

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

[Leave granted; Bill 82 read a first time]

Title: **Friday, November 2, 1984 10:00 a.m.**head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, the authors of the policy paper New Policy Directions on Cultural Diversity in Alberta. The executive of the Alberta Cultural Heritage Council and the executive and members of the Alberta Cultural Heritage Foundation are with us today, seated in your gallery. I ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill Pr. 14****Central Western Railway Corporation Act**

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill Pr. 14, the Central Western Railway Corporation Act.

The intent of this Act is to allow a private company to operate a railroad that is proposed to be abandoned in east-central Alberta.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 14 read a first time]

Bill 86**Gas Resources Preservation Act**

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 86, the Gas Resources Preservation Act.

The purpose of the legislation, which is a re-enactment with certain changes, is to provide the Energy Resources Conservation Board the authority to consider all aspects of the public interest, including economic benefits to Alberta, in assessing applications for permits to remove natural gas from Alberta; and, secondly, to expedite the approval of short-term or spot sales of natural gas where the removal relates to a small volume over a short period of time.

[Leave granted; Bill 86 read a first time]

Bill 82**Alberta Cultural Heritage Act**

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 82, the Alberta Cultural Heritage Act.

This Bill reaffirms the government of Alberta's commitment to the development of cultural heritage in Alberta. It sets out the objectives of the government's cultural heritage policy. It reaffirms the Alberta Cultural Heritage Council and the Alberta Cultural Heritage Foundation and incorporates the Alberta Heritage Day Act.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table for the information of the House a document entitled A New Democratic Future, Proposals for an Economic Strategy, 1985 to 1990. This was prepared by the economic development policy committee of the Alberta New Democratic Party.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you, and through you to Members of the Legislative Assembly, 17 students from Victoria composite high school who are enrolled in continuing education. They are accompanied by their leader, Mr. Scragg, and are seated in the members' gallery. I ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly some 36 students from Elizabeth Seton school in the constituency of Edmonton Beverly. They are accompanied by James Olson and are seated in the public gallery. I ask them to rise and receive the usual welcome of the Assembly.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud, it is my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 28 grade 6 students from the Greenfield school in Edmonton. They are accompanied by their teacher, Claudette Warnery, and are in the public gallery. I would like to point out to the students from Greenfield that their MLA is not playing hooky today. He probably has a note from the Premier and will be back tomorrow.

I would also indicate to members and to the students that Greenfield has some special memories for me. Almost 20 years ago, when I was going to university, I lived in that area, so I was through it some time ago. I notice there are trees there now, so it truly is Greenfield. I wonder if they would be kind enough to rise and receive the cordial welcome of the Assembly.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce a group of students who need no introduction to you, for it's on behalf of you as the MLA for Edmonton Meadowlark that I introduce to you and to hon. Members of the Legislative Assembly 25 grade 6 students from the Aldergrove school. The students are seated in the members' gallery and are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Gish, and by student teachers Debra Pace and Tracey Doyle. On your behalf, Mr. Speaker, I ask the students to rise and receive the warm welcome of the House.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS****Department of Culture**

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce new initiatives in support of the development of cultural heritage in our province.

In 1972 the government of Alberta issued a position paper on Alberta's cultural heritage. The overall aim of this policy was to preserve our cultural past, enrich our present, and enhance Alberta's cultural tomorrow. Since 1972 related ini-

tiatives have included the introduction of the Alberta Bill of Rights and the Individual's Rights Protection Act, proclamation of Alberta Heritage Day, the establishment of the Alberta Cultural Heritage Foundation, and the endorsement and encouragement of section 27 in the Canadian Charter of Rights, dealing with the preservation and enhancement of the multi-cultural heritage of Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, building on our past accomplishments and recognizing the social, economic, and cultural changes that have occurred, the government of Alberta is introducing the following initiatives. On October 25, 1983, Premier Lougheed announced the establishment of a permanent committee of the Executive Council to consider representations from the Alberta Cultural Heritage Council on its paper, *New Policy Directions on Cultural Diversity in Alberta*. Today the government wishes to reaffirm that the cabinet committee on cultural heritage, consisting of eight members and chaired by the Minister of Culture, will continue as a permanent committee of the Executive Council. The purpose of this committee will be to ensure that cultural heritage is recognized and respected in Alberta in the development of related government policies.

A new cultural heritage division within the Department of Culture will be established. This division will be headed by an assistant deputy minister, and its purposes will be:

- to recognize and endorse the cultural heritage of Alberta;
- to encourage the preservation, enhancement, and development of the artistic, historical, and language resources by the ethnocultural groups in Alberta;
- to encourage the ethnocultural groups in Alberta to share their traditions with others; and
- to foster circumstances under which the cultural heritage of Alberta is treated as a positive factor in economic, social, artistic, and educational development.

These broadened responsibilities will require the new division to maintain liaison with the other government departments, especially Alberta Education, Advanced Education, Tourism and Small Business, International Trade, and Manpower, and with the Alberta Human Rights Commission.

In order to ensure a co-ordinated approach to cultural heritage, Mr. Speaker, this new division will report directly to the Minister of Culture. This relationship will provide continuing liaison with the minister, other government departments, the Alberta Cultural Heritage Council and the foundation, and community organizations.

The government of Alberta acknowledges the valuable role played by the Alberta Cultural Heritage Council over the past decade and seeks to encourage even greater representation and participation of ethnocultural communities throughout the province. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the council will be restructured to include eight regional councils and a provincial co-ordinating committee. The regional councils will include: Fort McMurray and district, Lakeland, Peace River, Edmonton and district, central Alberta, Calgary and district, southwestern Alberta, and southeastern Alberta.

In recognition of the valuable accomplishments of the Alberta Cultural Heritage Foundation, earlier this year the government endorsed an increase in lottery revenues to the foundation from the Alberta division of the Western Canada Lottery Foundation. This allowed greater opportunities for organizations and persons to participate in the preservation, development, and promotion of the cultural heritage of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, a new piece of legislation called the Alberta Cultural Heritage Act was just introduced this morning. This Bill reaffirms the government of Alberta's commitment to the cultural heritage in Alberta and acknowledges the valuable contribution made by ethnocultural groups to the development of

our province. This new Act sets out the objectives of the government's cultural heritage policy and, as I said, reaffirms both the Alberta Cultural Heritage Council and the Alberta Cultural Heritage Foundation and incorporates the previous Alberta Heritage Day Act.

Mr. Speaker, the government is committed to an Alberta where each of us is able to benefit from the cultural heritage of others. Diversity of cultural expression will enrich the years to come and be of significant benefit to Albertans of tomorrow.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise briefly to respond to the ministerial announcement. We in the opposition are always encouraged when there is any positive initiative to deal with our cultural heritage in the province. The minister and I have had discussions. I know her commitment is very sincere, and I appreciate that. On the whole it seems to be a good announcement. I haven't had time to look at it. Obviously we in the opposition would like to look at it in a more detailed way to find out how much independence the council may have, for example, and that sort of thing. At some future date we will be giving a more detailed response.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Shut-in Oil Production

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It's a follow-up on the question we had on Wednesday, dealing with the possibility of a heavy oil shut-in. When did the minister's department first become aware of the serious problems in terms of getting heavy oil to market?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, a couple of comments in response to the hon. member's question. Firstly, I believe that at the very time or on the very day he was raising this matter in the Assembly — a matter which, I should add, had already received some public comment prior to that — officials of our department were in eastern Canada for discussions with representatives of the National Energy Board with respect to the particular circumstances which are the cause for concern.

I should make at least one clarification. The implication of the hon. member's question is that the sole cause of the likely complete capacity of the IPL system is attributable to the heavy oil situation. In fact, as recently as yesterday I had an opportunity to speak with ...

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. minister, it would appear to me that the question was very simple and direct and devoid of too many implications. It simply asked for a time when the minister or the government became aware of a certain situation.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: If I might, Mr. Speaker, the question as it was phrased asked for a date on which the government learned that there was some difficulty vis-à-vis heavy oil production. That is not in fact the situation, which is what I was trying to elaborate on in my response. The reason for the capacity circumstances being as they are relates not only to heavy oil production but to a number of other factors, including the increase in the allowables for production of our lighter oils, including the level of infill drilling that is occurring on the lighter oils as well. I simply wish to make it clear that the question is unanswerable in its current form, because it does not accurately state the circumstances as they prevail.

Having said that — and that response is a view that is shared by industry — we have been monitoring the situation for some period of time to try to come back to the Assembly with a very specific date as to when was the first inkling of some concern. That would require some research. I could pursue that matter, except to say that for a period of some weeks, and perhaps months as well, we've been focussing on the possible situation such as is being alluded to by the hon. member. But even now, both industry and government representatives are endeavouring to determine to what extent, if any, a problem will actually exist. So it would be premature to suggest that the extent of any possible shut-in circumstance is yet clear. It's a matter that representatives of industry and government at both levels, including the government of the province of Saskatchewan, are addressing.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister. As the minister is well aware, at least the National Energy Board seems to have some very definite views on this, that we do have the problem. It seems to us that it seems to have taken us by surprise.

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly the hon. member could come directly to the question.

MR. MARTIN: Has the minister asked for a review of the planning process within his department to find out why this came upon us as such a surprise at this time?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, it would be incorrect to suggest that the matter came as a surprise to us. It may have been a surprise to the hon. member, but we were certainly aware of the situation before he raised it in the House. As a matter of fact, the local media reported it about a week earlier than that. So that simply wasn't the case at all. As I said, we have had some awareness of the increasing productive capability in both Alberta and Saskatchewan for some time.

But in response to the question as it is phrased, I must say again that the situation is not attributable simply to a heavy oil production situation. It relates to matters of the increase in the allowables of our light and medium crude oil wells. It relates very much to the level of infill drilling. The fact of the matter is that we've been doing almost too well in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan in increasing our productive capability. But that's not a bad-news story, Mr. Speaker; that's a good-news story.

The fact of the matter is that if increases in our ability to transport oil are required, those matters are being addressed. Whether it's increasing the horsepower of our pumping stations on the current IPL system, whether it's looking at looping in terms of that system, whether it's increasing the utilization of the rangeland system or the transmountain system: these are matters that are all being addressed. It's an ongoing situation that arises from the very happy situation where the increasing production is occurring in western Canada, Mr. Speaker, because there's lots more oil to be found in western Canada.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the producers won't be very happy if they are producing and can't get it to the market.

