

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Tuesday, November 6, 1979 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce a group of parliamentarians visiting us from Nova Scotia, members of the select committee reviewing the Workers' Compensation Act. They met with members of our committee yesterday, the Workers' Compensation Board, and today the representatives from the occupational health and safety division.

They are seated in your gallery: Mr. Milne Pickings, chairman of the committee; the Hon. Ken Streach, Minister of Labour; Mr. Guy Brown — and may I mention that I had the pleasure of being with Mr. Brown in Mauritius at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference; James MacEachern; George Moody; and two members of staff, Gordon Gillis and John Benjamin. I would request that the members of this Assembly give them the usual welcome.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 76****The School Amendment Act, 1979**

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 76, The School Amendment Act, 1979.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill contains a number of amendments to The School Act. As is always the case when an Act is opened up, some of these changes are administrative in nature; others, however, are of real significance to individuals or groups among the public. The Bill amends certain procedures and conditions that affect petitions and public meetings, amends the conflict of interest and disqualification provisions of the Act, clarifies certain powers of the board of reference, improves the cash flow of municipalities, and provides greater authority to school boards and staff to deal with loitering and trespassing.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the most significant provisions of the Bill are these. First, it provides for the redistribution of undeclared corporate assessment on the basis of pupil enrolment where both the public and separate boards operate. This is in the spirit of a resolution adopted by the Legislature in 1977, and fulfils a commitment made by the previous Minister of Education. In this regard, my colleague the Minister of Education will be making an announcement at second reading about a transitional, compensatory funding program. The second significant provision is that the Bill provides for the minister to direct that tuition agreements be entered into by two adjacent boards, where a provincially imposed boundary change, or the

lack of Section 150 instruction, would impair a child's educational progress.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Leave granted; Bill 76 read a first time]

Bill 75**The Trust Companies Amendment Act, 1979**

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would beg leave to introduce Bill No. 75, The Trust Companies Amendment Act, 1979.

This amendment is being brought forward really to bring the old Act into line with current needs, and streamlines procedures so that the time involved in taking out loans can be shorter. It also requires that companies incorporated outside the province of Alberta be on the same standing and under the same requirements as companies incorporated inside Alberta. Perhaps one of the most important sections is 128(3), which allows trust companies to be involved in making business loans.

[Leave granted; Bill 75 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bills 75 and 76 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

[Two members rose]

MR. COOKSON: I won the draw.

Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to file with the Legislature three copies from the pollution control division of the Department of Environment, which deal with the problem of the tainted water, city of Edmonton water supply, October 1979.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the Alberta Weather Modification report on the Alberta hail project.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table copies of the annual report of the Attorney General's Department for the year ended March 31, 1979.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

DR. C. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to rise and introduce to you, and through you to the members of Assembly, 31 students from the grade 10 class at the Mallaig school. They are accompanied by their teacher Don Katerynych of Mallaig. I'd like them to rise to receive the welcome of the House.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to members of this House, an idol of mine who, in addition to the hon. Member for Rocky Mountain House, held down the blueline on the famous Hanna Hornets of the early 1950s. That's his first frame of reference with me, in addition to his many other accomplishments. I refer to Mr. Jack Horner, who

is seated in the public gallery. I'd ask him to rise and receive the greetings of this House.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

First Ministers' Meeting

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Premier. It deals with the announcements emanating from Ottawa today, that Monday and Tuesday of next week there will be a meeting of the first ministers. I'd like to ask the Premier, one, to confirm that; and secondly, if the Premier could indicate whether either elected or appointed officials of the government of Alberta have in fact initialled any agreement.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, there are two very different questions, which I'll try to respond to.

The first question dealt with an alleged announcement from Ottawa with regard to a meeting. My information would not indicate that that is accurate in terms of an announcement. As I always respect the position of the chairman of first ministers' meetings, I really feel that announcements of meetings should emanate from the chairman, in this case the Prime Minister of Canada.

With regard to the second and very independent question, I can assure hon. Members of the Legislative Assembly that there is no agreement with regard to a national energy package between the province of Alberta, with its ownership rights of crude oil and natural gas, and the federal government that is even close to the stage of any initialling. Although I can say negotiations are still under way, I'm not at all optimistic about them.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the first response the Premier gave, squabbling about the term announcement. Has the Premier been asked to attend a meeting of the first ministers which, according to information I have from Ottawa, is to be held the first two days of next week?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, when an announcement is made with regard to such a meeting, I can assure hon. members that I will be in attendance. The announcement of the meeting should come officially from the Prime Minister of Canada.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, having regard for the fact that the federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources is in Ottawa this afternoon speaking in terms, one, of the meeting to be held the first part of the week and, second, of the energy package the federal government wants to put before the people of Canada, I pose a supplementary question to the Premier. Has the Premier been contacted by the Prime Minister's office with regard to a meeting of first ministers?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, yes.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, while we're pulling teeth, a supplementary question. Then is the Premier expecting to be in Ottawa next Monday and Tuesday?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader may wish to press the matter, but my position is very clear. The understanding I have and that we have followed is that with regard to first ministers' meetings, as distinguished from meetings of premiers, the announcement will officially come from the office of the Prime Minister.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, we're not asking for a federal announcement. We're simply asking the Premier if he's going to be in Ottawa next Monday and Tuesday.

MR. SPEAKER: It would seem that the subject has been covered from several angles.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, what you're saying is that the answer will not be given.

MR. R. CLARK: Right.

Energy Prices

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct, a supplementary question to the Premier. Can the Premier give a commitment to the Assembly this afternoon that Alberta consumers will be sheltered from any major gasoline price increase which will be negotiated in the foreseeable future between Alberta and the federal government?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat my answer of a week ago today, as recorded in *Hansard*. I'm quite confident that the end result of negotiations if negotiations are completed, or in any event what occurs and transpires, will continue to find the citizens of this province enjoying the lowest cost petroleum products of any province in Canada and perhaps of any area in the western industrialized world.

Guaranteed Loans

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer or the Minister of Agriculture. Does either of the hon. gentlemen have any knowledge of the conventional lending institutions in the province foreclosing on guaranteed agricultural loans?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. leader, this would seem to be a rather unusual way of inquiring about the news.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, with great respect, sir, these loans are guaranteed by the Agricultural Development Corporation. We're trying to ascertain if either the Provincial Treasurer or the Minister of Agriculture has been made aware that chartered banks in the province are in fact foreclosing on some of these loans. Is either of the hon. gentlemen aware of that?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I have no information that any guaranteed loans are being called.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. Has the hon. minister had any discussions with officials of

chartered banks in relation to guaranteed loans under the ADC program?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I would [refer] the question to the Provincial Treasurer. I have had no personal involvement with the chartered banks at this time.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, of course tens of thousands of various loans are available. It hasn't come to my attention, in respect of chartered banks, that there's been any change in the regular historical pattern of that activity.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate whether the government or the ADC are transferring any guaranteed loans that farmers now have under the direct loan program — 9 per cent money — refinancing?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the programs under ADC are carrying on as in the past. The pegging of 9 per cent, because of the various interest rates, perhaps allows areas to become eligible in some of the loans available under the direct lending that may or may not have been available before.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. There are now some loans guaranteed by ADC from chartered banks. Will the loans they're starting to call be able to be refinanced under the direct loan program?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, those individuals who have loans outstanding at present have the opportunity to make application to ADC. If they're eligible for direct money, that money will be available to them.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate what the percentage of loans approved by ADC is in relation to all agricultural loans in the province of Alberta?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the exact number, but it seems to be my memory that ADC handles approximately 10 per cent of agricultural funding in the province.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. In light of the fact that 90 per cent of the loans are through, chartered banks or other lending institutions and 10 per cent with ADC, has the minister given any consideration to a program whereby the province would provide a direct interest subsidy to farmers who have either direct or guaranteed loans with ADC or other loans that have been negotiated with chartered banks or lending institutions?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, over the last two weeks we've had many suggestions as to various methods of providing funds to not only the agricultural industry across the province.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister aware of any other provinces that provide a program such as the one I've just outlined with regard to across-the-board interest subsidy?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect, the hon. member should perhaps do that kind of research outside the Assembly.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I have done that research, and the province of British Columbia guarantees all farm loans to 9 per cent. This government is doing nothing in that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Not a thing. Nothing. Two per cent of the loans in this province . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the hon. member wishes to make that kind of representation, it should be done by means of a motion on the Order Paper. It would appear from his subsequent remarks that he already has the information.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, these ministers don't do their work. Has the minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the hon. member wish to debate or to ask a further question?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I intend to ask a question.

Has the Minister of Agriculture met with the ministers of agriculture of the provinces of British Columbia or Saskatchewan to discuss the problem with regard to interest rates relative to farmers?

MR. SCHMIDT: Not this last month, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. Would the minister discuss the matter with the Minister of Agriculture from British Columbia to examine the good program in the province of British Columbia?

Will you or won't you?

MR. R. CLARK: Apparently you won't.

MR. R. SPEAKER: You don't care? That's what the farmers will find out, too.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Can he indicate if he has had any discussion with chartered banks in the province and the Alberta Opportunity Company as to the calling in of loans guaranteed by the Alberta Opportunity Company?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think the question might more appropriately be answered by the hon. Acting Minister of Tourism and Small Business. That is the ministry responsible in respect of the Alberta Opportunity Company.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd appreciate it if the hon. member would repeat the question.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, is the acting minister in a position to indicate if the minister or anybody in the department he's acting for has had discussions with

the chartered banks and the Alberta Opportunity Company to find out if loans guaranteed by the Alberta Opportunity Company are being called in?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, acting on behalf of the Minister of Tourism and Small Business I've had no such discussions, but I would take the second portion of the question as notice and advise the hon. member.

Committee on the Handicapped

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure I want to change the subject, but my question is to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health with regard to the MLA/handicapped joint committee. I understand that there is some consideration by the minister to change the terms of reference of that committee. Could the minister indicate whether there will be a change in terms of reference?

MR. BOGLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Discussions have taken place with members of the committee, and they've been advised of the intentions of the government in that regard.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate why the members of the opposition will be taken off that committee and not allowed to sit in on it?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, we have advised the members of the Action Group of the Disabled that because of the change in the way the government meets various delegations and groups, it would be appropriate to make the change at this time. We've encouraged that organization to continue its dialogue with all members of the Assembly, regardless of which area they represent.

Brooks Hatchery

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife. Could the minister indicate what the plans are for increasing the hatch at the pheasant hatchery in Brooks?

MR. MILLER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We presently have plans to draw up more pens. This year I think we were able to release between 30,000 and 40,000 pheasants. We are going to increase the hatch and the carrying capacity substantially. We hope eventually to be in the neighborhood of perhaps 80,000 birds hatched, some of which will be raised at Brooks. Others would be let out to fish and game associations or 4-H clubs.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What are the government's plans for the raptor program; that is, the birds of prey? Will that program be continued in Brooks?

