

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, March 20, 1973

GOVERNMENT BILLS - SECOND READINGBILL 23

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry. The Honourable Member has five minutes left.

MR. SHERMAN: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Five minutes.

MR. SHERMAN: Five minutes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well when we broke for dinner, Mr. Speaker, I think I was wading through the catcalls, many of them coming in the direction of my friend the Honourable Minister of Labour who doesn't like to be told that this government is at war with the doctors in this province, but that's the truth of the matter, and that was what was prompting much of the maelstrom of informal opposition that I was having to fight my way through to make the point. And I think I was asking questions, rhetorical though they might have been but important nonetheless, of the Minister of Health and Social Development at the time we broke up with respect to the viability and the rationale for the community clinic concept. And I admitted that there are areas of under-service in the medical and health services field in the province where community clinics or that concept no doubt has some value. But I would like to ask him at the same time whether he has considered the expense to the government and the taxpayer of taking service into those, albeit underserved, remote areas. And I wonder whether he's considered alternatives to the community clinic. If he's considered options like the travelling clinic, if he's considered options like incentive offers by government to young medical graduates, young doctors who would go up north or into remote areas, for example, for two to three to five years, and might get a forgiveness on a certain amount of their provincial income tax to take care of that kind of service and offer them some incentive for doing so.

Mr. Speaker, there is much more I would like to say on the subject of community clinics. I'll have to leave it until a later stage of this session because I only have two or three minutes left in this particular debate but the fact remains that the community clinic concept is unproven, emphatically unproven in terms of savings or reduction of health costs, and in terms of improvement of health care delivery. And until it's proven in both of those areas we challenge the government's intent and intention in moving into that kind of service except in those areas where because of under-service, a concept of that kind or a modification of that kind, would certainly be worth studying.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one thing clear in the moments remaining to me and that is, that nobody on this side, least of all I myself, am standing here arguing for an upward revision of fee schedules for the MMA. I am not asking for an upward revision in fee schedules for the MMA. What I am asking for - - (Interjections) - - what I am asking for is faith and trust and communication between the profession and this government because the people whose interests are really at heart and at stake are the people of Manitoba; and as long as this government is out to get the doctors, the doctors are going to make whatever kind of reaction, whatever kind of difficulty for the government that they can, and the whole problem of confrontation escalates and the losers are the people of Manitoba who have always enjoyed excellent service from their medical profession.

That is the point I am trying to make and until those channels of communication are open, Sir, and until there is a demonstration of good faith, both ways, then the losers are the people of Manitoba. I don't give a damn whether this government considers raising the fee schedule or not. The doctors claim they have a point in terms of the cost of living; medical costs have been held down; hospital administration costs have gone up; medical costs have been held under control, and there is substantial evidence to that fact in recent reports in the daily newspapers and in recent reports emanating from the Department of Health and Social Development itself. But the doctors mistrust the motives of this government and this government in my opinion has demonstrated from day one that it has mistrusted the motives of the doctors. And until that channel of trust and communication is restored the people will suffer. The people of Manitoba will be the losers. And that's what I'm asking this Minister to do. To sit down with the medical profession and put that consultation and that communication and that co-operation back together again instead of persisting in confrontation and adversary tactics,

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to Bill 23, the granting of a sum of money to Her Majesty. I didn't intend taking part in the debate but I must say in the beginning that I supported everything that my leader had to say, and I listened very intently to the Honourable Member for St. Johns today and he inspired me to take part in this debate. I am sorry he's not in his seat at the moment but I'm sure that he will possibly read what I have to say in Hansard but however, I'm glad to see him there. I've always had a tremendous respect for the Honourable Member for St. Johns and everything he has attempted to do throughout his career in the House.

Much has been said, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon and we heard particularly from the Honourable Member for St. Johns that much has been done. I hope, Sir, you'll give me the latitude that was extended to the Honourable Member in order that I may refer to some of the things he has said and in some way, in my own way, give an answer.

Mr. Speaker, he spoke rather harshly toward my former leader Mr. Weir in the handling of the Medicare plan. He also took the occasion to point very vindictively, I thought, to many of my colleagues on this side of the House. He challenged us to go to the hustings and tell the people of what we said then but I think a little look into history will not hurt. You recall, Mr. Speaker, at the inception of this Medicare plan we were asked to pass an enabling act, which we did. Ottawa set the rules and we were told that it was going to cost \$20 million, \$10 million from Ottawa and \$10 million from the people of the Province of Manitoba. My people were telling me on the street at that time, what's wrong with Blue Cross; leave it alone. Twelve months later, Mr. Speaker, to be honest, the very same people were saying why aren't you picking up that \$10 million from Ottawa; we are paying for it, and they were very right. But the Honourable Member for St. Johns will remember what that 12 months took out of Mr. Weir, and what Mr. Weir was attempting to do.

It was a tremendous program that the whole Dominion of Canada was entering into, including the Province of Manitoba, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that care was essential at that time. We went in 12 months later, and it was found that somebody had goofed. It wasn't going to cost the Province of Manitoba \$10 million, Mr. Speaker, but \$20 million, and \$20 million from Ottawa, which was \$40 million, and I know that the Honourable Member of St. Johns if he was honest would say that he was just as afraid, he was just as afraid of the cost of the item at that particular time as we were in government. -- (Interjection) --

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Honourable Minister of Labour to bide his time and join in this discussion and stay entirely out of my bailiwick. -- (Interjections) -- Mr. Speaker, in Swan River today \$53.00 a day to occupy a bed, it's true. It's true that this Party used as a plank that they would reduce the Medicare to a level that was acceptable to the people, but at the same time they didn't have the guts to tell the people where they were going to get the money from until after the election, then they stuck it in as a \$20 million tax load on those with the ability to pay. Those with the ability to pay, so we're paying now in the neighbourhood of around \$4.00 and some cents a month medicare. And if you were honest, Sir, you would agree with me that it's not even paying for the postage, the computers, and the staff, and the area that's being occupied by the staff that's doing the work, the four dollars and some cents. So where are you getting the money - out of general taxation. It's hidden like you do everything else. You bet your sweet life.

Mr. Speaker, our caution at the beginning was worthwhile. We are told now that last year to provide Medicare and hospitalization for the people of Canada only \$20, \$22 million, six billion, three hundred million, Sir. And we are told also today that by 1981 it's possible that it's going to be costing \$14 billion, 500 million. Sir, I suggest to you we should be addressing ourselves to that particular subject because it's going to be beyond the capacity of our population as it stands today to withstand that expense. Laugh if you will, but it's true, it's true. The trouble is, you won't be around long enough to have to handle it; somebody else will have to handle it, and the youngsters that are coming out of school today are going to have to handle it. You are mortgaging the future of the young people of this province, and don't you ever forget it.

Without going into a great deal of detail it has been suggested this afternoon that you'll get a buck where you can, and by God you do. Increased licencing, it has been that. It has been outlined by my colleague, or two colleagues, that you'll take a dollar wherever it can be

## GOVERNMENT BILLS

BILL 23

(MR. BILTON cont'd) . . . . painlessly extracted, and you're taking them in the millions, and you know it, and you know it.

The Minister of Mines and Resources by his own words the other day -- (Interjection) -- I agreed with him that he should put a dollar on the hunting licences to take care of farmers that were losing because of game -- a dollar on every licence you took. You told us the other day that it amounts to some \$300,000.00.

A MEMBER: What did he give back?

MR. BILTON: \$8,000. Have you said anything about cutting off that dollar, or cutting it down to fifty cents? No you go on and on and on and on, and as my leader said today, you will transfer it over wherever you want to when you feel like it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, the Honourable Member for . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The honourable member is suggesting that money is going to be transferred out of a trust account which is set up for the hunters certificate that the government has had. Mr. Speaker, there is no suggestion that that would be done, and no suggestion that it can be done. It is kept in trust for that purpose.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. BILTON: I accept the Minister's words but I would remind him that Ottawa did the same thing; they put a dollar on too -- and it costs a hunter something to go out hunting these days. -- (Interjection) -- Here's a little weekly newspaper struggling for an existence -- (Interjection) -- and they view the advertising agencies who go out all over the North American Continent in an endeavour to get us the advertising and we pay them 15 percent commission.

