

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Tuesday, March 21, 1978 2:30 p.m.**

[The House met at 2:30 p.m.]

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill 23**  
**The Fuel Oil**  
**Administration Act**

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, some uncertainty has developed as to whether Bill No. 23, The Fuel Oil Administration Act, which I introduced yesterday, is a money bill. In order to resolve that uncertainty I would like to provide the Assembly with the message of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor recommending Bill 23, The Fuel Oil Administration Act, which was introduced.

MR. SPEAKER: If Bill No. 23 is in fact a money bill, then of course it wasn't read a first time yesterday, because the first reading would be without effect; it would be unconstitutional. Having heard the motion today by the hon. Provincial Treasurer for first reading of Bill No. 23, The Fuel Oil Administration Act, would all those in favor please say aye?

[Leave granted; Bill 23 read a first time]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce to you, and on your behalf to the members of this House, 12 Warrior Cadets. They're from the Royal Canadian Sea Cadet Corps.

It occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, that cadet service has improved significantly since the time I did cadet service. I notice that the unit now includes both boys and girls. These cadets are from different areas of the city, and they are accompanied by their leader Mr. Ron Jacobsen, who is from Edmonton Calder. They are in the public gallery, and I'd ask that they be recognized by the members.

MR. ASHTON: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce a group of grade 9 students from Sherwood Heights school in the world's largest hamlet. They are seated in the members gallery. I'll ask them to stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, it's a pleasure for me to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, some 40 students from the Alberta Vocational Centre. They are accompanied by their teacher Marg Belyea. I understand they are

seated in the public gallery, and I would ask them to rise and be recognized by the House.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to revert to Tabling Returns and Reports. I'm sorry, I wasn't paying attention.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. FARRAN: I'd like to table the annual report of the Department of the Solicitor General.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

**Department of**  
**Advanced Education and Manpower**

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that this year will start a period of major construction of education facilities in advanced education institutions.

The continuing demand by the citizens of Alberta for postsecondary education resulted in excellent utilization of existing facilities during the period of restraint. However, the expansion of program activities, shift in emphasis of program directions, and addition of new programs have underscored the need for more space at a number of our institutions. Colleges and technical institutes have experienced a remarkable increase in enrolments.

This decision to resume construction is made at an appropriate time. We expect manpower to become available during periods of major construction in our province. The timing coincides with our needs without putting undue pressure on our labor force. This program is the first step in the throne speech commitment with respect to new construction.

Government is planning an expenditure of \$32,256,000 in new construction at public colleges, universities, and provincially administered institutions during the 1978-79 fiscal year. The total cost of these projects over the next three years is expected to be \$107,837,000.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the House that major projects are planned for the University of Alberta, Grant MacEwan Community College, the University of Lethbridge, and Red Deer College.

It gives me great pleasure to propose the following capital allocations during the new fiscal year. To accommodate increasing enrolments in agriculture and forestry, and to consolidate facilities for both these disciplines, \$5,498,000 has been allocated for a new agriculture building at the University of Alberta. To replace the present inadequate facilities and to better meet the enrolment demands and postsecondary educational needs of Edmonton area residents, Grant MacEwan Community College will receive \$5 million to begin construction on a new Jasper Place campus. To provide sufficient space for instructional facilities, phase two of the University of Lethbridge campus will begin, at a cost of \$2,280,000. To facilitate academic programs and increasing enrolments,

\$2,500,000 has been allotted to Red Deer College for a major addition.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague the hon. Mr. Yurko, Minister of Housing and Public Works, will be responsible for completing the following proposed projects at SAIT in Calgary, NAIT in Edmonton, Keyano College in Fort McMurray, and Fairview College. To expand athletic, recreational, and instructional capabilities, \$5,600,000 has been allocated for a campus centre at the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology. To provide instructional and student service facilities in addition to the comprehensive ones now in place, the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology, which has experienced significant enrolment increases, will receive \$3,280,000 for a major addition to the north portion of the existing campus. To replace temporary facilities, Mr. Speaker, which are becoming increasingly difficult and expensive to maintain, \$4,430,000 has been allotted for the construction of a permanent downtown campus and joint-use theatre at Keyano College in Fort McMurray. To provide a new student housing complex, dining facility, and administration centre, \$2,000,000 has been budgeted for Fairview College in northwestern Alberta.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I recommend that \$1,668,000 be approved for a special energy conservation program at the universities of Alberta, Calgary, and Lethbridge, and at Mount Royal College in Calgary. Upgrading the insulation in existing buildings, installing central monitoring systems, and other corrective measures are expected to result in energy saving amounting to as much as 40 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I further recommend that an additional \$32,882,968 be allocated to 23 postsecondary instructional facilities in our province. These moneys would be used throughout the advanced education system for furnishings and equipment, major and minor renovations, and various other projects.

For these purposes, I propose the following distribution of capital funds: \$13,709,000 to the University of Alberta, \$5,488,000 to the University of Calgary, \$654,000 to the University of Lethbridge, \$961,000 to the Banff Centre, \$250,000 to Athabasca University, \$6,600,000 to the 10 public colleges in Alberta, \$3,600,000 to the two technical institutes, and \$467,900 to the six provincially administered vocational centres. In addition, \$1,200,000 will be expended by Alberta Housing and Public Works for site development and minor renovations at NAIT, SAIT, the four Alberta Vocational Centres, and the Alberta Petroleum Industry Training Centre.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly endorse the approval of these projects to accommodate the growing educational needs of the province. This proposed construction reflects the confidence government continues to have in the development of Alberta's number one resource: the people of our province.

Thank you.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Official Opposition I would like to compliment the government and the minister. I believe it was the late President Roosevelt who said, nobody shoots Santa Claus. But I do sincerely compliment the government. I'm pleased to see that they recognize that if we're looking at renewable resources, we have started to put some emphasis on increasing the facili-

ties so we can have more agricultural and forestry graduates in this province.

I would also like to say that last week when I toured the NAIT facilities in Edmonton, I was very pleased to see that the former government had the foresight to carry out a program. I'm just as pleased to see that this provincial government is just as concerned about NAIT, SAIT, and related institutions. I believe I did miss something, Mr. Minister, about the Mill Woods campus of Grant MacEwan College, which I don't believe you mentioned. I would like to say to the hon. minister that I would like him to reconsider that area.

So I would like to compliment the government, Mr. Speaker. But at the same time let's not forget that even though we spend the money in capital facilities, we have to staff them; we'll need money for that.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

#### head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

##### **Strathcona County Annexation Talks**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. My question arises from a public meeting in the Sherwood Park area last night. Has the city of Edmonton made an application to the Local Authorities Board to annex a portion of the county of Strathcona to the city of Edmonton?

MR. JOHNSTON: As far as I know, Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is no.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate if he has had representation from the Edmonton MLAs re the annexation of refinery row in the county of Strathcona?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we meet in our caucus on almost an hourly basis. We have a very good pattern of communication, and certainly the question of the future urban form of Edmonton has been discussed, among other topics.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Can the minister indicate if the city of Edmonton has made formal or informal submissions re the annexation of refinery row from the county of Strathcona to the city of Edmonton?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the hon. minister indicate to the Legislature if he is giving serious consideration to the annexation of refinery row to the city of Edmonton?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the hon. Member for Clover Bar is well aware of the process, and it's not for me to decide at this point. It's a very rigid process involving the Local Authorities Board. I think it would be unnecessary for me to recount that process.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs allay the fears of the people in the

county of Strathcona and place a temporary freeze on negotiations re the annexation of the portion of the county of Strathcona to the city of Edmonton?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, of course the MLA from that area has represented that area very effectively and has brought its concerns to my attention. I will rely on his counsel for any advice with respect to the county of Strathcona.

MR. NOTLEY: What's that counsel?

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that, but I am interested in all the people of the county of Strathcona. Can the minister indicate when the people or the council of the county of Strathcona will be able to meet with the minister so they can have their fears allayed about this annexation taking place? Or have they met with the minister?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, during the Fort Saskatchewan annexation, in which the hon. Member for Clover Bar took a very active role, I did of course meet with the reeve of that county, and we discussed, among other questions — that is, the question of Fort Saskatchewan — the question of Edmonton annexations. The comments and the kinds of exchanges we had are, of course, privileged at this point.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the hon. minister. Can the minister assure this Legislature that a unilateral decision will not be made without full consultation with the county of Strathcona and its ratepayers?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I've already conveyed that message to Mr. Morrow through the MLA, Mr. Ashton, and I expect to hold to that commitment.

MR. ASHTON: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Was there any request for a freeze on annexations before the application by Fort Saskatchewan to take over a major part of Strathcona's assessment?

MR. JOHNSTON: No, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Freeze one part and not the other?

#### **Special Education Curriculum**

DR. BUCK: Puppets can laugh if they wish to. That's fine.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the Minister of Education, and it has to do with special education programs in the public system. Can the minister please advise the Assembly whether a new special education curriculum will be introduced within the public school system next September?

MR. KOZIAK: A number of items were developed during the course of the address by the Provincial Treasurer on Friday last, and I expect to be making a ministerial statement within the course of the next week or two outlining further details in the area of special education.

#### **Firestone Plant Closure**

MR. LITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I address my question to the hon. Minister of Business Development and Tourism? Could the minister advise the House what information he has, if any, pertaining to a pending closing of the Firestone tire plant in north-east Calgary?

MR. DOWLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Hon. members will recall that some two weeks ago there was a layoff of some 100 employees of the Firestone plant in Calgary. When the announcement came, I took the liberty of phoning the president of the organization in Toronto, Mr. Moore, and also, of course, the manager of the Calgary plant, to ascertain whether the information that came to my attention was correct. It was, according to the president.

After that, in the last week, the president called my office for an appointment. That meeting was held on Monday morning, yesterday, with Mr. Robert Standbury, the vice-president and counsel. At that meeting the president informed me there would be a total closure of the Calgary operation that would be phased in over a period of two months.

MR. LITTLE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In the course of his discussions with the president of the Firestone company, did the minister determine the reasons for closing the plant?

MR. DOWLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As you would imagine, we would have a considerable concern for all the entrepreneurial efforts in Alberta. We determined, in a short answer, the reasons for the closure were probably three: one being transportation, a second being economics, and a third being technical.

To enlarge on the latter two, the technical aspects of the operation were that Firestone in western Canada has produced bias tires, and they have really misread the market a bit. The market now is for radial. They do produce radial tires in Joliette, Quebec, and two other plants in eastern Canada. They feel that the cost of converting the plant in Calgary to the radial tire operation is such that they would not make a profit during the course of the next several years. You should also know, Mr. Speaker, that since 1972 the Calgary plant has not made a profit; therefore the decision was made to close the plant totally.

