

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, March 12, 1974

INTERIM SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's with some reservation that I choose to intrude on the Honourable Minister of Finance's business of the House that he's placed before us - Interim Supply - which deals with the additional expenditures involved in all departments of government, that I do however feel myself compelled to be drawn into the debate that has occupied the better part of the legislative day up until now.

And I'm happy to see the Minister of Northern Affairs is in his chair because he did make a contribution this afternoon which of course is in keeping with the general tenor of the contribution made by most honourable members for the last four or five years--on the opposite side of the House as the Member for Morris corrects me. And that can be summed up, that can really be summed up to the simple statement of fact that they persist, they persist in telling the story and in convincing themselves that nothing happened in the Province of Manitoba in the last one hundred years until the event, until the event of, New Democratic Party succeed into office. Well now I notice, Mr. Chairman, I notice "some" - I should qualify that some - in fact it was two - but I notice two heads shake in the negative in response to that statement, so I will modify my statement. At least two members of the present New Democratic Party are prepared to acknowledge the fact that there was in fact some progress made in the past one hundred years in the development of mankind, in the betterment of mankind's position in the Province of Manitoba, without the event of a New Democratic Party government. Two, out of a total of 31 members acknowledge us. Not the Minister of Finance, oh not him; not the Minister of Labour, not the Minister of Education, not the Minister of Northern Affairs, not the Minister of Tourism and Recreation but two backbench members, who maybe really should be given a second look at, some consideration for you know, replacing some of these all too often vacant seats in the front bench, they at least acknowledge, you know, that there might just have been something happening in Manitoba a hundred years prior to their commencement into political life that was in fact worthwhile.

Mr. Chairman, I want to remind the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs of one such event, one such event particularly that involves the question under debate in the last day or day and a half. That was the suggestion that the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs drew into the debate that in the past all too often northern fishermen have been at the mercy and have been abused because of their distance, their isolation to the vagaries of the competitive marketing in their product, their main product, fish, and I should tell the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs that it was largely, largely the result, largely the effort of the previous administration, of which I was privileged to be a member of, that brought about the formation of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board, to bring about a degree of order, a degree of fairness into the marketing of that so essential product, so essential to the very people that the Minister of Northern Affairs is concerned about. So, Mr. Speaker, it's not really fair game, and I respect the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs' intelligence for at least recognizing this. That while it is true that we did not pass, or we were not in a position to pass the final, you know, action of that act it is--(Interjection)--Pardon?

A MEMBER: You called a quick election.

MR. ENNS: Well the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose says we called a quick election. Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose that I never apologize - never - nor do the Conservative Party ever apologize for asking the people of Manitoba as to how they think we are managing their affairs - and accepting their decision. And accepting their decision. We have learned today, we have learned today the price of that decision, roughly \$250 million in unnecessary Hydro costs. But we were prepared to put that to the people, we were prepared to put that to the people--(Interjection)--yes there was a wild-eyed bushy tailed campaign mounted against us on this and other issues and we put the question to the people of Manitoba, and they rejected us. And they rejected us, and they rejected us as is their will and we don't quarrel with that will, we don't quarrel with that will, Mr. Chairman, but I just want to - you know this little part of my speech is there because of the interjection on the part of the Member for Ste. Rose who said that we did the dastardly thing, you know, we called a fast election. Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, through

## INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . you, that I never, I will never consider it a bad thing to ask the people of Manitoba to pass opinion upon my performance or upon the performance of my party. I never do that. I don't put that into the framework of calling a quick election or pulling off some cute political stunt. I think that's one of our jobs at all times, at all times to be prepared to ask the people of Manitoba, now what do you think of our performance?

Maybe the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose has another interjection to make and I may or may not dignify him with another five minutes response. However, Sir, the question really that concerns me, the question that really has to concern many people at this particular stage of the game, the performance of the Minister of Northern Affairs, and the absent Minister of Co-operative Development, is that through - Mr. Chairman, it can be said, it can be said, through a genuine co-operative effort, through efforts made by former Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, I can name them - the Honourable Sterling Lyon, the Honourable Gurney Evans, and Manitoba spear headed in Canada the formation and the development of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. And why did we do that, Sir? Was to try to bring the fishermen of this province - and, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to discriminate when I use that term, but I have to, to this extent, in the context of this debate, to say particularly the native fishermen of this province, to get them a fair deal, that was the purpose, that was the purpose of the initiation on the part of the Province of Manitoba to convince other provincial jurisdictions, and finally the Federal Government to establish the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me, you know I really don't have to, my leader did it so amply this afternoon, illustrate what this government has done with that vehicle in so short a time. The fishing industries of the north are in chaos and in shambles - right? Is there anyone there - do I hear the Member for Churchill, do I hear the Member from Thompson, do I hear the Member for Rupertsland say otherwise? The fishermen of this province owe money that they have no hope of repaying. We heard the Minister in charge of Co-operative and Social--well, Mr. Chairman, they have taken unto themselves so many fancy titles that even we have difficulty in pronouncing. But anyway, the Minister in charge of Co-ops has so confused the situation that he now reports that he is reduced to the level of reporting to the House that only "these" number of Co-ops are now going broke; you know, only these number of co-operatives are now owing so much money to these and these agencies.

This, Mr. Chairman, after the event, after the passage of necessary legislation with a great deal of effort, that established a Freshwater Fish Marketing Board that was to do away with the kind of - you know, to use the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs' favourite phrase you know, to do away with the robber barons of the north, you know, and he made reference to that this afternoon. We have no more robber barons in the north with respect to the fish industry, right? We have a broadly based federal controlled Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. We have the co-operation of the Provincial Government through the development of co-operatives to see that it works properly. Mr. Chairman, why then are today communities like South Indian Lake, you know - and I have pause for a minute around that particular community. That was the community that was held up to me as to be that tremendous self-sufficient community, that community that needs no welfare, that community that all it did was fish; give it the opportunity to catch the fish, give it the opportunity to trap and they wanted none of the white man's handouts. That community under the administration of this administration, this government, under the direction of the Member of Thompson, under the direction of the Member from Churchill, under the direction of the Member from Rupertsland, are dead broke and owe a massive amount of money; money, Mr. Chairman, that they will have difficulty repaying years to come. Years to come. That is the position that you put the people of the community of South Indian Lake into. And I hope you're proud of it, I hope you're proud of it. You won't recognize the possibility that there may have been one or two white men involved who spoke with forked tongue and who according to my leader's evidence, with my leader's evidence, probably abused their privilege . . .

A MEMBER: You should know.

MR. ENNS: . . . probably sucked the co-operative into expenditures of money that were uncalled for, that were unconscionable, that were indeed best described as outright election bribery.

A MEMBER: Hear. Hear.

## INTERIM SUPPLY

MR. ENNS: But, Mr. Chairman, you know, I'm not really particularly interested in even I think the case put by my leader under any normal circumstances would suffice that would ask any person. You know, if the Minister in charge were at least confident in proving his case he would be the first one to agree to a judicial inquiry. Mr. Speaker, judicial inquiries are not that foreign to development in the north. I can recall when the Liberal Party thought that there was tremendous need to have a judicial inquiry into the matter of certain contracts having to do with the development of the Grand Rapids Power development. And what did the government of the day do, the Conservative Government of the day of whom it was requested? They granted that judicial inquiry. And really all that was at stake here was a charge made by the then opposition that somebody who had the contract to haul water was making unconscionable profits or something like that. We granted the inquiry - you know, this has to be remembered. If the government of the day feels that they are on the side of the angels and they have nothing to hide--(Interjection)--well then why argue about not granting an inquiry? If nothing else, you should be willing to grant the inquiry to prove us wrong, to prove us wrong. If for no other reason at all you should grant the inquiry to prove that everything that my leader, my boss said was wrong.

A MEMBER: No way, no way.

MR. ENNS: Pardon? No I don't know he's wrong. I'm prepared, I would like to see somebody, some reasonably independent person say he's wrong or he's right. But, Mr. Chairman, it becomes patently obvious that those fellows opposite aren't prepared to take that chance. That's the central argument that he made. They are not prepared to take that chance.

