardest part, Mr. Speaker, was getting out of the bag. But Mr. McKenzie who represents . . . said this . . . and he spoke at some length. Hal McKenzie, I know him well, he beat his way up from a shift boss. I knew him when he was a shift boss; I worked for him as a miner. He said, "Tom, I am going to the top, I don't care whose neck I break, whose back I break, I am going to be the top dog in here," and he did it. He did it. But he said, and I'll tell you what he said. He said the mineral taxation, you know, he's the . . . He said the good days are gone, the good days are gone. He said, for who? For the corporation of course.

Now here is a little thing, I've been carrying around since 1969. I have showed the Minister of Mines, I have showed my colleagues and I just wanted to put this in the records, if you'll let me quote this from this paper, Mr. Speaker. It's beautiful.

A MEMBER: Is it the Free Press business section?

MR. BARROW: No it is CPA. What's that? Canadian Pacific. Oh yeah. About taxation: Here is an answer from a mining man to the claims of mining companies that they are being overtaxed in Canada or are going to be. Frank R. Jobin - French, no doubt - a geologist who was consultant to the United Nations development program says, "Despite all protestations to the contrary, the Canadian mines sector like . . . extractive oil and gas productions, enjoys the lowest average income tax rates of all industrial sections of our economy. Our mining industry is clearly a tax favoured industry. I would rank it as a leader among the top ten of the 50 non-communist parties of which I am familiar. In addition to low taxes, our governments help these companies with research, geological surveys and technical services which represent a saving of a minimum of 25 percent of total project costs." Now who is Frank Jobin? He is none other than the geologist who discovered the uranium possibilities at Elliott Lake, a known Conservative.

Now the Mayor speaks, gentlemen - and you are gentlemen, although I hate to

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. BARROW cont'd) admit it - he said, and he spoke long and loud, and, you know, Jobin he's a speaker, talks for hours and says very little, he's a liberal, Cabinet Minister and nothing, nothing . . . he said, "Over here we have the Senior Citizens homes, and over here we have new apartment buildings and this beautiful swimming pool, a new hospital, brand new hospital, a 22 unit home care building is now under construction, air and water controls, a stack 820 feet high, road construction, over three million dollars invested on . . . to 70 million dollar project to give Flin Floners a safe, straight road to the south." And he said, "All this has happened in the last six years but in the last six years . . ." Is it coincidence that this government has been in power for 6 years to that day in June, and you said nothing's happened in the North. And this was given by Mr. Jobin, a former cabinet minister, probably the last of an extinct tribe; he's our biggest booster. What can a substitute leader do or promise to equal this record? Now how the hell can he, how can he explain the pitiful performance of a Conservative government prior to '69. What a position he is in. You know, he may be a hurricane in your caucus but to us on this side of the House he is merely a mild breeze.

Your leadership campaign, let me tell you what working men say about your leaders. We'll start with Walter Weir. What fouled up Walter Weir besides getting stabbed by the two people on his left and right. What happened to him? What happened to him in Flin Flon when he came up there in 1969 in the election, what happened to him? And I asked a strong conservative follower who is now a friend of mine. He said, "Well Tom, he gave a speech. He opened up his coat and he stood there with his stomach hanging out like a pregnant cow, and he said to us, 'You must tighten up your belt.' You must tighten up your belt, not him. That was his downfall." You know, what intrigued me about Mr. Weir, --(Interjection)-- He gave our minerals from the earth away to the Americans and now by God, for years he is making money sticking . . . back in that same earth. That's Walter Weir.

And that man from River Heights, you know I feel sorry for him, really feel sorry for him, but he got what he deserved. If you live by the sword, you die by the sword.

And now we have a substitute leader, a man who I admire greatly, a teacher, an engineer, and what intrigued me about him was a statement he has made many, many times. He said about South Indian Lake, "What is the difference between 8 feet and 30 feet?" --(Interjection)-- 30 feet, 30 feet. And this stunned me, Mr. Speaker, so I went to my granddaughter, her name is Rhonda, she is seven years old, I said, "What is the difference between 8 feet and 30 feet?" She said, "Papa, 22 feet." That's the answer. And 30 feet will flood probably five times . . . and this is your leader today. My God. He has all my sympathy.