A MEMBER: Ten percent.

MR. BILTON: Not anymore with the province. They say no. Pay out the 15 percent commission. Another, another little extraction of money -- (Interjection) -- what did I tell you? From the weekly newspapers, and from the dailies if you like. -- (Interjection) -- What have you got to do with that, that's private business.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. BILTON: Why should you be asking the weekly newspapers to pay this government 15 percent for the advertising they place with the -- with the people simply to give the people a message of what the government intends to do, this way, that way, or the other way. Why should they be, why should they have to pay that? . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the honourable gentlemen that wish to converse amongst themselves would step out outside and let us hear the debate. I have very great difficulty hearing what's going on.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, you know me well enough that it is not my intention to provoke any argument on either side of the floor. Far be it from me, your troubles are big enough, and I would be the last in the world to cause you discomforts. However, we hear the other day, in no uncertain terms, that they're going to do away with the discount on the Hydro bill. If that's not an increase in taxation, then I don't know what is. It's going to happen. I asked the Premier in Swan River at a public meeting, if they intended to increase Hydro rates, he says like buying a bottle of milk, it'll ultimately have to be increased. It sure will. But they're starting by taking off the discount first. The little guy that you're trying to help who saves a dollar on his bill, you're going to take that away from him. You should be happy about that. You should be happy about that. \$33 million profit in liquor, and you don't even provide the bottle. It's handed to you and you take \$33 million, so you put 20 -- so Mr. Sims comes out and puts 25 cents increase on every bottle. When the manufacturer comes along and wants to put on 25 cents because labour wants more, packaging wants more, everybody wants more, he puts on 25 cents; what happens? Sims is indignant about that. But he takes the 25 cents in taxation. It's time, it's time they were lowering the price and give the little Scotchman a chance. And the English. (applause).

Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed the Honourable Member for St. Johns this afternoon. It's the greatest political speech I've heard him make. But I don't, I don't accept in the main many of his remarks. You know, Mr. Speaker, we as a Party when we were sitting over there, we did things in a constructive way. We dared, we dared, and we did, and we made mistakes but nevertheless we dared -- (Interjections) -- All these people have done has tried to pull down and ridicule the efforts we were making -- (Interjections) -- Apart from the biffy on the

## GOVERNMENT BILLS

BILL 23

(MR. BILTON cont'd) . . . . boulevard down here, and the building of the Louis Riel monument, they've created nothing, nothing, and I say nothing, in a constructive way. All they did since taking office was carry on with the plans that were laid by the Conservative Party, and if you want me to name them I'll name them. - - (Interjections) - - All they've done, Mr. Speaker, is promote give-away programs - - (Interjection) - - 1973, everything free under the NDP government, but look out, look out for '74 . . .

A MEMBER: We'll be back. In '74 we'll all score.

MR. BILTON: We constantly hear, Mr. Speaker, we constantly hear, Mr. Speaker, that those with the ability to pay will pay, and for the information of the honourable gentlemen opposite they're getting down to the people that can pay. I know of a man that's getting \$100.00 a week unemployment insurance; before he gets it \$18.00 is stopped - income tax and part of it comes to this province. Those are the people with the ability to pay - you're getting part of it; and the plumber that comes to your door now is charging \$9.00 and \$10.00 an hour for service, he's paying too, as you'll no doubt hear about it.

Mr. Speaker, people are not being fooled. The people provide the wherewithal and governments are nothing. I saw something the other day, Mr. Speaker, and I'm going to close on this point, and no doubt Sir Stafford Cripps is their model. It's reported here that Sir Stafford Cripps said a socialist government must exact every right to prolong its period in office, hold its power. He said that any attempt to dispute the authority of a socialist government must be quelled - I'm not going to say the next word because you've probably read it - but you're going to handle it your way if you're there long enough.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. BILTON: Apparently your patron saint, Sir Stafford Cripps, went further on to say that the power of the courts to challenge the power of the socialist government, he said even in the fundamental changes in the constitution must be taken away from the courts. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to rise and speak after the Member for Swan River. It's pretty obvious he brought some points home to the opposite side that bother them. It's pretty obvious the Member from Fort Garry brought some points home that bothered the other side. It's very obvious that the Member from St. Johns got up and spoke and brought some points home that bothered us because actually what he had to say was done in his usual marvellous parliamentary manner of basically trying to convince the people of Manitoba that they're not paying high taxes today, and the same as the Premier has done before him, is that the economy of this province has never been better. I'd be quite willing to put that statement in the paper: "The Premier says the economy has never been better in the Province of Manitoba; taxes have never been lower in the Province of Manitoba" - and put underneath it, I leave it up to you, because I assure you you'll get laughed right out of your seats over there.

A MEMBER: They will.

Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that during this session, or before this session, that the caucus on the other side got together and were rehearsed in a very marvellous way that anything that anybody in the opposition says, I'm sure they were told to stand up and say; what did you do? What did you do? Did you do it? What do they do in Alberta? What do they do in Ontario? Isn't that marvellous? For they say, you did it. And every time you get up and say, well you did it, that's reason for us to do it too. So basically, you know, when we criticize they say, well you did it. They're doing exactly what we criticized them for and they keep forgetting that we're in 1973 and we've been in this year for three or four months now and they can't even remember since 1969 that nothing has been done in this province as far as vantages to the taxpayer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's not really beat around the bush about it. The Minister, or the Member from St. Johns he did some commenting about people who make \$20,000 a year in this province. You know, I'm not sure of the figure but I'm very sure of the fact that less than five percent of the people in this province make \$20,000 and I'm very sure that the members on this side are not all that concerned about the person that makes \$20,000 either.

## GOVERNMENT BILLS

BILL 23

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd)

So let's talk about the middle income earner. We don't have to really go too far; we don't really have to look at anything but the facts in this province, and we just turn around and we take a look at this tax form that is sent out by the Federal Government and let's take the man who ends up with an income in Manitoba of say \$7400 taxable income. He pays \$1500 to the Federal government and to the Provincial Government he pays \$657.00.

A MEMBER: How do you like that.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: You know we've now taken over 22, nearly \$2200 from this man in taxes. Lets get down to the guy who maybe has three or four children and paying tax on \$7000 a year; he's paying \$1403 to the Federal Government, and he's paying \$614.70 to the Provincial Government. Lets get down to the guy at three or four children that's got a taxable income of \$5600 a year, \$1090 to the Federal, \$477.80 to the Provincial Government. And it's all bare facts, you all get one in the mail to mail in your income tax. And you say that the middle income man is not getting hit hard by taxes. Mr. Speaker, and where do we waste the money?

Well I'm not here to complain to the Member from St. Johns about helping people who need help, but I'm damn sick and tired of this government increasing the bureaucracy of people who tramp across provinces and continents to join socialist governments. All you got to do is have a socialist government come in power and they come from all over and the increase in the civil service is the same. And when you boil that down, when you boil that down, they say that the government has to have more people because we're into more things, and let's put it the other way, they're into more things so they have to have more people, and the policy of this government is to become more and more involved with the people's lives in Manitoba every day, therefore, what are we supporting? We're supporting a lot of nonsense.

