

[Chairman: Mr. Oldring]

[2 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe we can reconvene the meetings on the heritage trust fund. Before I introduce the minister in front of us this afternoon, I just want to point out to everyone that this is national diabetic month in Canada. I mention that for two reasons. The first is that I know the hon. Mr. Dinning's department lends in excess of \$2 million worth of support, not through the requisition he's here about this afternoon but certainly through his department, to diabetics in our province. You'll be interested to know that the second reason is that your chairman has been recruited and volunteered to follow a strict diabetic diet this week, so you'll see me sneaking snacks from my pocket from time to time. It's crumbly cookies, celery sticks, carrots, and anything else that's appropriate.

Mr. Minister, we want to welcome you here this afternoon. We're going to be reviewing Community and Occupational Health. It has been the tradition of the committee to offer you the opportunity to give us some brief opening remarks, and then from there we proceed to question period. On that note, I could maybe turn it over to you for opening comments.

MR. DINNING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to come before the committee and provide information and answer any questions you might have on the occupational health and safety heritage grant program for the fiscal year 1985-86.

You've all been provided with materials on the program, including some application forms and information of that sort, as well as an information piece entitled Presentation to the Standing Committee, Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Occupational Health & Safety Heritage Grant Program for the Fiscal Year 1985-86, as well as a status report dated October 20, basically under the same name.

I don't need to get into a lot of details, Mr. Chairman. We discussed this program in the Committee of Supply on August 21, and it was my first opportunity to relay to members the purpose of the program. I won't get into a lot of detail except to say that basically the objective or overall purpose of the program is to

support research, training and education

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

We do that through a number of means but primarily in the areas of research, education, and training/workshop/conference type situations.

If I may, I'll just respond briefly to the recommendations of the April 1986 report of the committee wherein the committee recommended that the program

expand its mandate to encourage funding to postsecondary educational institutions to teach occupational health and safety to students.

Quite quickly, Mr. Chairman, I believe we've made some good strides in that direction this year. We have a number of programs at a number of educational institutions. At NAIT, here in Edmonton, we have a program that is designing curriculum on welding safety for use in student training programs. At the Lethbridge Community College we've provided funds to continue the occupational safety credit program. At Athabasca University we've provided nearly \$48,000 for the possible development of a degree program in occupational health and safety. At Grant MacEwan Community College we've provided just short of \$400,000 through this program to help them put together a program for an occupational health nursing certificate. As well, working with the likes of Lakeland College, SAIT, Westerra, the University of Alberta, and the Banff School of Advanced Management, we are providing dollars for the possibility of a chair in safety engineering, for a course on confined space entry, a course on chemical risk management, and seed dollars to provide an occupational and environmental health and safety program at those schools. I believe we've responded positively to what was a very helpful recommendation.

I'd certainly welcome comments or discussion on other recommendations in last year's report, particularly one that relates to the social sciences research foundation that recommends research into alcoholism, aging, pain control, and palliative care. That doesn't fall under the occupational health and safety heritage grant

program, but it certainly falls under the responsibilities I have as Minister of Community and Occupational Health. As well, I'd be interested in any questions on recommendation 2 on research into industrial disease.

Mr. Chairman, let me just mention some very talented, committed, and capable people who I believe have been the mainstay of this grant program. It was first of all spearheaded by the dreams and a lot of good forward thinking by Bill Diachuk, who was my predecessor in the workers' health, safety, and compensation field. He, of course, was well-served and I continue to be well-served by Dr. Herb Buchwald, who is the managing director of the occupational health and safety division, and Dr. Lynn Hewitt, who is the director of research in occupational health and safety, as well as Hilary Lynas, who is helping us manage this very program.

The program has been under way since 1981. It's an eight-year program that sees \$10 million to be invested -- and I underscore "invested" -- between April 1, 1981, and March 31, 1989. An evaluation of the program is currently under way, headed by a consultant in the psychology field by the name of Dr. Ted Weiden. We expect his evaluation report to be with us by the end of this year.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to lay out just a few of the challenges I see facing us in the whole field of occupational health and safety, some of which I hope will come to us in the form of new research proposals in the days ahead. You can read the status report and see some very valuable research having been done. How do we communicate it better? How do we convince, inform, coerce, or twist the arms of both employers and employees to work more safely and understand the hazards of the worksite? Frankly, I would welcome a joint venture for a research project that might come from the communications or advertising industry and knowledgeable people in the whole field of occupational health and safety, perhaps an imaginative, bold kind of project that would see our getting the word out in a more effective way than workshops, brochures, and research reports. There's an awful lot of scope right there.

