

Standing Committee on Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act

Monday, August 16, 1982

Chairman: Dr. Reid

2:50 p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the committee can come to order again and we can go on to our second minister of the afternoon, the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. Would the minister introduce the gentleman with him, and does the minister have any preliminary remarks he would like to make before we go on to questioning by the committee?

MR. DIACHUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have Bill Ramsay with me, the program administrator. Bill has a staff of two, a research officer and a clerk typist. As some of the members of the committee saw, Bill has a whole box of files with him and will be able to dig into any specific one the members of the committee have questions on.

Mr. Chairman, as an introduction, may I recap the occupational health and safety heritage grant program a bit, a \$10 million investment of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund capital projects division established in 1981 as an eight-year program under the auspices of my portfolio. The grant program, established to complement services of the occupational health and safety division, encourages both public and private participation in responding to a broad range of health and safety research, training, and education concerns related to employment. Awards from this program will help to ensure that a variety of projects and approaches, including short- and long-term activities, will be directed toward the prevention of work-related accidents and ill health. The program is administered through the grant program office located in the research and education branch of the division. An interdepartmental steering committee is responsible for making recommendations to the managing director on projects appropriate for funding.

Although the program officially commenced in April 1981, a full staff complement of three was not achieved until March 1982 with the recruitment of the research officer. Formal terms of reference for the interdepartmental steering committee were established early in the fiscal year. Membership includes three representatives from the occupational health and safety division and one representative from each of the following: Advanced Education and Manpower, Environment, Labour, Personnel Administration, Social Services and Community Health, and the Workers' Compensation Board. This is the interdepartmental steering committee that reviews any application and makes recommendations to the managing director.

In the first year of program operation, emphasis was placed on developing guidelines and administrative procedures in considering grant submissions, ensuring that sufficient appropriate criteria were present in assessing proposals and providing relevant background information to members of the interdepartmental grant steering committee to assist them in their review of proposals. Three major categories were established: research, education, and conference workshops. In the research area, the grant program supports scientific activities designed to increase understanding of occupational health and safety problems and develop and assess new strategies and approaches to address these problems. Funding in the education category is used to sponsor activity relating to the development, delivery, and evaluation of educational programs, and training individuals in areas which emphasize the

recognition, avoidance, and control of hazards related to work. For the workshop-conference area, funds are used to assist organizations hosting workshops or conferences which focus on issues related to health and safety on the job.

Forty-nine grant applications requesting a total of some \$3 million were submitted to the steering committee in 1981-82. However, during the first fiscal year, as I have shared with all the members of the committee, some 15 projects were approved for funding, resulting in a commitment of \$410,980. This figure of \$3 million that I use will really reflect on 1982-83, because some of the applications made were finally approved in the current year, '82-83. Maybe the figure is a bit misleading in indicating the small percentage, \$410,000 out of \$3 million approved.

A formal critical review, carried out by specialists in appropriate subject areas, was obtained for each submission. During the year, over 60 formal reviews were requested and received. About half were obtained from in-house staff, while the remainder were prepared by experts throughout the country and, on several occasions, from other countries. In addition to the formal reviews, division research staff also review and provide critical comments on each proposal. As I indicated, the breakdown of those 15 is five for research, six for education, and four for conference workshops.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I would be prepared to accept any questions and discussion on that '81-82 program.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have three areas of questioning and perhaps several supplementaries on each of them. In terms of the overview, the minister indicated \$410,000. I take it that's the amount that will be expended, but the projects which we've been given in the handout, Occupational Health and Safety Heritage Grant Program: Approved Projects, work out to about \$1 million in my arithmetic. I assume that is because of the carry-over of these projects.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, the '81-82 funding was up to program 15.

MR. NOTLEY: I see.

MR. DIACHUK: I thought that that adds up to \$410,980. That includes 15.

MR. NOTLEY: That includes 15. Just taking our handout, one to 15 are the new applications for this year?

MR. DIACHUK: '81-82.

MR. NOTLEY: Okay. Then just so I have it clear in my mind here, 16 through 22 would include which applications?

MR. DIACHUK: Sixteen on are the current ones.

MR. NOTLEY: Six out of the 27 would be applications being accepted this year?

MR. DIACHUK: That's right.

MR. NOTLEY: So we have \$400,000 that will be in the year of the review, and \$600,000 being handed out for expenditure in the current year.

MR. DIACHUK: That's right.

MR. NOTLEY: How does that coincide with the \$234,000 we have on page 24 of the capital projects division?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we go into that, could we have clarification? Are there going to be any further projects approved for the current fiscal year, '82-83, in addition to item 27 that we have on this list?