MR. LITTLE: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister inform the Legislature whether the Firestone company has any plans to provide alternative employment for the terminated employees?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, there will be some minimal movement of senior people in the Calgary plant to eastern Canadian operations. That won't be very large. There will be no movement of personnel out of Canada into the United States to do the same kind of work, or work in the same kind of operation. The plant is really formally closed as of today, and is being phased out over the next two months.

Some arrangements are being made by the management with the people employed in the Calgary plant. I have not been apprized of the details of that at this time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. During the course of the minister's discussions with the president of Firestone, what discussions, if any, took place on the question of the federally sponsored work-sharing program that is available from the federal government and was advanced by, I believe, representatives of the union as one option they hoped the Firestone people would examine?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, that matter was not considered, since the management decision was to close the plant in Calgary, bearing in mind that the profit picture was a negative one since 1972, and very minimal in the two years prior to that. It was a management decision to close the plant. In their view there was nothing they could do to turn it around by way of conversion to other types of operations.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Was any effort made on the part of Business Development and Tourism, in view of the layoffs that are taking place in the city of Calgary, and that only the senior management people will be transferred and the others will now find themselves out of work — was there any assessment of the impact of this federal program on the possibility of keeping the Firestone plant open? Was there any separate assessment, apart from the managerial decision of the Firestone people?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview will know that having received notice only yesterday morning, that gives us very little time to do assessments of any kind. Of course, in the normal course of things, we will assess the presentation made to us by the Firestone Canada people and will apprise the House.

MR. NOTLEY: A further supplementary question to the hon. minister. I'm not talking about assessments subsequent to the decision to close the plant but, in view of the fact that this particular option of the federally sponsored work-sharing program has been in the mill for some time, whether the department reviewed that as an option which the minister would then be able to take up with the Firestone officials before the decision was made.

MR. DOWLING: No, Mr. Speaker, I can say we have not examined that. We feel the decision by the management of Firestone Canada was such that we would not want to interfere.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. Has the minister had an opportunity to consult with his officials in Calgary regarding re-employment assistance from the department for those men and women laid off as a result of the decision to close down the plant who will not be transferred, as the senior management personnel will be?

DR. HOHOL: No, I have not, but I'll certainly apprise myself of this situation. When there's plenty of time, it's not unusual for the Canada Manpower people, our own people, Business Development and Tourism, the trade unions, as well as management to look at alternative ways to employ people. Sometimes it isn't too late, even at this present time.

#### Income Tax

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Provincial Treasurer. Yesterday during the budget debate, the Leader of the Opposition indicated that the provincial budget will cost Alberta taxpayers another \$44 million in personal and corporate income tax. Could the Provincial Treasurer inform this Assembly which Alberta taxpayers will be affected?

MR. LEITCH: I assume, Mr. Speaker, that the figures the hon. member is referring to in his question are increases in personal and corporate income tax. I want to call to the attention of the members of the Assembly that there is an increase in anticipated revenue from those sources, but not as a result of any increase in taxes. Indeed, measures we introduced last fall would reduce taxes in some areas.

There will be an increased return from personal and corporate income taxes for one primary reason: there are more Albertans today than there were last year. The population has grown significantly. In addition, earnings in both the personal and corporate side have improved over last year, Mr. Speaker, and that would result in larger tax returns.

#### Wage Increases — Public Sector

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Labour. It follows up questions put yesterday with respect to public sector salary and wage awards. Is the minister able to advise the Assembly whether he's aware that 20 separate public sector contract negotiations involving municipalities and school boards are now before conciliation which, as the minister knows, is the last step before a strike vote is conducted?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this year the Department of Labour has some 5,000 contracts opening, for any of which the services of department staff are available if required. I would have to say to the hon. member that before coming here this afternoon, I hadn't counted precisely the 20 that he referred to, but I don't think the question has any particular significance.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Given the contention of many public service leaders that virtually every contract will now go to conciliation — as opposed to an average of about one in 10, I believe — has the government any plans at this stage to step up the conciliation services and acquire more conciliators?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, we're very flexible. In the event that pressures on existing staff get to be more than can be reasonably handled and still provide the services to the parties, we would retain —

we have, in fact, discussed the possibility of retaining — some conciliators on a contract basis.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Given the fact that the CPI in the city of Edmonton rose by 10.5 per cent between January 1, 1977, and January 1, 1978, is the Treasurer in a position to supply the Legislature with the statistics on the average public sector increases which occurred during 1977, and whether those increases matched the increase in the CPI?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure I can give the statistics on public sector increases. I'll check and let the hon. member and the House know whether those statistics are available. But I do want to reiterate what I said yesterday, that the hon. member is marrying two things that haven't been married historically; namely, the rise in wages and the increase in the cost of living.

Again, I point out what I pointed out yesterday: all of us in Canada and other nations of the world improve our lot as the economy improves. When the Canadian economy was healthy, we were all able to have salaries and benefits run far ahead of the cost of living increases we were experiencing during that period. Now, when the Canadian economy is suffering some serious setbacks, I don't think we can expect to take out of that economy sufficient to meet the increased cost of living. I think it's abundantly clear that if we do, far from improving our position — while one individual or group might be able to maintain or improve their position, it's bound to be at the expense of some other group or individuals. We simply have to face the fact that the Canadian economy is in difficulty, and the way to cure it isn't by increasing wages in accordance with the cost of living increase.

#### Public Utility Rates

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the hon. Provincial Treasurer or the hon. Attorney General in charge of the Public Utilities Board. Given the Provincial Treasurer's statement, will the government of Alberta instruct the PUB during this period of belt-tightening and restraint to modify the rules for increasing public utility applications, whatever they may be, so they too will be restricted to 6 per cent or thereabouts?

MR. FOSTER: The Public Utilities Board, as I've said so often before in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, is a selection of Albertans charged with the responsibility of fixing these rates. They obviously have to concern themselves with rate of return and costs of companies appearing before them, among other things. I don't see any particular role for the government to instruct the Public Utilities Board to ensure in their judgment that all matters coming before the board be tied to the budgetary limits of the provincial government, whatever they may be.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the Attorney General. Given the statements in this House by the hon. Provincial Treasurer indicating that at a time of restraint people must in fact take out less than the cost of living, is it still the view of the government of

Alberta that the rules which presently relate to the PUB and allow the PUB to grant 15 per cent guaranteed return on equity investment, also the substitution of equity for debt capital — is that in keeping with the spirit of this government in attempting to confront the problem of inflation?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I think the issues are quite separate and distinct, not related at all.

#### Tax Shelters

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. It's with regard to the announcement advertised recently by the Alberta Securities Commission, entitled Warning to Investors Re Tax Shelters. Could the minister indicate for what reason the Alberta Securities Commission is issuing the warning that some vendors selling tax shelter investments are not operating within the law?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that as notice, because obviously the Alberta Securities Commission does its job under the statute under which it operates. I will make further inquiries.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister indicate whether he has received any specific complaints with regard to shelter vendors breaking the law?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I think there has been a general concern about some of the securities that have been offered in the area of tax shelters. To be specific I would have to ask the Securities Commission for further information.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Attorney General. Have any charges been laid by the Department of the Attorney General with regard to the selling of tax shelters in violation of the law?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, not that I am aware of at this moment, but I could check if you wish.

#### CCIL Financial Status

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he is in a position to inform the Assembly whether his department has finalized a decision regarding a request for financial assistance from CCIL.

MR. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Some time ago the government of Canada and the other two provincial governments involved, together with the principals of Canadian Co-operative Implements Limited, requested that we provide some assistance by way of a guaranteed loan, a direct loan, or a combination of both. Earlier today we advised the federal government and other interested parties that the province of Alberta would agree to providing a loan guarantee to an approved lender in an amount up to \$2 million, subject to certain conditions.

MR. APPLEBY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister be in a position to outline what these conditions might be?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, very briefly the conditions are that the guarantee would be provided on the basis that sufficient security be made available, the nature of the security being that normally taken under Section 88 of the Canadian Bank Act; and that the term of the loan, the interest rate, and the repayment schedule be in accordance with normal commercial practices.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is there a CCIL manufacturing plant within Alberta?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the major manufacturing plant of Canadian Co-operative Implements Limited is located in Winnipeg, Manitoba, but dealerships and service and supply outlets are located in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. A considerable amount of farm machinery is being sold and serviced by that company in Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Might I preface it by saying that I am pleased to hear the government's announcement today and congratulate them for it.

My question is: is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly what the schedule of meetings will be now that Alberta has made its decision, so the final package can be put together? Will there be a meeting right away with the federal and provincial representatives to consolidate this so that we can get the show on the road?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, first of all the matter that's been under discussion is really an offer by the government of Alberta to provide loan guarantees under certain conditions. Because this decision was only taken a short time ago, I have not yet received a response from the company, the other provinces involved, or the federal government, as to whether or not the conditions attached to a loan guarantee are acceptable to all the parties involved or, indeed, to the company. One should not presume, Mr. Speaker, that because we've made this offer it will in fact be accepted. Insofar as further meetings are concerned, I can only await the outcome of the consideration given to our proposal. Further meetings may or may not be held within the next short while.

#### **Basketball Team — Magrath**

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. Does the minister intend to congratulate the Magrath high school, made up of 160 students, on proving last weekend that they have the best boys' high school basketball team in Alberta?

MR. ADAIR: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have already asked the hon. member for the names and addresses of those successful in the David and Goliath story.

DR. BUCK: How about Ed Lukowich from Medicine Hat?

#### **Trade Negotiations**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Has the minister received the lists from Ottawa with regard to the tariff and trade negotiations? If not, what representations has he made recently to get them?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, we did receive some information in Ottawa yesterday. We haven't yet had an opportunity to fully assess whether it is going to be adequate for our purposes, but it was received and purports to be the information we have been requesting with respect to offers made by the United States to the participants at Geneva.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. The other information I was interested in was whether Alberta has someone monitoring the process or the negotiations going on in Geneva, and what access they have to the negotiations. Secondly, what input, on a continuous basis, is being given to Ottawa from your department?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, over the last eight months we have been monitoring pretty consistently what we can ascertain with respect to the details of negotiations in Geneva. Members will recall that some time ago we asked the federal government for the formal status of an observer at Geneva. That was refused by the federal government. Since that time we have been endeavoring to get as much information as we can in a second-hand way.

