

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Tuesday, October 27, 1981 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, it's a special privilege for me today to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly Mr. Song Zheng-Zhi, an engineer with the Pipeline Design and Research Institute of the People's Republic of China. Mr. Song Zheng-Zhi graduated as a mechanical engineer from the Beijing Petroleum College and took part in the construction of the first oil pipeline in China in 1959. He's here as one of the people we have been able to get to Alberta to study our technology and help, of course, by showing them the excellent expertise we have in the province of Alberta regarding pipeline technology, equipment, and other assets of the petroleum and gas industry.

He's accompanied by Mr. Jim Wong, a vice-president of Nova, and his wife Carol. I would ask him to rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 82****Mortgage Brokers Regulation
Amendment Act, 1981**

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 82, the Mortgage Brokers Regulation Amendment Act, 1981.

The most significant features of the Bill are the requirement for mortgage brokers to maintain a trust account and, secondly, the authority provided to the Superintendent of Real Estate to apply, when circumstances warrant, for the appointment by the court of a receiver, receiver-manager, or trustee. Mr. Speaker, these features will result in greater consumer protection for those dealing with mortgage brokers.

[Motion carried; Bill 82 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to file five copies of the newest manual of Operating a Small Construction Business in Alberta.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to Question No. 133.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Gas Alberta Operating Fund financial statements for the year ended March 31, 1981, as required by statute.

I also wish to file for the Legislature Library a state-

ment of policy respecting the location and approval procedures for major electric transmission lines. This policy statement results from an extensive review initiated some time ago after a resolution introduced by the Member for Three Hills and, as indicated to the Member for Olds-Didsbury, we advised that it would be filed during this fall sitting.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker; it is a pleasure for me today to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly 45 members from Victoria Composite high school in the Edmonton Centre constituency. They are seated in the public gallery, and I would ask that they rise and receive the very warm welcome of this Assembly.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly 42 residents of the interesting constituency of Calgary Millican. They are from three of the senior citizen facilities located in downtown Calgary: Edwards Place, Carter Place, and King Tower. Accompanied by bus driver Alf Denny and by Mavis Clark and Lois Carter, I hope they will all stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, the grade 9 class from Milton Williams high school in the constituency of Calgary Elbow. Accompanied by Mr. Marchand and Mrs. Sorensen, I'd ask that they rise and be recognized.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Small Business in Alberta**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Tourism and Small Business and is with regard to the fact that it's Small Business Week. The minister made a statement yesterday, but I wonder if he could be more definite in terms of the program that's going to be available to small businesses in this province, indicating support for small businesses across Alberta.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, in the broad sense of the question by the hon. member, I would best point out first that the Small Business Week promotion, if I can call it that, is primarily sponsored by the Alberta Chamber of Commerce and the various chambers of commerce in the province, along with quite a number of other associations; for example, the Alberta Construction Association, the Federation of Independent Business, the Organization of Small Business, the Federal Business Development Bank, the Management Advisory Institute, and the Retail Merchants' Association.

We as a department are also involved with them in promoting a program to identify for the people of the province of Alberta the very important role small business plays in this province. I'm not sure that all of us are aware of them, but some of the facts are that primarily 97 per cent of the businesses in this province are small, and that roughly covers 110,000-plus businesses in the province, and that 42 per cent of the work force is involved in those businesses, and that's roughly 470,000 jobs.

The individual business community, in its own strength

as a private sector part of this province, has done a super job, and we tend to take them for granted. As a result, we were most happy to co-operate with the chambers in identifying small business for what it is in this province, and Small Business Week, particularly, as this week.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the minister is willing to co-operate.

In a question to the minister, I understand that two months ago the government's program called the small business association, for which there was an available budget of \$60,000, collapsed, that the person hired to do the work was not able to accomplish that, and that the program is not in place or proceeding. Could the minister explain the details of that matter?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any program we may have offered that has collapsed. If you have some details, I'd be quite happy to pursue it. I'm not sure what you're referring to.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. minister please use the ordinary parliamentary form.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, further to the question I've just referred to the minister, could he indicate that there was a provincial government steering committee supporting the small business association? Was that committee within the Department of Tourism and Small Business, and does the committee still exist?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, in relation to that particular question, yes, a joint steering committee was established to create the Small Business Week program. That committee is still active and it was chaired by a young lady from Calgary by the name Catherine Pearmain. As a result of the work of that steering committee — and I might point out we as a department were responsible to assist them with some funding — and their recommendation, Small Business Week is in fact a fact of life and very healthy indeed.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Was it the intent of the government to have that committee carry on the program of Small Business Week at the present time?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, this is the first-ever Small Business Week promotion in the province of Alberta. It would be my intention, through the department, to evaluate what has happened during this week in co-operation with the various chambers and other associations involved. If the success rate is what we think it would be, we would be more than happy to assist them in ongoing years.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate that the program presently in place is mainly carried by the Edmonton Chamber of Commerce, or are other chambers co-operating in a similar manner?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I might correct the hon. member in that it is mainly carried by the Alberta Chamber of Commerce and the steering committee, but it involves members of the Edmonton Chamber, the Calgary Chamber, and quite a number of other chambers in the province. I can't name the total list, but a good

number of them, as I mentioned a little earlier, were involved. As I did say, the primary members were the Calgary Chamber, the Edmonton Chamber, plus a number of other associations. I'm quite sure I can get the list of the chambers actively involved, but the Alberta Chamber and the steering committee, headed by Miss Catherine Pearmain, were the motivators and instigators of the program itself.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, could the minister indicate whether funds are being considered to be forwarded to these respective chambers of commerce for promoting this week?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, funds were provided to the steering committee to set up the week. There is no contemplation at this particular point in time nor, to my knowledge, any request from them for additional funds. As private sector people, they are carrying it on their own.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister, with regard to potential legislation this session. I understand the minister considered legislation governing interest paid on overdue accounts. Could the minister indicate what decisions have been made with regard to that matter?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, the reason I chuckled was that that happened quite some time ago. Last spring, I believe the hon. Provincial Treasurer passed the necessary amendment to the Act, which in fact provided the capacity to charge interest on overdue accounts. I might respond by saying that one of the thrusts for that particular amendment was through the Department of Tourism and Small Business, and the main idea behind it was the fact that we didn't have a vehicle by which the government could pay interest on overdue accounts. With that amendment now in place, that capacity is there.

All other things being equal, we also pursued with the Provincial Treasurer that the availability of additional funds to pay interest, if it should have to be paid, would not be made available, and thus the departments would be "sharper" in processing their bills. At this point in time, I might add that doing a monthly assessment, that appears to have happened, and we do not have the problem that was perceived to be there. I say "perceived" in the sense that there was a general perception that a lot of the bills were not being paid on time. Our understanding at the time was that it was roughly 7 to 9 per cent. That has been improved since then, not by paying interest on overdue accounts but by a little better processing of the accounts as they come in.

Highway Safety

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my second question to either the Minister of Transportation or the Solicitor General. Given that in Alberta last year we had over 103,000 motor vehicle accidents and that 16,611 of those caused death or injury, I was wondering specifically whether either minister could comment on some of the actions being proposed to prevent this kind of disaster in our province.

MR. KROEGER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can comment, although I don't know how specific I would be able to be. Certainly we're totally aware of what is happening on the

highway system, the road system, the streets in the cities, and so on.

With a view to getting a handle on what is happening, as the hon. leader might know, last spring we set up a group made up of representatives from police departments, safety councils, the AMA, and so on, to help us identify the real reasons for what appears to be going on. We also commissioned a firm to do a one-to-one survey involving 1,200 people to bring to us the citizens' view as to what is actually happening, and the report has now come in.

As recently as yesterday, we met to analyse what that report said. We will be releasing it as soon as we can finish the summary and some other work we think has to be done, but it will be released shortly. We're actually looking for suggestions and guidance.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Transportation. It's with regard to recommendations of the Alberta Safety Council since 1975 with regard to a provisional licensing program which would monitor and correct the driving habits of new drivers before giving them a permanent licence. I wonder what the status of that situation is at the present time, and whether the government is considering that kind of program.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I'd refer that question to the Solicitor General.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, as far as I can understand, that is presently implemented, because the present demerit system is such that the beginning driver is, in effect, a probationary driver. A great deal of effort is devoted by the system and by the driver control board, trying to improve the driving habits of those beginning drivers who might run into difficulties.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Transportation. I wonder if the minister would give serious consideration to expanding the concept of what took place on Highway 16 west of Edmonton, which was called Operation 16, so that same type of program could be instrumental in bringing to light some of the driving patterns, more police check stops, and so on, on some of the major highways in other areas in the province where some of this death and carnage is happening.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I think that program was effective but, again, since law enforcement falls into the area of jurisdiction of the Solicitor General, I will refer the question to him.

MR. HARLE: I would like to hear the question again.

MR. PURDY: I'm not sure if I can get out the same wording for the minister. What I was specifically asking was if the minister would consider expanding Operation Highway 16, which was on Highway 16 west of Edmonton and which proved to be an excellent program done by the RCMP in the province, to other highway systems in the province where death and carnage is now very evident?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, certainly every effort will be made by police forces, particularly the RCMP, to patrol our highways. However, I would point out that there may

be success; sometimes it's difficult to measure. We know that efforts were made to increase the policing on Highway No. 2, and it simply didn't result in any reduction in accidents. So it's sometimes difficult to get a true handle on the productive statistics.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Solicitor General. In light of the fact that we seem to have more suspended, unlicensed, and uninsured drivers driving on our highways, can the Solicitor General indicate what program the department is looking at putting into place to cut this down? This is becoming more than a serious matter, Mr. Minister.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that's receiving a great deal of attention. We do have a lot of suspended drivers. In order for that system to work, there must be co-ordination between the courts, the Attorney General's Department, and the Solicitor General's Department, as far as the motor vehicle registration and driving licence system is concerned, and contact with the police in the field. In order to do that, an efficient computer system is necessary.

I think the hon. member will recall that in his report, Kirby recommended what's euphemistically known as decriminalization of the traffic violation system. Now, it's all really tied together. What we're hoping to do, and what is well in process at the present time, is a system whereby we can, first of all, have an accurate base of information and quick response and assistance for the policeman when he stops a vehicle. That system is in the process of being developed. Of course, part of it is presently operating, and a great deal more work needs to be done.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the hon. minister is trying to get these three departments together, but it's reaching crisis proportions. Is the minister in a position to indicate what the Solicitor General's Department is going to do right now? The problem is becoming of crisis proportion. Where have you been the last 18 months if you don't realize that? [interjections]

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I've already said that I think the system is well along. The police are now able to check a driving licence within 5 minutes or so. Of course, there are periods of down time on a computer, and there are times radio contact is difficult. But within those constraints, there's no reason the system isn't working; in fact, it is working.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, one short question. Is the minister in a position to indicate if the figure of between 10,000 and 15,000 people who are suspended and we suspect are driving, is going up or down?