But the true leader, the true leader on that side of the House is not sitting there. He is not sitting over there. It's the member from Lakeside. He is the leader. Oh yes, he's the leader there. He fires the bullets, he fires the gun, he's . . . and I admire his speeches. The Member from Lakeside. I really like to hear him talk. He plays to the gallery, the press. He puts on a great performance. He is an immature Errol Flynn.

A MEMBER: Explain.

MR. BARROW: Explain, I'll explain, and he comes from the same category, Mr. Speaker. I'm only saying that Member from Lakeside is a cattle farmer and Errol Flynn's father was a sheep farmer. And Errol Flynn, it's an example here if you read his biography at one time during his childhood in a moment of fun and pre-occupation took a long cord with a piece of salt pork, he fed it to his duck, and the duck's digestive process being what it is, it went through him, and there were 23 ducks, and they all ate the pork and they come up on the first step and stuck, and there they were, 23 ducks going around and around in a circle, and there they are over there - 23 ducks.

Now we will go to the leader, and I hate saying leader. You know, to me a leader is a guy who leads. He doesn't sit back of the troops. We had that in the army. Generals still go and lead . . . shot you know, that's what he's saying. He has a very short memory. And I saw him on the John Harvard show . . . and John Harvard is very . . . I like John Harvard. You know, he is obnoxious lots of times, but he is

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. BARROW cont'd) truthful. He said, "Mr. Lyons, are you getting any money from the Party." "No, no, nothing, I am doing this strictly for the policy, I am a conservative." Half an hour later, he came back and he said, "3,000 dollars a month." The best leader money can buy. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask some questions in this House of the Attorney-General who is a considerable force. He is taking money under false pretences, that's fraud. And I want you to answer that, Mr. Attorney-General. Mr. Lyon, \$3,000 a month to put bread on the table. My God, how much bread will \$3,000 buy? You could build a house with 3,000 loaves of bread. -- (Interjection) -- What's that? They get . . .

Now let's talk about our safety and health programs. Now here is something I could talk for hours and hours and hours, I won't do this. --(Interjection)-- Leave? Thank you. I have some support in the back.

I've worked in mines since the time I was fifteen. Eighteen years of coal mines, 15 in hard rock. Mind you, I won't bore you with it all, but in Northern England 14 was the age - that's your destiny to go underground and produce. And I'm telling you with all sincerity there was no safety. A shovel had more value than man, the . . . were better looked after and there was no safety at all. And now we're coming into another era, another era and we still have this. We have conditions at Tank House and the zinc plants, and the Snow Lake Mines that are atrocious. And I'm talking to my Minister of Mines right there, who we all respect and like, and we have put in company inspectors. Now let's look at the company inspector, an inspector of safety hired by the company. Now what is his role, and who is he paid by, and where does his allegiance lie? True, to the company. No way will he insult them or hurt them, so it's a complete farce. I worked in the worst place in the mine in Flin Flon, north main the biggest mine, what an old . . . they said was impossible to take out. I worked there for 11 months and not once did the safety inspector enter that. I told that to their face and I've told them at public meetings, it's a complete farce. And now we have government inspectors and this is better, much better but it can be improved. And what we need with the company inspectors is co-operation with the union safety committees so they have a complete affiliation with the inspector. They can tell him, he can tell them and there's where his first loyalties lie, not to the government, not to the company, but to the union and these safety committees.

And sooner or later this will be adopted, I hope, because we have a new group of safety kids there, youth militant, in all our mining areas. And they are all asking for safety precautions, health precautions - a tank house where a man's teeth rot out, a crusher plant where a man is dying from silicosis and they say he should stop smoking. We're not asking anymore, no more, because that socialist government, we're demanding that something will be done in the mining area towards safety and health. And there's government co-operation and they're going to get it, it will be successful.

Take a look at the corporations, Mr. Speaker. I hate saying this day after day, time after time, and these people who head these corporations are nice people, they're dressed well, they wash, they shave, they put on deodorant, they give your kids apples at Halloween, Christmas cards at Christmas, but where does their loyalties lie? Not to the worker, not to the poor miner, not the guy that smells of the zinc tank, the tank house; to the shareholder, that big gold dollar up there, up in the sky, \$40 million profits. You don't need a fan in that place, this is their attitude.

