

said: "We have Treasury Board directives which protect federal Government workers." That is not good enough, Mr. Speaker. These people deserve the same legislative protection as the workers, and that legislative protection is much more extensive than Treasury Board directives which can change at the whim of any government. People who work for the Government of Canada and for the people of Canada deserve to have the same legislative protection. The same thing goes for people who work on ships, on trains and for the airlines. The same thing should apply to those who work for Atomic Energy of Canada and the various elements of the uranium and nuclear industries. Those workers deserve legislative protection and they deserve to be able to go to the Minister of Labour to ask that Canadian legislation be enforced, that inspections take place and that their lives, their health and safety, be protected by the laws of Canada.

One of the problems this Bill does not address is the need for adequate inspection by representatives of the Department of Labour. In numerous committees of this House the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ouellet), the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Gray) and others have been asked why there are so few inspectors in Labour Canada. They have been asked why it is impossible for inspectors from Labour Canada to get to most worksites under federal jurisdiction; why miners in communities like Flin Flon and Snow Lake who come under federal jurisdiction almost never see a representative of Labour Canada acting as an inspector. Why, Mr. Speaker, is that the case? Why has the Government of Canada refused to provide adequate inspections to enforce the Labour Code as it stands at the present time? The improvements before us today will require even more inspectors, making visits more often to the worksite. If we do not have federal Government inspection, regardless how good the law is, regardless of what improvements we pass into law, we will not meet the needs of safety and the health of workers in the workplace.

Let me give you some idea of the problems we face in Canada, Sir. I want to take some information from Labour Canada's own figures for 1981. There were 830 fatalities in workplaces. Total work injuries amounted to 1.21 million out of 9.34 million workers, or 12 per cent. There were 585,000 people who suffered disabling injuries. The total cost, benefit payments and indirect costs, was over \$9.2 billion.

The union issued a "Black Paper" for the Public Service for 1982-3. Despite the misunderstanding many Canadians have, it is not safe to have a job working for the federal Government in Canada. There were over 20 fatalities in 1982-83. There were 31,000 reported injuries and the cost in workmen's compensation alone was \$40 million.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, there are many needs and many reasons for passing legislation to protect both workers who come under the Labour Code at the present time and those who do not. This House on a number of occasions has talked about the *Ocean Ranger* incident, the tragic loss on February 15, 1982, of 84 lives. One of the reasons that tragedy occurred was the failure to solve the jurisdiction problem between the federal Government and the provinces. Another

Canada Labour Code

reason for those deaths is that the federal Government did not bring the operation of drilling rigs under the jurisdiction of the Canada Labour Code.

A report has been made public in the United States on the *Ocean Ranger*. Of course, in Canada we are still waiting for the investigation to be completed and for the report to be issued, even though it is well over two years since the incident took place. The major reasons for the accident cited in the American report was the lack of adequate training for the crew with regard to safety and operational procedures in dangerous times. That lack of training in terms of safety and that lack of knowledge in terms of operating in treacherous waters caused 84 deaths.

• (1210)

I could give other examples, such as the death of a worker in a silo. There had been inadequate inspection by the federal Government which resulted in Paul John Jovanov being buried alive and dying of suffocation. I could talk about lead smelter operations with poor ventilation. Workers are subject to acid fumes, dust and smoke. Again there has been lack of protection because of inadequate inspection and inadequate enforcement. I could talk about workers on federal Government sites. They work in a sealed environment with a lack of air exchange. They are suffering from respiratory problems, nausea, headaches, eye and ear irritations, and quite often have a high rate of abnormal births. I could talk about people who work in CN maintenance shops. They work with lava-like lead with only heavy canvas gloves and aprons for protection. I could talk about the increased use of video display terminals and the resulting eye strain, back fatigue, birth defects and miscarriages. There has been a failure to implement or suggest any legislative controls in terms of radiation screens, hours of work on VDTs and continuous exposure within a small area.

Recent statistics also show that over the last two years VDT users were absent from work three times as much as non-users. That study was conducted by the New York Mount Sinai School of Medicine. There are a number of examples of people dying and suffering from health problems. Also they are faced with safety problems, with miscarriages and with abnormal births. This has been caused by a lack of adequate inspection, adequate legislation and adequate standards within Canada.

We require legislation to be in place. It must be followed up with adequate regulations and inspections. As I said earlier, the best legislation in the world is of no value if it cannot be enforced. It is of no value if we do not have standards by which to measure the legislation.

I should like to deal with some other aspects of the Bill for a few minutes. There is a need for improvement in the legislation. We will make a number of amendments at committee stage. One area in which the Government is moving very slowly and inadequately is in the matter of sexual harassment. The proposed amendments only compel employers to attempt to keep the workplace free of sexual harassment. We would like some federal guidelines to explain what is and what is not acceptable behaviour. We would also like to see the Human