MR. DIACHUK: Yes, there will be. The year end is April 1, 1983.

MR. NOTLEY: Okay, but let's go back to what we have in our report here. Mr. Diachuk, on page 24 we have \$234,000 for 1982. You've given us \$410,000 and another \$600,000 here, so I'm just a little uncertain of where we're at. Perhaps one of you could give us a reconciliation, if you like, of the handout and page 24.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, I'll have Bill Ramsay go through the figures and explain it to you.

MR. RAMSAY: Yes, the \$410,000 was approved in '81-82. We've had expenditures of \$177,000 during that fiscal year, resulting in a commitment or carry-over, if you will, of \$233,000 into '82-83. So although \$410,000 of grant money was approved in 1981-82, that was not all expended.

MR. NOTLEY: So that's the explanation for \$234,000 on page 24 of the report, Mr. Ramsay? You see, I just refer you to the annual report, capital projects investments, under Executive Council, occupational health and safety, research and education.

MR. RAMSAY: Okay, \$234,000 is the total expenditure of '81-82; \$177,000 of that was directly related to grants. There are also manpower expenditures, supplies and services, in that whole element that add up to the \$234,000. Of that \$234,000, \$177,000 was directly related to grants.

MR. NOTLEY: Okay. Just as a supplementary on that question, Mr. Chairman, at the end of this year, what is the projection? You've agreed to \$410,000 on one to 15. These were all done last year, and presumably there's a carry-over as you say. Now you have 16 to 27. What other applications are now being considered, and what is the projection for the end of this year?

MR. RAMSAY: The projection for the end of this year, in terms of grant funds, is about \$830,000.

MR. NOTLEY: That would be the total of the \$600,000 plus another \$200,000? I'm trying to ascertain from you what additional money is likely to be made, available because of some of these applications which perhaps we'll be discussing a little later. So what is the likelihood as to the total for the year?

MR. RAMSAY: The total for the year -- excuse me?

MR. NOTLEY: What's the budget? Do you anticipate actually expending that . . .

MR. RAMSAY: Excuse me. The budget was \$1 million. The grant control group was \$820,000. We expect it will expend the entire amount for this fiscal year.

MR. NOTLEY: I see. So there's about another \$200,000, if my arithmetic is right, which is available for disposition in the current fiscal year?

MR. RAMSAY: Well, that carried over comes to about \$233,000, and we're looking at another \$600,000 on top of that expenditure this fiscal year.

MR. NOTLEY: I see. So with the carry-over, are we talking about additional projects which can be financed this year, or have we in fact closed the door because of this carry-over of projects that were already started but not completed?

MR. RAMSAY: We have about \$600,000 of new projects for this fiscal year.

MR. NOTLEY: \$600,000 would be basically 16 to 27. Would that not be correct, as I look over the figures here?

MR. RAMSAY: Well, some of those figures you have are the total amount for the projects. Some of the larger projects will be spread over two fiscal years. In other words, it won't all be spent this fiscal year; it'll be carried over to the following '83-84 fiscal year.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the question I would ask either Mr. Diachuk or Mr. Ramsay is: what amount of money is in fact available for disposition under this program for the current year?

MR. DIACHUK: 1982-83?

MR. NOTLEY: Yes.

MR. DIACHUK: It's \$1 million.

MR. NOTLEY: No, no. Left for disposition.

MR. DIACHUK: Oh, left. Sorry. Mr. Chairman, what we have now approved for 1982-83 is \$637,892. The balance, to make up \$1 million, is what is still available for applicants, Mr. Notley. The steering committee is even scheduled to meet later this month to consider further applications they have on them.

MR. NOTLEY: So that balance, Mr. Diachuk, would be the difference between whatever administrative costs you're looking at out of the \$1 million -- which would be what, \$100,000? Are you in a position to give the committee some guidance as to what in fact is left?

MR. RAMSAY: The administrative cost is about \$150,000.

MR. NOTLEY: Then about \$220,000 could be made available under this program?

MR. DIACHUK: Yes.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on the second set of projects . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is this a further supplementary, because . . .

MR. NOTLEY: Yes. If it's not, I have another question dealing more specifically with the handout, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Another member of the committee wants a supplementary on this first item.

MRS. FYFE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Coming back to the question of the approval date, you said that your fiscal year is the end of March. Do you approve projects right up to the end of the fiscal year if funds are still available, or do you have a cut-off date for applications?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, the experience of the first year naturally didn't give us a good indication because we didn't have our organization in place, nor did we have enough applications before us. But we did indicate to all applicants that those would be carried on to the '82-83 year. The same indication would be given to applicants whose application isn't completed in the present fiscal year, to the following year, '83-84, because the funds that have not been used are carried over to the following year. They are not lost. They are there for future applications.

