

[Chairman: Mr. Kowalski]

[2 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome again to another meeting of the Standing Committee on Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act. Appearing before us this afternoon is the Hon. William Diachuk, Minister of Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation.

Welcome, Mr. Diachuk. If you would like to introduce those officials of your department that you have with you, we would very much appreciate that. If you have an opening statement, please proceed. Then we'll go to questions from the committee.

All committee members have just recently received a document entitled Occupational Health and Safety Heritage Grant Program. Unlike last year, Mr. Diachuk, when committee members suggested to their chairman that it would be appropriate if they got the information on the same day of the meeting, this year, because of the increased interest of committee members in their work, they've sort of requested that the information come a day or two before. My apologies for not conveying that to you. We thank you for bringing it now. Welcome.

MR. DIACHUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to apologize, because last year we had offered to give that material ahead of time. We were advised: no, bring it to the meeting. I understand that this year some of the committee members would have liked to have had it yesterday. However, next year we'll check with the chairman. I know the chairman is the same. But some committee members may have changed, and maybe that's why the change.

I want to introduce Dr. Robert Orford, executive director of occupational health services, on my right; on my immediate left Dr. Lynn Hewitt, director of research branch; and next to her on my far left is the administrator of this program, Eileen Perfrement. I pronounced the name as well as I could; I have difficulty with a name like Perfrement. If you have difficulty pronouncing Eileen's name, do as I do. Just address her as Eileen, and she'll welcome that.

I have a few comments I would like to make to you. I take pleasure in reporting on the third year of the \$10 million, eight-year program to provide funds for research, training, and education in worker health safety. Grants from the program were first made available in April 1981 through the capital projects division of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, with the objective of developing ways of preventing accidents and ill health resulting from employment. Through the eight-year commitment of the program, we saw an opportunity to ensure continuity of funds to stimulate research and education initiatives in occupational health and safety. Many of the projects developed through the grant program result in research and education programs and activities which will continue long after the funding period ends.

For example, last year I highlighted a project developed by the Alberta Federation of Labour. The project focussed on the training of a nucleus of 30 health and safety instructors. These instructors from various industries and geographical regions in Alberta have trained an additional 230 health and safety representatives from some 25 unions throughout the province. Based on the success of this project,

additional project work has been jointly funded by the Alberta Federation of Labour and the grant program to develop more in-depth material for instructors and to further develop the skills and knowledge of these instructors. It is anticipated that these instructors will continue to train others in the work force and to provide material and information on health and safety issues to an increasing number of workers.

Other projects with the potential for long-term use and impact are under way in several industries, including mining, logging, construction, electrical utility, trucking, and tree trimming and brushing. I highlight tree trimming.

I would like to mention here a major grant which was recently awarded to the University of Alberta. This award was for the establishment of a Chair in occupational health. The professor who holds this Chair will be responsible for initiating and conducting research activities on occupational health issues. He will also provide consultant service to industry, labour, and government; provide clinical service to workers; and teach medical students. This project is especially significant because it involves a co-operative funding arrangement with industry. An endowment fund provided by several Alberta industries and a matching grant from this program together sponsored this sophisticated research and teaching program in occupational health.

I would now like to highlight a new direction that grant program staff have been taking. In addition to receiving unsolicited grant applications, the program staff are actively encouraging researchers to consider making submissions in areas of high research priority. Last year we carried out a major study to determine those research areas of highest significance to the occupational health and safety field in Alberta. The two areas of highest priority at this time are: determining which prevention strategies are most effective in reducing job-related accidents and illness in high-risk situations, and assessing the hazards of work procedures and work process in high-risk situations. Grant program staff have initiated a number of meetings with educators, researchers, safety professionals, and others to encourage the development of both research and educational proposals designed to promote the health and well-being of Alberta workers.

Program staff have also been promoting the outcome of completed projects. Final reports for completed projects are circulated for review to experts in the field and to potential users of the project results. These reviewers are asked to suggest innovative ways of using the project results and distributing the information to users. For example, one completed project on mine safety was presented at a seminar for safety professionals in the mining industry. As a result the films and educational material developed for the project have been widely used by both the industry and universities in Alberta and have also received international attention.

All projects which are completed under this grant program are evaluated for their quality and usefulness. The formal project evaluation indicates that for the most part the projects are meeting their original objectives. In particular, specific safety concerns are being addressed by the development of educational materials, specific expertise, and new knowledge. However, the evaluators noted that some

projects produce quality materials but do not develop adequate plans to encourage workers to use the information. In future more emphasis will be placed on developing methods of making the project results more accessible to the worker.

Rather than going into detail on the grant program, Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to refer you to the material which has been distributed. The material highlights the program administrative structure and financial expenditures over the last three years. In addition, those projects funded over the past fiscal year have been described in order to demonstrate the broad application of the program to a variety of health and safety concerns in various sectors of industry. Unless there are any immediate questions, I would like to suggest that Eileen Perfremment, the program administrator, perhaps take us quickly through the material at hand. Should you have any questions during or after the presentation, we would be pleased to entertain them.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I don't see material within the document relating to the question I wanted to ask. Would it be the preference of the Chair or the minister to — if there's going to be a presentation, I could wait until it's made and then pose my question, if you'd put me on the list.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's in order. Mr. Diachuk gave you an opening if there's a question thus far in his remarks.

MR. GOGO: [Inaudible] Mr. Chairman, of something I thought should be there. Perhaps I'll wait until the presentation and then raise it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. DIACHUK: Eileen?

MS PERFREMENT: Thank you. The packet begins with a presentation to the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee. The first section, on the introduction, has already been covered in the opening remarks, so I'd like to skip on to the next part, which is Objectives.

Under the Objectives section, we briefly reiterate what the program is about. In particular, the grant program offers awards in three major categories: research, education, and conference workshops. In the research area — scientific activities designed to increase the understanding of occupational health and safety problems and to develop and assess new strategies and approaches to address these problems. In the education category, development and evaluation of new and innovative educational programs is involved and also the training of individuals in areas which emphasize recognition, avoidance, and control of hazards related to work. So we fund the development of programs, and we fund assistance for individuals to take part in training programs.

The other area we deal with is the workshop conference. In that area we assist organizations in planning workshops and conferences which again focus on issues related to health and safety on the job. We also send individuals to conferences out of Alberta which have a high significance for workers in

Alberta.

The next section, Program Operation. We have an interdepartmental steering committee responsible for making recommendations on project funding to the managing director of occupational health and safety division. The committee involves a variety of departments. In the back of your packet, we list the specific departments which are involved on the steering committee, and it is this group which recommends the approval of projects. In the last three years, the committee has met 32 times. We have found the committee members to provide a valuable contribution to the grant program. We definitely appreciate the participation and commitment of the interdepartmental steering committee members.

The next section, Program Activities, lists the activities particularly over the past year. Briefly summarizing the activities: the major emphasis in the first year was to develop the guidelines and administrative procedures and appropriate criteria; in the second year, concentration was on the review of grant applications and on the administration of approved projects; and finally, in this third year, emphasis has been placed on the review and evaluation of ongoing and completed projects. In fact in this past year, we have had 40 projects that we have been dealing with at various stages.