The conditions in Flin Flon were atrocious. Even on the surface, air pollution. That's been cured. Now we have to go further into the plants and into the mines. And you know when you ask us of the Socialist philosophy - and I'm proud to be a Socialist, very proud to be a Socialist, and my philosophy is this, and I will abide by it or die by it. I don't think it does anything for me to add to the abundance of those who have much, but to add to the abundance of those who have too little - a worn out phrase but I'll live and die by that.

Now let's talk about wage and price controls. It's going to come up here. We're going to spend a lot of hours on it, a lot of time, a lot of the guys are going to make headlines, you're going to go for brownie points, and I will tell a very simple story, because you listened to my friend here, from the Bible - and parables. And this story

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. BARROW cont'd)pertains - I'll steal it from Bob Pickens, you know Bob Pickens. It's a baseball story. At a convention he mentions batting average in the They were batting so much, we were batting so much, but one of the big batters in there, the 400 is Mickey Mantle and Billy Martin. They were professional ball players but very avid hunters and they decided to take a trip together, Mr. Speaker, a hunting trip somewhere up in the north in Alberta, and Mantle had gone there for many years and established a relationship with a farmer where he could stay and hunt as much as he liked. So they drove up to this farm house and Mickey said, "Billy, you sit in the car, I'll go in and arrange our accommodations." Okay. So he went in and the farmer said, "Sure, stay as long as you like, Mickey, hunt as much as you want, but how about doing me a favour?" "What's the favour?" "Well," he said, "I have a horse up in the pasture, it's old and sick and I've got to do away with it. How about shooting it for me?" Well, what could he do? "Sure." So he went outside to the car and he decided to have a little fun with Billy Martin so he pretended he was very angry. He said, "What's the matter?" "That old son-of-a-gun, we can't stay here, we can't hunt here." And he grabbed his rifle and loaded it. Martin said, "What are you going to do?" "The old son-of-a-bitch I'm going to shoot his horse." "Don't do that, don't do that." "Yes, I'm going to do that." As he walked to the pasture he tried talking him out of it, and he up and he shot the horse. He heard two quick rifle shots and there was Billy Martin and he said to Martin, "What did you do?" "Screw the old son-of-a-bitch, I just shot two of his cows." And to me this is what we're doing. We're going to form a Wage and Price controls on a whim by Mr. Trudeau for he shot the horse, labour, and somebody will shoot two more shots. I don't think we . . . that.

I think I should say a word about our leader - he doesn't get much credit and I'd like to be short and snappy like some of my friends across the way there. And I was at a social where the drinks were free - it was the chiropractors or the hotel keepers - and knowing the people on this side, if there would be free drinks they'd take advantage of it. I don't have that trouble myself, I mean drinking too much. Occasionally, I've been served too well by some of the waitresses. But this night we got carried away and they - I'm glad you laughed. But they're very good friends of mine, we stick very close together and I won't name their names, it will be a little embarrassing. And one said to me, "Tom, if we had your leader we'd be sitting over there." And the other one said, "Yes, God damn it, if we had your leader we'd be the government." And this is our leader compared to theirs. I won't go into that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will be the first to admit that this government is far from perfect but it is the very best vehicle we have for the majority of the people. I believe in that. And I'd be very very remiss if I didn't take a crack at the press up there under the dome. This is told from Ed Cass - Ed Cass is 84 years old, he is a ball player; a very very sincere, honest man, Ed Cass. He did more for baseball in Manitoba than Gordie Howe has done for hockey in Detroit. But he was criticizing the press, the sports writers, well, how they would misquote. He told this story about a farmer who had worked hard all his life and wanted to buy a thoroughbred horse. He couldn't afford a horse so he bought a mule or an ass and he entered it in the race. And by God, it came in third and the headlines came out "Farmer Jones' ass well placed." The second race, by God he comes in second - "Farmer Brown's ass shows." The third race he put him in, the mayor was hostile - he was something like Mayor Juba - how could you put a mule in a thoroughbred race. The headlines came out, big boxed headlines, "Mayor scratches Jones' ass."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll close by saying just this. As long as I am a member of a government who considers all people, the haves, the have nots, the Medicare Program, the Denticare, and every program we have, I'll remain a Socialist. I'm not ashamed of that; dogs don't bite me. And with those few short words, Mr. Speaker, I thank you much.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time in the House after observing about a week of the rules and the friendly tone of debate and the crossfire which is amusing at times and very thought provoking at others.