MR. HARLE: The number of people being suspended is increasing all the time. Whether or not they're driving is another matter.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, the minister had better find out, because that's what he's getting paid for. [interjections]

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Solicitor General given any consideration to making driver training mandatory for prospective drivers in Alberta before they get their licences?

MR. HARLE: Not at the present time. As I think the hon. member is aware, various programs that encourage taking driver training are in place. Certainly the basic testing of drivers is being improved. We're just getting started with some new equipment which we think will certainly help take out more of the discretion area involved in testing, putting in a better system to eliminate that, so we have a more accurate driver test for people getting their licences.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Solicitor General or his department considered increasing the penalties for bad drivers in the province of Alberta?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, the question of penalties and whether or not they're effective in reducing the problem opens a whole realm of debate. I don't think there's any doubt that there are many, many offences in legislation for which the penalties are quite adequate. We recently increased the penalties for suspended drivers and, whenever the legislation is looked at, we're certainly trying to make sure the penalties are up to date. Right now, however, with the period of rapid inflation occurring, I'm sure that penalties in all pieces of legislation certainly might appear out of date. That's a question that really has to be looked at from a point of view of what levels of penalties are being assessed by the courts. I suggest that at the present time, even the maximums are not being used by the court system.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a short supplementary to the Minister of Transportation on the question of safety. In light of the fact that several communities in the province have made representation to the minister as to the use of flashing lights on school buses, is the minister in a position to indicate if the government is looking at amending that section of The Highway Traffic Act to permit communities to have flashing lights on buses?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, our best information is that allowing school buses to use red flashing lights under all circumstances is a greater hazard than the system we have devised. One problem with the way the system is working now is that it is not well understood.

Stopping all traffic when a school bus stops in areas where the speed limit is 30 miles an hour, or roughly 50 kilometres an hour, creates congestion. Keeping in mind that those students are being unloaded on the curb side, it doesn't really warrant bringing all traffic to a halt and constantly piling it up. So the answer is no, we are not planning on changing it now. We'll have to find out if this is not going to work. Certainly we'll be glad to look at it, but at the moment we're satisfied that we have to keep it going.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is either to the Solicitor General or the Minister of Transportation. It's to inquire if either hon. minister still continues the policy of calling together, once a year, the heads of the major law enforcement agencies in the province, the Alberta Safety Council, the A.M.A., and all other groups interested in safety and policing in this province, and in fact attempting to pull together a co-ordinated approach toward this question of safety on our

highways in the province. Is that practice still followed by the hon. members? If so, when was the last meeting of this group?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, that is the make-up of the safety committee I made reference to in the first question a little earlier. That consists of the chiefs of police of Edmonton and Calgary, representation from the RCMP, the Safety Council, the A.M.A., and so on. We met yesterday.

MR. R. CLARK: Then specifically to the minister. In the course of recent meetings, has the minister asked the groups he refers to specifically what steps they'd recommend to the government to come to grips with the very, very major increase in accidents, even in this calendar year?

MR. KROEGER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, as recently as yesterday, we were discussing the very serious situation I think we have on our hands. There were some positive comments from members of that committee and instructions to the director of our safety branch on some action that ought to be taken. We will be reporting to this House within a week.

Fertilizer Prices

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, my question regarding fertilizer prices is to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the minister been able to verify that Alberta-based companies are exporting fertilizer to American points cheaper than they are selling the same product to Alberta farmers?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, information has been made available in regard to the export of some Canadian fertilizer to the United States. Some figures have been quoted as to the price for that basic fertilizer. On the surface, there appears to be some differential in pricing between the wholesale prices quoted and the retail prices paid for fertilizer within the province.

At this time, I could only say that we are interested in that differential and will be looking into the matter further. But I have no information as yet that would be a suitable answer to the hon. member's question.

MRS. CRIPPS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If 34-0-0 fertilizer is shipped from Redwater to Montana at \$92 per ton, could the minister make available to the Assembly the shipping charges which would make the same fertilizer \$200 in Wetaskiwin? That's the price I checked this morning, albeit that fertilizer was shipped from Calgary.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, as I stated, the available figures certainly request further review. I would like to have that opportunity to review the total picture before I make any further comments.

Heritage Trust Fund Accounting

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Provincial Treasurer. This morning, in providing testimony to the select standing committee on the heritage fund, the Auditor General revealed that in addition to providing audited financial statements, he also provided what he termed management control reports or letters that dealt with accounting and management control systems for the heritage fund. My question to the Provincial

Treasurer is: could the Provincial Treasurer indicate to the Legislative Assembly how many of these management control reports or letters either he or his department has received over the life of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund?

I ask this question, bearing in mind the testimony provided to the committee by the Provincial Treasurer; that is, that there is one appropriate individual held accountable for the entire heritage fund and all its decisions, and that's the Provincial Treasurer.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I gather the question relates to some specifics over four or more years. If the hon. member would put it on the Order Paper, we'll consider it in the usual form.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The question relates to all the years, including the current year, of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and if in fact there are such reports or management letters provided to the Provincial Treasurer or his department, as indicated by the Auditor General this morning. Could the Provincial Treasurer please give consideration to providing those management reports to the legislative committee on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, my recollection of The Auditor General Act is that those reports are not to be tabled in the Assembly, so that would apply to the committee as well. But if the hon. member would put his question as a possible motion for a return, we'll consider whether it's in order.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The Auditor General Act, Section 26 says, "The Auditor General shall" — not may; it's not a discretionary matter — "supply" . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It would seem that the hon. member is anticipating the debate on his motion for a return.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Provincial Treasurer please provide to the committee supplementary information respecting the financial statements or report of the Auditor General on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, the annual report of the Auditor General is the one which is required by statute and by this House and which deals with all matters that are significant or material.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not asking the Provincial Treasurer for the Auditor General's annual report. I'm asking for specific reports that deal with the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, which the Auditor General indicated this morning to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee are supplied to the Provincial Treasurer or his department on a regular basis.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, large numbers of management letters are supplied regularly under the provisions of The Auditor General Act to all ministers and deputy ministers of all various departments and Crown agencies. However, the statute clearly requires that certain reports must be tabled and provided by the Auditor General and provided by various ministers. Therefore, I and other ministers will certainly table all that's required

by statute and will do so fully, but will not be required and will not be tabling those items not covered by the statute and not required, and I believe management letters are included in that.

MR. SINDLINGER: A final supplementary, please, Mr. Speaker. Could the Provincial Treasurer please give consideration to giving to the legislative committee on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund those management reports that deal with the Heritage Savings Trust Fund accounting and managerial systems, so that that committee can properly fulfil its responsibility as outlined by the Provincial Treasurer himself in the introduction to the heritage fund report; that is, that the "Committee of the Legislative Assembly conducts an annual in-depth review of the activities of the Heritage Fund."

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, there's nothing we have done or not done that in any way restricts the activities of the heritage fund committee. We'll certainly be prepared and will table any and all documents required by this Legislature through a statute or regulation.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Provincial Treasurer. Could the Provincial Treasurer confirm that he has received from the Auditor General secret management reports that contain significant information about the Heritage Savings Trust Fund and its management?

MR. HYNDMAN: The use of the word "secret" is puzzling, Mr. Speaker. As the hon. member knows, when The Auditor General Act was put through, provided therein are requirements for the Auditor General to send out management letters following the exit meeting, which are done regularly and have been for three or four years, to all Crown departments and agencies. Only those matters which are material or significant or which the Auditor General feels are noteworthy of review are translated by the Auditor General into his annual report. So the annual report of the Auditor General is the key one for review of the Assembly, the key accountability document. We have always provided not only existing information but quite often more than is required, as the Auditor General has mentioned on a number of occasions.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Provincial Treasurer. After discussion with the Auditor General, would the Provincial Treasurer consider tabling the respective management reports referred to in our present discussion?

MR. HYNDMAN: I'm not sure it's appropriate that I discuss these matters with the Auditor General as an officer of the Legislature, Mr. Speaker.

Again, we will table, and I will table, any and all documents required by this Assembly pursuant to statute or regulation.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the Provincial Treasurer confirm that prior to those management reports going to the Provincial Treasurer via the deputy Provincial Treasurer, discussions are held between the Provincial Treasurer, the deputy Provincial Treasurer, and the Auditor General, with regard to the matters further summarized in the management reports that come to the Provincial Treasurer?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have had no such discussions or meetings with the Auditor General. The department, of course, the deputy, and the heads of all the various departments and Crown corporations, do have discussions with the Auditor General and his staff at the exit conference, in order to review and discuss with the Auditor General — suggest, maybe — ways to improve. But those are not the subject of meetings between me and the Auditor General.

Cattle Industry

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the Minister of Agriculture. In light of the announcement yesterday that the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources would be looking at some type of assistance or incentive program for the small oil and gas producers, is the minister in a position to indicate what discussions he has had in the last week or 10 days with the different cattle-producing groups in this province as to the problems those groups are having?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, we've had the opportunity to receive the reports from meetings being held throughout the province; first of all, by the Cattle Commission in regard to meetings held in regard to their own organization. Of course, we have had the opportunity to discuss the total industry, and have also been kept up to date of any meeting of producers of any number that represent an area, a community, or a part of an organized group representing agriculture to date. We can only report that the results of those meetings are very similar to those held two or three weeks before, recognizing that an evaluation being done by those involved, whether they represent the cow-calf or the feeding industry, still recognizing and showing some concern and watching the prices as they affect the cow-calf industry.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a short supplementary. Is the minister in a position to indicate if he's been receiving many phone calls from individual cattle producers in the province, as to the serious problem these people seem to find themselves in?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the calls I have been receiving are mainly on behalf of organized groups rather than individuals. I've had the opportunity to discuss their concerns with individuals, and certainly some of the solutions as to where we go on behalf of the total industry. But I would say the majority of the conversations have been held with organized groups rather than with individuals.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. At this time, the minister is indicating that the government will not be providing any assistance to the cattle industry. Is that what the minister is saying?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I think it was stated in and outside this House that we in agriculture, and this government, are deeply concerned about the livestock industry, and have also stated that the industry collectively will have that opportunity to sit down with government and discuss the problems we're facing. But you also have to recognize that at this particular time, the industry is still in the process of holding their meetings. There is some unanimity as to the direction one should go, but

certainly differences of opinion are being expressed as to what some of the longer term solutions should be.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources did announce that there would be some assistance for the small oil and gas producers in this province, I'd like to table two phone numbers, so the people of this province can phone this government, because it is supposedly an open government. They are the numbers of the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works, Mr. Chambers, if they have mortgage problems, and for the cattle industry. I think the people of this province should really know who to phone. Mr. Speaker, I would like to table this for your information. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: I'm not sure the hon. member's documents qualify for either a tabling or a filing under the *Standing Orders*, but I'm concerned about whether he's in breach of a copyright.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table it and put it in the library. If not, I'd be pleased for either minister to have it, so they can advertise the numbers across the province so individual Albertans can call those two numbers.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to add the other two numbers. My department has availability to the general public at three numbers, and they're available to all. We have an open-door policy, and I don't think it's necessary to advertise one number. If you wish to advertise, please give them all three.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. In light of his enthusiasm, would he also like to add his residence number, so people can call him on the weekend?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, that's a [listed] number as well. It's in the book and everyone is aware of it.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. In the monitoring the minister's department is doing with regard to cattle leaving the province, could the minister indicate at this point if many calves are leaving the province of Alberta and going to other provinces?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, to date [there is] no indication that any numbers that would exceed a normal year are going out of the province to either other provinces, mainly eastern Canada, or the United States.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question relative to the cattle industry to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. It relates to a brief that came from my constituency to the Minister of Agriculture re: the Moore plan for cattle subsidy. I wonder if the minister could indicate at this time the present status of the Moore plan for cattle support.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, there is no such plan. I believe the reference is being made to largely incorrect information which circulated throughout southern Alberta just prior to the cabinet tour of that region some time ago. But I can provide to the hon. member the exact same information as the hon. Minister of Agriculture: the

matter is being discussed throughout the province, and a number of plans are being discussed.