The completed projects, in addition to a careful monitoring throughout their development, are evaluated upon completion and reviewed to determine quality and usefulness, and are also internally audited. Program staff have also emphasized the promotion of research priority areas and the results of completed projects. There have been 23 individual applications within just this last three-month period. So we have been trying to reach a lot of people and inform them of the grant program, particularly of the research priority areas.

We have also been promoting the findings of completed projects. The way we have been handling that is circulating final reports to experts in the field to get an indication of the best way these results can be used and then trying to implement some of the suggestions they have made. We have received 54 grant applications during this past year and have sent all of these for a formal critical review by subject area experts and research experts.

I would like to refer you now to the tables in the packet. Table I indicates the numbers of approvals, as I have just indicated. We have a total of 57 projects that have been approved to date. The approvals are listed on your table by research, education, and conference areas.

Table II indicates expenditures of the project over the three years. In this last year, we were able to spend 93 percent of the allocation, a total amount of \$2,396,000.

In Table III we have listed the projects which were approved between April 1, 1983, and March 31, 1984, this last fiscal year. We have organized them in this table by research projects on the first page, education projects on the following two pages, and conference awards on the final page.

The last page of your packet lists the interdepartmental steering committee that I mentioned earlier and the departments which are represented on that steering committee.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr. Diachuk and Ms. Perfrement.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Minister, I hope all this research we're going into has an application and a value to the private sector. I would like to know exactly what involvement the private sector has had in these programs and the dollar amount. Are they spending their money there, giving us expertise, or what are they doing?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Moore, and then I will ask Dr. Hewitt to assist me on it for more elaboration. The private sector is always looked at to be involved. At all times the researcher or whoever makes the proposal for the research is also encouraged to involve both the employer and the worker, because we need both parties to be involved to carry out thorough research. There are some good examples. One was the study in the previous year on McIntyre Mines. A great amount of that, and even some of it in the present program of \$21,990 which is in progress, is really for the private sector in the mining industry. Lynn?

DR. HEWITT: I think the private sector benefits both directly and indirectly through this program. Some have been direct grants to employer groups like McIntyre Mines or Nisku Medical Services, which provided the services of a co-operative safety professional to industry in an area of town until about a year ago, when it was forced into receivership because of the downturn of the economy. But through that project, I think the seeds were sown to encourage interest and participation of employers in co-operatively funding safety and health services within the private sector.

We also fund a number of industrial associations such as the Alberta Trucking Association, the Construction Association, and the Forest Products Association, which provide safety programs through employers in those industries and have involved both workers and employers in putting those programs together and in delivering them. These are both educational and training programs as well as more conventional research projects.

In terms of actual dollar amounts, during the first three years of the program we have spent approximately \$700,000 directly on employer-related projects. This includes both specific employers and industrial associations representing employers.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, to the minister, on this same area. You mentioned the Trucking Association and various other associations that cover the entire country. I wonder about the participation of other jurisdictions. Do we co-ordinate our research with other jurisdictions? Or have we got 10 provinces going merrily on their own way and each of these associations getting a little help from each province separately, independently of it? Are we co-ordinating this to benefit — let's use the truckers' association — all the truckers across Canada?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Moore. Yes, there is co-ordination. Dr. Buchwald, the managing director, wasn't able to be here today. But as a governor of the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety, which is located in Hamilton, he

would have assured you that we are directly linked with a terminal and are able to identify whether a research project on what is being asked for is taking place in any other part of the country. At the same time we share the information. All provinces are linked with the Canadian centre; therefore they are able to receive that information through the terminal in their respective province. It is true that the employer groups don't have that terminal, but we have the employer groups or employers coming over to our offices on a continuous basis to utilize the services of the library which has the terminal in it. Lynn, anything more on that?

DR. HEWITT: On some of these projects, I think we have benefitted from experiences in other jurisdictions, but the real advantage of this program is that we can tailor it specifically to the requirements of Alberta industry. For example, mining and forestry in this province are different from those in other provinces, and people here really need the materials tailored to their specific requirements.

MR. R. MOORE: Just a third, probably hypothetical, question to the minister, Mr. Chairman. What percentage of the results of these research programs do you feel is being utilized by the private sector?

MR. DIACHUK: I would have to guess, Mr. Moore, so I'm going to ask Eileen.

MS PERFREMENT: We have 12 out of 57 projects right now in the private sector.

MR. R. MOORE: [Inaudible] you feel that the results will be utilized?

MS PERFREMENT: Yes. In the project objectives, we specifically ask to indicate how the materials will be used by the various associations. In particular, in the projects in the private sector, the employer groups are tailoring their materials for the specific needs of their members. Yes, those are all used, in fact as they're being developed, and they definitely will be used when the project is completed.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. It's interesting. My questions really are follow-ups to those asked by the Member for Lacombe. I guess I'd like to get into your Table III and try to develop some kind of scenario for the information of the committee. It's very well and good to have the program, but if the people aren't getting the information, it's valueless.

However, let's take a program that's developed and put together by the University of Alberta or Calgary or whatever the case may be. They come to some conclusions. How is that information placed into the workplace for those people who are actually working out there — who don't have a PhD, a master's, a doctorate in something, or whatever the case may be — so they can utilize it in their benefit and, I guess as far as that's concerned, so the employer can best look after his employees?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, first of all we are the owners of all of these final results. I say we — the occupational health and safety division, the

provincial government indirectly. We also permit that researcher or that body to utilize it as well if they want to, because it isn't information we want to keep exclusive. We don't maintain a copyright. As Eileen and I have touched on, in the third year we're finding out that in the proposals we need a little more on how the researcher is going to utilize it, on the concern you're raising, Mr. Nelson. From the second year of studies, we found that the utilization you have a concern on wasn't right there. I'd ask Eileen to give a few more examples of how some of the completed projects are utilized in the workplace.

MS PERFREMENT: In particular, the proposers of the studies done at the university submit a final report to us. What we are asking is that the potential users of that information have a look at the results of the project and make recommendations to us as to how this can best be used. An example is the study by Dr. Harrell in agriculture on farm accidents. We sent that report to various user groups in the province, including Unifarm. They suggested that we circulate the material, submit it in newsletters, and also make the results really available to the various groups through seminars.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to follow up on that, on one in particular that's on this list. It's an item called Compliance Profile for Health Technologists. I'm having some difficulty with that one totally as to why first of all we would expend money on that. How is that going to be treated and given to people to utilize? What is the information for?

MR. DIACHUK: Dr. Orford?

DR. ORFORD: This is a master's project which is being carried out by a student at the Faculty of Environmental Design at the University of Calgary. As I understand it, based on her own experience as a histology technician in a clinical setting, she is determining what hazards histology technologists face and what measures they take to avoid exposure to or otherwise protect themselves from effects of those hazards. She's also more specifically looking at what those individuals are required to do by provincial legislation and by laboratory procedures and whether they're following that legislation and those procedures. I don't know what the results of the report are going to be, but it may prove of some use to us in determining how best to meet the needs of that particular sector. Histology technologists are a small group.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I'm developing a lot of questions as we discuss this thing. In that particular case, I guess it's only a \$15,000 item, if you want to use the term "only". But if rules and regulations are placed there by the government, when we probably have inspectors out there to see to it that the rules and regulations are being followed, why are we using this type of money to have someone there examining whether there's some compliance or whatever the case may be? Here again, this is a very short item as far as discussing the actual description of the project. But I question why we would be expending moneys in an area like this when, if what is written here is correct, there

are already rules and regulations there for the inspectors to rely on.