My question to the minister is, what specific steps is the department taking to remedy what could be a very serious situation?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I think I just answered the hon. member's question. It's not simply a matter of a provincial government initiative; it involves working very closely with

industry and with federal officials and, I might add, Saskatchewan officials. That process is ongoing. Some of the measures involved here are the ones I alluded to earlier: increasing the horsepower capacity of pumping stations; looking at looping possibilities in the IPL system, which is very achievable within a time frame; as well as greater utilization of the other pipeline systems that exist, including the rangeland and the transmountain system as well as others. These are all matters that are being actively pursued.

To suggest that this is a negative situation, which I think the question does, Mr. Speaker — the overall one is very positive. The fact is that our expectations are that in 1985 the productive capacity here in western Canada is going to be significantly higher than it was in 1984. From a revenue standpoint and all things considered, what might occur in '85 shouldn't result in a lesser revenue than would have occurred in '84. It's simply a matter of ensuring that we can realize the full revenue opportunities that our productive capacity should hold for us in 1985.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. It's nice to be positive, but let's try to put it in dollars and cents at this point. I want to clarify this with the minister. There have been various estimates. Some say we could lose 90,000 barrels of oil and that it could cost producers up to \$3 million. Does the minister have cost estimates which would either confirm or contradict these figures that have been thrown around?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know that I can elaborate much further without being somewhat repetitive. First of all, while the hon. member tends to want to focus on a more negative assessment of the situation, in my earlier response I think I referenced that in fact the circumstance we are experiencing is one of increasing productive capacity anticipated in 1985 vis-à-vis 1984. At this juncture, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be quite inaccurate to suggest that there will be any loss of revenue in 1985 relative to 1984. The question that remains is, will we be able to realize the full revenue potential in 1985 that we should have, when one looks at the productive capacity that is expected to be on stream?

But again it is clear in discussions — and I've had extensive discussions on this over a period of time, and certainly that has continued to be the case in the last number of days — that there is still no final determination, either by industry or any of the governmental authorities, as to exactly where the productive capacity will be in December 1984 and into 1985 and whether or not our existing pipeline facilities will be able to handle that capacity in full.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I remind the minister it's not me being negative; we're going by the National Energy Board.

My supplementary question is, has the minister's department prepared any ballpark figure for him of potential lost revenue to the province of Alberta as a result of this possible shut-in?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I think I responded to that question earlier.

MR. MARTIN: No, Mr. Speaker. We asked about the producers. I'm asking about revenue to this government. Is there any ballpark figure of what we might lose in the next four or five months as the result of it?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I've just indicated that within the entire energy industry and governmental process, a final

conclusion in terms of what level of shut-in, if any, might be experienced in the near term has not been arrived at. That being the case, how can one come up with an estimate of loss when there hasn't been a final determination as to whether or not there will be a shut-in situation? It's stating the obvious to indicate that there is concern that there may be some shut-in, but the process is one of both examining the exact level of productive capability and production that we anticipate will occur and seeking out ways in which that productive capability can be brought to market. So we're not spending our time trying to crunch out numbers as to what will happen if we do nothing. We're trying to see what can be done about the situation, and we're working hard in co-operation with the other players.

MR. MARTIN: The answer is that the minister doesn't know.

Let me ask another supplementary question of the minister. It's our understanding that Husky will drill 300 heavy oil wells in the Lloydminster area by the end of 1984 and that 100 of those will be in production at the start of the new year. Chieftain and Esso have also announced plans to go ahead with their heavy oil projects. [some applause] You can clap. If you can't get it to market, it's not going to do much good. They're worried about it.

What estimates has the minister received on the effects these new developments will have on an already overcrowded pipeline capacity?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, if you produce more oil, you need a higher capability of getting it to market. That's pretty clear. As I said, the situation is not one ... The member continually tries to put the focus simply on new heavy oil production. There is a significant amount of that occurring, and that's a very positive factor. But the reality — and this will be confirmed if he wants to do a little research with people in industry — is that the situation arises from a multitude of factors, of which that is only one. To focus on it in any exclusive way would frankly be a mis-stating on our part of the reality of the situation.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister. I can assure you that we are going by industry with these figures. Admittedly it's not just heavy oil. That's not the problem; nobody said it was. We're suggesting that there is a lot of heavy oil ready to come on stream. Is there any estimate of how much of that new heavy oil can come on stream in the next four months? Does the department have any estimates on that?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, we're in ongoing communication with industry, and that's a matter of the normal process. What we're endeavouring to do is ensure that all the oil that will be capable of coming on stream in 1985 can be brought to market to the extent that the pipeline facilities can cause that to occur and, if there is going to be a problem, some prompt action to ensure that that oil can be brought to market as quickly as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. minister, it would seem to me that the question was quite direct and simple and not particularly fraught with implications. It was whether the department has certain estimates.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, as I answered in my initial response, estimates are carried out in the normal course. If that's the answer you're looking for, that's the answer.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have a supplementary for the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Could he tell members of the Assembly when his most recent consultation with the Independent Petroleum Association of Canada occurred?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Yesterday.

MR. MARTIN: Not one of those tough questions. [interjections]

Sunday Observance

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to see if another minister knows a little more about his department, and I direct my next question to the hon. Attorney General. It has to do with Sunday shopping. I know the minister is well aware of the problem here. We well know that Sears and other major department stores are now contemplating opening on Sundays along with the supermarkets. Will the Attorney General advise the Assembly what plans he has to ban Sunday shopping before the entire retail industry becomes open on Sundays — before we have wide-open Sundays?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is raising a question of what legislative steps the government might consider in due course. The present situation is that the federal laws with respect to Sunday openings, which have up until recently applied, no longer apply in Alberta, as a result of a decision of our Court of Appeal; therefore no enforcement under that legislation could take place. That situation will be clarified one way or the other when the Supreme Court of Canada delivers a decision on the appeal that has been taken from that particular judgment.

As to other legislative initiatives, I'm not able to express in detail to the hon. member today. I know that implicit in his question, if not explicit, is the inquiry as to whether or not legislation relative to provincial jurisdiction is anticipated at the present time.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Attorney General had an opportunity to review the Retail Business Holidays Act of Ontario? I would like to file three copies of it for the information of the Legislature. I might point out that it's significant because this Act recently stood the test of a challenge at the Supreme Court level in Ontario in terms of its constitutionality. By a unanimous decision, the court ruled that the Act met the constitutional requirement. If the minister has read it — and I take it that he has — what assessment has he made of this Act? Is there any intention to follow the Ontario lead in this matter?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I dealt with that in part in answering the previous inquiry from the hon. member. I indicated to him that the government has taken no decision until the present time as to the suitability of provincial legislation. I think that even though the Supreme Court of Canada decision which is anticipated might not bear directly on that issue, either the decision itself or the wording of the judgment would at least be some guidance to us with respect to addressing the policies relative to provincial laws that might apply in this area.

In answer to the specific question about a review of the Ontario legislation, that has surely been done by me several times, as well as of all the provisions of other legislation across the country.

MR. MARTIN: A simple supplementary question to the minister. When will he be bringing in a similar Act?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, as sometimes happens when the hon. member refers to the simplicity of his question, the answers aren't necessarily simple. I believe I answered that by saying the government has not yet reached a stage of making any proposal to the Assembly with respect to provincial legislation.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, we always hope the government will get around to making a decision.

A supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General. What is the response of the government to representations that I know his department has had, and we have had, from retail store employees who oppose the trend toward sort of free-for-all Sunday shopping?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, we basically had to respond based on the existing law, indicating what the situation is with respect to the proceedings that have been argued but with no judgment delivered before the Supreme Court of Canada in respect of the federal legislation I referred to earlier. As to specific concerns, I think we're certainly aware of those concerns and respond to people on that basis and on the basis that we are not yet able to give them a definitive answer with respect to provincial policy.

MR. MARTIN: I'd like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. What assessment has the minister made of the increased cost of goods and services to consumers as a result of the retail industry being open a full seven days a week?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, we haven't done a canvass or such a survey.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the Minister of Tourism and Small Business, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister asked his officials to do any study of the effect on the small retail sector, particularly the corner grocery stores, of the current move to wide-open Sunday shopping at large centres?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, other than having the department watch with interest what is now occurring and awaiting the decision the Attorney General referred to — that is the present position.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, a supplemental question to the Attorney General regarding the decision from the Supreme Court of Canada on the federal legislation. I've asked the question before, but we've been told, maybe April '84. Now it's November '84. Can the minister indicate when we may get a decision from the Supreme Court of Canada?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that's always difficult to try to estimate. The court does have a heavy workload and a number of judgments to deliver with respect to a very wide range of matters. The only response I can give the hon. member is that we do make estimates as to when the judgment might come down. I've done my best. I now hope it will be before the end of the year.

MRS. CRIPPS: A supplementary. Is the Minister of Tourism and Small Business also evaluating whether more consumer dollars are being spent through Sunday shopping or whether

it's just being stretched over a period of seven days instead of six?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I'm not too sure what the gist of the question was. Would you repeat it, please?

MRS. CRIPPS: I guess my question was, is there an increase in consumer spending because of seven-day shopping, or is it just a matter of the same consumer dollars being spent in seven days instead of six?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I don't have any information on that. I'm not sure that the department has been able to determine it in the time that the stores have been open in that period, but it is being watched.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Attorney General. Subject to the Supreme Court of Canada's decision, is it the Attorney General's intention to make every effort to bring legislation relevant to the issue of Sunday shopping to this House in the spring?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think previous answers dealt with that question, in the sense that I informed hon. members that I am not yet in a position to describe to the Assembly a definitive government policy on the issue. Not being in that position, I have difficulty with the timing as well.

MR. NELSON: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it not the intention of the Attorney General to put out some flag to the community for encouragement to the small businesses that are suffering drastically due to the takeover of Sunday by the multinationals and other large corporations?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to thank the hon. member for that question and for the rather explicit support for the position that I hold as a member of caucus but should not declare on behalf of the government.

MRS. FYFE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. While we're waiting for the decision from the Supreme Court, is the Attorney General proceeding with an evaluation of the effectiveness of other legislation such as in Ontario? Does it actually keep businesses closed on Sunday?

MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, we're able to make that evaluation, Mr. Speaker. Of course, the results to some extent are sometimes uneven and variable over the period of the history of enforcement. By and large, the Ontario legislation has held up very well and is evidently enforceable and being followed.

MR. McPHERSON: A supplemental, Mr. Speaker, to either the Attorney General or the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is either gentleman aware of enabling legislation that would permit a municipality to enact a bylaw that would restrict Sunday shopping in that municipality?

MR. KOZIAK: As the minister responsible for the administration of the Municipal Government Act, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might respond and indicate that the Act sets out the authority of councils of the municipalities in the province to determine and set the hours of operation of businesses within that municipality.