Mr. Speaker, I should like as a new member - and if I do abuse the rules it will not be intentional and I hope you will bear with me - I would like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment, and I would like to congratulate the new Member for Crescentwood; you both well deserve your elected positions.

I would publicly like to sincerely thank the people of Wolseley for supporting the working candidate in the last election and I hope I can become their sounding board in this House.

Polarization now seems complete and our caucus welcomes the extra office space.

I would like to take a few minutes of the members of the House to describe the constituency which I represent and like the Member from Wellington, the gentleman that quotes the Bible, who was the first to speak, my constituency is very similar to his. Our old schools teach the three R's but they seem to lack that wall to wall carpeting. We have a few small parks and Wolseley is a changing area like all of us with age. Its boundaries are Assiniboine River on the south and the north Portage Avenue. The constituency starts across the street from this Chamber and goes in a westerly direction to the St. James underpass. Here again on our side of the underpass we have long grass and old drums and the odd time a derelict car but on the other side you have the plush landscaping to the west. Wolseley . . . --(Interjection)--That's St. James.

Wolseley however is a mosaic of people of different nationalities and political persuasion. We have many new Canadians with language problems but we all live together side by side working to improve our community. Our easy accessibility to the cultural amenities of the downtown core is a major plus. We have the friendliest corner stores in town - most of them which vote Conservative - and we don't have any transportation worries even when there's a strike. All these things seem to make Wolseley the type of place where people want to live. I was born in Wolseley; I still live in Wolseley. Our constituency has some of the finest citizen-run local community clubs. We have the Laura Secord Recreational Centre, the new Broadway Optimist grounds, and of course the Wolseley Joint . . . one of the first in Winnipeg in the Wolseley School. However, our children seem to have a lot of fun despite the central living.

You know Wolseley even has a not too well known park; the Minister of Mines might remember it, it's called Izzy Park. But like his party at last resort it was sinking, or should I say sliding into the river. Like the famous elm tree, you know, it might soon be forgotten unless the EMO, or the Emergency Measures Organization would come up with some sand bags. I'm sorry the Minister of Tourism isn't here because I was going to plead with him for some signage because we could make this a more famous park.

The last Liberal who was running there said running for politics or political office is like putting your head in a pail and asking somebody to hit it. Obviously somebody did because I'm very proud to serve in this House.

Mr. Speaker, the Wolseley constituency is named after Colonel Wolseley, and with a group of men he deposed of the Provincial Government of the day and it is my intention, like in 1870, to work with another fine group of men and hopefully in 1970 depose of the Provincial Government of the day. It's history repeating itself.

Mr. Speaker, as we enter this new era for the people of Wolseley I would like to acknowledge the contribution to this House of my former predecessors, the Honourable Duff Roblin, the late Leonard Claydon and of course, I. H. Asper.

Yes, my constituency is similar to the Member from Wellington except that the people freely chose a Progressive Conservative member to represent them. They did this--(Interjection)--Thank you. They did this after duly considering the issues and policy of this government. Let it be understood by this Chamber that my people seem to deliver a message to this government. The message of course was a surprise in some respects to both sides of the House and certainly to the legal profession, which

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. WILSON cont'd) was well represented in the campaign against me. I'm reminded of course of the particular situation but there again however it would seem that the message that the New Democratic Party must have got from the people is that it's losing its way. This government is no longer concerned with people's problems with the exception of the Member from Churchill who spoke the other day and I listened to his comments, I felt that they were sincere. Of course since that time I've listened to the Member from Ste. Rose and I liked his comments about the red hens and the Regina Manifesto and the four million turkeys, and I was tempted, of course, wanting to be polite the first time around, to say there was 30 more in the Chamber, but I will pass that by.