Members will recall and will have read the submissions made by the province, the first made in a couple of decades, on the question of industry and agriculture submissions for Alberta made last year. We are constantly asking the federal government for, and we hope we will receive from them over the course of the months ahead, information as to how negotiations are proceeding in Geneva.

MR. GOGO: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Do any jurisdictions in Canada other than the federal government attend the GATT talks in Geneva, as observers or otherwise?

MR. HYNDMAN: No, not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. The federal government took the policy decision last year that no province and, to my knowledge, no private entity would have observer status; that it was a matter in which the federal government of Canada would operate and receive information from the various provinces. However, the results of the Premier's submissions at the recent first ministers' conference now appear to have resulted in an improved climate of consultation for Alberta and, indeed, for all the provinces in Canada by reason of his initiatives.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. Could the minister indicate in what type of time frame the negotiations will take place? For example, I have recommended to a number of agricultural organizations that within the next two months, or even a month, they should make any presentations to the Alberta government or particularly to the fed-

eral minister so their input is considered. Is that a correct assumption?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, on the negotiations in Geneva, Mr. Speaker, I would think it would take some months, probably into the fall of this year, before matters are finalized, depending on the status of the various nations there. But I would think if there are supplementary submissions which groups in Alberta wish to make, they should be made right away, because it's my understanding the negotiating team in Geneva is now in the process of being involved in the round of negotiations which involve something over 1,000 tariffs and 98 countries.

#### **Rehabilitation Program**

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Solicitor General. Would the hon. Solicitor General consider adding boxing to the recreational rehabilitation program in our correctional institutions, where there are qualified instructors?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I have no hang-ups about boxing so long as it's confined to the ring. I suppose it's been long regarded as a noble and manly art, and I would have thought it would have been worthy of consideration as an athletic program at our new facility at St. Paul.

#### **Red Deer College**

MR. COOKSON: I'd like to ask a question of the hon. Solicitor General, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister could indicate the results of the plebiscite held at Red Deer College with regard to a liquor lounge.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the exact figures before me, but I understand there was a comparatively poor turnout. About 60 per cent of the students voted in favor of a licensed facility. This doesn't make it automatic. No application has been received from the Board of Governors, and the Alberta Liquor Control Board has not yet sat on the matter. Their decision is final. It's not a question of win or lose on the plebiscite; that's merely an expression of opinion.

MR. COOKSON: Perhaps I could ask a supplementary. Is it normal procedure to establish a plebiscite within the confines of a college, or are there instances where the area of the plebiscite also includes the municipality in which the college is located?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, it's normally been done within the confines of a campus, but where a lot of people are involved in one of the smaller cities such as Red Deer, where parents have some right to express their opinions too, it may well be advisable to call another plebiscite over a larger area. This will be a matter for the Alberta Liquor Control Board.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, one further supplementary to the minister, based on the ministerial statement of the minister of postsecondary education this afternoon. Does the minister know whether the capital cost allowance for Red Deer College that was

announced today would include capital facilities for a liquor lounge?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, the addition at Red Deer that would presumably provide the space if that decision were to be made — and it certainly has not been made — is an estimate of the present fiscal year.

#### **Water Management**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Has the government had any change in plans with regard to repairing the Bassano dam, or construction of a new dam at the Eyremore site on the Bow River?

MR. RUSSELL: The current status of that proposal, Mr. Speaker, is that we received the report from the PFRA that we undertook to have carried out on behalf of the irrigation board and sent it to them, which recommended against proceeding with Eyremore. They considered it and have sent us a response commenting on the various recommendations in the report, and we've made plans to meet with the board and discuss both reports. At the time, though, no information has come to us that would lead us to want to change that earlier decision.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister had any recent discussion with federal officials with regard to the funding of the repairing of the Bassano Dam?

MR. RUSSELL: No, Mr. Speaker. We're covered in our earlier agreement, whereby the federal government undertakes 100 per cent funding for that project.

#### **Women in Public Service Management**

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to provide the answer to a question asked of me during question period on March 8 by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. He asked whether I had any figures indicating the success rate of the personnel planning and career development unit, which is in the personnel administration office. One of its functions is to endeavor to increase the number of women in the public service holding senior managerial positions.

I have now obtained those figures, Mr. Speaker, and am advised that as of December 30, 1977, there were 182 women in managerial positions in the Alberta public service. That included persons occupying the Senior Officer I, Senior Officer II, E.O. I, and E.O. II positions. In addition, a number of women occupied a variety of senior positions in other areas, including deputy ministers. Those figures I've just given would include boards, agencies, and commissions under the purview of The Public Service Act.

By way of comparison, Mr. Speaker, I got the figures for July 1975, and find there has been what I regard as the most encouraging and impressive increase since that time, in that we now have 73 per cent more women in those managerial positions than we had in July 1975.

I would like to conclude by announcing a first for treasury branches, in that within the past couple of

weeks, we appointed the first woman manager of a treasury branch at Nanton, Alberta.

#### **Brucellosis**

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. Member for Lacombe asked me some questions with regard to brucellosis control. I'd like to provide the following brief information. On January 1, 1977, there were 66 herds under quarantine. At the present time, some 15 months later, 33 herds are under quarantine in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, new brucellosis regulations are to become effective April 1. The heart of the regulations is designating provinces as either brucellosis-free, low incidence area, or undesignated area. Alberta will be a low incidence area, and will not be greatly affected by the new regulations. However, the new regulations will have a profound effect on livestock movements in Ontario and Quebec, which will be undesignated areas, and between those two provinces and the rest of Canada. In that case all females sold in those two provinces must have brucellosis certification before they leave the farm. They must also be certified as having had two herd tests, with no additions in between, to move from the undesignated area to another province designated as a low incidence or brucellosis-free area.

#### **Red Deer College** (continued)

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, in case there's any question about the financing of a liquor lounge at the Red Deer College, in a discussion between the hon. Member for Lacombe, my colleague the hon. Solicitor General, and me, I want to make it clear that the lounge, if that were to occur, would have to be entirely financed by the students. Even though that is the case, the application would have to be made on behalf of the college by the Board of Governors of that college. At the present time, the Alberta Liquor Control Board has no such application from the board.

#### **Postsecondary Facilities**

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question to the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker — and I'd like to apologize to the minister. I asked if there were any additional facilities in Mill Woods. I meant to ask: are new facilities going to be built in Sherwood Park? Land was set aside last year, and I'd like to know if the minister considered a new facility in Sherwood Park.

DR. HOHOL: That consideration had been made in a tentative way by people from Grant MacEwan, Sherwood Park, and our department. As the discussion progressed, it became clear that the municipality was not in a position to relinquish the land, that it wasn't large enough for a college, and that it had purposes of its own for that particular land. On a long-term basis, the issue of a college or some kind of postsecondary institution in that area is not a closed issue; but that particular site, that particular college or campus is.

MR. ASHTON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Have there been any requests for a Grant MacEwan college in Fort Saskatchewan?

DR. HOHOL: Not yet, sir. [interjections]

#### **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Drumheller, the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, has asked me to announce that the first and organizational meeting of the committee will be held on Wednesday, March 22, at 10 a.m.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I move . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I think the hon. Member for Stony Plain has a point of order.

MR. PURDY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to make a correction to Hansard ['blues'] of March 20, when I participated in the budget debate. While dealing with electrical power developments in Alberta, I stated, the Alberta Power proposal near Sheerness, and it should have read, "the development near Genesee".\*

#### **head: WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I move that Question 121 stand.

[Motion carried]

#### **head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS**

111. Dr. Buck moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

- (1) a listing by government department, board, agency, or commission of all public money paid or agreed by contract to be paid to all newspapers during the year ending March 31, 1977, for the purpose of publicizing any activity or program or disseminating any information to the public, but excluding therefrom the cost of publicizing government personnel requirements;
- (2) a listing by department, board, agency, or commission of all public money paid or agreed by contract to be paid during the year ending March 31, 1977, to all radio and television companies for the purposes set out in (1);
- (3) a listing by department, board, agency, or commission of all public relations firms employed by said departments during the year ending March 31, 1977, and the amount of money which each firm has been paid in the year ending March 31, 1977, for the purposes of preparing or assisting in the preparation of material which has been distributed to newspapers and television and radio stations for the purposes set out in (1).

[Motion carried]

113. Mr. R. Speaker moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing all payments of public funds to any and all media sources for the advertisement of the various activities of the fall 1977 tour of the provincial cabinet to southern Alberta.

\*See page 307, left column, first paragraph



[Motion carried]

116. Dr. Buck moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:
- (1) the number of studies contracted by Department of Business Development and Tourism during the fiscal years 1976-77 and 1977-78 (to date),
  - (2) the individual or corporation to whom each of these contracts was awarded,
  - (3) the research objective of each contract,
  - (4) the dollar value of each contract.

[Motion carried]

119. On behalf of Mr. Clark, Dr. Buck moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing, with reference to the health facility construction cost analysis study, the following information:
- (a) the names of all firms which
    - (1) conduct the research, and
    - (2) prepared the published report, on behalf of the Alberta Hospital Services Commission;
  - (b) the amounts paid by the government of Alberta for services rendered by each of the firms as outlined in (a).

[Motion carried]

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the hon. member Mr. Clark is not here and would like to move an amendment, I ask that Motion 120 be held.

[Motion carried]

#### head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

204. Moved by Mr. Taylor:
- Be it resolved that the government of Alberta give consideration to the adoption of the automatic assumption principle in Workers' Compensation, under which a miner who has been exposed to coal dust or rock dust for a period of 20 years or more and who is suffering from loss of lung function, be given the benefit of any doubt which may exist as to the cause of the lung condition and compensated accordingly for either pneumoconiosis or silicosis.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The first item I would like to mention is that the automatic assumption principle has been recognized in The Workers' Compensation Act. I refer to Section 16(2):

Where a worker is found dead at a place where the worker had a right during the course of his employment to be, it shall be presumed that his death was the result of personal injury by accident arising out of and during the course of his employment, unless there is evidence sufficient to rebut that presumption.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution asks the same automatic assumption for black lung.

While I have included "pneumoconiosis or silicosis", actually silicosis has no statute of limitations under the present act. Silicosis is covered in the act to a good degree. Providing there's two years exposure to dust or silica, and the lungs show the neces-

sary scars, et cetera, silicosis is accepted by the Workers' Compensation Board.

Now with black lung it is a different matter entirely. Within the act there is a statute of limitations of one year, and the board can waive that one year. But I certainly think the statute of limitations should be amended, eliminating that one year in connection with black lung.

