

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
10 a.m., Friday, March 26, 1976

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I have a Flood Forecasting Committee release which I'd like to read.

The Flood Forecasting Committee held its second meeting of the year on March 25th, 1976. The Committee met to review the situation concerning flood prospects on the Red and Assiniboine Rivers. The committee reports that precipitation since its February meeting has been well above normal in both the Assiniboine and Red River basins. This has led to significant increase in the expected runoff in both basins.

On the Red River with normal weather conditions overbank flows are anticipated from Emerson to the Floodway inland. With normal precipitation from now and throughout the snow-melt period and with the normal rate of snow-melt flooding of the valley lands is anticipated along the Assiniboine River from St. Lazare to Portage la Prairie.

The committee emphasizes the fact that weather conditions from now on will be highly significant. Above normal precipitation and a rapid snow-melt could further increase the extent of flooding on the Assiniboine River and could produce flooding similar to that of 1974 along the Red River.

The committee reports that runoff has not yet begun on the Assiniboine River. On the Red River runoff is well under way south of Grand Forks. Runoff from Grand Forks to the International Boundary has just begun but has not started in Manitoba. The situation on both rivers will be kept under constant surveillance by the committee up to and throughout the breakup period.

Should unusual conditions develop causing a marked change in the above forecast further reports will be issued. The following information was available to the committee for its appraisal of the spring runoff situation. And then it just indicates, Mr. Speaker, what information was available to the committee in making this report and I don't think it's necessary for me to read that out. It's in the statement.

There's also a news release from the Water Resources Division with respect to the spring runoff outlook.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. RENE TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the Annual Report for the Liquor Control Commission ending March 31st, 1975.

MR. SPEAKER: We are under Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon have a point of procedure.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to present this petition to you.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. CLERK: A Petition of the Jewish Foundation of Manitoba praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Jewish Foundation of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Minister for Corrections.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE (Minister responsible for Corrections and Rehabilitation) (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill 40, an Act to amend The Corrections Act.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital) introduced Bill 43 the Manitoba Chartered Secretaries and Administrators Act.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Leader of the Official Opposition) (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite sure who to direct the question to, it's in relation to the proposed piggyback facility in the Wilkes and Kenaston area. Perhaps to the Minister of Urban Affairs. I wonder if the Minister of Urban Affairs can indicate whether the transactions that were indicated that might take place between MHRC and the Federal Government have been completed, whether the land has been transferred for the piggyback purpose.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Urban Affairs.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister for Urban Affairs) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the House the transaction, to use the term, has been completed, the Federal Government had issued expropriation orders, but that wasn't necessary because the sale was made voluntarily.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I understand the Federal Government did do an environmental impact statement, my question I guess to the Minister in charge of Environment is to whether their environmental impact statement was reviewed in view of the fact that this facility is right next door to the deer sanctuary where approximately five deer were killed in the last couple of days by a train in that area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the question as to whether it is being located in a place which is permissible is one of zoning and planning on municipal authority. The question as to whether it will release contaminants into the air is one which we would have jurisdiction on through the Clean Environment Commission. The question as to whether our Clean Environment Commission Acts would be binding on the Federal Government is something that I can't answer at this moment.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister in charge of Renewable Resources was perhaps the Minister that may have been involved in the establishment of the sanctuary that is right next door, and I would perhaps direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Resources as to whether or not some special concern was not raised by that department in relation to the development that is about to take place there.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't answer with respect to that question, but I will take it as notice. Certainly, regardless of whether an environmental impact assessment is done or not one can ask any authority, including public, to use some common sense on the establishment of that facility, but after that it is up to the authority to deal with the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Because of the Federal Government decision to hold the line on research and because of the important role that research plays in the health care delivery system of this province, will the Minister of Health pick up the slack in funding created by the decision of the Federal Government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Health and Social Development) (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, we will have enough trouble trying to keep up any commitments here without trying to pick up the slack from the Federal Government.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Would the Minister confirm that a meeting scheduled for three o'clock this afternoon with the Souris Valley Flood Association has been cancelled by that Association?

## ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am advised that my afternoon will be less difficult than I thought. The Association cancelled its meeting. They held a meeting with me last year as well, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WATT: Would the Minister indicate why the meeting was cancelled for this afternoon? Would he indicate that the meeting was cancelled because the meeting was intended to include the Premier and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Let us get the question period straight. If the members wish to make an argument they should not utilize the question period for it. If they have genuine information they desire that's permissible, otherwise I will have to suggest these strictures more often and really get difficult with the members who persist. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there was no reason given to my office, but I rather expect that the representatives of this Association feel that I am not a big enough person to meet with. I feel that they are not big enough persons for me to meet with.

MR. WATT: I direct a question to the First Minister. The day before yesterday I asked the First Minister if he had been approached to meet with the Souris Valley Association and at that time he replied "no". I ask him again, has he had any correspondence with the Souris Valley Association to meet with the Premier of the Province of Manitoba and not the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Well if that's the case, somebody's playing games. There is a Minister completely competent in the matter. If they don't want to meet with him, I can only assume that it's for irrational reasons.

MR. WATT: A supplementary question. Would the First Minister then not be prepared to meet with the Souris Valley Association in regard to flooding and to all other problems pertaining to the Souris Valley basin?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, only if I was satisfied that there was some good reason why they feel that they cannot get to the nub of the matter in discussing it with my colleague in the normal way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. Order please. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: . . . they are having a problem with the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and they want to meet with the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Again, the honourable member is not asking a question, he's making a statement and I must caution him that I shall have a mote in my eye when he gets up the next time. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Colleges and Universities a question. In view of the fact that the universities will be closing in about a month's time, can the Minister indicate to the House whether he expects any serious problem of employment with college and university students this summer in the province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education; Minister of Colleges and Universities Affairs) (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, this year we have our STEP Program once again and the honourable member will have an opportunity to assess it and the extent to which it will have an impact on relieving the unemployment situation which the honourable member anticipates may occur, the extent of which we at this point in time do not know.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. In view of the cutback in the OFY Program and the reduction in the STEP Program, is the Minister taking steps to assess what the employment prospects will be and whether any problems will be encountered come this May?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, we have no intention or desire to take any responsibility for any actions of the Federal Government. Our STEP Program has been operating very successfully over the years and no doubt this year, once again, we will

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . . examine the employment needs of the university students of the Province of Manitoba and a program will be designed and established in accordance with our needs to meet their needs.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the Minister indicate then that the government has contingency plans available if in fact the employment problem of college and university students is severe?

MR. HANUSCHAK: A contingency plan for what, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs on the same topic. Can the Minister indicate whether, if this Piggyback facility does go ahead, which it appears it will, will the MHRC proceed with building housing next door to it on the remaining land that they have out of the parcel that was not sold to the CNR?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I believe there is something like 300 acres, perhaps 275, certainly large enough so that housing can be built. The land acquired is simply land which would make it possible for Wilkes Avenue to be moved over somewhat. So MHRC would be in exactly the same position as they are today, they'd still be funding a Wilkes Avenue and there would still be a railroad as there is today.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a further question. Now, it isn't entirely to the one Minister. In view of the fact that it was intended for residential purposes and it had a road between it and the railroad before, and in view of the fact that a sanctuary was established there for wildlife, I wonder if collectively the government is going to, or has just sat by and watched this thing happen with the vested interest it obviously had in retaining the area in a more natural state.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I can speak only for MHRC. The land is fairly extensive and large. There's ample room there for housing. As far as the Department of Urban Affairs is concerned, the city dealt with the matter, is dealing with the matter. The Federal Government, of course, has its authority, is not subject to the City of Winnipeg nor provincial zoning or jurisdiction. I believe the city has been meeting with the Federal Government on this. It's entirely in their hands.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could not indicate in relation to the rail relocation study that was undertaken two or three years ago in Winnipeg and which I understand is not resolved or solved yet, is it not somewhat hasty for the government to allow this thing to be approved before that major study may, in fact, relocate the whole thing.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition uses the word 'allowed'. As I indicated, the Federal Government has jurisdiction which is beyond that of the province of the city. It's not a matter of allowing.

The land in question that MHRC is holding, 21 or 22 acres, was sold to CNR literally hours prior to an expropriation order being served. The Federal Government has that authority.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister of Education. Last year he accepted four Orders for Return to provide information in respect to the Planning and Research Division of his department. These orders have not been returned and I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Education is going to be able to provide that information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I'll put a check on that, Mr. Speaker. My recollection is that I did see those Orders for Return in my office. I'm surprised that they were not tabled in the House, or that the honourable member had not received the Order for Return between sessions.

I will certainly check. While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, just one further point that I wanted to make in response of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, that

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . . in determining the magnitude of our government-sponsored student employment programs, we also take into account the social and economic usefulness of such programs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Urban Affairs and arises out of the flood forecast delivered by his colleague.

What will the response of the Emergency Measures Organization be to a forecast of this kind? Will they now be back in touch with officials of municipalities in the potentially affected areas?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the EMO as the co-ordinating body certainly will be involved as it has in the past to co-ordinate as between the departments of government and municipalities.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The Minister had advised us earlier that there had been some seminars held with municipal officials to prepare them for a possible recurrence of a flooding situation. Will there be further seminars held now based on the kind of report that came out today?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if seminars would be needed. I think at this point in time the municipalities have to start preparing because they are the first line of defence and they have to take the initiative. EMO, of course, is prepared to work with them and advise them, because at this point in time they should have their plans all set to go.