MR. MILLER: No, Mr. Speaker. A federal government facility at Wainwright is involved in the raising of raptors, and private individuals in southern Alberta are raising and releasing raptors.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Another supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What is the future of the waterfowl program at the hatchery in Brooks?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the waterfowl program is basically that of raising Canada geese, some of which are released in different areas of the province to more or less get them established throughout all Alberta. Our main concentration is going to be on the pheasant program. We are going to carry on the Canada goose program.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. With the problems they're having with visitors touring the facility, does the minister have any plans to change the regulations for visitors in the hatchery?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, we have some building plans, and we do have a concern about the number of visitors presently going to Brooks. We hope to be able to accommodate them by an information program, and by upgrading the administration building.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister indicate roughly what percentage of the birds raised in the hatchery at Brooks is released through the fish and game and the 4-H program?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I believe I should take that question as notice, because I'm not sure just what percentage of birds is given out to 4-H clubs and fish and game associations. Off the top of my head, I believe it would be about one-third, but I would like to take that as notice, if I may.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. Can the minister indicate how many of the birds are released by the 4-H and fish and game groups in central Alberta and the north? Can the minister get that information for us?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I'll also get that information for the member.

Telecommunications — Shared Lines

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Associate Minister of Telephones, and results from a statement made by the hon. associate minister on June 26 this year, when he indicated that AGT could stand to lose up to \$7 million in revenue if the ruling of the Canadian radio-television commission with respect to the shared use of transmission lines was applied to the province.

Is the associate minister now in a position to indicate to this House whether that ruling will be applied to this province, and what the impact of that is?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member is referring to the CRTC decision which allowed CN/CP to interconnect with the Bell network, and the economic impact on AGT as presented at the hearings. In view of the decision being somewhat different from the original application, Alberta Government Telephones has had to reassess the possible economic impact. Since the decision only pertained to Bell Tele-

phone, any possible interconnection in Alberta would have to come via a different route.

MR. D. ANDERSON: A supplementary question. Is the minister indicating that currently there is no negative economic impact on the Alberta Government Telephones system as a result of the radio-television commission ruling?

DR. WEBBER: No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not saying that at all. I believe Alberta Government Telephones is still of the opinion that there would be an economic impact. However, so many factors are involved in the total revenues coming into the company that, say, four years from now I think it would be fairly difficult to determine the economic impact related to a particular decision such as the one the hon. member mentions.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is it the position of the government of Alberta, then, that the CRTC ruling should proceed, or is the government taking a position at this time?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the decision is out of the hands of the Alberta government with regard to interconnection with Bell. It's a CRTC decision. Should interconnection take place in Alberta, it is my understanding that it would have to come about as the result of an agreement between CN/CP and Alberta Government Telephones, or through the Public Utilities Board.

Interest Rates

DR. PAPROSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Would the minister indicate to the House whether a municipality's rate of interest paid will change as a result of the historical rise in prime interest rate?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the present situation is that municipalities are able to borrow from the Municipal Financing Corporation at an effective interest rate of 8 per cent.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, that's very gratifying to hear.

Would the minister also indicate to the House whether the interest rate will be changed or maintained if the high prime interest rate is continued for a long period of time?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the matter of a review of that particular interest rate is under consideration with respect to each budget year, and will be considered during the course of the government's deliberations on the 1980-81 budget.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. Would the minister take a bit of time to review the municipal lending program and look at a lower interest rate for farmers as well — maybe 8 per cent?

DR. BUCK: They don't care about farmers.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to refer this back to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I know he

just mentioned that he is going to advise the House during the budget debate whether the 8 per cent interest rate would be maintained. But there's some concern expressed in the city of Calgary — where the long-range financing of a very, very large civic centre — that that 8 per cent rate may be increased substantially; and concern is being raised that if the government doesn't indicate it's going to stay with that rate or very close to it the future financing is going to be very ...

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member coming to a question?

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the hon. minister if he is going to include in his budget proposals something more than just a year for the House to consider?

DR. BUCK: Have to wait for the budget.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, members should be aware that when the government first introduced a program of subsidizing funds required by municipalities, the effective subsidy was slightly over 1 per cent at that time. I believe the effective interest rate borrowing on money markets was somewhere in the order of 9.25 per cent. The subsidy being provided now is somewhere in the order of 6 to 7 per cent. I think it would be less than responsible if that matter were not reviewed each year in the context of the government's overall budgetary provisions. I have nothing further to add except that that matter will obviously be dealt with sometime early in 1980 when the Provincial Treasurer presents his budget.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would also confirm that the low interest rate paid [by] municipalities is actually passed on to the rural community and farmers?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

Municipal Taxation

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question — I'm not sure if it goes to the Minister of Municipal Affairs or the Provincial Treasurer. Has either department had representation from municipalities, mainly the city of Edmonton, for changes in legislation structuring so the municipality may be able to collect a gasoline tax?

MR. HYNDMAN: No such representations have come to my office, Mr. Speaker.

Interest Rates (continued)

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. It deals with this question of interest rates again, following the question posed by my colleague for Little Bow about the program in British Columbia where farmers are protected from all interest rates above 9 per cent, and the money is reimbursed to the farmers at the end of the year.

In light of the reports from the Agricultural Development Corporation of guaranteed loans being called,

and reports from other farmers that their loans are being called by some of the conventional lending institutions, has the Minister of Agriculture made any recommendations to ADC or any government agency that will alleviate the problem of interests at 16 and 17 per cent, which an awful lot of farmers and small business men in this province are facing?

MR. SCHMIDT: First, Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to discuss with many provinces the various programs they have on subsidized interest rates as they pertain to the beginning farmer. We've had that opportunity to discuss those areas, and we've also had the opportunity to review the programs as to what they were to achieve. One has to take into consideration the types of programs, the areas of subsidy, what they have achieved, what they lack, and review our own. That has been going on. Of course at the same time one also has to take into consideration the number of people those programs have to serve.

MR. R. CLARK: Also the heritage fund of Alberta. Keep the surplus, too.

MR. SCHMIDT: We've got half of it answered, Mr. Speaker. The other half is that I'm not aware of any loans being called at the present time that have been issued through guarantees by ADC.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, a question was asked by the Member for Little Bow as to whether individuals entering the hog industry and making applications on behalf of themselves were being turned down by ADC because of the factor that perhaps sufficient hogs were being produced in the province of Alberta. That is not true. Whether they wish to go into the hog industry or any other aspect of agriculture, individuals who wish to make an application to ADC are indeed accepted. The only time that production would appear is in the amounts and of course price as it affects repayment. There is absolutely no truth to the fact that those individuals making application are being turned down because of the present system or the state of production in the province.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has the minister made recommendations to ADC, the Provincial Treasurer, or any government agency, that's going to help farmers who have guaranteed loans outstanding and who are now paying 16 per cent, compared to 9 per cent in some cases when they took the loan out under Dr. Horner's program in 1972? Perhaps I should add that at that time Dr. Horner himself went and spoke to the lending institutions to get the program initiated.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, since the interest rates started to rise at a fairly rapid rate, and before, I have had the opportunity to meet with the ADC chairman on a weekly basis. You can rest assured that interest rates and the applications that are before [ADC] and those farmers being served by ADC are indeed of prime importance and the topic of discussion.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Following these weekly meetings with the chairman of ADC, what program has the minister now got in place to protect farmers from these interest rates as a result of

the guaranteed loans? If we had all these weekly meetings, we should have something in place.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the announcement of the freezing of direct lending at 9 per cent has indeed sheltered those in agriculture that are available to ADC under that basic program.

The review of the total program in regard to guaranteed loans, as was stated in this House when the interest rates started to rise, was certainly a topic of consideration and is still under consideration. One must remember, Mr. Speaker, that collectively we do not have the option, to override the types of interest charged by chartered banks. At present we are in the position of monitoring the effect it has on those farmers who have guaranteed loans through ADC.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might put this supplementary question to the minister. Can the minister explain to the Assembly how come the government in British Columbia can enter into a program which protects farmers ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm sure the hon. leader is aware that that is directly, unquestionably, and incontrovertibly debate.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, something's got to get the minister going.

Photography Show

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister responsible for Culture. Is the minister in a position to outline what plans are in place for the Alberta Selection show of outstanding Alberta photographers through the visual arts branch of the department? Can the minister indicate what point that show is at?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is the minister in a position to indicate in what areas in the province or in Canada this show will be taking place?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I said I'd take that question as notice, and I'll report back.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, has the minister had any representation from photographers in the province as to their feelings on the proposed Beny purchase?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: Can the minister indicate to the Legislature what that representation was?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I'll take notice of that question and report back.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I'm glad to see the minister has been prompted by her front benchers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. The minister has indicated that representation has been made to the minister's department by the Alberta photographers who will be putting on this show. Is the minister still saying she is not in a position to indicate that this show will be taking place?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I said I would report back on that question, but to my knowledge the show is still continuing.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Could the minister indicate what type of financial support will be made available from the Alberta government to this show called the Alberta Selection show?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in the representation made to the minister by the select group of Alberta photographers, was there any indication by the photographers that there was a possibility of a boycott if the purchase of the Beny collection was proceeded with?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: I stated earlier, Mr. Speaker, that I'd take that question as notice.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Has the minister now decided that the information has been received by the minister and the minister is in a position to indicate the further details of the proposed show by Alberta photographers? The minister seemed to say at one time she didn't know, then the minister says, I do know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

DR. BUCK: Is the minister now in a position to indicate if she can enlarge to the Assembly upon the show? Can the minister indicate what the photographers will be doing and when and where? I mean now that the minister's had a chance to reflect.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I believe I said I'd take that question as notice. I also stated that I had had representation and that I will report back on the entire matter.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is the minister in a position to confirm to the Assembly that five of the individuals selected to take part in this show have written to the minister indicating that if the government goes ahead with finalizing the arrangements for the Beny collection they will in fact boycott the show?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I stated that I did have representation and that I would report back on the overall question.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Has the minister received representation from five of the artists that they'll boycott the show if the government goes ahead with the Beny collection, or not?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is simply multiplying questions, and that one has been asked before.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. The minister has indicated that she has received that information in written form. Is the minister in a position to indicate to the Legislature the content of that information?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I said I'd report back on that question.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate to the Assembly whether the minister's office or part of her staff were involved in the planning and preparation that has led up to and will be involved in the Alberta Selection show that's going to be held in Beaver House Gallery, Edmonton?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, that falls under the department of visual arts, and I will report back on the overall scene of that showing.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, could the minister clarify her answer and indicate whether she was directly involved in the planning of this show and in earlier discussions in preparation for the show?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, that is in the hands of the department. I was not involved in the original planning of the art show.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister. From the photographers and artists who made a presentation to the minister's office, can the minister indicate if one of the artists indicated that they would withdraw their showing if the Beny purchase was ... [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We've been asked about five. We've been asked about three. Now we're being asked about one. Are we going to exhaust all the numbers before this is over?

DR. BUCK: They can hide the minister any way they wish to, Mr. Speaker. That's fine.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It has nothing to do with hiding the minister.

MR. R. CLARK: Not much.

DR. BUCK: Not too much, Mr. Speaker, but quite a lot.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

head: POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of personal privilege.