Pneumoconiosis may cover a number of lung diseases, but today I'm confining my remarks generally to what is known in coal mining as black lung. Black lung occurs when coal dust that irritates the lungs eventually forms scars that destroy the lung tissue and surrounding blood tissue. This either prevents air from getting to the lungs or prevents air in the lungs from getting into the bloodstream. The disease also causes heart attacks, because the heart must work harder to force the lungs to function. Black lung or pneumoconiosis is caused by breathing coal dust for long periods of time, and it is incurable. According to the West Virginia Black Lung Association:

Many of those fortunate to survive in the mines, where the accident rate is double that of any other occupation, die slowly from 'black lung', an occupational disease that slowly incapacitates and finally kills.

Dusts usually cause disease only in the lungs. This resolution is vitally important to all people in our coal mines who must work in dust, or people who must work in dust outside the coal mines. It's not only applicable to coal mines, but the disease is found largely in coal mines. One of these lung diseases is called pneumoconiosis. It's derived from the Greek words *pneumo*, which means lung; *konis*, meaning dust; and *osis*, meaning reaction. So the dust gets into the lungs and causes a reaction.

In her book *Work is Dangerous to Your Health*, Dr. Jean M. Stelman points out that particle size affects the toxicity of dust. The smaller the particle, the further down into the lungs it can go, and the greater the amount of dust that will be retained in the body. I think that statement by Dr. Stelman is very important: the finer the dust, the further down it goes into the lungs, and the greater the amount of dust that will be retained in the body.

Dust particles may be so small that they are visible only by microscopic analysis, and that's another point I very definitely want to deal with in a moment or so. Particles this small behave essentially like air, passing practically unimpeded through the protective barriers of hair and mucus in the upper airways. Therefore, air sacs and small air tubes receive a very large dose, and the intensity of lung reaction is greater than if the same quantity of larger particles had been inhaled.

Loss of lung function should be differentiated from ordinary chronic lung disease. The loss of lung function referred to is impairment in the ability to oxygenate the blood, and not simply a chronic airway disease. Anthracite or hard coal which contains silica causes the lung disease called silicosis, which shows up on X rays fairly early. I suppose that is why the act has a two-year period of working in silica. Lung impairment is a major consequence of much occupational disease, including black lung.

Exposure to coal dust, particularly soft coal dust, causes simple pneumoconiosis or black lung. Large amounts of black dust are deposited in the lungs,

especially at the ends of the small air tubes just before the end of the air sacs. Dr. Stelman writes:

The peculiar location and the properties of the dust itself give the disease the characteristics both of bronchitis and emphysema, and of silicosis. Like emphysema, it shows up late or not at all on chest X-rays, and most simple lung function tests. Like silicosis, it leads to lung scarring, which makes the lung stiff and may lead to heart strain.

I want to stop there for a moment or so. Many of our miners feel that doctors diagnose black lung as bronchitis or emphysema. In many, many cases, X rays do not show anything in connection with black lung unless it's very far advanced. Consequently using X rays to determine black lung is not in accordance with the best medical evidence; it does not reveal whether a man has black lung or pneumoconiosis or something else. This resolution would say that if a man who has worked in soft coal dust in a mine for a period of 20 years or more, has a loss of lung function, unless it can definitely be shown it is due to something else, it would be assumed to be black lung, and he would be placed on compensation.

Twenty years is a very, very fair period in connection with black lung. Dr. Stelman writes that sometimes complicated pneumoconiosis "results when the small scars of simple pneumoconiosis join together to form large masses of scar tissue".

Since its inception, the Alberta Workers' Compensation Board has accepted permanent disabilities in miners with lung diseases related to pneumoconiosis. As far as I've been able to ascertain, black lung is not mentioned in The Workers' Compensation Act, but it is included in pneumoconiosis. The board tells me many people are receiving permanent pensions, and some widows are receiving pensions. The sheet put out by the board, entitled Enumeration of Industrial Diseases, includes

... pneumoconiosis, including interalial silicosis, silico-tuberculosis, and anthracosilicosis, asbestosis, and all chronic changes in the lung induced by the prolonged inhalation of dust of a non-living character.

A lady in Canmore, who made a very careful study of black lung in order to get her master's degree, issued her report in December 1977. In this report she tells of a man in Canmore who has worked underground for 34 years and has been exposed to high levels of rock and coal dust. Because it did not show up on the X ray, or because doctors thought it was emphysema or something else not due to mining, he was not placed on compensation until after four years of continual medical examinations.

I want to emphasize that after many miners die a very great amount of black lung shows in the autopsy. At that time, it doesn't do the man much good. If you go to any coal-mining area in the province where mines have been working for years, you will find a number of miners who have lung deficiencies or loss of function of the lung. If that loss of function is due to something else that can definitely be shown, the automatic principle would not be established. But if it can't, it would be automatically assumed that loss of lung function came from working in the mine.

The Workers' Compensation Board insists the miner's loss of function is not related to his working environment. This is the case in quite a number of

coal mine cases. The board, working on medical evidence, claims the loss of function is not due to the fact he has been breathing a vast amount of small dust for a period of years. In many cases it is lumped with other chest disabilities and aggravated by chronic conditions.

The secretary-treasurer of Canmore UMW Local No. 7297 stated in a letter to me:

- (a) Some miners in Canmore who show signs of shortness of breath, coughing, and in two recent cases, a positive reaction to tests for tuberculosis, are repeatedly denied compensation for their disabilities.

Perhaps it is due to the fact this doesn't show up on X rays, and the board depends on medical evidence for compensation. Dr. Riva continues:

- (b) Numerous problems turn up in this small mining operation in connection with our workers' attempts to provide proof ... of black lung.
- (c) If a survey were ever taken throughout the other coal fields in Alberta with special emphasis placed on the older miners it would not be surprising to find the numbers who are crippled from lung disorders.
- (d) Every second miner who has worked 20 years or more in a coal mine and has retired certainly has a degree of disability known as black lung.

It took four years for one miner to prove he had black lung, and then he received a pension of \$52.50. In '53 the medical report said, your condition has not disabled [you] from employment. In '74 the report said, you have a disability attributable to your employment in the coal-mining industry.

Another miner had a different diagnosis since 1961 — asthma, bronchitis, emphysema. In 1977 the doctor said it was due to cigarette smoking. Yet this miner has worked for more than 20 years in our coal mines and was denied compensation.

In the U.S.A. over 100,000 coal miners suffer from industrial disease known as black lung. The cause, of course, is the inhalation of coal dust. This dust is retained in large amounts in the lungs and results in scarring. As scarring increases, the small scars join together and, in doing so, rip the walls of the air sacs in the lungs. The lungs become stiff and unable to function efficiently. As a result emphysema develops, and this often leads to heart strain. In North America over 4,000 workers die every year as a result of black lung. This disease is incurable. Workers who develop it and remain in dust exposure will just deteriorate. The man who gets black lung will suffer with it the rest of his life.

One nice thing about this is that black lung can be prevented. In an attempt to stop the increasing incidence of black lung, the U.S. government in its coal-mining act has adopted a standard of two milligrams of dust for every cubic metre of air. Intensive studies into the problem have shown that in the future this will eliminate most cases. In Europe, governments have also set standards, although not as stringent as those in the U.S.A. In Great Britain, checks have shown that men who were denied compensation on grounds that they did not suffer from black lung were subsequently shown, through autopsy, to have that disease.

One stumbling block is the reading of the chest X

rays. All applicants with black lung are first judged by X-ray plates. Dr. Rasmussen of the Appalachian Pulmonary Laboratory in Berkeley, West Virginia, has stated:

There is no correlation between what one sees on the X-rays so far as pneumoconiosis is concerned, and the loss of function or symptom. What the X-ray fails to show is the presence of destruction of lung tissue which you can see in autopsies.

Many miners who display the symptoms of silicosis and pneumoconiosis or black lung, particularly black lung, are rejected on the basis of X-ray plates.

In West Virginia, where automatic assumption is law, a man is compensated:

if he displays loss of lung function, and has a diagnosis compatible with [black lung or] pneumoconiosis, and has worked 10 out of the past 15 years in the mine.

The principle of compensating a man for loss of lung function after 20 years service without having to prove pneumoconiosis has been endorsed in West Virginia.

In the interests of the coal miners who spend 20 years of their lives in the bosom of the earth, working in very, very, great masses of dust, I would ask hon. members that this resolution be adopted in order that the government may consider establishing the automatic assumption principle for black lung.

MR. DONNELLY: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to participate in the debate on Motion 204, proposed by the Member for Drumheller. If I may take some freedom at this point, knowing the Member for Drumheller will sit through the total debate when he's not feeling well: if he feels he would be better to leave and read it in *Hansard*, I won't feel bad.

Mr. Speaker, I would agree basically with the intent of the motion, but I would like to submit some variations as to its possible implementation. I will also be introducing a minor amendment to the motion.

In regard to the motion, there is little doubt in my mind that underground miners who have been employed for 20 years or more were exposed to very hazardous conditions of dust and fumes in the earlier years. In recent years improved ventilation systems and provision of personal protective devices have reduced the hazard significantly. It would not be unreasonable to adopt for old-timers a presumptive clause that disability is caused by a lung condition.

Mr. Speaker, if this motion is adopted — and I agree with the motion — it would be my recommendation that the worker should receive a lifetime disability award of a percentage equal to the proportion that is medically assessed as being directly caused by employment, as it compares with his overall disability; that the balance of disability be presumed to be related to employment, and a proportionate supplementary award be paid to age 65.

I say this because we should be aware that some of the cause of the ailment happens with everyday activities we all participate in. As an example, if the overall assessed disability is 100 per cent, and the assessed disability because of working conditions is pegged at 25 per cent and the remaining 75 per cent is due to other causes, I feel that the permanent pension award of 25 per cent be charged to the experience account of the employer. The remaining

cost of 75 per cent of the supplementary award would be charged to the reserve for enhanced disabilities, to which industry as a whole contributes. At the age of 65 the worker would revert to only his permanent award, but would of course be eligible for an old-age security pension.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm agreeing that if it's assessed that the man has 100 per cent disability, we should look after him to age 65. Then at age 65, when he is eligible for security pensions and so on, he should be paid worker's compensation on the assessed medical value.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned earlier I would be introducing an amendment to the motion, and I would like to do that at this time. My amendment is:

Be it resolved that the motion be amended by striking out "either pneumoconiosis or silicosis" and substituting "obstructive airway disease."