MRS. FYFE: Further related to the applications themselves, after a project is approved, does the committee follow up to ensure, for example, that the project was completed, that there was a benefit to your portfolio as a whole? What type of evaluation would take place on these projects?

MR. DIACHUK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. As a matter of fact, an auditor from the Alberta Department of Labour carries out a random audit of programs on accountability. That's why most of these programs are funded in stages. Until the committee and the staff are satisfied that the first stage is completed, further funding isn't approved. So we have two audits: the financial audit is carried out by a person from another department, then the staff reviews the report, whatever is in that first stage. A good example is that some of the programs in 1981-82 were approved that way, in two stages.

MRS. FYFE: This report is then made public? The reports of the projects themselves are all public information?

MR. DIACHUK: Yes. Mr. Chairman, all that information is available to everybody through the research and education division as part of the library. It's there. It's not released publicly until it's all completed because of the need to complete the whole report. But as soon as the report is completed, it's available to all employers and organizations from the library section of the occupational health and safety division.

MRS. FYFE: That's all. Thank you.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I was not quite clear as to -- I know we have \$1 million allotted for the current fiscal year. I understand that. But the comment that threw me off a little is that some projects will not expend all their funds, and that remaining amount will carry on into the next year.

For example, let's take project 17. It's \$20,000. Let's say they spend \$10,000 this year, and they may carry \$10,000 into next year. Now the projected cost of expenditure this year is \$637,892. That's committed to projects already. That's if every project spent its total allotted funds. But they may not expend all their funds, which means that we really won't have \$200,000 left at the end of the current fiscal year, but may have more. So we may be able to have more projects than just \$200,000 assigned in the current year. I hope I've stated it as clearly as possible. Is that understanding right?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, that is right. I was really referring to the committee the fact that in the first fiscal year we didn't appropriate the full \$1 million -- that is what is carried over -- but also that from experience we find that even though we budget, if the project or program isn't completed in the time frame, sometimes those moneys are carried over. From experience of other funding programs of this nature, we're advised that sometimes second and third stages of a project aren't proceeded with because of inadequacy, withdrawal, or whatever reason. Those funds are therefore also added to the following year.

MR. R. SPEAKER: To the minister, Mr. Chairman. Those funds are not rebudgeted for other programs but are held in trust for those respective programs you have approved. Is that correct?

MR. DIACHUK: Yes, that is right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the Chair could get some clarification on this. The minister is saying that the amounts listed here are not the budgeted expenditures in the '81-82 fiscal year, or in the '82-83 fiscal year, but rather are the total amounts of the values of these individual projects. A year from now, when the committee is reviewing the report on the current fiscal year, we may not be looking at \$600,000 and some odd; we may be looking at \$400,000 and some odd, and the rest would be to complete those projects.

MR. RAMSAY: That's correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So in other words, we can't compare one dollar sum with another. I think this is where the confusion is arising.  
Thank you.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just going back to the approval process, it's my understanding that several years ago discussions were carried on with the Federation of Labour concerning No. 26. To either Mr. Diachuk or Mr. Ramsay: was there any reason why that wouldn't have been placed in the initial set of projects, 1 to 15 in the first year? Was there any obstacle to working out an agreement?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, it was reviewed by the steering committee and recommendations were made to the Alberta Federation of Labour to revise and resubmit it. That's what was worked out, and that was why it was delayed and wasn't in the first 15. I want to assure members of the committee, Mr. Chairman, that in the format placed before the steering committee, these applications, when finally being recommended by the steering committee, come to the managing director for the division and then to me for approval.

Mr. Ramsay, possibly you could just add what some of the difficulties were with that particular application.

MR. RAMSAY: Mr. Chairman, the Alberta Federation of Labour, for example. The budget was quite sizable -- if I'm not mistaken, almost three times as much as was approved. That was more than our budget for one fiscal year. That was one of the problems. I think the approach that was submitted required some more clarification and study. After we got back to the AFL, the executive, as well as some divisional officials, researched a little further, visited some other jurisdictions, and came up with this proposal which they felt quite happy with, as did the steering committee.

MR. NOTLEY: So what we had was a substantial scaling down of the proposal.

MR. RAMSAY: A scaling down and a different approach to the training.

MR. NOTLEY: And over how long a time is this \$360,000?

MR. RAMSAY: That would be 12 months.