MR. SHERMAN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. How do they best prepare? By getting in touch now with EMO?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, if they so desire they can get in touch with EMO. I believe that municipalities at the seminars were informed what they should do. They have that information and I'm sure they'll follow it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Northern Affairs. I wonder if he could advise the House if the northern freighting program over the winter road system has been completed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. RONALD McBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, all the roads that were intended to be open were open and a considerable amount of freight was hauled over. Some of the roads surprisingly are still being kept open and some freight is still moving.

MR. BLAKE: Then there's no significant amount of freight that will be left on the landing sites.

MR. McBRYDE: Well, Mr. Speaker, if there is any freight left it's not the fault of the winter roads.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Is the Minister aware that large copper price increases announced over this week were announced by the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting and other big Canadian copper companies?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I confess that I was not aware of the increase in copper prices.

MR. BARROW: Is the Honourable Minister aware that 25,000 workers were demonstrating these . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order, please. The Minister's awareness non-awareness is not a matter of procedure. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. About ten days ago I asked him if the Department of Education and the City of Winnipeg had made application to the Government of Canada for capital assistance in improving

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . . French language facilities in the city. Does he have a report yet as to whether application has been made and whether it's still pending?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I think it was the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge wanted to know when the regulation governing the district health programs under Bill 48 would be ready. I've checked with the Manitoba Health Services Commission who is working on them now and I'm told that they should be ready sometime in May or June.

I wonder if I could have leave to give more information to the House on the question of Swine influenza.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed) The Honourable Minister.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, as I stated yesterday, we've been in touch with the Federal Government and the Advisory Committee on immunizing agents and these are their views, recommendations:

"(a) The Fort Dix situation has demonstrated clear evidence of human person to person transmission of this major new strain. The potential for increased virulence resulting from human passage exists but cannot at present be evaluated with certainty. It does, however, raise the threat of general population infection.

(b) As noted, the Swine influenza virus is suspected to have caused a pandemic in 1918-20, and

(c) On all previous known occasions when a major and antigenic variant of influenza, "A" virus has become established it has been followed by epidemics."

They've approved a federal plan, and they wanted to know first of all if we wished to go in bulk purchasing with the Federal Government. We've said, yes. They will probably help in the administration of this program. We would have to order it now unfortunately because it takes so long. Yet our intention is to get approximately - it's strictly insurance, it might be no good at all, I hope it won't be needed, but we would probably purchase about half a million dollars worth, and we would not immunize everybody. It would start probably with those from 20 to 50 years old and all those over 65 years old and those with chronic ill health conditions at this time. But we haven't finalized a decision yet. We're in constant contact with the Federal Government and other provinces.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition asked a series of questions with respect to relative rates of inflation as between Canada and the Manitoba economies, and I think we had some inconclusive exchange of data on that.

I might indicate to the honourable member that on the basis of comparing December to December, that the data that he used in his question was correct. That on the basis of comparing February to February - this is the point I was trying to make yesterday, Sir - the annualized rates of inflation could be quite different. Upon checking I find that indeed they are, Sir. I can now reply to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that the February to February rates of inflation are indexed at 2.5 percent Winnipeg, 4.1 percent Canada. So it's a complete inversion of the rates as they show up for December to December.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder just for clarification. The figure used, 2.5 percent, is that in a month, since December, for the year or what?

MR. SCHREYER: The data that was used yesterday was making a comparison of annualized rates by using December to December and January to January. Indeed the usual method is to use the average price level at mid-year to the average price level in the other mid-year. In any case, the data for February to February comparison is to take the February increment or escalation and multiply it by 12, and on that basis the

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . rates are annualized at 2.5 for Winnipeg and 4.1 for Canada. One should not read too much into these figures, Sir, because clearly they will not look quite that good for the duration of the year.

MR. CRAIK: For fear of compounding the confusion, Mr. Speaker, may I then ask the First Minister that if the predictions bear out from these annualized projections that one year from now we can expect an inflation rate of only 2.5 percent for that year in Canada at 4. If he is correct, Sir, that's certainly good news.

MR. SCHREYER: Which really points out, Mr. Speaker, the hazards of using statistical data out of context. Perhaps both of us could beware of that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health in follow-up to his statement on the regulations on district health boards. Can the Minister indicate whether in the preparation of these regulations there has been consultation with the Manitoba Health Organization or boards of the hospitals that may be affected; and if there hasn't been, do they intend to before they are proclaimed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: There has been constant discussions with these groups, now how far they discuss these regulations I can't tell you at this time. I certainly will have this information during the Estimates anyway.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - SECOND READING - GOVERNMENT BILLS  
BILL NO. 17 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE LIQUOR CONTROL ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would now proceed with the adjourned debates on second readings.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Bill No. 17 proposed by the Honourable Minister of Tourism. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote against the legislation before us contained in Bill 17 and I want to spend a few moments, Sir, explaining why.

I would say at the outset that I have no quarrel with some of the housekeeping provisions of the legislation. I think they are necessary and I think that they will help to rationalize the operations of the Commission and the responsibilities of the Minister where consistency and conformity with related legislation and practices, is concerned. But I am vigorously opposed, Sir, regardless of whether there appears to be an inconsistency in this or not, I am vigorously opposed to the principle of making home delivery of wines available. And the reason why I am vigorously opposed to the principle of making that kind of home delivery available is because I am opposed, Sir, to any further extension or expansion of the avenues of accessibility of liquor among our community in Manitoba today.

I would stress that, as my colleagues can assure you, I am no puritan on this subject, I am not a non-drinker, I was in favour of the liberalization introduced in the province in the wake of the Bracken Commission. But, Sir, I think that enough is enough. I think that there are ample opportunities available to Manitobans who like to have a drink to find access to liquor, beer, wine and other spirits and I must ask the question as to how far do we intend to go in this direction of opening up avenues and accessibility to a point almost of absurdity and certainly of social danger. It seems to me, Sir, that there is a penchant developing for a kind of a booze shuttle service in this city and in this province, and I would liken it to an operation that could be described as booze via the yellow pages, and I don't think that that is necessary, desirable or healthy.

I think, Sir, that I will be challenged in the area of consistency because I know the beer stores are able to engage in the practice of home deliveries, but I think the time has come to ask the question that I posed a moment ago as to how much further do we have to go, and if we have to be inconsistent in drawing the line somewhere then I say it is probably time for a little bit of inconsistency. I don't subscribe to the view that simply because it is done in one area of the overall situation at the present time that

## BILL 17

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . that necessarily means that it should be applied in other areas. If that were so, if I believed in that kind of an ethic, then I would have to say --(Interjection)--yes I am prepared to accept a question but let me just continue this one train of thought, Mr. Speaker.

If I were to follow that line of thinking that I suggested a moment ago, that one should be consistent and say all right if it is done here then it should be done there, then I would have to say that I think that marijuana should be legalized and I have been absolutely firm and committed since I had any acquaintanceship with the question or the problem that I am dead against the legalization of marijuana, and that I am dead against the opening up of accessibility in further areas of drugs and narcotics. So I say to you I can defend whatever inconsistency the Minister or others may throw at me in this case, because I think it is possible to say all right we have got alcohol, but we don't need to extend that kind of concession and that kind of accessibility to include other drugs and other narcotics. We have gone far enough, probably too far in the area of alcohol and I don't see that consistency demands of us that we must make the same rules and the same regulations apply in the area of other drugs and narcotics. I can live with that inconsistency, I say that we have gone far enough and probably too far in the area of making alcohol accessible and one mistake does not justify further mistakes.

So I can defend the position that I take in this area of possible home delivery from wine stores when it already exists where beer stores are concerned, by saying that we have done it once, we have done it in one area, but that doesn't argue to me that we have to do it in additional areas. Now the Minister of Tourism and Recreation wanted to ask me a question, I'll yield to it, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Spekker, is the honourable member aware that the delivery will not be had through the stores, but through the wineries themselves the same as the breweries. The liquor vendors will not be delivering wine or any other type of spirits, but it is making it possible for the wineries, the two wineries that we have in the province to deliver wine. Is the honourable member aware of that?

MR. SHERMAN: It doesn't change the nature of the situation, or my conviction that the kind of broadening of accessibility that we are faced with here is undesirable at the present time. It doesn't change my conviction that what we should be doing is perhaps making a stand against further widening of accessibility. No one here is, at least certainly I am not preaching for any rollback to the days of rigid regulation or prohibition. That would be unthinkable.

I was not in favour of that kind of climate of law, and I would not be in favour of any steps in that direction because I think that that contains as many or more dangers as excessive drinking does. I think that prohibition demonstrably is a greater evil, or certainly as great an evil as excessive drinking, because prohibition invites lawlessness, bootlegging, disrespect for the law, crime, the cost of police enforcement. It also leads to health problems that are immeasurable, through the marketing and the use of bad liquor, that can affect the health and indeed threaten the lives of those consuming it. I hold no brief for that kind of an activity, but I say that we have reached a point where accessibility is certainly wide enough and certainly reasonable enough, I don't think we have to go any further in this area, at least until we measure the impact and the effect on our community, and on our society of the distance we've travelled thus far.

So the point that the Minister emphasizes in his question does not alter my position. My basic position is that we have taken some steps that have been more realistic and more in tune with the age we live in but we now probably have a responsibility to measure the distance we've come without going off on additional courses of extending the accessibility and the liberalism of our laws any further at this time.