Mr. Speaker, I put forward this amendment for two reasons. One, I find two of the last four words particularly difficult to pronounce. Secondly, and more seriously, it expands the area of lung disease conditions. And with today's advances in the medical field, I feel it is a necessary amendment. Also it is a term I would like to see workers' compensation boards across Canada adopt for the good of our past and present miners.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: May I draw to the attention of hon. members who may not yet have had an opportunity to read or fully consider the amendment, that what is now before the House is the narrow question as to whether this motion should read as it originally reads or whether the words at the end, the last four words, "either pneumoconiosis or silicosis", should be struck out and replaced by the expression "obstructive airway disease". That is the narrow question now before the House: which of those two expressions should remain in the motion. Once the House has decided whether or not that substitution is to take place, we may proceed with the debate on the main motion or on the main motion as amended.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order just for clarification. In view of the fact that the terminology in the amendment is similar in many respects, resulting in lung disfunction, and recognizing that pneumoconiosis, silicosis, and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, in fact, have a similar problem, would the Speaker consider allowing a wider range debate, because in fact we are discussing the same thing, but one may not want to go on one or the other side of the amendment at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm in the hands of the Assembly. We're going to try to follow good procedure, of course. And, as the hon. member knows, the *Standing Orders* provide that a member moving an amendment may speak to the amendment and the main motion in one speech. Once the amendment has been moved, and until it has been disposed of, all speakers thereafter must confine their offerings to the House to the narrow issue of the amendment. I think it might perhaps be sound if we follow that long-proven, time-tested way of dealing with it.

because in that way we'll have the greatest clarity of debate and perhaps the clearest result.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the amendment. I think the two terms are synonymous, but the part that worries me a little is that pneumoconiosis and silicosis are the words used in the act and are the words that today are interpreted to mean black lung or silicosis.

Another problem that bothers me a little too is that pneumoconiosis may very well include other lung diseases under the compensation act; "obstructive airway disease" may or may not include black lung. I think it would, but to be absolutely certain I think if we use the term the board is using, there'll be no misinterpretation.

MR. KIDD: Mr. Speaker, while I appreciate the amendment by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, I think that to spend time on the narrow amendment in this House would not fulfill the real purpose of the motion. Therefore I propose that we do not accept the amendment.

[Motion on amendment lost]

MR. KIDD: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to participate in the debate on this motion, and I congratulate the hon. Member for Drumheller who proposed the motion. Again, I hope he doesn't feel he needs to be here; I know he would be if he were feeling better.

Mr. Speaker, this motion refers specifically to miners, and to this province that means primarily coal mining. In my view dramatic developments will occur in Alberta in both strip and underground coal mining in the next few years. So maybe in this House, to get the members' full attention, we might suppose our sons and grandsons are going to be involved in that underground coal mining. I think that puts a little different slant on it for everybody, if we think of it in those terms.

Again I want to congratulate the hon. Member for Drumheller on this very important motion, and I look forward to the participation of many members. It is an important debate.

Mr. Speaker, I was raised in a coal-mining town, and the prevalent belief in the town at that time was that coal dust was not injurious, that the only way you got lung disease was through hard rock, through silica. In fact the coal miners brought forth the argument that they liked coal mining because coal dust did not hurt you. You know, that's very strange because Emile Zola, in his 1880 novel *Germinal*, described in great detail the horrors of breathing and coughing disabilities in coal miners at that time.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's been a long and arduous process right up to the present time to bring the effects of this disease, which can be of major significance. In fact it may be the single most important occupational disease in North America. Right here in Alberta at this time, with the low in our underground coal mining, it doesn't appear to be that important. It's certainly important to those few who are affected. But when we think of the several hundreds of thousands of miners who are involved in North America, that's why it's probably the most important occupational disease.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Drumheller

described the disease at some length. However, because of its importance, perhaps a little repetition may not be out of order at this time. We spoke of terms. Now with due respect, pneumoconiosis, as defined in 1971 by the International Labour Office — in other words the international definition — is: the accumulation of dust in the lungs and the resulting tissual reaction to its presence. Pneumoconiosis is the all-inclusive term which in fact includes silicosis, asbestosis, [byssinosis], and many other effects. It is the all-inclusive term.

Coal workers' pneumoconiosis, which is called black lung — and because of some developments in the United States, which I'll just speak on briefly, you have to be very careful in that regard. Due to recent legislation in West Virginia, black lung is accepted as any sort of disability which really requires no medical evidence whatsoever. So let's just call it coal workers' pneumoconiosis.

It's diagnosed as a disorder of the respiratory system occurring in persons exposed to coal dust, and is presently attributable to its inhalation. Now the diagnosis of coal workers' pneumoconiosis is usually considered to require a history of exposure to coal dust for 10 to 20 years, and an X ray showing fine stippling in the lung field arrayed in a characteristic fashion. Based on X-ray analysis, simple CWP is defined in various stages on the basis of non-coalesced dust particles, separate little dust particles in the lungs.

Complicated pneumoconiosis is where dust particles are coalesced, such as solid masses of what appears to be scar tissue, to which the term "progressive massive fibrosis" has been given. Each year about 2 per cent of simple pneumoconiosis cases develop PMF, progressive massive fibrosis, and it is progressive. When you have PMF, progression occurs after you leave the mine. It continues and gets worse.

Repeating what the hon. member from Drumheller said, and this is very important: X-ray evidence of coal workers' pneumoconiosis does not correlate well with dyspnea, which is labored breathing with coughing, sputum, and pulmonary function detriment, until the latter stages of simple CWP or progressive massive fibrosis is reached. Dyspnea — coughing, sputum, reduced lung capacity — is what bothers the individual. Mr. Speaker, therein lies the crux of the problem. Let me repeat it: X-ray evidence of coal workers' pneumoconiosis does not correlate well with labored breathing, coughing, sputum, and pulmonary function detriment until the latter stages.

Mr. Speaker, the provincial board of health regulations in this province require that every person engaged in any occupation where he is or may be exposed to the inhalation of any substance which may produce fibrosis of the lungs shall submit, not less than once every two years, to an examination, to include an X-ray and a pulmonary function test. This requirement was introduced in 1971; not very long ago, in terms of the age of the coal-mining industry.

These tests are generally performed by the local or company doctor. Where such an examination shows disability, the individual involved may make a claim to the Workers' Compensation Board. Also, any worker at any time may make a claim to the Workers' Compensation Board. If considered justifiable, in the case of lung disability the miner is given a thorough examination. I am informed, and I accept that infor-

mation, that such lung examinations, carried out by a board of Workers' Compensation doctors at the University Hospital, are exhaustive and may take two or three days. They rank with the best in the world.

Mr. Speaker, all our lungs degrade to some degree as we get older. That's a fact of life. The medical examiners have the responsibility of deciding whether a miner's degradation in lung capacity is due to his occupation or to external causes, such as heavy smoking. I am assured that X rays alone are not taken as the criterion. But pulmonary function alone can form the basis for the examining doctors' judgment whether compensation is justified; that's where the Workers' Compensation Board does the examination.

Mr. Speaker, with due respect I think it's important to make this statement: it's inconceivable to me that any medical practitioner would be biased against the patient in such instances; that they would, and do, give the miner the benefit of the doubt. I think it's an extremely important fact that as normal human beings as well as good doctors they do give the miner the benefit of the doubt.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe we can lay the responsibility entirely at the feet of the medical profession, or change their procedures very much by this motion. Concerning the comments by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, I have great difficulty with his motion, where we're laying at the feet of medical doctors the responsibility to assess the degree of disability: 20 per cent caused by the mine, 80 per cent caused by heavy smoking. I think that is a very difficult portion of the recommendation of the hon. Member for Calgary Millican. I do appreciate the thought he has put into it.

Mr. Speaker, we are really talking about the responsibility and debt which society as a whole owes to those engaged in this hazardous occupation. Surely the total benefits to humans of mining coal are only justifiable in relation to the effects on those who perform the work. Again, think in terms of your sons and grandsons working in those mines. But I make that point with regard to this motion and the implication of this motion. I don't believe we can lay it at the feet of the medical society as a whole. I think we are talking about society's obligations to the miners, and I think that must be an integral part of the motion.

Mr. Speaker, the real answer is prevention. Is it inconceivable that we could have an underground mine, say at Drumheller, where the coal-mining machine is enclosed so the miner can wear a white shirt when he goes into the mine, and still have a white shirt when he comes out? It isn't inconceivable because it's happening right now with the new mine Esso opened up in Illinois. Those things can happen, given the justification. Is it impossible to reduce the level of respirable dust to one milligram per cubic centimetre. If you look at the curves — and there are several of them — at about two milligrams of such dust per cubic centimetre, the probability of lung damage is about zero. Can we look at reducing it to one? Mr. Speaker, with such measures, could we not plan right now so that pneumoconiosis will be entirely eliminated in a few short years?

This motion impinges on many aspects of the manner in which coal miners are treated, not the least of which is the level of their retirement benefits. It seems to me that careful consideration . . .

I have a correction here. It's milligrams per cubic metre. I'm talking about a reduction of one milligram per cubic metre. Thank you for correcting me.

As I say, this motion impinges on many aspects of the manner in which coal miners are treated, not the least of which is the measure of their retirement benefits. It seems to me that careful consideration must be given to where compensation applies and where a good level of retirement benefits apply. Also, I wonder whether such a motion could be practical unless either limited to those who have worked 20 years in Alberta mines, or the motion applies across Canada. All these factors need careful consideration. Indeed, that is what is being asked by the mover: consideration to all facets of the problem.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think this motion is extremely important. Its importance relates to the fact that we're embarking on a great enlargement of all our coal mining in Alberta. Twenty years from now I'm sure we'll see highly efficient underground mines in Drumheller and many other places. So, Mr. Speaker, I support this motion and ask other members to do so also.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, in rising to say a few words on the resolution by the Member for Drumheller, I would say that at the present time I don't have any underground mines in my constituency. That isn't to say we don't have a large amount of coal in that particular area. As the Member for Banff has just pointed out, 20 or 30 years down the road we could have large areas in the province that will produce coal for use here as well as in the rest of the world.

The resolution the Member for Drumheller has worded talks about automatic assumption. I was interested in the remarks he made, because he did indicate that the term, or the intent of the term, is already in The Workers' Compensation Act. My understanding is that it has been interpreted quite narrowly. He cited a particular case where a miner was found deceased and the automatic assumption clause came into effect.

Perhaps I could say, Mr. Speaker, and it hasn't been mentioned in speaking to the resolution: perhaps we should give consideration as well to some of the other diseases that occur after 20 years in a particular industry or operation. I say that in all sincerity because I know, and medical evidence indicates, that we do have industrial diseases that occur because of situations under which employees work.