MR. McPHERSON: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware of any municipality that has enacted such a bylaw?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that many such bylaws have been enacted over the years. Without having had the opportunity of doing some research, I can't give the hon. member an indication of all the bylaws in this particular area that might exist or might have existed at some time during the course of the history of the province of Alberta.

Temporary Government Personnel

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration. Last spring the minister announced a new policy with regard to temporary personnel, that they would be going to the private sector to replace temporary personnel. Could the minister advise the House whether this has been effective in his view and what the cost savings have been, if any?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, when the program was announced in the throne speech, we had earlier advised those persons who were listed as providing services to government for temporary placement that they should be prepared for the change. In addition, we contacted the private-sector industry. I believe we had something like 34 to 39 bids from the private sector in the two major cities to do the job. When that began as of June 1, I think 23 companies provided the service. There's been a saving to government, not only in reduction of the staff in personnel — about six persons were able to be effectively redeployed — but of about 25 percent on the hourly rates for the services provided by the private sector.

MR. GOGO: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. As I recall, members — and certainly myself — were flooded with letters from people who were affected or going to be affected. Could the minister tell us if he's continuing to receive complaints from people who were affected, or has that pretty well been put to bed?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I've had no further correspondence from any of the persons who were listed at that time with the temporary staff services of the department. However, I have advice from a number of the private-sector firms that have in fact employed persons who were formerly on our lists. I don't have an indication of the number of people who affected that relationship.

Armed Forces Training Grounds

MR. ALGER: Mr. Speaker, my question this morning is to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Recent reports in the news media indicate that the federal government has made some definite decisions with regard to the Department of National Defence negotiations with the Nelson Ranch people in the Highwood area. I wonder if the minister would describe to the Legislature the content of his personal communication with members of the federal government in this regard.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that this matter was raised in the question period on October 19 and again on October 30. At that time I indicated to the Assembly that negotiations with respect to the possibility of a change of use of the grazing lease were not closed insofar as Alberta was concerned.

I think it is fair to say that there has been a breakdown in communications with the federal government relative to that particular issue. Since the last question was asked of me in the House on October 30, I indicated to the federal government.

through officials of the department, that we wished to clarify that misunderstanding and to make it clear that while it is true that the government has serious reservations about the use of the Nelson Ranch property for military training purposes, we had not made any final decision to rule that out.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we have urged the Department of National Defence to pursue a number of alternatives to that particular location. Without going into detail, we have suggested to the Department of National Defence that at least four alternative locations might be considered before further pursuing the Nelson Ranch property.

As I indicated previously, it is being made quite clear that there is a great deal of concern in the area about the use of that property and the change of use of that property from its current agricultural use to one of a military nature. However, I want to take this opportunity to indicate that in our discussions and negotiations with the government of Canada, we are attempting to clarify any misunderstanding that may have arisen between our two governments.

Vencap Equities Alberta Ltd.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Provincial Treasurer has to do with that dynamic tool for economic recovery, Vencap Equities Alberta Ltd. Can the minister indicate our present share of Vencap Equities at this time, just in ballpark figures? Secondly, is the government looking at increasing or decreasing that participation in Vencap Equities Alberta Ltd.?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the exact detail on that, and the question is important enough that I want to get it. No change would be proposed by the government, though, with respect to the original dollars which were voted by the Assembly for setting up Vencap.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to indicate if he has any monitoring going on to see what part of that fund has now been invested in Alberta businesses?

MR. HYNDMAN: No, Mr. Speaker. The approach which originally set up the Vencap corporation, which was endorsed by the Legislature not only in supply motions but also in legislation, set up the corporation at arm's length from the government so that decisions would be made on a business basis.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in his monitoring of this fund, can the Provincial Treasurer indicate what this fund has done for reducing unemployment in this province?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think I'll take that question in the absence of the Minister of Economic Development. You have to remember that the purpose of the Vencap corporation was, and is today, to provide venture capital for businesses in the province of Alberta. They are moving towards and beginning to do that. In that sense it is providing economic development assistance to the province of Alberta. The purposes mentioned by the hon. gentleman are dealt with in other ways by the government.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Can the Provincial Treasurer indicate, or does he have any knowledge of, when the entire fund or a large part of it will be invested in Alberta businesses?

MR. HYNDMAN: Again, Mr. Speaker, I refer the hon. member to the original parameters approved by this Assembly for the Vencap corporation. I will take the question as notice, and either I or the Minister of Economic Development will respond further.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the minister. Now that we have the Premier's tailor looked after in his appointment to head of Government House South in Calgary, can the Provincial Treasurer indicate what the role of Ted Mills, the former member in the Premier's office, will be in the Vencap Equities Calgary office at this time?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, those are decisions of the Vencap board, which I presume would be looking for people of talent and ability.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the Provincial Treasurer in a position to indicate if the appointment of Mr. Mills to the Vencap board or as an employee of Vencap was encouraged by the provincial government, to look after the taxpayers' share of the equity in Vencap Equities?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Vencap board makes its own decisions.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is appointing Mr. Mills an attempt by the provincial government to have some liaison between the taxpayers of Alberta and Vencap Equities? Is that the intent of this appointment?

MR. HYNDMAN: Again, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should talk to the Vencap board.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, is the Provincial Treasurer saying that the government did not make the recommendation that Mr. Mills be appointed to the board?

MR. HYNDMAN: That's correct, Mr. Speaker.

Victorian Order of Nurses

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. minister of social services and public health. Last year we had to give a grant to the Victorian Order of Nurses. I guess Mayor Ralph Klein in Calgary was quite upset. The local board of health did not engage their services, and we finally had to give them a provincial grant to keep them from going bankrupt and laying off nurses. Can the minister inform us if he knows if the Calgary local board of health will be hiring the services of the VON this year?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has increased my responsibilities by referring to me as the minister responsible for public health; however, that's fine.

In terms of the Victorian Order of Nurses and the Calgary board of health, the Victorian Order of Nurses is providing services. The expansion of the home care program has added to the load of those organizations providing services for the Calgary board of health. The Victorian Order of Nurses was in financial difficulty. At the end of last May, I believe, we provided it with a \$30,000 grant to enable it to carry on until the Calgary board of health decided how it was going to handle the provision of services in the Calgary area. The decision was that come the spring of 1985, they would be tendering for these

services and asking different organizations, including the Victorian Order of Nurses, for their bids.

Red Deer Continuous Corridor

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transportation. Can the minister indicate if his department is giving any consideration to recent requests from the city of Red Deer with respect to a major continuous corridor?

MR. M. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Staff of the Department of Transportation and the city of Red Deer have been working on a concept that's different from others that have been considered over the last three or four years, in that it would involve a major continuous corridor basically along the line that's presently occupied by the rail line. That would result in movement of the rail line and accomplish both moving the rail line out of the downtown core and the construction of a major continuous corridor through the city at the same time. That proposal is almost complete in terms of cost figures and so on, and I expect we will very shortly be looking at making some decision as to whether or not our government can accommodate the request of the city of Red Deer for that particular plan.

Alberta Economic Strategy

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier and the ministers of Economic Development and of Advanced Education, I'd like to direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer. The hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud was recently quoted to the effect that the provincial government's white paper, *Proposals for an Industrial and Science Strategy for Albertans, 1985 to 1990*, should be viewed as a catalogue of choices. My question to the Treasurer is, does the government concur in this assessment?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, the government white paper is getting very widespread discussion and debate, not only in Alberta but across the country. I think the views of the hon. member and others, indicating that it is a white paper for discussion, are entirely correct.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the Treasurer. Will the government undertake to publish another paper in which its chosen economic strategies will be laid out clearly for Albertans, and will it be published before the next provincial election?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I refer the hon. member to page 2 of the white paper, I believe, which indicates the process that will be followed with respect to possible position papers in the months ahead.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer advise whether or not an economic development strategy guiding the work of this government is currently in place, before the white paper?

MR. HYNDMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As indicated in a large part of the white paper, the economic and industrial strategy of the province, which began in 1971 — and I won't go through all those at the moment — and was then reaffirmed and stated further in 1974, has been clearly stated, known, understood, and largely responsible for the very remarkable progress made by the province since 1971.

DR. BUCK: Tell that to the 200,000 unemployed.

MR. MARTIN: On Monday, May 3, 1982, the Premier said in this Assembly: "The Alsands project was not in any way part of the economic planning of the province, in the sense of relying upon it". My question to the minister is, can the Treasurer advise whether or not the economic planning referred to at that time by the Premier is substantially the same as the economic strategy presently guiding this government?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman will have to draw his own conclusions as to the extent to which those policies are paralleled or otherwise. All I've indicated is that the initiatives taken by the government in recent months have clearly indicated — and the results are now coming clear, as my colleague the Minister of Energy and Natural Resource indicated, in terms of recovery and confidence in the energy industry and others.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. We're just trying to find out what the strategy is. Albertans are wondering. Can the Treasurer advise whether or not the economic strategy eventually adopted by the government will, as a matter of course, take cognizance of the multibillion dollar megaprojects?

MR. HYNDMAN: The development of large projects is referred to specifically in the white paper, Mr. Speaker. One of the questions posed in the latter part of the white paper is the extent to which there should be involvement or investment by the heritage trust fund, or through other means, in large projects if necessary to get such projects going. We're still assessing the reactions to the forums and the reactions from constituents in that regard.

One aspect of the government's policy which has become focussed and very firm, though, has been the recent announcement I was able to make with respect to encouraging processing and upgrading in the province of Alberta. That is one aspect of the white paper that has now been put into effect.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Member for Lloydminster revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**
(*reversion*)

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I welcome this opportunity to introduce to you and to members of the Legislature 45 grade 6 students from Kitscoty. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mrs. Harris and Mrs. Gordon. I should point out that they were up and on the bus at 6:30 this morning to be able to join us today. They are seated in the members' gallery, and I ask that they stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS** (**Second Reading**)

Bill 83 **Child Transportation Safety Act**

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 83, the Child Transportation Safety Act.

The number one cause of death of children over the age of one year in this province is automobile accidents. In the three-year period of 1980, 1981, 1982, 36 children died in Alberta in automobile traffic accidents. In addition to that, 168 were seriously injured, and over 2,000 children suffered minor injuries during that three-year period. Had all these children been fastened in a safety seat, or regular seat belts for those older children, most of the 36 would be alive today, and very few of the serious injuries and almost none of the minor injuries would have occurred. We can add up the cost of medical care, of the despair and problems with respect to death and injuries, and put a figure on it, but I don't believe it's appropriate to even consider a figure when you're dealing with the lives of our young people. We present this legislation in that context.