A MEMBER: Because we caught them with their hand in the till.

MR. ENNS: They're not prepared to take that chance. And I, Sir, really ask, I really ask you, Mr. Chairman, you know, to remember, you know, and it becomes unfortunately a pattern of debate. It doesn't matter what it is that we challenge this government with. We have from time to time attempted because we honestly felt a matter deserved the attention, to call for emergency debates in this House. The Honourable Deputy House Leader I'm sure he can recall the numerous times that he and even - well there's not too many members of the Liberal Party other than the Member from Assiniboia that can recall, that, you know, the question of having an emergency debate in this House was not all that uncommon. As a matter of fact, I can recall that being granted, I can recall that being granted on one occasion when it was proposed by the member that sat in this very chair, the Member of St. George, he called for and succeeded in getting an emergency debate because the streets were particularly slippery that day, the highways were slippery and he was worried about what the Department of Highways were doing to modify that situation. I can tell you, Sir, Mr. Chairman, that in five years we have moved 23 attempts to bring about emergency debate but only one of them were succeeded, and that was when the former Leader of the Liberal Party moved an emergency debate that was essentially directed against us, . . .

A MEMBER: Not the government.

MR. ENNS: Not the government but against us. Senator Molgat now, moved the debate. That's when the Speaker acknowledged, that's the last emergency debate that we had in the session. 23 to 1 - 23 to 1.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the honourable members should realize that casting reflections on the Chair is not really strictly according to hoyle in this House.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, what I'm trying to in my own style bring across to the members opposite, that previous administrations were open to the kind of charges that we were making and said, "Okay, if there is any merit in them let's investigate them, let's have the truth speak out." And I'm offering the members opposite the olive branch, you know, not just have the Minister stand up and challenge the credibility of my leader, you know that's the kind of you know, bric-à-brac that we throw about in this Chamber. Let him stand up, let him accept a judicial inquiry. You know I can't really understand why the honourable members opposite would not welcome, why they would not welcome a judicial inquiry. Or is it, Mr. Speaker, that they do have a great deal to hide. Is it, Mr. Speaker, that the whole mass of vote buying that has been taking place in the north is not so coincidental? Is it, Mr. Speaker, that ever since the Minister of Northern Affairs himself as a civil servant coupled with, I don't know the man, the Honourable Member from Rupertsland, coupled with the Honourable Member from Dillen who have all been the same kind--or the Honourable Member from

## INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . Thompson--who have all enjoyed these kind of social animation contracts at twelve or twenty thousand dollars a year, have all of a sudden, all of a sudden found themselves in this Legislature, proving the eminent success of that political orientated program. That's striking a pretty good average, that's a pretty good average.

Well I want to tell the Honourable Member from Thompson, the Honourable Member from Rupertsland that prior to my entry into politics it was not necessary for me to be on the public payroll, and I want to tell that to the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs also. I didn't have to buy my votes in Lakeside the way this government is happily buying the votes of the five seats in the north, and they're buying them, and they're buying them with a missing \$600, 000 in the South Indian Lake Co-op that nobody on that side is prepared to stand up and answer for. Six hundred thousand dollars of public money that they're not prepared to answer for. Mr. Chairman, it's the kind of corruption, the kind of blatant politicization of the whole system that Manitoba has not seen, has not seen. Now we have, we already have, we know they have ongoing contacts right now. Right now they have people being paid \$37, 000 a year because they want to have some idea about what the people of the north think about their Northern Affairs Act. Now they want to have an independent opinion so they don't ask people, they don't phone people or they go to people's homes, no, they pay people to come to them. They pay them you know \$5. 00 a day you know, and tell them, now tell us what your independent feeling is about this government that just gave you \$5. 00 a day to tell us what nice fellows we are. You know - what? Mr. Chairman - well I say no more, I say no more.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable members opposite have shown a singular lack of desire to answer any of the basic charges made by my leader. They have not even shown a concern about what length of time, for instance, did the fishermen not receive their full due. This very same Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation that was set up to bring about a fair price to fishermen, that established the price at 17 cents a pound and through mismanagement the fishermen in the north weren't getting it, they were getting 12 or 13 cents a pound. It was only when a major meeting took place that all of a sudden they changed their price, you know not through market demand, but just because of some in-house political pressure all of a sudden the price jumped back to 17 cents. Now for how long did the fishermen in the north get four or five cents less? Has any one of the Ministers, has any one of the members in the north worried about that? No. No. No, no, no. No. Did this cost you know, this fisherman \$80. 00, did this cost that fisherman his week's groceries, did this cost that fisherman his outboard motor? That's not their concern. They're not even prepared to investigate that matter, not prepared to investigate that matter.

Does this government show any concern at all that they have strapped these communities, South Indian Lake, Ilford, the one that my leader can't pronounce and I can't pronounce, with a capital debt that they cannot ever pay? That they cannot pay. Are they worried about that? No. No, they're not worried about that. In fact the Minister gets up and says that well they're going to start paying that on their next year's fishing program. So now we're mortgaging on their next year's fishing program the kind of capital debt that we've saddled them down with. But that's not their concern, Mr. Chairman, that's not their concern.

You know, Mr. Chairman, as the Minister of Agriculture I must admit to a particular pride and feeling for that particular part of my portfolio which included the northern co-operatives. And despite, despite you know this cocky socialist attitude of members opposite, I can tell the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs that on most of the lakes that he's ever been on I enjoyed a fresh pickerel fry with the members of the co-operatives that were fishing at that particular time, whether it was Norway House, whether it was South Indian Lake, whether it was Williams Lake or whether it was these other places. It was--(Interjection)-- No, in Manitoba. You know in Manitoba, in Manitoba. One of the better lakes that we have in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I can tell you, that the whole question of responsibility you know, of not foisting on to people a position that they can't get out of is the major responsibility for that, you know, sponsoring group, namely government. It was my pleasure to watch the development of some of the co-operative movements there. Yes, they were small. They started off with assets of \$14, 000, with \$28, 000 and slowly were moving along. But, you know, along came our bureaucrats, members opposite, you know we see it so often. We've seen many a good farmer destroyed by that attitude. We've seen many a good business manager destroyed by

## INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . that attitude. He says, oh, no, you can't sit along here with a 14, 15 thousand dollar co-op, you've got to get into this business in millions. You need a \$60,000 conveyer belt. You need a \$30,000 house for the manager. You need a \$10,000 chain link fence around your complex. You know, you need a \$200,000 cobbling complex instead of making your own ice. You need all these things. But my question is, and this really is the tragedy, this whole damn debate. That in northern Manitoba right now, in the only occupation and the only business where the north has a hope, has a commercial, has a fundamental base, this government has ruined it. When we hear about this bankruptcy or the approaching bankruptcy of South Indian Lake, of Ilford, of Oxford House or others, you know, really, I mean the measure of success surely has to be with all that outflowing of money, with all that effort of funds, I would expect the Minister of Agriculture to be able to tell us, you know, that things are--you know, we're struggling, but we're coming along and we're moving on to solid progress. We've done away with those, in the words of the Minister of Northern Affairs, those robber barons of private enterprise that used to gyp and cheat and short-change the fisherman in the north, we've done away with them. We've established our Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation.

A MEMBER: And replaced it with himself.

MR. ENNS: Well, you know, that really is the case. The Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation says that the fishermen are entitled to this price and this Minister's agent short-changed them by four or five cents a pound.

A MEMBER: They don't even know it happened.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I won't belabour the point. But the fact of the matter is, the fact of the matter is, I am sure when you would take into account the manifold increase of public presence in terms of dollars and cents, when you would consider that this government--you know I can remember--let's just remember, five years ago before this government spent \$10 million dollars in South Indian Lake, South Indian Lake was a viable community, it made money, nobody was on welfare. Right? Nobody was on welfare. It made money and it supported them. If anybody there opposite dares to challenge that statement, then you have to erase a hell of a lot of your Hansard. Because that's what I was charged with when I suggested the flooding of South Indian Lake. Right? Do you remember that gentlemen? Do you remember that? So, five years ago the community of South Indian Lake was a completely viable community. They were making money. They were selling their fish. They had no problems. Five years later . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ENNS: . . . after the investment of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The member's time has elapsed. The Honourable Member have leave? No. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I know that honourable members are wont to give vent to their . . .