We're supporting a lot of people who - - and if I want to, Mr. Speaker, and I really would hate to start quoting from it again, but nobody is ever, nobody has ever - - (Interjection) - - nobody has ever sued the man who wrote this book, and you fellows are always talking about, about the wonderful things that happened in the Douglas era, and you've never disagreed with it as far as I know, and it's been brought up about the amount of money that is spent by the travelling, you know, and it says here, on Page 158, "Public Servants of the underprivileged genius snidely call the Department of Industry and Information, the Department of Vacations Unlimited." So-called business trips, of expense accounts in total at the end of the fiscal year read like the log book of a luxury liner cruise. Mr. Speaker, and that is exactly the same as - - (Interjection) - - and after I'm finished I'll answer some questions. That is exactly the same as what has been happening and I'm not, I'm not going to go so far as criticize the Ministers for travelling, they are on government business, but the amount of travelling and roaming around of the bureaucraties, the hundreds that you've brought into this province to really do your political footwork for you, is just amazing. And that's why these people are paying this amount of tax that I just read off to you.

There's another - - you know there's other things that happen and I'm not going to indulge in names. The Member from St. Johns well would know the name, but there we have a man who was brought in to work on the City of Winnipeg, got paid \$17,870 to, what I would say, ruin the City of Winnipeg, and not only that, increase the taxes to the people of the City of Winnipeg higher than they've ever been before, and high and they're going higher still. If the City of Winnipeg doesn't build a road if they don't build another curb, if they don't do anything, they've got another \$12 million in expenditures. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Johns state his matter of privilege?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleagues the credit for having carried through Unicity not the gentleman that is being referred to by the honourable member. He did not carry out the plan of the unification of services in the City of Winnipeg.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I accept the member's explanation, but okay then we'll use it for reference or consulting purposes, and I don't think the Minister can dispute that because I said I don't want to indulge in names but the gentleman was here through all the hearings, etc.

So, Mr. Speaker, then we have this kind of money being spent on reports that the

## GOVERNMENT BILLS

BILL 23

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . . government bring out, they get somebody to write a report, they they go out and they talk to the people. They went out and the Member from St. Johns talked to all the people in the City of Winnipeg, basically got told they didn't want it; basically put up an argument that the reason we should make it one city is because when you travel to Toronto, or Calgary, or London, that people say, "Where do you come from?" So you say, "Winnipeg", and that was obviously a good enough reason not to listen to the people and go ahead and put this mess that we have in the City of Winnipeg forward, that's costing us a lot of money at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, it amuses me when I travel in the north to take a look at what I call the Red Air Force; that presently this government has more aeroplanes flying around than we ever had before. It was amusing to me when I was standing in Thompson, I was trying to go from Thompson over to . . . Gillam, pardon me, and trying to get from Gillam to Thompson, and there was not a scheduled plane at that time and one of those red planes came in with a charter from Manitoba Telephone and when somebody charters a plane they have the right to say if somebody can hitchhike with them, but unfortunately they were loaded, they couldn't carry myself and the Honourable Member from Emerson, and the pilot said to me, he said, "Are you in government business?" and I said, "No. As a matter of fact, I'm certainly not on government business," I said, "I'm on what you would call Party business." He said, "Oh that's too bad," he said, "if you were on government business we could have radioed over and got a plane over here to pick you up." Now really if that is the way we're transporting people around in the north at the present time with the Red Air Force, as I call it, which is parked up there at Thompson. Here again is the reason these people are paying the amount of taxes that I read out to you in this sheet of paper.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, he's had what I would call a fairly tough time but don't think he would call it that, I think that he has enjoyed every single minute of it, and I have sat very patiently and listened to some of his arguments, and I have to refer to one that he made the other night when he was speaking. And he said that a man who wanted, or needed, 5,000 square feet of space, and I cannot go word for word and if I am wrong I'm sure I'll be corrected by the Minister, but the reference was if he needed 5,000 square feet of space he might possibly build 10,000 square feet of space and he would use the extra 5,000 to help have income to pay for the other, or pay for his operation and I hope I've got the trend that he was working to. If the Minister agrees on that type of a program, Mr. Speaker, I would wonder why he wouldn't have agreed, or the government wouldn't have agreed, to that type of a program on Hydro in Manitoba. I would have said that the flooding of South Indian Lake to a higher level, to a medium level that we have spoken about on this side of the House, would have produced the power along the diversion and along the Nelson, and I would say, Mr. Speaker, that in time with the sale of that power, or even the tax returns on the sale of that power, the people in Manitoba who would use it, would have gone a long way to helping to pay for the regulating of Lake Winnipeg.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, . . . member permit a question since he's referred to me?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. GREEN: Is the honourable member not aware that I used that argument as the argument for proceeding with the Churchill River diversion for the hydro question.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite aware that you used that argument, and that's why I cannot understand why when you use that argument you would proceed the way you are. Well you can't -- when the money can be used -- (Interjection) -- that's right. One of the member's mentions power export. The money can be used, and would be used, and to regulate Lake Winnipeg instead of the people of Manitoba paying the exorbitant price that they're paying at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, if -- (Interjection) -- That's right. If 10 years of exports, Mr. Speaker, had been laid in the hands of the people of Manitoba we wouldn't be up there digging trenches, rooting augers, and all this sort of business, and we wouldn't be in the problem we have at the present time. We wouldn't be having dredges frozen and all of this sort of nonsense. You know all we need to do -- that's logical business, and that's what the Minister has used as an example, so I'm saying to him why didn't he look at that from the sale of power regulating Lake Winnipeg.

## GOVERNMENT BILLS

BILL 23

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd)

It's strange too, that, you know, if you have any comments or agreements about the report that we've had from Professor Kierans that he kind of suggests, and he certainly did to me in one of the meetings, the Economic Meetings, that it would be of value to have the profits of the northern resources used to help develop southern Manitoba, and on that basis, if he's going to do it that way, why didn't they do the same thing on hydro. If this is the theory that the government is working on, why then did they spend all this money on hydro at the present time in Lake Winnipeg. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you why I think it was done because this government campaigned before the election on the basis of whether flooding South Indian Lake was the proper thing to do, on the basis of whether it should or should not be done, and I would say that this money that is being spent in Lake Winnipeg at the present time, unnecessarily ahead of time by the people of Manitoba, is just a face saving sham for the Premier and that government on the other side. And that is a tremendous, tremendous cost to the people of this Province.

Referring back to the Hydro I would like to be in a position also to compliment the government. You know, I'm only going to do this because I believe that after four years they've finally decided to do what we were going to do, and I would like to - I'd like to compliment the government because, you know - - I'd like just for a minute to refer to the people of this House - - I'm sorry the Member for Crescentwood isn't here, because here we have an article by - - (Interjection) - - That's right, he is. It's an article "Meet Bucky Fuller", Buckminster Fuller who's a great scientist, as we all know, and he - - (Interjection) - - he demonstrates the playing of a goal of worldwide games to predict in advance potential problems associated with the world resources and bearing on human poverty and suffering. In other words, they're going to find out how to use the world resources for bearing on, suffering, for poverty and suffering. This can be done Fuller believes by discarding assumptions that there is not enough to go around, and he obviously in this article believes he does. So what he did, he says, to achieve this, says Fuller, by offering the performance of each unit of invested world resources until so much more is accomplished with so much less, that the high standard of living will be effected for all humanity.

Fuller cites the communication satellite weighing only a quarter of a ton, it now outperforms the communication capabilities of 150,000 tons of trans-Atlantic cable. Now here's what we have about Hydro with the groups. Students and scientists all over the world are playing world games. Last summer typically after three days of lectures by Fuller on his views of the universe, 22 students spent their vacation in New York City determining a way to provide 2,000 kilowatts of power per year to every man, woman and child on earth. After developing an inventory of the world resources it became obvious to a group that power was the key to making the world work for man. Where enough energy was available human hunger was banished and industry boomed.

The group solution called for a world grid of hydro electric power. The reasons: water to turn the generators is available in many of the low power areas of the world and hydro electricity has no products to pollute the earth.

Mr. Speaker, on that basis I have to say to the government I'm very sorry it took them two years to find out that power and hydro-electricity is something that will help human hunger and also Manitoba is in the position to be one of the leaders of this move to help in this respect.