I know it concerns a lot of people in our society and many members of this Legislature when we bring in legislation that one might suggest should be the responsibility of society, in this case parents, to undertake without legislation. However, we cannot escape the fact that in spite of our best efforts we continue to have a situation where a small percentage of children are carried in car safety seats in Alberta, as compared to provinces which have introduced legislation that requires safety seats to be used for children under the age of five years. We very sincerely believe that the most effective way to ensure that youngsters are saved from death, from serious injury, and from the very, very many minor injuries that occur in traffic accidents is to adopt this legislation.

Let me say as well that I view the matter of legislation with regard to car safety seats as entirely different and separate and apart from seat-belt legislation for older people and those over five years of age who use regular seat belts. We're dealing here with a situation where babies and youngsters under the age of five are literally human projectiles when car accidents occur. In addition to the injury that's suffered by them, as some of my colleagues have pointed out, there is often a major distraction to the driver when braking suddenly or facing a potential accident and trying to hold the youngster from flying into the dash or through the windshield, oftentimes resulting in the accident being worse than it might have been because the driver is not able to give his or her full attention to driving the automobile. So it's in that context, following the example of other provinces, states in the United States, and other parts of the world, that we bring forward legislation that we believe will be effective in saving a number of lives and many, many injuries.

The incidence of the use of seat belts or car safety seats in the province of Saskatchewan, to the east of us, was 14 percent prior to introduction of legislation similar to what you have before you today. Over the course of a couple of years, that increased to some 50 percent in that province. One could expect that the same kinds of results would occur in Alberta.

Now let me deal with some of the principles in the Bill, Mr. Speaker. It applies to children under the age of five years who are born on or after January 1, 1985. I've been questioned already about the fact that those youngsters under five who were born before January 1, 1985, won't be mandatorily covered by this legislation, and that is correct. That is so because we wanted to give parents and guardians an opportunity to

phase in to this legislation. We hope that in doing that they'll recognize that while the legislation doesn't apply to someone born before January 1, 1985, the principle of buckling them in, in order to save their lives and save injuries, is equally valid for those who were born before and after that date. So we're going to make a very determined effort to encourage people to adopt this legislation on a voluntary basis, even though it may not apply in terms of the law.

The matter of how this legislation is policed and the regulations involving it are important as well. Mr. Speaker, in order that members may have an opportunity between now and committee study of this Bill to consider how we intend to adopt regulations, I have copies of draft Child Transportation Safety Act regulations that I'd like to have the pages distributed to hon. members this morning. They might want to consider them over the course of the next while and see if there are some things in those draft regulations that they believe might be altered or added to or changed in some particular way.

I will also be forwarding a copy of those draft regulations to literally dozens of volunteer organizations throughout the province and asking for their input. We're in a field where the matter of how you regulate something like this isn't as well defined as it often is. I think the only way I can be sure we've covered almost every eventuality or exemption or problem that might exist in the regulations is to circulate a draft and get comment from a wide variety of people.

The matter of the cost of these seats to young parents and guardians who might be required to make such purchases has obviously been drawn to my attention. They range from the area of \$50 for the toddler seat that's designed for those up to nine months of age to as high as \$150 for a first-class seat for those who weigh up to 40 pounds and are perhaps up to four years of age. I believe there are enough grandparents and parents and interested people in most of the areas and regions of this province that people will make their own purchases.

I also want to mention that at the present time there are more than 60 volunteer groups throughout the province that rent or lease seats. I am certain that with the advent of this legislation the number of groups doing that will increase even more. So we should have a situation existing shortly after the new year, if it doesn't exist now, where any parent who doesn't have the necessary funds to purchase a car safety seat will be provided with one at a reasonable rental rate by one of the many volunteer organizations that exist across the province today. I want to say to those organizations, whoever they are — health units, ladies' and men's clubs, clubs connected with hospitals, police departments, motor associations, and so on — that the Department of Transportation intends to give every possible co-operation to the efforts they make in this regard.

I'll conclude my remarks by again emphasizing that we believe this legislation is necessary to increase the voluntary use of child safety seats that has occurred in the past three years. Mr. Speaker, it is not in any way associated with seat belts for all adults, and I don't intend to expand it in that way or to introduce legislation in that regard. It is my hope to have the regulations adopted prior to the first of the year and to be in a position either on January 1 or shortly thereafter to proclaim the legislation and adopt the regulations.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope as well that on January 2, or as near as possible to it, I will be privileged to be able to present one of these car safety seats to the first baby born after midnight on January 1, 1985, in Edmonton, in Calgary, and in a centre in the northern half of the province, north of Red Deer, and also in the southern half of the province. I intend to make that effort to make sure the people of this province know that in addition to legislating the requirement for the use of child car

safety seats, the government does indeed have a real concern about encouraging parents to use them.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this legislation to all members of the Assembly.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make just a few comments about Bill 83. Needless to say, I intend to support the Bill, but I wish we could follow the logic through. The Child Transportation Safety Act is long overdue, and we will support it; but if it is logical and good for children under five, then by extension seat belts should follow for all Albertans. I am a little disappointed that the government hasn't screwed up its political courage. I know it's controversial, and I know it's controversial within the caucus. By making this first step, the minister is clearly aware that this is a necessary and good thing to do for children under five. Then we should, as other provinces are doing, bring in seat-belt legislation.

We cannot always bring in Acts that everybody agrees with. But in the studies I have seen, Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of Albertans will support seat-belt legislation. So I say this to the minister: I hope this is just step one and that the government is considering bringing in seat-belt legislation for all Albertans. There's nothing magical about the age of five; a child of six can be killed just as easily. The minister is well aware of that.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make another point in terms of seat-belt legislation. I've said this before, and I think it's important. Besides the well-known and well-documented fact that seat belts save lives and unnecessary injuries — and we point to the hospital utilization report that was given to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. They said that in Ontario, where they have compulsory seat-belt legislation, there was a 15 percent decline in deaths after they brought in that particular Act. That would go along with the minister's numbers in terms of dealing with children.

Mr. Speaker, another very important point as we deal with the rising costs of medical care is that seat belts also save a lot of money. I remind hon. members that in that particular study they said that if you were wearing a seat belt, the average accident cost around \$200; if you were not wearing a seat belt, that cost went up to \$400. That's a significant saving over a province. I think that's an important point to be made here. I would again encourage the government to look at expanding what they've started here today.

I know the argument, and I've heard it many times: you're cutting into my freedom; you're not going to strap me in with that seat belt. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, every law cuts into somebody's freedom. When it's costing us money, when we have the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care complaining about the high cost of hospital services, then they're cutting into our freedom if they refuse to wear a seat belt. I think there's a dividing line there. The minister may clarify this, but I think we're the only province other than P.E.I., that doesn't have seat-belt legislation. We will be slightly ahead of P.E.I., if we pass this Bill.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I will support the Bill because it is at least a small step in the right direction. I again urge the minister to look at seat belts for everybody, right across the board. He knows and I know that they save lives and money. As far as I'm concerned, that fallacious argument about individual freedom is just not appropriate when it comes to a Bill like this.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAHL: I would like to rise and briefly indicate my support for Bill 83. I was interested in the remarks of the acting Leader of the Opposition. When I was first elected to this Assembly

in 1979, based on my experience of wearing seat belts as a stock-car driver on dirt tracks in Hanna, Castor, and Olds, Alberta, and Kindersley, Saskatchewan, I was a believer in seat belts. That extended to flight training, where you automatically wear seat belts. I still support the idea of comprehensive seat-belt legislation. So in 1979 I put the question to my constituents with respect to their views on compulsory seat-belt legislation for all passengers in automobiles. In the enlightened position I advanced in the local newspaper, I said that this was an important enough issue that I didn't want phone calls; I wanted to see written support. I'm very pleased to say that of the some 30,000 individuals who lived in the constituency of Edmonton Mill Woods at the time, I received 100 percent support for my position: both of the people who wrote in said yes. I've since discovered that the majority of my constituents in Edmonton Mill Woods, who have since grown to some 60,000 people, really have not followed my leadership in terms of my views on what is best for them and how their freedoms should be limited or not limited. I think I find a very positive response from most people to do it, but there is that thing that says we shouldn't be made to buckle up. I respect the views of my constituents in that regard. However, as I got a very favourable response over the course of the summer on the motion put forward by my colleague from Calgary Foothills, I am very confident that my constituents, the people I represent, will certainly support Bill 83. I say that because Bill 83 seeks to protect those people who in no way are able to protect or speak for themselves in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to pass on to the Assembly an interesting anecdote — maybe it's not interesting so much as it's almost grisly — from the time I sponsored an amendment to the Fatality Inquiries Act which enabled the collection of pituitary glands for use in providing for the manufacture of a growth hormone for growth-deficient children and for research in the area. The medical profession members, particularly in research, were very supportive. After we had discussed the successful passage of the legislation through the House, one of them who shall remain nameless said, only slightly in jest, "Make sure you don't pass any seat-belt legislation, because it'll certainly dry up the supply of pituitary glands". I think that makes the point far more graphically than I could and speaks eloquently for support of the legislation.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to become a little bit partisan. Although the majority of my constituents in Edmonton Mill Woods did not support my lobbying or my view on compulsory seat-belt legislation, the Edmonton Mill Woods Progressive Conservative Constituency Association showed leadership within our party in this area and was able to sponsor a resolution that put forth the idea of compulsory child restraints. That was accepted within our party, and I'm happy to see that it was reflected in Motion 210 and now in Bill 83. So the democratic process is working. There is a grass-roots development for the support. I think it reflects a general consensus across the province, and it also reflects an opportunity to protect those in our society who do not have the wherewithal, let alone the freedom, to protect themselves. I hope all members of the House see fit to support Bill 83.

Thank you.

[The members for Calgary Currie and Calgary Foothills rose]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary Foothills caught my eye first, and I think that's quite understandable. [laughter]

MRS. KOPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to be able to stand today and address second reading of this Bill. I

commend the minister on the introduction of the Bill. We have talked about mandatory seat-belt legislation many times in the House. In 1980 the hon. Member for Calgary Currie talked about mandatory legislation for children under the age of 18. In 1982 the Member for Calgary North West was trying to focus on seat-belt education and awareness programs. In 1983 the hon. Member for Stony Plain introduced a motion regarding mandatory seat-belt legislation right across the board, and then in the spring of 1984 a specific motion for children under the age of five.

This type of legislation is very difficult to consider. Indeed, we want to protect our freedoms. But I think the Bill also has the principle that we are trying to protect young children who cannot make the decision for themselves. Mr. Speaker, I think that is the general focus. As the hon. Minister responsible for Native Affairs mentioned, there seems to be a general awareness of and public support for the idea that seat belts can save lives, but for young children specifically it makes all the difference.