The NDP has mismanaged the government business with respect to Autopac, Flyer Coach and Saunders Aircraft, but it would seem that because of these unjustified actions the people of Wolseley said by their votes that the government should get out of questionable businesses. They said to me, "Government spending is too high. Would you not consider 23 per cent above the average rate of inflation?" They claim that taxation on their homes was too high. They're concerned because vital and essential services are walking out on strike, and I think this is terrible. This government seems to be drunk with money and is wasting it on foolish things. They took to making blue jeans with old sewing machines that didn't work, \$215,767 loss on whatever St. Jean Sportswear was supposed to be making. They even financed Chinese frozen food when pizzas were popular - King Choy, \$228,898; and if you gentlemen will listen I want to show you how foolish you can really get because I understand you've gone into the drug and toiletry business. In 1975, here it is, T . . . Laboratories, male deodorant genital spray contains vitamin E, protects body odor. Isn't that something? I say that government business sense stinks like that does and they should stop these far-out investments. Use some reasoning, please gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, during this my first session it is my intention to be labelled a no-nonsense candidate, and I was going to quote Mr. Burke but I'll pass that by. But I would like to see whether this government has recognized my concerns and those of the people of Wolseley and whether you're going to take the corrective measures. I always present my constituent concerns and stand up for things that bother them and even support . . . I even support your government, and I will support your government for the policies and actions that are in the people's interests. The Minister of Mines, the Honourable Mr. Green, one of my famous constituents, has said in the media he is concerned. So I am taking this opportunity as a constituent, without his permission, to warn the Manitoba Development Corporation to proceed with caution. The reported \$21 million in losses this year cannot continue.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister, on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: A small matter, Mr. Speaker, it's a new member but I think he should be aware that he's not to name a member in the House.

MR. WILSON: I did repeat the Minister of Mines, one of my famous constituents, if I mentioned his name I apologize, Mr. Speaker.

I've been honoured to have been appointed the caucus critic for Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services. I see the Minister is not here this evening to receive some of my comments. I was intending to be a little fair but since he's not here I probably will mention a few things on the negative side.

Although this Minister and I went to the same school in Wellington riding, Daniel Mac Collegiate, we didn't get to know each other, but for the next period of time I'm hopefully going to know all about him. I always strive for a balance between the employment sector and the consumer. I support a proper balance between the landlords and the tenants. Does the Minister consult the public sector or the people? Does he ever consult anyone? We shall see.

Mr. Speaker, I've done my homework to obtain my university of life degree in this and other governing areas. My experience as a city councillor and Vice-Chairman of Health, Welfare and Social Services opened up my eyes to the needs of the less fortunate and I say, "The victims of legal aid." I'd like to think about the Alexander case in which a new Canadian and his wife came over here with a simple problem, Jamaica via London. They arrived and his wife being lonely for home started dialing

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. WILSON cont'd) her mother. The fellow didn't have the sense because . . . of course he sought professional advice, he was an employee of the Provincial Government. They told him to go down and see a marriage counsellor if he couldn't stop her making the long distance calls. If he had come to see me I'd have told him to take the phone out. But these marriage counsellors, which it has been suggested are really agents for legal aid, immediately referred these two people to legal aid lawyers. The result is that this summer this gentleman and his wife will be divorced, five lawyers later, fee generating, and this is the whole system when you expand a particular program at an unreasonable rate.

A MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. WILSON: My experiences as a private bailiff solving consumer rental problems since 1958 have showed me the problems people face when they face a cold impersonal bureaucratic empire. The average person has a hard time knowing the division between provincial and federal programs. It is my intention to ask that this confusion stop and the government have some thrust to do some advertising to cut out the confusion.

The duplication of services, the featherbedding in the departments, the waste in tax dollars on overstocking of products and questionable purchases beyond public knowledge, it reminds me of a little humour story, of course, where the Department of Education - the Minister is here - went out in their wisdom in the capital budget, or maybe it was a current budget, or maybe it was a divisional budget, and purchased \$25,000 worth of musical instruments. Somebody in his department cut out the music teacher so the instruments are under a plastic cover. This is what I mean about lack of co-ordination of government waste. Mr. Speaker, I understand the Minister copied the federal regulations in his new Corporations Act for Manitoba. If you want to ask me about the violins after I'll be glad to tell you.

I will put in an Order for Return and if the other person that wants the answer about the pigeons, I'll also do that as well.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the Minister copied the federal regulations for his new Corporation Act for Manitoba which will be introduced shortly, but any changes in federal and other provincial programs which should be copied, and I will give him credit for allowing them to be copied, and I hope he presents them as new bills, if they are not good for the consumer they won't get my support.