A MEMBER: . . . Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I've already recognized the Minister of Labour.

A MEMBER: Okay.

MR. PAULLEY: I realize, Mr. Chairman, that members are wont to give vent to their idiosyncracies from time to time and we've listened to the Honourable Member for Lakeside. Actually what we're dealing with, as I understand the motion before us, is as to whether or not we should grant interim supply of 25 percent to carry on in the next ensuing fiscal year. And it appears to me that the members of the opposition have attempted to use this in order to give vent to their feelings and to carry on the tirade, which is of course, unfounded, that was started this afternoon by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, who is so unknowledgeable of the destiny of Manitoba, that he did speak for a considerable period of time, and he has the licence to do so under the rules of the House, that he went on with a tirade that was nonsensical, had no substance in fact, but typical of my honourable friend the Member for River Heights, he went on and on and on, and the more he went on the less he said that was intelligent and understandable by the people of the Province of Manitoba, let alone those of us who suffered listening to him during his tirade this afternoon. He made many accusations, he made many accusations unfounded in fact, and I'm sure that an analysis of what he said by anybody who has any intellect, would realize that the honourable member should have done what he is now doing, leaving the Chamber, because he didn't add anything to the contribution of the debates of this House this afternoon.

## INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)

But, really, Mr. Chairman, what are we dealing with this evening? We're dealing with a proposition of the Honourable the Minister of Finance for a 25 percent interim allocation in the Estimates to carry forward the forward thrust of this government. And since we became government in 1969, I would suggest Mr. Chairman, more progress has been made in Manitoba than there ever was in the hundred years since we became a government. (Applause)

MR. ENNS: It's all very well, Mr. Chairman--yet it's a matter of opinion. I would suggest to my honourable friend the Member for Swan River that that opinion was expressed last year when we were elected with the largest majority that has been our majority for many a year and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order. Order, please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside has had his 30 minutes. If he wants a further thirty when the present member is speaking, perhaps he'll catch the Speaker's eye or the Chairman's eye, but at the present time I think I should quote the rules to him. When an honourable member is speaking it is not in order for another member to interrupt him and make noises. If the honourable member wants to engage in yelling, I suggest he go elsewhere and exercise his lungs.

MR. PAULLEY: And if I may continue, Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that this present government, as a result of the election last year, has received the greatest support that a government of Manitoba has received in the last 10 or 12 years. And, one of my friends opposite says, "popycock"; I refer him to the document that I tabled on behalf of the Clerk of the House not so long ago.

So what we are dealing with now, Mr. Chairman, is not the idiosyncracies of the Honourable Member for Lakeside, but whether or not, because this is the 12th day of March, whether or not this Assembly will grant to the government 25 percent of the appropriations for the next ensuing fiscal year, in order that we may carry on the program of the New Democratic Party into the next fiscal year. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, there may be some reticence or some reservations of my honourable friends opposite, but I suggest that the program of our party is the most forward-looking program that this province of ours, the land of my birth, has ever had in its whole history. What are we doing? What are we asking for? Are we asking the Honourable Member for Lakeside and his leader to give us in this Assembly a bunch of tripe and verbiage about some incidents that may have happened, or are we really asking this Assembly on behalf of the people of Manitoba to give us the bucks that are necessary in order to provide for the services that this government has enacted over the shortcomings and over the objections of the official opposition in particular?

A MEMBER: Another million for the co-ops.

MR. PAULLEY: Another million for the co-ops? Yes. Because we, Mr. Chairman, unlike the Honourable Member for Swan River, believe in the co-operative movement. The Honourable Member for Swan River with his involvement in government, consistently and persistently opposed the development of the co-op movement in the Province of Manitoba, and he admits it. He has admitted it, Mr. Chairman by his interjection here this evening.--(Interjection)--It is not true? I say that it is true. I say that the Honourable Member for Lakeside and the Honourable Member for Swan River, and the whole caboodle of the Conservative Party, have consistently opposed the gradual reduction of the imposition of taxes at the local level. They have consistently and persistently, Mr. Chairman, voted against the progressive measures of the New Democratic Government of Manitoba in the field of relieving property taxpayers of their obligations. They have consistently opposed programs such as Autopac, that we brought in, that reduce the incident of premiums. And my honourable friend from Souris-Killarney was in this because he had a pecuniary interest in the Autopac in Manitoba, and he led the opposition. But I would say that because of the forward-looking programs of this particular government, the user of automobile insurance is better off than they ever were before.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman--I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that what we are dealing with is a matter of an agreement or approval of this Legislature for 25 percent of the budget for next year, which, in the field of agriculture means an increase of 4.5 millions of dollars for the agricultural industry. I recall, Mr. Chairman, when I sat opposite, listening to successive ministers of agriculture, that they only decided on their policies with a prayer on a wing. In the meantime the agricultural industry of Manitoba suffered undue penalties because of the ineffectiveness of the programs of the former Conservative administration. The people

## INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . of Manitoba eventually got wise to them and elected the New Democrats to government.--(Interjection)--No. I'm not choking on it. But, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to my honourable friend, the Member for Souris-Killarney, if there was any choking at all, it was choking by the Conservative Party in Manitoba who went down to the lowest ebb that they had been since 1958, and deservedly so. Because they did not have any consideration for the agricultural industry in the Province of Manitoba, as much as my honourable friend from Lakeside loves to harp. It is a fact that the Conservative Party in Manitoba have been rejected by the agricultural community, as indeed they have been by the urban community as well. And where are we now? Where are we now? What are we asking for today, Mr. Chairman? What are we asking for today? And I must forgive the rabble, because history documents that the rabble are very, very voiciferous but lacking in intellectual approach to the problems of the day. And that is what's happening. That is what's happening, Mr. Chairman, today. Where do we stand now? What are we asking for, Mr. Chairman? We're asking for an addition . . . --(Interjection)--more money yes, and more money, Mr. Chairman, based on the ability to pay, that the Conservative Government never ever knew the meaning of when they had the power in the Province of Manitoba. We're asking for an additional \$11 millions of dollars in the field of education, the colleges and the universities in the Province of Manitoba, in order to try and give to every boy and girl in Manitoba equal rights to full education based on their ability to absorb knowledge. Something that the previous minister of education rejected time after time after time. I refer, of course, Mr. Chairman, to the present Member of Riel. He didn't give a continental and neither did the Conservative Party give a continental when they were the government of Manitoba, as to whether or not Mary and Jane had an opportunity to full educational facilities in the Province of Manitoba.

What are we asking for, Mr. Chairman, what are we asking for today? A 25 percent advancement for the program for next year in the field of health and social development, an increase of some 49 millions of dollars. It's a heck of a lot of money. I agree, Mr. Chairman, that it's a heck of a lot of money. Who is paying for it today? Not the premium payers that was imposed with the costs under the Conservative administration on a premium basis, but to give to every man, woman and child in Manitoba an opportunity to be able to receive the benefits of the advances in medical, hospital care on a basis, not by virtue of them being able to pay premiums, but on the basis of ability to pay.--(Interjection)--We gave them nothing, of course, we didn't give them anything. Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend from Rock Lake is so right. We didn't give them anything, did we? We didn't reduce, we didn't reduce the costs for those that are in our nursing homes, from per diems of \$22.00 per day to \$4.50 per day. Of course we didn't reduce them, did we? We didn't reduce the premiums to nothing. Maybe my honourable friend from Rock Lake now has to pay more than he ever did before, and I'm sure, Mr. Chairman that he has the ability to pay more. But under the typical approach of the Conservative Government of Manitoba, they didn't give a damn about the people of Manitoba. Time after time after time we stood on that side of the House and argued for more equality, equality for the people of Manitoba to be able to use the resources of Manitoba for the advancement of all. And who were the opponents? Boy oh boy, as I stand here tonight, Mr. Chairman, I can see them . . .