Accounting Profession

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer in his capacity as the minister responsible for professional legislation dealing with the whole area of accounting. What is the government's timetable with regard to the proposals to rationalize the accounting professions in Alberta?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, no timetable has been established to date. A significant number of representations from various groups in the accounting area have been made over the past six months. I'm now considering those various representations and expect the matter will be the subject of a government caucus discussion in the near future.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of the fact that as I understand it, the three groups primarily concerned have not been able to get together and come to some agreement, which I suppose isn't surprising, is the minister considering the possibility of he or an official of the department attempting to become the catalyst to get the three groups together?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, some months ago, I wrote to each of those groups mentioned by the hon. member and suggested that it would be useful if they got together and tried to find what common ground might be available. There was some common ground but also other areas of very significant disagreement. There cannot be said to be general agreement between the various groups. Therefore, I am considering the import and quality of the various representations and will be taking that to caucus. A decision will be made shortly as to the pace of change in that area of professional legislation.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one last supplementary question to the minister. Has the minister satisfied himself and the people in the department that in fact an arrangement, accommodation, or joint proposal cannot come forward from the chartered accountants, the Society of Management Accountants of Alberta, and the CGAs? As I understand the situation, at this time the CGAs have not been able to be a part of an agreement with the other two groups and, to be very candid, find themselves left out in the cold.

MR. HYNDMAN: The hon. member is correct in that the first two groups mentioned have come to an agreement as to general proposals to which they agree as between themselves. However, another group does not share that view, and indeed others of a smaller size are concerned as well. So trying to work out the fairest and most equitable approach — dealing with all the people in the accounting area, who are all very busy now, of course — is the matter under consideration now, which will shortly be decided by government caucus.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

202. Moved by Mr. Little:

Be it resolved that this Assembly urge the government of Alberta to consider the establishment of a task force to study the need for human tissue for therapeutic purposes, medical education, and scientific research, and to recommend appropriate ways of meeting any such need.

[Adjourned debate April 14: Mr. Gogo]

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I think Motion 202, introduced last April 14 by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall, is a particularly important motion for this Assembly to give serious consideration to. We've had perhaps a dozen members of the Assembly speak to it since it was introduced. I've not heard any serious argument against the adoption of this motion. In my remarks today, I just can't see where I could possibly object to the intent of the motion, being:

... that this Assembly urge [the operative word being "urge"] the government of Alberta to consider the establishment of a task force to study the need for human tissue for therapeutic purposes, medical education, and scientific research, and [further] to recommend appropriate ways of meeting any such need.

The Member for Calgary McCall was particularly eloquent. He obviously did a great deal of research in moving this motion and speaking at some great length and detail in support of it. I really can't see how anybody could object to it.

I'm reminded, Mr. Speaker, of a couple of years ago. The hon. Member for Grande Prairie at that time, the hon. Dr. Backus, moved a somewhat similar motion that, again, met strong support of members of the Assembly, particularly the Member for Clover Bar who, although he expressed some great degree of concern as to whether that type of motion would alleviate the condition of his hairline, spoke strongly to the point that included with the intent of the motion that provision be made for transplanting such things as teeth. Recognizing his occupation, one could well appreciate his interest in that area.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be good to recap some of the comments made previously, particularly with regard to legislation as it exists now in this jurisdiction. Following that, I would like to make comments relative to the fact that we are a very, very mobile 24 million people in Canada. If the motion should be carried, perhaps that task force would consider the implications for Canadians right across our nation, particularly with Albertans who travel through other parts of the country.

During his discussion, the Member for Calgary McCall quoted very accurately what legislation is now in place. I would ask the indulgence of the members of the Assembly to quickly quote that. First of all, back on the 100th anniversary of Canada, 1967, The Human Tissue Act was passed in Alberta, that provided for a person 18 years or older to donate any parts of his or her body to research or medicine. At that time, to be effective it had to be done in writing and witnessed by two people, similar to a will. If that had not been given, other steps had to be taken to ensure that action could be carried out. However, in 1973 this government passed The Human Tissue

Gift Act, which was modelled on the 1967 Human Tissue Act except that the age as such was replaced by the age of majority, which in this province is 18.

Then in 1976, the Member for Edmonton Mill Woods, I believe, was the sponsor of a very important piece of legislation which tended to eliminate coroners in the province of Alberta and provide it with a medical examiners system, similar to the province of Ontario, under the aegis of The Fatality Inquiries Act. I think that made it possible then, with regard to this motion, to carry out some very important functions. One, it was to allow for the removal of the pituitary gland of the body without the permission, the express consent, of the next of kin. In other words, I guess it was really by default, if no previous objection had been given in writing. If one thinks of that a minute, it's not difficult to understand why there would be no previous objection given, because it's not the sort of thing people even think about.

Just last year, all members will recall, the government of Alberta made a substantial expenditure of \$10 million for the blood transfusion service building at the University of Alberta. Many of the comments by the mover of this motion, the hon. Member for Calgary McCall, touched on if that were utilized to the proper extent, we could have built around that very facility where the funds were being allocated, a substantial portion of his motion, which I'll speak to in greater detail in just a moment.

As I recall, the previous Solicitor General, the hon. Roy Farran, made an announcement in 1977 with regard to provision being made for the licensed drivers in Alberta. At the time of renewing their automobile operator permits, they could make provision in writing so that the fact that they wished to donate all the parts of their body for either recipients or the universities' use was on record. Mr. Speaker, I really don't know how successful that has been. As the Member for St. Paul so readily pointed out at that time, along with the Member for Calgary Mountain View, there seems to be quite an emotional attachment to one's organs and without proper and adequate preparation — and I'm speaking to the point when they're alive — some great difficulty in reconciling in their minds how they could be perceived as being cut up in various pieces and distributed to many parts of the globe. I recall very vividly the Member for St. Paul pointing out that surgeons who in fact did this kind of work treated the body just as they would a living person. I feel he made an eloquent speech that Albertans considering this type of thing should not really be concerned about the body being mutilated, because the body indeed was handled with respect by those surgeons performing that operation.

I recall as well the strong case the Member for Calgary McCall made with regard to an implementation procedure if the motion should be carried, and indeed we ended up with this being carried out by the government of Alberta. That was, if I may quote him from *Hansard*: Due to the nature of the organs and the fact that they can't be preserved for any great length of time, we could have that information set up on a registry system on 24-hour call, computer-actuated, so that not only would the donor be known but it would indicate the next of kin, the witnesses, and any attendant problems.

Mr. Speaker, the crux of the motion really seems to be how it would be put in place, if it's adopted.

I also recall vividly the hon. Member for Edson, who went to some length in attempting to speak as a legislator, not a physician, but he just couldn't help himself. He went on in great detail, pointing out the various parts of

the body used now in terms of transplants and organ donations.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the statistics used last time of the existing situation, I think it would be important to see where we are today. For example, dealing with tissues and organs: the ears, particularly the inner ears, the liver — which is obviously a critical element in anybody's body, because if you don't have one that's functioning, you're not going to be around very long. But particular attention was made by four speakers, I think, with regard to the cornea transplant. Although it's been going on for some 30-odd years, it would be interesting to note not just the number of transplants done, but the long waiting list by Albertans. For example, in 1978 there were 119 donations which resulted in 80 transplants. In 1979, there were 52 transplants. In 1980, it was up again to 88. But this year, 1981, with three-quarters of the year gone, only 30 have been carried out, with 191 people still waiting. That would tend to indicate to me, on the surface, that not many people are really aware of the fact that they either can or wish to donate any part or parts of their body to their fellow man.

I remember the Member for St. Albert speaking out in reference to the comments of the Member for St. Paul, that if we achieve nothing else in the debate, we could bring to the attention of Albertans the very real need for fellow Albertans to have these things. I think that would be most important and to some degree it has been achieved. How well I recall the Member for Edmonton Mill Woods saying, if only the members of the fourth estate could excuse themselves from a cup of coffee long enough to stay in their gallery and report some of the information that's being expanded upon by members of the Assembly. I don't know how important his words were because I've never seen them come back since. I do think, Mr. Speaker, that it's particularly important that members of this Assembly on both sides of the House, when they speak to these issues, somehow be given the opportunity of seeing that information communicated through the various media to Albertans.

Kidney transplants, of course, have gone on for almost a quarter of a century. Again, it's interesting to look at where we are in Alberta. To date in 1980, we're at a record level of kidney transplants. Over 35 have been done to date this year, but we still have well over 100 people waiting. As we all know, Mr. Speaker, those who are in need of a kidney transplant are undoubtedly on a dialysis system now. When I think of the community I represent, and the tremendous number — I say that because there are over 20, and for that community that's quite a number. Many of those had to commute by Greyhound three times weekly to go on the machine at the unit at Foothills hospital in Calgary. It's only in the past half dozen years that this government has made provision for dialysis to be done in their own locality and, indeed, in their own home. As I understand it, the government supplies not only the equipment but provides the heavy duty wiring necessary in people's homes to utilize this. However, there are still well over 100 people waiting at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to leave on the record a couple of concerns I have. One of them is based on the comment from the Member for Calgary Millican that sometimes in our anxieties or our urgency to put things into the statute books, we don't always give consideration to those people it may adversely affect, either physically or in other ways. I speak with regard to the Member for Calgary Millican, who said that we must at all times give

some consideration for those of religious beliefs, the spiritual side of any legislation we deal with, particularly with regard to something as sensitive as organs and tissues.

So, Mr. Speaker, should this motion pass, and I'm an optimist, ample consideration should be given to that group of society who for various religious reasons have strong feelings, when the committee recommends appropriate ways to meet any such need for therapeutic, medical education, and scientific research. Simply because they don't indicate in a written document that they don't wish a portion of their body to go to science, that somebody arbitrarily would do that . . .