DR. ORFORD: If I can comment, it's like the difference between micro- and macro-economics. This particular investigator is knowledgeable in the very limited area of histology technology. She is very familiar with that particular type of working environment. Our inspectors come from different backgrounds by and large. They would not normally be focussing on a group in quite the way she's doing that, and I think her information will be helpful to that particular group of workers. Granted that the provincial government does inspect laboratories and that those laboratories would from time to time include clinical laboratories, but we do not have the resources ourselves to do a study of this kind.

MR. MARTIN: Just to follow up. I wouldn't pretend to know whether studies are good. I take it that they are. Most of them look reasonable to me, and with my limited understanding, I'm sure they're all reasonable. But I think what people are trying to get at is the relevance to the workplace, which is after all what these studies are about. I know that's difficult.

A twofold question. I believe we're into the third year now. Do we have any evidence that some of the money being spent — that there are fewer accidents or fewer hazards or whatever, that in fact the programs are actually working, that we can come back and say, yes, there is some evidence that this is having an impact?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, I can say yes, but I am going to ask Dr. Hewitt to respond more fully to that.

DR. HEWITT: I think there is clearly a higher level of involvement of workers and employers in health and safety issues now than there was before the grant program started. I don't think we can attribute all of their participation right now in health and safety projects to the grant program only but also to other division programs. But I think the grant program has effectively complemented other division initiatives.

I think one of the indicators of employer and worker interest and participation in health and safety right now is reflected in the number of requests we in the division are receiving for assistance of all kinds. It is at an all-time high right now for information on chemical hazards, for loans of films, for information on accidents and where they're happening and to whom they're happening. People are very interested in using this information to set up their own safety programs now. I realize those are indirect indicators, but I think it does reflect an increased level of interest and involvement in health and safety.

We can also say that over the last four to five years, not only have numbers of lost-time claims and fatalities been dropping in this province but as well the rates of lost-time accidents and the rates of fatalities have also been declining. In fact in terms of the fatalities we have investigated within the division, they have dropped 50 percent in the last three years. Of course we can't attribute this strictly to the grant program either, but again I think it is an indicator that things are getting better out there in workplaces. I think the grant program is one

contributing influence on that.

MR. MARTIN: Let me just follow up. A key point in two areas is advertising. One, in terms of whether it has to do with the university or with the private sector, how is advertising done that this money is there if somebody is interested? Is it well known throughout the private sector, say, especially in the small-business area? I guess the other key point is the results of the studies. If they have some merit, something has been found, how does the department get this information back, especially to the small-business sector, where they may be in need of this information?

MR. DIACHUK: Eileen?

MS PERFREMENT: In answer to the first part of your question, we have published the information on the grant program in the division's newsletter, which reaches virtually all the private companies in Alberta. So they are aware of the grant program through that newsletter, through personal contacts we have with various individuals throughout the province, and through contacts in the division. We have made all the division health inspectors aware of the grant program and encouraged them to talk to the people they see on the worksites. So we have at least those two routes that are publicizing the information on the grant program.

The second part of your question was how we get the results of a particular project out. Again, we are using the division newsletter. We are also using seminars. We are looking for other ways that may reach individuals as well, particularly through their contacts with associations that may find the information of benefit. Some of the educational materials are directly applicable to other industries. So if it's developed in one area — in the construction industry, say — it may also be useful to steelworkers.

MR. MARTIN: Just to follow up. I think this approach may work in some of the larger industries where in many cases they have safety directors. I expect that one of their responsibilities would be to stay on top of the latest information. I think one of the things we've learned is that it breaks down — I don't have an easy answer here — getting to the smaller companies who can't afford these sorts of people. My question is: what effort has been made specifically in the small-business area, in terms of both advertising the projects which could be valuable to them and especially getting the results of some of these studies?

MR. DIACHUK: Lynn?

DR. HEWITT: Reaching small business is a very difficult problem for us as a division as well as through this program. Probably our most effective means of reaching them right now is through the industrial associations; for example, the Alberta Forest Products Association. They do represent large forestry operations, but they also represent a number of extremely small operators who certainly couldn't afford a safety professional on their own. I think we are really going through these umbrella groups to try to reach the small employer that can be reached by them.

In the project we have funded with the Alberta Construction Association as well, they are making these materials available to people who are not members of the association. So there is the possibility of a small employer benefitting from the project indirectly. But again, as I say, we don't have easy answers here either.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, as Eileen pointed out, we mail the newsletter to all employers. I think she may have omitted, and I would like to add — to all the employers listed on the Workers' Compensation terminals. They all get the same information. So whether it's a big employer or a small one, they get it. The other challenge is that we are working co-operatively, as Dr. Hewitt pointed out, with the associations.

Dr. Orford, I think you had a supplement.

DR. ORFORD: No.

MR. DIACHUK: No, it's okay. Fine.

It is an ongoing thing, and that's why I touched on it in my remarks. We are now asking the proposers of future programs how they would look at disseminating the information once they complete the study. We didn't really ask that, Mr. Martin, in the first two years and possibly even the third year. But we are now saying: we would like to have from you in your proposal how you are going to distribute, how we would distribute jointly with you, or how best to distribute this information to the small business. So it's still an ongoing challenge for us.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I guess part of my question has been asked by the previous three members now. Part of it stems from the discussion we had yesterday with the Minister of Agriculture on Farming for the Future and the list of funding for research — is it effective, is it research for research's sake, or is it research that can be used for practical purposes? That leads me to the question of the largest component, that of the endowment for the Chair or whatever it's called at the U of A, 240-some thousand or thereabouts. I would like to know what it cost for that Chair and how that amount was made up. Specifically, as I remember the press release — and I haven't got it in front of me — it paid tribute to a union person who had put a considerable amount of time into developing the project and getting and keeping everybody together to complete it. Is there financial involvement from all levels of organizations — workers, employers, the government? What's the breakdown on that?

MR. DIACHUK: I'll ask Dr. Orford to elaborate on the program a little more. Yes, it was Neil Reimer, who was a member of the Occupational Health and Safety Council and also a member of the Gale task force, who showed a keen interest and got encouragement from my office and the officials of occupational health and safety to encourage the industry. In his contact, he got some good commitments from several industries to place an endowment, and that is what we matched from this fund.

This program is not new in Alberta, because we do have a Chair of occupational medicine at the University of Calgary. Am I right? Or there used to

be one. Go ahead, Bob; you elaborate on it. What's the difference between this one and the Calgary one?