MR. NOTLEY: Twelve months.

MR. RAMSAY: So in reference to expending that much on that one fiscal year, it will be pretty much divided between two fiscal years.

MR. NOTLEY: I see.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know how you want to deal with some of these specific ones, but perhaps I'll be guided by your judgment. I have several questions with respect to specific projects. Perhaps a series of supplementaries might be simpler, but however you want to handle it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have two other members who wish to get into the discussion, so perhaps the Member for Spirit River-Fairview can take one of the ones he wishes to discuss and then we can go to the Member for Bonnyville, the Member for Calgary McKnight, and back to the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, if that's satisfactory. [interjection]

Sorry. I thought that was a supplementary. The Member for Bonnyville, the Member for Little Bow, the Member for Calgary McKnight, and then back to the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, if that's acceptable.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'll just exercise that and, with respect to No. 14, \$141,522 to McIntyre Mines, ask the minister if either he or Mr. Ramsay can tell us exactly where that sits at the moment in view of the layoffs at the mine, what has been expended, and what is happening to the project now that we have this definite layoff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, perhaps I can get into that because, as one might guess, I was going to come to the same one. I remember considerable discussions prior to the approval of this one. We've recently had some public declarations by McIntyre Mines that they may be getting out of underground mining, and that's my concern. So perhaps the two questions can be answered together as one.

MR. DIACHUK: To you, Mr. Chairman, and to Mr. Notley, we regret that the situation at McIntyre is such, because we were looking forward to their program of foreman training, and therefore I approved the program in January. The application was for an eight-month program which was supposed to be completed in October or, at the latest, November. I am advised -- and I'll ask Mr. Ramsay to give more detail on it -- that only \$100,000 has been expended.

MR. RAMSAY: That's correct. We've actually expended \$110,000, and the rest is a holdback until the final report. Apparently most of the work has been completed. The training package has been developed. One of the things stipulated by the steering committee at that time was that they didn't want to make the approval on a project that was going to be specific to McIntyre, rather that it would have applicability to all underground mining activity in Alberta and would be available to all mining companies.

MR. DIACHUK: If I may just add, Mr. Chairman. Part of the reason that program No. 14 was delayed considerably, Mr. Notley, was that at first it was

exclusively for that company. The program was delayed many months before we were able to concur with them that this would be a program for the benefit of all underground mining in the province. That's the way it stands.

MR. NOTLEY: Just a supplementary question. I would ask either Mr. Diachuk or Mr. Ramsay what the time frame was. The minister indicates that it was approved in January. Presumably it stopped in early June, when the layoff was announced. What was the impact? Did the layoff stop it immediately, and what happened to the program at that point? Has any evaluation been done, and how will this information be shared with other companies?

MR. RAMSAY: Mr. Chairman, from my understanding, the training package is complete. The packages have not been distributed to foremen for the actual training part, but for all intents and purposes the package is complete. They have reported to an advisory committee which was established from the beginning of the project, and that advisory committee approved the package as it was completed to release payment of that second instalment of \$75,000. So the major work on it has been done. If we do nothing else from here on in, it can still be relevant to other companies. We have a package, even though it hasn't been implemented. It has not been evaluated, of course, because there hasn't been any implementation.

MR. NOTLEY: To supplement that, Mr. Chairman. You've developed a course of study, if you like -- to put it a slightly different way -- which could be implemented by McIntyre once they reopen. Do we have a commitment that they will do that, or shift it over to another underground mine should McIntyre not follow through on this? Or is there a definite agreement that McIntyre will pursue it?

MR. RAMSAY: In the last month or so, I've heard nothing in terms of what their future plans are. If McIntyre did pursue it -- it's not an either/or situation. Hopefully other companies would pursue it concurrently. McIntyre was not established to deliver the actual program. The modules and everything would be made available to individual companies so they could deliver it to their own employees.

MR. NOTLEY: What are the modules? Just describe that, Mr. Ramsay, if you would be a little more helpful to us.

MR. RAMSAY: A major element of the package involves some audio-visual presentations on the foreman's responsibilities. If time permits, I could go back to the actual proposal and be more specific.

MR. NOTLEY: But it's essentially audio-visual.

MR. RAMSAY: Audio-visual and instructor's manuals.

MR. NOTLEY: To what extent will it be work-related? Will the training take place underground? Will any part of it be underground? Since it's an underground mine foreman's training package, to what extent is part of the program to look at safety in a foreman's capacity underground? Will there be any aspect . . .