Another concern I have, Mr. Speaker, is that we are a very mobile society. I understand that one-fifth of all Canadians move every year. So, we're very mobile. Somehow, I would think this committee should give consideration for sister jurisdictions, perhaps all the jurisdictions in Canada, to be tied into a common grid. Heaven knows that if you're speeding on Highway 2, whether it be in Nova Scotia or Alberta, within 12 seconds the Royal Canadian Mounted Police officer out of Ottawa, through electronic devices, could find out whether you had any previous conviction. With that achievement in law enforcement, surely we can achieve something similar with regard to the suggestion of the Member for Calgary McCall of monitoring on a computer those people who are registered.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to mention that we now have in Alberta a system which I don't think is second to any in the country, and that is the aids to daily living programs. Unlike America, we have programs here where various people who have problems — dialysis, as I've mentioned — have access to very economical and quick treatment right in their own communities. Perhaps one that's even more important, to those unfortunate Albertans who go through various procedures and end up ostomy patients, is a program we now have in place called aids to daily living that provides the paraphernalia necessary for these people to lead normal lives. If I'm not mistaken, we've either addressed or are addressing through aids program those 30,000 or 40,000 diabetics in our province who, unlike those who suffer from a broken leg or broken arm, are condemned really to life with daily administration of insulin and the high expense that goes with it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, if the Assembly passes this motion and we see in place a committee structured by government to look into these matters, I would strongly recommend that every step be taken to inform the public in a very positive way. The way it is today, as we've seen from the figures just related, which I think only substantiate the Member for Calgary McCall and the Member for Edson in the debate last spring, there's a crying need under the present system for those donor volunteers in Alberta to come forward and indicate in some way they're prepared to donate those organs. If one were to look at the statistics for the province of Alberta, we get into the fact we have about 35,000 live births a year in this province and still have 12,000 to 14,000 deaths.

If one considers the great potential — without wanting to sound negative, I think the word "harvest" was used by the Member for Calgary McCall. There's a shortage of harvest in terms of these organs. If one views the fact that 12,000 to 14,000 people are buried annually — I'm not referring to the accident victims and the motor vehicles; I'm referring primarily to the natural deaths — it would indeed go a long way to assisting Albertans in receiving the various types of tissues and organs they need to give

them a healthy life.

So on that basis, Mr. Speaker, I'm more than pleased to support Motion 202, moved by the Member for Calgary McCall, and would urge all members of the Assembly to do likewise. Thank you.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, the motion before us today was debated in the Legislature on April 14, 1981. The Member for Lethbridge West indicated at that time that it was a very dramatic debate. Today he has stated that the issue is a very sensitive one.

I wish to commend my Calgary colleague the Member for Calgary McCall for bringing this motion into the Assembly. His research into this topic was very detailed. It resulted in a factual but sensitive presentation. I wish to commend all the members of the Assembly who participated in that debate on April 14 for their individual, interesting presentations. Each of the participants taking part in the debate agreed on the value and importance of organ and tissue transplants, and the urgency of the need to find more donors. Further to that agreement, there was strong support for the motion which urges the government to set up a task force.

Let us look back to the success of this debate in our Legislature. The hon. Member for Calgary McCall stated three objectives as his reason for introducing this motion. The first one was to make members of the Legislature and the public more aware of the organ transplant program; secondly, to encourage the donation of human organs and to alleviate the anxiety and suffering of those many, many persons in this province who are waiting for a transplant. Hopefully, this debate has increased public awareness.

What we do appear to need in Alberta is much greater public support, knowledge of the program, and active participation. Alberta has shown leadership in this area in the past. Under the human organ procurement exchange program, \$50,000 per year hires two nurses to educate medical staff and the public about the need for organ donations. What a horrendous task for two people to be involved in across this province. No doubt their efforts have been very successful. In September 1980, \$10 million provided a blood transfusion service building at the University of Alberta, hopefully to expand and include a comprehensive tissue bank storing bones, joints, corneas, skin, blood, and cells. In 1977, the Department of the Solicitor General began attaching an organ donor card to Alberta driver licences.

Today the Member for Lethbridge West mentioned two of his specific concerns in regard to this program: the sensitivity for some minority groups and the mobility of our population. I'd like to add substantial reasons why we need a task force set up in Alberta. Times change, and needs change. Surely there is time for an assessment of the programs that have been in place for a while. Hopefully, with the increase in our population in Alberta, we must consider possible expansion of these programs.

At the present time, we do not have a method of determining how many donations were a direct result of the driver licence program. With the shortage of donors, we should possibly consider what is done in one of the Scandinavian countries, mentioned in the debate by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall. It may appear to be startling, but in that program you are automatically a participant. If you don't want to be a donor, you must sign a document which releases you from the commitment. The Member for St. Albert stated that the greatest challenge in public education is to convince people to

make the decision to donate. The Member for St. Paul stated that there are many psychological and social problems associated with transplant tissue going to patients. Another concern is the recruitment of donors by individuals or relatives.

I submit that the terminology used could be a factor in public education for recruitment. It is very difficult for some people when they hear the words "harvesting donations". Even the words "tissue transplant" are not as meaningful to the average person in the public as the words "kidney transplant". Other problems centre on obtaining and transporting organs within Canada. Another concern is the cost of treatment for patients today.

I would like to mention at this time that last Friday I was privileged to attend the opening of the new service building at the Foothills Provincial General hospital. One of the many services within that building will be a renal dialysis unit. The building was of course built from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and while the renal dialysis unit is not open at this time, it's very significant to look at the excellent facilities that will be available there. But one has to question the cost of these facilities, when the solution might be more transplants for these patients.

Another concern is the publicizing of donor cards. There has not been a determination of how many donations were a direct result of the driver's licence.

So, reviewing and reflecting back on all these concerns, I think the motion brought before us in the spring and today is very pertinent in that it urges the government to consider setting up a task force and, hopefully, this task force would review all these concerns and probably many other issues that could be identified. I'm very pleased to support this motion, and I would like to urge all members of the Assembly to support it.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank all hon. members who took part in this debate and compliment them on the excellent research they have done. In particular, I would like to compliment the Member for Lethbridge West and the Member for Calgary North West who today so adequately and concisely summed up the whole debate.

Mr. Speaker, there is a significant need in this province for more donors and, in spite of the programs this government has supported, that need has not been adequately met. It would appear that other jurisdictions are experiencing much more success than we are, and I think it would be useful if a committee such as the one recommended could take a look at the actions being taken by these other jurisdictions. Many of them are rather unique, as was pointed out by the Member for Calgary North West.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all members to support this motion.

[Motion carried]

212. Moved by Mr. Woo:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to consider approval of additional comprehensive workers' safety technician programs to be offered

at one or more postsecondary institutions and leading to certification in this field.

MR. WOO: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to bring this motion before the Assembly today. The purpose behind the motion is to reflect the broad principle that through education, the safety record in this province, particularly in industry, will be greatly improved. I recognize that it is impossible for any one person to do justice to the subject of safety professionals and occupational health and safety in the time allotted, Mr. Speaker. But I hope to touch upon a number of areas in speaking to this motion, and in doing so I would hope to provoke some meaningful debate which will eventually lead to some definitive conclusions with respect to a matter that I think is of great importance to the province, particularly in this day and time.

I think I can say that an informed worker is more conscious of his work environment and, as such, in all probability will spot danger to himself much more rapidly. He's also more apt to encourage others to avoid danger and unnecessary risks. To be informed and to establish an informed work force, a number of essential ingredients must be in place. In my view, Mr. Speaker, the most important is that commitment and co-operation of government, industry, and labor. To ensure that a framework is created whereby occupational health and safety receives the priority it deserves, there is a further requirement which I quite frankly think is extremely critical. That requirement may be new, but it is the need for the public at large, perhaps, to accept and support the concept of occupational health and safety as part of society's obligation in the area of social responsibility. I suspect that that statement is apt to raise a few hackles, particularly among those of us who view from a purely economic standpoint any form of social program as an unnecessary evil. The problem with that sort of thinking, as I see it, is that we're too prone to assess social programs by using the cost/benefit yardstick. That is a process with which I disagree. In my view, it is an inappropriate method to use in measuring the effectiveness of social programs. It is like saying that because the money we spend on preventive drug- and alcohol-abuse programs is too great in proportion to the number of people a program might reach, we should be prepared to drop it. Let me say this: we had better be prepared to pick up the costs of a remedial program for those people who might have benefited from the dropped program, and believe me, it will probably cost us in society a hundred times more in the long run.

In June of last year, the hon. Member for Calgary North West proposed a motion that recommended the establishment of an occupational health and safety foundation. The purpose of such a foundation was to make safety training program recommendations and how such programs might be made available to jobsites through private and public agencies and institutions. In addition, such a foundation would also recommend ways in which research for the betterment of working conditions in Alberta might be stimulated and supported. In an earlier speech before this Assembly, in response to the throne speech, the hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn expressed a hope that occupational health concerns could somehow be addressed within the activities of the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research. Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling that the views held by both hon. members are much more relevant today than ever before.

The motion before the Assembly today calls for work-

ers' safety technician programs which will lead to certification of individuals entering such programs offered through our various universities, colleges, and technical institutions. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I also hold a concurrent view that an Alberta association of registered safety professionals be established with an appropriate code of ethics, standards, and discipline. The establishment of such an association would serve a number of purposes, the primary ones being, first, the demonstration by this government of its priority commitment to the welfare of its working citizens; secondly, the provision of necessary credibility to both the concept of workers' safety and the graduated and qualified safety technician who becomes registered; thirdly, and perhaps most importantly from a functional point of view, the clout to get the job done.

Perhaps it is not so true today, Mr. Speaker, but in the past the concept of workers' safety held a dubious position and interpretation within our social and economic system. Speaking about attitudes, I would like to cite an Ontario experience, which was referred by an official in the Construction Safety Association of Ontario. It is one which I think should bear serious consideration by interested parties in our own province. Since 1977, when putting projects to bid major contractors in the province of Ontario have requested construction firms and subcontractors to include an official accident record with their tenders. Upon opening these tenders, all else being equal, the construction firm or subcontractor with the best accident record was awarded the contract. Amongst the companies that participated in this very major advancement have been the Steel Company of Canada, Bell Canada, and Ontario Hydro. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that since 1977 this criteria has applied to approximately one-third of the major projects tendered in Ontario.

In current terms, I'm convinced that we are still far short of that level of workers' safety awareness that I feel is desirable. This feeling is reinforced all the more when I view it in terms of the pressure cooker environment of industrial growth forecast for this province over the course of the next two decades. I suggest very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that if it is necessary to create meaningful workers' safety standards by legislation, we move in that direction.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, there are those of my hon. colleagues in this House who will disagree with me, who will insist that legislation will only represent more government intrusion, who will say that legislation in those areas which will directly affect the economics of a free market system have no place in our system, that there should be less government intrusion in free enterprise, that social programs are always attended by huge costs. As I said earlier, if I were to judge those statements from a purely economic standpoint, in all probability I would agree. However, I view the concern of workers' safety from the moral and social area responsibility to our society. Inasmuch as that social legislation results in some economic cost, then I say that is part of the price we pay. If we as legislators and society as a whole are in agreement with the arguments we propose in support of worker health and safety, so be it.