The hon. Premier has recently called to my attention

that a telephone conversation I had with an Alberta provincial judge, Judge R. L. Tibbitt, might be interpreted as interfering with the administration of justice. I had no such intention, made no such attempt, and do not believe my actions could be so interpreted. I have nevertheless concluded that I should give the relevant facts to Members of the Legislative Assembly.

During the past summer, I had a number of conversations with or on behalf of a constituent who had not been previously known to me. These conversations were in my capacity as an MLA and related to certain apparent mental health problems of a member of the constituent's family. The constituent was very concerned about the possibility of someone being injured. An application under The Mental Health Act had been made to Judge Tibbitt, seeking a warrant authorizing a medical examination. The warrant had been issued, the examination held, and the person examined had been released.

I was advised that the examination by a doctor had been very brief. I was in no position to know whether or not such a brief examination would serve the necessary purpose. However, as a layman, I was very troubled over whether a doctor could determine in a relatively short examination the mental health of a person who had exhibited bizarre behavior. Because of that concern, I discussed the nature of these examinations with my colleague the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. He shared my concern and later advised me that he had reassessed the procedures for such examination in provincial institutions, and had requested that a reassessment be undertaken to look at cases involving circumstances where someone was admitted to the hospital under a warrant.

Some time later I was contacted by a policeman seeking advice on behalf of my constituent, because the member of the constituent's family who had been examined in the way I have described was exhibiting even more threatening and dangerous behavior. The constituent, through the policeman, was seeking my advice as an MLA on what to do. I was worried about what appeared to be a potentially very dangerous situation, believed another application ought to be made under The Mental Health Act, and so advised the policeman. We agreed that it ought to be made quickly, but at that time he didn't know where the court would be sitting the next day. I said I would call the provincial judge to find out.

I then called Judge Tibbitt, whom I have known for some time, and during the course of our conversation he told me about previously issuing a warrant. I told him that I had been troubled by the nature of the medical examination that had occurred when he issued the warrant and that I had reviewed the nature of these examinations with the Minister of Social Services and Community Health and had been advised that a reassessment of examination procedures would be conducted.

Mr. Speaker, that is the extent of my involvement in this matter, and I wish to assure Members of the Legislative Assembly that I did not have the slightest intention in any way whatsoever of making any actual representations on the merits of any proceedings under the mental health legislation which might come again before the judge I spoke to, or any other provincial judge. I sincerely believe that my discussion with Judge Tibbitt could not be interpreted as the making of any representation in regard to the merits of any

proceedings. My sole motive for being involved in the matter at all was my concern about the obvious distress of my constituent and what appeared to me to be a potentially very dangerous situation, either to the person who had been examined or to others.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to advise Members of the Legislative Assembly that the second application was not heard by Judge Tibbitt. Finally, when the possible interpretation of my phone call was called to my attention, I thought I should provide this statement of what occurred to Members of the Legislative Assembly.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the motions for returns shown on the Order Paper for today stand.

[Motion carried]

head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

206. Moved by Mrs Embury:

Be it resolved that this Legislative Assembly recommend for the consideration of the government of Alberta that an occupational health and safety foundation be established with the following responsibilities:

- (1) to examine and make recommendations in respect to safety training programs and to recommend ways in which such programs might be provided to work sites through private and public agencies and institutions.
- (2) to recommend ways in which research for the betterment of working conditions in Alberta might be stimulated and supported.

[Adjourned debate June 19: Mr. Diachuk]

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, several months ago I adjourned debate on the motion brought to this Assembly by the hon. Member for Calgary North West. During the initial debate, some good presentations were made. Initially the mover of the resolution, Mrs. Embury, covered many of the concerns very well, particularly where she used various examples of safety programs found within industry, and that industry established through trade union movements. However, as she indicated, most of these programs only touched the surface of the problem because of the size of the Alberta work force and the low priority on safety to the present time by both management and workers.

The hon. Member for St. Albert cautioned members of the Assembly that we don't fragment many of our programs. I think it is the intent of this resolution that we bring together and have both employers and employees aware of different programs. Over a number of years, as industries were getting established in this part of the country and even in all of Canada, there has been a fragmentation of programs and of educational approach.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

On the suggestion that an advisory committee to the minister could be set up, I want to say that we do have an advisory committee called the Occupational Health and Safety Council. I would see this council, which has met on an average of once a month over the last three years, continuing to do this kind of work, and not another advisory committee. The council consists of four representatives from each of labor, industry, and the public at large, which includes an MLA. In the past the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood served on this, and presently Mr. Andy Little from Calgary is the representative from the public at large.

Mrs. Rita Nybuck, a very well known citizen of the rural area of Camrose, was appointed this spring. She has a great background, being involved in the local school board and local organizations, possibly too numerous to mention here, and is very highly qualified to serve on this council.

Dr. Chris Varvis is a practising physician specializing in internal medicine, who has also done and does consulting work in respiriology and general medicine. He is active in the organizations of his profession and is a past president of the Alberta Medical Association. He was also a member of the Gale commission. He is chairman of this council and devotes a lot of time to his work. He also has a great background. Like some members of this Assembly, he worked his way through university in different construction fields. In one of my discussions with him, I found that he has a strong opinion about the work force in the oil fields; he also has spent time working on drilling rigs.

The fourth member from the public at large, Mr. David Kirkbride, comes from the city of Edmonton and adds balance to the overall committee. In my opinion, the present Occupational Health and Safety Council would be an ideal mechanism to continue giving advice and working with the foundation, if and when it's established.

The other members who participated — Dr. Reid, Mr. Stan Kushner, Mr. Rollie Cook, Mr. Bill Mack, Mrs. Chichak, Mr. Grant Notley, and Dr. Charles Anderson — all provided many possibilities that this foundation could be involved in. At the same time, *Hansard* records that they provide some caution to the approach, rather than to duplicate and get into areas that possibly we shouldn't get into.

We have the council involved in many of the present programs. Several members of this council travelled to British Columbia within the last few weeks and examined their program of joint worksite committees. The council does more than just meet once a month to work over the agenda that my officials provide to them. From joint worksite committees to meeting with Dr. Kaegi, who is commissioned to do work for us on black lung disease, the Occupational Health and Safety people may be involved in many related areas.

We should also bear in mind that we now have in Canada, as of this year, the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety. Dr. Herb Buckwald, my chief executive officer, is a member of the board that administers this centre. This new centre was established independently of government influence but is funded by the government of Canada. It will be established, I believe, in the city of Hamilton, Ontario. The Canadian Centre will have funds which may reach a value of some \$5 million annually, and predictions are that if industry really is convinced, the sum may rise to as much as \$10 million annually. However, it is under-

stood that this centre will address only national priorities, and it's unlikely it would focus on local needs with regard to educational programs, training, and research. That could be a very fine mechanism for co-ordinating the work done by the different provinces.

Of interest, Dr. Gordon Atherley is the new director of this centre. Dr. Atherley is a remarkable Canadian, who has a career that I want to reflect on. His career started in England, where he initiated a highly successful occupational health and safety department at Birmingham's University of Aston. His plans for building the occupational health and safety graduate program at the University of Toronto into a model of its kind follow what was established in England.

He has indicated that the mandate he has received from the present Minister of Labour is to develop the centre so it is dedicated to occupational health and safety in the best interests of Canadian workers. He has some objectives. The objectives are that in the next five years he would have within this centre a group of people renowned for giving reliable answers to tough questions; for example, what are the risks involved in uranium mining? What constitutes a danger in a work place? Even the definition of "danger" is now being debated. He is also hoping that it would be a place where the Canadian dimension of occupational health and safety is discussed. Dr. Atherley regards Canada as too dependent on the United States for occupational health and safety expertise. His third objective is to get Canada on the international occupational health and safety map by being a focal point for occupational health and safety data generated in this country.

This is just an example of what is being done nationally, and its timing is very appropriate. Only recently, Labour Canada released a report that pointed out that Canada's record of safety in the work place is a national disgrace, despite millions of dollars poured into training and education. At some of my recent addresses I've mentioned that the federal Department of Labour estimates that some 1,071,484 Canadians were injured on jobs in 1978. This is four times as many as those injured on Canada's roads.

The blame keeps going back and forth. Labor often accuses management or the employer of negligence; the employer often accuses the employee of being negligent, and so forth. But to give you an example, just some two weeks ago at a conference in Toronto, management was starting to call the shots. They're starting to name the responsibility. Mr. John Hanley, president of Monsanto, told industrial researchers that it is time there were stiffer penalties including jail sentences for corporate managers who willfully and unreasonably endanger the lives and health of others. This is one employer saying this to another group of employers. He does admit that most of the industry is sincerely trying to do a good job of protecting health and the environment, but he said there have been cases where too many have been negligent, giving industry a black eye.

In my time of office, I've found that employers have been and are continuing to respond. They are responding in positive ways by recognizing people who are doing things. The Canada Safety Council recently recognized two very distinguished members involved in safety: Dr. Ernest Mastromatteo, who is the occupational health director for Inco, and Mr. Hugh M. Douglas, senior loss control co-ordinator of Imperial

Oil. These gentlemen received Canada's most prestigious occupational safety awards at the Canada Safety Council conference in Quebec City in September this year.

We do that here in Alberta too. Annually, in the month of January, we have the life of Alberta awards which I, as a member of the Legislature, and some of my colleagues have had the privilege to attend on several occasions. The officials of Occupational Health and Safety have a program recognizing workers who, through training in first aid, used their knowledge to save the life of a fellow employee. So recognition is being given to workers by industry when workers are involved in doing things.

I've briefly covered our Canadian scene; I've briefly recapped our Alberta scene. But I do want to mention that there is also an international scene. Internationally, because of the interest of the United Nations, a large organization devotes its time to the rural workers in the world. That is because from time immemorial the majority of mankind has been engaged in rural occupations, but only recently have the problems and research peculiar to such work been generally recognized. Modernization has brought both new hazards and stresses. The need to quantify productivity, including that of labor, even today requires attention. The topics they cover range over many professions, from medicine to industrial engineering, from forestry to dairying. The fields of forestry, horticulture, livestock, crops and vines: all have sufficient in common that work done in one may be relevant to another nation. This is being done internationally through organizations such as the international organization on the rationalization of farm work and other UN organizations.

In the question of the international approach, I've been made aware that there are countries trying to develop a program or come to a conclusion — as we are here in Canada, in Alberta — with regard to the automatic assumption that there is such a concern called "farmers' lung", which is a result of working in crop husbandry. This is a new one, but I just thought I'd share it with the members.

Mr. Speaker, I have other items, but I do just want to share — and it may take me a minute past my permitted time — the concept that I see, with my officials, after giving consideration when the resolution was introduced.

The establishment of an occupational health and safety foundation would help to alleviate some of the shortcomings in the research and education spheres in the following ways. The foundation could endow funds for research and teaching at universities and colleges. The foundation would encourage research independent of government by involving a variety of research expertise. Considerable interest in accident and disease prevention would be generated in areas where it currently does not exist.