MR. RAMSAY: The practical part of it would all be underground. In terms of the audio-visual material, some of the modules are theoretical as well as practical. It will be practised underground.



MR. NOTLEY: So we have \$30,000 left of \$110,000, which would cover whatever practical application there is. Is that enough?

MR. RAMSAY: At that time it was considered enough, and agreed and accepted by both parties.

MR. NOTLEY: Would McIntyre be bearing the responsibility of that? How would you monitor it underground? Who's going to do that?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Notley, you're asking that if McIntyre doesn't reopen, who would . . .

MR. NOTLEY: No, I presume it will be. I'm just asking how the practical part of it underground will be monitored. Obviously you must have worked that out with McIntyre.

MR. DIACHUK: Oh, yes.

MR. NOTLEY: How will it be handled?

MR. RAMSAY: The package is being developed in concert with an advisory committee to that project. In terms of providing guidance and working in concert with McIntyre, right now it's up to that advisory committee.

MR. NOTLEY: I don't want to belabor it, but I want to pursue it so I understand it. How will the program be administered? In the design of a program of \$140,000 -- \$110,000 of which seems to be theoretical in the presentation of audio-visual material, et cetera -- surely there's going to be some practical application, because some of these theories would be untried and untested until they're worked out underground where it actually makes sense. Otherwise there's no point in going into partnership with McIntyre-Porcupine. You have the University of Alberta do it. What is the practical application of this program, and who's going to handle it?

MR. RAMSAY: The person handling it will be the safety and training person at McIntyre Mines.

MR. NOTLEY: I see. He will do an evaluation which will be part of this study?

MR. RAMSAY: The evaluation was built into the study. That will be part of it and is a requirement of the grant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In other words, the \$30,000 was to enable the development of the practical part, in addition to the \$110,000 which, obviously, was largely for the theoretical part. The \$30,000 was to enable . . .

MR. RAMSAY: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to put figures on certain elements. It's just how we broke up the grant so we'd have a holdback at the end. The \$30,000 isn't necessarily toward the practical part. That was just a holdback until we got the final report, so it could be more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In other words, McIntyre would have to put some money of their own into the practical part which would be training their foremen.

MR. RAMSAY: The full intention of McIntyre when they started out was that this was seed money, as most of these grants are. McIntyre would pick it up from there.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, as a supplementary. If it was seed money, presumably there is going to be some cost to McIntyre. Do we have any idea what that would be, and where does it now stand? Is that part of any sort of ongoing discussion between the department and the company? If we've put our \$110,000 into this project, presumably at some point, and as quickly as possible, we would want the practical application of it. We've signed with one company to do it, in this case McIntyre, and if they can't or won't do it, that really raises the issue of whether we made the right choice. Should it have gone to another underground mine?

MR. DIACHUK: There wasn't another underground mine. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of members, this was the only underground mine in January or even last fall when we were considering it. That is why we made the stipulation that it wouldn't be McIntyre's program. It would be a program that could be used. In other words, they don't have the rights to that program.

I'm also advised -- and I was just asking Mr. Ramsay -- that some of that implementation has already been carried out. Some of that practical experience on the module had been carried out prior to the second funding. Bill might be able to add something on the more detailed thing.

MR. RAMSAY: All that is remaining is the actual delivering of the course. The package has been validated and is ready to go.

MR. DIACHUK: It would appear that McIntyre has more of an investment in it than we do, but we've held this back, as we always do, until the final thing is ready. When we're satisfied the module is in place, the rest of the money will be forwarded to McIntyre if it's completed. If somebody else has to complete it, naturally we would be looking at no further advances to McIntyre.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, my question is with regard to No. 15 -- not so much the item itself, but I think that over the last year we've seen Mr. Lougheed and Mr. Trudeau wipe out the oil and gas industry in this country. Working rigs have gone down from 400 to just over 80 at the present time. The number of people working on the rigs are, I'm sure, only the professionals, people who have worked there for a long time. Job competition is keen. Maybe we're spending only \$25,300, but it's the principle or object of such a program in a time when I'm sure any rig working out there is competing and looking after its workers and has top efficiency. So here we merrily go on with the program. That's one question I raise. Why has the minister evaluated it on that basis?