Later on in my reply I would like to offer thoughts that may be of help to a particular Minister, but right now I am dealing with the Department of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services. I would like to see a government follow Ontario's Bill 165 and Quebec's Bill 19, and license wholesale tour operators and travel agencies. Experience in other areas of stranded passengers, bankrupt tour wholesalers, and resorts that do not deliver cannot be allowed to continue. The consumer must be protected. The first step in protecting the travelling consumer is to protect their funds, and making the industry responsible for any misfortunes that befall the consumer. The compensation fund that needs to be set up must have government backing. In Ontario the funds lost from deposits on Sand Pebble Tours and Blue Vista Enterprises cleaned out the fund that they set up only months after it was formed.

Mr. Speaker, if I may digress for a moment with the hope that the Provincial Government will get out of the tour business and simply regulate the industry where necessary, I am told that in complete innocence the NDP Tours, now Manitours, paid a consultant over \$50,000 for information they could have received from any airline district sales manager for free. Do you recognize this book you had before? I intend to file an Order for Return asking about Mr. Solmundson's company and how much they received. I'm disturbed that the government thought they could enter this viable industry, and again the NDP has learned that governments cannot run a business at a profit without certain professionalism. The wholesaler they funded in that book closed his doors and disappeared. Lately the American agents that they've been wining and dining at government expense - they brought them up here and explained the government packages. These happy-go-lucky people simply borrow our land arrangements and they go back south of the border and put together their own packages. Why should they give our government the

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. WILSON cont'd)profit? Mr. Speaker, I would rather the government financially support tourism, the tourist sector, instead of attempting to compete and take over. I'm told that the Provincial Government only supports it to the tune - I'm talking about the organizations - of \$98,000, when the City of Denver alone, they get \$750,000 to support tourism to that city.

Getting back to the --(Interjection)--Well I would just like to see that tourism, which is a sure winner for the people of Manitoba - you know, it could be number one, and certainly since this present government seems to have spoiled the revenues from Hydro for at least the time being, that tourism should be number one very shortly, and the Minister is to be congratulated for bringing it to about number three now, and I think he's moving in the right direction.

Getting back to the Minister - who is not here, of course - of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services, I would like to see his rentalsman department or his rentalsman, take Manitoba Housing and Renewal to court, to task maybe, to the Minister, because it seems to me that in many areas of complaint they seem exempt from government scrutiny, and I refer to the Wolseley constituency and the Evanson and Arlington properties.

I would like to see more legislation on door to door salesmen, the patent medicine boys, and the siding salesmen, and others too numerous to mention. I would like to see a modern or new modern warranty legislation. I find it very strange that after buying a television set that I have to then go out and buy a warranty policy for \$74.00 a year. This isn't the only item of which you have to buy a warranty policy after you purchase it. It doesn't seem right to me.--(Interjection)--Yes, I'm sure if the government was selling televisions they'd want to sell a policy as well, but I'll reserve that view.

I'm waiting for the Minister to slow down because if he wants to wait for Autopac I'm getting to that very shortly.

Lastly, would the Member for Osborne reconsider his long range everlasting rent control. My personal thoughts, and I say these are my personal thoughts only, are that I would like to see the Rentalsman Review Committee roll back unfair rental increases from one or two, from the only one or two questionable agencies. I would like to see the increased frequency of legal charges against those few low-life landlords who take advantage of the handicapped, sick and the aged. I would like to see it to be an offence under the Law Society, the Law Society Act, for a member of the society to be a slum landlord and be charged, should be dealt with by the society. Most important I am sure, a re-examination of government capital priorities would soon solve the apartment shelter problem, and somebody asked me, "Do I have a solution." If you will be kind enough to listen for a moment, here is one of them - and the Minister of Public Works might well listen to this - because, if you turn around and take care of the low income people in these categories as mentioned above, the competition in the marketplace will take care of the wealthy tenants. Just think of how many citizens would appreciate a small apartment instead of a huge \$10 million government employee garage. Pay the government employees, buy them a monthly transit pass, and return the money from these government garages to housing.

Mr. Speaker, any program that is squandering money may for the first time be discovered by thrifty Bob. Electric cars, as I mentioned electric guitars, and \$25,000 items will come under my scrutiny. Even if you notice, I've got the books here on what is alluded to be affectionately known as the "Red Air Force." I find it very strange that in 1972 you were less than a million and now you're over two million.