The minister has already mentioned that it's the number one health problem facing children, and action really needs to be taken. The minister also mentioned that it's proven that usage increases dramatically in any province where legislation is enacted. But vehicle crashes are a health problem, and the only preventative medicine against this killer andcrippler is the use of seat belts and child restraint devices. Only adults can make this life-saving choice for either themselves or their children. The Child Transportation Safety Act is a reminder to me that this is so important.

Every day in 1983 at least one life was lost in a traffic collision. There were 52 people injured each day. There were 256 traffic collisions reported on our roads in Alberta. With those kinds of statistics, I don't think we can afford to ignore this any longer.

There are many arguments about enforceability; we've heard them here. I think this Bill very clearly states a law that is clear and predictable. The application will be enforceable, because it applies to a limited age group. It may be difficult at first, but I think the growing awareness that it will bring to our public will certainly make it much easier to enforce.

The minister briefly mentioned some of the people who have supported it over the years. The Alberta Safety Council, the Alberta Motor Association, the Alberta Medical Association, the Health Unit Association of Alberta, police departments, ambulance drivers, the Alberta Public Health Association, the Registered Nurses Association, the University of Calgary injury research unit: these people can no longer be ignored. They all have worked hard for this day of recognition of the problem.

In 1979, the Year of the Child, a project in regard to action for child safety and transportation was initiated. This Alberta Action Committee for Child Transportation Safety had a goal of 70 percent utilization by 1984. They haven't quite made it. I hope this Bill will give the extra impetus so they will achieve their goal of 70 percent utilization — 100 percent. The low percentage of people who use seat belts is rather shocking. However, I would like to commend groups such as this for their educational programs. This particular group has done many workshops for health professionals and car dealers. They've initiated car seat rental programs. They've provided demonstration car seats for pediatricians' offices. They've provided programs for prenatal classes and newborn nurseries. They have health promotion in community locations and have given guidance to physicians and nurses, and many media and TV interviews. They've studied seat-belt legislation across Canada and have done a great deal of work to bring it to public attention.

Mr. Speaker, that program and the Buckle Up Babe program have done an awful lot to increase public awareness. This group and the 60 other groups throughout the province have resulted in an improvement. Fatality rates have decreased over the past year. In fact there were fewer fatalities in Alberta in 1983 than there had been in any year since 1971. Nonfatal injury and collision rates have also decreased over the past year, and property damage has decreased. I think their efforts are showing some small progress.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this Bill is important because it addresses perhaps a fundamental indiscipline, lack of forethought, absentmindedness, or even stubbornness. It reminds us that failure to wear seat belts is usually related to something like that rather than to a problem with wanting to be safe.

In addition to the initiative of the Bill shown here, this is an opportunity to say thanks to all the people who have worked hard over the years and to protect one of our most valuable resources. In our work with the regulations, I hope we will be able to review the importance with the public and that it will raise the level of concern for all of us to wear safety belts.

Thank you.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to participate in debate of this Bill this afternoon and to begin by congratulating the hon. Minister of Transportation, who has successfully managed to chart this Bill through rough waters to reach this point in the Legislature. It is indeed a red-letter day for those of us who have long advocated such legislation, inside and outside this House. As members will recall, just after entering the Legislature in 1979 I introduced a Bill that would have required seat belts or child restraint devices for those in our society under 18. That was preceded by moves by other members in this Assembly, notably the Member for Stony Plain, who has long advocated full use of seat-belt legislation, and more recently the hon. Member for Calgary Foothills, whose motion is still on the Order Paper.

It is my opinion that this is more than just a piece of legislation designed to assist certain people in our community and to save certain lives. It is fundamental legislation that speaks to the philosophical base of Legislatures. I say that because it's my firm belief that legislators have two prime responsibilities. One is clearly to dispense justice and to design a system that will do that. The second is to protect those who will not or cannot protect themselves; "cannot" may be the more appropriate term. Here we are dealing with individuals in our society most unable to protect themselves.

Arguments have long been made that it is the responsibility of the family to look after that kind of issue for children of the age we're speaking of, and indeed I strongly support and advocate that belief. However, the reality of our society is that we've been elected as a government to protect individuals who in fact are not protected through that system, despite the desirability of that happening. Through all the statistics which have been clearly identified in this Legislature time and time again, there is no question that we have lost many young lives in the province of Alberta and that many have been harmed and injured because of individuals not using the devices that are now available.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I would have preferred that we would have gone to legislation for those under 18. As I've identified previously in this House, I believe in that particular age simply because it's consistent. We have decided in the past, rightly or wrongly, that individuals reach the age of maturity at 18 and that indeed they then have the right to vote and to consume alcohol if they so desire, and it's my belief that that should be the age limit established for something of this

sort as well. However, this is a major step forward and deals with the individuals who more than any other in that age group are unable to decide for themselves whether they will buckle up or sit in a device. Clearly that can't happen on the basis of individuals; it can and hopefully will in the large majority of cases by the decisions of their parents.

I have few other points to make, Mr. Speaker, except to say that we will indeed be watching this legislation and its implementation. I recognize that because of the many details involved, the regulations the minister has to establish and work on are quite complex, and I'm sure that our police officers will use a great deal of discretion in implementing this law. But I think there is no question that this falls within the parameters of the responsibilities of this Assembly and that we are making a major step forward in moving in that way today.

I would just close with saying that like the hon. Minister responsible for Native Affairs, I have asked my constituents their views on this issue on several occasions and note that though five years ago there was much less enthusiasm, in the latest survey I took clearly 83 percent supported this legislation, 73 percent for 18 and under, and it was still running about fifty-fifty for full seat-belt legislation. At least with respect to Calgary Currie, we're clearly moving in a direction which the majority of citizens support and advocate. Again, I commend the minister and those who've worked hard at developing this legislation, in and out of this Assembly, and I urge all members to support this Bill.

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to Bill 83, the Child Transportation Safety Act, I want first of all to stress my full support for this particular legislation. Bravo and accolades to the Minister of Transportation for bringing this Bill forward on this date. Secondly, this Bill will save our children's lives and will save our children from injury. Thirdly, I perceive a tremendous spin-off to develop for all of us a better understanding of the value of seat belts in our vehicular-dominated society. I'm convinced that more of our Alberta citizens will wear seat belts voluntarily and that the education of our adults will indeed be enhanced by this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, other members have referred to questionnaires that they have forwarded to their constituents. I must indicate that approximately two years ago I forwarded a similar questionnaire. Over 50 percent of the respondents indicated very clearly that they were in favour of this type of legislation. I know they will be happy with the introduction of this Bill, and they will be more happy when it is ultimately passed.

Mr. Speaker, there is so much evidence to substantiate the need for Bill 83. As a member of the health and social services caucus committee, I have been very fortunate to receive a number of briefs, comments, phone calls, and letters from individuals and organizations that clearly enunciate for all the members of that particular committee the need for this type of legislation.

In my estimation, the arguments shared for car safety seats for children are unequivocal. The Bill may guide us to implement legislation for older children and indeed for adults. But I hope we won't have to legislate in those particular areas. I hope that citizens would see the benefits to their health and safety themselves and that they would start buckling up of their own accord.

In turning to some of the data I referred to previously, the following are some examples of representations that have been provided to me. The north Calgary Jaycees have presented their views in favour of this type of legislation extremely well. The president of the Alberta Medical Association, Dr. John Hnatuik, has vociferously and intelligently shared his strong support

for this legislation. I'd like to quote for the Assembly from a speech made by Dr. Hnatuik on May 2.

Child safety seats do work. They are 85 percent effective in preventing the deaths of children in automobile accidents, and 65 percent effective in preventing injuries.

Some people claim that safety seats cost too much money, and that people can't afford them. It's a bogus argument. If a person can't afford a child safety seat, then that motorist can't afford two or three tanks of gasoline ... or the insurance on the truck or car ... or the car or truck itself.

Mr. Speaker, in November 1983 I received a copy of a letter from Dr. Neil Gray, then president of the Alberta Medical Association, stressing that the 2,900 members of the AMA endorsed the following resolution.

THAT the Association strongly encourage the government of Alberta to introduce mandatory child restraint legislation.

The Alberta advisory committee for child transportation safety has provided excellent information on why this legislation is required. In addition, the Alberta Motor Association must be commended for its in-depth study on child restraints, and I'd like to stress just a few points that they, enunciated in many of the briefs that they forwarded to this member.

In 1980 the AMA asked its members if they approved or disapproved of legislation making the use of child restraints in automobiles compulsory. Their response was an overwhelming 81.5 percent. Secondly, each year about 70 children under the age of five are killed and another 4,000 are injured in motor vehicle accidents in Canada. Investigations of these accidents show that infant and child restraint systems, when properly used, could have reduced deaths by 90 percent. Some 63 of those children would be alive today, making their parents happy, growing, and eventually contributing to our society. What a tragedy, Mr. Speaker. In 1982 in Alberta, 17 children under five years of age died in traffic collisions, and a further 513 children were disabled. I don't have to tell you of the horrendous impact that has on families and on our health care system. What a tragedy. If that legislation had been incorporated some years ago, in all likelihood those statistics would not be occurring. Saskatchewan introduced child restraint legislation two years ago and over that period of time has not had a child fatally injured while occupying a restraining device.

Mr. Speaker, I think the evidence is very clear. In closing, I want to state that I am strongly in favour of this legislation and that it is, indeed overdue. I'd like to leave members with some words from the constitution of the American Academy of Pediatrics:

Children are our most enduring and vulnerable legacy.

For nations as well as for individual families, they represent the link between past and future, between experience and promise. The nurturing of future generations is the most basic, and most important, of human activities.

I ask members to support this Bill.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to support the Bill. I think it's a compromise Bill that's worthy of passage, and it's certainly popular with the young people I have talked to who are of child-bearing age. It will at least protect those that can't protect themselves. I would have preferred a Bill that's little stronger. However, this is certainly a start. I think it will be the start of a fantastic educational process for those children born after January 1, 1985. Once they become accustomed to having their children strapped in until they're five years old, I'm sure that most people will be conditioned and will continue to have them strapped in. I use a seat belt all the

time when I'm driving the car but not necessarily when somebody else is driving. [interjections] I guess it's probably because of my driving. Other members are saying that the only time they buckle up is when they're riding with me.