Secondly, who do the theatre people play to? The theatregoers? None of them even know what a rig is. That's number one. Number two, do the people presently on the rigs, if I have the right interpretation of the play, get special showings of this? Are they brought into some theatre or some area to see what's going on? Those are questions I raise. Could the minister respond?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, I welcome those questions from Mr. Speaker. I accepted an invitation to see the production of the play "Rigs". I've asked Mr. Ramsay to pull the file on that particular grant. No funds were expended until the play was produced and filmed. We even sought opinion from people in the oil industry. What we now have is a good example of an introduction to green hands that we so often have to face. Back in '79 when the Sage Institute inquiry was commissioned and we were advised that the cause of a lot of the fatalities was because of green hands, this was part of the reason for the approval of this grant. It doesn't cover the total cost of that

production. But we now have the opportunity to use this in further educational programs. Bill, do you want to break it down?

MR. RAMSAY: Yes, the total cost was close to \$73,000. As you indicated, we contributed \$25,300 to that play.

MR. DIACHUK: Now, if I may continue. I just wanted to get that breakdown. Mr. Chairman, from the occupational health and safety aspect, we still have concern about activity in the oil industry, and no doubt we have the responsibility to be prepared when the industry is revived and the need for this training program is there. But that was why the decision was made to fund that production.

MR. R. SPEAKER: What assurance do we have that new rig hands will see this? I have a rig working not too far from my farm. The guys who gained employment there came out to the site and said, look, we need a job; we want to go to work tonight. They didn't have time to see a film or go down to the Citadel playhouse here and get prepared for it. By the time they see it and they're green, the accidents have happened. You know, where is the audience for this kind of thing? Who thought of that when you designed it? Have you put it in place before an audience?

MR. DIACHUK: I want to assure the committee that that play was not held at the Citadel. It was held in many rural parts of Alberta. Naturally it was presented to the people with interest. The oil industry, particularly the drilling industry, was interested in it because of the calibre of work carried out to present and write this. I viewed it in a little theatre in north Edmonton and not in the Citadel.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Is the film the property of the government then or of a department? Whose property is the film in the end result? And will it be distributed throughout the province through some film library, or will the industry distribute the film? What will happen?

MR. RAMSAY: Mr. Chairman, we now have copies in our possession in our film library as part of the grant, and we will be making it available to any party that would like it. We'll be publicizing it in various formats, likely in the Occupational Health and Safety newsletter which, as you're probably aware, reaches, I think, 65,000 employers. So it will be widely known and available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Calgary Buffalo had a supplementary, but while he's considering that, is the film available on both film and videotape, or is it available only as film?

MR. RAMSAY: It's available as videotape, sir.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, just out of curiosity, I didn't catch who paid the other portion of the total cost. The Alberta government paid \$25,300. Who paid the rest of it, and how was it solicited? Secondly, how many people have seen it to date?

MR. RAMSAY: In terms of other contributions, they received a \$10,000 grant from the Canadian Theatre Today conference, the Canada Council, as well as tour guarantees at the various sites where they produced it. One of the reasons for our grant was to subsidize the actual cost of attending these performances so they would become more accessible to people. Otherwise, if they relied simply on revenue from the performances, they thought they would

have been outpricing the market \$12 to \$15 to attend a conference as opposed to maybe \$5 or \$6.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I don't think those numbers added up to \$75,000 or the total cost, if that's what it was. The second question I had was: how many people have seen it to date?

MR. RAMSAY: In terms of total cost, continuing on with tour guarantees, they're looking at close to \$23,000, another \$8,000 with guarantees. So you're looking at \$30,000 in tour guarantees. Those figures should come close to \$45,000, \$47,000, coupled with the \$25,000 that we supported them with. In terms of the attendance, I'll have to check into that.

MR. SINDLINGER: Have you kept attendance figures, or are you going to make an approximation for us?

MR. RAMSAY: We have actual attendance figures that they supplied for each performance.

MR. SINDLINGER: Can you give us just a rough ballpark number today?

MR. DIACHUK: We'll have to get that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, can we go on to the next question, which was from the Member for Calgary McKnight?

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, my question is of a general nature. When I review these various projects, I am concerned that perhaps the objective of the minister is not being met. I hope I'm wrong, but when I look at some of these -- you know, No. 1, an inventory of people and specialists involved in occupational hygiene. My reaction to that is, what are you going to do with it when you get it? It changes day to day. Some people die. Some people graduate. Some people decide not to be occupational hygienists any more.

I move on to the next one, Mount Royal College, \$60,000 for an occupational hygiene program, yet I read in the paper that we're not going to give them any more funds to expand programs. Why would we give them money to set up a program?

No 8: Mr. Darcangelo, World Health Organization conference. Great. Did his employer turn him down, and he replied to you and got the grant? I don't know. Underground mine foremen's training, back in McIntyre Mines. Is there nothing similar to that available in industry?