If there is a feeling that we are beginning to see some daylight on the subject, Mr. Speaker, let me hasten to say that we are not yet out of the woods in terms of making the argument for or against the appropriate legislation and place that workers' health and safety legislation should occupy, and who and what agencies will deal with

it.

I say that in light of another interesting proposition which I would like to touch upon briefly, and that has to do with women in the work place. Traditionally — and it is a tradition which I am pleased to note is going the way of the dodo, albeit not as rapidly — women have been relegated to second-class work environments. This is the sort of environment which usually reflects end-of-the-line or dead-end jobs. This is the sort of environment which creates its own framework of mental and health hazards. Add to this the concerns of sexual discrimination and sexual harassment in the work place. If we are to accept these concerns as part of the hazards we associate with the question of worker health and safety, and I see no reason not to, is it not logical that somewhere along the line the activities of worker health and safety will bring about a convergence of government, industry, labor, and the Human Rights Commission?

Certainly at the present time, the Human Rights Commission is only involved with those concerns related to job discrimination by reason of sex and sexual harassment on a much narrower plane. The interesting proposition I raise is that given the direction in which we are going, it may well be that the Human Rights Commission could become very much a part of all those activities related to worker health and safety.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, every hon. member in this Assembly knows the traumatic and tragic impact that accidents, injuries, and fatalities have on the family unit. Underlying all this is always the nagging thought that in most cases the accident, injury, or fatality might have been prevented except for an ambivalent attitude to safety as a result of non-existent or superficial safety education programs.

For those of us who still have reservations with regard to the legislative process, I would simply make this observation. On an increasing basis over the years, governments have taken over the responsibility to regulate certain individuals, groups, and professionals, for the increased benefit or protection of society as a whole. Based upon such precedents, it is my view that governments have a responsibility, perhaps a very major responsibility, in establishing through legislation adequate standards with respect to health and safety. I would go beyond that by saying that based upon a demonstrated need, that responsibility should perhaps be extended to the regulation of the work place, to create adequate standards and to ensure a safe and proper environment for those individuals who comprise our essential work force.

Over the last five years, Mr. Speaker, there has been increasing interest in occupational health and safety. That interest has usually followed two lines: first, as a subject of societal public interest; secondly, from the point of view of what government and industry are doing about it. In this province, that interest culminated in and was sustained by the report of the Industrial Health and Safety Commission, more commonly referred to as the Gale commission. It is interesting to note that the numerous studies conducted throughout the nation have resulted in just as many shapes and forms of frameworks, approaches, and regulatory bodies with differing regulations to deal with a common concern. Here in the province of Alberta, we have chosen a program of occupational health and safety which is primarily consultative in nature. We are basically relying on the philosophy of voluntary action by concerned elements within the governmental, industrial, and labor framework to address the concerns of worker health and safety through increased

co-operation and communication.

Mr. Speaker, I am in total agreement that given the ideal situation, this philosophy would certainly produce an effective program. But I am not so certain that we can achieve the objective through voluntary action alone, because I fail to see an ideal situation developing. I am of the opinion that our home-brew program lacks the punch of systems in use in other parts of Canada. Some systems call for emphasis on worker participation through mandatory joint worksite committees. In some jurisdictions there is effective legislation or regulations which give and define refusal-to-work rights. When you add educational programs, the concept of self-regulation, increased commitment and co-operation, the use of economic incentives, and perhaps most significantly the capacity, capability, and willingness to enforce regulations, then I suggest we have a package.

To some people, this may sound too drastic. But let me cite a few facts taken from a publication authored by Mr. N. Ashford, Cambridge, Massachusetts, titled, *Crisis in the Workplace: Occupational Disease & Injury*. In Canada in 1976, there were 1,044,940 compensable injuries. From 1967 to 1978, there were about 1,200 work-related fatalities annually. That means that from 1967 to 1978, inclusive, a period of 12 years, there were about 14,400 work-related deaths. In 1976, 11 million working days were lost through strikes, but 14 million working days were lost through injury and illness in the work place.

Let's take a look at the direct cost of work-related illness, injuries, and fatalities. In 1974, the cost was \$537 million. In 1976, the cost rose to \$800 million. In 1980, the cost was projected to rise to \$1 billion. Given those figures, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Canadian cost will rise to \$1.2 billion in 1981.

In light of these facts and in terms of the steps I feel we should take, I suppose the question I would ask is: how drastic can it be before it becomes too drastic? Certainly I subscribe to the philosophy that through increased co-operation and communication we could end up with a very effective occupational health and safety program based on voluntary action. However, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest — and I am now speaking about the total concerns of worker health and safety — that if the objective, which is to effectively meet those concerns, cannot be achieved through the spirit of mutual co-operation and moral suasion under our present framework, the alternative is for government to legislate. My feeling in this regard is further strengthened in that I detect a significant degree of inability on the part of all concerned to recognize occupational health as distinct from workers' safety in that we are dealing with a different set of circumstances. Health and safety in the work place, on a broader plane, are complex problems, particularly in this day and age of technical and chemical advances. Perhaps we have compounded the problems because we have inadvertently made it more difficult to reach consensus on solutions because we indiscriminately interchange the words "work" and "occupational" with the words "health" and "safety". Again, maybe it doesn't really matter.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to conclude my remarks by saying that central to all I've said is a desperate need for more trained and qualified specialists and safety professionals. In my view, the safety professional is the catalyst who makes safety programs work effectively and efficiently. I'm confident that we can meet the need for more safety specialists through the offer of additional comprehensive programs through our universities, colleges, and technical

institutions. The University of Alberta presently offers a course which is supported and designed by government, industry, the university and, more importantly, safety professionals themselves. In my view, it is a step in the right direction. I recognize that over the course of the last few years, particularly subsequent to the report of the Gale commission, through the establishment of a specific department under a very conscientious minister, we have made some tremendous strides in the direction of seeking solutions to those concerns expressed within the occupational health and safety field. I recognize and commend the \$10 million, eight-year program announced not too long ago by the hon. minister, which I am sure some hon. members, and probably the minister himself, would wish to speak to.

I look forward to debate in support of this motion by other hon. members in this Assembly.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to speak today on Motion 212 and wish to commend the hon. Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park for introducing this motion. My interest in this area is long standing. In June 1979, I presented a motion recommending the consideration of an occupational health and safety foundation. In June 1980, while on a trip in the British Isles, I went to Montrose, Scotland, and visited a petroleum training centre. It was interesting to see what they were doing and how they were doing it. One appealing aspect of that program, which was very similar to what we do in Alberta, was the concept of decentralizing in Scotland. This was a small town not too far outside Aberdeen, but it was an interesting town and certainly a very adequate place to have this petroleum training program.

The major concern in that program naturally was with firefighting on the offshore drilling rigs, but they were also expanding to look at other aspects of the program. They had had a lot of communication with our minister in this portfolio, were very pleased at the co-operation they had received, and were certainly learning a lot that would be useful to them in Scotland from the programs offered in Alberta.

On a trip to California in June 1981, I visited Dr. Linda Clever in San Francisco. Dr. Clever is a physician with further education in occupational health. She is employed by a large medical centre in San Francisco. It was interesting to note what types of programs had been initiated by her at this medical centre.

At this particular centre in California, their philosophy was that the best place to start with a program was in their own facility. The number one program Dr. Clever had initiated, of course, was for all workers in the Pacific Medical Center. Her second objective was to work with groups outside the centre, and she was very busy involved in many programs with groups like the unions down there and any other interested group. This gave me an insight into what other parts of the world had been doing in this area.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park mentioned the existing safety program in Alberta which is available at the University of Alberta. Of course, this program is directed to the safety professional who deals in any way with safety, whether the application is teaching or researching as part of the job. A certificate is offered for successful completion of this program.

The other successful programs I would primarily like to deal with are for occupational health nurses. In 1974, a diploma program in occupational health nursing was established at Grant MacEwan college in Edmonton. This

was to be taken on a part-time basis over three to four years. In 1977, the course was offered on a full-time, daytime basis with a staff complement of one full-time salaried instructor. In 1978, the course was offered through Mount Royal college in Calgary. In 1980, a second instructor was added to this program. Over the six-year period of the program, 112 nurses have graduated, most of whom are now working in the industry.

These two types of programs are merely two offered in the educational institutions. Other programs are offered by the Alberta Petroleum Industry Training Centre, the government of Alberta, and our technical institutes. One of the concerns identified that must be addressed of course is the lack of interest by students taking these programs. A lot of large companies in the province have evolved and developed their own programs, and many small companies unfortunately do not support their staff attending these programs.

Lack of good instructors will be a concern. With competitive salaries, just increasing the number of qualified instructors is difficult. Lack of funding is also a concern. These programs require a large amount of money initially to make sure the programs are started. Another concern of course is the lack of specialization in the programs. While it appears that there should certainly be a generalist concept, in this particular area there must be enough basic concepts applicable to people right across our different industries in this province. However, there is some concern because of the high degree of specialization in some of our industries. One would think generally of the oil industry in speaking about that.

Some of the considerations that I hope would be addressed in establishing programs that would meet the needs for our requirements in Alberta are, first of all, the curriculum. There must be identification of the skills and knowledge used by each practitioner group. The identification of these curricula, be they in the educational institutions, must of course be in co-operation with the government. A second concern is addressing the student population. This might depend on the locale and the type of delivery mode. Hopefully, this is an area where there could be a lot of innovation by using television and multi-media or correspondence courses.

One of the available media I would like to mention and hope it would be picked up in this regard is the availability of two studios through Alberta Government Telephones, one in Edmonton and one in Calgary. Using these studios with TV cameras, a teacher can be in Edmonton and have two-way communication going in the classroom which allows students in Calgary to participate at the same time. A graduate studies course in nursing, which has received a grant from innovative projects, is using this method of teaching and it is most successful. Hopefully, this would make it easier for people around the province to participate in these courses. I would also like to stress the value of individual learning packages, such as learning modules, as another way of stimulating and motivating students to participate in basic knowledge courses in this area.

I mentioned before that naturally there are constraints to these programs. Among the constraints that must be addressed are the existing or impending legislation and regulations, the time available to train personnel, the geographic location of students, the availability of necessary curriculum expertise, learning resources, and educational delivery mechanisms. However, looking at some of the concerns that may be a result of the initiation of these programs, consideration still has to be given in our

province. In this province, with our increased population and our increased activity, not only in the oil industry but in the construction industry and on the farm — and I believe the Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park addressed the concerns — we are all aware that statistics indicate that we have more accidents. Traditional methods utilized are not decreasing the number or severity of these accidents.

It is interesting to note that there is a need for eight categories of occupational health and safety practitioners in Alberta. There is an acute shortage of trained occupational health and safety personnel. That is why I think the hon. Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park should be commended for bringing this motion forward at this particular time, so that these issues can be addressed.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to refer to a letter I received in December 1979 following the debate in the Legislature on my motion. During that debate, the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway stated his concern about the lack of properly trained people in Alberta.

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.