Nevertheless, I think this is a start, and I'd like to commend the minister. Hopefully this will save the lives and bodies of these young children who cannot protect themselves.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to be able to speak in support of second reading of this Bill. I would like to comment on the principle of the Bill from a little different perspective from some of the previous speakers. Many of the previous speakers have referred to general surveys and assessments they have done to ascertain support for this type of legislation. When this idea was being proposed and the legislation was being prepared, I thought it was most important to talk to some of the current users of child restraint devices and people who are likely to be users of these devices. I think some of the points they made are very relevant to the Bill and supportive of it.

Many young parents in my constituency are currently using the seat belts, but they pointed out that the presence of such legislation would be a signal to them. It would be something that would be in place and uniform, and it would be a reminder. It would aid in the consistency with which they use seat belts for their young children. They also saw it as the responsibility of all parents and something that should be done to protect young children who are not in a position to make the decision or to protect themselves.

A second point was that it is certainly good training. The early application and use of seat belts will be something that young people will associate with responsibility for an automobile in later life. It will provide a proper start in terms of the use of a motor vehicle.

One item that was also mentioned — this is the sort of thing that is sometimes missed by people in the whole area of children riding in vehicles — was brought out in discussion with a school teacher who happens to have four boys under the age of five. He pointed out that we sometimes wonder why young children are so active in a car; they bounce around, want to walk on the seats, and so on. This is simply due to the fact that our motor vehicles are not made in such a way that they can see out when sitting on the seat in the normal manner. The existence of a comfortable and high child restraint device provides them with a better view of the road and aids a great deal in the control and better behaviour of children in motor vehicles. Many people have commented to me that their children really get used to their seat, as they come to know it, and look forward to a car ride much more than they did before. The existence and use of these child restraint devices is certainly going to be a great aid to the driver.

I do not see, and the people that I've spoken to do not see, that obtaining or purchasing the seats is going to be a matter that cannot be overcome. It could be a considerable cost for many people, but with the Christmas season approaching, I'm sure many grandparents, relatives, and friends will think of this as a suitable item to provided to young families.

We've had reference in the debate thus far to the seat-belt awareness and education programs and the fact that they have had some success, Mr. Speaker. This Bill contains the initiative which I think will be the greatest program of seat-belt awareness and, as I've said before, will have long-lasting results as people use vehicles in later life.

In making these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am not at all indicating that the main argument for such legislation is not extremely important; that is, the incidence of traffic accidents

is the number one health problem for children. Unlike other health problems, we do not have to wait and hope for medical research to solve it. We know that the use of child restraint devices will cut down on injury and death among young children due to traffic accidents. It is therefore something that certainly promises definite results.

The last point I'd like to make, Mr. Speaker, is that we're always in need of reasonable laws. I think this one is reasonable in its approach to enforcement. It encourages the application of the benefit of this legislation rather than putting the greatest emphasis on some type of punitive action. I think the approach in section 4 of the Bill is very constructive and is to be commended. I feel that this legislation will have an overall positive effect on the safe transport of children in motor vehicles, and I certainly support it.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add some words of support for the Bill regarding mandatory child restraints for children under the age of five.

Some of the comments or concerns of people in Alberta in previous years have been well related by the members who have already spoken. There are always those who feel this is an infringement on their rights and responsibilities. Yet government has a responsibility for the health and safety of its citizens. We protect members of our society in a very wide variety of ways. We have regulations to ensure that contaminated food is neither sold nor served. We have laws that protect our children from child abuse. We have mandatory schooling and accessible health care. We have a multitude of programs, laws, and regulations within in our society that are designed to protect people. I applaud the minister for his tenacity in pursuing this matter of child restraints.

Many people in our province have spoken in support of child restraints and mandatory seat belts for quite a few years. Yet there are still some who feel this is going too far, that we could achieve the same ends by education. Yet I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this has not been effective. Many groups have tried education. The federal Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs regulates the actual manufacturing of child restraints and has been involved in education for well over a decade. Manufacturers and retailers in the private sector have been involved in communication and displays of these types of devices. The organizations that have been alluded to by other members have tried in so many ways to communicate to parents in this province that they have a responsibility to ensure that their children are not knocking around in a vehicle that is in motion.

There have been television commercials and films. Through the public health units, communications are given to every new parent who has immunization, and we have 95 or 98 percent participation in immunization programs. It's not that parents aren't aware. I'm sure that the majority are aware that it is a danger to travel in a vehicle without being restrained. Unless they are restrained, there is no protection for a small person who cannot put their feet against the back or front seats to brace themselves or cannot reach down and do up a seat belt themselves. In my mind, it's absolutely unbelievable to see little children standing in the front seat of a truck or a car driving along in the traffic. Often there's one adult in the car. The brakes are applied, and you see the little kid disappear onto the floor. It's amazing that there aren't more injuries. I find it absolutely unbelievable that with the amount of public education by so many well-meaning groups and individuals, there has not been broader application and use of child restraints.

In the Legislature today, we come to a decision on passing second reading of this piece of legislation to make it mandatory for children born after the new year to be restrained in a vehicle. I think this is an approach that will have the acceptance of the majority of people. I have gone door-to-door in the constituency that I represent and have asked a number of residents their feelings on this question, among others. There was overwhelming support to protect children in vehicles. Many comments related to the fact that if parents aren't responsible, then we as a society have to consider taking the responsibility to protect those who are least able to protect themselves.

I believe that because this is a persuasive type of legislation — it has a mandatory nature — and because it is being staged in over a period of years, it will be particularly successful in changing attitudes. People resist the mandatory nature of many types of laws, and change is slow to be accepted by members of our society. But while some feel that it's too slow and that perhaps we're dragging our feet, I think there's wisdom in this approach, in saying that if we move more slowly, perhaps in a persuasive way, we will convince people this is important to their families. It provides a protection to their families, the same as a smoke detector or any other device provides protection to our families. We know that many families now have smoke detectors who didn't have them a year ago. I see this as a similar kind of thing. It's a simple step that I am hopeful will change attitudes in the near future.

In addition to this, I think there's the strong argument that if children are restrained they will say: "Hey, how about you, mom and dad? How can we be buckled up and you're not?" I think that over a period of time we will see a dramatic shift in the use of restraints by all who travel in vehicles.

In speaking previously in this House, I have said I believe using restraints is really just a matter of habit. I can use myself as an example. When I visit a province that has mandatory restraints and legislation, for the first few days it may seem uncomfortable or awkward, but after that it simply becomes a matter of habit. This is a habit I think is well worthy of encouragement and support.

I conclude by commending the minister for proceeding with this step. I know the children who will be precluded from serious accident or injury, without being able to stand in the Legislature to say thank you, will also appreciate the fact that we have a government that has taken a step to care about them, their health, and their future.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to rise to make a few remarks on Bill 83. At the same time, I'd like to rise in my place to speak on full seat-belt legislation and indicate that we should have gone the full direction on it. But I think this is the first step on it. I'm sure the debate on the introduction of seat belts for all Albertans in the province will be back in this Assembly at some other time. As a director of the Alberta Safety Council and the Canada Safety Council, I applaud the government and the minister in this first step.

My one particular caution is the January 1, 1985, date when the legislation comes into existence for newborns. My concern is that we're going to have 200,000 children under the age of five who will not be buckled up or restrained unless there is a real educational program, as stated by the minister. I think it's got to be a volunteer program by the parents, that they know the child should be restrained. I hope the percentage of children wearing restraint devices will rise substantially after January 1, 1985.

There have been a number of discussions on seat-belt restraint for children. My colleague from Calgary Foothills outlined the number of organizations that have been involved

in presentations to the government over the last number of years, especially the last year. I would just like to share with members the Alberta Safety Council news release of September 20, 1983. The past chairman, Bob Gray, made the following statement:

"Motor vehicle occupant injury is the leading cause of death beyond the first year of life," said Bob Gray, Alberta Safety Council chairman. "The Alberta Action Committee for Child Transportation Safety studied 192 motor vehicle occupant deaths of children ages 0 to 15 in Alberta from 1975 to 1979. The results indicated that 42 per cent were ejected from the vehicle, 62 per cent sustained head injuries and none [of those] were properly restrained."

From December 1 to 7 this year, we will have Safe Driving Week, which is sponsored by the Canada Safety Council. They have a brochure which I think hon. members will probably see, because the package is sent out to various people in the province. One of their emphases during Safe Driving Week is "Buckle Up for Safety". The Canada Safety Council has been a real supporter of Buckle Up for Safety, not only for children but for adults.

We've also had a number of discussion papers in the province. I have one that was done by Alberta Transportation. It's a question-and-answer type of discussion paper, and I would commend it to members of the Assembly who would like to read it. I think it has a lot of useful information in it. I have shared some of the information in this particular document with constituents who approached me on my stand on compulsory seat-belt legislation for adults and children. A discussion of this particular paper certainly changed their views in many instances.

Most of the statistics have been debated in the House this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, so I don't think it's incumbent upon me to bring the statements out again. Other hon. members of the Assembly have made the particular point of what has taken place, the number of injuries and deaths, and other statistics regarding seat belts.

What I'd like to say is that if a plane crashes in the province, and 350 people are lost in a 747 or whatever it is, it is on the front of the newspapers for a week and there's a real campaign for air safety. But you can turn on your radio or TV tonight and hear that an individual was killed in a motor vehicle accident, tossed out of the vehicle and hitting an embankment or whatever the case was, and there's not very much mention of that. It goes about as far as the local area that knew the person. There's no other discussion on it. But what's happening in the province of Alberta over the last number of years is that between 500 and 700 people, mostly under 30, have been killed in motor vehicle accidents.

I'd like to say that in some instances seat belts aren't going to help you. In 1981 seat belts wouldn't have helped the 85 pedestrians, 12 bicyclists, or 47 people that were killed operating motorcycles. But it's shown that a lot of the 695 would not be dead today, would not have sustained injury, or would not have been injured as greatly as they were. We know that about 14.5 percent of our population in the province wear restraint devices right now. This is taken from statistics and investigations of accidents that have happened.

The other debate that has been held is the availability of car seats. One of the reasons for not moving with full legislation right now is that they say the availability of the seats is not there. But knowing the private entrepreneurs we have in this province and in Canada, I'm sure that child restraint devices could be made readily available in a short time. There are a number of suppliers that supply them. They run anywhere from \$40 to \$100 for a really good type of restraint.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to an article that was printed in *The Calgary Herald* in February 1984. It was done by Catherine Ford. She called it murder not to buckle up kids. She offered — and I think this particular information is very useful in this whole debate:

In a collision at 30 kilometres an hour, no mother can hold her baby — even if he weighs less than a decent-sized roast of beef and she's the strongest woman in the world. At that speed (about half normal for Calgary) ...

I guess she's saying they speed in Calgary.

... the youngster is propelled forward, and his mass becomes the equivalent of 300 kilograms.