Clinical assessment and management of risk in honey bee sting sensitivity: surely this has been done somewhere else at some time. No. 24: Filmwest. Is that a program of the applicant, and how does it fit into the minister's overall program? Does the minister have a veto over his committee's decisions as far as making grants? If not, why not?

I thought the \$1 million that had come forward from the program was to try to improve the health and safety standards of the province of Alberta. As a long-time committee member of the safety council of the city of Calgary, I know the involvement of industry and of government, and I know the kinds of objectives you work towards. I also know the kinds of things that are going on all the time when people don't get the money they want, so they go in another direction. I just wonder, are the objectives being met in the minister's opinion?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Musgreave. Yes, I have the veto. I have to share that I have watched very carefully that funded programs are carried out

in Alberta by Alberta residents, first to benefit Alberta workers, and not exclusively retain for the benefit of Alberta workers so we could then share them with other people in Canada. Those are the first criteria that I have personally watched for. The steering committee has also been very careful to make sure that these are the kinds of programs we're looking at.

When we look at the overall variety of programs, as I indicated in my opening remarks, with the background of the steering committee and the resource people, and some of the applicants, a good example is the Alberta Federation of Labour proposal. The executive brought in people to support their proposal, specialists, professional people to support the purpose of the program they were proposing.

The McIntyre program is another example. They brought in professionals to support their argument as to why they needed this type of program. This is true. It's hard to understand that there isn't an underground training module in this province after underground mining for many years. The steering committee accepted that that was the purpose of this type of program. I am reviewing the program after my managing director approves it, and in concert with him recommended and approved all of these programs.

A good example is the first one. I appreciate that it's hard to imagine what "An Inventory of People and Specialists involved in Occupational Hygiene Activities in Alberta" is, but when this program was approved and we had our discussion on the motion Mrs. Embury presented to this Legislature, we were very concerned with the continuous demand on the division to do what really may be done by the private sector. In other words, when we say that we feel you, Mr. Businessman, should contract, there is a private firm in Alberta that will do the same thing our hygienists have the ability to do. We don't want to take work away from the private firm. The reason to get an inventory of where some of these people are was because demands were coming to the occupational health and safety division to carry out all these safety programs, even monitoring. We just don't have the resources to do it, nor do we want to take it away from the private sector that is set up. It wasn't available at that time, Mr. Musgreave.

Yes, I can veto it, and I returned some applications when they didn't appear to be an Alberta concept to serve Alberta workers. That was a primary purpose. They would review them then and re-establish them so they would be more acceptable to the steering committee.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Chairman, I was absent for a period of time, so maybe some of these have been touched on. I'm interested in some background on some of these projects, if I may. Starting with No. 5, Mr. Minister, the Student Safety Education Pilot Project in St. Paul, what was the objective of the project? What did it try to do?

MR. DIACHUK: I'll touch on it briefly and have Mr. Ramsay explain it further. As I indicated in my opening remarks, we waited for the initiative from the private and public sector to come forward. The St. Paul project was because of the interest in that school division to try to bring an awareness and also to see how much young people are aware. I'm advised that the program was completed the end of June and the report was just received this month. Once it's reviewed, it will be made public to any parties. Bill?

MR. RAMSAY: Yes, the objective of that particular project was to test the feasibility of incorporating general safety information in the school curriculum to increase student knowledge and influence the development of positive safety attitudes of potential workers. As Mr. Diachuk has indicated, that project was received recently and is currently under review.

MR. ISLEY: So the purpose of the project was to create an awareness of safety in the work place once they leave the school. It wasn't dealing with in-school safety, such as the shops, gymnasiums, and so on?

MR. RAMSAY: It was to be incorporated into their curriculum in all subject areas, not just shops but everything. Basically, it was a pilot project using St. Paul school district because they've done some work and shown interest. It was bringing all the teachers together, developing a package and trying it out in that school district.

MR. ISLEY: Project No. 6 on the first page, Underground Position Location. Position of what?

MR. DIACHUK: I have a little bit of knowledge about it, but I'll ask Mr. Ramsay. It involves the city of Edmonton underground sewer work. Am I right?

MR. RAMSAY: Right.

MR. ISLEY: One last one, 26, on the last page I believe, \$369,000 to the Alberta Federation of Labour, Health and Safety Training for Labour Representatives. Who is being trained here, or is it the development of a program or just what?

MR. RAMSAY: They're going to develop a core of instructors from different companies throughout industry in Alberta and provide a four-week training program to them. In turn, they will travel throughout the province and deliver it to safety representatives of individual companies who, in turn, will bring it to their own staff and colleagues. It will be a snowball type of approach.