A MEMBER: We're still here.

MR. PAULLEY: The Member for Swan River, the Member for Souris-Killarney, the Member for Rock Lake, the Member for Roblin, the Member for Lakeside, opposed all of the progressive suggestions that were made by we who were on that side of the House. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the reasons there has been a transformation from we being on that side to this side is because of the fact that we realize that people are people and they didn't give a continental about people when they were the government of the Province of Manitoba.

And what are we doing in the field of highway development? In the field of highway development we talk about northern Manitoba, Mr. Chairman. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition spouted for an hour and a half or so this afternoon about the development of the north and the co-ops. They didn't give a damn about the north when they were the government of Manitoba. And since, and since we have become the Government of Manitoba there has been more development and more extension of the facilities in northern Manitoba than ever before. Based on what, Mr. Chairman? Based on the ability to pay and based on contributions from those of us who live in southern Manitoba to the development of northern Manitoba. And all I

## INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . heard, all I heard during the years that the present Member for Lakeside was a member of the treasury bench was, how much could we get out of the people in the south for the development of our friends the entrepreneurs in northern Manitoba. We've changed that, Mr. Chairman. We have recognized, we have recognized as a government that when the natural resources of this province are being utilized for the private entrepreneur that we as people of Manitoba, as ordinary citizens should at least receive a fair shake for the depletion of our natural resources.

Here's a former Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, Mr. Chairman, who was quite prepared to flood out Southern Indian Lake completely, he now stands up on his hind legs and squawks because of the fact that somebody, somebody may be prejudiced slightly as a result of the raising of the water at Southern Indian Lake. Mr. Chairman, what a change in attitude. What a change takes place when political positions change in the Province of Manitoba. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, and I suggest to my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources of days gone by, that he should read some of the speeches that he made. He didn't give a damn about the people of Southern Indian Lake as to whether or not--(Interjection)--and you didn't either. Didn't give a damn whether they were flooded out. He didn't care a continental. And now, and now, Mr. Chairman, he puts on a mantle of sanctity, he puts on, oh lord I am God and the likes of that today, but he didn't care. He didn't care then and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that even today, even today he puts on a mantle of holiness but it's sacrilegious. He doesn't give a damn about the people of the north and neither does his party. And I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, the people of the north, the people of the north recognized this fact, Mr. Chairman, when they elected five New Democrats to the Assembly in Manitoba.

My honourable friend the Member for Lakeside as much as he would like to, by his verbiage and the verbiage of his leader - and for how long I don't know how he's going to be the leader - attempt to fool the people of northern Manitoba. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, despite some of the attributes that my honourable friend from Lakeside has given to the people of Manitoba they're not going to be scuttled by - and they're not gullible as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon and the Member for Lakeside this evening. I give them more credit for their intelligence. It might well be, Mr. Chairman, that they haven't had the formal academic education that some of the other members in this House have had, but I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that they are intelligent people. They saw through the programs of the Conservative Party, they rejected them in totality and elected as I indicated a moment or two ago, five New Democrats to represent them in this Assembly. And in this Assembly where they are receiving far more benefits than ever was visualized by the people who have no vision, who ruled this roost in Manitoba for ten years. What are we doing?

In the Estimates of the Department of Northern Affairs an additional \$2.5 million as an addition. And what is the opposition attempting to do, Mr. Chairman? What is the opposition attempting to do? Scuttle the objectives of this government by wasting time by unfounded charges of some fishing co-operative. Here, as I indicate, Mr. Chairman, \$2.5 million for a forward thrust in northern development in the Department of Northern Affairs. Seven millions of dollars in roads of which a great proportion of it will go for the development of northern Manitoba. Eleven millions of dollars for a forward thrust in the field of education for the benefit of all the youngsters in the Province of Manitoba. And what is the official opposition attempting to do? Muckrake. Red herrings and attempting through their leader, who may be displaced before too long as I understand, the forward thrust or the thrust of the Conservative Party - oh yes my smiling friend he did, he did as memory serves me displace one of the more effective representatives of the constituency of River Heights that has ever been in this House. I recall well the program of my honourable friend the present Member of River Heights, was Maitland Steinkopf. I'm not unmindful of that and I want to say to him as he vanishes out of this Chamber the same may happen to him. That's his privilege to vanish, yes, and I suggest that the Conservative Party may take advantage of this and allow him to vanish permanently.

What is the suggestion of the Conservatives today, Mr. Chairman? A judicial inquiry into an operation of a co-op or two in northern Manitoba. And when the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was talking of this he had the consummate gall to refer to an incident which occurred in Brandon with the Canada Packers and an inquiry there by the then Chief Justice,

INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . Mr. Tritschler. What a comparison. Here was a government, the Conservative government that was determined to scuttle the labour movement in Brandon and the labour movement in Manitoba by an imposition of a so-called judicial inquiry. Yes, hmmm. What a coincidence. But how typical, Mr. Chairman, how typical of the Conservative Party at that time, how typical of the Conservative Party today. They don't give a damn, they didn't give a damn then, they don't give a damn now about the ordinary person in the Province of Manitoba. The people of Manitoba made their declaration of what they think about the Conservative Party in Manitoba, and I suggest, I suggest to the Honourable Member for Lakeside as ambitious as he may be to take over the mantle of leadership of the Conservative Party, unless he comes to a realization of the false base that is the base that is the base of the Conservative Party today I would suggest to him that he changes his way and not accept the leadership.

I predicted a number of years ago, Mr. Chairman, that the Liberal Party in Manitoba were doomed to oblivion and my prediction came true. I suggested that prior to the election in 1969 to the then Premier of Manitoba, Walter Weir, that if he were to call an election based on the ineffectual programs of the Conservative Party that they would be defeated and I have been proven to be correct. And now, Mr. Chairman, and now, Mr. Chairman, when the Minister of Finance asks this House, asks this Committee to advance 25 percent of the Interim Supply for the next ensuing year, what do we get from the Conservative Party? Muckraking, red herringinism and the likes of that. And my honourable friend from Fort Garry who seems to be so concerned, who seems to be so concerned about the destiny of the civil service, surely my honourable friend realizes that in the Estimates that we have before us, there is an item of \$13,500,000 salary increases for the Civil Service. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for Fort Garry doesn't give a continental as to whether or not we should have approval of an advancement to the salary increases of our Civil Service. Oh, sure, he can stand up here and he can rant and rave, as is his custom, of what we are suggesting by this--(Interjection)--I'm trying to knock some sense into your woodenheaded brain - excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw reference to brain of my honourable friend the Member for Swan River. Please, Mr. Chairman, forgive me for the error of my ways. But, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, what the proposition is before us is not muckraking, it's not--(Interjection)--not at all, not at all. I don't have to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . cover up the Minister of Agriculture. All I want, Mr. Chairman, is to indicate to the aspiring next leader of the Conservative Party . . .

A MEMBER: Sweep it under the rug. Cover up. Snow job.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. ORDER! I refer the Honourable Member for Lakeside to Rule 40--ORDER--Order please. Order. Is the honourable member going to desist or do I have to report the matter to the Speaker? ORDER PLEASE. The Honourable Minister of Labour. Are you on a point of order? All right, would you state your point of privilege.

MR. McKENZIE: On a point of privilege. Is the time that's allocated to listen to this speech charged to our 90 hours in Estimates?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I refer the honourable member to our House Rule 64 (1). The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I realize . . .