I have been impressed by the advertising program of the Liquor Commission and the department in the last year, Mr. Speaker, because it has emphasized the value of restraint and moderation, but I see an interesting inconsistency between the advertising program and the practices of the government in this area itself. On the one hand we have an advertising message which says in effect, nice and easy does it and we'll still be here



## BILL 17

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . tomorrow and that sort of thing, stressing the value of moderation, which I think is desirable. On the other hand, it seems to me that the government by its actions and by legislation year by year, really seems to be operating in the face of that kind of a theme. The availability, the accessibility, the marketing, the flogging of alcohol, if you like, is continually being expanded by the government, notwithstanding the advertising messages that it develops and disseminates.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues from La Verendrye and Pembina have urged a raising of the drinking age to the age of 19. Well this was something that I might remind you, Sir, I broached as a subject for consideration or proposed as a subject for consideration in this Chamber last year, and as has been noted in debate this year, the State of Minnesota is doing it and the Province of Ontario is considering it. So we have ample support for an examination at least of the proposition. We have ample reason to address ourselves to it when we consider neighbouring societies, states and provinces who are, in their judgment of the situation, convinced that this kind of thing is now desirable. But I would like to propose that some more definitive action in the area of examination of the problem be undertaken. I think that there should be whole full-scale investigation, whether official or unofficial, into the whole tragic question of underage drinking.

I mean the reason why colleagues of mine and others have talked about raising the drinking age from 18 to 19 or 20 or even back to 21 is not that we are suggesting that you can legislate a sharp distinction between a 19-year old and an 18-year old in terms of maturity; you can't even legislate it between a 19-year old and a 45-year old in terms of maturity. No one is suggesting that that can be done. But the basis and the reason for the argument is that - and I don't want to labour a point that we've laboured in past sessions - is that the further you bring the drinking age down, the underage goes down in proportion, where a 21-year old has access to liquor legally, an 18-year old has access to liquor illegally because 18-year olds can often pass for 21. Consequently, where an 18-year old has access to liquor legally, a 16-year old often has access to liquor illegally because a 16-year old can pass for an 18-year old. That is the argument for keeping the legal drinking age in a higher bracket. Not that a 19-year old is necessarily more mature than an 18-year old. We all know 16 and 17-year olds, I'm sure, who are more mature than many 30-year olds we know. But the problem is the capacity to handle and to cope with liquor when one is at a particular stage of one's physical and emotional development and when one is being exposed to the automobile and the dangers of modern day traffic and all the other challenges and responsibilities of life today that young people have to learn to cope with in a hurry, and the basic tragedy as I suggested is that the lower you bring down the legal age, the more you're inviting persons beneath that age, and in fact opening up the opportunity for persons beneath that age, to be able to have access to that kind of product or practice, whatever it is, in this case alcohol. And no one can argue, no one can argue sensibly that 15 and 16-year olds are capable of handling alcohol and handling automobiles and handling inter-personal relationships and handling school problems, because it's simply not correct. Fifteen year olds and 16-year olds are not capable of handling those things. And 15-year olds and 16-year olds are being challenged to handle them when 18 is the legal drinking age. That's what is at the root of the kind of argument or pressure that some of my colleagues and I have put forward in this session and recent sessions for re-examination of the legal age.

But, Sir, I think we should go beyond that, perhaps that mere partial antidote to look at the whole tragic problem of teen-age drinking and underage drinking. I think it could be done through a government commission study of some kind or it could be done by this Minister in consultation with his counterparts in other provinces across this country. And I would ask this Minister and I hope that his response will be affirmative and informative. Is he in consultation with his counterparts across this country, ministers in other provinces responsible for the enforcement of liquor legislation - is he in consultation with them on the question of teen-age and underage drinking and the massive national tragedy and the massive national epidemic of tragedy that results from the mixture of youth, alcohol and very often gasoline in the form of an automobile? I would hope the Minister is in continual consultation with them. If not, I would hope that he

## BILL 17

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . . would take the initiative perhaps to launch a round of discussions with them, leading to a full-scale examination of this national problem. And indeed it's more than a national problem, it's a continental and probably a world-wide problem. But all we can do is try to cope with it in the national context of Canada. And this Minister, as his counterparts in other provinces, has a responsibility to start examining the problem that has been created, or to intensify it if he has already started the program.

Sir, the point is often argued, and I'm sure I've been guilty of it myself, that we have to have pretty liberal drinking laws in this day and age, we have to have a pretty substantial volume of sales of alcohol because we need the cash revenue, we need the money that accrues to the treasury from the sale of booze to do the things that the public and the community need done in the area of general welfare and general well-being. We note for example, that in the statement of revenue and expenditure for the year ended March 31st, 1975, the revenue accruing to the treasury of the Province of Manitoba from the Liquor Control Commission was \$45,917,000, \$45.9 million. No one would dispute that that's a lot of money, and no one would dispute that that's money that can be used to build roads, build schools, provide programs for the needy, develop incentives to industry, etc. etc. all the things that governments are supposed to do.

But, Sir, I wonder if anybody has sat down and looked at the other side of the equation. Has anybody in this administration or in any other provincial administration across this country sat down and tried to calculate the cost on the other side of the equation, the cost of--(Interjection)--Well my colleague, the Member for Morris, says Autopac alone and that's not as facetious a remark or as cynical a remark as it may sound, because on the other side of the equation are the costs to the treasury of hospitalization where alcohol has been involved, the cost to the treasury of rehabilitation programs, the cost of family support, the cost of industrial accidents and workdays lost, the cost of court cases and prison sentences and welfare programs, and related alcohol induced problems of that kind. I note that not so long ago, well as a matter of fact, just a few weeks ago, a federal health department official, speaking in Ottawa and quoted in the Winnipeg Free Press, an official by the name of F. H. Hicks, said that the majority of early retirements in the Federal public service are related to alcoholism. Well this may say something for the Federal public service, Sir, but it's not a point that we perhaps should joke about at this point.

Doctor Hicks estimated that alcohol related problems in the public service represent an annual productivity loss of \$4 million. Well, there's a criteria, there's a yardstick perhaps we can go by. If Dr. Hicks estimates that alcohol related problems in the public service represent an annual productivity loss of \$4 million and Manitoba's population is approximately five percent of the Canadian population, then we could perhaps estimate or guesstimate for the purposes of argument, that alcohol related problems in the public service of Manitoba represent an annual productivity loss of approximately \$200,000.00. I'm not saying that they do, but I'm saying based on that kind of a statistic, it might not be unreasonable, for the sake of argument, to assume that there is 200,000 or a quarter of a million dollars lost each year through alcohol related problems in the public service of Manitoba, where productivity is concerned. If you take that statistic and put it up against the \$45.9 million in revenue that I spoke about a minute ago, that reduces that \$45.9 million to \$45.6-1/2.--(Interjection)--Yes, \$45,650,000.00.

If you continue with these other things that I've referred to, the other problems, the other alcohol induced problems that generate and necessitate public expenditure in these other fields, you continually come up with sums like that that you must subtract from that overall revenue total, so that total keeps coming down. So we can't argue as we've often done, and I said I'm as guilty as most in this area, we can't argue glibly that booze brings in \$45.9 million and we need that \$45.9 million. If you measure what's going out to cope with the problems created, it doesn't bring in \$45.9 million. It might, in fact, surprise us to find out that the total equation might indicate that it doesn't bring in very much at all. And if that's the case then the whole argument is debunk.

## BILL 17

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd)

So, Sir, I would like to propose that some examination of this question be undertaken by this Minister. He could demonstrate a very worthwhile initiative in this field if he would undertake, through his department, to try to identify the other half of the equation and see how it works out try to identify the financial cost of widespread use of alcohol in our community.

I think it would be difficult to obtain precise figures, because I know we are dealing in a lot of areas that are very complex and complicated and it would be extremely tedious to try to isolate the specific cost related to one specific patient in one specific hospital or sanitarium; but I think that a kind of a general impression could be obtained, I think a kind of a general picture could be put together, and I for one would be willing to vote this Minister an additional \$20,000 in his appropriation to pay a young man or a young woman to work for a year to do that for him. I think that probably a person with normal reasonable curiosity and normal reasonable intelligence could be assigned to an assignment of that kind and probably do it in one year. And if one young person on the Ministers staff were hired and paid \$20,000 to do nothing but explore the costs to the community of the excessive use of alcohol by looking into these different areas and compiling a case for him, I'm sure that that person could do it within a year, and I would be prepared, notwithstanding all of our arguments of restraint in spending, to vote him an additional \$20,000 in his appropriations to pay that salary. I think it would produce a very interesting catalogue of information for us with which to address ourselves in the future, in the near future, hopefully, to the whole question of just what is just being gained in the alcohol business; and I think that that would be as effective and as valuable as any direct steps that we were to take at this time to perhaps re-adjust the statute in terms of drinking age, or in terms of any of the other regulations, because I'm not sure that raising the drinking age to 19 would be good enough. It may be that the drinking age should go back to 21, the legal age. I'm not advocating that at this juncture, but I say before starting on piecemeal ad hoc measures of that kind perhaps we should try to obtain for ourselves a knowledgeable overview of the whole situation and the whole problem and then develop our laws and our approaches from there and parallel to this investigation that I would like to see undertaken to determine the financial cost of excessive use of alcohol, I would like to see an inquiry as I suggested a few moments ago into the whole problem of teen-age and underage drinking. The reasons for it, the results of it, the attitudes and manners and mores that have to be considered in meeting it and coping with it, and the kinds of things that we can do, perhaps, to salvage the situation before it gets anymore out of hand than is already the case.