A MEMBER: Oh, that's nothing.

MR. WILSON: I've been talking to Mr. Swystun, and I'm attempting to find out if his figure - the government owes 39 planes--(Interjection)--The unbiased Mr. Swystun, did you say? Well I would like somebody on that side of the House to tell me how many planes you do own because these reports here do not give me any indication other than the fact you seem to be acquiring new ones, and I would like at this time to say after studying the seven hundred and some odd thousand subsidy you intended to pour into your proposed new airline, and this is in addition to the very famous - I don't know

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. WILSON cont'd) what the name of it is, it's called the Red Air Force as far as the average citizen goes - that in the Skywest situation I think that you should be prepared to give at least 10 per cent of the amount that you were prepared to support your own airline, you should give that to the private sector.

In the area of taxation we must strive as never before for municipal fiscal reform - and that even includes Churchill to the Minister. In the City of Winnipeg we cannot continue to exist under the present form of fiscal witchcraft. And I wish that the Minister, the First Minister was here because he might know what I mean when I say "witchcraft" because a glimpse of a particular Minister in power sort of by a puff of smoke and a rabbit from a hat, will not allow the city to commence a program. The Municipal Board and the necessary funds seem to be his magic wand to make city capital programs disappear with the exception of the new Osborne Street bridge. The formula for growth tax sharing is totally wrong. While the fires of inflation fatten the provincial treasury the municipalities suffer under increased costs to deliver even below normal services to the taxpayer.

You know I was proud to be part of that municipal meeting March 26, 1975, which was called a Fair Share of Growth Taxes. You know more meetings are needed to show the Government that municipal might exist; if all the municipalities got together the voting power would make this government listen. While this story is old and the situation now at a crisis level, I would like to point out to the NDP sponsored unions - you know, these unions receive salaries of the City of Winnipeg which when this quote was written was \$105 million. Of this, approximately 25 per cent is returned to your provincial coffers, your provincial treasury by means of sales tax, income tax, etc. Is it fair to say that the province is really giving back the city very little and possibly just their own employees' money back.

Public Transit should be funded 50/50 on the losses. I would like to see you follow Ontario's example, who has been sharing 50/50 for years. Mr. Speaker, I would like to see many many services to people taken over by the Provincial Government because it seems to me that this government will never part with their vote getting dollars. The complete funding of health, welfare, social services in the city is long overdue and discriminates against the property owner, the property homeowner. I would like to see, and here's a very important new concept, I don't know if anyone on that side of the House has thought of it before, but I would like to see the protection of our citizens paid for by the Provincial Government. I have a letter from Chief Norm Stewart in reply to one I wrote to him in which I expressed concern about the increase in violent crime in Wolseley. It was suggested that crime had increased, the percentage, by 24 per cent in 1973 and 1974, 10 per cent and 14 per cent respectfully. And the only solution was to hire more policemen. But, as you know the City has no money. I plead with this government to fund the city for the protection of its citizens and for once recognize an emergency. I will have more to say about this number one priority for Wolseley during the session.

Just remember you can never keep your promise - and I remember this promise - that the City of Winnipeg Act, the Unicity would mean substantial savings, you will never keep your promise to accept full responsibility for transitional costs. The citizens of Winnipeg have been misled; the citizens of Winnipeg have not been fooled and will place the blame at your feet, unless, unless something is done before the next election. I want to get to know some of you fellows on the other side and if this doesn't happen I might as well say goodbye to the Members from Wellington, St. Matthews, Logan and Osborne. I purposely left some other gentlemen out; I saved that for the next speech.

I would like to see the amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act return more responsibility to the local community and elect a public relations mayor at large, which you already have done.

In closing I would like to leave several ideas for your consideration. I think that your very mammoth Legal Aid Program is wrong because it is growing by leaps and bounds and has become a fantastic money-maker for lawyers who have become civil servants, paramutuel or, we call them civil servants, and of course junior lawyers who

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. WILSON cont'd) are enjoying the amenity they receive under this expanding program. There seems to be no clause to discourage abuse and there is complete lack of care on behalf of the Attorney-General's department, who is leaning down there, under whose supervision the Legal Aid Services Act falls. Their Outreach Program, as I mentioned, encourages divorce; it looks for civil suits; it is expanding at a frightening rate. I would like to see the Minister consult with the Law Society and put a freeze on the spending and expansion, and I certainly don't go along with these Portage Avenue locations. How many law firms can afford to be in the Dayton Building on the main floor?