DR. ORFORD: The Calgary program was set up about three years ago and was a limited-term project which ended up being a two-year program. The expectation had been that the university would assume the funding for that particular Chair, as you referred to it. However because of economic restraints on the universities they were unable to do that, and as a result the professor is now working as a medical director for the city of Calgary and is no longer with the university.

The position at the University of Alberta was set up on a longer term basis. As I understand the history, approximately five years ago Mr. Reimer met with the dean of the medical school and said he felt it was important for Alberta to have a Chair, a professor that is, in occupational health and how much would that cost. The dean told him it would be about half a million dollars. He then approached industry, and I believe they came up with a total of about \$245,000 towards the cost of the Chair. This included — I think there were six or seven large employers, mainly in the oil industry. When the university went about recruiting, they had some difficulty at first, and then eventually were successful in recruiting a full-time professor, who started at the university this summer. Knowing that the Chair was soon to be filled, in March of this year the occupational health and safety grant program matched the commitment that industry had made, which was \$245,000. So that fund has been provided toward the support of the Chair.

The purposes of the Chair are outlined at the bottom of the first page of Table III, with which you've been provided, and include research, consulting services, teaching, and clinical services. The incumbent, who is by name Dr. Tee Guidotti, is formerly the head of the occupational health program at the University of San Diego in California.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you. So in other words the split was industry and government. There weren't any other contributors to the thing? I guess my question was to find out the split specifically. Is that right?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Hyland — industry and the Alberta taxpayers.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you. My third question is a two-part one. One is: will that endowment now make a permanent funding for that Chair so the university will continue it, or will it just go for a period of years and they'll drop it and then try to put pressure on otherwise to get more funding for it? Secondly, I notice from the list of the steering committee that they're all departmental people, various levels of government departments. My question is, why is there nobody from the private sector and/or union movement per se involved in that group? Why is it an all government group? Is it possible we could be accused of using this as an extension of a departmental budget?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to take his last question first, and then I'm going to refer the first question to Dr. Orford. The officials or

representatives from the different departments are even more sensitive to the fact that there would be no funding to departments. They are very hard on any proposal that may be from a government department or agency.

The continuation of the funding — I was assured by the president of the university that the endowment that is set up is very, very solid and sound and would be for many years, because all they're doing is pretty well taking the investment out of the endowment, only using the investment not the principal. Bob?

DR. ORFORD: That's correct. This is a permanent position at the university. Of course, since it's a position for which the current professor will have to earn tenure, it's not necessarily a permanent position for that professor. However, the position itself is definitely a permanent position. The incumbent of the position will be eligible for funding from this grant fund as he would be from any other grant fund in the occupational health and safety area. So we expect to see some applications to this grant fund coming from the University of Alberta over the next two or three years.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, Minister, looking at the objectives of the program:

- (a) preventing accidents and ill health resulting from employment, and
- (b) promoting the health and well-being of Alberta workers through improved working conditions.

You may recall, Minister, that I raised the matter last year. It seems to me that with over 1 million employed in Alberta and apparently, if one is to believe the statistics, six in every 100 working people in Alberta having a problem with alcohol and drugs — that seems to be somewhat factual given that AADAC treats 16,000 each year — I'm very puzzled not to see something that would fit in with the objectives of the program that deals with alcohol and drug abuse on the worksite. The programs in your handout indicate those that have been approved. The first question is, could you tell me whether any applications were received for research dealing with alcohol and drug abuse in terms of the workplace or worksite?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, I'll ask Eileen to respond to that particular question.

MS PERFREMENT: There were none on alcohol and drug abuse that were directly received.

MR. GOGO: Minister, it would seem to me that if we're spending a million dollars of taxpayers' money, perhaps an initiative of the chairman of that committee or the department — if the facts I've stated are accurate, perhaps an initiative should come from you to that committee. Have you or your officials in the past directed the members of the committee to look into particular areas such as alcohol and drug abuse?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, as I sit here, I first of all am always cautious that I don't get into an area that somebody's doing very well. AADAC is doing a job very well, and we welcome their co-operation in the workplace anytime. I say publicly here that if

AADAC has a good researcher or an individual that is interested in doing it, they can co-operate with that individual to make a proposal. But I would caution that we do not fund AADAC directly. That would be exactly what I indicated earlier we're trying to avoid through the steering committee — not to directly fund government department programs or government agencies. But I do want to say: yes, over the last few years my officials and I have seen some of the results of the co-operation with AADAC. They are doing an excellent job. I know they're limited, and I would welcome any proposal to look at an area in research and education that they cannot enter into.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the minister that something will come forward from somebody. I would indicate that I am somewhat surprised to find that if the facts I stated are accurate — of the 700 people killed on the roadways last year, 350 involved alcohol; some of them, many of them I'm told, were on the way home from work. I find it very difficult to understand why one of the primary expenditures of this government through this foundation and this fund does not deal with such a pertinent subject. I ask the minister to give serious consideration to use whatever influence he has to see that the members of the committee give very considerate consideration to any proposal he may receive.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, I realize I've missed something here to share with the committee. I don't influence any proposal. The proposal, when it is approved by the steering committee, comes to me for final approval. I do say that on one or two occasions I have bounced them back. But I hope members don't encourage people to bring proposals to my office. First of all, this would be inappropriate because there is an interdepartmental steering committee set up. Secondly, I wouldn't want to be flooded with them. So my encouragement would be that they take that proposal to the division directly and then prove the worthiness of the proposal to the steering committee.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I didn't mean that the proper procedure shouldn't be followed. I just meant that if and when it arrived on the minister's desk, he would still have his pen in his hand.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I have a question from page [6] of this book, regarding health and safety training for labour representatives by the Alberta Federation of Labour — \$369,315 and it's in progress. My question is, what special qualifications does the Alberta Federation of Labour have in training people to train instructors?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, may I start off the response to Mr. Thompson? First of all, as I indicated, the previous year we had a program that was approved for them to train a nucleus of some 30 instructors. This nucleus has now done a lot more training. They are the only unionized body that we recognize and have accepted a proposal from.

Lynn, did you want to add anything more on what is so unique that we treated their application? Is that what you're asking?

MR. THOMPSON: No, my question was, what special qualifications does the union have to train these people?

MR. DIACHUK: The qualification was first that we co-operated with them, and through specialists, they trained 30 people to be a nucleus.

But, Lynn, you may want to explain in more detail the special qualifications of the people and how the program was implemented.

DR. HEWITT: They had a very highly trained individual who is head of their safety education area, who was able to get this proposal finalized with us and to demonstrate that she had a very good handle on the way materials should be developed for instructors. These were materials that were to be prepared for instructors who would then go out and train health and safety representatives — a train-the-trainer type of approach.

In fact it took a number of years for the Alberta Federation of Labour to be able to develop an extensive proposal and demonstrate to us and to reviewers that they would be able to do a good job in the training area. I think they demonstrated that, plus the completed project demonstrated that they were very capable.

MR. DIACHUK: Dr. Orford, you wanted to supplement the answer?