So Sir, these are considerations that I would put before the Minister in defence of my position to vote against this legislation; and I repeat that I am not advocating anything resembling prohibition, that is a worse evil than the kind of thing we have today. What I am asking for, is an examination - we had problems when we had prohibition, I nearly said coalition but I mean prohibition, we had problems then too. We had problems when we had prohibition so society in its enlightened way developed a thrust for examination of the problems and through the Bracken Commission and related exercises and related input came up with more enlightened, more progressive laws in tune with human nature and in tune with the temperament of today, and in tune with the life style of today. And one can't fly in the face of one's contemporary life style. It would be foolish, absurd to suggest that people aren't going to drink; it would be foolish or absurd to suggest that I'm not going to drink, because I am. But the pendulum in all these things can swing too far, Sir, that is what I am saying to the Minister and we now have got another problem, and I would think it would be timely to look at that problem - underage and teenage drinking on the one hand and parallel to that the financial cost of excessive access to alcohol and how that balances off against the revenues.

If the Minister could come up with a couple of answers in those areas I think we would all be in his debt and I would be prepared to support legislation that he brought into this House based on those conclusions. At this juncture the only way that I can put emphasis or impact behind my appeal to him to do these things is to tell him reluctantly

## BILL 17

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . that I will have to vote against his legislation at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. STEVE DEREWIANCHUK (Emerson): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express a few thoughts pertaining to the suggestion by members of the opposition that we raise the legal age for the consumption of alcoholic beverages to 19 years.

I am sure that the members of the opposition are well-meaning in their suggestion, but I should like to point out to these honourable gentlemen that they are being unrealistic if not downright naive, in imagining that all the government has to do is legislate the legal drinking age up to 19 and all the problems, real or imaginative, pertaining to teenage drinking will be solved.

May I draw the attention of the honourable members of the opposition back to the era of prohibition for a moment of reflection? Surely you do not need me to remind you of the failure of that particular attempt to legislate to prevent the consumption of alcoholic beverages; all that was achieved by making the consumption of alcoholic beverages illegal was to create one of the greatest crime waves in recent history. What I am attempting to point out gentlemen is simply this, if we legislate the legal drinking up to 19 we will succeed only in preventing 18-year olds from drinking in beverage rooms and restaurants and force them back to their former practice of drinking in parked cars and other less desirable places. In other words, gentlemen, do you honestly believe that 18, 19 and 20 year olds did not consume alcohol prior to the lowering of the drinking age to 18? Well I for one do not, and I challenge you to poll those who were below the age of 21 prior to the lowering of the drinking age from 21 to 18; or better yet, reflect yourself, reflect back on your own youth and that of your friends. Did you all patiently wait until you were 21 before you had your first taste of alcohol?

I ask you, is it not better being as young people will drink anyway whether or not we legally allow them to do so, to have young people consume their alcoholic beverages under the supervision of the Liquor Commission guidelines in public beverage rooms rather than on the sly, and unrestrained and in defiance? There is an old saying advising against attempting to swim upstream. It is my opinion that an attempt to prevent 18-year olds from drinking by legislating the legal drinking age back up to 19 would be trying to swim upstream. If the honourable members of the opposition persist in their attempts to raise the legal drinking age, may I then ask this: Are you also prepared to raise the legal age when one is considered mature enough to die in the military service of one's country? Are you also prepared to raise the age when one is considered mature enough to be tried in adult, rather than in juvenile court? Or do you propose that we act as the stock parental character in literature who tell Johnny to grow up and act like a man in one breath and shake their finger at him with the next and tell him "no, no Johnny you are too young." Thus may I conclude, Mr. Speaker, honourable members of the opposition, by saying that your suggestion of raising the legal age to 19 is unrealistic and inconsistent. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 18 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE CLEAN ENVIRONMENT ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 18 proposed by the Honourable Minister of Mines. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I will speak only briefly on this to indicate that there won't be a unanimous vote in the Conservative opposition with regard to this Bill, although I expect that the majority of the conservative group will support the government on the Bill, that we certainly will regard it as being a free and wide open vote as far as our members are concerned because we are all caught in for our own different

## BILL 18

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . . reasons for wanting to vote for or against something of this nature. So, Mr. Speaker, on speaking on this Bill I speak not representing a party position on it but simply the position of the Member for Riel on the Bill. With those terms of reference I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I will vote against the Bill, not because it doesn't have a good principle of handing powers back to municipalities or de-centralization of power, I'll vote against it because I don't think that we should be at this stage of the game yet de-centralizing power from the environmental interests, and this may happen at some point in time.

I think the jury is still out on this full environmental movement that we have been seeing over the last six to eight years and despite all the problems that all of us experience from time to time I think that the people primarily with biological interests have, as a result of the movement that has taken place in the last six to ten years, have been doing a lot of searching around to try and reach a method of integrating environmental considerations into public policy, and I think they are still finding it pretty awkward to deal in this realm of public interest as opposed to straight biological interests. We are used to hearing of the outcries from the environmentalists on almost any issue that has the least potential of an impact on the environment and there is often a tendency on the part of the public to write off the environmental outcry as being those of a few hot-heads or radicals that don't really know what they are talking about or in fact don't have any sort of perspective on the best public interests but are preoccupied, they're generally written off as being preoccupied with only a small facet of it and can't see the public interest side of it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in many cases I think that may be true, but I don't think we should judge the whole necessity or requirement for greater environmental protection, judge them on the basis of what are sometimes irrational outcries even though they are hard to put up with. I say simply that I feel that a little more time should be given to see whether this centralization of environmental protection at a provincial level can't work itself out. I think we have got a problem at the federal level, the environmental department there was created and they have never been able to exercise fully their responsibility because a lot of it has been vested in departments other than the Department of the Environment at the federal level. There is a bit of a problem there. But it is pretty clear, in the provinces there is a very clear area of responsibility for environmental protection and I think that to take it, even though it is desirable to see local control on issues, but to take any semblance of that responsibility and control away from a body that has and should be vested with the responsibility of developing an overall environmental policy for the province regardless of the political boundaries within the province, regardless of those boundaries, to take it away at this time, or to even appear to take it away, is not the right move to be making.

I'm opposed, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill that's coming in from the Department of Agriculture on pesticide and herbicide control on the grounds that I don't want to see that sort of power put in the hands of a department other than an environmental department that has responsibility over that area as well. I don't want to see the whole environmental protection effort being fragmented at this point in time to tell that body, to give it a vote of confidence and tell it to go ahead, and I think we are going to have to put up with the problem, that they are going to be in defiance of an emotional electorate many times before finally we resolve down to how these issues are handled.

I don't know exactly what the answer is and I think time may well prove it, but I think to pull more power away from the environmental authority in the province, regardless whether it's the Clean Environment Commission or whatever may emerge as a department of environment or anything else, to take it away at this time is not in the best interests. And I say this not only on this Bill, to put the powers in the hands of the municipalities - which incidentally is a smart political move right at the present time, because I am sure that I am probably taking this stand not voicing the majority opinion of my constituents and unfortunately that's the way it has to be. I think that they probably would say, spray, to hell with the problem, the indecision that is being cast by the environmental people, go ahead and spray, we would rather do that, shoot first and ask

## BILL 18

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . . questions later. But I don't think it is in the best interests at this point to in any way be watering down, at this stage of the game, when we know that so many problems are arising from the uses of chemicals that are cumulated over a period of years, there has to be extra precautions. I think now is the wrong time.

I would suggest also, that consideration be given to putting the control of the pesticides and herbicides into the same group and not in the Department of Agriculture that is indicated in the bill following. And again, I know that that will not receive unanimous support, Mr. Speaker, but unfortunately that's the comments of the Member for Riel on these two bills.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the . . . The Honourable Minister of Mines shall be closing debate.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 23 proposed by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. The Honourable Member for Morris.

BILL NO. 25 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE HIGHWAY PROTECTION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 25 proposed by the Honourable Minister of Mines. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Well Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make some remarks on this bill. It's under The Highway Protection Act. In reading the Minister's remarks he speaks of the work of the board; it's divided into two sections and he suggests setting up two different boards to deal with it. This is probably so because I can see the work of the board being quite different, and he suggests another three members for this board.

I just wonder, since it's dividing up the board if it couldn't have maybe reduced the other board's number by three so as to cut down on some of the boards and appointments that we have.

Outside of that I can see that the work is somewhat different and I think it's a good idea that two people off the board can carry on and make a decision if something happens to one of them, so as not to hold up a decision.

As to relieving the board of its responsibilities for any decision it makes, if it happens to have made the wrong decision and can be sued, I thought that this was probably in all legislation but if it isn't so, I'm wondering how come we've got by all these years without any members of a board being sued. I thought all boards were relieved of that responsibility. So I was just wondering is this something that is covered in other boards that are appointed by the government.

So I'm wondering now when the boards are relieved of any liability in case of a wrong decision, I wonder what happens to a person that has had a wrong decision or even in the future has a bad decision which affects him and then maybe later on he can prove it. I am wondering will he have a recourse to go to the Ombudsman and say that he wasn't treated properly by this board and that he should have an adjustment or some different decision in his favour.