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, speaking on the same point of privilege. Is this being allocated to our 90 hours of debate in the Estimates?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. For the honourable member's edification, the 90 hours belongs to this House, both sides, not to one side or the other. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: All I want to indicate, all I want to indicate, Mr. Chairman, that in accordance with the rules of the House, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition took a considerable period--(Interjection)--yes, I know you don't like hearing what I'm saying--that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition took considerable period of time, length of time to establish his point. I am a member of this House and I suggest that I have equal right with the Leader of the Opposition, or indeed any other member of this House, to say to the opposition or even to my own colleagues, that under the rules of the House I have an opportunity in this debate to say that never in the history of 103 years have we had a government that has been more concerned with the destiny of people of Manitoba than we have at the present time,

INTERIM SUPPLY

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . and that by the activity of the Conservative Party they are attempting to thwart, they are attempting to thwart . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order. Order please. The time being 9:00 o'clock, the last hour of every day being private members' hour, committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, your Committee of Supply begs me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Private members' hour. Tuesday night the first item is private bills. Bill No. 26. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

BILL NO. 26

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa) presented Bill No. 26, an Act to incorporate The Minnedosa Foundation, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, the Bill before the House is a simple bill as it suggests, an Act to incorporate the Minnedosa Foundation, which is brought about by donation by a former resident of Minnedosa, one Adam Crosley, deceased, who left a bequest in his will of \$10,000 to be left in trust to one Walter Weir, the former Premier of Manitoba, for the betterment of the citizenry of Minnedosa.

A MEMBER: Don't tell me the Socialists haven't got their hands on it yet.

MR. BLAKE: Not yet.

This item, this amount, Mr. Speaker, has been on deposit for some years now in a chartered bank and naturally with the interest rates that are paid by the charter bank it has grown to quite a large sum at this stage. It is now obvious that the former Premier is not in a position, in not residing in the Province of Manitoba or in Minnedosa, to be in a position to decide to just what charitable organization or what charitable cause that this donation should be bequeathed to. So he has proposed to the Mayor and the Council of Minnedosa that a fund known as the Minnedosa Foundation be established and hopefully that this donation, which is now some 14 or \$15,000 I suppose, be deposited as the first donation and would act as sort of "seed" money that may attract other bequests or other donations from people who wish to further the interests and the benefits of the citizens of Minnedosa in cultural or recreational activities, whichever the committee in charge of the funding of the interest on this foundation may deem wise--or in the interests of the bequest of one Adam Crosley.

I might say a word, Mr. Speaker, Adam Crosley was the owner and publisher of the Minnedosa Tribune, the local newspaper, and the Minnedosa Tribune will be 100 years old in 1983. And I think Adam Crosley was the, probably the second owner of the Minnedosa Tribune. He was a kindly gentleman, and I have not in my short number of years in Minnedosa, I have not heard one bad word or one derogatory comment about the late Adam Crosley. He was a particularly good friend of the previous Premier, Mr. Walter Weir, and I understand from speaking to the local residents that Mr. and Mrs. Weir befriended Mr. Crosley on many occasions--and probably on account of their kindness to him, he felt that he should leave something of his estate that would be a continuing remembrance of the kindnesses that the citizens of Minnedosa had shown to him in the many years that he resided in their midst. And through this, Mr. Speaker, has arisen the suggestion or the foundation of the bill to incorporate a fund known as the Minnedosa Foundation, which those of us in Minnedosa who wish to see the town progress have instituted the Minnedosa Foundation Fund, which we hope with this initial deposit, which will be possible through the incorporation of the Minnedosa Foundation will perpetuate

## BILL 26

(MR. BLAKE cont'd) . . . . the memory of Adam Crosley and will attract further deposits and build the Minnedosa Foundation into a continuing fund that will provide an interest revenue that will give an annual contribution to the committee in charge of the foundation to make a donation each year over the many, many years to come for the betterment of the citizens of Minnedosa, whether it be recreational or cultural. And for this reason they have incorporated the Minnedosa Foundation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, that debate be adjourned. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 23. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Resolutions. Resolution No. 20. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

RESOLUTION 20

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa; that

WHEREAS many farmers of the Province of Manitoba are suffering undue economic difficulties; and

WHEREAS the Mineral Acreage Tax as it now stands will serve to add further to the economic difficulties borne by Manitoba farm population; and

WHEREAS the present definition of farmers as used in the Act serves to create confusion as to the responsibility of persons for the payment of the tax;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of undertaking an amendment to the Mineral Acreage Tax Act so as to render it applicable solely to corporations not engaged in actual farming.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In bringing in this resolution I would like first to comment on the first paragraph, because some people may think that the farm people aren't still having difficulty financing in many cases, and as has been said in this House here many times recently, we know that there's about 50 percent of the population, rural population, even without waterworks in their houses. So, really there is a class of people here that really haven't got so much money, and I don't believe it would be the intention of any government to be trying to tax these people. Actually, when you talk about people on the rural areas being without waterworks and the conveniences they have, it is true that the people on welfare or in low rental housing today wouldn't be expected to set up with the type of accommodation of living that many rural people have.

I think that we should look at this tax in a very down to earth way. I don't like to use all the expressions that some others might like to use. I know it can be said that we voted for it; some might say that we were misled by the Minister. I would say that possibly I was misled by the Minister, but I would say it wasn't done intentionally on his part. I have enough faith in the Minister of Finance that I don't believe it was intentional. I do believe, however, that it did mislead the House, because--and I want to read from Hansard, it's on Page 3889 on July 6th, and I want to read this paragraph. It's been read many times, but I think it's probably necessary: "The tax would be on the mineral rights held by corporations, not by individuals. An internal study made by the government has shown that about three quarters of the mineral rights, some 9.1 mineral acreage are held by individuals, and it is not proposed to tax those at all."

Now I'm speaking for myself, and I believe for others on this side, when I say that when we had that explanation and we were in speed-up, that we accepted the Minister of Finance's word as being gospel, as you could say, we thought this was what he meant. And since we were in speed-up there was nobody bothered much more with it, I know--I went over the thing now, the explanations and that, and I realized that possibly we should have. But I don't believe that the Minister himself meant to at that time, and I'm not even sure that the back benchers did; I think some way or another that got worded that way, I even don't believe that the party on that other side meant to tax those type of individuals. An individual in the definition is a person other than a corporation, and taking that as an example, you just wouldn't think that those people

## RESOLUTION 20

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) . . . . were going to be taxed. And when we were in speed-up and sitting the hours we were, we just didn't look at it, and I think for that very reason alone I don't believe that tax bills in particular should be brought in during speed-up. Because it's all-right to say that every bill should be researched and every clause should be gone through, but I'm sure that the members here know that this doesn't happen unless they feel there's something contentious about the bill or something that their attention has been drawn to. And we have a good example of this when we passed the Farm Machinery Act, which we did in speed-up too. And here was an Act that was brought in . . .

A MEMBER: Two o'clock in the morning.

MR. HENDERSON: Well, whether it was two o'clock or not, it was brought in in speed-up, it was when we were rushed--and we did hurry this Act through. There was about 39 clauses in it, but before we were through with that Act, there was about 50 amendments went on it. In fact, I think they rewrote the whole Act in the final analysis. And then we ended up with something which we had thought and had hoped would be beneficial to farmers which really turned out to be not so at all. In fact it turned out to be a detriment to farmers. And I think for this reason that there never should be tax bills brought in in speed-up.

Another example of bringing something in in speed-up is when we brought in the Artificial Insemination Bill, where they were putting it all under the monopoly of one Crown agency, and we see that we rushed through something which the people weren't ready for, they weren't asking for it and they weren't prepared to accept, and which certainly isn't functioning properly. And it's caused a great deal of resentment in the country, and there's no one here that can say that it isn't because we just have to think back to the meeting in Portage where so many people from all over the province came and expressed their views. And frankly, I must say that I was very disappointed that the Minister of Agriculture or the Premier didn't appear that day to give an explanation to those people, because surely they had their own side of it, they could have said--but not to show when the people were there wanting answers, was really bad.