The gentleman who wrote me, Mr. M.D. Crucefix, coordinator of safety and training for Esso Resources Canada Limited, states that that quote of the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway is 100 per cent correct. "I have been in the occupational safety and health field for 10 years and concur with Dr. Paproski."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The matter is perhaps not too serious, although I'd be reluctant to see it taken as a precedent. As hon. members know, the purpose for debate in the Assembly is for the members to express their views. Non-members are not elected to express their views in the Assembly. That becomes of much more direct concern when we have a non-member commenting on something said in the Assembly by a member. True enough, in this particular case it happens to be a remark made by a non-member agreeing with what a member says. But can you imagine some of the examples of violent disagreement which may be read in the Assembly if we're going to adopt a practice like this?

MRS. EMBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was using this letter to indicate to the Assembly my expressed and very keen interest in this topic. I wanted to show that this is also a matter of concern to many people who are out there working in the industry.

I would like to urge the members of this Assembly to support this motion.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on Motion 212, I'd like to congratulate my friend the Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park for getting into an area where quite a number of the members of this Legislative Assembly have some concerns, interests and, in some cases, some experience. That latter remark was not throwing nasturtiums at anybody.

The motion addresses an increasing problem in our province. In the time I have lived here, we have changed our society and our economy as radically as any area in the world. When I came to Alberta 25 years ago, we had essentially an agricultural industry. We had the dying stages of what had been a very active coal-mining industry. We had the very beginnings of an oil industry, and I

don't think many of us at that time realized how significant that oil industry was going to become. But as I said, at that time it was essentially a farming industry — not that farming is immune from accidents; far be it from that — the packing industry that was based on that farming industry, a transportation of the products, the servicing industries, but very little modern technological industry.

If you look at the province 25 years later, we have oil sands plants, gas extraction plants for both sulphur and natural gas liquids, propane, butane, pentanes plus. We have petrochemicals mushrooming as an industry all over the province. We have paper and pulp mills. I might add that in 1955, the very first pulp mill under construction in the province, by what was then North Western Pulp and Power, was regarded as being a colossal construction project in Alberta. Nowadays it would be only a medium-sized project. We also have general chemicals and a resurgence of the coal-mining industry, both above and below ground.

This diversification in our economy and our industrial base has not just happened by type of diversification. There is also the scale and the number of the plants involved. In total, the work force in Alberta, while growing very rapidly and much more rapidly than anywhere else in Canada, has also been exposed to what for Alberta are new accident and health hazards. In brief, Mr. Speaker, we have gone from a basically agrarian, relatively simple society and economy to a typical complex, modern, technological society, with the underlying economic base for that.

Many members have expressed concerns about other problems, both sociological and environmental, that come from this burgeoning growth and diversification. But today we're addressing a relatively narrow problem that has come from it, and that is that no longer can one look at the Workers' Compensation Board and say, well, that answers all the problems of accidents in industry. That was addressed by the recent select committee of this Legislature on The Workers' Compensation Act.

Among the adjustments that have had to be made by Alberta are the educational field, the technological and vocational institutes under the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, where the Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park has been suggesting we should add courses on workers' safety technician programs. Those institutes of themselves indicate the increasing technology of the province. When one looks at the manpower difficulties we are suffering — one can see it even with the rapid increase in its size — we are not able to cope with the problem and have to import many skilled workers into our newer industries.

As I said, 25 years ago the Workers' Compensation Board, by looking after the injuries, paying the doctors and paying compensation, was essentially regarded as answering the problem in the industries covered under the Act. No longer can we honestly say that that is the case. Nowadays we have to look at the avoidance of accidents, the avoidance of occupational disease and ill health, by what is referred to as accident and occupational health preventative programs.

These can be very simple. I think I've mentioned before in this Assembly that in woodlands workers in Hinton, we reduced our accidents from power saws by some 90 per cent by introducing compulsory safety toes on boots, insisting that they wear hard hats, introducing protective clothing with nylon mesh in the pant legs, and by devising, with the aid of the power saw industry, some chains

for those saws that didn't kick back nearly so easily. Those are relatively simple changes to make and were made by people with as little training in that area of industrial medicine as myself.

When one looks at the increasingly complex industry in the province, one can no longer look at such simple answers. In its journeys to Europe — Germany, Sweden, and Britain — as well as looking at just the provision of compensation and rehabilitation, the select committee looked at how those much more complex industrial societies are handling the problem. It's quite interesting to look at the tremendous attention paid to the technological industry in, say, Germany, where the committee visited a complex at Leverkusen, where the Bayer chemical company has its headquarters, with more than 30,000 workers. Now that's probably more chemical workers than there are in Canada, and certainly many more than there are in Alberta. But even when one allows for the scale of that plant, in that one location there were some 20 industrial physicians, 28 full-time work council technicians, and some 22 part-time technicians working on works councils. An additional 180 technicians were working purely on safety, accident prevention, and chemical studies in relation to occupational health. There were some 800 part-time safety stewards. It means about one worker in 25 is involved, full-time or part-time, in the avoidance of accidents and industrial disease.

When one looks at the scale in that one plant in Germany, one realizes that the answers so far in Canada have been inadequate. The member for Calgary North West mentioned that we need some eight types of trained people in the Alberta industry as it develops. Of course, we run into the spectrum similar to the spectrum we nowadays have in medicine. Twenty-five years ago, accident prevention work was as if it were only general practitioners. As our industry has become more complex, we need the specialists, just as in medicine we have also had to change in our practice techniques and in training. There is no doubt whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, that one considerable demand is going to be for the people who have enough expertise to function at the worksite level on the joint worksite safety committees.

The problem in Alberta has been that, while our industry has been expanding and while the activities of the compensation board and the department of occupational health and safety have been expanding, the number of accidents has not been decreasing relative to the work force. Over the last decade, it has remained pretty persistently in the vicinity of 160 to 200 accidents per 1,000 workers. The severity of those accidents has certainly been decreasing, because the number of fatalities has gone up very little while the work force has doubled. But as yet, we have not attained anything like the European success in reducing the number of accidents. When our select committee was in Germany, we learned that over a 15-year period in Nordrhein-Westfalen they had reduced their number of accidents by some 45 per cent. At the same time, they had halved the number of fatal accidents. That's gross numbers, not in relation to the number of workers. Unfortunately, in Alberta we cannot claim to have been quite so successful. It's obvious that we must look at the European techniques, experience, and methods for making our worksites safer, from both an accident and an industrial health standpoint.

If we are going to do this, we are going to have to introduce trained people of various types. Obviously, the lesser training will be for the greater number of people. I'm not suggesting that we are going to put PhD chemists

and biochemists into every chemical plant. On the other hand, we do need some people of that type. But certainly, to have the delivery at the worksite, we are going to have to improve the functioning of the joint worksite committee, by giving the people who function on those committees some additional training. That doesn't mean that those people who are essentially workers functioning on a committee would have to go to the technician program, but in worksites of the medium size one requires additional people, between the worksite safety committee and the PhD or MD, who have some technical training and expertise which they can apply to their own particular location. The motion of the Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park addresses this problem in particular.

It was a recommendation of the select committee on The Workers' Compensation Act, probably our last recommendation in Section 5, that the government give priority to the establishment and accreditation of training and qualifications for those who practise in the field of occupational health and safety. We didn't go any further than that recommendation. We didn't specify what degree of training was required or the different types of people who were required for the different industries, partly because I think the other members of the committee, just like me, didn't feel that we had sufficient expertise to make those recommendations. After all, we represented the dental profession, the medical profession, and a few others. None of us was actually in the accident prevention or occupational health field.

Mr. Speaker, what it comes down to is that, with a changing society and a very rapidly developing industrial base, we can no longer function in the horse and buggy days. Just as the automobile grew to become an elephant and then had to specialize and become much more economical, we will have to do the same in the occupational health field. It's going to be a responsibility of the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation, both the present minister and his successors, to make sure that the functioning of occupational health and accident prevention in this province keeps up with — and in some cases, unfortunately, catches up with — the present situation in the province and the future situation that will arise as our industrial base increases in complexity.

The problem is essentially a human one. We all know the results of the failure of accident prevention or the prevention of occupational disease. Surely the motion by the Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park addresses a particular part of this problem. I would like to support the recommendation he has made in this motion and would urge other members of the Assembly similarly to support it.

MRS. FYFE: I, too, would add my complimentary words to the Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park for bringing forward this motion. I would like to make a few comments on the motion this afternoon.

As has been said by the previous speakers, Alberta has indeed experienced unprecedented growth over the last number of years. This tremendous growth in industry and, unfortunately, the accidents and illnesses that come as a result of this growth, are something that have been recognized, though, by the government of Alberta. As was mentioned, this recognition took place in 1973, primarily with the establishment of the Gale commission on industrial health and safety. This commission, which handed its report to the Legislature in 1975, conducted a study and survey of the policies and programs in Alberta,

and recommended plans to provide a co-ordinated program of occupational health and health functions. As a result of this report, the occupational health and safety division was formed under the Department of Labour and, as a consequence of the establishment of this division, was followed by The Occupational Health and Safety Act in December 1976. This division is now part of the department that was established in 1979 under the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation, the hon. Mr. Diachuk.

During the past few years, it has become quite clear that government can play a significant role in influencing the worksite, and have some effect on the number of accidents and the ways in which we can prevent industrial illness. Unfortunately, there is a limit to this effectiveness. If we are to have any degree of effect on the number of tragic accidents and the number of illnesses that result, I believe it is imperative that there be a greater awareness, a greater motivation, and a greater knowledge on the part of employers and workers alike.

As government's influence is limited, it would be nice if we could find the recipe or the formula to legislate attitude, but this is not within our power. As the Member for Edson mentioned a few moments ago, in our tour in February last year to a number of European countries, one of the most startling — startling to me at least — areas we observed was the very different attitude and approach the Europeans have taken towards the work place. It didn't just come through as a result of attitude towards industrial health and safety, but perhaps a more inclusive attitude towards total labor.

In West Germany, which is one of the most industrialized countries on this earth, there was an extremely positive attitude on the part of management, government, and workers. The three areas worked together. They agreed that certain objectives would be beneficial, such as ensuring that the work place was as safe as possible, that there was joint participation of the workers and management. This attitude permeates through the whole labor area, to the point where there is also agreement that strikes do not serve a useful purpose in the development of the economy of that country and that there had to be a more productive, more useful, more beneficial way of resolving differences. I agree with the previous speaker who said we have a great deal to learn from areas such as West Germany, which has much longer experience. Industrial development within the province of Alberta is relatively new, as was said. If we can look at the positive experiences that have happened and are taking place in other parts of the world, I think it will be a tremendous boon to the workers and to the families of workers within this province.