MR. ISLEY: It's a type of in-service safety training program to thrust out into the field then?

MR. RAMSAY: [Inaudible] to the workers.

MR. ISLEY: Thank you.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask a question about one of the projects that didn't make it on our list, the proposal of the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees. Just harking back to Mr. Musgreave's comments about being on the safety committee for the city of Calgary, I understand there's a safety program under way in conjunction with the AUPE and the personnel department that was formulated as a result of fairly close co-operation between the personnel department of the government and the union, and that an application had been made for a project by the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees that would have expanded that into evaluation of the high-risk areas for provincial employees. I wonder if either Mr. Diachuk or Mr. Ramsay -- perhaps Mr. Ramsay because I note that he responded -- could give some indication why what I would think would be a fairly practical project dealing with the health and safety of our own provincial employees would not be considered for funding at this time?

MR. RAMSAY: One of the reasons the committee recommended not approving it was the fact that the proposal seemed to contain a little bit of everything versus an actual project *per se*. It wasn't as specific as other proposals had been in terms of what they planned to do. From what they received, it was difficult for the committee to understand exactly what these moneys would be

spent on. Some global budgets were mentioned, some generalities talked about, but in terms of specifics, this proposal seemed to lack them.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, a supplementary question. I have the proposal. It strikes me as quite specific in terms of education programs, but I don't pretend to be an expert in the area. We do have the example of the Alberta Federation of Labour, where a proposal had been made and then apparently discussion had taken place with the officers and the department, which strikes me as a reasonable course to follow. Could you tell us whether any consideration was given to discussions with AUPE? It strikes me that surely the government has an overriding obligation to practise safety among its own employees, and we should be working in concert with the union. If there's ever an example of worker/management co-operation, surely it should be among the employees of the government itself. So perhaps you could outline what steps, if any, were taken to contact the officers of AUPE to determine whether some variation of this proposal would be acceptable.

MR. RAMSAY: I did not contact them. Another reason I was just thinking of in terms of their proposal is that, given the limited budget for one fiscal year, it becomes quite competitive when we're talking about a sizable amount such as the AFL proposed. Since they are also beneficiaries of the AFL, if they could tie in with the AFL as well, under the umbrella, was another consideration in terms of turning down that request.

MR. NOTLEY: Could I supplement that, Mr. Ramsay? I'm not asking these questions to be argumentative, but to try to ascertain what the reasoning was, because really there are two different things. The AFL is an overall program dealing with shop stewards across the board; the AUPE proposal zeroed in on high-risk areas of our own public employees. It seems to me that one isn't covered by the other. That being the case, I would ask why the evaluation committee didn't get back to the union and perhaps look at some review and reapplication.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, I hope I can assure Mr. Notley that because the questions were raised and, as I indicated, I do not interfere in the application that goes before the steering committee, I will inquire what steps are now available to AUPE, or what has been done. Mr. Ramsay is not a member of the steering committee either, so we'll try to get an answer for members of this committee on the next stage for AUPE and what consultation took place from the steering committee back to AUPE.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Diachuk, if the president of the union were to call you tomorrow, then you would be prepared to meet with him to discuss his proposal.

MR. DIACHUK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This is a course that is always available, but that doesn't need to be done. I will now take it as notice from this committee to look into it.

MR. NOTLEY: Okay.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Diachuk, I just wonder if this is the total cost for all the projects here, or whether any more funds are allocated from your normal budget to any one of these projects.

MR. DIACHUK: No, Mr. Chairman. As a matter of fact, Mr. Sindlinger, because of this availability, the grant budget in the last fiscal year has been very much reduced in the division in my department. So no other grant program is

going directly to any of these applicants from the division of occupational health and safety. However, there are benefits: counselling and consultation. So often we enter and, when I or the managing director receive an inquiry, we always recommend to any applicant or applicants to first sit down with the staff from research and education on how best present their proposal. That is an indirect benefit to them and a cost to my department.

MR. SINDLINGER: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions for the minister from the members of the committee?

It looks like that's the end of the discussion of some very interesting proposals, Mr. Minister. Thank you for your time. I imagine you'll be back next year to report on the progress of the projects currently under way.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, may I say thank you. I have every reason to believe Mr. Ramsay will be here; I can't give you that assurance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Neither can I. Thank you very much, Mr. Minister.

I suggest that we take an adjournment of 5 minutes while we contact the Minister of Recreation and Parks to get him here with, I hope, some people from the Kananaskis Country project staff. If it's all right with the committee, can we adjourn until 4 p.m.?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

*The meeting recessed at 3:55 p.m.*