Or for most of us who are not yet metric, about 600 pounds.

First the baby hits the dashboard, then Mom follows a fraction of a second later, and mashes her own child. By any accounts, that's a double injury to a small body with undeveloped neck muscles and a relatively large and soft head.

She goes on to say, and I agree with her:

Babies don't know the difference, and toddlers brought up always wearing a seat belt ... are incredibly conscientious about wearing them.

That brings me to the conclusion of my remarks, Mr. Speaker. I know child restraints work, and I know seat belts work. I went through a very difficult tragedy in our own family less than four months ago. If it had not been for seat belts and restraints on a five-year-old girl, we would have lost three loved ones instead of two.

Thank you.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like the opportunity to participate in second reading of Bill 83. I will try to refrain from speaking at any length, because I spoke on this subject on May 1 under Motion 210, introduced by the hon. Member for Calgary Foothills.

Initially, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to commend the minister for introducing this Bill. I would like to congratulate and commend the Member for Calgary Foothills for introducing Motion 210 in the spring session of this legislative sitting, the Member for Calgary Currie, who I know has been actively involved in introducing this type of legislation to the Legislature over the years, and really all members who have participated in this important debate, recognizing full well that it carries a certain amount of controversy with it.

On balance I can be most supportive of this particular Bill. Mr. Speaker, I support it because the figures and the evidence are so absolutely overwhelming on the necessity for individuals and parents to reduce the highway carnage happening to those who cannot make their own decisions or determinations in protecting themselves. I don't think there's any question — surely there's not an Albertan who is not aware, who has not been adequately educated, of the fact that seat belts and restraint devices for children do save lives. I would be surprised to hear of one Albertan who would disagree with that fact.

While that may be true, Mr. Speaker, it's becoming abundantly clear, in terms of surveys and empirical evidence, that while our education program has been excellent, it has not resulted in a marked increase in utilization of seat belts and safety devices for children. I notice that a survey of a random 500 families in Calgary on utilization of child safety restraints revealed that only 27 percent of parents reported that they always used a restraint for their children. Over 50 percent never used a safety restraint, for a variety of reasons. The Member for Calgary Foothills articulated some of them: lack of comfort for the child, inconvenience, the distance of the trip being too short, perhaps the belief that car seats are not safe — although

I can't believe that anybody would actually hold that view. Perhaps a reason is that the costs are excessive, but it is difficult for me to imagine a circumstance where someone can afford a car but can't at the same time afford a safety device. There are a variety of reasons, the point being that utilization really has not increased markedly as a result of education.

I was rather shocked and surprised to hear the statistic trotted out by the Member for Edmonton Kingsway, that Saskatchewan introduced child restraint legislation two years ago and there has not been one fatality in those two years. That boggles my mind; I had no idea of that. Surely that must demonstrate the worthiness of this particular Bill.

Mr. Speaker, when I spoke to Motion 210 on May 1, 1984, I started to underline some of the results of a survey that was just being undertaken in my constituency at the time. I said I hoped I would have the opportunity in due course to articulate the full results of that survey. They're in. I sent out 22,000 questionnaires in the constituency of Red Deer. I asked the question on seat belts:

Compulsory seat belt legislation has been suggested by a number of interest groups. Alberta is currently the only province that does not have such legislation. Should the Government of Alberta enact compulsory seat belt legislation?

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you I was frankly surprised at the results. It's been said before that in many constituencies in many areas across this province the idea of mandatory seat-belt usage is really split, and Red Deer is no different. The results were 46.1 percent in favour of that question, keeping in mind that we're dealing with full mandatory seat-belt usage, and 44.9 percent not in favour of mandatory seat belts. So it's evenly split on mandatory seat-belt legislation, and to be perfectly frank I have a certain number of difficulties with regard to mandatory seat-belt usage for those who can make the responsible decision on their own to do something for their own good.

Mr. Speaker, I would have to say I subscribe to a proper balance between individual accountability and system accountability. I hold the view that holding individuals accountable for their behaviour does not excuse or justify a bad system that encourages poor individual behaviour. A bad system needs reform. But equally, bad systems don't justify bad behaviour. Individuals must be held accountable for their actions.

I was interested in the comments made by the Member for Edmonton Norwood, who suggested that the argument of freedoms in the area of mandatory seat-belt usage is fallacious. I have real difficulty with that. Anyone who believes in private property, limited government, voluntary exchange, and free enterprise certainly has to be concerned with the freedoms involved in mandatory legislation. He quite correctly pointed out that every time a piece of legislation is enacted in law, certain freedoms are taken away.

I think it becomes a very important question, and I offer what I think is a rather interesting comment on that very subject. I notice that the Alberta Medical Association, who of course are very, very supportive and have advocated the cause of legislated mandatory seat-belt usage for many years, called for mandatory seat-belt usage in the resolutions book of their annual meeting of 1981 — clear-cut, period. In the very next sentence, they said they would also call for a trauma registry so long as it did not antagonize physicians. I find an interesting parallel there, Mr. Speaker. While I certainly support the Alberta Medical Association's efforts in education and in bringing this important issue to the fore, I find it interesting that they would call for mandatory seat-belt legislation while at the same suggesting they would like a trauma registry only if it didn't bother

or antagonize physicians. Surely there are other Albertans who may be somewhat antagonized by mandatory seat-belt legislation. But all in all, I am clearly most supportive of this Bill that calls for child restraints for those who don't have the opportunity or the ability to make those decisions on their own.

Mr. Speaker, I have one further comment with regard to mandatory seat-belt usage. Frankly, I can't understand why the general insurance industry can't establish some mechanism to provide incentives for individuals to wear their seat belts. I can speak from personal experience in the area of the insurance business that I'm familiar with; that is, the life insurance business. For about the last five or six years, the life insurance industry has provided very significant incentives for individuals who [don't] smoke to purchase life insurance at marked reductions in premium rates. A nonsmoker can now buy life insurance at about 50 percent of the cost of a smoker. It strikes me that that kind of development in the general insurance industry, to provide incentives for people who wear seat belts, would clearly be a responsible action.

There of course will be those who would say, how would you control that? I could go on. It's quite easy. They do retail credit checks. They determine at the outset whether the individual is a seat-belt wearer. If a person was involved in a car accident and was found not to have been wearing his seat belt, they could reduce the payment by the amount of premium that would have been accorded in the full case.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my remarks simply by complimenting the minister and other members who have supported this Bill. As you can probably feel from the comments I have made, I am fully supportive of Bill 83. While I have some reservations in the overall area of mandatory seat-belt usage, I am pleased to stand in my place and be fully supportive of child restraint devices.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't going to speak on this Bill, but the Member for Stony Plain raised a point in which he said he thought this was a first step. If I thought it was a first step to total, mandatory seat-belt legislation, I'd have to oppose the Bill. I don't believe it is. I believe it's the first step on the long road to educating the public of the effective role of seat belts in preventing traffic fatalities. If it influences people to voluntarily wear seat belts, I'll support it.

Mr. Speaker, I support it because children are in a relaxed position and are unprepared to protect themselves in case of an accident which they may not foresee and certainly aren't prepared for. I know many of the constituents of Drayton Valley, will support child restraint seats, but I also know they would not support mandatory seat belts for all people. I would just like to say that this would be an excellent present for grandma and grandfather to give this Christmas. If I get a chance, I'll suggest that.

MR. KOWALSKI: You're not old enough to be a grandmother.

MRS. CRIPPS: Thank you, sir. I'm old enough but not fast enough.

I'd just like to say I support this legislation as a first step in educating the public of Alberta, not as a first step in mandatory seat belts for all ages.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in my place to support the Bill presently before us. I should say I have gone on record as supporting mandatory seat belts for all vehicle drivers and passengers. I always find it rather distasteful that we have to legislate something we should just be doing as

responsible citizens, responsible for our own well-being and for the care of our loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, having a family with three teenagers, I find that they will not put those belts on. They just won't. I have threatened and told them they can't have the car unless they get into them habit of putting them on. I do it by example. The minute the car moves, I put my belt on, in either the passenger's seat or the driver's seat. But they won't put them on. I know my own father, who was a truck driver of many years' experience, spent half a day taking the beeper out of his car so that infernal thing would stop beeping and telling him to put the stupid seat belt on. I said, "Why won't you wear it?" He had some harum-scarum reason why he wouldn't wear it.

Mr. Speaker, because the government has not been brave enough to go with the entire package of making it mandatory that we all wear seat belts, I think we have to look at some type of alternative, be it a penalty on medical coverage. We as taxpayers, participants in the medical plan, have to pay for those people who, because of their outright, flagrant negligence in protecting themselves, will not wear belts. We have to pay to put them back together. Maybe it's through insurance; I don't know. But it always bothers me that we have to pass laws to make people protect themselves against an injury.

In having to pass laws which I find distasteful, the law. I find the most mind-boggling is in, I believe, Australia or New Zealand, where you are fined if you don't go to vote. To me that just flies in the face of democracy. People should have that ballot so sacred that they vote. To fine them because they don't vote is to me the ultimate in people's irresponsibility, that you have to fine them to exercise their democratically given franchise.

Mr. Speaker, I support the legislation, because it is a small step in the right direction. If we see children being placed in restraining devices, hopefully in many instances we will save these children from being severely injured or killed outright. Maybe the child will survive as an orphan because the mother and father sitting in the front seat wouldn't put the belt on. I have said in the Assembly before that I am not going by personal experience. If I were going to use that as an example, I would be against compulsory seat belts. We were in a head-on collision where a third of the car was taken off. My wife — my fiancée at the time — was the driver. Both doors were cut off. Had she had a seat belt on, she would not be here today. But anybody with above-average or even below-average intelligence knows that statistically seat belts save lives.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my short contribution, I support it, but it is not as far as we should have gone.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, no one would ever argue that democracy works. We as a government have been criticized continually for our lack of initiative. If one assumes that 10 percent of Canadians, namely Albertans, have the common sense that eight other provinces have, one has to wonder on the one hand what makes we in Alberta so different. I think the proof of the system is unique to Alberta. It takes time because we elect 79 members of the Assembly. The majority are with one political party, but obviously they are not all of the same view.

I'm proud to be part of a system where, unlike other jurisdictions, a premier and certain key members of a cabinet do not make all the decisions or run the province but recognize that it takes the total caucus to resolve serious social issues. I think that's the reason we're dealing with this today as opposed to one, two, three, or four years ago. It's very important for Albertans to realize that, with the leadership they have in this province, represented by the member of the Assembly they

elect — and we're not united on this; that's been obvious just reading the press in the past year — indeed the system truly works.