While I've mentioned that attitude is something we in this Legislature cannot change, cannot legislate, perhaps there is a way we could influence that change in attitude. I think that way may be partly a result of this Motion No. 212, which suggests we consider additional comprehensive workers' safety technician programs. The way I believe we can influence that attitude is through training programs that could be established elsewhere. The mover of this motion has described in some detail programs that are presently in effect, such as the industrial safety officers program at the University of Alberta. This program, originally only a 90-hour, part-time program in industrial prevention administration, came about as a result of the co-operation between the University of Alberta, Extension, the Alberta Association of Safety Personnel, the division of industrial health services, and the accident

prevention department of the Workers' Compensation Board. Last year, this program was upgraded to a certificate program. The hours increased from 90 to 291. Now I as a member of this Legislature am certainly not in a position to say whether that number of hours is adequate. But as a lay person thinking about that type of program, it would seem to me that due to the vast variety of fields and the complexity of our industrial world, it couldn't possibly be a program that would satisfy the needs of our entire province. Because we are a growth province and many people are moving here, many new workers are coming from a variety of countries to participate in our economy, I think it's even more essential that we look at the present program and at the possibility of expanding this program to other areas. There may be divisions we could look at, one that would have a basic level of training and intermediate and senior levels, to put it into the very simplest of terms.

Through some of the reading I have done, I understand that the province of Ontario initiated a three-year industrial safety officers' course for postsecondary high school graduates, but that this course has not been particularly successful. I would suggest that perhaps one of the reasons this program has not enjoyed a great deal of success is that I would seriously doubt that young students coming out of high school would have a great deal of interest in developing safety in the work place. My observation of many young people is that safety is often not a prime concern to them as there is that feeling of immortality when you're younger, that you won't be affected by accident or injury.

I would further suggest that as we mature, we become more aware of some of the incidents that take place around us, some of the tragic happenings of our fellow workers, of families, friends, people we're close to. Life's experiences, life's tragedies, become more meaningful. And that point in time when we become aware of the great need for prevention and increased safety programs is probably the time that the person entering a postsecondary program would be most interested, and therefore the course most suitable for him or her.

Therefore, I feel that any safety technician program established should have a prerequisite of prior industrial experience. This does not have to be years and years of experience, because some people mature very early — maybe even a short period of time. But I think it would be an area that should be considered in a training program. Whether it's a short 291-hour program or a longer three-year program, whatever the mix, I think work experience should be essential.

The other area I would foresee as perhaps causing some challenge, I think would describe it, is the development of curriculum. Once again, because of the complexities of the work force and our industry, so many different areas and elements, so many different aspects of safety have to be studied and considered to make them applicable to the worksite.

Once again, in the development of curriculum, I think it's also imperative that programs revolve around practical experience which could only be gathered on a real worksite. I think curriculum will have to be developed based on standards. That's another area where work has been done, but continuing work will have to be done on the standards of practice.

I think an area covered previously by other members related to cost effectiveness. The Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park mentioned that it's very difficult to do a cost/benefit analysis on a social program. It's certainly

even more difficult to do this type of analysis on preventive programs. We know the statistics, the number of injuries. In some ways, we can predict the number of industrial diseases that may result if a worker is in a worksite such as an underground mine over a certain period of years. We can project those from experiences in other countries or experiences in the past. But it's very difficult to say that if we initiate such and such program, we will have saved so many man-hours because so many workers will not have been injured, because we never know precisely what would have come about.

Common sense says prevention in an area such as the work place is cost effective not only as far as dollars. In fact, the international labour conference in 1980 estimated that accident and industrial disease cost about 4 per cent of the gross national product. That's a staggering figure, because that's not the gross national income, that's the gross national product — a very large figure indeed. If in effect we can reduce that 4 per cent by half a percentage, this would mean a tremendous amount to the economy of any country.

I don't think it's fair to leave any cost effectiveness only in terms of dollars. Having served on the workers' compensation select committee, part of our review took place in the rehabilitation centres both abroad and in this area. In fact, some members of our committee travelled to other parts of Canada, the United States, and New Zealand, and came back with reams of material that was of very great assistance to our committee in making recommendations.

But you certainly cannot help but feel a tremendous sense of sadness and despair when you look at a young person who has lost their limbs, the capability to walk, to ride a bike, perhaps to drive a car, to carry on the same type of life they had, because of an accident that could have been prevented. Those costs to individuals, the families, and their friends just simply cannot be measured in any terms.

So if the motion put forward by the member will assist in any way in the development of programs, standards, and technicians who are capable and effective in the worksite, I believe this motion is worthy of support by all members of this Legislature. Thank you.

MR. MACK: It is a privilege to participate today in the debate of Motion 212, proposed by my hon. colleague from Sherwood Park. I would first like to discuss present safety legislative requirements, who they affect, and the obligatory requirements. Then I would like to discuss what role the joint committee can and should play.

As worded, the principle behind this motion is that through safety education, workers in all industries involved in the economic growth of Alberta will have an improved safety record, and an informed worker and employer can spot danger faster and avoid unnecessary risks. The intent of my remarks today is to expand on this motion by using the mechanism of a mandatory joint committee as an additional means of achieving safety on the worksite.

There are numerous existing safety programs in the province. I would like to make note of them. For example, the University of Alberta has an occupational safety program which is directed to the safety professional who deals in any way with safety, whether the application is in the area of teaching or researching, as part of the responsibility. The student covers basic management topics, with a total of 291 hours dedicated to this particular instruction program. Certificates are received from the

university by these students for successful completion of the program. The program itself is an educational standard for the safety professional which they must attain.

There are some problems with this course, such as perhaps lack of interest. Lack of funding is another problem. I see one of the very major lacks is of specialization that the program offers. From the industry's standpoint, someone who has successfully completed this program is perhaps, at best, a generalist in knowledge in their approach to safety, how they might implement safety programs, how they might ensure that these are in place in the work place, and how they might communicate these to workers in the work place. While he may possess a solid background in the general aspects of safety, very often he is unfamiliar with the specific safety problems associated with, for example, a drilling rig or dealing with chemicals. Many safety officers believe that an apprenticeship program is necessary to supplement the general program or the general safety course which they might receive at the university.

As far as chemicals, drilling rig problems, and the many injuries received by workers in the oil industry by workers, I think we can also include those workers who are more and more exposed to dangers which call for their expertise to go underground, work in deep sewers, and so on. Not too many weeks ago, we just had the sad experience where four workers lost their lives. If proper policy procedures had been in place, I think those workers should not have remained underground when there was an inordinate rainfall during that particular period. For their very safety, they should have been brought to the surface. This did not occur, of course, and the tragedy of it all was that four workers were lost to their families, friends, and their employer in their expertise.

Another type of safety program offered is seminars at the Faculty of Extension at the University of Alberta. For example, one such course is manual materials handling, a seminar on the safety aspects that relate to how a worker might prevent injuring his or her back in lifting heavy substances. They are three-hour per lesson programs over a five-day period, and the cost is approximately \$85. This is a fairly heavy cost to the average worker. Although management personnel have the advantage of being able to be sent by industry to take this particular course, the worker, the other very important component of any safety committee because it's the worker who is constantly at the worksite, does not have the opportunity, and very often does not take the opportunity because of the sheer cost and perhaps the time they would have to take from the work place. Therefore, they do not take advantage of this particular program which is offered and would be extremely meaningful to them. It is already in place, but somehow we have not grasped the significance of it. As a result, our employees or the workers in the work place are not taking advantage of the special extension course programs which our postsecondary educational system provides today.

So it's not necessarily that it's not in place. It's the mechanism of taking advantage. I believe that if we had mandated joint worksite safety committees, it would be very prudent for industry and management to ensure that the people who served on the committees were informed and capable of assessing and discharging their role in the capacity far more effectively and fully, perhaps, if they had the opportunity of taking this additional training.

Some of the resource people involved in the extension course are a professor of industrial and premedical engineering and a professor in the department of physical

therapy, and the associate professor of biomedical engineering and applied sciences at the U of A. As well, technical institutes offer programs relating to loss control management due to injuries and time loss at work, supervision and safety, apprenticeship programs, foremanship, and supplementary training courses. These kinds of courses are useful. However, in most cases they do not go far enough in offering a comprehensive approach to safety.

The most important time to train workers in safety is during their apprenticeship years. Normally in most trades they spend four years. These are the people who spend a great deal of their time in the work place in the various industries, and they would be a tremendous benefit if in fact it were mandated that part of the apprenticeship program had a very comprehensive safety curriculum which they might be taking and taught at the same time.

The government of Alberta offers various types of safety programs which are in place today. Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation offers a half-day course on the basic principles of safeguarding machinery and lockout procedures on the machinery. It explains where and why protective guards are necessary when a worker is working with specific machinery, hazard control procedures, why lockout procedures are needed, and how to introduce these methods. These are already in place. One has some difficulty determining whether they are fully being taken advantage of.

Together with Labour, occupational health and safety offers an accident control course for supervisors. Again, it's directed to supervisors, just one-half the component of a safety committee. If we might reiterate what I said earlier, I suppose one reason is simply that the supervisor can be taken from the work place with the salary continuing, but this is not necessarily always the case with the ordinary worker. It uses planned exercises and discussions to show that accidents are symptomatic of various supervisory problems. It further provides insight into ways of overcoming these problems through the use of standard supervision, human relations, and safety programs. The course is three hours long and over a five-day period.

Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation, together with Agriculture — and I think this is a very progressive move on the part of the government. I commend the department because we too are experiencing a lot of injuries in the agricultural area, where workers quite often receive very serious, if not fatal, injuries. The farm safety workshops are designed for small groups of 10 to 30 people. They go right down to age 16 and up. The workshop includes farm group discussions and evaluation of farm hazards, and reviews ideas to improve both farm and work safety. These are very, very commendable initiatives.

Further, occupational health and safety has a division of research and education. The branch offers various courses including basic accident control for supervisors, entry into confined spaces, and joint workshop health and safety committee training. There are some problems with the education component of this branch, however, and I would like to review a few. The education section does not have the personnel to meet the present education needs and demands, particularly on a province-wide basis. The program development component is lacking. Opportunities for engaging in educational research are very limited. To date, the involvement of postsecondary and technical institutions in occupational health and safety training and education is still at the exploratory stage.

Although a variety of educational and training programs are being offered by industry, government educational institutions, and private organizations, they focus on specific issues and tend to be unco-ordinated and fragmented.

I think it is obvious that at present, safety programs could be improved. That is, the programs mentioned all have good intentions but in many cases these intentions are too general in scope. To improve the safety record in the province, we should be directing our energies to mandatory joint committees for all professions.

In Alberta now there are some 110 joint worksite committees. These committees are of a voluntary nature, not mandatory. To date, they have been very successful, as management and employees have been able to work together. If our safety programs are going to be meaningful and produce the types of results all of us would like to see, I believe they must be mutually accepted. The responsibility must be of a mutual nature, and the employee or worker must feel that the burden of ensuring safety is as much on them as it is to ensure that management provides the work place as a safe place to work.

Until we achieve these goals, I think we will be struggling and will constantly have difficulty being able to come up with the kind of end result that would produce a marked decrease in worker injuries, many of a fatal nature, many taking the worker out of the work force for many, many man-days. I believe that if we had such a joint approach — and I believe that this could possibly be achieved much more readily if a safety committee were mandated where a specific number of employees would be on the worksite on an extended basis or on a specific length of time, if not on a permanent basis. The burden of responsibility has to be on the worker as well as on the employer.