Number two, the foundation could endow chairs in occupational medicine, and occupational safety and health in one of the universities. Number three, the foundation could provide scholarships and training grants for occupational health and safety professionals and technologists, for training within or outside Alberta.

Number four, the foundation could establish resource centres at universities and colleges, which would provide information and teaching capability. The infor-

mation would be available to students in all technologies, as well as to business sectors and the public. Number five, the foundation could promote education and training by sponsoring lectures, workshops, and seminars, and by assisting with the funding of training and educational programs to the following groups: professionals, including physicians, engineers, hygienists, nurses, industrial designers, architects, and industrial safety professionals; employers, with emphasis on particular industries or particular matters; workers, including program design for specific hazards, occupation, and for apprentice in technical institutes.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. members of this Assembly, we have a lot to consider. I want to encourage participation. I want to say I appreciate the participation that's been done. I look forward to the presentations made by the members of the Assembly today.

Thank you very much.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to Motion 206, "that an Occupational Health and Safety Foundation be established ... to examine and to make recommendations in respect to safety training programs and to recommend ways ... [and] research for the betterment of working conditions," I would like from the outset to congratulate the hon. Member for Calgary North West for bringing this motion forward. I think it's very timely and very appropriate, as we have heard already from many of the speakers.

I'm pleased that the hon. minister gave an overview of some of the speakers to date. I'm pleased that the health and safety council is actively involved with activities in our province, with sound membership. I happen to know many of those, and I would concur with the hon. minister's statement.

But there may be a need to increase that council's activity, not only by way of time, but to accelerate them by way of support staff. I wonder if the hon. minister would take note of that, and maybe do something about that. Because, Mr. Speaker, I feel the members of the Assembly should be alerted, with the statistics we have on hand, that there is not only a need, but an urgency, when we see the number of accidents we have in the work place.

With respect to the Canada Centre that the hon. minister mentioned, I'm pleased that such a centre is in existence, and that there's activity going on. But again, I'm concerned when I hear from the minister that the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety will be concerned with national issues only. There should indeed be a concern for regional items as well as local items. To indicate in this House, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian Centre is looking over a period of five years — again, I'm distressed in a most serious way. The national safety record is a disgrace, and it's been quoted so many times by hon. learned men, not only in this Legislature, but in other places across this country. When injuries in the worksite are four times higher than road accidents, I suggest again that there is a need for acceleration and urgency.

If I give nothing more to this Legislature by the time I've completed my few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that I would impart a degree of urgency to each member of the Assembly, and especially to the minister in charge of that very important department.

Indeed, I'd like to congratulate the minister in charge of that department. I know that his background should create a degree of sensitivity that is needed in that department, not only for the workers in the work place, but the problems of their families as a result of injuries. His background and experience on various boards and agencies will serve him well, I'm sure, to do a good job. We're looking forward to that. But if I leave nothing else after these brief remarks, I hope he marks down the word "urgency".

Mr. Speaker, rising to speak to Motion 206, may I from the outset say I support the direction of the hon. Member for Calgary North West, providing the newly formed department has not and will not be carrying out these functions, directly or indirectly. Clearly, the priority of the government in setting up a department, as we have, to deal with this issue — that is, workers' health and safety — must be to examine and recommend regarding safety training programs via private or public agencies. Surely that department must have responsibility to recommend, initiate, and do research for the betterment of working conditions.

So, Mr. Speaker, agreeing with the motion quickly is an automatic thing — I don't think anybody in this Legislative Assembly could dispute that — but only if the department so newly formed will not and cannot carry out the function articulated in this particular motion. Frankly, I feel the department can and should do it, and I'm hopeful that it will. Because even if you have the foundation that is mentioned in this motion, the department has that responsibility.

I know the hon. member who brought the motion has a very high degree of interest in this area, or should have, and by bringing the motion forward demonstrates that sensitivity and degree of interest. Because I'm sure she's not only here as an MLA, but also as a nurse, as a member of the medical profession, although she hasn't mentioned that. Similarly, I can say that I am sensitive to this area, not only as MLA for Edmonton Kingsway, but also as a member of the medical profession for a quarter of a century — that sounds like a long time — and as having served on two select committees of the Legislature dealing with workers' compensation, having heard many of those stories via that route and via my particular medical practice.

As I reflect over the years of that medical practice, Mr. Speaker, I often ask myself, how did that accident, causing such a serious disability and/or death, occur? The kind of questions that come up are so simple and straightforward. Why did it occur? How much more painful it is, Mr. Speaker and members of the Assembly, to family, friends, employer, and employees when I hear: I should have been more careful; he should have worn his goggles; he should have seen the sign there; or, where is the sign that should have been there; there should have been a railing there; no one told me that was a hazardous substance or a hazardous way of doing things; and so on.

Very simply, Mr. Speaker, to bring forward the issue as some members have already, with even more vivid horror stories, I can tell you that the statistics are just unreal. In 1977 in Alberta, one in five was injured at the worksite at a cost of \$47.6 million in compensation, almost half of them under age 25. We're only talking about the compensation aspect; how about the millions of dollars lost because of loss of work?

There are various statistics. We can go to the

Compensation Board's statistics:

In fact, between 1973 and 1978 Workers' Compensation Board claims increased 53 per cent. From 1975 to 1978 they increased 32 per cent. In the past three years 528 workers were killed on-the-job.

One hundred and seventy six people a [year].

Mr. Speaker, it's very striking, because when we think of these deaths, these people are in the prime of life. They are the breadwinners of our society. It's not only the loss from work, but the loss from our society on a very specific basis. I'm now speaking of almost a million man-days lost in 1978, and apparently it's increasing again. So it is a disgrace. It's not only a disgrace, but there's an urgency.

If there were an epidemic in the province of Alberta causing that many injuries — some bacterium, if you wish, or some other illness — I can assure you that we'd be acting very quickly. Yet we take this for granted. Some will argue that with the advent of the boom economy and an increased labor force, injuries, accidents, and/or deaths will increase.

I'm sure members of the Assembly, the hon. member who brought forward the motion, as well as the other speakers agree that this has to be minimized as much as possible. I don't think we can say we're trying hard enough until we try everything to the utmost degree. So to this end, Mr. Speaker, I feel it's important that we have intense concentration and effort to put in place all the elements at every worksite, wherever there is a hazard. Frankly, that means almost every worksite, except maybe in some very casual worksite areas. Indeed we must intensify education and the safety programs, and enforce them in co-operation with private and public agencies, workers, unions, employers, governments, families, et cetera. It's interesting to note, members of the Assembly, that every one of these segments is concerned: the workers, unions, employers, employees, and families. I have not yet met anyone who hasn't been concerned about this.

I'm really pleased and excited when I see on my desk the so-called advertising program that just came out recently from Alberta Occupational Health and Safety entitled, *Alive: A Program for Occupational Health & Safety*. It's precisely this type of advertising and publicity that we need in conjunction with many, many more programs. This program has an interesting target area: construction, manufacturing, trades, workers. Just as importantly it says, "secondary audiences include the workers' family and health and safety personnel and associations". I think that's very important, because you cannot focus on the worker alone; everybody at the worksite must be concerned. As I understand, the advertising campaign began in February with eight weeks of television and print ads. The print ads ran in *Oilweek*, *Roughneck*, *Construction Alberta News*, and so forth. Then we have the so-called trailer advertising along with this.

I take a few minutes on this item, Mr. Speaker, because I think it's so important. Many of us are flooded with newspapers, magazines, and letters, and we don't read everything. So I think it's important to record in *Hansard* that something is being done by way of advertising. The so-called trailer, a mobile "Alive" trailer, will travel around Alberta for six months carrying health and safety messages to communities and worksites across Alberta.

It is essentially a classroom on wheels complete with displays, audio-visuals, and brochures which

were geared to impress the health and safety message upon every visitor.

There are brochures that I think are just excellent: the type of thing we need, too often delayed. Here's one on occupational health and safety for riggers — very good; occupational health and safety for small business, for roofers, for the petroleum industry; and a guide to The Occupational Health and Safety Act. So there are many things like this. Then there are posters, Mr. Speaker: Tom's not going to work today; Clean up your act; Don't make an ash of yourself. It's a very good ad, except that it has to get to the workers.

We can go on and on, Mr. Speaker. Circumscribed by this type of publicity that we need, or education regarding safety programs, we certainly need ongoing research to improve that effort to bring to the attention of all the new areas that are not yet known — and there are many that are indeed hazardous to the worker and those involved — and recognize and deal with elements unknown to safety. Many of these have been brought forward by previous speakers, so I'm not going into any detail about that.

We must improve our effort, not merely sit around and wait for a new foundation. Although the foundation concept is good in principle, any new foundation or organization and structure takes years to put into full motion. I'm suggesting that the hon. minister, with the information available in the department, across North America, and internationally, has enough information to apply that properly.

As I recall in my medical practice, Mr. Speaker, all too often new research and new drugs come on, yet we're waiting for something, when in fact if we applied all the health information we now have, with the information we have for our citizens, they'd be a lot healthier. We don't actually need that research except in a very small percentage way, for very specialized areas. So I'm not convinced that we need a foundation. I think the federal centre should be accelerated, and that we as a province have a responsibility to give them a nudge, as we have a responsibility to give a nudge to our universities and possibly get extra dollars, be it from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund or maybe even the heritage medical research fund, which I strongly recommend for a possibility of funding this particular area.

Being a practical person as most of us are, and I'm sure all of us are here in the Assembly, I suggest we explore existing avenues carefully and apply in full force the known areas now in place, as I've indicated before. I can't possibly overemphasize that I think it's important we intensify and expand existing programs using knowledge presently available. If the minister went to his department and reviewed this area, I think he'd find so much wasted effort and not enough being done that he'd be amazed. And I'm sure that's true in every department of every government agency anywhere in this country. He should intensify the safety committees at the worksite with workers and management alike, and continue his pressure relentlessly, thoroughly, and in a meaningful way; in other words, be sure that knowledge regarding health and safety at the worksite is now being utilized completely and fully. There are many examples of this.

Hon. members may wonder why I am stressing application of what we already know. A year or two ago, the hon. minister and I entered into debate with one of the opposition members here regarding black lung

and silicosis. This has been known for a long, long time, yet anyone in this Assembly can drive around the city of Edmonton or other parts of the province and see on the street a man working with a sandblasting machine, dust all over hell, and he's inhaling this. [interjection] Edmonton, Calgary, or any other rural point. Mr. Speaker, when you see this happening, I'm suggesting we need firm, present application of the modern knowledge we have of what silicosis means and what inhalation of that kind of material means.

Let me give you another example. We're setting up a petrochemical industry — and have done very well in this province — with wide knowledge of hazards. We've had case after case reported internationally. The information is there. What is necessary is application of that information. If the hon. minister doesn't know about it, I suggest he travel to the United States or Japan and get that information. The benefit will not only be for the workers on a long-range basis, but for the surrounding communities.