DR. ORFORD: Yes, just to add a comment on the individual to whom Dr. Hewitt has referred. Janet Bertinuson is a very well qualified industrial hygienist who was trained, I believe, at the master's level in the United States and who worked for a number of years in Berkeley, California, in a service which provided occupational hygiene consulting services to industry and the work force in that particular area of the United States. She was the driving force behind this particular proposal. We think very highly of her qualifications.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, my second question has to do with the ratio in the dollar amount of what kind of a breakdown you have between pure research and applied research in these grant programs.

MR. DIACHUK: Who's going to volunteer that one?

DR. ORFORD: Perhaps I can.

MR. DIACHUK: Dr. Orford will start it off.

DR. ORFORD: I can take a stab at it. One of the criteria which the committee considers in assessing an application is whether it is pure research or applied research. The committee's position in the past has been to avoid funding pure research when it can't be demonstrated to have any applied benefits. So at least in theory, none of the research funded by the grant fund is pure research. But it depends of course on how you define what is pure research and what is applied research, because the benefits of almost any research, with the possible exception of pure mathematics, could be applied in some way. Even there, the applications can be quite considerable.

MR. THOMPSON: That's an answer, Mr. Chairman. I'm going on to my third question. Do people bring ideas to this screening committee that you have — and it goes back to what Gogo said here — when they don't particularly want to initiate the research and make a project of it themselves? Are there suggestions coming in to the committee from people that don't particularly want to get a job there? Or are the only ones you consider the ones where somebody is looking for money to do the research themselves?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Thompson. I can say that often, even from myself, I encourage people to first discuss with the staff the proposal they have in mind and then get some assistance in putting it on paper. But I will ask Eileen to elaborate on this.

Eileen?

MS PERFREMENT: Yes, I very often get requests from individuals with just general ideas about what they would like to do in a particular area and assist them in putting those ideas down into a proposal.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, this isn't a question; it may be clarification. I'm not talking about somebody who is coming up with a suggestion where they want to start a research program. I'm talking about people who say, could we do something in this area, and then leave it to your screening committee to find somebody to do the research.

MR. DIACHUK: Eileen?

MS PERFREMENT: I haven't had that particular request yet. I certainly would be willing to assist. I know of other individuals in the province that may be working in a particular area, and I would be pleased to put them in touch with any other individuals. But I myself haven't had that particular request yet.

MR. DIACHUK: Yes. Can I just indicate that in most of the cases, even in my case, somebody is already available or interested in doing the program. I don't recall any request, as Mr. Gogo pointed out, for study of alcohol and drugs in the workplace. But "I'm not going to do it; I'd like you, Mr. Minister, to initiate it" — no, we haven't had that type of request, to the best of our knowledge, in the last three years.

Bob?

DR. ORFORD: We have on occasion had requests for funding when the researchers themselves did not have adequate skills to carry out the research. In those cases we have suggested that they contact individuals who would be better prepared to carry out the study and facilitated that kind of connection.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, my first question isn't meant to be derogatory in any way with respect to members of the steering committee but to explore with the minister the reason for a steering committee composed entirely of people who are working within the departments. I raise that because the Farming for the Future board has producers on it. It occurs to me that it might be useful, in terms of deciding which projects go and which don't, if you

had some representation from business, some from labour, perhaps even a Chair at the University of Alberta.

MR. DIACHUK: I think it's a fair question and, if I recall, that was asked in the first year. The reason is for continuity. We don't even identify the person; it is a position from the different departments that a person may be filling, and they rotate. But as we pointed out, most proposals are referred to specialists, employer groups, worker groups, and so forth, quite often before the approval is given.

Eileen?

MS PERFREMENT: Yes, all our proposals are sent for external review to experts in the field. We make that information available to the members of the steering committee, and they very often base their comments on the proposal on those comments we receive from the experts.

MR. NOTLEY: I understand that, but as noted here, of the total number of applications I think only 38 percent had been agreed to by the steering committee. This is no disrespect to the public employees on the steering committee; obviously you need people of the background these people bring. But I'm just wondering — where you have to make subjective as well as objective evaluations as to what goes and what doesn't, it seems to me there might be some value in supplementing that with other people. That's just an observation and essentially something I direct to the minister for his future consideration, not to the other members of the panel this afternoon. Bearing in mind that 38 percent figure and also noting that there was an increase from '81-82 to '82-83, I am interested in your estimate as to what is needed in the future for this program to continue.

MR. DIACHUK: My direction is that with the restraints we're implementing all over the place, we have tried to maintain it at no more than a million dollars a year in order to budget for it. As you see, in the last three years the total amount has not been expended, and I would propose that the same amount be considered for the next fiscal year. Lynn, do you want to comment on the future budget allocation?

DR. HEWITT: I think you've covered it.

MR. DIACHUK: I think the officials agree that we would be trying to maintain it at a million dollars because there hasn't been a shown need for more.

MR. NOTLEY: Final question, Mr. Chairman. I'd be a little more interested in how you deal with this evaluation of these projects once completed. What's the general approach to evaluation? Who does it? I suppose it would be different people, but is there some role here for the steering committee people or is that done totally by department? Obviously, of those 63 projects, some of which have been completed, I'm sure your evaluation project would tell us that some have been complete busts and wastes of money and time. I'm sure you would — there must be a process that does that. I'd like to know if in fact, as a consequence of that formalized process of evaluation, there have been some we

weren't very happy with.

MR. DIACHUK: Dr. Hewitt?

DR. HEWITT: Yes, there have been, and I think we've definitely profited from seeing those projects occur. I think one of the things we learned from it was that it's very difficult to get a project on stream if the original proposal isn't adequate. If people haven't laid out their objectives and expected outcomes very clearly at the beginning of the project, almost no amount of attention is going to save that project in the long run. I think that's why you're seeing what appears to be this rather low acceptance rate by the steering committee. That's because they're very exacting at the outset of the project.

In terms of evaluation, that's done in a number of ways. Part of it is ongoing. If the project is a large one, it will have a steering committee comprised of government and industry representatives which will monitor the progress of the project and, if necessary, change directions in the middle if they think it's going astray. At the conclusion of the project, we have found that most people who design training programs are not evaluation consultants. They do not have the skills to adequately and independently evaluate their own project. So we typically hire an external consultant to take an independent view after the project is completed and also do a follow-up to see if there were other consequences of a project, say six months down the road, whether there were spin-offs, or whether in fact there were adverse outcomes that we were unaware of at the time the report was done.

I might mention too that we intend to evaluate whether the overall grant program is meeting its objectives this year. Again we intend to go outside the division in order to get an independent assessment of that. So we are also attempting to evaluate this program on a higher level.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I guess my questions would come under the topic of initiating projects and a follow-up to Mr. Thompson's. One of the projects we have under way in the province at the present time is at the Swan Hills site in terms of chemical and other wastes. Are you involved in that or is there any kind of project — I notice that on page 5 of this report, we have the Recycling and Disposal of Chemical Wastes. There's only \$18,900 being used for research in that area. This multimillion dollar project that will be built would seem like a likely place for some kind of research to be done now so that when it's in operation we have some good background. Is there any association between what you're doing and that plant, or are they doing it as well? What are the present circumstances?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, the project that's listed is very much related. I'll ask Dr. Orford to elaborate on the project that has been approved and also respond to whether we are involved in any other projects at Swan Hills.