The other point I'd like to make is — reference was made today to polls. You can't live by polls. First of all, if you're a politician you make the assumption when you put a question out that the answer is one you can live with, so you reword the question in such a way. So let's be very cautious, because we assume that the person answering the question is as well informed as the person asking the question. That's not always true, as certain hon. members are aware.

Mr. Speaker, we should give credit where credit is due. The Minister of Transportation has been commended for his initiative. He's only one of several. I'd like to particularly commend the Member for Chinook, who as the Minister of Transportation was continually in the headlines of this province, pointing out the facts as to why people should wear safety belts.

Probably one of the reasons it has taken this long is that we continue to call them "seat belts". They're really nothing to do with seats; they're to do with safety. Maybe that's not a bad place to start; start a new term. If we're talking safety, let's talk safety. I recall that several years ago the Member for Calgary Currie urged us to deal with minors. Maybe the idea was a little before its time; I don't know. The Member for Calgary Foothills, who we know was the sponsor of that motion on the Order Paper, has spoken so eloquently as to the need.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe for one minute that passing a law is the answer. But surely it's the beginning of the answer. As I read Bill 83 I say to myself: if the legislation is necessary to save a child's life, is it not necessary to save those 200,000 lives the Member for Stony Plain referred to, that will not come under this legislation? One has to wonder what is so magical about having this legislation only applicable to those born after the magical New Year's Eve of 1984. There again, I believe that an astute person outside this House observing the debate would recognize that there are certain compromises that are necessary to get legislation through.

I would like to comment — and many members have already commented — on the results of wearing safety belts, the experiences in Saskatchewan and Ontario. I don't think there's any argument. As many members have already said, no one in their right mind would dispute that there is a valid role and place for safety devices.

We must come back, though, to the role of government. It's been said so often: the role of government is to help those who can help themselves. While I can agree and accept, there are many members of this Assembly who are very concerned and supportive of the role of health units but don't for one moment accept the very fundamental principle that's already available in this province for preventing tooth decay, and that's fluoridation. Calgary continues to hang out there, and I guess that's their business. But don't come here asking for support for a dental program when at the same time you refuse to accept some of the most fundamental, well-proven ...

DR. BUCK: We need the business down there, John. It's good — lots of cavities.

MR. GOGO: With deference to the Member for Clover Bar, I hadn't considered that.

Mr. Speaker, in the area I represent, I think the Lethbridge Health Unit does a remarkable job in providing these safety seats for infants up to nine or 10 months of age. I think this is important to the minister, because he's made reference to various groups throughout the province. It's very important for the minister to be aware that the service clubs, of which we

have 17 in Lethbridge and literally hundreds in Alberta, are out there seeking projects whereby they can help. The Jaycettes, which was the first female Jaycees club in the country, launched a program three years ago whereby they would raise funds and provide these seats for newborns through the health unit. I point out that their revenue comes from fund-raising projects, one of which was to host Margaret Trudeau a couple of years ago just after the publication of her book. It was so popular it was a sellout; they had to do it twice. That meant that many young mothers in Alberta got an opportunity to get a seat that they perhaps otherwise wouldn't have had.

Mr. Speaker, reference was made by the Member for Red Deer to who else can help. I suggest that the announcement by the minister that the New Year's babies will be the recipients is an excellent idea. The Member for Drayton Valley has said, what a great Christmas gift. I think it would be an excellent idea if we could convince the banks — they're on every street corner in Canada — that instead of giving a toaster to open a new account they give a child restraint device. There are some political associations and organizations in Alberta that always want to be part of the scene, and it might not be a bad idea for the most politically progressive organization in the province to get involved. Maybe the PC association in Clover Bar would do it. I'm sure that would be extremely exciting.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Red Deer made reference to the insurance industry. I had raised this before in the House. I'm somewhat disappointed by the insurance industry. They're never late in collecting my premium. When I look at the fact that 428 people were killed in traffic fatalities last year — and with no-fault insurance it obviously cost the industry a lot of money — it seems to me that if they wanted to participate, why not offer a reduced premium for those who will sign an affidavit that they'll wear their safety belt? I've made this suggestion before. I'm told that those who buy abstainer insurance with regard to drinking and smoking and get a 10 percent premium decrease — the decrease in the number of people is dramatic. I think that should be a challenge from this Assembly to the insurance industry. Why don't you get with it? It's nice to sit over there in the corner and make all the proposals, but why don't you put your money where your mouth is? We know that other associations are strongly supportive.

I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, because I know other members want to speak. I talked to Dr. Duncan Brown in Lethbridge over the past couple of years. He's a plastic surgeon; he's in the business of putting your face back after it's gone or stuck to the windshield or dashboard. He tells me that if only people who are interested in opposing safety-belt legislation could observe some of the very tragic consequences of an automobile at 100 km or 63 miles an hour which comes to an abrupt stop — when the body meets an immobile force, something that won't move, it starts moving at the same rate of speed, and you see the very tragic consequences in the hospital system. Never mind the broken bones and the hearts torn through the chest — just the faces of people, which they spend years trying to reconstruct with plastic surgery. In my opinion, no one in their right mind could possibly, get into an automobile without being cautious of that fact, as the Member for Clover Bar has pointed out.

I support the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I am disappointed that it doesn't go far enough. I'm disappointed that there are maybe 200,000 young Albertans out there who will not be covered on New Year's Day. I hope that at some stage, I don't know when, members would be prepared to come back to this House and assume what I believe is a true leadership role — having informed their constituents of not only the positive side of this Bill but also its limitations — to seriously address the question: are we sincere about safety-belt legislation?

Thank you.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few brief comments with respect to Bill 83, the Child Transportation Safety Act, 1984. The previous speaker made a very salient point, that really we should stop talking about seat belts and talk about safety belts. So it's interesting that the title of the Bill does pick up the Child Transportation Safety Act. With respect to developments under way within the automobile industry, no doubt in time one won't be talking so much about the belt aspect of safety within a vehicle as the matter of inflatable bags and how their introduction will affect the development of car manufacture and as a consequent result individual passenger safety with respect to motor vehicle accidents.

For the time being, I commend the minister for the introduction of this Act. It is indeed a very positive beginning. I have been an advocate of safety belts for all passengers in vehicles for a number of years. I admit that I am also one who is guilty of requesting people who are just travelling in the front seat to put on the safety belts. Nevertheless I don't believe that we should be imposing complete safety-belt legislation on all persons within the province, because I respect the fact that a number of people feel very strongly that they want to maintain their individual choice. [interjection]

Nevertheless, picking up on the helpful hints for parliamentary speakers being offered from my right hand here, I'd like to go on to make a few brief comments about the number of people I have seen in brain-damage units in social care and health care facilities in other provinces as well as this one, who would not have been there had they been wearing some kind of safety harness or safety belt. There's no doubt that people who are involved in those accidents, if they survive, survive to a life which is more of an existence rather than a life that can be described as being fully alive. The drain upon those individuals and their families, the emotional drain upon all the health care people who have to maintain life for those individuals, and the financial drain are indeed considerable.

Oftentimes we as individuals have seen people driving down the highway or within city areas of transportation with children who aren't seated at all. Either the mother or father or perhaps the baby-sitter or grandparent is driving. You wonder how they have any semblance of control of the vehicle, because you can see one or sometimes more than one infant or young person running around inside the car, bouncing up and down like a couple of caged monkeys. You know that the parent just can't be concentrating on driving the vehicle.

With respect to the Bill, if people feel they are suffering undue hardship in terms of not being able to purchase restraint safety devices for their youngsters, I hope volunteer groups throughout the province will see this as being one area where they can come and help out.

While I support the principle and commend the minister for introducing it, I am also one of those who is quite concerned that the Bill really should include children who are up to the age of five on January 1 and that we should not be simply phasing this in over a five-year period. That is not attacking the problem in the manner in which I personally believe it should be attacked.

Thank you.

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few comments with respect to the Bill. This has been an issue which has been discussed in public for years. In my own case, I was involved in an accident where a seat belt would certainly have helped the situation. It happened some years ago, when one of my daughters, aged five days, was in the front seat. When we

had a head-on collision on Calgary Trail, the baby was actually thrust into the front dash and suffered a major concussion and fracture of the skull. If there had been some provision for maintaining the child in a certain way, the injuries would have been a lot less. In those days I didn't even have a seat belt in the car.

I know all cars are now provided with seat belts. The question is, how do you get people to wear them? The argument that they are not useful or that they do not prevent injuries has been pretty well done away with. They are useful. The question is, how do you change the attitude of the general public with regard to wearing them? Do you mandate them? Do you do it through legislation, or do you do it through education? I can share what has happened subsequently. I note that within my own family, where the youngsters have taken driver training programs, all of them will buckle up their seat belts without having to be told. The issue becomes whether you force everyone to do it under legislation or look at it in terms of the young people being educated so that in the years ahead they will willingly comply with wearing them from their own individual perspective; that is, it is good for them to do it. It is something that will prevent injury, and therefore they will want to wear them.

I think the legislation that's been introduced is very useful from this sense, that it will probably condition our youngsters into wanting to wear them. It's very much like wearing helmets in hockey. We saw the day when helmets first came in. There was a rejection of helmets. Now we see the situation where most of the professional hockey players are in fact wearing them. The people not wearing them are the exception today. Through legislation such as this, I hope young people will develop the attitudes and habits such that we will not have to actually legislate in the future, that people will want to wear them.

I know there are many people who object very strongly to the mandatory seat-belt legislation, yet they buckle up very religiously. The issue today with seat belts is whether

government should be telling its citizens what to do. We have this debate going on — whether it should be the educational component in trying to get people to wear the belts or we should be forcing them through legislation. It would be interesting to know what has happened in some of the other provinces where they did in fact legislate, what effect it had in terms of people wearing them in the initial few years, and then whether there was a drop-off in the rate of people wearing seat belts. Anytime you introduce something new, there is a tendency for people to comply and follow, and when the initial thrust is gone, people tend to go back to previous patterns. If one can achieve the same results in terms of wearing seat belts through education and modification of the attitudes of young people, maybe legislation for all will not be necessary.

Mr. Speaker, having opposed mandatory legislation right across the board, I would support the notion of instituting the program in such a way that all children under five would have to wear seat belts, as opposed to phasing it in the way the Bill proposes.

Those are a few remarks, Mr. Speaker, with regard to this issue.

[Motion carried; Bill 83 read a second time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on Monday it is proposed to do second readings of Bills on the Order Paper, starting with Bills 78 and 79. If there is time, other Bills will also be undertaken, not including the one with respect to cultural heritage which was introduced this morning. It is not proposed that the Assembly sit on Monday night. I move we call it I o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 12:47 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 4, the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]