Early in the session we heard about X-ray hazards. True, unless it's excessive, we don't know the exact amount of X-ray radiation that will cause damage. We don't know the minimal amount that will cause problems, but we know that beyond a certain amount there is a problem. I heard from the hon. minister that when he took over the department, there was a shortage of staff to do this. I respect that. It's not his fault, and it's not the fault of that department. It's an issue that's cross-country. It's an issue that, well, we've had for such a long time that we're just going to dawdle along with all the other departments and carry on the same way. I know the minister is acutely aware of the concern about injuries, so he's increasing his staff and doing something about it. But there's another example, and I can go on and on. The hon. minister knows very well that I'm not being critical; I'm being observant. He's knowledgeable about that. But for the record, he's going to push hard, and I know he is.

Regarding research, with some 10,000 new chemicals — and 10,000 was the information that was obtained about five years ago when I raised it in the Legislature — coming on stream every year, we must indeed do research to find out how these chemicals are hurting our workers. Finding that out, of course; will help us improve the situation for our communities.

Yes, with accidents increasing above that which we expect or anticipate — and shouldn't accept any — we need research to find out why this is continuing, if we don't know the reason after we apply to the full all the information we already have. Yes, with every new industry we will need evaluation of that industry to assure safety in research.

One more item, Mr. Speaker: trained personnel. As important as it is to expand to our society the application of health and safety knowledge that we have, we need trained personnel. Unfortunately, trained personnel are sorely lacking. Institutions and facilities across this world will train people to deal with various items, but numerically we just don't have enough. I think every effort should be made to recruit, set up proper schools, or nudge the universities to get these personnel into the field to help us. If we increase information regarding chemicals, radiation, and worksite problems, whether they be farming, contractors, mining, petrochemicals, et cetera, it will be a very important item that will benefit all society.

If I make only one comment regarding this particu-

lar item, I'm suggesting very, very careful use of the positive information, the knowledge we have now, fully and completely and with urgency. Do the research, do the studies, gather the new information, and co-ordinate. Health and safety is and should be a paramount thrust of this government.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, practical and intense application of our present knowledge is a very important item. I'm pleased that the amendments to the Act provided for health and safety for mines and quarries, and provisions to protect workers from hazardous substances. But we know that all the written paper in the world is not going to help us if we don't apply directly and urgently the information we have. For there are workers out there now whose lives are being threatened, and they're being hurt. We need to carry on research, co-ordinated with other areas of the country, the province, and the world. We should increase our personnel, and apply pressure to utilize these personnel as quickly as possible. Just as important, we need ongoing surveillance with persistence. If there is anything else I'd like to leave with the minister: please, finally, do it.

Thank you.

MR. WOO: Mr. Speaker, since this motion was first presented to the Assembly during the spring session, many hon. members have spoken with considerable knowledge and a keen sense of interest addressing the subject of occupational health and safety. A great deal of facts and figures have been generated. These are important, and I'm sure will be often repeated during the course of this debate. Certainly, in many cases, they will bear repeating.

However, not wanting to be repetitious, today I will risk using what I call the girdle theory in speaking to the weight of the facts already stated. The theory operates on this principle: a girdle does not change the weight of its wearer; it merely relocates it to a more interesting position, and in the process, perhaps develops a broader appreciation of the subject.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in support of the motion presented by the Member for Calgary North West. In speaking to the subject, I intend to touch on a number of areas, some philosophical, some practical, and some fairly pragmatic in terms of certain conclusions that may be arrived at.

Historically, it is fairly difficult to determine just when awareness of occupational health and safety emerged. For example, the hon. minister has touched on an area related to the developing countries on an international basis. It is interesting to note that during the developmental phases of the third world countries, the strategy was developed on the basis that target dates, project orientation, and so on, were the primary factors. The worker/labor force became a secondary consideration. In terms of economic development and strategies, the occupational health and worker safety aspects were quite often non-existent.

Another dimension that can be used in terms of comparative analysis relates to countries, particularly in the Far East, where there is overpopulation and a scarcity of jobs. In this respect I think Hong Kong and China provide good examples of countries faced with too many workers and not enough jobs. To overcome the imbalance, there is a tendency to introduce what is termed a stretch-out process, whereby specific development strategies are established in such a

way that more jobs are created than are actually needed. The effect is that good practices, in terms of worker safety, are sacrificed to provide, in an analogy, a situation of one working in safety to three working in danger.

In terms of the developing awareness of worker safety and occupational health, it is quite conceivable that this could have come about through the trade union movements in the United Kingdom, coupled with the concerns of responsible management, and during the process became highly refined in highly industrial countries, particularly in North America. A real concern for worker safety was expressed through the labor movement to the United Nations through the FAO and its other member organizations. Through this activity and the concern of developing countries, there was a direct movement towards universal awareness of worker health and safety. In many cases the motivational factor of company profits and an attitude of getting the job done at all costs were replaced by genuine concern for workers. Certainly in this area government concerns and interests influence many changes.

In another area, Mr. Speaker, in the average discussion relative to occupational health and worker safety, there are other consequences which are not normally taken into consideration during the initial discussions. I think an important and significant example of this is the social costs involved in terms of families where there is loss of the earning capacity of the wage earner or, in the extreme, loss of life of the wage earner. These concerns occur only as secondary concerns and only at home via the headlines and newspapers; for example. Six Workers Killed in Cave-in, Workers Overcome by Fumes, and so on. Yet I think the important thing to remember, Mr. Speaker, is that the majority of these accidents could have been prevented. In saying that, it really narrows down to a case of foresight rather than hindsight.

The hon. Member for Calgary North West presented a brief review of the Gale commission. The commission report stated at that time that Alberta was not sufficiently advanced to warrant implementation of certain recommendations directed to the broad question of occupational health and safety. Perhaps the commission was remiss in this regard, particularly when we look around and see where we are today just six short years since the commission made its findings known. In saying that, I'm in no way seeking to find fault, for I believe the commission did an excellent job. This can be verified. Through implementation of its various recommendations we have today a full-fledged ministry of Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation.

What I do suggest, Mr. Speaker, is the use of foresight in tying health and safety to the overall planning process of socio-economic development strategies in the province of Alberta. The hon. Member for St. Albert raised a number of valid observations, and the hon. Member for Edson dealt with a number of interesting specifics, all of which reflected concerns in the area of occupational health.

In terms of the operational aspects of The Occupational Health and Safety Act itself, the hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont touched on a number of items which I would like to examine briefly from a localized point of view. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, the constituency of Edmonton Sherwood Park presents an example of a tremendous industrial complex that deals in

the areas of oil, gas, petrochemicals, construction, fabrication, pipeline industry, bottling, industrial and domestic moving, turbines and motor rewinding, service industries, electrical industries, and specialized services. All these forms of industry have specific concerns that are unique and associated with a very broad spectrum.

Speaking first to some of the specifics relative to this area, there is a general feeling that current interest in health and safety is too orientated toward the construction and petroleum industries. As a result, programs directed to other industries such as manufacturing, mining, forestry, and so on, are not receiving the attention they deserve.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, there is a question or concern re over-legislation, particularly where the focus is placed more on penalties to offenders who breach the Act than on program improvement. At the same time, there's a recognition to balance this concern with a need to enforce regulations to ensure that companies initiate and carry out safety programs.

A third area of concern is worker responsibility. How do you convince a worker that safety programs are for his own good? Basically it boils down to the creation of a hard-hat mentality or attitude. In order to foster this attitude, some companies have initiated incentive safety programs where so-called safe workers are rewarded with some form of recognition. There are difficulties in achieving ideal levels of safety consciousness in private-sector enterprise, unlike the military, where such optimum levels are achieved through strict discipline and regimentation.

In this regard I strongly support the motion of the hon. Member for Calgary North West. I see this as a step in the right direction. A foundation or institute of a private nature could ideally operate on a tripartite basis, with involvement from government, industry, and the union labor force. There is a need for such a body to look into all aspects which directly or indirectly impact upon occupational health and safety. These include the areas of research, prevention, remedial programs, establishment of educational and awareness seminars and publications, and so on. The critical factor, Mr. Speaker, will be the ability of such a foundation or institute to translate all this into effective programs addressed to the health and safety of workers.

I just want to use another example, Mr. Speaker, of how various countries develop an awareness for the safety of their workers. It was found during the course of studies within a number of communes on mainland China that because there was a need to employ people and to develop certain types of programs addressed to creating jobs rather than to worker safety, a type of industry was developed that offered a tremendous amount of repetition in terms of manufacture and so on. Over a period of time it was found that because of the repetitiveness of the work, a sort of disorientation began to set in, and an increasing incidence of accidents emerged.

Because of the system under which it operated, it was quite difficult to come up with some sort of system or reward as an incentive. But it was found that by breaking up the work period in such a way that workers were allowed, say, 15 minutes to half an hour out of each half-day of work to do as they pleased, to rest and relax — rather than get into the nicotine and caffeine break as we know it, they engendered what was termed

a sort of *tai chi* system of relaxation. Actually it was very much an art form of calisthenics.

AN HON. MEMBER: Back to the girdle.

MR. WOO: Back to the girdle.

Mr. Speaker, I know there are a number of other areas I could touch upon. But in concluding my remarks might I respectfully suggest that there are certain occupational hazards inherent in the jobs occupied by members of this Assembly. In this regard I would respectfully recommend that the question period be converted to an hour of the ancient art of *tai chi*, wherefrom we may return to the business of the House with renewed physical vigor and greater mental alertness.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Speaker, I support Motion 206, moved by the hon. Member for Calgary North West, which recommends the establishment of an occupational health and safety foundation.

Accidents result from a lack of education and training. For this reason, a foundation must be implemented to provide scholarships and grants for research purposes to professions in occupational health and safety. In spite of encouraging trends such as the reduced fatality rate, it is becoming increasingly apparent that traditional methods of preventing occupational accidents and ill health, such as enforcement of the Act and its regulations, are inadequate. There is a limit to what the government program can do in the prevention of accidents, illness, and death in the work place. Greater awareness, motivation, and knowledge by employers and workers will be the key to important progress.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the farming industry, often a solitary operation, is not overlooked in this proposed legislation. Many folks think of agriculture in terms of quiet nights, quiet days, leaping lambs in green pastures, cattle grazing on lonely hills and plains, waving stands of golden grain, and a quiet, relaxing, pastoral life style. Surely not a threatening vision, Mr. Speaker. However, the necessary and often frantic race against time and weather during seeding, haying, and harvesting; the operation of hazardous machinery; and the handling of tools, toxic chemicals, and unpredictable livestock often result in serious accidents and tragic death.

The Department of Agriculture has conducted surveys and discovered much. Farming is the third most dangerous occupation in North America in terms of death rate. Despite a decrease in farm population, surveys show that the death rate in farm accidents has increased so much that today the chance of a farmer being accidentally killed is greater than that of the city dweller. Mr. Speaker, surveys further reveal that 20 per cent of all reported farm accidents involve children and that, on the average, farm accidents will cause more than two deaths per month. These surveys show that farm accidents most frequently happen in the farm yard, cause injury to hands or arms, happen between 8 and 11 a.m., happen to farmers between the ages of 18 and 34, and cause lacerations and contusions. The surveys reveal that the total hours worked before an accident are between one and four, and that the time loss before resuming full workload is seven days.