This part that refers to about approaches off the highways. I think that it is high time that we had this because in the rural areas there's many different people that are really complaining about the length of time it takes when there's an approach needed or if there's a different use in an approach.

So I think the Highway Department really know what they're doing, they realize the trouble they've had over the years. If it will facilitate the work so as it can be done quicker, that will surely be a good thing. Because I hope this goes through.

And also the need to advertise and to send notice for a certain number of days to people where they know the result, you know, but it's just a good common sense decision, and if they can get the approval of everybody that's concerned to go ahead and make that decision without advertising it too many days, I think that's a proper thing too.

BILL 25

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd)

So outside of that I don't see - generally I'm in favour of the bill, but I'd like to reserve the right to be able to criticize it at other times if when it comes up it isn't too favorable.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Agriculture is not in his seat, I'm sorry.

MR. GREEN: Sorry. I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

. . . . . continued

SUPPLY - DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 38 of your Estimates book. Resolution 79 Labour Relations, Salaries \$247,400--pass. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to make a few points in respect to the Labour Relations section. Mr. Chairman, I know that the department's officers were involved in many disputes this past year and there were some 259 employers involved with 33,000 employees, and it's indicated in the report that many of these were resolved, or more than 80 were resolved and settled without any work stoppage. So this speaks very highly, Mr. Chairman, for our conciliation officers.

My point to the Minister at this time is, has the Minister sufficient conciliation officers in his department? Because I believe they've been working overtime last year, but I believe that from now on they will be called continually to do much more than they have in the past, because it's indicated from the report that has just been put out by the Federal Government concerning the whole scene in Canada, the National scene, it's been indicated now that 42 percent of all settlements in the country, 42 percent required extra, or required staff and conciliation officers or arbitrators, and so on. So if we're talking about all settlements in the country, that 42 percent require some staff, some assistance to bring the two parties together and to resolve their negotiating problems and to get them to come to terms, so this is an indication in itself, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister in this area will need more and more conciliation officers and more people. The other point I would raise to the Minister: I know that in this area we also will deal with the Manitoba Labour Board and the conciliation officers. I know we've talked about this before that the Chairman of the board perhaps should be full time, and this is no disrespect to the chairman at the present time, I think he's doing a good job.

But again I think the job is getting to be quite an onerous job that it requires so much time and maybe it should be a completely full-time job in this area. So perhaps the Minister can again indicate to us, has he got any intentions or endeavours what will happen, or what will the Minister's recommendation be? So in respect to the Chairman of the Labour Board I --(Interjection)-- That's right. Again I said it's no disrespect to the Chairman, I think he's doing a good job. But I feel from our labour hearings that there was an indication that it's coming to the point that the board may be overburdened with work and as more time and more study is required to consider, the point is that the recent survey that was just tabled by the House of Commons I believe for the Federal Government, had indicated on a national scope that 42 percent of all settlements across the country required some staff and required some help and some conciliation officers. So what it indicates to me, and one would be inclined to believe that more and more now there's some staff required to settle - and I'm not talking about the government settlement, I'm talking about all contracts - so something's telling us that more and more staff is required to resolve these problems.

I could see by the Minister's report where 87 percent of problems in the province were resolved which contained some 33,000 employees, 80 percent were resolved without any work stoppage, and to me that's an indication that there is good work done by the conciliation officers and perhaps maybe that area could be expanded and looked after a little more closely, what function and what other part they can play to see that we haven't got as much work stoppage as we have at the present time.

I know we've talked about more conciliation officers and more experience, which was indicated in the Woods Committee report, and perhaps the conciliation officers could have more power by statute where not only after the strike has taken place, or could the Minister require to have the conciliation officers to get the two parties to meet before the contract expired actually, or before the contract expires so there would be negotiations and the Minister would be aware of what's going on. So perhaps he can answer some of these questions that I've posed to him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Yes, Mr. Chairman. It's always judgmental as to the number of staff that is required to perform a function, particularly in the field of Labour Management Relations and conciliation officers.

There has been a change in the trend in most collective agreements in that instead of being collective agreements for two or three years the concentration in



## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . . collective agreements at the present time is a lesser period of time, which of course means that the parties concerned meet more frequently to consider the collective agreements.

There is no provision in the Estimates under review for one additional conciliation officer and one additional board officer in order to accommodate what we visualize as the increased work load in this section of government.

I appreciate the remarks of my honourable friend insofar as the officers are concerned. I made reference to them the other day when I was discussing the overall picture insofar as our staff in the conciliation services. And I appreciate what he said of their dedication and devotion. It is true, it is true that they are involved in working a considerable amount of overtime. We try to be fair and reasonable with them in more or less of a saw-off of time off from time to time and recognition of that factor.

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, of indicating to my honourable friend that we have such a close liaison between the respective officers, the conciliation officers, that if one is withdrawn or for some reason is not available to continue the negotiations, we can send in his workmate because of the knowledgeability between the staff as to what is going on.

Just by way of illustration I'm sure my honourable friend is aware of the fact that the strike situation at Victoria Hospital has now been resolved. The operating engineers went back to work last night and the maintenance personnel that were out on strike went back this morning. I use that as an illustration because the conciliation officer who had been working on the case for a reasonable period of time found it necessary to leave for a day or so, so another conciliation officer just took over like that and continued the negotiations and a conclusion was arrived at. Not because of the change of the conciliation officer, but because of the close co-operation that's existing between members of staff, and I'm sure the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia will realize that this makes the Minister of Labour not only fortunate but happy in the knowledgeability that we have this type of relationship between staff in this important field of conciliation.

I also want to draw to my friend's attention two or three clauses that are in the present Labour Relations Act, dealing with involvement prior to the end of a collective agreements. There is a requirement at the present time on both management and labour that they are to notify the Minister of Labour two weeks before the end of a collective agreement as to what the situation is prevailing in negotiations. The reason for that is to give me an opportunity of appointing a conciliation officer without a request from either party, which ministerial power I have under The Labour Relations Act. Unfortunately in some cases, or a number of cases, both union and management have been negligent in forwarding the information two weeks before the end of an agreement. But however a circular has gone out now, once again drawing this fact to the parties concerned so that we can have conciliation involved, and conciliation officers involved prior to the end of a collective agreement.

Also I want to indicate to my honourable friend that there is a provision in the White Paper, so-called, that has been considered by the Industrial Relations Committee, a section that indicates that it will become compulsory for the parties to meet. There is the proposal in the White Paper - I'm sure my honourable friend is aware of it - a proposal to make it compulsory for parties to meet with the conciliation officer after his appointment. At the present time there seems to be a difference of opinion as to whether or not the conciliation officer has the right to demand that the people meet with him at such and such a time. We're going to endeavour to clear that up providing the proposal contained in that White Paper is adopted by the Assembly.

I note just in passing that one managerial group, pretty close to home in Transcona, indicated through its Chairman the other day that they're not going to meet the conciliation officer unless certain action is taken by the other party. I question this type of approach, even if it is in Transcona, and that is one of the objectives that we have in making it compulsory to meet with a conciliation officer in order to resolve differences.

My honourable friend mentioned the question of the appointment of a full-time chairman of the board, and I appreciate his remarks indicating support for the present

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . occupier of the position. I do want to indicate to my honourable friend that discussions are taking place at the present time as to whether or not a full-time chairman should be appointed. There's no barrier to it; I appreciate, as indeed the honourable member does, the problems insofar as negotiations are concerned are being aggravated almost daily, and it's necessary to give serious consideration to a full-time chairman of the board, and it may well be before too many months are over such a position will be on a full-time basis. So I give that information to my friend.

I'm happy in some degree, Mr. Chairman, too, despite possible future upheavals in labour-management relations in the Province of Manitoba, that with the exception of two continuing strikes that I can think of at the present time, the situation is relatively such that we're clear of strikes. One strike of two that I have in mind at the present time, is the continuing strike of Dycks Containers up in the Swan River-The Pas area, that's been going on now for quite awhile, and the other is Quality Bedding and Spring which has been on for some considerable time. I don't know if there are any others right at the present moment. Of course my colleagues and staff would inform me if what I say is not absolutely correct, but it does seem that we have a slight lull, and I refer to it, Mr. Chairman, as a slight lull because negotiations are proceeding in many areas. And I note that my colleague, the Minister of Colleges and Universities and Education, is back with me now. I do want to indicate that we do use the services, or the services of the Department of Labour are used in conflicts or disputes in the educational field as well. Thus far, I've allowed my honourable friend just to write me a letter asking for involvement and I haven't charged him back for the services rendered. I'm having quite a job extracting from him sufficient funds for repayment.

But as I say, Mr. Chairman, by and large, as of this moment, the situation isn't too bad. We've come through some very trying times; I'm sure the Honourable Member for Assiniboia and the rest of the members of the committee realize that, and I hope to heaven that what we have just come through is not an indication of what is in store for us in the future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: I've just got a few more questions to the Minister and I won't keep keep him on this, but I do recall when last year the Minister got up on his feet and he said, something has gone crazy in this country in respect to negotiations and settlements, and he's in a different tone today. But I would like to indicate to the Minister that in Canada, 1975 was not a good year when we had more time lost through strikes than . . . I believe only one other country, which was Italy had lost more. So our record as far as the labour situation is concerned has not been a good one, and I know that the Minister has got concern.