When the Liberal Leader talks about resource, about the resources that possibly may be down in South Indian Lake, where we are planning to flood, I wish he would remember the power resource that powered us. Electric heat: get rid of a dirty old boiler in a basement that spews out smoke and dust all over the world, and we are moving that way and when you talk about a resource, a resource that is renewable continually to keep the generators going and giving us power, the hydro-electric power resources is just massive, and we have the opportunity to be ahead in this game and we should go for it.

And it's strange to me that the Member from Crescentwood, who isn't in his seat at the present time, who talks about humanity and hunger could in any way disregard the hydro resource that is in this province and do anything in any way, shape or form to stop it.

Mr. Speaker, another little way that we talk about the money being spent that these people are paying for - - you know we just went through an advertising campaign in Manitoba

## GOVERNMENT BILLS

BILL 23

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . in January. We had -- (Interjection) -- I well remember, I well remember my colleague from Lakeside standing up with this bit of paper for the benefit of the Minister of Finance at that time, and waving it around. He also said what a dog's breakfast this would be to fill out and for anybody to come and finally get their money back from the province, it would be all right. It was really rough, that's correct. And I can explain the reasons why for that. But it was really rough and here the Minister, I believe, the next day, or two or three days later came in the House with this and said, all you have to do is find page such and such and it's a very simple form to fill out, there's no problem whatsoever. Well if there was no problem, Mr. Speaker, why did we have an advertising campaign in Manitoba by the Provincial Government that must have cost upwards of \$250,000 anyway. It was in every paper; it was on every radio, and all we heard from the Premier at that time was, well they did it in Ontario. Well they advertised in Ontario. We're not Ontario. Ontario doesn't pay 42 percent of their federal tax -- (Interjection) -- that's right. That's right. They've got a Tory Government and there's lots of tax money but we haven't got lots of money in this province, and we can't afford you guys blowing it around on advertising the way you did.

And then you turn around and what would happen, you know we all of a sudden now we've got a long distance phone you know. This was an easy thing to do according to the Minister of Finance, and now we've got a long distance phone number for anybody in Manitoba, anywhere in Manitoba, to phone in and find out how to fill out this form. You know I would -- I have never made the calculation but I have travelled enough in my time that, you know, if the phone call is charged to the province, these people are paying for it. Then the staff is sitting there; an office is opened up for these people to talk to them over the telephone, and these people are paying for it. If it happens to be Portage la Prairie and you're paying the guy by the hour, and you're paying his expenses by car to tell them how to fill up this form, these people were paying for it. So when you talk about the advertising that we had pushed at us by this government to have these people pay this kind of money, you also talk about the offices that were opened up, the telephone lines that were opened up -- and you know, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government did it too and they're just as crazy as this government or vice versa, it doesn't matter which.

So, Mr. Speaker, why, why do these people on this government sit there calmly and say taxes have never been better. My God. Everything is up in price; you don't go to anything in the last four years in recreation in this province that is not up in price as far as getting into that facility is concerned, and the argument that we have, Mr. Speaker, is that, well the prices were so low for years, and we kept them that way on this side, we believed recreation was for the people at as low a cost as possible. I don't think we ever took the attitude that we would raise the price just because it hasn't been raised for a few years and here was the government, here was the government that turned around and said, you know the Liquor Commission is making all kinds of money -- I'm sorry when I said "said" I've used the wrong word, but could see by the figures that the Liquor Commission was making a better profit than it ever did; we're serving liquor to more people than we ever did; we're doing all of these things, and then we turn around and we raise the price. You know, we gotta make more profit. We gotta make more profit on the liquor board, and that's exactly what they did. They state more profit again towards recreation. And then we turn around on the liquor board -- and the Attorney-General's not here -- all of a sudden we find the Chairman of the Liquor Board and the Attorney-General starting to be saints all of a sudden. They're on the television every day saying, you know don't drink too much, don't do this, don't do that, and I can agree, but I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, there are organizations who do that such as alcoholics foundations and people that will do it much better than Frank Syms will ever do, and they don't go on the radio just to advertise themselves and boast, and that's exactly what these people are paying for in this province. It's just this scruffy government wasting money advertising themselves. Now, Mr. Speaker, well we had another comment from -- well I guess I'm wrong, I can't see him anymore, the Member from Flin Flon. I lost his voice.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, we again keep comparing -- the First Minister loves to compare us with Ontario. He loves to compare us with Alberta, and he loves to say well you did it, and then he loves to stand up and he says, well the gross national product of Manitoba has never been better. I agree, I agree. He stands up and he says, in ten years we moved about a

## GOVERNMENT BILLS

BILL 23

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . million - - a billion and a half I think were his figures - - and then he says, that do you know in the last four years - - in ten you moved a billion and a half, two, three something, which was double in ten years when you really take the figures that he had. But then he says, we in four years did the same thing. We did just as much in four years. Well I will tell you this, Mr. Speaker. In four years you didn't double it, you only increased by about a third or maybe 40 percent. It certainly isn't double and the only way it is the way it is, is because, Mr. Speaker, it is the government that is spending all the money on the gross national product, it is the government spending that is absolutely doing it.

The economy is up, Mr. Speaker, the consumer economy is up. Christmas sales were never better in Manitoba. Why? Because the Unemployment Insurance was putting money into people's hands unnecessarily, because there is welfare being paid out unnecessarily every day by this province because they aren't taking a close look at the welfare situation. There are welfare abuses, and you know it, and every day, and who is paying for it? That's the reason why this little guy - - and I really feel sorry for this guy down here when he gets \$555, 00 - \$5, 500. 00 net income per year in Manitoba and this government takes one thousand - - the Federal Government takes 1, 068 and this government takes \$468. 00 from him, and what is he paying for? Not one of them, not one of them would care about helping people who need help, but they sure care about the waste that this government is pouring on the people, and it's happening every single day. All you have to do is look around you and you can see this government spending more money. You know it even bothers me at some times, Mr. Speaker - - (Interjection) - - That's fine. I don't play to them, you love playing to them, I don't play to them.

But, Mr. Speaker, here is another, you know, I found a card when I was travelling up north, you know, I don't know how many of these we're printing for every employee that we've got up there but by God he looks like the Premier, Ralph Neault, Field Councillor, Towow Project, probably doing a marvellous job, but you know that's a little thing but are we printing them for every guy that works for this government? You know it's another - - (Interjection) - - Yah, - - only the NDP. It's another expense that we just keep going through, and these little things, these little things keep adding up to the millions and millions of dollars that is being overspent by this government. There's no question. My Leader said there are millions of dollars to be found in the budgets and the spending of the NDP government and it's there. It's there because it's a very poorly run organization. And it's a very - - it's run exactly the way socialism is run all over the world, and that is, become more involved in everybody's life, have more involvement of government into business, which means more employees, and that's what this little guy is paying for again.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is no question about the fact that this government is, you know, completely confuses everybody at times but I become very very confused at times. I was - - I sit and I listen and I think we've all been reading the hearings that have been held on CFI, Mr. Speaker, and I will not get in to sub judice subject, I'll just talk about the fact that there were hearings. I'll talk about the fact that hearings take lawyers, and hearings take all kinds of expenses from day to day, and yet, Mr. Speaker, we had the occasion for the Attorney-General to say that there were some charges that possibly could be laid but it had to be determined as whether they should be laid before the hearings were - - while the hearings were on or before they were over and so they would delay the charges a certain amount but you know, Mr. Speaker, that's strictly contrary to what the thinking of the government is really. I can recall a King Choy in Winnipeg, or in Manitoba, and strangely enough it says here, "Mr. Schreyer said a loan application can be so made as to give good impressions of a company's solvency when in fact this is not the case." You know it did happen to the Premier. Isn't that something, you know. This is infallible government over here. You know, it says, Mr. Schreyer said, - - (Interjection) - - yah, a loan equity. He said, he has some reason to believe that there was an irregularity in the King Choy application - - so does a lot of other people and that's pretty obvious. And here he goes on to say, "Whoever is involved in this King Choy group or firm I have instructed the civil servants on the case if they find any irregularities to nail them and nail them fast. I want no stone left unturned in this case the Premier said." You know isn't that amazing? Isn't that amazing? The government wants people brought