Mr. Speaker, most farming accidents in Alberta involve machinery more than any other aspect. In 1978

half of all farm accidental deaths involved tractors. Surveys further reveal that a great portion of machinery accidents occur during maintenance or repairs, but most accidents occur while farm machines are being operated. Of tractor-related deaths reported in 1978, half involved roll-overs. Because of the nature of farming, many other serious injuries involved chains, sprockets, v-belts, pulleys, power take-offs, cutter bars, augers, jacks, and noise.

Noise is the leading cause of hearing loss on the farm. Many improved tractor cabs have reduced the decibels to safer levels, but the problem of length of exposure still remains. Consider the number of hours a day that a farmer works with machinery during seeding and harvesting year after year. The saddest part about hearing loss is that it can begin without notice. By the time loss of hearing is noticeable, it's too late to do anything. The tiny nerve cells inside the inner ear have been destroyed. That means a severe hearing handicap or total deafness.

Mr. Speaker, although machinery presents many hazards, other agents on the farm are involved. No animal comes with a manual on proper care and handling. There's no off/on switch to use in times of danger. Hence, accidents involving livestock are a major cause of injuries and death each year. Livestock is second only to machinery as a major cause of reported accidents, and a large proportion of these accidents occur inside buildings and corrals. Also, Mr. Speaker, many diseases can be contracted from handling livestock: black lip disease of lambs, milker's nodules — I looked these up; I know what they mean — Newcastle disease, tetanus, anthrax, ungulate fever, Weil's disease, bovine tuberculosis, farmer's lung, and many others.

Farm accidents involving tools are the third most common type of accident. Modern farming requires many more tools to repair and maintain machinery.

Agricultural chemicals are indispensable in modern farming. One-third of all chemical accidents occur while spraying, handling containers, and mixing chemicals. In addition, Mr. Speaker, farm deaths also occur from silo gas and liquid manure. Silo gas is the common name given to the combination of carbon dioxide and nitrogen dioxide, produced by fermenting silage materials. Carbon dioxide is colorless and odorless. Nitrogen dioxide may be red, orange, dark brown, or a mixture of these colors, depending on temperature, and it has a disagreeable odor. Both these gases may cause death. Liquid manure gas is made up of ammonia, hydrogen sulphide, carbon dioxide, and methane. All these gases are produced during the decomposition of organic material. Carbon dioxide and methane are odorless, and all four gases are colorless. Hydrogen sulphide and ammonia are explosive, and all these gases may cause death.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a condemnation of the safety program of the Department of Agriculture. It has a good safety program which includes farm safety workshops and speakers, poster contests for children, poster handouts, and grants for agricultural societies using the safety theme at fairs. For example, in 1978 the Barrhead exhibition board, the Viking fair committee, the Yellowhead agriculture society, the La Glace agriculture society, and the Lomond community agriculture society received \$100 each for using the safety theme at their fairs.

Other aspects of the safety program include displays,

radio spots, pamphlets, press releases, and films, particularly one entitled *The Sixth Sense*, a 15-minute film about livestock safety produced by the Douglas Film Group for the Alberta farm safety program, a program co-sponsored by Alberta Agriculture and Alberta Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. The film is the first of its kind to be produced in Canada. It takes a look at some of the dangers a person faces when handling livestock. *The Sixth Sense* also discusses why farm animals behave the way they do, and the conditions that can lead to livestock accidents involving horses, dairy and beef cattle, sheep, and hogs.

However, the Department of Agriculture can only do so much. Mr. Speaker, the point of the whole thing is that the foundation is necessary to offer further education, training, and research in farm hazards, farm machinery design, the farming environment, and even the attitude of the farmer himself.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all members to support [Motion] 206. We must do much more to further reduce and eliminate injuries and accidents to our farm population which result in loss of arms, legs, hands, and feet, broken bones, cuts, bruises, burns, loss of eyesight and hearing, loss of time, loss of income, and death.

Thank you.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak with regard to Resolution 206. I also rise with a certain amount of fear, because I've been hearing some examples of farm accidents related by the members on either side of me, and I'm a little concerned that they might interrupt as I go through this discourse.

At any rate, Calgary Millican is a riding which has a great diversity of interests. Certain portions of the riding include not only the stockyards but a great number of industries which really cover the whole spectrum of industrial activity in this province. So it behooves me to speak with regard to this present motion.

I would like to go back to a bit of ancient history with regard to my own career. The first instance I would bring to light, in terms of this discussion this afternoon, is the time I worked for an undertaker in Medicine Hat. At the time I was about 19 years old, and I remember one industrial accident which scared the dickens out of me for a while. There was a young fellow who had recently come to Canada from Holland. He was working in a trench at Bow Island. They were laying sewer pipe. As he was down in that trenching operation, he managed to back up too far with the result that the backhoe struck him on the back and killed him.

Years later, when I was working on the railroad to put myself through university, I remember that, as I worked for a chemical company, no one gave us any kind of indication as to whether the material we worked with was toxic in nature. By the same token, they also had us involved with various bits and pieces of machinery, in addition to working with the railroad cars. Again, it was that kind of situation where people told you, go out there, do the job; but no one really dealt with the matter of safety on the job.

Again, I can remember falling off a tank car when it was moving, because I had been negligent in the way I was dressing, in the sense that I had too much clothing on. The cuffs of my trousers caught on a piece of piping, and I tripped and fell off that train. Thank goodness it was moving slowly.

On another occasion, when we were busy loading chemical into these tank cars, as the operator of the train I was underneath it. Because the train crew were busy horsing around and having a chat, they managed to start the train with me underneath. Again, that's another example that you soon learn to have a little more care on the job once you've had, if I may use a theological term, the hell scared out of you.

More recently, I have been fortunate enough to take up another occupation with regard to a pipeline company. A few weeks back I was flying in a helicopter, and I must admit I was a bit apprehensive about this on-job training, because the week before we had had that helicopter crash at the downtown Calgary heliport. Nevertheless, I overcame my nervousness at this new role. But I made certain, when I was on board the aircraft, that I very quickly learned from the pilot how one could obtain a very quick release from the seatbelt mechanism in order to get out, because it's my understanding that that was part of the problem as to the death which occurred at the crash of the previous week.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Again, most of us who have at least watched helicopters on TV realize that, when you get out of a helicopter, you'd better duck your head, or you might not have a head to duck the next time.

In my previous occupation as a clergyman working in the inner city of Calgary . . . I have to bring this up because this is another place where occupational health and safety comes into play. I'm referring not only to the hierarchy within the institution but to the fact that in the inner city one has a tremendous number of transients come to knock on the doors. In that occupation I always had to instruct my secretary that she should carry a hammer to deal with some of the more obstreperous members who would come in off the street. I would also point out that most of the time the secretary didn't need to worry about any native people, but had to worry much more about white transients, because white people, when they get into their cups, seem to be much more aggressive and obnoxious.

One of the things that happen in our society, and a number of speakers have touched on this, is the whole problem of hearing defects. Through the whole increase in the level of noise in our society, this is indeed going to be more and more of a problem. Fairly recently, I was touring the steel mill at Camrose, and I was interested to see that all the employees were wearing not only helmets but also industrial earmuffs. That was also true at the industrial site at Joffre. This, of course, is a whole new development, and hopefully it will aid in saving the hearing of a tremendous number of Albertans.

The hon. Member for Innisfail commented with regard to farming and the occupational hazards involved there. Within the last number of years, I was able to tour one of the slaughter house facilities in the province, and again I was amazed by the kind of conditions under which those folks work; not only the disembowelling actions or the smell but the whole matter of industrial safety when it came to slithering around on the floor as you moved from one place to another. When I was visiting that site, not being given any kind of induction as to proper behavior in a slaughter house — whatever that might be — I managed to get myself slugged by a suspended car-

cass and decorated by various bits and pieces of the animal. Perhaps that was a prelude to coming into politics. I'm not certain.

Again, on various job locations in the province — I'm sure all members will be amused at this, but nevertheless it is a fact of life — many accidents occur from what might be termed distractions. Again, I would refer to a time when I worked in a glass factory at Redcliff. Most of the time you wondered if some of the male operators in the plant were going to lose fingers in the machinery because they were being distracted by female employees.

Some of the accidents on industrial sites are of course caused by boredom, the sheer repetition of a particular action with a machine. Sometimes you take that machine for granted and then discover you are missing certain portions of your anatomy. This kind of thing, casualness with machinery, is something every one of us here has been guilty of in the operation of our motor vehicles. Many times we sort of come to and realize that we have been driving at an excessive rate of speed or in a dangerous manner, depending on the weather conditions.

All these factors are of course involved in hoping to develop a growing awareness of training on the job. One of the real difficulties in any job situation is to have supervisory personnel who have the time and who regard it as an essential portion of their job description to take new employees and familiarize them with the various hazards that can occur on that particular jobsite.

In terms of occupational and job safety yet another problem is involved. Perhaps it applies more to the male of the species. All too often we get caught up in a somewhat macho image that it isn't manly for us to get involved with carrying out full safety precautions. We can say, oh, it doesn't matter that I should be wearing my safety goggles, after all, it really doesn't conform with my image as a he-man. The same thing can apply for a helmet on a construction site or with any other safety item.

One of the other things involved — and I note with a great deal of interest that as I have moved through government buildings in Edmonton, a good listing of people who have taken the time to be instructed in first aid seems to be posted in various locations. That of course is very commendable. Again, in terms of Motion No. 206 that kind of program should be encouraged with regard to the whole matter of various ways in which programs might be provided at worksites through both private and public agencies and institutions. It's the whole matter of awareness on the job, the various means of dealing with difficult and dangerous situations, and the matter of first aid instruction.

Mr. Speaker, in a very definitive way Motion 206 does set out various approaches to this whole important issue in the province, and reasonable and diligent application of solutions to various concerns and problems. Also, it would hope to work out the supervision of sites and situations in a very positive fashion, and gives some very definitive thought to the matter of training personnel. We do need more fully trained personnel and greater numbers of them in this very interesting, challenging province, this province which is very much involved in high growth, especially over the next decades.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to rise today to join the mover, the Member for Calgary North West, and those members of this Assembly who have spoken to this motion. I deeply share the dedication, work, and support of the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation in this issue.

The Member for Innisfail reminded us of farm accidents and the impact they have on the farmer, the family, and our farm production. The Member for Edmonton Kingsway reminded us of the industrial work dangers we face in this growing province, the safety programs we have, and the very important need for employees to recognize dangerous practices and habits and to be aware of safety procedures.

Following the Member for Calgary Millican, I want to take a moment to comment on the programs of the government of Alberta. Since 1971 there has been a threefold increase in the funds the province of Alberta spends on accident prevention; \$2.88 million was assigned to this program in 1978. There is a fivefold increase in the assessment revenue toward workers' compensation.

The other statistic I want to mention to the House: as of October 1979, there were 31 fatal accidents in this province with which workers' compensation is or may be involved, compared to six in October '78. That's a 400 per cent increase. The total number of fatal accidents in 1978 was 140; the total number of fatal accidents to date this year is 177, about a 26 per cent increase. New claims have gone up 32 per cent, Mr. Speaker. The total claims to date have increased 14 per cent. This is a sharp rise, perhaps due not only to the booming economy but to good weather in 1979, which has meant more men and women are on the job.