DR. ORFORD: This project was initiated by Dr. Armour at the University of Alberta and relates in part to this publication called Hazardous Chemicals Information and Disposal Guide, which the chemistry

department at the university put together about two years ago, partially with funding from our division. In compiling this information, they have found there is a need to continue to update the disposal practices for hazardous chemicals as new information on disposal becomes available. As I understand it, they have a list of hazardous chemicals in computerized format which they make available to a select mailing list of approximately 70 to 80 people, mainly in the laboratory setting. This information would be available to the people in the Department of the Environment and so on. In fact I believe they are probably already on the mailing list. But it is geared primarily toward small-scale disposal, if you will, in a laboratory setting rather than to the larger scale disposal that's intended in the Swan Hills facility.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister and the officials. I would see the people that are going to transport hazardous wastes to this site having to have certain kinds of information and understandings. The people that work at the site will have to have certain kinds of understandings. I think there is a need there. In your responsibilities, do you often as a group go out and say: let's check and see if somebody is doing something in that area; if not, maybe we can; or we could suggest to the group that, let's say, the Department of the Environment should be doing something. It's part of the initiation rather than just the receiver of ideas. I would find that being just the receiver, you wouldn't always have the priority subject brought to your attention. It may be somebody's pet project, but nothing to do with the major priority of Albertans, so . . .

MR. DIACHUK: Dr. Orford, go ahead and respond. I just want to . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: . . . maybe you could comment on the process again as well as this specific instance.

MR. DIACHUK: Go ahead.

DR. ORFORD: What you're describing to me is more of a line function; i.e., to determine what hazardous materials are present, how they're being handled, and to ensure that measures are being taken to protect the workers that are handling those materials. This is covered by our other programs through the occupational health and safety division, not through the grant program itself. The other point is that the Department of the Environment has to date been the prime actor in matters relating to the hazardous waste disposal. It would possibly be more appropriate for you to address some of those concerns to the Department of the Environment rather than to this particular group before you now.

MR. R. SPEAKER: In terms of initiating projects, through your work as minister, you notice a number of things that have happened in the workplace. There'll be an area where a higher frequency of accidents or hazards occur, et cetera. When you note that, do you take that on as part of your responsibility as a group and pursue some of those areas? Or, as the minister, do you assign that to someone else?

MR. DIACHUK: No, Mr. Speaker, we don't assign

that to someone else. We have constant co-operation, including through the terminal, and information from the Workers' Compensation Board on where these things are happening. As alluded to earlier, we will even look to someone, first of all our own officials, our own staff, to carry out some preliminary work and then interest someone in taking on more detailed study or an educational program. But we don't wait for it. We have continuous monitoring of where that peak could take place, in which work force in Alberta, from the information of Workers' Compensation. Lynn?

DR. HEWITT: Maybe I could just add that some of our people who spent a good deal of time in the field, such as our forestry specialists, oil field specialists, and education officers, are kept aware of what the accident rates are within those particular industries and where they're happening. They are in a position to tell people out there about the grant program and encourage them to submit either a training or research proposal to us. So I'd say we're proactive, not only through the grant program but also through other division staff, in areas that we feel should be a high priority in the province.

DR. ORFORD: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to raise the point that we have a rather sophisticated system in this province, thanks to the Workers' Compensation Board computer, to identify accident rates by industry and indeed by individual companies. That information is available to our inspectors and in fact is reported on a regular basis by certain industry groups such as the oil industry, the coal mining industry, and so on. Those reports are publicly available and are made available to the industries themselves. In assessing the results of those reports, certainly either the industry or an inspector within the division would be able to make a suggestion that a project in a particular area be initiated. But up to this time, the grant program steering committee has not had that particular function itself.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to echo some of the earlier sentiments that the department consider reorganizing the steering committee so that rather than having an in-house operation, people from outside the departments are involved in making those decisions, that some expertise in the private sector and from labour be involved as well. I think we may even consider that in the recommendation sessions.

I'd like to ask a couple of questions. Are there industries that are perceived to be high risk that the program has targeted for extra attention? It follows on Mr. Speaker's point that it might be worth while to have studies commissioned in an area where there is a priority rather than wait for someone to come up with a proposal.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Cook. I hope my answer was that we do that. As I indicated, we have the information from the Workers' Compensation Board, and Dr. Orford elaborated on that. I'm going to ask Dr. Hewitt, who has spent some time in that, to indicate maybe one or two examples of areas where we have taken some action, even through this program, to look at problems in certain industries. Lynn?

DR. HEWITT: I think an example of that is the forest industry project, where our education people have been working with our own forestry specialists and members of the association to put together a training project for that industry. The main problem there has really been to come up with some sort of delivery strategy to reach all the small operators in such a mobile industry. But that is an area where we have been somewhat proactive.

In the grant program, we haven't specifically identified industries as being high risk. The division itself has identified some on the basis of claims data to the Workers' Compensation Board. But within the grant program we certainly are aware of where the major problems are and who is at greatest risk. Certainly those proposals that are addressing a significant problem receive serious consideration when they come in.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask about a new industry to the province, the petrochemical industry. We don't have a lot of experience with it yet. For example, we might not yet be seeing health problems related to vinyl chlorides developing in the population, but we might also say to ourselves that odds are that we ought to be aware of some developing problems. Do you work with a new industry like that and see what the safety programs are, how they compare to other jurisdictions, for example on the U.S. gulf coast or in other areas?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Cook, yes. We not only work but we have the information both from the Canadian centre and the American organizations. It's been continuous co-operation. I have to say from my experience that that industry is one of the more co-operative industries in our society. Bob?

DR. ORFORD: I'd just like to add that we work very closely with the professionals that are employed in those industries. Most of the oil companies with head offices in Calgary also have their senior medical health and safety and environment people located there. We're in almost weekly, if not daily sometimes, communications with them. We also interact quite often with that particular sector through their industry associations. For example, this year Dr. Buchwald made a presentation to the CAODC in which he made that group aware of our grant program among other things. There is quite a bit of communication interaction with that sector.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, from the total moneys spent, it seems that your basic priorities are on education projects and conferences, not on research. It's an extension service in a sense. How are those materials distributed? For example, if you're dealing with an agency like the Industrial Vegetation Management Association, how do you make the material available to people who are out there actually trimming trees? I think that's what that is. How would you make available a film or a program or a course? Would you just rely on the association to do that for you?

MR. DIACHUK: Eileen?

MS PERFREMENT: We ask the proposers to indicate in their proposal how they will make the information available. Yes, we do rely on the proposers and on the association to make the material available.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to go back to where I left off a few moments ago. We seem to be having a lot of bees come up in the last two days, with Agriculture breeding and producing them in northern Alberta. Now we have bee stings, hypersensitivity. What I would like to know is: from the time you start research until the time you finish the program, how is a beekeeper out in the field going to know how you're going to tailor immunotherapy programs to that individual?

MR. DIACHUK: Dr. Orford?