Just to cite a few: one in particular that I am concerned about is the present debate over the effect of grain dust on the different air passages of the body. We have a large number of elevator systems throughout the province, and it has only recently been brought to the attention of Workers' Compensation and the people of the province how detrimental and serious this grain dust can be. Recent amendments and requirements under federal law are causing a considerable tightening up of the equipment and methods used to control dust in our grain elevator system, also in our feed mill operations. There is considerable resistance by industry to these rather costly corrections in their operation. The pool elevator system has expressed considerable concern to the federal government with regard to what they may have to do to change their system to make it safer for

employees, in dealing with dust and its consequent problems of bronchitis and emphysema, to mention just two.

Most of the new elevator systems are now required to include dust control in their construction. I note one that was recently built by the Alberta Wheat Pool in Bentley, one of the small villages in my own constituency. They have included quite an elaborate system of dust control. I'm not yet sure how successful that particular system will be. It will be interesting to know, because a lot of this is really in the experimental stage.

We're running across hearing problems in industry, particularly in agriculture. One could probably go into some of the senior lodges or nursing homes in our province and readily identify the kinds of industrial diseases that have happened over a period of years. Anyone with any knowledge of these problems could almost identify, by talking to an individual, the kind of background that person had.

Hearing has been of great concern in the last five or 10 years, particularly on farms. The industry has tried to improve cabs, to cut down noise and vibration. I might say that the earlier cabs created more noise and vibration than if they hadn't existed. There has been a real improvement in that particular area. But the large number of farmers who for long hours operated those tractors and those high-horsepower motors, prior to the use of proper cabs, many of them — perhaps I should say many of us — suffered from that high decibel sound; some more than others.

The Member for Innisfail is not here right now, but I don't think I'm telling tales out of school when I say that one of the standard practices was to remove the muffler from the tractor in order to get more horsepower. The Member for Innisfail has often mentioned this was one of his practices in the early days. He said that's probably one of the reasons he suffers some hearing disability at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, that leads to this point with regard to the motion put forth by the Member for Drumheller: the responsibility of both the employer and the employee to make sure the proper procedures are used to protect oneself from some of these disabilities. I have been in a number of situations where I've watched employees working; they're required to wear hard helmets, and they're not wearing them; they're required, under the Compensation Board, to wear covering over their faces, and they don't have it. So when we move in the direction of automatic assumption, I think we have to be careful that we have ensured that, through the years, the employees have followed very carefully the minimum requirements laid down by Workers' Compensation.

I think workers' compensation is a great program. I regret very much that as yet our farm people have not been enticed into taking out workers' compensation. But someone suggested that they are the last vestige of free enterprise, that the employee take care of himself the way the employer has, and that he sees no reason for workers' compensation. That is not to say we don't have a fair number of programs on our farms for protection of the employee. Many of the larger and more successful farm operators do carry liability to protect themselves against lawsuit, which they wouldn't really have to have if they could be encouraged to possibly look at workers' compensation.

Several other diseases I would like to see included in any kind of automatic assumption amendments to the compensation act would be the problem of asbestos damage to the lungs, which I think the Member for Drumheller alluded to, and the problems of some of the chemicals we handle that cause long-term disability. In particular I'm thinking of one we've hopefully eliminated to some degree, and that is mercury poisoning. I'm sure some of our senior citizens today are suffering from improper use of minerals such as mercury.

The other pretty serious kind of industrial disease which I know is very difficult to identify is the common disease known as cancer. Just recently I read of a case in British Columbia where the worker was successful in making a claim because of the incidence of cancer and was awarded accordingly because of some particular chemicals they were working with in the industry in which he was occupied.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to see perhaps a broadening of this motion. I certainly support the intent of the hon. Member for Drumheller.

I also know we should look very carefully at the economics of the thing. I was in an industry until a year or two ago, where the employer paid up to 15 per cent to cover themselves against injury or accident. There is a point where the cost becomes excessive. Now one can argue that no cost is excessive if the revenue from it is used to help someone suffering from an industrial disease. I think there are arguments on both sides. I would suggest one has to move very, very carefully in this particular area. Because of the other possible diseases one could include under this, we could broaden the requirements to such a degree that the economics of the thing would just erode.

So, while just simply alerting the Legislature to those possibilities, I support the intent of the motion.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, as I rise to speak on this motion in support of assistance to workers and specifically to miners, may I congratulate the hon. Member for Drumheller, the hon. senior member and most respected member of this Legislature, who has brought forward this motion for the Legislature to consider, for our workers, our miners.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to serve on two select committees of the Workers' Compensation Board, one with the hon. Member for Drumheller and the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, and I can assure you that their concerns and my concerns did not go unheard in those hearings during our deliberations. I also would like to congratulate the hon. members for Banff, Drumheller, and Lacombe for that matter, for giving their medical and technical overviews on this particular matter.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the amendment the hon. Member for Calgary Millican proposed did not alter the main thrust of the motion, although I concede without any hesitation the need for a proper definitive definition, otherwise the compensation board could have difficulty in the vein the hon. Member for Lacombe indicated.

But as I see it, the main thrust of the motion is to follow the principle the Workers' Compensation Board has adopted, certainly since I've been in office;

that is, in any case where there is reasonable doubt, compensation shall be provided for the injured worker, or for his dependants if he dies.

This motion states that a miner exposed to coal dust or rock dust for a period of 20-plus years who suffers from the loss of lung function, he — or she; I suppose "she" is possible in this particular case because, with the advent of the changing work world, I'm sure females will be able to do this too — be given the benefit of doubt as to the cause of the loss of lung function — lung function, Mr. Speaker, or pulmonary function, whatever definition you'd like to use — and be compensated accordingly for the definition covered under the act under pneumoconiosis or silicosis.

Mr. Speaker, by calling it chronic, obstructive lung disease, we're actually expanding it. There is indeed a hazard in that, because as it is we're having difficulty with even the specific at this time. And not only the specific, namely, pneumoconiosis. Silicosis at least has an historical background.

Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment, as I support the notion in the motion, which assumes that the lung problem was indeed caused by coal or rock dust, as the case may be. I have no hesitation in stating that, with the history behind this type of entity known well in North America and around the world, if there is a lung disfunction the worker/miner should be granted a fixed percentage by the compensation board, if not 100 per cent disability depending on what standard we set.

Mr. Speaker, all too often in our society — despite the precise knowledge of a disease and the causative factors, as in the case before us — for some reason many tend to ignore the very, very probable obvious, which in this case would very simply mean loss of lung or pulmonary function. For workers in a coal mine or in a rock dust environment for X years — we're saying 20-plus years — this must be due to this hazardous factor, in large part or at least in some part. I can't believe anyone should argue against that, and no one has. That is a fact, although we all know that chronic, obstructive pulmonary diseases, scarring, and the resultant problems associated with it, which has been described so well by the previous speakers, can be caused by a variety of other factors or combination and varying degrees of those factors; for example, smoking or other forms of inhalants, or aging.

But, Mr. Speaker, the central point here is: we know the miner, the worker, presumably has been exposed. If we don't know, of course how would we give him compensation? The second part is: a long chronic exposure, of 20 years we say — I suggest even 10 years would be adequate — in a coal or rock dust environment will, I suggest unequivocally, play a role, as a matter of fact a major role, in causing pulmonary disfunction and disability. I suggest the statistics prove that, and medical knowledge proves it without any doubt.

Unfortunately, as members of the Legislature know, the final proof all too often comes too late. It comes at post-mortem time, when the pathological microscopic examination reveals that coal or rock dust, or what have you, was the cause.

With these facts in hand, Mr. Speaker, why is there any difficulty in providing compensation? It's an interesting question. I suggest it's just a matter of a judgment decision and a decision by our society, as

we are here in this Legislature today saying that historically we know enough medical information on this and we should make a decision. By bringing this to the floor of this House, I suggest the hon. Member for Drumheller has done a very, very big favor for the workers and miners. It's amazing that this hasn't been done before.

I suggest the assumption that lung disfunction even after exposure for a shorter period of time, 10 years, can be accepted and be compensable. Pneumoconiosis has been stated as a term embracing all chronic changes in the lung induced by so-called non-living inhalants, such as dust and so forth. We know the definition of silicosis: scarring of lung tissue resulting from inhaling silica or silicates; asbestosis, caused by inhaling threads of asbestos; and of course pneumoconiosis, caused by coal workers inhaling coal dust. You can go on and on, Mr. Speaker. The tissue reaction causes scarring and fibrosis. This is documented in every pathology book. Students of medicine know this, and doctors know this. There is definitely loss of function of the lung and resultant pulmonary disfunction and, as the hon. Member for Drumheller has indicated, dyspnea, coughing, heart failure, and eventually death.

So when a diagnosis is made — and one relates this to the history of exposure of 10 or 20 years, and there is obviously then a causative factor — there's no difficulty in receiving compensation. But, Mr. Speaker, all too often, and unfortunately, the investigation is not complete enough or is not adequate. Not adequate and not complete enough to be definitive up to this time unless we bring in this type of an amendment or suggestion within the compensation act.

The history is taken and there is exposure. That's easy. Any member in the House can take that history and say the person has worked in a coal mine and dust environment for 10 or 20 years. X rays may be adequate if the entity is severe enough, and this has already been stated. In other words, it has to be quite severe in most cases before the X-ray diagnosis can definitively say there is disability. But the X ray very often is not adequate. And if scarring is not severe enough to visualize on the X-ray plate, which is, after all, only a picture . . . Yet we know, unfortunately, there can be widespread destruction of the lung tissue and severe damage to that individual.

So with X rays being inadequate in a good percentage of the cases — and it doesn't matter what percentage, a good percentage is significant — one should turn to pulmonary function tests to ascertain the degree of pulmonary disfunction. I suggest that particular testing is very accurate, and it certainly can be utilized to a great degree to measure the degree of disability.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, of course if we want an absolute diagnosis, we have to do a lung biopsy, which is a surgical removal of a portion of the lung tissue, and examine it under a microscope. That will definitively prove it. Unfortunately, as members of the Assembly would understand, many workers fear and shy away from a surgical biopsy, and I can't blame them. However, that is one way the proof can be made without equivocation.

The point here, Mr. Speaker, is that with a history of long exposure and positive X-ray findings, minor or severe — and minor X-ray findings doesn't necessari-

ly mean it's minor involvement; it could be major — plus loss of pulmonary function, that person in fact should be compensated, as the motion states.

The question many can ask is: how much loss of function before compensation should begin? Again the worker is delayed in the decision of compensation. All too often compensation is denied, Mr. Speaker, as we all know.