The Member for Sherwood Park also spoke about a number of concerns which I share. His reference to girdles reminds me of the increasing percentage of females in our labor force. I want to bring to the attention of the Assembly — in the case of Drumheller, in the case as it was in Canmore, or in the case of the Pincher Creek-Crowsnest Pass area — the tradition of the work of mining. In the United States, for example, a woman in a coal mine brings bad luck, so the superstition goes. No women mined coal in Tennessee; no women went underground. But all that changed about two years ago after a coal operator in Tennessee wouldn't let a woman member of a local public interest group tour a mine. Today, women fill 2,600 jobs in the industry, and coal mining commands a national American work force of over 200,000. Women are entering this male-dominated force more and more. It's interesting to note that two women recently died in a coal mining accident in the United States. So I just mention that we're dealing with humans, the tragedies that affect their families, and the loss to Alberta if we do not make a positive effort toward improving our safety.

I think it's very clear, as mentioned by the Member for Calgary Millican, that as an employer working with the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees, the government of Alberta has embarked on a wide program to protect the health and safety of provincial employees. In 1976 a committee was formed of six senior departmental managers and six members representing the employees and the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees. Jointly they developed a government safety program. This government approved the

recommendations in 1977, and implementation commenced immediately.

We're making every effort to provide all our employees with safe working conditions, equipment, and materials as far as we reasonably can. We're taking all precautions to protect the health and safety of each of our employees. Our programs provide guidelines for departments to implement policies and procedures aimed at preventing worksite accidents. We believe this will reduce the number of accidents and injuries occurring to our provincial employees, and will reduce the days lost and the related costs.

It's a new program. Mr. Speaker, 1978 is the first full year in which we've had an opportunity to evaluate the program. But there are indications that we're having a positive impact on our employees and on the management and supervisors. We have joint worksite committees in 150 locations throughout the province to deal with health and safety and working conditions at the jobsite. The committees endeavor to handle them locally. In addition, there are joint departmental health and safety committees responsible for reviewing the departments' problems. They make recommendations on standards which apply to the departments and evaluate the departments' programs.

We also have a quarterly meeting of a joint government occupational health and safety committee, which makes recommendations across our provincial departments. We feel that involvement in the safety program of manager and employee alike creates the necessary interest and commitment that the Member for Edmonton Kingsway mentioned, bringing a responsibility on a personal basis for establishing work procedures in a safe environment. It's our policy that each employee has access to this worksite committee. This will be an objective consideration of health and safety measures.

I should mention also that to date about six departments are currently providing defensive driver training for those employees involved in driving. Our personnel administration office is presently arranging for a government-wide review of the defensive driver program. We will encourage all departments to participate.

In 1978 there were 2,166 injuries involving provincial employees in work-related incidents and accidents. Of these, 961 resulted in nearly 12,000 lost days. There were seven fatalities, five from aircraft and two from drowning. The direct costs attributed to these injuries were \$1.5 million for compensation, medical expense, and pension awards. But that doesn't include property damage losses, manpower replacement costs, overtime costs, additional training, supervisory costs — costs which could well amount to four times that immediate loss.

During the first quarter of 1979 we had a reduction in the reported work accidents. About 500 have been reported today, less than the rate in the quarter before. But that's still a loss of 3,000 days and a direct cost of about \$425,000.

Mr. Speaker and members of the Assembly, I support the resolution before us. I'm privileged to work on behalf of all of the people of Alberta as the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration in ensuring that these programs are made available to our employees, in consultation with the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to speak to [Motion] 206. I would like to congratulate and compliment the Member for Calgary North West for bringing this before the House. I recently attended a meeting of the Occupational Health and Safety Council, and the member's ears would have been burning if she had heard the very complimentary remarks that were passed concerning this [motion] and its possible implications.

I noticed the Member for Calgary Millican reminisced a great deal on his previous occupation. There's no way I can equal his experiences on the slaughter house floors, slithering and sliding around. But I could say that for a good number of years I had the dubious privilege of attending all sudden deaths in the city of Calgary, which include murders, manslaughters, suicides, and of course industrial deaths.

I was still in my teens when I attended my first post-mortem. And I can tell you that if my parents hadn't early introduced me to the habit of eating, I would have given up the vocation as of then. It was the very first dead body I had ever seen and much less than a fresh one. It had been in the river for several months, so it was a very, very unpleasant experience.

It appeared to me in attending many of these deaths that industrial deaths, or mostly construction deaths, far outnumbered any other type. It's a very unglamorous type of death, to fall off a building. If a policeman or a fireman gets killed in the course of his occupation, he gets a great deal of favorable coverage in the newspapers and quite an outstanding funeral. I noticed that these industrial deaths made a small amount of press in the local paper. I don't know what the department was doing at that time; of course, there wasn't an occupational health and safety division. I would imagine there wasn't a great deal done about it.

I mentioned yesterday, in second reading of The Occupational Health and Safety Amendment Act, 1979, that this new look at our concern for occupational health and safety came as a response of the government by way of the Gale committee. I would recommend to all hon. members that they take time to read the Gale committee report. They did extensive research into the problem and its probable solutions in the province of Alberta.

So it was in 1976 that the province of Alberta responded to this extremely serious problem. I see by a recent issue of the *Financial Times* that it is still a very grave problem in the whole country. The article I refer to is entitled *A National Disgrace: The Tragic and Costly Story of Job Safety*.

Canada's safety record in the work place is a national disgrace despite millions of dollars [being] poured into training and education.

It goes on to tell that there are four times as many persons injured — many of them disabled for shorter periods or some for life — in the work place as there are on the highways of Canada. Of course, once again we're talking about the media reaction to it. Media reaction to highway deaths is always high profile. The industrial death frequently gets little or no attention. In spite of increasing dollars being poured into programs, the frequency of injuries is increasing.

Over the past decade, the number of employees mangled and maimed each year has increased by more than a third.

So as I say, the government did respond to the problem by way of creating the occupational health

and safety division. My perception is that they're doing a marvellous job, but I do think we need something more than is going on from the government standpoint. I would suggest that the answer is the foundation suggested by [Motion] 206, presented by the Member for Calgary North West.

I have a note from the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight, who said that if I had any decency in my soul I would give credit to his research assistant. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Calgary McKnight loaned me his copy of the *Financial Times*. With your permission, may I inform the member that I will return the copy with the amount of the subscription that represents one copy?

I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that I feel the occupational health and safety division is doing an admirable job, but in certain areas I think it's necessary to attract volunteer or non-government organizations, or in fact to get the whole public involved in the problem. It appears to me that this would be the most important thrust of this [motion]; that is, the involvement of non-government agencies in the areas of research, development, and volunteerism. It has been my own experience that volunteer organizations have made significant contributions in the area of safety.

In our own city, my Rotary Club built a safety city several years ago. I realize that this is not in the work place, but it demonstrates safety training. Nine thousand children, ranging in age from four to nine, have gone through this program. To the best of our record keeping, not one child who has gone through the program has been injured in a street accident. This is the volunteer organization. I'm happy to report that the organization did get a few dollars from the provincial government to assist in its efforts.

Another organization that is always front and centre in this country in promoting industrial, highway, and home-safety is the Canada Safety Council, of which I'm a member, Mr. Speaker. They've done an admirable job through the years in bringing these problems to the attention of the public. But unfortunately, they too are being caught by the crunch of the devalued dollar and inflation, and they've had a great deal of difficulty maintaining their programs the last few years. I would hope that a foundation such as is suggested in [Motion] 206 would be in the position to assist such organizations.

Just as I came into the House, I believe I heard the Member for Innisfail speaking of farm accidents. Earlier this fall, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of attending the annual meeting and convention of the War Amps of Canada. It is a considerable time since there have been numbers of war amps. I believe this is the longest period in the history of this country that we've gone without being involved in a major war. I certainly am happy to report that. They have changed their efforts in the community to the assistance of child amputees across the country. They have not only helped them to obtain proper appliances but assisted them in counselling, getting their education, and getting back into the mainstream after this very traumatic experience. But to further the points brought forward by the Member for Innisfail, they reported that 90 per cent of all child amputations in this country are as a result of farm accidents. So there's another area we have to look into.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest the main purpose we're looking at this afternoon is what function the foundation

can fulfil that is not being fulfilled by government agencies at present. The member has given us a goodly list of areas that can be developed, principally in education, research, scholarships, and promotion of resource centres. These are principally areas not covered by government agencies.

Therefore I would certainly support this [motion] myself, Mr. Speaker, and I would urge all other hon. members to do likewise.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to speak to Motion 206, introduced by the Member for Calgary North West back in June. I believe the Member for Calgary North West certainly has a great deal of experience in health-related matters, not just by virtue of her profession but indeed by her association with many others.

Mr. Speaker, before commenting specifically on the pros and cons — because personally I'm not convinced the motion should be passed — I would like, if I may, to point out some areas I think members should consider prior to either endorsing or rejecting the motion. Many people have spoken, probably 15 or 16 members. The Minister responsible for Personnel Administration put it very clearly, I think, as to the participation of the Alberta government to date, in dollar terms, toward assisting the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation and his department in being effective in terms of prevention in the work place.

I submit that we in Alberta are unique in terms of economic activity. I understand there are probably in excess of 60,000 worksites in the province of Alberta. Surely we should recognize that there is simply no way we can have worksite inspectors on all these locations.

I would just like to reiterate some of the statements made by hon. members in the debate so far. Some have been particularly encouraging, in terms of indicating the amount of time they've spent considering the matter. I recall that last spring the Member for Edson — and I think he has more than adequate experience in dealing with victims of accidents — pointed out, as has been reiterated by the Member for Edmonton Kingsway, that prevention encompasses many, many things; not just the physical work place but the environmental concerns in the work place. The Member for Calgary Mountain View, as we all recall, felt that the so-called traditional prevention methods we used were not adequate. I recall the Member for Edmonton Glengarry saying that he felt the foundation would be the ideal vehicle.

When he mentions the foundation I think of the Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park, who made comments relative to foundations in a slightly different context. The Minister responsible for Personnel Administration remarked that society has changed in that women are in the work place. He reminded the House that he thought of that as a result of the Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park mentioning girdles. I don't really like to tell tales out of school, but one of my colleagues in the House does wear a girdle. I happened to notice it a while ago. When I asked him why he was wearing a girdle and how long he'd been wearing it, he told me, ever since his wife had found it in the glove compartment.

Mr. Speaker, when I listen to the Member for Calgary Millican as he relates his experiences in the work force over the years, I can readily understand why he's in the profession he's in; because, as I added up the

chronological number of both employment opportunities and experiences he had, he comes to be about the age of 118. Certainly I think one would have to believe in the hereafter to practise in his profession, and he's obviously had enough jobs to be able to relate that.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to get serious for a moment, and draw members' attention to the flip side of what we all like to keep endorsing in terms of foundation and research. We hear the Member for Innisfail ever so eloquently spell out the real significance of farm accidents. The Member for Calgary McCall says about 90 per cent of accidents with young people who end up using prosthesis happen on the farm. Yet here we are in 1979 in this great Assembly of Alberta, and we haven't yet introduced workers' compensation to the very area which I suggest historically has had the record of the greatest number of accidents per year. We also know that, historically, workers' compensation had a primary purpose of prevention, prior to the benefit side. That has now been shifted to occupational health.