I know when he opened his remarks he believed in the collective bargaining, so do I. I'm committed to the principle that workmen can best improve their situation through strong collective bargaining, through unions, through democratic unions - if they're not democratic then they're not serving the employees or their members. So, I believe in that. I believe they should be responsible because they have to be responsible to their members and so I have no argument on that with the Minister.

A point the Minister did raise when he introduced his remarks about price and wage control, and that the First Minister and the Minister himself is committed, and on that point I would really like to support the Minister and the First Minister, congratulate them for it, because I'm not happy with what's taking place on a national basis when you have the President of the Canadian Federation of Labour fighting every day against any kind of controls, and still he's not presenting any kind of recommendations himself, or his executive is not making any recommendations where the changes should come or what their action should be. So on that basis I hope the Minister of Labour was as strong in his position as the First Minister when this was discussed because, Mr. Chairman, in 1974 we had eight to nine percent wage settlements in this country --(Interjection)-- eight to nine percent that's what the wage settlements were. In 1975 they were 20 percent on the national average, 20 percent in 1975 right across the board.

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . So there was a concern. On the other hand we had GNP growth every year between five and six percent for many years. In 1975 it was zero, there was no growth, so we had to get ourselves concerned. Unemployment used to run between five and six and last year, as the Minister knows, it reached over seven percent. So we had some problems.

The trade balance, which I don't believe we had a deficit since the '40s, in 1975 I'm told the latest statistics reached \$12 billion. So it's indicating to us something's going wrong. And there must be closer co-operation between management and labour and government, and I don't know if it's possible in this country. I know in some parts of Europe it is where the management and government and labour sit down and say, look this is what our growth is going to be, it's eight percent, and we have to try to deal within that scheme. Well I don't know if we've reached that point but my concern is that when you have \$12 billion trade deficit in this country we must be pricing ourselves out of, you know, the market in many many areas. And the problem is, who it's going to affect, it's going to affect the people, the employees, because they won't have jobs. If you can't market your goods, you can't sell your goods, you know, there'll be layoffs and we'll have serious serious problems. The thing that really concerns me, when you have the President of the Canadian Federation of Labour not offering any alternatives, and not saying that we have problems, it really concerns me that kind of leadership, are they really offering leadership or are they not. I don't think, you know, that's leadership and I am concerned.

What I want to say to the Minister, if he's taken as strong a position as the First Minister in this area to give a chance to the program to work, and I congratulate him for it. I think that's just the right attitude to take, there's nothing else we can do because if nobody did anything I think I'd be more critical of that situation because the circumstances may be much worse. So the reason I'm making this point is because the Minister raised them when he introduced the Estimates at the start. --(Interjection)-- I know, I know, it's not easy for the Minister in his position to take the position that he did.

I see where the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants in Canada have indicated that controls are breaking the back of inflation, that was after their meeting and through a speech by Marcel Ballinger in Winnipeg, and they must have some indication because really these are the people that do most of the accounting of all the accounting, and they must have some indication what's happening. I hope it's true. I don't know how accurate the statements are by the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants that inflation is coming down and has come down a few percentage points already. If this is so then I think that the program has some effect.

The other point that I would be concerned with, Mr. Chairman, and I'd like to ask the Minister: Can he give us some indication what has happened? I'm really concerned that our labour force had such a small small growth from 424,000 to 427,000. I'm sure the Minister must have some reasons why there was such a small growth because surely we're getting at least 20,000 or 25,000 each year out of our high schools and universities on the market, and there isn't that many people leaving the force. I just wondered what happened. Have we had many part-time? Is it a result of statistics, or what has really happened? I believe that it's the smallest growth that we have ever had for quite a few years. So I hope that the Minister would indicate to the House what is the reason for such a small labour force growth.

The other point that I wish to raise with the Minister at the present time, and that's to do with Woods Committee Report, and perhaps this is too early and, if it is I'm sure that the Minister had no time to really formulate any policy in respect to our Labour Relations Hearings, and the point that I'm really interested in, the recommendation that was made by the, I believe, brief representing the Manitoba hospitals and hospital services organizations, where they indicated that there should be a minimum, when there is a strike that everybody would be considered on strike in that plant, even the people that would be required to work as would be agreed by the management and labour, but if there is a stoppage in a hospital that there would be a minimum of services provided. I know it has some drawbacks and it has some problems; it may

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . delay the settlement of the strike longer and maybe cause more difficulties, but it has some, probably some small solution and I believe, according to the Woods Committee that it was agreed by labour and management, in the Woods Committee Report, that some minimum, minimum standard if there's some dialysis machines or things like that that have to be provided and these patients could not be discharged, that there'd be a minimum standard provided as agreed by both sides and the people that would be working, they would actually be on strike but they would be providing this service, and they would naturally be getting paid, but that doesn't mean that there's no strike. So I think it's sort of an interesting thing. I was most interested in it, and I hope that the Minister is giving some consideration to it and perhaps he can give us some indication - it may be too early, I don't know, because we just had the hearings. But it sounded like a fairly good recommendation and perhaps the Minister can give us his expertise, what he thinks of that idea. So these are the questions that I wish to pose to the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, first of all, Mr. Chairman, I doubt very much whether I can give even a superficial answer to my honourable friend as to the lack of growth in the labour force with any real intelligent approach. I too have observed that the force does not seem to be growing on the same ratio as it was previously, but I think that also is true of the rate of growth in total population. Now whether there's a relationship between the two or whether it's because of the age factor, a catch-up in respect of age groups or not that not so many are entering into the statistical arena for labour force in the Province of Manitoba, I'm not sure. So I think my honourable friend and members of the committee can appreciate that there's so many factors that can be involved in arriving at the answer to the question, which I think is a valid question, but I'm sorry that as Minister of Labour I haven't any precise answer at this time to give to my friend.

Dealing with the Woods Committee, and in particular the Woods Committee Report in the public sector, which report I think that I received about a year or year and a half ago. I felt that it was a very comprehensive report that was forwarded by the joint council between labour-management with the involvement, of course, of the Department of Labour and others. And just as an aside, I regret that apparently the same type of co-operation is at least temporarily suspended on the national level as the result of opposition to anti-inflation. I trust and hope the same will not prevail here in Manitoba, and I would do my best to see that such was not the case.

I think though, Mr. Chairman, it would be only fair to say that while there were a considerable number of good recommendations contained in the Woods Committee Report, that I've just referred to, there was no suggestion that I could find that the desire should be achieved through legislation. There were recommendations made, Mr. Chairman, as to what would be the desire that is through co-operation of management and labour, particularly in the area of the hospital and the ongoing functions of hospitals, that there would be no . . . There was no suggestion as I read the report of depriving the service and the employees from the right to strike. There was no suggestion in the Woods Committee Report as I recall it to that effect. But there were a number of regulations, or recommendations I should say, that where an essential service went on strike, and in particular hospitals, that by common agreement between management and labour engaged in the functioning of the hospital, that there should be provision for the continuation of basic services instead of just simply banning of strikes altogether. Now after we had received the Woods Committee - I shouldn't say after we had received it, the Committee Report, Mr. Chairman. In the Committee Report there was a recommendation that the report and the parties concerned continue to explore and to expand this particular area of endeavour in the public sector. The report on the public sector, employee-employer relations in Manitoba, was submitted by the committee September 7th, 1974, and was made public immediately thereafter by the Minister. The recommendations and observations in the report covered a wide-range of issues in the field of public service employment relations of concern to the parties themselves, and to the general public of course. The first recommendation of the committee was very

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . general but important, and that recommendation was: "That public policy should continue for the foreseeable future to support collective bargaining in all areas of public service employment." And of course, that's just what I've referred to a moment ago.

"The current government has always held this position as a matter of public policy. Amendments to The Labour Relations Act and policy statements made prior to the receipt of the committee's report reflect this fact.

"Other committee recommendations were of the more detailed nature dealing with specific matters, such as the establishment of bargaining units, the scope of bargaining, the role of third party intervention," and I'm sure the members of the committee are well aware of my stance insofar as the question of third party and the resolving of strikes by voluntary binding arbitration and a different approach than actual withdrawal of strikes.

"Resolution of impasses. Designation of emergency personnel and other matters, including a proposal that the Woods Committee be expanded to include representation from the public sector. A primary reason for this proposal, as the committee itself noted, would be to enable public sector representatives to give detailed considerations to the report's proposals.

"There were two reasons why the committee in that report made this observation. Firstly, the report was made by the committee as it was then constituted and the committee could not presume to represent its recommendations as those of other people. It thought that those concerned should add their considerations to the proposals and this could take place through the expanded committee.

"Secondly, while some of the committee's recommendations concerned changes to legislation, many of them are addressed to the parties themselves." As a matter of fact I would suggest the majority, to the parties themselves. Indeed the general philosophy underlined the approach to employee-employer relations urged by the report is that the parties should voluntarily develop procedures for improving their relationships, resolving impasses and protecting the public interest. Third party intervention should only be used as a last resort. Voluntary action by the parties, which is a continuing process, has been encouraged as a result of the committees expansion." And I want to indicate to my honourable friends on this committee that this is a constant process that is going on, particularly in the field of management-labour relations in the health services field. So action has been taken on the committees recommendations.

"The general support for collective bargaining in the public sector is and has been the policy of this government since assuming office. Steps were taken immediately after the report was received to implement the proposal to expand the committee and public sector members on the expanded committee have since begun detailed considerations of the balance of the proposals in the report as the committee thought that they should do."