But today the motion clearly states: exposure 20 years, loss of pulmonary function. I suggest we can establish that — a percentage can be set down arbitrarily — and we compensate. After the history of this particular disease, this problem in our society, I suggest that there should be no difficulty in supporting that kind of motion, providing we define the degree of lung disfunction before compensation is provided. But there should be that history plus some degree of X-ray finding. It would be nice of course to have the lung biopsy and sputum examination to prove and substantiate it, but that should not be necessary to support this type of motion and to provide compensation.

Mr. Speaker, as important as this motion is, I hope that consideration is given to change the workers' compensation rules in another area, to allow cases to be reviewed with no time limitation and no need to report a problem or injury within a specified period of time.

I'm referring here to Section 16(8) of the act, which states:

No compensation shall be paid to a worker unless the claim is made to the Board by the worker within one year of the date of the accident.

Mr. Speaker, that concerns me, because there are many, many new hazards in our industry, the one talked about today in the motion being one. But many other problems or hazards in industry are not necessarily known at this time, which I suggest in the future can become information that has resulted in diseases and problems, injury to the worker. I suggest we should modify the rules of the compensation board, to allow a worker who can show, even many, many years after working in that area, that he has been exposed to an industrial hazard, to apply for compensation and be heard if he can prove the work environment caused the problem. This of course includes such things as chemicals, as we've indicated before, and in this House previously we've heard of exposure to asbestosis and the problems related to that.

So in summary, Mr. Speaker, I suggest we consider changes in the compensation act to allow any case, any time, to be heard for the first time if a causative, industrial factor can be established to result in ill health, injury, death, which then should be compensated. Because of our modern world, changing factors, the thousands of chemicals, the variety of environmental exposures, and the knowledge that this in fact happens and is continuing to happen, I suggest the worker should have the privilege of bringing this to the compensation board at any time in the future if a causative relationship can be established.

Number two: because ample evidence shows that coal and rock dust are a direct cause of pulmonary disfunction and disability — and this has been established over many years — after a period of time, even 10 years would be acceptable, where there is lung disfunction I'd suggest that compensation should in-

deed be provided, with the caveat that a definitive history of exposure has been made and that lung disfunction occurs to a substantive degree or an X degree that should be established. Truly, Mr. Speaker, a positive approach to help our workers and our miners who all too often, through no fault of their own, are seriously hurt or die, and make our society a better place deserve that kind of approach.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest the assumptive diagnosis in the case discussed in this motion today is hardly an assumption at all. With the information we have, not only presented here but in document after document in the library and medical circles, for practical purposes it is a fact that if you're exposed to this thing over a long period of time, disfunction occurs, is a disability, and compensation should be provided.

The hon. Member for Banff indicated and covered the area of prevention, which must certainly be the most important area. In our modern technology and information, prevention has to be the most important aspect here, to prevent such tragedies that we have in our society. No compensation, Mr. Speaker, will be sufficient when the person reaches the stage that has been discussed here of a serious pulmonary disfunction, because he is on a slide downhill, and his disability is so severe that compensation in dollars merely makes it slightly more pleasant.

On a note of caution, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. Member for Lacombe indicated this already, such a judgment of automatic assumption should only be included in the act after we have a long history and an adequate body of expert medical or industrial knowledge of the entity. In this case, that is so. I suggest that in the future, if any other entities are brought into this automatic assumption notion which is in the motion, if a wide body of industrial and medical experts can show there should be an automatic assumption rule for any industrial disease, we must have a very high probability of accuracy that in fact there is a causative relationship. In other words, there should not be an automatic assumption rule for any other particular diseases unless we have that historical background over many years or many cases.

Of course, in the case of the discussion today I'm confident that is not the situation. We have that background. I'm suggesting that this body of knowledge from these experts should be canvassed on every new entity that is brought in under the act. In other words, we can be very confident that the automatic assumption factor has a high probability of accuracy and that this really caused the problem.

Mr. Speaker, with these comments I encourage members of the Assembly to read over the motion again. Draw your own conclusions, but I ask you to support the motion.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm certainly pleased to be able to participate this afternoon in this debate on an important topic which affects a number of the constituents I represent. I'd like to congratulate the hon. Member for Drumheller for bringing this motion forward at this time. It's certainly timely. I'd like to congratulate him on the excellent presentation he made. This afternoon a number of hon. members have spoken and have covered a number of different aspects with regard to this resolution — the effects of loss of lung function on coal miners.



I have visited with senior citizens in the lodge in the Crowsnest Pass. A number of them have been coal miners, and it is certainly evident to me that they have suffered from a loss of lung function. The resolution brought forward today by the hon. Member for Drumheller recognizes that and brings forward the principle that there should be an automatic assumption clause in The Workers' Compensation Act to compensate these people, recognizing that they've been underground for 20 years or more. I can certainly sympathize with the disabled coal miners in my constituency who have suffered from a loss of lung function after having worked underground for a number of years.

As a number of members have mentioned, we have to recognize that conditions in our coal mines today are certainly different from those 20 to 50 years ago — drastic changes, in terms of the requirements of underground mining and safety measures which are taken to try to eliminate coal dust at the face of a mine. But even after those measures have been taken, a great deal of coal dust still exists today at the face of a mine. Within the last five to seven years I have been underground, and certainly a great deal of dust is still there.

In terms of this discussion today, there is a great deal of variance with regard to conditions in individual mines. I can take examples from the constituency which I represent. The Vicary Creek mine seems to have less incidence of coal miners ending up with a loss of lung function compared to the McGillivray coal mine, which was operating 20 years previous. I've talked to some medical people in the constituency, and they've suggested that miners who worked in the McGillivray coal mine, which mined a higher sulphur content coal, experienced a greater degree of loss of lung function than those who worked in the Vicary Creek mine.

When we look at the coal mining picture in the province, we find that a number of miners have moved from mine to mine. It certainly makes a difference whether they spent a great deal of time in one coal mine which perhaps had better operating conditions, or in other mines which had more severe operating conditions. Of course, coal miners who have worked in the hardrock mines in Ontario and have previously been exposed to rock dust and higher silicon content dust have come here. So this has to be taken into consideration.

I think we must also consider the definition of a coal miner. Certainly there are individuals who have worked in surface operations, in tipples, which also create a very high degree of dust content, depending on the area in that surface operation where they have worked. This principle should also extend to those who are exposed to a high degree of coal dust in these surface operations.

Dealing with the remarks made by the hon. Member for Lacombe, I think one may be able to assume that a farmer operating a tractor in a field on a very windy day could be exposed to some very high levels of dust which may also cause fibrosis. Our farmers may also be suffering from similar conditions due to the nature of the area in which they have been operating, particularly in the southern part of the province where a great deal of wind creates a lot of dust.

It's also been suggested to me that dust from soil

perhaps has a more disabling effect than coal dust, because coal is inert to a certain degree whereas dirt contains a number of other bacteria.

The implications of a discussion like this today with regard to people who work in grain elevators — a number of people who have been exposed to grain dust in grain elevators for an extended period of time also suffer a loss of pulmonary function. Similarly, an experience which we really don't have in this province, but in Great Britain individuals who have worked in wool and cotton mills, exposed to fibres in the air, have also developed this fibrosis which has resulted in a loss of lung elasticity.

To a great degree our coal miners, having spent an extended period of time — 20 years or longer — underground, do in fact suffer from a loss of lung function. Depending on where they have worked and under what conditions, that loss of lung function can be minimal, from 10 to 25 per cent, to almost total disability.

I would like to support the motion brought forward today by the hon. Member for Drumheller. In a case where there has been a demonstrable loss of lung function after an extended period of work underground, I think there should be no doubt about it. The benefit of the doubt should be clearly given to the disabled miner, and he should receive a pension accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, I support the motion.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Member for Stony Plain adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

205. Moved by Dr. Walker:

Be it resolved that the government of Alberta consider the introduction of legislation to standardize the requirements for incorporation of a village to the minimum regulations as now required for incorporation of a summer village, thus enabling many hamlets to become eligible for greater autonomy and greater representation on rural municipal councils.

DR. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this motion I would like to explain first of all what a hamlet is. Basically, a hamlet is defined as an area of land that is subdivided into lots and blocks as a townsite, and that plan is then registered in the Land Titles Office. It can also be formed when declared to be a hamlet by an order of the minister.

There are a great number of inequities in our present set-up of hamlets under the jurisdiction of municipalities and counties. Firstly, the assessment on farmland in municipalities and counties is at a basic fixed rate, generally about \$45 an acre, with some extra assessments on irrigated land and other improvements. But there is no assessment on the house or improvements. The assessment on hamlets is done on the lots themselves, the houses, and other improvements; it is made on an assessment done by the Department of Municipal Affairs and relates to the market value of that land, the home, and the buildings. We thus get the ridiculous situation of an empty lot in a little hamlet like Shaughnessy being

assessed at \$14,000. Nobody in his right mind would pay that sort of price for a lot in any hamlet.

When a road past a farm home is paved, there is no change in the assessment of that property, whereas when pavement and sidewalks are installed in a hamlet under the same jurisdiction, a very large frontage tax is applied against the property. When sewer and water are installed, the government portion of the expense is paid directly to the municipality or county and goes into the general revenue, so the hamlet may not get the full benefit of the government grant.

In order to correct this inequity, five municipalities in Alberta have attempted to rationalize their taxation system so that the mill rate applying to a municipality is split, the lesser rate being applied to hamlets rather than to farmland. Not all municipalities do this, nor is there any compulsion for them to make such an arrangement. Many hamlets feel they are being discriminated against, and would be very much happier if they could run their own affairs and make their own mistakes.

At present the requirements for the formation of village status under Section 14 of The Municipal Government Act states:

- upon receipt by the Minister of a petition
  - (i) signed by [a majority] of the proprietary electors thereof, and
  - (ii) accompanied by a plan showing the proposed boundaries of the proposed summer village,

[may] form any summer resort into a summer village if the area that [could] be included in the summer village contains not less than 50 separate buildings, each of which has been occupied as a dwelling at any time during the six-month period preceding the receipt of the petition;

In Section 14(1)(c) the requirements to form an ordinary village other than a summer village are much the same, except that the village must contain "not less than 75 separate buildings ...". Why should we have two differing standards for forming villages in Alberta? Surely we can standardize this procedure; make the requirements for a summer village apply to the requirements for formation of all villages and give hamlets the option of looking after their own affairs or remaining under the jurisdiction of their municipality or county council.

We have reduced the drinking age and the age of majority for our young people. Why not give the same concessions to hamlets and let them form a village at a lesser stage of their development than we heretofore did?