DR. ORFORD: The research to which you refer was carried out by Dr. Day, who spent a couple of summers, I believe, in Alberta in very close association with the Alberta Beekeepers' Association. In the first part of the study, Dr. Day and a number of other researchers in this area made presentations to the beekeepers and their families in Falher near Peace River. I was present at that, and it was a very exciting presentation. In fact the beekeepers were able to interact directly with Dr. Day, asking questions about the proposed research. He was then in touch with them individually to carry out his study.

I understand the study has just been completed. I was speaking with a Department of Agriculture representative the other day. I haven't seen it yet myself, but I suspect there will be some effort made to ensure that the beekeepers are made aware of the results through the Beekeepers' Association.

MR. NELSON: I guess he didn't get down to Medicine Hat for the beekeepers there. Mr. Chairman, if I could, possibly to assist me in better understanding this total program — I have this thing in my mind where I'm thinking that some highly paid university professor with a big line of initials behind his name is somehow developing a great big thick dossier on something and then presenting it. Of course it's very difficult for some poor guy in the workplace with no initials behind his name, like me, to get that information, take it to my job as a construction worker or whatever the case may be, and define what the heck was said in that document. As far as I'm concerned right now, the bottom line is: what happens to that information from the time it comes from this great big long, thick document, if that be the case — and I'm assuming something here — to the time that it may come down to a little brochure or some function that would assist me in the workplace and tell me what that person actually did, other than by a play that I may never see, that cost \$25,000 to put together?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, on several occasions this afternoon, I think we have pointed out some of the approaches we are going through now to get that information disseminated to the worker. We have assured the committee here that we also continuously look at how to do it better. As the minister, I can only assure you that I too continuously strive to be able to get that information out to the worker, the

workplace, and the employer. I still don't have anything better than the full mailing list that is provided to us by the Workers' Compensation Board and our own publications, including through that the seminars Eileen has pointed out, the professional groups, and the association groups Dr. Hewitt has pointed out, be they the associations of employers or the Alberta Federation of Labour. We sit here and know we possibly still have a percentage that are not receiving the information. But our office is continuing to increase by the requests from employers, individuals, and workers. I can only assure the committee that we will strive to continue to broaden the dissemination of this information.

Now the specific approach when a report is that bulky — it is true that some employer may be interested in just a portion of that report or just the final impact. Bob?

DR. ORFORD: I'm very pleased to hear the support Mr. Nelson is giving us for the priority we've placed on educational programs in the grant program. That's what — I forget the percentage — somewhere in the vicinity of three-quarters of the fund is being used for, and I think it's very appropriate.

MR. NELSON: Just before you get too conclusive about my support — maybe before that comes, I'm still having some difficulty. Very briefly, we have these little brochures you send out or make available to various employment or employee groups so they know why they shouldn't do a particular thing. I guess what's really bothering me is that we've got all these things happening out here that are really meaningless unless the worker or the employer or both can get that information to assist them in the workplace. How are you going to do it? I mean, all these programs — cripes, I don't know how you're going to do it. I want you to tell me how, because that's a million dollars and I don't want it thrown down the drain. We've got lots of things we can do with a million dollars.

DR. ORFORD: We can't be all things to all people and provide every worker with every piece of information that the grant program is going to generate through the research that's carried out. We are making a sincere effort, and in fact in many cases we are involved directly with the education of workers through the programs we are supporting. As I say, it's true that not every worker will know everything that is done under the grant program. I don't think it's necessarily appropriate that that should be the case. It would be a tremendous amount of information for any individual to absorb. As in any other field of endeavour, this information is generated, used, and fed back into the workplace. We're trying to develop and have developed mechanisms to encourage that to occur more. Particularly in a program like the heritage program, where there is a grant program administration at the provincial level, I think it's much more possible for us to do that in a meaningful way than it would be for a central body in some other area of Canada who wouldn't be quite as close to the workers as we are.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I'd like to touch a little on the terms of reference of this committee that does the selection of these projects.

First of all, I would like a sort of overview of the terms of reference, particularly in the area of the beneficiaries of these projects, the workers and the taxpayers. I take it that on any of these projects we're interested in the worker and also in the taxpayer that's footing the bill. So in your terms of reference, how do you ensure that the major beneficiaries will be the workers and that the taxpayer is getting full value for the dollar spent?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, I ensure that from my own office by treating them as one. The worker is the taxpayer. I'm confident that my officials also treat it the same way. But I'm not naive enough to sit here and say that the benefits are received by all taxpayers in this province. We will continue to strive to get the benefit there. Our best approach presently is with the associations and the federation, whichever one we can. Some suggestions have been made here for my consideration. If any member of this committee has any suggestion today or tomorrow on how to better implement an educational program or the recommendations that are a result of research, I would welcome that. Other than that, I can only hope and maybe even predict that the results of this program will really be felt and seen a few years down the road — half a dozen, 10, 20 years. It's quite a unique program in Canada, and I know we're sharing it with the rest of the Canadians because of the fact that all the information is available through the Canadian centre. Lynn? Or Eileen?

MS PERFREMENT: I'd like to indicate to you the factors we use to consider the worth of a proposal. In particular, in research areas we're looking to identify incidence and prevalence of concerns of problems in the workplace. So if a proposal is not addressing a significant problem, it is not likely to be funded through the grant program. A second factor is that the project must demonstrate potential for improving preventive strategies in reducing work-related accidents and illnesses; a third one, focus on areas of priority concern to employers, employees, and government; demonstrate potential for broad application and impact in the field of occupational health and safety; and finally, enhance public awareness and understanding of occupational health and safety problems. So we do have terms of reference or specific factors that we look at in evaluating each proposal.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, we take that all into consideration. I'm looking at value for dollar spent. I see two programs that are very similar, yet they're treated separately. I wonder how they got through your selection committee as two separate programs. One is called the Occupational Health Nursing Certificate Program (Calgary), and it says:

To allow Alberta nurses working in occupational health nursing positions in the Calgary area to take the Occupational Health Nursing Certificate Program at a cost equivalent to on-campus rates at Grant MacEwan Community College [in Edmonton].

That's \$70,000. When we look at the same thing over here, Occupational Health Nursing Program Off-Campus (Calgary), Grant MacEwan Community College, it says pretty well the same thing:

To allow Alberta nurses working in occupational health nursing positions in the Calgary area to take the Occupational Health Nursing Certificate Program at a cost equivalent to on-campus... at Grant MacEwan Community.

And it's \$51,800.

Other than on-campus or off-campus, they're the same projects. How in the world do we justify to the taxpayers of Alberta that we spend \$70,000 for this group to examine, \$51,800 for this group to examine, when basically you get to the same problem or the same thing off- or on-campus?

MR. DIACHUK: We welcome that one, because it's a good program. But I will have Dr. Orford...

DR. ORFORD: It is not only the same type of project; it was the same individual who made the application in each case. What you are looking at is two different years of support for the occupational health nursing program which was delivered through Mount Royal College by Grant MacEwan Community College.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, they are both indicated as being in progress. Does that mean to say that we are paying for one program from last year and carrying on an entirely new one in the same thing so we can carry it on next year, so it's ongoing? They are both indicated as being in progress, not one completed and another one in addition to it.