Mr. Speaker, since the Provincial Government makes all the money, and of course here's another suggestion of mine - I'm sure it's been thought of before - but as Chairman of the Derelict Car Committee I'd like to see the revenue, you know the automobile during its lifetime, well the revenue from it accrues to the Provincial Government, and I'd like to see the Provincial Government pay for the cost of burying scrap and derelict automobiles. You know I'm sort of an environmentalist at heart and your solid waste disposal policy seems to discriminate against the City of Winnipeg, And it would be high on my list of suggestions that either you could add 50 cents or a dollar to the present licenses to pay to get rid of this junk out of the city, and I would hope that some thought would be given to it.

But that doesn't mean to say that the rumours that persist in the business community are to be followed in other areas. We all know that scrap metal is in demand and I'm sure the government and the people of Winnipeg could make money if they knew where to take this. I understand Mandac is paying about \$71.00 a ton and each car possibly weighs a ton and a quarter. But I would like to plead with Autopac to halt its suggested plans to take over the salvage and wrecking business in this province, because if you create a monopoly and only one person has all the parts for cars, you can imagine what's going to happen to the price of them, especially if this government on the other side is running a deficit budget, they're going to look for ways to make money. And I would hope that since they won't properly divide the spoils that they would give up their suggested plan to take over the Autopac towing. I'd like to see this returned to the private sector. It would seem to me to be fairer to establish a rate schedule. If that rate schedule is \$11.00 a tow job it seems absolutely ridiculous to have one company go from Bowman Avenue all the way to Headingley when there's a towing company in the Headingley area. And I can't for the life of me see how the police if they see a car stalled in the ditch are compelled to phone the Autopac towing thing. It would seem to me the closest towing company - the private sector should be allowed to tow that car at the established government rate.

I wanted to talk about the Minister of Labour who talked about this as a pleasant session and while I've got a little ways to go, you have been very pleasant and I appreciate it, but again I would like to echo the comments of one of our members who said that this government on the other side has to give some thought to the native people who have been denied participation in government policy to a large extent.

Finally, I would like to ask the government for some form, and I know it's rather, I guess, impossible after all those other comments to ask the government for some form of relief for senior citizen home owners, but I'm asking it anyway because it would seem that a special grant to cover educational tax levies on their mounting yearly tax bills is something that has to be done. And believe you me I really say this sincerely that well I think that after paying property taxes for 40 years, and if you're in a low income bracket, if you want to put it in the low income bracket, give them a break. I'm told that several . . . well I understand that there is a mysterious folder coming out. It talks about co-operatives or something and if you were to average out the cost of this new educational piece at \$3.00 a piece, you would probably come to about a million dollars if every classroom in the country was to get one. I think that's a complete waste and to me it's a form of brainwashing of the students to print this kind of thing for a million dollars, and I've been searching for it in the Budget and I will be asking that somebody point out where it appears in the Budget --(Interjection)--Well I think that it is more important that the senior citizens be given a break and that the educational

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. WILSON cont'd)costs be slowed down. I fail to see why we have to enter into new programs.

I possibly could go on; I had wanted to refer to my literature in which I stated that what has increased faster than the cost of food, the cost of houses, the cost of clothing, and when the people were to turn the page, the message was the cost of your government, the cost of Mr. Ed Schreyer.

With those opening remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you for your attentiveness and, Mr. Speaker, to the members of the government I just want to tell you my concerns are for the people.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would permit, I would wish to ask him a question for clarification of a comment that he made during his speech, and that was the \$25,000 expenditure. I wasn't clear whether this was an expenditure supposedly made by the Department of Education or by some school division.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: I believe it was a school division but as a new member I tie every waste to the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, unless there is somebody in the Chamber that wishes to speak I intend to adjourn the debate. I would move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Tourism, that debate be now adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the Minister adjourning debate or is the Minister . . .

MR. GREEN: No I wanted to adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wolseley, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Minister of Mines, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wolseley, the House do now adjourn. Agreed? So ordered. The House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon (Wednesday).