## GOVERNMENT BILLS

BILL 23

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . to justice in a hurry if they're taking this province. They want them brought to justice in a hurry, yet I become very very confused why we are spending continually legal fees, and continually carrying on with hearings when we have the RCMP, the Royal RCMP -- the Member from Swan River -- (Interjection) -- the Royal Canadian RCMP, is that right? -- who have an ability to find out that there is somebody they believe took some money from the Province of Manitoba, and when they found out the hearings were delayed for a long time, yet in the case of King Choy the Premier stands up and says, leave no -- nail them and nail them fast, I want no stone left unturned. Now do you really believe the people of Manitoba should be paying this kind of taxes when this kind of nonsense is going on on the other side? What are we paying for? We're paying for a game to be played on the other side, a political game, coming up in an election year is exactly what we have before us at the present time. You know, Mr. Speaker -- (Interjection) -- Politics is right. My colleague mentions politics and . . .

A MEMBER: Point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member state his point of privilege.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe the honourable member is dangerously close, if not right on, reflecting on the character of Mr. Justice C. Rhodes Smith, Messrs. Donnelly and Mitchell, suggesting that in some way they are manipulating the hearings for the purpose of a partisan political objective. Well, Mr. Speaker, he says that the hearings were mysteriously delayed; what are we paying for? a circus, a political circus; and Mr. Speaker, he was referring to the fact that the hearings were delayed, that there's a political circus, that dollars are being spent. I want him to know that those hearings are being conducted by the former Chief Justice C. Rhodes Smith, Leon Mitchell, Professor Donnelly of the University, and I think that it is contrary to our rules and constitutes a point of parliamentary privilege for a person to reflect on such a commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if that's the impression I gave the member and if that's the interpretation he makes of it, I am very sorry and I apologize. So let me get it another way for him. I insinuated that on one occasion the government wanted to do this in a hurry, they wanted to nail the man in a hurry because somebody had absconded or the RCMP had found a reason to lay criminal charges, and at the King Choy situation they wanted to nail him in a hurry. Yet in this situation -- thank you, Mr. Speaker -- in this situation that the Attorney-General -- nothing to do with the Commission and anything -- decided that this wouldn't be done this fast or the government decided that we would not be doing it this fast. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: . . . entitled to -- the honourable member is well aware and this reflects on the point of privilege that I was making, that in this particular case the Commission was started prior to the kind of information that he is talking about being obtained. As a matter of fact the Commission uncovered the information which led subsequently to the Attorney-General hiring special counsel.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, again I say that I had no reflection on this Commission. I am saying that there was a time when the RCMP found reason that charges should be laid so it was not done. So really, when I refer to circus I mean the circus of government on that side of the House that is playing around with the people's money. Why do we have to keep on going continually? Why? Or why didn't the government at least lay the charges? Keep the Commission going if you like but there were the charges and in the case of King Choy, Sir, the Premier said, "I want no stone left unturned. Nail them and nail them quick." Mr. Speaker, this government has continually argued and argued, and go around with their placid way, saying things were never better in Manitoba. Yet, yet we find that there are less people using hydro for industry in this province than there was before. That was brought up today. I am allowed to read a report and take that out of it. That was brought up today, sure the consumption is up but now we have less people using hydro for industry in this province. I don't know, I think that has a very serious connotation as to what's happening to the economy of the province. The little guys are getting eaten up regularly all the time. They can't make

GOVERNMENT BILLS

BILL 23

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . . it go in this province and, Mr. Speaker, if you think that all this great consumer sales, all this great things that you see is a lasting type of sales only because money is put in by government, you're very wrong. The only lasting type of economy is economy built on something other than just handouts the way this government is working at the present time.

. . . . . continued on next page

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: The resolution - Order, please. The bill will remain in the adjournment of the Member for Emerson. The hour being 9:00 o'clock we have reached Private Members' Hour. The first item under Private Members' Hour on Tuesday night is private bills, second one is public bills for private members. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

BILL 10

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson) presented Bill No. 10, An Act to amend The Health Services Insurance Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have been waiting for some time and have spent a great deal of time in preparation for the presentation of this bill, and knowing the time limit is somewhat not what it used to be I have reduced my comments to a bare minimum, which will be about ten minutes. --(Interjection)-- 20 minutes? Well, I'm not going to inflict myself for 20 minutes, I'll cut it down to about ten. If I were giving the government heck I'd probably go for 20 minutes but I'm not so I'll keep it down to 10.

Mr. Speaker, the bill, as you can see, is short and to the point, self-explanatory. There is one error in the bill and that is in the first clause, the (k), both of the (k's) must be struck out and replaced with an (l). This was an error that was made by the Legislative Counsel who drafted the bill up and if it gets to Committee I'm sure that we can change it at that time.

Mr. Speaker, the petition which I am going to read into the record has been distributed to all the members of this Legislature and sent to all the members of parliament in Ottawa and the petition, also like the bill, is self-explanatory and I'd like to read it into the record. It's called Alliance against Abortion and it's called The Petition to Parliament Against Abortion.

1. WHEREAS in Canada the right to life and property is guaranteed by the common law and set forth in the Canadian Bill of Rights, and the Supreme Court of Canada has ruled that a child in gestation is entitled to recover damages for injury if injury was deliberately caused by another person;

2. WHEREAS The Canadian Medical Code of Ethics states that induction or procuring of abortion involves the destruction of life and is a violation of both the moral law and the Criminal Code of Canada;

3. WHEREAS Canada is a charter member of the United Nations and has given full support to the United Nations Bill of Rights which declares that the unborn is entitled "to full protection under the law before and after birth, with inalienable rights to inherit property and bring legal action in courts of law;"

4. AND WHEREAS the Canadian Government has already introduced a bill into the present sitting of parliament to abolish state murder by hanging because "State killing by hanging is a low minded act of cruelty, brutal revenge and destruction of human life," and this is a quotation by the Solicitor General of Canada;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Government immediately introduce a bill into parliament to abolish state murder by abortion because state killing by medical abortion is a low minded act of cruelty and destruction of human life.

This is signed by myself as chairman, Legislative Building, Winnipeg, Alliance Against Abortion.

Mr. Speaker, in the last two days we've had some fresh breeze blowing in this area. The Minister of Health in Ontario, according to last night's paper, and I must thank the Minister of Mines and Resources who brought it to my attention - this is in last night's paper - "Toronto Canadian Press, Health Minister Richard Potter said Friday therapeutic abortions should not be covered under the Ontario Health Insurance Plan. 'I am sure that there are people today who use abortion as a means of birth control,' he said. 'We don't hand out free birth control devices so why should we hand out free abortions?' Dr. Potter, giving his views in an interview, apparently was expressing his personal opinion rather than stating government policy, but he said that the health plan would be changed in line with his views if he had his way."

Tonight I received, or this afternoon I received a phone call from a group in Toronto who tell me that the Secretary-General of the Ontario Medical Association has come out on behalf of that large association indicating complete support to the Minister and I am told that in Cabinet the Minister has some support. So there is a possibility, Mr. Speaker, that those terrible Tories in Ontario may yet make a breakthrough in this area in Ontario, and if they do I am sure

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR  
BILL 10

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) . . . . they're going to get a great deal of campaign workers from Manitoba and Ontario to help them win the next election if they should do this.

Mr. Speaker, the members are also aware that Justice Minister Otto Lang ordered a long overdue investigation into the naked abuses of the present abortion law. If what most of us have been hearing from doctors is only half true, then I predict that the investigation will reveal more abortion cheaters than unemployment insurance cheaters. This investigation will be concluded shortly and I'm sure all of us will be waiting anxiously to see what the results are.