Mr. Speaker, that leads me to consider, where's the responsibility of the individual? Where's the responsibility of the worker? I suggest we've seen many examples over the years where we have either appointed commissions at the federal level or have struck various committees to look into, advise, and report, as a result of research, areas that should be implemented. Yet we never seem to hear that perhaps there is a role for the individual here, the man or lady in the work place. Are they really doing their fair share in terms of prevention? Are they really taking the time to check out the possibilities of preventing accidents on the worksite? I question that, Mr. Speaker.

I think we sometimes look to structuring either royal commissions, in the case of lotteries, or foundations, in the case of looking into accident prevention, and we seem to forget that accidents don't just happen. I suggest they're caused. I suggest that people have a responsibility in the area of accidents. I wonder how effective a role we're playing in reminding people of their responsibility.

The Solicitor General goes to great pains and great expense each year to see that we have properly signed highways designed in terms of people who like to drink a little before they drive. The Minister of Transportation spends heaven knows how much money in terms of safety matters on highways, to remind people that there's a curve ahead. Yet people continue to have accidents. Well, I suggest that all the research in the world is not really going to do very much except change the color of the sign or make it a little bigger. No, Mr. Speaker, I don't accept in principle that simply endowing a foundation is going to result in any great, dramatic decrease in accidents in the province of Alberta.

I recall a businessman telling me just a year or two ago of an incident not far from this city where they were stringing power lines. They had to take one down in order to put one up, and so on. He left specific instructions to a worker to stop the traffic and not allow it to go by. A chap was up on a pole across the road, and the fellow who was to stop the traffic suddenly had a call of nature — probably logically so. He disappeared. In the meantime, a vehicle came along, caught that wire, snapped the pole, and killed the individual on the pole. As I understand it, a lawsuit was then launched to the owner of the company. The

individual concerned was fired. I understand that he appealed to somebody, because we have so many appeal procedures. None the less, because of the economic health of this province, he immediately had another job somewhere else.

Now where was the responsibility there? Would the foundation we're talking about come up with a result that's going to stop that? I suggest it wouldn't. It might take 50,000 pages to prove it wouldn't, but as I hear members on both sides of the House endorse, I get the impression that that's the answer.

I think the hon. minister mentioned a million days lost. I understand last year in Canada alone, 750,000 man-days or -weeks were lost, not from accidents but from factors other than accidents. I really haven't heard many suggestions since then as to what to do. We try to high-profile some areas, such as those related to life style, but they get about as much attention as the members do from the press gallery up there. Are people really interested, and do they really care? I would submit, Mr. Speaker, in all honesty and fairness, that endowing a chair at the university would certainly assist those people in the university who tend to besiege the minister for more funds, but would it result in a decline in accidents? I think in all fairness we have to ask ourselves that.

I keep coming back to the area of individual responsibility. We're talking here about Alberta. Reference was made by the minister, I think, to the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety. I think that's commendable. That implies that with \$5 million, which is five times the annual postage of medicare in Alberta, they are going to do marvellous things. I wish them good luck.

Mr. Speaker, when we consider that about 35,000 people, I understand, migrate into this province from other areas of Canada — and they're prime people because they're coming here to work, and they're in that 25 to 40 age group — unless they are exposed to some sense of responsibility, what good would the foundation do?

As many members know, Mr. Speaker, I'm many things, but I never knock programs, so I wouldn't like people to get the impression that I'm knocking this. But I think in fairness, of all the speeches I've heard in favor, I'd hate to think that once the Assembly would recommend this out of hand and then put undue onus on the minister to try to endow a chair at the university just for worker health and safety, to look at areas that perhaps are somewhat related to personal responsibility — I would question it.

In conclusion, I'd like to reiterate what I feel have been the two most important matters raised. One is, are we getting value for the money we're spending today from the Alberta government in terms of worker safety? I suggest we think about that a minute, because I think we've made very generous appropriations. I recall when The Occupational Health and Safety. [Act] came in, there were no financial implications other than the component with Workers' Compensation being shifted over. I would think we only have to look at the estimate books to see that's been magnified. Has the effect come into play? Do we have fewer accidents?

The other point was raised by the hon. Member for Innisfail, who spelled out very clearly the number of farm accidents. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that all the endowments, all the foundations, all the research, and all the paper in the world are not going to have much

effect on the farms until the people on the farms accept as a personal responsibility the operation of those machines, in the cold mornings when all the accidents happen, as the Member for Innisfail says; unless we can somehow get that very sense of personal responsibility that somehow we have to get back into the work force of the people of Alberta. I suggest this is a way of life, an attitude today. It's not research.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I also am pleased to rise in the House today and speak on this motion, because I'm sure the idea and the thought behind this motion from the hon. Member for Calgary North West will find universal support. I have an ulterior motive because, serving on the select committee of Workers' Compensation, they have my name on the page, and underneath they have "MLA, Calgary North West". The hon. Member for Calgary North West is a first-class member, and I'm only too pleased to assist her in any way I can and in rising to speak on this motion.

The need for improvements in work safety is shown by the 122,000 accidents which gave rise to claims to the Workers' Compensation Board. Mr. Speaker, 138 of those accidents were fatal. I think that should show the severity of the problem and what must be done in workers' safety.

No worker wants to be involved in an accident. The term accident means just what it implies. However, accidents are caused by too much haste, too little care, and often ignorance of safety measures, and something usually could have been done to avoid a dangerous situation. No employer wants to have an accident. He doesn't want any of his workers injured. The employer has a lot of money invested in each of his workers, and if he loses one off the job it's costly. This has been repeatedly shown as we've toured the province with the Workers' Compensation Board. Being a member of that committee, prior to that time I knew nothing about workers' safety and nothing really about the Workers' Compensation Board. But in hearings across the province, as we listened to workers and employers voicing their concerns, it was emphasized over and over that no worker and no employer wants any injuries on the job.

However, as this motion is put forward, the primary question is whether it's necessary to establish a foundation to achieve a better awareness of health and safety. If the objective is to improve safety on jobsites, it would seem appropriate to encourage the workers and management at each site to consider greater safety precautions. Safety must be promoted at the shop floor level. It must be a joint effort between workers and management aimed at better systems and a more aware employee. Nothing can encourage such awareness like participation. The most profitable route to achieving greater awareness of safety is through direct participation of workers in jobsite safety committees. This allows everyone from both sides, the workers and the employers, to see hazards on the job and to recommend ways in which they can be minimized. When that is working properly, management must always be ready to act on recommendations of the safety committee, and workers must also be ready.

The second key point to safety is knowing what the dangers and problems are. The hon. Member for Innisfail mentioned the film *The Sixth Sense*. I'm proud of that film, because most of it was made in the Clare-

sholm area; the people in that film now being shown in schools and across the province are my constituents. It makes me very aware of the accidents that can happen on farms.

The hon. Member for Lethbridge West suggests that farmers have more accidents than anyone else. I would suggest that if on all equipment we had all the safety features that would prevent any accidents, his famous litre of milk that he talks about in relation to other spirits would be a lot more costly.

But I commend this film *The Sixth Sense* and also the Alive program, which has been undertaken by the hon. Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. It reminds people of the dangers that exist on a jobsite and how they can be avoided. I really feel that money should go into expansion of the Alive program and to more films like *The Sixth Sense*. It's through programs like that, Mr. Speaker, that people really become aware of what's going on around them.

I don't like to quote too many statistics, but I'd like to mention some accidents in 1978. One out of every five workers, or 20 per cent, was involved in an industrial accident last year. There were 122,222 accident claims under workers' compensation. There were 938,401 man-days, nearly a million man-days, lost last year because of accidents. The figure is \$43 million; just about \$44 million dollars were given out in claims last year, and those claims are passed back to the employer. He adds it to his cost of doing business, and it's passed on to the consumer. It's important to every one of us, not only workers and employers but all consumers, that we look at safety.

I picked up this 1973 magazine from the Department of Labour from the library. It has a paragraph that I think is imperative to what I'm trying to put across. It says:

To prevent employment accidents and diseases in today's complex industrial enterprises requires not only common sense but also rigorous application of technical, scientific, psychological, social and educational techniques.

Legislation alone cannot be a ... guide to what should be done; it cannot cover every contingency. It can at best only prescribe a standard of safety which is reasonably [practical] of achievement by most enterprises and it makes [requirements] only of those precautions that can be [specific] in legal form ... that can be checked by those responsible for enforcement.

That's 1973. Even further, there's a great man in our history, and I'd like to close with his comments. In 1918, Mackenzie King said this:

The losses which still arise in Industry from preventable causes are enormous. Frightful as ... the losses in war, they are paralleled by sacrifices in Industry of which the world takes little or no account.

That's back in 1918. I wonder, when we talk about workers' safety, all the comments that have been made this afternoon, how far have we come and how much emphasis are we putting on it?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I've listened with interest this afternoon to the many people who have got up and supported this [motion]. I thank the Member for Calgary North West for giving us an opportunity to get up and discuss something that we obviously feel quite concerned about. The fact that there's a ministry particularly related to health and safety is another indication that this government is deeply concerned about this problem in our society.

With the high construction rate in this province and the influx of a lot of young people, it's paramount that a lot of people are going onto jobs they're not familiar with. There's been an indication by statistics that a lot of accidents are caused by young people inexperienced in the jobs they are working at, and that more experienced workmen tend to avoid some of the pitfalls. I think it's paramount in a young country like ours that has a high degree of construction, oil work, and related industries that we give every emphasis to the training of these people about the hazards they are facing.

Health and safety relate to other occupations that are not commonly considered. As a second-term member of the Legislature, I've found that my life style changed considerably when I came into the Legislature. Something I had never had to do in my life was get exercise. As an active farmer I found that by the end of the day I'd got most of the exercise I needed. But after spending several months in the Legislature and developing two or three more inches of waistline than I needed, I found that I had to get out and get the exercise that most city people find ...

The other problem we have as legislators is that we are brought into the city for short periods of time and consequently do not develop permanent homes. Most of us are housed in hotels in the major part of the city. Now, getting exercise in the evening is generally a fairly risky business. You tend to take a friend along, and you find that occupations other than what you would anticipate are going on in the street. Some of the conversation tends to be a little bizarre. I heard one girl say to a boy the other night, "Don't you remember me?" He said, "I don't know why I wouldn't, after six shots of penicillin." [laughter] Those are the hazards that some of the new members may face.

So, due to the hour I will adjourn the debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: You'd better do that, Charlie.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, in order that members might have some entertainment this evening, the House will not be sitting. Tomorrow afternoon we will proceed further with committee study of Bills on the Order Paper, in order.

[At 5:28 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]