And then, Mr. Chairman, this approach was carried through for awhile, but when the anti-inflation legislation was proposed, the Woods Committee for a conference or two felt that they should concentrate their efforts, at least temporarily, on having explanations made of the effect of the anti-inflation legislation; and as a result of that the Woods Committee undertook one or two seminars with the involvement of the officials of the anti-inflation staff from Ottawa, met in the Fort Garry Hotel for a session or two. But I do want to assure my honourable friend and members of the committee that the Woods Committee is still continuing and will continue, having obtained the approval so to do, its further considerations of labour-management relations, particularly in the public sector and primarily in such areas as the provision of health services.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by saying I wish to have it recorded that certainly the Progressive-Conservative benches are very pleased and very grateful for the job that the conciliation officers of the Department of Labour in the Province of Manitoba have done and continue to do in the field of labour relations, and industrial relations in this province.

The record of our conciliation officers is a source of pride I'm sure to all of us and to all Manitobans, and names such as those of Mr. Lou Plantje come readily to mind

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . when one thinks of the difficult industrial contract situations that have arisen in the past year or two and with which these officers have had to cope and have succeeded in resolving.

So I second the remarks of the Minister of the other day when he was introducing his Estimates when he made reference to the conciliation officers of his department, and would like him to know, and would like them to know, that we have watched with great satisfaction and pride, as I say, the work that these individual people have done, individually and collectively.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of areas in the field of labour relations that I think are approaching the boiling point for the Minister at the present time, and I would hope to have his assurances that he's addressing himself to them and that they are susceptible to resolution. He has said that there is more, relatively more of a lull than of a period of difficulty and a period of dispute existing in the labour relations field in the province today, and we can all be thankful for that. One has no guarantee that these things will last any great length of time, but we're certainly thankful that at the moment perhaps the situation could be described as relatively quiet rather than relatively stormy. But as the Minister says himself, it's probably only a lull.

I know that he has three hot potatoes on his plate right now, and I don't expect him to divulge confidential information nor would he be disposed to do so. But I do want to remind members of the House that there is the contract situation with Manitoba Hydro, with the CUPE local members, that is unresolved at the present time and I believe the Minister has appointed a conciliator in that dispute.

There is the situation existing between the Winnipeg Teachers and the Winnipeg School Board. There are 2,300 teachers in the Winnipeg Teachers' Association negotiating a new contract with the Winnipeg School Board and they have requested conciliation. I'm not certain whether the Minister has appointed a conciliator up to this point, but it has been requested.

And of course, thirdly, but by no means lastly in terms of importance, there is the contract negotiations going on at the present time between the Manitoba Government Employees Association and the Provincial Government.

So there are these three contract situations that are in progress at the present time, all of which hopefully can be resolved quickly and peacefully. But all of which nonetheless present a substantial challenge to the department and to the people of Manitoba, because on the basis of the past two or three years, and the general industrial climate in the country referred to by the Minister in his opening remarks of a few days ago, I think one would be foolish to be complacent or to be over-optimistic with respect to any of those disputes. I am not optimistic at the moment that any of the three will be resolved immediately. I hope the Minister can assure us that they are close to resolution, but they're all potentially pretty difficulty problems. And if the Minister has appointed a conciliation officer in the teachers' negotiations perhaps he can give us a report on what that conciliation officer may have reported to date to him.

He has appointed a conciliator in the Hydro contract negotiations, so it may be possible for him to report to the committee as to what word he's had back from his conciliator in that area. And I leave it to the Minister to advise us whether he had anything that he can - without breaking confidences - disclose with respect to the negotiations involving the MGEA.

Mr. Chairman, I believe there are two other difficult and chronically troublesome labour relations areas, contract negotiations areas, which I would like to see the Minister acting on and which I would appreciate an accounting from him on, and one is in respect to the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and the members of that union who were working on construction projects on Manitoba Hydro's sites and elsewhere. This situation is one that has produced grievances from individual union members from time to time and the Minister is as familiar with them as I am. As a matter of fact there has been a submission to the Industrial Relations Committee from a labour union member involved with respect to the manner in which the IBEW does or does not carry out the rules of its own constitution where Hydro construction workers in the north and remote areas of Manitoba are concerned, and it's been a continuing and

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . a chronic subject of dispute. There have been representations and submissions made to me and to many of us, and I know to the Minister, over the past few years by discontented members of the labour force who feel that they are being handcuffed and gagged and deprived of their rights by the manner in which union regulations and union instructions are imposed and carried out on those Hydro sites. And I would hope that the Minister could shed some light on that situation for us during the consideration of these Estimates.

Another area of dispute that has been brought to my attention, and I know to the Minister's attention, concerns musicians in this city and the difficulties that they have with some of the booking agents who act as intermediaries between themselves and hotels and other places of entertainment in this city; and the difficulties that they have in finding themselves rightfully defended by their own labour union, which is the American Federation of Musicians. Now I would never have suspected that the American Federation of Musicians could be accused of applying a light hand to any dispute. I have always regarded or considered, rightfully or wrongly, that the AF of M is a pretty powerful union and does not brook tinkering or toying with the rights and the privileges of its members. But I'm led to believe that because of the structure of the arrangement between the headquarters of the union and its locals here, that where local musicians have difficulties with booking agents and with places of employment, they receive a lack of support for one reason or another, perhaps quite legitimately, but a lack of backup and a lack of support from their union and from its headquarters in the United States, and they are left, as they describe it, rather defenseless in terms of their local difficulties here. I wouldn't have believed that possible where the AF of M is concerned, but I'm told that it is. So the question arises when we're concerned with people in this community and in this labour force, if they're not getting the representation and getting the support that one would think they would be entitled to from their union, what does the Labour Department of the Province and the Labour Relations Branch of the department have to suggest to them in a way of procedures for a reasonable hearing of their grievances and a reasonable solution to their problems.

I know that some members of the Musicians' Union have been in touch with the Minister on this point and I recognize that it is a difficult one that contains many shades of grey and it's not easy to clearly identify legitimate courses of action that can be taken. But at the present time there appears to be no recourse, no defense, no representation that aggrieved members of the union here can undertake. And I would suggest that's a problem that we should be addressing ourselves to and attempting to resolve.

Mr. Chairman, I was very pleased that the Industrial Relations Committee was called recently, prior to and shortly after the opening of the current session, to entertain representations with respect to proposed changes in The Manitoba Labour Relations Act and I think some very constructive concepts and suggestions came forward out of those hearings. I welcomed the meetings of that committee, and like many others I await with interest the proposed legislation, the proposed amendments that the Minister will presumably be bringing forward. The matter of a possible solution to the thorny question of strikes in vital services has been broached earlier in discussion on these Estimates, but it's one that I want to stress for a moment because it's one, as the Minister well knows, that has occupied considerable attention by my party, and I think that the suggestion made by the spokesman for the Manitoba Health Organization who appeared before the committee is one that has met with considerable interest and enthusiasm in the community generally. And I would hope that the Minister is intending to develop the concept in the amendments to the legislation which he is proposing to bring forth. That was the suggestion alluded to earlier that specific categories of work, specific categories of assignment within vital industries be classified as essential and by agreement between the union and the employers, between the union and management, when the contract is being negotiated that those specific roles be recognized as fundamental and as necessary, notwithstanding whatever labour disputes may ensue. Under that kind of an arrangement those roles would be designated, the personnel to carry them

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . out wouldn't be designated until the time for designation was necessary, but the jobs would be designated and it would be recognized by union and by management that the union could be on a legal strike but those specific eight, ten twelve categorical jobs, whatever it was, would continue to be maintained while the strike was in progress. Those carrying out those jobs would still be regarded as being on legal strike.

Certainly in the area of health services and protection of the community, I would think that this concept first broached, as acknowledged, in the report of the Woods Commission, but then articulated by the Manitoba Health organizations in its presentation before the committee, this approach I would think would go a long way towards solving the philosophical dispute, which I submit troubles a great many members of society today over the question of strikes in essential services and the necessity of putting the maintenance of life and health and the protection of the community above the right to strike and the necessity of assuring that the life and safety and health of the community would never be sacrificed to any other objectives. So I will be looking for and hopeful that the Minister will be developing that concept in a practical way to be included and examined in the propositions he's bringing forward later in the session.

Mr. Chairman, in the Speech from the Throne that opened this session there was specific reference to the cost of industrial accidents in the province and the point was made that during the last year, four times more working days were lost in Manitoba through accidents at work than were lost through industrial strikes and lock-outs. The Speech from the Throne went on to emphasize that the government thus was concerned with increasing the capacity of employers and employees to agree jointly on improving safety and health conditions in work places. Well, no one can do other than support that kind of concept, that kind of approach, and no doubt later in the consideration of the Estimates we will have a report from the Minister as to what he envisages in terms of programs for improving safety and health conditions in work places.

But the point I would like to address to the Minister at this juncture is that the total estimated number of working days lost in the Province of Manitoba through work stoppages between November 1st, 1974 and October 31st, 1975, as the Minister well knows from his own departmental report, was 147,940. Now that's a considerable number of working days lost, 147,940. Now if industrial accidents in this province cost four times last year in working days what the work stoppages total is, then we're looking at a figure of approximately 600,000 working days lost through industrial accidents. That is a mind-boggling figure and I for one am not prepared to gloss over that fact of life, if indeed it is a fact of life. If this province last year lost 600,000 working days through industrial accidents, then there is indeed something seriously wrong and critically wrong with the safety and health standards being maintained in industry throughout this province, and I would suggest with the Department of Labour in terms of its commitment to the working force of this province to guarantee its safety and health, the figure of working days lost for work stoppages is bad enough. We all are mindful of the kind of year that we came through and the industrial difficulties that we had and I shudder at the total of 147,940 days lost but I can accept it - perhaps that's the wrong term, not accept it but I can believe it because we did have an extremely difficult year.