I think it's important to give the members some background to understand how all of this has come to pass, and before I pass on to that, Mr. Speaker, I think for the edification of members and certainly for the public that may be present and be reading about this, that in the United States, even though they have the wide open abortions since that unfortunate Supreme Court decision, in the United States people still pay for their abortion except in extreme cases where the State picks it up. I believe in California there was something like 6,000 free abortions given out of a total of 136,000. So what we are asking for in this bill and what the Minister of Health in Ontario is talking about, is standard procedure throughout the United States.

Until 1967 in the United States and a year later in Canada, abortion was forbidden by law except to save the life of the mother. The change in law for abortion on very limited grounds has led to many abuses until we have what really amounts to abortion on demand. And that is why our federal Minister ordered an investigation. In 1972 there was over 1,200 abortions in Manitoba and approximately 50,000 in Canada, which cost about \$45 million. I note the figures that the Minister of Health from Ontario gives. I believe there must have been a printing error because the figures we have are that abortions cost total approximately \$1,000 per abortion. But even though most of those abortions were in violation of the act, the taxpayers in Manitoba and Canada collectively paid for all of them. This cruel blight was foisted on us by fraudulent arguments and is still spreading and increasing in terms of numbers and grounds for its misuse. Those opposing abortions four years ago predicted that the next step was abortion on demand and euthanasia. They were right on both counts. A local doctor on a hot line a couple of weeks ago has admitted to selective euthanasia in a Winnipeg hospital and beds, hospital beds permitting, we have abortion on demand already.

Mr. Speaker, since I am a Roman Catholic I have often been accused on hot line programs and on television and on speaking engagements that I'm really fighting the issue on religious grounds, meaning that because that is what my faith states that I am simply bowing to the church authorities and fighting their case. I can assure you that it has never been the case and I am not fighting the issue on it now any more than many of the people in this House who are not Catholic are fighting the issue.

The following quotations, Mr. Speaker, I think will dispel this charge. The Right Reverend Richard S. Emery, the Episcopal Bishop of Michigan, has written: "Abortion is for me and millions of others the killing of innocent human life. It is not like eating fish on Friday or going to church on Sunday or like the Mormons refusing to drink coffee. I will not be quiet for the sake of peace or tolerance any more than I will be quiet before the gas chambers."

Karl Barth, considered a giant among modern Protestant theologians, emphasized that: "The unborn child is from the very first a child. He who destroys germinating life kills a man."

Traditionally, Jewish morality also holds that abortion is strictly forbidden unless directly affecting the life of the mother. The Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada in 1970 has unequivocally condemned the practice. Rabbi Meyer Cohen, the group's Executive Director, has termed abortion: "doubly sinful and repugnant because the unborn child is innocent and defenceless." In Jerusalem 700 Rabbis, recently called into assembly by Chief Rabbi Isaac Mishem and Yehooda Unterman, voted unanimously to condemn abortion "as a transgression against religion and humanity". Anglican bishops of Australia stated that abortion be given its rightful name "murder". Lutheran theologian Dietrich Bonhoefer, who was liquidated by Hitler, stated: "Abortion is nothing but murder". And finally I'll quote Vatican Council too. It linked abortion with infanticide and labelled both as "unspeakable crimes". Dr. William Lynch, Boston gynaecologist and obstetrician, says you can't have it both ways. Medical scientists claim they are creating life, human life, in a test tube. Well you can't call

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR  
BILL 10

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) . . . . it something else in a womb, he states.

By now you have probably come to the conclusion that while abortion may not be a Catholic issue it certainly is a religious one, and again I must say, that is wrong. It was the medical profession who brought forth and created and maintained the abortion laws throughout the world and throughout history, dating back to the Hypocratic Oath which pre-dates Christianity and therefore Catholicism. In the original U.S. Constitution, Jim Crow laws stated that a negro was only three-fifths human. The blatant misuse of the present abortion laws makes the Jim Crow law look like the Twentieth Century Magna Carta. The United States and Canadian laws are derived from English law, which in turn was derived from 13th Century English common law, which in turn was derived from the Hypocratic Oath. When this law was enacted by the British parliament in the 1800s Catholics were excluded entirely from holding elected office.

Members of the Legislature, careful study and logical analysis must lead one to conclude that legally, philosophically, theologically, scientifically and historically, the unborn has always been regarded as human. Modern medical science, including embryo and fetal photography clearly show it is human life. Further, aborticide has been condemned throughout history by law, medicine and Judaeo-Christian teaching. Let us as Manitobans add our condemnation to this impressive list. Let us not do inadvertently what the Nazis did with deliberate intent. When the German physicians subordinated their ethics to the plan of Hitler they became, as Dr. Andrew C. Ivey stated at Nuremberg trials, servants of the state, healers on the one hand, respected murderers on the other. It was this loss of principle by the medical profession which subsequently prompted the Geneva declaration of the World Health Organization which states, I quote: "I will maintain the utmost respect for human life from the time of conception."

Physicians are trained for healing to save life at a great public expense, Mr. Speaker, not to kill by abortion. The great physician and humanitarian Dr. Albert Schweitzer said it clearly, "Reverence for life, life of all kinds, is the first principle of civilization. No physician, no parent, no hospital group, no Legislative Assembly or government has the right to take innocent life." Perhaps he should have added Women's Lib to that group also.

I would ask members to consider one other point. Last year we allowed, by this Legislature, a certain group of people to opt out of paying union dues due to their religious beliefs. On that basis alone abortion should be taken out of Medicare because it violates almost every religion in Manitoba that I'm aware of. The late Martin Luther King, a Baptist Minister, flanked by dozens of clergy from all over, from all the major religions in the United States and Canada, marched down the streets of Selma and Birmingham, Alabama, followed by thousands of marchers, in open violation of local and state laws and even court ordered injunctions. Three thousand five hundred of those marchers were arrested and put in jail and because the city jail and all surrounding area jails were packed to over capacity with arrested marchers, 4,000 were allowed to continue to march. Politicians of every stripe, U.S. and Canadian included, either supported or personally joined this massive civil disobedience. The marchers produced violent demonstrations, riots, shootings, beatings, arson, indiscriminate burning and looting, in a word the wholesale carnival of murder and terrorism not witnessed since the Civil War. And what was the cause of this historic revolt by the dispossessed Negro, Mr. Speaker? Were they shooting the Negroes as they did at one time? Were they starving them? Were the Jim Crow laws still on the statute books? Mr. Speaker, it was none of those. The grievance was for equal pay. The Negro grievance was for equal pay, equal job opportunity, better shacks, the right to use the same washroom as whitey, the right to share a bus seat with whitey, etc., etc. If one can justify and support, as most Canadians did, such extreme action, then how much more tolerant should you be to those in Manitoba who fight to defend life itself?

Fellow members, we are not talking about fish on Friday or church on Sunday or fasting during Lent or better jobs or the right to use the same washroom as whitey. We're talking about ruthless, low-minded and cruel destruction of defenseless human life. We are talking about medical child murder at public expense. Like the Negro of America we refuse to be silent for the sake of peace and for the 50,000 that were aborted the peace of death. We refuse to be whining armchair pacifists; we refuse to be dragged silently down the corridors of our

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR  
BILL 10

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) . . . . medical gas chambers or, as the late Dr. Luther King so eloquently stated, we refuse to obey an evil law.