Now, I think the main thing that's wrong with this Act--generally speaking, we're not opposed to the principle of taxing corporations that aren't in farming, but I think there's--in the definition of a farmer; that we have to make some improvements because there's so many people that don't really know whether this Act applies to them or not. And just an example of this is, is if a person is hiring his work done and yet he's the boss of the operation, is he a farmer or is he not when he's hiring the work done? Now I've read definitions too of a farmer, and I don't know where that man would be. And I don't know where another man that's farming part of it and has his income or works other places besides--has two occupations shall we say, whether it's driving a school bus or whether it's working for some industry part time--I'm not just so sure whether he's called a farmer or not because he might be hiring a lot of his work done. Then we have widows that are living on the land which still own it and they're still out there, but their children are working it, on some type of a crop arrangement and on a buying deal on the machinery and that. And it's very unfortunate if the Act is going to be just so definite that it's just going to be allowing the people that's actually doing the work to be exempt, because I can think of all sorts of examples where it's going to cause trouble, even in estates that are left to--with a divided interest--and maybe the one home doing it might be left out according to the way the estate's left. I can even think of a person like myself who is an MLA, which is hiring the work done or farming on a share basis on part of the land with my son and he's doing the work on the other, and where do you come out? And then if it's based on income, where are you? Because one time you might make more on your farm and the next time you might make more as having another occupation.

So I think there's an awful lot of reasons to think that this here definition of a farmer should be re-defined. We certainly don't mean to on this side, and we never thought it was so when we were putting it through, that we'd be taxing the widows of people and people that are hard up and senior citizens that are just living in the home and have this land out there, and shall we say they're thinking this is something like a sweepstake ticket or their ship that might come in, and we're even going to take it away from them. On top of this, it's a very bad psychological effect because these people don't like this and they feel that the government is moving to take over, and I'm sure you're aware of this. I'm sure you're aware of it and I . . . --(Interjection)--Pardon?--(Interjection)--Well, there's been enough people tell them without

RESOLUTION 20

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) . . . . me that they're--(Interjection)--Well, sometimes it looks like this with your land lease programs and so forth, and this is the way I interpret it because I am not in favour of that. So I think that we'd be doing a very good thing if we'd reconsider the definition of a farmer in connection with this Act. And it says that to consider their advisability of it, so it doesn't even tie you down to it. But I really think that the definition of farmer really does need to be defined, and in such a way as not to tax the poor people who are out there, who have very little money. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the resolution by the Honourable Member for Pembina, I would like to remind the members that it is some two years ago that a considerable debate was carried on on Bill 59, the Mineral Acreage Tax, and there was a considerable number of days that debate had taken place on this particular bill. At that particular time, Mr. Speaker, after second reading, the bill went--and I would like to just remind the members--the bill went into the Committee of the Whole, was brought back to the Committee of the Whole for third reading, and based on some suggestions from the Honourable Members opposite, it went back to the Committee of the Whole, amendments were introduced and then came back to the House for third reading, where it was finally passed on division.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago the Conservative Party of Manitoba on February 28th 1974, put an ad in the Manitoba Co-operator headed, "The Manitoba Government's Mineral Acreage Tax Act is cruel". Notice, notice, and it goes on: ". . . that the members of the Manitoba Legislature and the people of Manitoba have been deceived by the Schreyer administration regarding this act and the government's intent in passing this legislation." Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to fault all members from the opposite because I . . .

. . . . continued on next page

## RESOLUTION 20

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: No, I will, I will read the various sections. I will not fault all members in the opposition, because the Member for La Verendrye was not present in the House at the time, the Member for Minnedosa was not present in the House at the time, the Member for Rhineland was not a member of the Legislature, the Member for St. James was not a member, in fact the Member for - I believe those are the four members who were not members of the House at that particular time but they did - who were not members of the House at the time - but they did add their names to this ad which states that on July 6, 1972, Finance Minister Saul Cherniack told members during discussion of the bill that - and I quote, "That the tax charge would be on mineral rights held by corporations not the individuals." This is what is put in quotation in this ad. The Minister also stated that individuals, stated that three-quarters of the province's mineral rights are held by individuals and it is not proposed to tax those at all. Well, Mr. Speaker, this was on July 6th -- and if members opposite remember that in the ensuing days during the debate on the Mineral Acreage Tax Bill No. 59, as a result of some of the proposals and suggestions by members opposite the Minister did take into account those particular concerns and did in fact bring in after bringing it out of third reading, brought the bill back to Committee of the Whole and did bring in certain amendments which met with the support of the members opposite. And I would like to quote from one member, the Member for Lakeside who rose in this House and stated: "Mr. Chairman, and if only -- Mr. Speaker -- I guess he was talking to you -- "the members opposite would take time as this Minister did on this particular bill, you know, to in fact bring about better government as a result of our participation and our discussions rather than as in most cases dig their heels in and avoid - not listen to the concrete suggestions that are forthcoming on this side then surely, Mr. Chairman, we would in fact be fulfilling our function in here as legislators of the Province of Manitoba." And this is quoted on Page 4145 in Hansard on July 12th. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the position that was taken by the Conservative Party in 1972.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to go back to the resolution before us. I don't deny - and I will have some more quotations going back to 1972 from some of the members opposite -- but in referring to the resolution before us, I don't deny that some farmers are still having some economic difficulties. Now the Honourable Member for Rhineland stood up today and stated that this government has done very little in the way of alleviating the hardships of the farmer. Well, Mr. Speaker, through this SAMCAN program when he talked of waterworks, a large number of farmers for the first time in their life have been able to have water system in their homes.

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

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I haven't said a word all day.

A MEMBER: No, you're wong, Harry.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: I beg your pardon, the Member for Pembina. But, Mr. Speaker, going to the first Whereas, this, the first Whereas seems to be a serious overstatement. How can the Honourable Member for Pembina suggest that many farmers of this province are suffering undue economic hardships today at a time when grain prices have never looked better?

A MEMBER: Talk to the farmer. He'll tell you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: I was a farmer, I still have my soul on the farm and I know the problems, but the fact is that since 1969, Mr. Speaker, this government has worked in a way that has never happened by any other previous administration to help the farmers through the program of \$100.00 assistance. Mr. Speaker, these members opposite they seem to forget that in 1969 we removed 50 percent of that inequitable tax of \$203.00 -- or \$204.00. In 1973 - 72 -- I forget now, 72 or 73, the total elimination of Medicare premiums. That meant in the vast majority of farmers, that meant that they had a saving of \$204.00.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Two hundred and four dollars. I know for most -- I understand that some 95 percent of the farmers do not pay income tax because they do have certain expenditures, and that was up till 1969. They are paying income tax today and they are very

## RESOLUTION 20

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd) . . . . happy to pay income tax because they have enough income to now pay income tax.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the value of agricultural production in Manitoba for 1973 is estimated at some \$1.3 billion. That is almost double the 1972 figure and two and a half times the level which prevailed under the Conservative administration. That was up till 1969. The value of farm cash income for 1972 is estimated at some 620 million, an increase of 27.8 percent.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: You can ask the Minister of Agriculture when you come to his resolution. Now this was an increase of 27.8 percent over the 1972 level of 485 million, which was 27.3 percent higher than the 1971 figure of 381 million, which was 11.7 percent higher than the 1970 figure of 341 million. Mr. Speaker, during the last years of the honourable members' party's sojourn in power, farm cash income declined by 1.1 percent in 1967, 2.1 percent --(Interjection)-- there was an increase, 2.1 percent in 1968 and 4.1 percent in 1969, and an increase in 1970 over the 1969 by some 11.7 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the second Whereas is equally questionable. With the boom, and I believe it is a boom that the farmers are enjoying, how can anyone argue that any tax especially one with a built-in exemption for farmers who farm their own land can add to farmers' economic difficulties? Mr. Speaker, according to the Agricultural Economic Research Council of Canada, the various -- this was in the Globe and Mail on Tuesday, February 19th, 1974: "The various income tax changes introduced since 1971 have the effect of reducing farmers' income tax from 75 million under the pre 1972 rules to 51 million under the rules in effect today." This seems to be in stark conflict with the suggestion of the Honourable Member for Pembina -- and given a choice between listening to the Agricultural Economics Research Council of Canada and the Honourable Member for Pembina, you know who I'd choose, The Agricultural Economics Research Council.