There are a number of dangers in the choice of a hamlet forming into a village. I would briefly refer to them, and would suggest that the possible pitfalls be explained to all hamlets hoping to become villages. Just as young people now get privileges at an earlier age than they used to, if a hamlet chooses to become a village, along with the privileges of being self-governing they must also accept a much greater degree of responsibility, notably in the areas of welfare and health of the inhabitants — including fire protection, sanitation, waste removal, and so on — which are now the responsibility of the municipality in which the hamlet is situated. Many existing villages have great difficulty, handling these responsibilities.

Hamlets should be fully informed before they petition for formation. But in many other cases the election of local residents to form a local government gives the citizens a much more personal awareness of their problems and the ability to deal directly with them. All taxes then levied for municipal purposes and any grants receivable by the village would be applied directly to the services and programs of the local council, instead of only 50 per cent of municipal taxes collected from the hamlet, required under municipality administration.

I must point out, however, that in many hamlets in Alberta, well in excess of this 50 per cent is applied to the hamlet. It must be pointed out to the prospective village that they would require an office and staff for administration, not only of that office itself but they must also provide fire protection, street maintenance, sanitation, recreation, and all the other services ordinarily demanded by residents.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to all hon. members that the requirements for incorporation be reduced to the standard least common denominator now required for summer villages, and allow the citizens to accept responsibility for their own local government.

Thank you.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to say a few words on this motion, I'm not sure if my hon. colleague from Macleod is for or against the motion on his presentation this afternoon.

I'm one of probably two members in this Assembly who lives in a hamlet — and we're certainly over 75 permanent residences in the hamlet of Wabamun. I'm sure the Member for Edmonton Ottewell, living in Sherwood Park — well over 75 separate buildings there. Both communities have made no attempt to go to village status at this time.

The Member for Macleod indicated that some hamlets are being assessed by the provincial government, and he pointed out Shaughnessy in southern Alberta. But in the hamlet where I reside, the assessment is done by the county of Parkland assessment division, and the taxes are collected by the county of Parkland. I'm sure it's the same with Sherwood Park. Now if a hamlet feels it is not getting its fair share of moneys being expended in the town, it can petition, by having 50 per cent of the people sign a petition, for 50 per cent of the moneys collected in taxes last year to be expended the following year for capital maintenance projects.

I look at my constituency of Stony Plain, and I guess we're unique in that in Alberta there are about 35 summer villages. The constituency of Stony Plain has 32 or 33 summer villages, one village, four hamlets, two towns, and part of the city of Edmonton.

Summer villages are mainly a part-time situation where people from the city of Edmonton or some other area may have a summer cabin adjoining one of the major lakes and are there from May to September; the rest of the time the cabin is closed down. As the Member for Macleod said, the criterion to form a summer village is that there must be 50 separate buildings, and all of these do.

I look with interest at the summer villages that have over 50 separate buildings. In my constituency they are Alberta Beach, Seba Beach, and Edmonton Beach. They have a lot more than 50 separate resi-

dences; they are probably up in the 200 to 300 figure, but they have maintained their status quo as summer villages.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the argument I put forth in this Legislature four or five years ago has helped these three villages maintain their separate identity. I argued quite effectively that the summer villages were acting, in a lot of regards, as provincial parks for the urban people from Edmonton and other areas. That way we received a special grant for these villages, and it has helped them maintain that status. They have not sought special village status. We got that grant on the premise that we had the increase overload from the city of Edmonton; they required, therefore, increased policing, garbage collection, and street maintenance.

Summer villages don't have the large tax assessment that most villages do. Mr. Speaker, we have to look at it in this perspective: many villages in the province will have a commercial block, thus enabling the town council to have a higher assessment. But if you look at the 33 summer villages I have, 30 in the Stony Plain constituency don't have any type of industrial or commercial tax base at all. The other three do have some, but it just would not be feasible for the other 30 to go into hamlet or village status.

So I'm saying that if the small summer villages were turned into hamlet status and then made application to become villages, they could not do it without a lot of government assistance. Many of them, if they went from hamlet to village status, are now carrying a high debt load because of water and sewer installations and other things that have been done by the municipality that is responsible for them. They would also have to be responsible for their own policing, if they were over a population of 1,500. If they were under 1,500, they'd have the RCMP contract. The municipality, or the county in this regard, is supplying garbage pick-up. If they went to village status, they'd have to supply their own garbage pick-up, street maintenance, and office and administration staff.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm a little hesitant in supporting the resolution of the Member for Macleod. I think he's picking out a special case in the south part of the province. I'm picking out special cases in the northern part of the province. I'd want to look at this thing in more detail and hear the debate of other members in this Assembly as to what they feel should be done to alleviate some of the problems that may be evident within some of our hamlets and villages in Alberta.

Thank you.

MR. JAMISON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to put an amendment to this resolution. But after what happened this afternoon to the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, I think I'll just speak on the resolution itself.

Mr. Speaker, I too am a little confused as to whether or not the hon. Member for Macleod is for or against the motion. Also I really didn't gain too much from the Member for Stony Plain.

I'd like to give a few examples of why I don't think that going from hamlet to village status is just too great. I think the hon. Member for Macleod pointed out he'd like to have the lowest denominator. It seems to me it's a "me too" sort of resolution. Because we have regulations on summer villages of 50 buildings, and on regular villages on a year-round basis there must be a minimum of 75, we're mixing

apples and oranges.

In the case of summer villages, the people don't need all the things required on a year-round basis. In particular, if you were to go from a hamlet to a village municipality, you'd have the hiring of qualified municipal staff, particularly the municipal administrator, which is extremely difficult, if not impossible, for a small municipality with limited finances. It should be noted that at present there are small municipalities, villages, with small assessments under \$200,000. The turnover of staff in small municipalities is very high, and the resultant lack of continuity creates considerable problems in continuing viable administration.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to point out that today water and sewer are regarded as necessities in our way of life, and the financing of villages for that particular job is very tough. They don't have the borrowing power when they go to the Municipal Financing Corporation, and as a result they continue with their poor water and sewer services.

I'd like to use an example of a hamlet called Vimy, which is 40 miles north of Edmonton, that was going to become a village. They had discussed the possibility of becoming a village and thought they could put in their own sewer service. The cost factor of putting in the sewer made it impossible. So we approached the MD of Westlock, and with their resources and the amount of assessment they had, we were able to install an adequate sewer system for the hamlet of Vimy.

In the case of recreation facilities, once again under regional recreation I think it's working out quite well. Where there are places for recreation facilities, particularly in the regional schools, in a lot of cases that's where the recreation facilities are located.

Mr. Speaker, many existing hamlets in the province of Alberta, either of a permanent or summer resort nature, to date have chosen not to incorporate and because of economics are remaining at their present status. Incorporation is simply not viable for economic reasons. Presently, existing hamlets located within municipal districts or counties can petition the rural municipality, under the authority of Section 268 of The Municipal Government Act, to have at least 50 per cent of the municipal assessment from their hamlet go back into public works.

If a hamlet becomes incorporated into a municipality, it has to have elected representatives. With the small amount of assessment they have, I think this is not feasible. With the tremendous inflation today, I would recommend that rather than go back on the size regulation of 75 units to a village, we would be better going ahead, say up to 150, which would make a viable unit.

Thank you.

MR. ASHTON: Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to participate in the debate today. But when I first heard the word "hamlet" I decided, coming from Sherwood Park, that somehow I have an obligation to say something. I intend to sort of follow the precedent set by some of my colleagues in the debate previous to me and speak neither for nor against the resolution.

I realize the resolution uses the word "consider", asking the government to consider the introduction of legislation, and that the resolution indicates the legis-

lation, if approved, would be permissive. But what concerns me, I suppose, is primarily that the resolution seems to imply some advantages to incorporation as a village, or further on.

I would like to relate the rather unique experience of the hamlet of Sherwood Park within the county of Strathcona structure. As far as I can find out, it is quite unique in North America that such a large urban community, which is approximately the size of Red Deer, would exist without being incorporated and work so well within a county council. It is true that at present there is substantial urban representation on the county council, which has occurred as a result of the co-operation of this government during the last few years. But I should also point out something unique about the county of Strathcona, in that here we have had develop over the last number of years a very major urban community. While most of this development was occurring, it was supervised basically by a rural council. This occurred without fuss, without drama, and with great efficiency.

Compare that type of development with growth which is occurring at a similar rate in the Fort McMurray area. The government felt compelled to pass special legislation dealing with the area. We are constantly hearing about major programs dealing with the Fort McMurray area, and about all the problems that appear to have to be dealt with there. Yet the Sherwood Park experience, as initiated and developed by the county of Strathcona council, occurred without all these problems. As Albertans, I think we owe a debt of gratitude to the Strathcona county council for the fact that they supervised this major development and growth in Alberta without requiring special legislation or programs. It is rather unique.

Going back to my initial remarks, I felt we should review some of the advantages of not incorporating as a village. I asked the hon. member who introduced the motion about this particular item. He also seems to suggest at the end of this motion, that if they incorporate as a village they receive greater representation on rural municipal councils. Well, I suggest that exactly the opposite occurs, because if they incorporate they will no longer have any representation on the rural municipal council. It's very well put to raise the topic for debate, but because the motion seems to imply that hamlets should incorporate, I would have to vote against the motion on the basis that I disagree with the implication.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I also had not intended to get involved in the resolution. But after hearing from a number of the members, I thought it only appropriate that I add a few comments.

After having heard a number of hamlets mentioned in the House: Shaughnessy, Vimy, and some of the smaller ones — Sherwood Park and so on — I thought I should draw the attention of the members of the Assembly to some of the hamlets in my constituency. I'm sure my constituents would have been disappointed had I not, on this opportunity, mentioned the names of some of the communities.

We have an interesting situation along the south shore of Lesser Slave Lake. We have communities of similar size, some incorporated as villages and others as hamlets. I noted, too, in the resolution from the hon. Member for Macleod that there would be no compulsion in this recommendation; it would be the choice of the community. That is only as it should be.

However, in looking at the results, within improvement districts of either hamlets or villages, operating either incorporated or remaining as hamlets, it appears that within improvement districts there is an advantage in remaining a hamlet, depending on the circumstances of the particular settlement, as has been clearly illustrated by the member from Sherwood Park. There are certain advantages that flow to hamlets and certain responsibilities that villages must undertake, once they incorporate.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear further debate on this matter before making up my mind as to how I'd like to vote, and I'm interested in hearing other members participate in the debate.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the time, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. member adjourn the debate?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Would all those in favor of the motion for adjournment please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is adopted.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 5:30.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 5:16 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]