You, the legislators, have the power to pass this bill and save the taxpayers of Manitoba a great deal of money and about five or six hundred Manitobans in the womb in one year. We can in the process release dozens of desperately needed hospital beds for the genuinely sick. You can also take a giant step into repatriating freedom of conscience and religion in our province where abortion is concerned. On the other hand, you may filibuster or defeat this bill now or later, and make a criminal out of me and perhaps other conscientious Manitobans. I leave it in your hands, trusting in your sense of justice, compassion and your respect for the civil liberties of others. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my intention to add just very briefly my personal views and my indication of support for the measure before us. Mr. Speaker, in doing so I do so for reasons that are straightforward and understandable reasons to myself. I'm not prepared, Mr. Speaker, to extend or to encourage what to me is the repugnant route, the repugnant route of abortion for the solution or helping to solve social problems that we have. I'm not prepared, Mr. Speaker, to admit that our present laws that provide for therapeutic abortion where a serious medical situation arises are not in fact adequate to look after the health and welfare of those women who find themselves under those circumstances that they cannot avail themselves of the . . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, . . . the honourable member just permit a question because I'm trying to understand him. The present laws permit the therapeutic abortion. Are you referring to the laws before the Criminal Code was changed? I want to understand what the member is referring to. The present laws permit the therapeutic abortion and the health plan will pay for what is legal under the Criminal Code. Prior to the Criminal Code being changed an abortion could only be performed, as I understand it, to save the life of the mother. There was an opening. Are you talking about the existing change which has sort of broadened the field or the previous laws, because I want to understand the honourable member and I'd like to get his point.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I should perhaps acknowledge the help that I just received from the Honourable Member for Inkster in this sense, that it was my understanding that the change which broadened and made more readily available abortion on demand - this is perhaps not the right terminology, I'm using perhaps common vernacular which is applied to that kind of situation - is which I find myself in disagreement with and one that I can't accept. Mr. Speaker, furthermore I don't really find myself necessarily coming down on the moral issue, on the religious issue, but I do find myself in difficulty in legislating in such a way that for those people in our society who feel very strongly about how they participate, and it's unfortunate that this is of course -- we are going to find ourselves in greater and greater conflict with this as we apply more and more universal programs through our governments upon our people. And I find myself, Mr. Speaker, with no difficulty at all whether it's a consistent position or whether it's a position that can be -- with the logic that some members bring to bear in their debate can shoot holes in, I find myself not having any difficulty in standing up in this House to defend the position of people who feel themselves compelled to do something which is basically and fundamentally against their will and basically and fundamentally in their interpretation in error or basically and fundamentally against their religious convictions or their moral convictions. By this I mean the simple, the simple helping of making payment, the simple transaction of paying their taxation and their medical premiums to what in their minds is an immoral, illegal, irreligious act. Mr. Speaker, on those grounds I intend to support the bill that's introduced by the Member for Thompson as it comes up in the vote. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I thought that I would not be involved in speaking on this question, at least for some time, and I really don't want to make any indication of my ultimate position on the question but I would like to discuss a couple of the nuances that come. At the present time the Criminal Code has been altered so that given certain procedures and a committee at the hospital, a person wishing to have an operation to abort a child can have one, and the

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR  
BILL 10

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . Medicare program, the health program, pays for that in the same way as it pays for any other medical treatment, and I can tell the honourable member that I have had no difficulty being part of the administration which administers that law, so to that extent my position is clear, that I wouldn't feel that I couldn't in any way accommodate myself to such a law and I don't think that there is any problem in that connection. That doesn't change what one ultimately feels about the bill itself. And I repeat, I'm not going to really be discussing that. I would like to discuss the issue from a more personal and perhaps practical, in a peculiar sense of the word, term -- manner.

I, Mr. Speaker, am sort of directly acquainted with this field as a result of my law practice, and I think I can tell the honourable members that the first case that I ever saw in a court, I saw when I was going to register for law school -- it might not be the first case but one of the first cases. After registration I went downstairs and was watching a trial and it happened to be an abortion trial, and I can tell the honourable member that when the girl was giving her evidence as to what had occurred that I got physically sick and was unable to endure the trial. I can tell the honourable member that later in my practice I was involved in at least three trials which I handled as if -- and I suppose this shows a certain coldness that I handled it like I would handle a pickpocketing trial because it became, it became something which I suppose that I was hardened to and I'm not saying that as a compliment to myself, I'm merely stating the facts, that I became very hardened to it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the difficulty is this. The difficulty is that there are going to be the kind of abortions that the honourable member is referring to. I am certain as I stand here, because I know it, that what the Honourable Member for Thompson objects to, what the Honourable Member for Lakeside feels we should respect the wishes of others as I understood his argument, is going to occur. It's occurred from time immemorial and it occurred during my practice, and I saw it occurring, Mr. Speaker, under most horrendous circumstances. In two cases I was the lawyer for the defence of an abortionist who had had four or five previous convictions, at least one of them having involved manslaughter where the girl had died as a result of the illegal operation; that despite the fact that she had been convicted in this way and spent time in jail she was still being called upon -- and I'm not being judgmental as to her conduct; it was certainly criminal and illegal and she was punished for it -- but she continually was called upon to perform this type of operation and she was only one person.

Another case which was most shocking and from which I don't think I've ever recovered, was being called to the police station in the middle of the night, coming, being told by the woman that she was charged with abortion, and then she related the following story, that she was performing an operation on this young girl, that the young girl fainted and when she fainted the abortionist screamed. As a result of her scream the boyfriend who had been waiting downstairs came up the stairs, said, "What happened?" He saw the abortionist leaning over the girl, she was taking her pulse, and the abortionist said, "My God, she's dead", and the fellow ran down to the basement, took out a gun and shot himself in the head. The girl was not dead but the person performing the operation thought that she was.

Mr. Speaker, I had a very relatively short legal career, probably was involved in less of these cases than other people. Therefore I saw not the tip of the iceberg but the molecule at the top of the iceberg. Knowing, as I am certain that this type of thing is going to happen I think society has the problem not of resolving whether it is right or wrong, but how are they going to deal with it, and are they going to decide that to let the -- or make it necessary, or if not necessary make it inevitable, that the young girls who are in this trouble or think they are in this trouble are going to go to get illegal operations under what can only be described as horrendous circumstances, or are they going to say that this is a malady like others, that often people are the authors of their own medical problems, that despite the fact that they are the authors of their own medical problems the medical plan pays for their cure. And that really is the dilemma, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not . . .

MR. BOROWSKI: . . . allow me a question or an observation ?

MR. SPEAKER: Question only.

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister aware that the bill will not prevent legal abortions. The bill is simply saying that they pay for their own. They will still get it in hospital which is a federal law but they will pay for their own as they are doing in the United States.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR  
BILL 10