Mr. Speaker, the third Whereas is also inaccurate. The present definition in the Act creates no confusion. Let me quote from the Act -- and this is to deal with the question that was raised as to the definition of farmer: "A farmer means (1), an individual whose principal occupation is farming, or the spouse of such an individual; or (2) a corporation, the principal business of which is farming and the majority in number and value of the shares of which are held by individuals whose chief occupation is farming, or by the spouses of such individuals." And this was in the (d) section. And "(e) Farming means" - and I quote from the Act: "(1) The growing of cereal crops, vegetable crops or special crops; or (2) the raising or keeping of livestock or poultry; or (3) dairying; or (4) agriculture; or (5) fur ranching. Notwithstanding Section (5), who are entitled to minerals in or under the land as vested in the farmer in whom title to the surface of the land is vested, no tax is payable by the farmer in respect of the minerals in, on or under the land so vested in him and used by him for the purpose of farming." Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I do not see any confusion as to the definition.

As to the Resolved portion of the resolution the suggestion that the tax be applicable solely to corporations not engaged in actual farming was considered in debate on the Act in 1972 from July 6th to July 12th, I believe were the dates. In fact under the bill as originally introduced in the House, only corporations would have been subject to this tax. In Committee, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Liberal Party in Hansard on Page 4063-4064 of July 11th argued in fact in favour of an increase in the tax rate and that the coverage of the tax should be extended to individuals holding mineral rights for speculative purposes, otherwise it would encourage the corporate speculators to de-incorporate and avoid the tax. And on tax avoidance, the Leader of the Liberal Party I believe is quite an expert, he has been writing all of these little columns. I trust that the Honourable Member for Pembina is not suggesting that such an escape clause should be reintroduced. In fact, Mr. Speaker, in 1972 the Minister did indicate that during the 1972 debate that - and he stated that, as we require more information as to the impact of the Mineral Acreage Tax, the government will consider and will be reviewing what the results are.

Possibly the members opposite would like further review of the debate that continued in 1972. It is also interesting to note at that particular time though the Member for Morris did rise some time ago to bring attention to this Mineral Acreage Tax this year that in 1972, he did not rise on any occasion except on procedural matter and that was to correct the

## RESOLUTION 20

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd) . . . . the Honourable Member for Rhineland — pardon me, for Riel, to correct the Honourable Member for Riel, to state that there had been some consultation between the Minister of Finance and the opposition members and the members of the Liberal Party as to the introduction of certain amendments. But this is where at that particular time, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Lakeside was moved to rise and compliment the government on the fact that they were prone to consider those particular objections and proposals that were raised by the members opposite and that the government accepted it. And if I may quote that again, Mr. Speaker, and if only, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: . . . the members opposite would take time as this Minister did on this particular bill, you know, to in fact bring about better governing as a result of our participation in our discussions rather than as in most cases dig their heels in and avoid and not listen to the concrete suggestions that are forthcoming on this side. And surely, Mr. Speaker, as he would want to rise, we would in fact be fulfilling our function here as legislators of the Province of Manitoba. What are they doing today, Mr. Speaker? They've come up with that type of a story. Trying to hide because — maybe they're right. I'm not sure but the fact is that the Minister did indicate that he was prepared and would be reviewing to see what they in fact of this particular Mineral Acreage Tax passed in 1972 would do. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill, that the resolution be amended by deleting all the words after the word "Whereas" in the first line and replacing them with the following: "The Mineral Acreage Tax Act was passed in 1972 after considerable discussions and subsequent amendment during debate in the House and in Committee; and Whereas the first assessment notices were sent out at the beginning of 1974 and new concerns are being expressed; and Whereas the Minister of Finance indicated in the 1972 debate that the Department would be attempting to study the incidence of taxation in this field and the impact of it;

NOW BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of amending the Mineral Acreage Tax Act.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, really my only words at this time would be that I would devoutly hope that the honourable members opposite would pay as much attention to my words now and my influence now as they did a short year ago, and that they would consider, you know, seriously every jewel, every little word that I now utter in this House, that they be forever enshrined in a gold framed Hansard for members opposite to repeat back to me.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate to you right at the outset that I think, that I believe that the Honourable Member from Radisson, his amendment before the House is quite acceptable to the members of the opposition, that we see in this consideration by the government and this acceptance by the government to reconsider their position. And I say so, Mr. Speaker, without prolonging the debate on this question, they do so because they themselves and in particular the Minister of Finance has some respect, has some concern about his own integrity in this matter, has some concern and has some respect about his own integrity. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that he has any — now I'm not prepared to say that — but I'm concerned that he had some concern about his public relations and his portrayal and his image, about appearing to have some integrity in this matter.

I know I would make the Minister of Finance more happier if I started my debate in this context because, Mr. Speaker, without prolonging the debate I am convinced, I am convinced that the questions concerning, that the manner and the way in which the bill, the original bill was presented to this Chamber by the Minister of Finance had nothing to do quite correctly as the Member for Radisson has related to this House of the Whereas concerned in this resolution: Whereas the farmers of the Province of Manitoba are suffering undue economic difficulties and Whereas the Mineral Acreage Tax Act as it now stands will serve to add the further economic difficulties borne by Manitoba's farm population; and Whereas the present definition of farmers as used in the Act serves to create confusion as to the responsibility of a person for payment of the tax — I don't think, Sir, that for a moment these Whereas had, you know, played any major part in the presentation of the taxation, new taxation bill that was put forward by the Minister of Finance at that particular occasion.

## RESOLUTION 20

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

He, Sir, convinced us because at that time we accepted the fact that perhaps he had some integrity, but essentially what he was talking about was . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ENNS: . . . essentially what he was talking about was that - and I can refer to his Hansards. I won't, I haven't got them readily available. But he was talking about assessing a nominal taxation measure against the untold thousands of acres that are being held by mining corporations and consortiums and what-have-you in the Province of Manitoba. Now, Sir, we in the Conservative Party accepted that proposition put forward by the Honourable Minister of Finance. And no matter what you want to call it, duplicity on our part, misunderstanding on our part or wilful distortion on our part -- but I don't think the Honourable Minister of Finance honestly believed that I as a practicing farmer who happens to have all his land in his wife's name should pay the tax, should pay the tax. My main income is farming, it is not in this business -- and it's a very risky business of being in politics as the Honourable Minister of Finance knows. But he want to tax my wife. I've made my sole determined occupation in farming, but he wants to tax my wife for the mineral taxation rights that I may or may not have. Now he did not, he did not tell us that in the House.

Now all the subsequent finite definitions of what constitutes a farmer, you know, and there happens to be many cases -- and the Minister of Finance is now finding out and, Mr. Speaker, we have no better proof of acknowledging the fact that he is now finding out by his very willingness to concede to the kind of resolution or amendment that the Member of Radisson is offering in this Chamber. He is now finding out that there are many, many little old mothers in Manitoba who still own the farm, their sons are operating the farm and they're living on the same farm, and he is now taxing them and he didn't really mean to tax them in the first instance. It was one thing to talk about taxing some speculators of land and it was one thing to talk about taxing, you know, Sherritt-Gordon or Hudson's Bay or INCO or CPR, that was one thing, but he didn't really want to tax 73-year-old Mrs. Smith who is living on a little three-quarter section farm in Beasejour with her one son or two sons and she has yet to hand over the title to her sons. He didn't really want to do that, but he is now doing that and that's why he is considering, Mr. Speaker, that's why he is now considering -- you know, in fact he is the author. Really, I have a lot of respect for the Member for Radisson, in fact he's a formidable defense player in hockey, but he has yet to show himself as any particular author of a commendable resolution in this House. So, Mr. Chairman, let me understand the words put into the Member of Radisson's mouth were put there and placed there by the Minister of Finance.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. ENNS: By the Minister of Finance -- because he also wants to find a way out, because he recognized that the people of Manitoba are beginning to see in this Act passed innocently by the Minister of Finance as a deliberate attempt to, you know, to put a little bit more muscle on those arms, to assume a bit more rights, you know, just the wording of the Act. You know, most occasions, most things -- even a vicious, you know, finance company will give you one or two or three notices, but not the Minister of Finance. He says failure to pay - failure to pay, failure to pay your Mineral Acreage Taxation will mean automatic accrual to the Crown the rights of the Act, as passed February 20 . . . And this same Minister, you know, had the consummate gall to stand up in this Chamber just a few days ago, weeks ago, a week ago, and is purporting to lend that evidence right now by allowing his caucus member to present this amendment to this resolution, that he is still prepared to consider it.