Educational provisions should be extended to the worker serving on the safety committee — a mandated safety committee, I would like to think, rather than a voluntary one. A voluntary one has some inherent difficulty. Quite frequently, if a worker were somewhat aggressive — and there is a training period for anyone. You know, we assume a certain responsibility, and we're gung-ho to make sure those we're going to represent are well represented; therefore, we may be overly aggressive in some areas and perhaps less aggressive in others. But because of the emotional desire to ensure a contribution is being made and the discharging of that responsibility is done with sincerity and effectiveness, perhaps there may be a misinterpretation of the employee by management. Consequently, that employee is removed from the voluntary safety work committee and is replaced perhaps by someone less aggressive and more passive. It would be best if a passive individual perhaps did not serve on a committee. They must be able to respond and have the courage of their convictions to say it as it is. Unless they do, I think both are poorer for that particular experience because the safety of the workers is in jeopardy.

I'm sure that if top management realized what was happening, they would not condone this. Quite often it's third or fourth level management that deals in those types of committees. They are of a smaller group dealing with a specific section of the worksite. This presents some unique and specific situations that, in my judgment, are perhaps deleterious rather than of benefit to the committee. So I would strongly urge that on any mandated committee — and, hopefully, in time all these will be — the workers or peers appoint or recommend who should serve on the committee representing them, and let man-

agement do the same. There are inherent problems if management does the picking and choosing — not in every instance, but I submit that there are problems with it.

It is important to note the following statistics. In 1979, the Alberta labor force covered by the Workers' Compensation Board was 751,700, up 59,100 from 1978. Further, 122,222 accident and illness claims were reported to the Workers' Compensation Board in 1978. In 1979, there were 142,219 claims. This represents an increase of 19,997 claims. To be sure the work force may be growing, and correspondingly there will likely be more claims, but the increases noted from 1978 to 1979 are the highest since 1975, when this type of statistic began to be recorded.

This further demonstrates the province's profound increase in worker injuries and illness, in spite of the initiatives we have introduced in attempting to cope with ever-increasing worker injuries. We recognize that our province is an industrial province, and at times industry naturally creates the kind of atmosphere where the worker barely has an opportunity to think of safety, let alone practise it. I think therein is the importance for us to ensure that we have the kind of trained safety committees that would ensure that they can think for the other employees and remind the workers that safety must be first, both their safety and safety of the people they work with in the work place.

I think some of these statistics are scary and astronomical, and I trust that some of the new initiatives the minister has introduced will not only result in increased compensation to injured workers, which is very, very necessary, but will also bring awareness of the necessity of ensuring that the work place is in fact practising safety measures.

I believe that quite often we just do not have that type of daily awareness to our employees. It could be a bulletin board at the main entrance to the work place, reminding the workers: let's have today as an accident-free day. Other initiatives can be taken and, in some industries, have been taken. They actually recognize a group of employees and have safety months, free from any accidents. They highlight these. I think we're not doing enough of this kind of work. It's a matter of awareness, and until such time as we and the workers become aware of the necessity of practising safety measures on a daily basis and not on a weekly, monthly, or bi-monthly basis . . .

It seems to us that in many cases safety in the work place takes very little consequence, and we pay very little consequence to it. Of course the end result is quite often either serious injury or even a fatal accident, such as a very few weeks ago where in an industrial accident here in the city, a young fellow was caught in a cutting machine. I think it's tragic. If it were someone we knew, if it were a family member, we would respond to it with a tremendous degree of remorsefulness. But somehow we read these statistics, and they don't really register. We don't become aware that one young 18-year old lost his life, and we don't really know — I'm sure that the minister's department will have a very, very thorough review of it. But these sorts of things bother me as an individual. If we can prevent them, no amount of money is worth a life. It's not dollars we're talking about. We're basically talking about a program of awareness, of education, where both elements must have the opportunity of training, in the industrial setting particularly.

In 1978, there was a new program of voluntary joint workshop committees in 150 locations throughout the

province. I commend the ministers responsible for that. These committees handled health, safety, and working conditions locally at the jobsite. In addition, joint departmental health and safety committees were responsible for reviewing departments' problems. The statistics mentioned previously do not support voluntary workshop committees. That is, there was a further increase in accidents and claims to the Workers' Compensation Board despite the voluntary joint workshop committee.

I would now like to refer to the June 1981 Construction Safety Task Force on construction safety in the province, submitted to the hon. minister Bill Diachuk, which recommends the solution of mandatory joint workshop health and safety committees to decrease accidents on the worksite. I would like to quote directly from that report.

It is the view of this task force that health and safety at work can be achieved only through joint efforts — government, employers, and workers — and that one of the most effective means to this end is the joint worksite health and safety committee. Workers must have an effective voice if they are to assume joint responsibility.

I think that's the key. They must have an effective voice if they are to assume joint responsibility. As noted in an earlier section, only 138 committees have been established at the construction site since the non-mandatory programs were implemented in 1978, which I believe was by ministerial order. I'm not totally satisfied whether that was actually in construction or throughout the province — perhaps throughout the province. Considering that approximately 18,000 construction sites are currently active in the province, the task force feels that the number of committees is totally inadequate. The success which other provinces appear to be having with their committee systems is an encouraging sign.

I'm quoting this because this is information I received from the report. Its veracity: I assume it's on a fairly sound basis that the report is making reference to. The very transient nature of most construction sites makes the establishment of highly structured health and safety committees impractical. Unlike an industrial plant, for example, the number of trades and workers on a construction project varies greatly from time to time. As a result, I believe that a joint committee on the construction site must be designed with considerable flexibility in mind.

It is worth noting that some provinces have introduced special provisions for the construction industry in relation to joint committees. In Quebec, for example, construction safety committees are to be formed where the work will last at least two months and where the minimum number of employees will not drop below 25 workers. Again, it has flexibility in it. It's not mandating an employer with seven or eight workers to establish a worksite.

The task force has examined Alberta's joint worksite health and safety committee regulations, Alberta regulations 197/77, and is of the opinion that many of the regulations are inappropriate for meeting the particular safety needs of the construction site. For example, the regulations limit the number of committee members to 12. Section 2: such a limit may be suitable for some types of worksites, but where there's a large construction site with many participating sub-trades on site, it's conceivable that a limit of 12 would not necessarily provide one worker from each component to sit on the joint safety committee. Therefore, it provides some difficulties. I would trust that that particular aspect would receive some attention to ensure that the 12 is not etched in stone

so that all sub-trades on a project do not have that responsibility — more so, I think, to ensure they are responsible for their part on the construction site, as well as the others who have a member on the committee.

Some construction sites have instituted weekly tool box meetings; in other words, just a sort of meeting on a weekly basis where the workers get together and review the week's work and the work ahead of them. I believe these informal meetings should be encouraged, as many safety issues can be discussed in this forum; for example, have management project meetings on a regular basis. But primarily these meetings are related to progress on the project — what sub-trade may be holding up another trade and so on — to ensure mobility and that the project is going ahead without one particular trade holding back another. I think quite often this could be expanded to the safety committees, so they too can discharge their responsibilities to ensure that, as the project is being built, every worker on that project would also be able to achieve the rewards of a finished product with complete health at the end of the project.

It is the view of the task force that a mandatory program of joint workshop site committees for construction sites should be instituted as soon as possible. These committees should advise on safety concerns, monitor safety conditions, offer constructive suggestions for improvement and follow up to ensure that necessary improvements have been carried out. The committee should provide an essential co-ordinating role for the entire site.

Elsewhere in this report, recommendations are . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. With great respect to the hon. member, apart from his time having elapsed, I have some concern about a custom being established of reading at length from reports which have been made to the Assembly. It would appear that the making of the report suffices, and that the hon. member's views are what we should be receiving now in this debate.

MR. MACK: Mr. Speaker, thank you for reminding me of the time.

I think refreshing the members and my colleagues in the Assembly is certainly worth while. Although these reports are here, we're discussing a specific item and I think it's important that we refresh the memory on what has been done and what has been paid for with government funds. In that regard, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your indulgence. I do appreciate the opportunity of participating in this debate.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to thank the hon. Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park for introducing this motion, and the other members of the Assembly for the thorough debate that took place this afternoon, and the listeners for the patience they've had, even though I may have been a little saddened by the lack of participation by some. But time is running out; therefore, not all of us can. I wish to make a few comments and sincerely thank the members for their participation.

One thing I'd like to share with hon. members, Mr. Speaker, is from a report I received. We are so often concerned about the expenditure going into workers' compensation programs, because in all other provinces, as members are aware, occupational health and safety or the accident prevention is part of the Workers' Compensation Board of those provinces. Some provinces have an Act, but their accident prevention and that legislation stays under the administration of the Workers' Comp-

sation Board. It was in Alberta, as was reflected and shared by the hon. Member for St. Albert, that we moved in a positive way in this area.

Still, we must remember that in jurisdictions in Canada, only some 1 per cent of the total payroll is spent on workers' compensation benefits. Only 1 per cent of the total payroll of this nation is spent on the benefits of workers' compensation. It isn't that much. So often we receive criticism that employers are spending 15 and 20 per cent of their budget on workers' compensation. Well, I can only share with hon. members that either the figures are inaccurate or it depends how anybody calculates them.

The resolution provides for an approach to encourage educational opportunity for worker safety technicians. The hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont reflected on the program of mandatory joint health and safety worksites. I welcomed his comments that this should be mutually accepted. The difficulty of mandatory worksites is because so often they are not mutually accepted. Even if we had a program of mandatory joint worksite committees on all worksites in this province, there's no doubt in anybody's mind that these committees need technicians, people with training, to assist them in carrying out the safe conditions. I believe this is what the mover of the motion really had in mind.

We have many interested people, many workers, who are prepared to serve. But they lack leadership, lack some programs within their own work force. That's where the technician would be. As one of the speakers said this afternoon, there is a need for somebody between the worker and the person with a PhD. This is where the technician would fit in and would be available to assist

the committees that several members spoke of.

I have always encouraged employers to move with their program of joint worksite committees rather than waiting to have it legislated. At the same time, employers share with me that they need people within their work force, particularly when the work force is larger, to lead their committee rather than have them without any direction and rudderless in their program, in their industry.

The hon. member who served on the committee, Dr. Reid, pointed out the example that is indelible to me: the industry of Bayer's chemical plant in West Germany. We may have been accused of visiting many government programs, but that was one example where we didn't. We visited a private enterprise, a corporation that didn't sit back and wait for government to legislate but had a commitment and an attitude with a large work force. As was shared, an average of one out of 25 workers was involved in some area of safety in that industry.

There are many examples even in this nation. My officials and I are sharing with other provincial programs. Through this debate and this motion, as other motions have brought about positive steps in the program of occupational health and safety, we hope we would be in position to move positively.

Mr. Speaker, because of the time, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is not proposed that the House sit this evening.

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