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I know what the bill says, but if the Honourable Member for Thompson, who I know is sincere, follows his position, then he will not permit the hospitals to murder little children even if they are paid for and this -- Well, Mr. Speaker, I know the Member for Thompson I think a little bit, and I think that he has to start with this type of bill. I think that the logic of his position, that is that life is being murdered, is not going to be able to stop the Member for Thompson, that he will not be able to stop with this bill and I wouldn't expect him to, that he will then be inevitably forced to say that the hospitals that are maintained by the public should not murder little children. And the Member must say that. And I don't think he would say no, and I really don't want to beat him by some kind of a debating trick. I am talking about this bill; I am saying that if we recognize this as a malady - don't forget that that is the basis on which a therapeutic abortion is performed, three doctors I believe, and I'm not too familiar with the rules but they have to say that either the mental or physical or emotional health of the person is affected by the fact that she's going to have a child, and it's only on the basis that there is that type of problem that this can take place - that this would say that Medicare recognizes other forms of health problems, many of which are brought upon by the person himself but will not recognize this one.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in getting up I didn't really intend to be definitive and I'm not going to be. I am merely saying that there is certainly a dilemma and it involves, it involves moral conviction, it involves convictions of civil rights, such as the Honourable Member for Lakeside has mentioned; it involves religious convictions, and I don't think that anybody should be ashamed of the fact that it could involve religious convictions; and it also involves a social problem, and that dilemma cannot be resolved by taking out an absolute measuring rod and saying that it must apply in this way and that is how the issue must be resolved. There is no -- (Interjection) -- Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Honourable Minister answered the Member for Thompson's question correctly. I wonder now if he would answer my question which is exactly the same as the Member for Thompson's question, but I'm not the Member for Thompson asking that question, and if he would not agree that there is no discussion here about the prohibition of illegally performed abortions under the best of clinic and hospital staff or the best of medical capacity, and whether or not, whether or not that is not a social responsibility that should not be looked at or engaged upon by other socially responsible organizations within our community or society, that's another question. But I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lakeside's question is harder than the Member for Thompson's question, because the Member for Lakeside's question touches a very very deep nerve. He says that society is doing something for which it is collecting from all of its members, that certain people in that society have an absolute conviction against what is happening, therefore they should not be required to pay for that which is happening. Ultimately the person who takes that position, and I will take it on certain issues -- it all depends on which issue you come up with. If it was suggested that that issue applies again absolutely, then there'd be no issue on which society could be satisfied that it attacks everybody in society. For instance Joan Baez would not then have gone to jail for refusing to pay taxes for the Vietnam war. Another - Thoreau would not have gone to jail for refusing to pay his taxes when he did so, and another person could disagree with the drainage of farms and say that they're not going to pay taxes because they believe that the farms should not be drained, that it should be left there for the hunters. So eventually that issue if taken to its logical conclusion would mean that there could be no collective programs in which 100 percent of the people do not agree or else that they could opt out of for the payment of that program. Now I am not suggesting that the person who feels that strongly shouldn't take that position. I know the Member for Thompson went to jail because he did not wish to charge the sales tax. I didn't think that he had a moral issue there, and I told him so. The important thing is that he thought so and that having thought so, he behaved in that way. I think that when -- (Interjection) -- Well, you know I don't think that the honourable member . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR  
BILL 10

MR. GREEN: I don't think that the honourable member knows the Honourable Member for Thompson as well as I do. I don't think that when that particular incident occurred which was - I don't think that the Member for Thompson honestly thought that he'd ever be running in an election, or elected to the Legislature, but then maybe I'm naive, but I think that I know the Member for Thompson.

So there are those types of issues and I don't even think that a Progressive Conservative Government which believes in doing less collectively would be able to say - would be able to maintain that kind of civil libertarian approach for every single program. I believe that people have to adopt that approach. I repeat to the honourable member, I will do it, on certain things I will do it. But when I do it, I will be brought before a magistrate, I will be convicted, and I will have to follow that position all of the way. If then society looks and sees what happens and says that we have done wrong because that person should not be in jail for having violated that particular ordinance, whatever it may be, then they may change. And this has happened. People, you know, in 1919 the Manitoba Government sent, oh five or six people anyway to jail in 1919 after the strike.

A MEMBER: Twelve of them.

MR. GREEN: Ivan was in jail; Queen was in jail; Robb Russell was in jail, and the public looked and said, what did these fellows do? Why did they go to jail? And when they got out they sent them to the Legislature. It almost became a prerequisite to go to the Legislature that you had had to serve time in jail, and ultimately the public said that what they believed in was so right and they went to jail for it, that we are going to change that law. And that's the only way ultimately that I suppose one can follow through the type of reasoning which I very thoroughly respect that the Member for Lakeside has posed. But I say it's a more difficult question, and it can only really be answered by experience not by some definitive moral absolutism because it just won't work that way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I too had really not earlier figured that I would speak on the bill tonight. I am really not prepared and haven't got some of the material that I wanted to use in the debate on second reading of this bill. However I think it's probably just as well to make a few remarks at this time and probably have further debate in committee. I certainly will come straightforward and speak out in support of the bill. We have the two statues here in the Chamber, one of Moses. Moses brought down the law and one of the Commandments is: Thou shalt not kill. And I feel that as the Member for Thompson has already brought out, this is definitely killing. Abortions mean that life is being taken, and while we are not actually discussing that part so much in the bill before us, nevertheless - - Mr. Speaker, if we could have less interference on the other side . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. FROESE: Well I feel that the issue in the bill is not itself the killing that is caused by abortion, it is the matter of contributing to this particular fund which makes the person contributing to the fund a participatory, participant to such an action and I think this is the big objection that is being raised here, and I am sure that there are many people in this province who object to being participating, or being a participant, and providing funds that this can be done.

Just two years ago I think it was when we had a Canadian Convention here in the Concert Hall in Winnipeg of the Canadian Medical Association and the Canadian Hospital Association, I think it was a joint venture, and they had a special debate, a special panel on the matter of abortion at the time. There were two imminent doctors who spoke on this very subject and they came out very strongly against abortion and the way it is being done. And they told of some of the things that were happening in this country of ours, and I think at that time they mentioned there were some 30,000 abortions in Canada at a cost of over \$800.00 apiece, so this amounts to a large amount of money.

Now I don't think we should consider it so much from the point of cost because if the abortion didn't take place nevertheless the birth would be there and the cost would still have to be borne by the insurance corporation. But I think the objection is that we as people paying into the fund and contributing to the fund become participants of this whole thing and this is what I feel the member objects to very strongly, and to which I also object very strongly.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR  
BILL 10

(MR. FROESE cont'd)

I note, or I heard, and I have also received literature at that time and later in connection with abortion and what is going on in Canada. And one particular pamphlet that I got showed garbage bags full of young babies aborted, and these medical doctors at that time, too, made mention of this, and in one case they were going to throw them in the incinerator and lo and behold one of the babies cried out. So this is what happens, and can happen in situations of this type.

And I feel very strongly on a matter of this type. I feel that even the law should be changed not only in what we are trying to do here but to have it go further than that. But since the amendment is introduced, the bill is introduced, and this is what is before us at the present time, and I certainly will support the bill on second reading, and also later on there may be amendments made to it in committee so that we don't know what the final outcome will be, but certainly the bill as it stands has my support.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House prepared to . . . the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish to add a few words to what has been spoken so far on the subject. Societies of all ages have always been gauged on the amount of concern that they exercise for the weak, whether the weak be old, be of the female sex, or be the young. Certainly some societies, the more primitive ones, have practiced abortion on various scales in the past. It seems that even civilized societies in their dying days developed the practice of allowing abortions. Certainly the Greeks didn't look upon a child in their dying, in the last days of their existence as truly a free and productive society, didn't look upon a child as a human being until he was something like two years old and followed the practice of exposing the child if it wasn't wanted.

It is difficult to speak on a subject that is so important. A respect for life is the most sacred thing there is and one would expect that mother love is the most deep emotion that exists in mankind.

Mr. Speaker, this bill only deals with a very small step along a long road that we have to follow if we are to survive as a society, as a civilization. A long road back to where we were, the road that led us to a certain eminence - - the Member for Fort Rouge has a most irritating voice at times - - What the bill deals with is simply with not - with stopping the imposition on every one of us of participation in acts which many of us abhor. Abortion I believe is murder. The killing of a human being has been justified throughout history in terms of self-defence. It's a little difficult to define, to figure out how the unborn attacks the one who gave it life in the first place. And so, Mr. Speaker, I'll support this bill as one small step on a very long road which I hope we'll take.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak on this I'll move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that debate be adjourned. MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: We have 15 minutes left for Private Members' Resolutions. The first resolution on the Order Paper is Resolution No. 14. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party. The next one is in his name as well, they'll both go down to the bottom.

No. 1 - Resolution No. 1. The Honourable Member for St. Johns has 15 minutes left on this resolution.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, not having heard a motion to adjourn from the side of the private members then obviously I must proceed to deal with this resolution. I was going to give the Member for Lakeside an opportunity but since he doesn't want to take advantage of it, okay.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm suggesting that maybe that there is ample reason in view of the announcement of the Premier that we are approaching budget discussions that we make an adjournment of the House at this time to take advantage to bone up on the time. I move that we adjourn, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: I second that.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 Wednesday afternoon.