Mr. Speaker, we know one thing of the Minister of Finance. We know one thing of the Minister of Finance, that there is no recall, no recall to this question. It will be a device used to remove this vexatious problem out of this House. He has no intention, absolutely none of reconsidering his position because that may prove him wrong, that may prove him wrong. And, Mr. Speaker, I go one step further. It is also basically and fundamentally against his principles, because he does believe and as do most members opposite believe, that all these kind of things do belong to the Crown in the first instance and should have never been released to private people in the first place. Now I don't think any members opposite can argue with that supposition. Now I just ask them, Sir, I just ask them to be honest with the people of Manitoba as on several occasions I've asked that they be honest with the people of Manitoba.

## RESOLUTION 20

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . You know, it wasn't that long ago that somebody from the opposite side asked us who speaks for Conservatism on this side? You know, what our biggest complaint about you fellows opposite is that you're all a bunch of socialists, but given the politically expedient moment most of you will deny it, most of you will deny it. Now I just ask, I just ask the Minister of Finance to stand up in his chair and say, yes these are rightfully properties belonging to the Crown and to the people of Manitoba and it was no business of any government previous ever to have issued those rights to private individuals -- and then we'd have this kind of clearcut debate in this House. But don't play games with us, don't play games with us about whether or not at the hour of one or two o'clock at night under speedup motions, whether or not we should support the bill or not. --(Interjection)-- Yes, at midnight I know, that was after about a month of speedup. Yes, yes. That's fine. Fine. I make the position right now, and I make the position that the Minister suggests that he was prepared to consider a week ago, a week ago that maybe -- and, Sir, I make the position that the Minister is prepared to consider by sitting in his seat and allowing that amendment to be put to this bill that his Party, his government is prepared to consider the fact that they made a mistake a year ago. That's what the amendment that the Member for Radisson --(Interjection)-- Well . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member state his matter of order.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Yes. The point of order is that in 1972 the Minister of Finance did indicate that they would be looking to see what the impact of The Mineral Acreage Act is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: . . . and for him to stand up now . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make the point. The fact is a year ago we passed a piece of legislation in this House. A year later we are accepting a resolution that suggests that we will consider the impact of that resolution, with the obvious implication being that, you know, if the impact is bad or not, the one that we desired, that we will change it. So, Mr. Speaker, I honestly believe that it's not out of order for me to suggest that that original piece of legislation might have been wrong, might have been off base. Then I'm suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that the reason, that the reason why this government is allowing the Party Whip of the New Democratic Party to bring out this amendment, is because they are receiving the kind of mail that we are receiving and that they are being told that they are being told about this.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Radisson state his point of order.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: The point of order is that the Minister of Finance had nothing to do with me speaking on this resolution by saying that he allowed me, it is something that if you notice the members in the back do speak on the resolutions in most cases. Just indicate he allowed me, I didn't ask him, he didn't ask me, I decided I was going to do it on my own. (Applause)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I knew some weeks ago, some weeks ago, fortified with the pads of the shoulder and the head guard and the shin pads that within the Member of Radisson there was a man of independent decision, that he would not be misled by any smooth-talking Philadelphia lawyer. I saw in that man that is now rising in his chair the makings of a Conservative . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ENNS: . . . if but given a chance.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside has five minutes.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I hope at least I'm building up some credits with you with the quickness to which I accede my chair to any possible points of order raised by members opposite. I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that there have been the odd occasion where I have, Sir, strained my relationship with you, Sir, where I have perhaps, you know, somewhat bent the

## RESOLUTION 20

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . the rules of this Chamber and taxed your patience, Sir. That's why, Sir, I find myself making every attempt to give honourable members opposite every opportunity to challenge me for whatever I say. But I say, Sir - and I make no accusation, I make no accusation -- but certainly, certainly, the very fact, Sir, that the Minister of Finance did not rise, did not get up to maybe - what --(Interjection)-- Well I don't think that would happen in a socialist society, that he would chastise the Honourable Member for Radisson -- but he gave every opportunity for me to rise and make the kind of deductions that I think are reasonable and honourable.

The fact of the matter is that this government that passed a taxation bill but a short year ago is now considering the advisability to change it, and the reason why they're considering the advisability of changing it is because of the arguments of the Member for Pembina, because of the arguments made by different members of this Chamber and because -- because they realize that they are not quite ready to take the gloves off, you know, that naked hand, that fist of socialism; they're not quite prepared to tell the people of Manitoba that this government and this state wants and demands to own everything and all. They still want to put on the show and the portrayal that individuals have a right in this province and those rights may well include mineral rights, they may well include mineral rights. And, Sir, above all, above all they do not want to really put themselves to the test, really put themselves to the test -- that when the Minister of Finance stood up and introduced this bill in this Chamber he calmed us, he sold us on the legitimate proposition that it was one thing for large acreages of land to be held in limbo by corporations, by Sherritt-Gordon, by Hudsons Bay, by INCO, what-have-you; and he said to us that we intend to impose a mineral acreage taxation on these corporations, not on individuals he said. Not on individuals. The fact of the matter is that what transpired thereafter, you know, will be something to debate for many years to come. I am prepared --(Interjection)-- Fine, you know, fine. It's in Hansard. The Honourable Member from Radisson read it in Hansard - but then I want now you know -- and I make, Mr. Speaker -- I had on one occasion I think about a week ago I made the deal with the Honourable Minister of Finance right now. I said let's --(Interjection)--

MR. CHERNIACK: Matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister state his matter of privilege.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I believe I have never, and certainly not in the last two years, even contemplated in the wildest imagination making a deal of any kind with the Member for Lakeside. (Applause)

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come to take the bull square by the tail and look him in the eye. You know, you know, I would be very worried about making any deal with the Minister of Finance myself. --(Interjection)-- Right. Because I might all of a sudden find out who was best man at my wedding. But the fact of the matter is, the fact of the matter is that the Minister stands up in all his righteousness, all his syrupy smoothness, and all his hypocrisy, and tried to tell the people of Manitoba that he is prepared to consider this issue and I say that's a bunch of horse shit, that's a bunch of horse shit. Because really -- really what he wants, what he wants is his mineral rights. What he wants are those mineral rights. What he wants are his mineral rights. Now, I tell you, he told us a week ago that the question was resolved. He gives us the impression by accepting this amendment that the question isn't resolved. And right today he's expropriating the mineral rights of the people of Manitoba. And I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, that that was not the manner and the way this minister presented -- that's not the manner of the way this minister presented this situation to the people, to the members of this House. And I told him not to make . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ENNS: . . . a deal with me, but to suggest to him if he wants to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Order please. The Honourable Member's time is up. Are you ready for the question?

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MOTION as amended, presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I would like to speak on the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: On the amended motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I have just again heard a disgusting display from the

## RESOLUTION 20

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . Member for Lakeside who proved years back, and not that many, but well within the minds of all of us, that he's prepared to lie and decieve in order to affect an individual . . . --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. --(Interjection)-- Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. ORDER, PLEASE!! Would everybody shut up!! Sit down!!

A MEMBER: Why don't you throw him out!

MR. SPEAKER: I'm going to ask the Honourable Member to sit down for the last time, or else I'll name him.

A MEMBER: Who called who a liar, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm going to ask the Honourable Member to sit down. The hour of adjournment having arrived, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.