DR. ORFORD: It's my understanding that the initial one has now been completed. But perhaps Eileen could speak further on that.

MS PERFREMENT: That's right. You're looking at the annual review from last year. At that time it was in progress. Now we have the second phase which is in progress, but the first phase has been completed. So of the two booklets you have, one is last year's report.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Do we find that a lot of these research projects come, give us a value for it, and once they get into it then come back for additional funds? Don't they give you a complete project, and you know the complete cost at the start?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, I'll ask Dr. Orford. What you have referred to, Mr. Moore, is not a research program; it was an educational program. Bob?

DR. ORFORD: Funding was requested one year at a time. So funding was requested for the first year of the program. It was then determined that there was an additional need for the second program to be carried out, and that will be completed either this year or next year. I can't remember when the exact completion date was.

MS PERFREMENT: It's in the next year. In 1984-85 it will be completed.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, some of my questions

have been answered. I still have a couple left, or one question and a comment. The comment relates again to the steering committee. I was just looking over the Farming for the Future program, and all the subcommittees on that are chaired by producers. Out of 17 people on the main board, which the minister chairs, there are three departmental people, one Department of Agriculture, one university faculty, and nine producers. So the producers could be compared to industry or labour personnel in this particular allotment. That's a statement, whether or not the minister wants to comment on it. I think there has been quite a bit said about it today, and maybe we could review the situation and consider putting other members on the board.

We've talked about the reports; we've talked about getting them out to the people. But I've seen various reports that have been prepared from studies, and you can't read the darn things. The language is in the language the researcher talks in. It isn't in the language of the person who has to read it or that the average person can understand. My other question is: when these programs are accepted by the committee, do they suggest guidelines in telling the writers of the report to put it in language that can be understood by the average person? You look at the list of the advisory committee, and they are well aware of the acronyms and everything that would be in the industry. The average person reading it may not be able to understand that.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, I enjoy Mr. Hyland's question, because I'm sure that if I asked him and Mr. Cook what is average, I'll have two different opinions of what is average. But I will ask Eileen to respond on how these reports are directed to be able to be read by average persons.

MS PERFREMENT: The results of several of the projects, particularly the education projects, are in fact designed for lay-language individuals. They are designed in that way and are also reviewed by education experts to ensure that the documents that are finally produced are in lay language.

MR. HYLAND: When you say "education experts", that scares me maybe even more. What about public relations experts? I can remember when I first got elected to this Legislature in 1975 that you were lucky if you could read some of the annual reports, if you could plow through them and understand what they said. Since then they have changed somewhat, so you can understand. Like your report, they're in language that can be understood.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, I can only assure Mr. Hyland that every effort is being made. Eileen herself is a schoolteacher by profession but chose to leave it and work for a more exciting organization such as the government.

Lynn?

DR. HEWITT: I would like to add that quite often the final product of one of these projects is not a report. It could be a set of films or videotapes, a set of seminars, or training materials that would be used with laypeople, and it wouldn't read like a report at all. So only in maybe half of these projects would the ultimate outcome be a final report that would be

housed in a library.

MR. HYLAND: Have I got one more?

MR. CHAIRMAN: One more.

MR. HYLAND: Whatever it is, whether it's tapes or a report or whatever, as long as it's understandable by the people who need to use it.

MR. DIACHUK: Very much so, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ZIP: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Member for Lethbridge West brought up a very good point on the factor of alcohol and drug abuse being an important cause of work-related accidents. Having been an employer myself for many years, I can certainly attest to this. I would like to ask the hon. minister: wouldn't it be very worth while to consider this as a proper area of research, with a view to lessening and preventing accidents due to alcohol and drug abuse, say, somewhat along the line of the very impressive AADAC program? I've looked through all these various subjects, and I think the most practical one is not being dealt with.

MR. DIACHUK: I think I've responded to that, Mr. Chairman, and I will still welcome any further direct submission on a proposal. We have had no proposal made to us to study that. But at the same time, can I only relate that we had a proposal that my officials advised me was referred to Farming for the Future; that was, the modification of farm equipment for handicapped people. Because it was so specific, the steering committee recommended that that proposal be referred to Alberta Agriculture. That may happen even with a proposal in the area you're asking, Mr. Zip, or that Mr. Gogo has asked. It may be referred to AADAC for at least the preliminary review of it, because we may not have anybody on this committee that is expert or even wishes to make their decision on a proposal. Sure, we would welcome that — maybe at the same time not only the area of alcohol and drug abuse in the workplace by the worker but alcohol and drug abuse by employers.

MR. ZIP: A further question. Has thought been given to study means of placing a greater onus on both employers and employees to avoid this serious industry problem related to alcohol and drug abuse and levy a penalty on noncompliance? It seems to me and my experience has been that some people just seem to take it for granted that they're in good shape when they go to work, and they're not. That's the cause of some very serious accidents that I've seen in my lifetime in the workplace.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, the Occupational Health and Safety Act now requires an employer or a coworker to refuse to work next to or permit to work someone who is impaired. Both parties or one or the other would be in violation of the legislation we presently have in this province. Bob, you wanted to elaborate on that?

DR. ORFORD: I didn't wish to speak on that issue specifically, but I wanted to point out and thank AADAC for providing the services of two excellent consultants in the occupational alcoholism field —

one based in Edmonton and the other in Calgary — and for its efforts to set up educational programs for the training of educational assistance program staff members, such as the one I believe is coming up soon in Grande Prairie. The primary responsibility in this area in the past has been with AADAC, and perhaps Mr. Gogo would like to comment further on that.

MR. DIACHUK: Do you want to take my chair, Mr. Gogo?

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, if I could respond. I very much appreciate the comments that have been made. I simply point out that AADAC is not a regulatory body; its mandate is prevention, education, and treatment, and it comes on bended knee for funding. I think this is a grand opportunity with the minister's department with the heritage fund to launch an extremely worthwhile project. Although I accept with glee the comments that have been passed, that doesn't alter the fact that we must do some type of research with regard to prevention and understanding the problem. In my opinion the only way that can be done is through a group with the credibility that that committee has.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will there be additional questions from committee members?

Mr. Diachuk, to you and to those members of your division who have accompanied you this afternoon, thank you very much for your frankness and openness in responding to the questions. It seems to me that the major theme throughout most of the discussion dealt with communication, and we thank you for being here to communicate with us and for the information. We look forward to meeting with you again one year hence.

MR. DIACHUK: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee members, tomorrow we'll be meeting at 10 o'clock in the morning rather than 2 o'clock in the afternoon. We'll be meeting with the Hon. David Russell, Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care.

You will recall as well from the schedule that we had kept next Tuesday, August 28, as an open date in the event that there were adjustments to our schedule. There have been none, so we will not be meeting at all next Tuesday, August 28. Next week, we'll be meeting on Wednesday the 29th and Thursday the 30th.

I thank you very much, and if there are no further questions of an administrative nature and/or any other type, I'll bid you adieu until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock. Ann has two documents that Mr. Russell has made available for tomorrow morning, if you'd like to pick them up on the way out.

[The meeting adjourned at 3:42 p.m.]