But that is a challenge in itself, if we cannot gear up the harmony in our work force in this province to get through a year without losing close to 150,000 working days through industrial stoppages and dispute, then we're in deep economic trouble that's going to take severe measures in order to recover from it. But if at the same time we're losing 600,000 working days through industrial accidents, well something is terribly wrong somewhere. Either all employers, public and private, in this province are completely mindless and heedless of safety and health conditions, or the Province of Manitoba itself and the Department of Labour itself and the Minister himself are failing to address themselves fully enough and sufficiently to that challenge of maintaining thoroughly strict and immovable safety and health regulations. So I'm looking forward



## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . . to the Minister's response on that point.

We have not discussed that aspect of the Throne Speech up to this time in the debate, and it was a point in the Speech from the Throne that commanded the attention of many of us immediately we encountered it. There's been no opportunity really until now, in consideration of these Estimates, to explore it further. But it's certainly a provocative and a disturbing thought and if it's a reality it's certainly a provocative and a disturbing reality.

Mr. Chairman, there are a wide number of points in the whole area of labour relations that concern me and that I want to hear from the Minister about. Related to the point I just made is the whole question of working days lost through work stoppages and disputes, too, because that total as I have said of 147,940 is high enough and is disturbing enough. If one looks at the record over the past five years in the department's report, one notes that that is the highest for the years recorded, substantially higher than anything previous. The immediately preceding year, 1973-1974 recorded an abnormally high total number of estimated working days lost through work stoppages too, that total was 131,411, but the two years prior to that recorded totals of 82.9 thousand and 49.4 thousand respectively. So the trend is very clear, since the 1971-72 period the curve has zoomed upward at an accelerating and very disturbing rate, and last year's total establishes at least for the last five year period a very unenviable record. It appears from the lull referred to by the Minister in his remarks earlier this morning, that we may be headed for a somewhat better performance this year but that's not necessarily guaranteed when we consider the transit strike in the City of Winnipeg that we just came through and some of the disputes in recent months in the health sciences field, which have resulted in work stoppages in a number of situations and a number of employment categories where they were concerned. It would be interesting if the Minister could provide us with a comparison for the period of the year covered so far and perhaps acquaint us with how the record for this period of this year compares with the record for the equivalent period for last year so that we might determine how we're headed in the overall picture for the full year on the basis of the performance to date.

Mr. Chairman, let me put another point or two to the Minister for consideration so that he might deal with all of them at the same time when he's responding. We still operate under this government and under the labour relations legislation introduced by this government and under the labour relations atmosphere practised by this government in a climate that I would say could best be described as one of supremacy of the union at the expense of the individual. I would like to know what is being contemplated by the Minister and what might be possible in terms of legislation in the future to ensure that those persons in the work force of the Province of Manitoba who do not wish to belong to unions, be they male or female, to what extent their rights not to belong to unions are being protected and guaranteed.

There are persons in the work force, as I am sure the Minister knows, who are as equally enthusiastic about not being in unions as there are those who are enthusiastic about being in them. The numbers may not be equivalent, I don't suggest that for a moment, but the fact remains that the rights of the individual who does not want to be a member of a union are not in my view protected as fully as they should be. I believe it is extremely difficult for individual labour community members, individual workers in the Province of Manitoba in many many instances, all too many, in industry and in the public service and elsewhere to opt out of union membership and enjoy full rights and freedom and privileges, I think there are sanctions of an obvious and of a subtle nature that are imposed on those who prefer to opt out of the organized trade union movement, and I think that that is an unfortunate and a discouraging situation. I believe that the rights of those who do not wish to be union members are entitled to as full a respect and as full a guarantee as those who do. And indeed there may not be too many constraints in written regulation or in written legislation that prevent industrial workers from staying out of unions, but I suggest that there are sanctions of a subtle nature that are taken against them that may get extremely

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . uncomfortable, unprofitable, and unpleasant for them to pursue their individuality and their independence. And I don't think that that is democratic or just and I would think that this Department of Labour as any department of labour in any democratic society, should be concerned about those rights as well as the rights and the sanctity of the organized trade union membership and the organized trade union leadership itself.

We had an extremely interesting and provocative presentation before the Industrial Relations Committee by a spokesman for the Manitoba Federation of Labour who made the point, and made it quite sincerely and quite legitimately, that in his view the Department of Labour really had a one dimension responsibility, and he believed it should have a one dimension responsibility. That particular representative speaking before the committee said that he believed the Department of Labour had a responsibility, and a sole responsibility to the labour movement, to the labour community, and that it should not be encumbering itself with time consuming concerns in the areas of management and the areas of supervision and the areas of government from the point of view of direction and management of departmental operations. That what it should be concerning itself with is the worker, the labour force individual the trade union movement, the labour community. Well that was an interesting point and one that I . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, the honourable member's time has expired.

A MEMBER: Closure . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, there is no closure the honourable member knows the rules of the House - 30 minutes. Resolution 79(a). The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, I stand up to be recognized and I'll sit down and the member can go another 40 minutes if he wishes.

MR. SPEAKER: Thirty minutes. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the intervention of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie very much. I hadn't realized I was over my time limit, Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry. The Minister had spoken at length on two or three occasions this morning and so had the Member for Assiniboia and I had not been aware that I had used up my 30 minutes. I appreciate the intervention and the indulgence of the Minister. I would like to finish a point that I was making. That I think that's a valid point for a trade unionist to take; but I reject it because I believe the Department of Labour and its responsibilities are a two-sided coin, at least a two-sided coin I believe that the Minister of Labour in this Province has a responsibility for both sides of the labour coin and the labour community. And that means management as well as labour, and that means the individual as well as the institutionalized union to which he belongs, and in many cases is committed to belong if he wants a job. So it can't be, it can't be democratic and fair and just in my view if it is just a department and just a responsibility that is directed towards protecting and enshrining the institution of the trade union itself. That may be a valid view for a trade unionist, and I don't object to his putting it, and in fact I was impressed by the fact that he put it as candidly as he did, he has no doubts about his philosophy and I respect that, but I reject the philosophy because I believe that, I've said, the labour community is far broader than just the leadership of the trade union movement, and the Minister has a responsibility to these other elements in the labour community. I enjoy him to examine the rights of the individual, as I've suggested, to ensure that they are not being trampled under big unionism, under bureaucratic unionism. I think that many of us would share the attitude in this House cutting across party lines, that we are opposed to big government and we are opposed to big business and that we are opposed to big labour, and what has happened in the economic community to a degree that threatens our economic prosperity now in Canada and in North America is that all three of these elements have become so large and so powerful and so unwieldy and so intransigent that the individuals rights, whether it be an individual worker or an individual entrepreneur or an individual professional, or an individual municipality, is buried under the structure of bureaucracy and is incapable of achieving any sort of

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . recognition from the authorities, whether they be government authorities, or business authorities, or trade union authorities. I would like the Minister to know that I feel strongly on that point of individual rights and on that point of his responsibility to solve the problems or at least to address himself to the problems of the whole community of labour - and that really means the whole community of the economy.

We are in the anomalous situation here in Canada today, Mr. Chairman, of grappling with wage settlements that are being limited to a certain extent at the moment by the anti-inflation measures introduced by the Federal Government but until very recently were ranging upwards of 20 percent in the average; whereas in the United States, a country with a far, far wealthier society and a far, far greater gross national product, and a far, far higher per capita individual wealth, they have been operating in the area for the past year of wage settlements that have been averaging something between eight and twelve percent and they have recovered from the economic recession that plagued the whole North American continent two years ago and still, indeed, plagues this country. I think that that is a paradoxical, an absurd situation when we look to that rich economy to the south of us and look to the manner in which they have fought back out of recession and look to the manner in which their economy is healthy again and look to their wage settlements and then look at ours.

I support the Minister in the stand that he and his government have taken with respect to the anti-inflation fight and hope that he can be influential in his position as a senior member of the trade union movement and the labour ministry in this country, hope that he will be influential in persuading his colleagues in the Canadian Labour Congress and elsewhere, that it is sheer madness to continue in the economic course that we are on at the present time. And if anyone needs an example of an absurd juxtaposition of situations all one has to do is look, as I say, to the comparison between the United States and its wage settlements and its recovery and the condition here in Canada.

Mr. Chairman, that's probably a broad scatter shot range of topics that are on my mind in the area of labour relations that I want to leave to the Minister's consideration and hopefully to his response; there are one or two other subjects that have also occupied my attention while waiting to get to the Minister's Estimates, such as the matter of professional strikebreakers and the suggestions that have emanated, not necessarily from this Minister but from other sources, that professional strikebreaking will be outlawed very likely in Manitoba in the ensuing year and I would of course encourage the Minister's comments and response in that area, but I have probably given him enough of a scatter shot approach to occupy him for the immediate future, and having exceeded my time on the floor when I was speaking a few minutes ago Mr. Chairman, I will yield the floor to him now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 12:30, I am leaving the Chair until 2:30 this afternoon.