I suppose what I would hope to see in the days ahead is more input or proposals from what I call the frontline practitioners in the safety field, workers and employers, so that those

people who are out there on the front line can submit some research proposals that we could take a good look at and hopefully be able to fund.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the number of issues that I think we're going to be facing, and that I'd welcome comments and debate on, in the whole health and safety field is numerous. One is mental stress in the workplace. How does small business put together a viable health and safety promotion program and an accident prevention program? What about the ethics, rights, and responsibilities of the workers and employers in the workplace? What about fitness to work? What about drug testing? All that comes into the health and safety field. What about right to information, the right of a worker to know what kind of environment, hazardous or otherwise, he or she is working in so that worker will operate, manage, and work sensitively, responsively, and with an understanding of the hazards he or she faces?

I throw out to you and your colleagues, Mr. Chairman, those issues, those challenges that we all face in the days ahead. I would welcome any questions, particularly any ideas, and certainly some good thoughts when your committee reports to the Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Minister, for some good comments and some interesting challenges. Don't be surprised to see some of those challenges come right back to you during question period here. We'll begin with the Member for Cypress-Redcliff, followed by the Member for Calgary Fish Creek, and then I have eight other people on the list right now.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Firstly, Mr. Minister, in the stuff that was passed out this morning, the status report for October 20, 1986, I notice that out of 15 research projects, only three involve industry; the rest involve the universities. Yet if you go beyond that and get into the education projects. It's just a turnaround, and I wonder why. I know you need certain facilities to carry ahead research, but my concern is that there is not enough involvement by industry in the pure research. How useful will what comes out of those projects be to industry if they don't have industry involvement in them? Why would there be the difference between so little industry

involvement there, yet tremendous industry involvement once you get into education, as I said?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Chairman, one thing is that we are guided by and make decisions on proposals and projects that come to us, so we are in fact responding. We're starting to do a little cultivating and nurturing and encouraging people to submit projects and proposals, but we're limited by that which we can judge.

If I'm not mistaken, Mr. Chairman, what we find is that an awful lot of those proposals on the research side do come from the educational institutions, whereas the application of that research and those research results in the form of education is brought forward by industry, by industry groups and by specific companies. Those companies are more interested, I am certain, in educating their workers rather than using them as guinea pigs. I would suggest that the answer is perhaps just as simple as that.

MR. HYLAND: My second question is related to the makeup of the grant steering committee or whatever it's called; I guess that's the right term. One of the questions I have asked for the last couple of years — the year before last there was a recommendation from the committee that some public people be appointed to the committee, and I note that four public people, two from employers and two from employees, have been appointed to the committee. Of course, it's still heavily involved in government-appointed people. Would it be your intent to leave it at four public appointees, or would you increase it to get more public input into the granting structure?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Chairman, I realize that that was a recommendation of the 1984 committee, and it's a very valid question. I think we responded by taking four members from the Occupational Health and Safety Council; the four gentlemen Mr. Hyland cited are from that council. If it's felt by the committee that more public input is required, I would welcome that suggestion.

The committee might be interested to know that in addition to the evaluation study going on, I have asked the Occupational Health and Safety Council, currently under the chairmanship of one of our former colleagues Mr. Andy Little, to do a careful review of the

program to date and the criteria we use to choose projects and to give me some advice on the priority areas we ought to be researching and studying in the days ahead. Mr. Chairman, that is something I'm going to find very useful in providing further guidance to the grant steering committee on the kind of research we should be encouraging. We should be going out and encouraging more of that research. Rather than simply laying out our criteria and saying, "Here's what we'd like in the form of research proposals," let's go out and say to certain groups, "We think you could do some good work in this area, and we encourage you to submit a proposal." With that review by the council, I hope to have more public involvement.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you.

I guess you've almost totally covered my other concern. It's nice to have all this research, and we face this not only in occupational health and safety but also in agriculture, for example. We have a whole bunch of pure research and wonder how we get it out to the guys using it -- i.e., the farmer or the employer/employee type of thing — especially those with smaller businesses, where there's less. I suppose there's no magic answer, and your opinion is probably one of many that we could do. I guess that's more of a comment than a question, because I think you've basically answered that.

MR. DINNING: The importance of communication.

MR. HYLAND: Right.

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like for a moment to draw a distinction with the minister between large and small companies. In the larger companies we find well-established and functioning safety committees. Frontline supervisors and line managers are periodically encouraged by senior management to incorporate safe practices in their management and supervisory styles. Some individuals, perhaps from the personnel department, are allocated specific responsibilities in the safety area on either a half-time basis or possibly a full-time basis.

Contrast that with the very small company, in whatever field, of half a dozen or possibly 10 employees, where it's perceived by them not to

be practical to have full-time safety officers and all the other apparatus that goes with safe operations. As a result, it will come as no surprise that on a per capita basis the incidence of injury is far higher in smaller companies, even in smaller companies in a lower rated hazard field.

With that as a backdrop, I read with interest the Occupational Health and Safety Heritage Grant Program Status Report, dated October 20. I'm more than prepared to admit that through those 27 pages there's a lot of very worthwhile research going on, but in that entire report I found one reference to small business. That was the page 8 reference to developing a guidebook on occupational health and safety. I have no quarrel with guidebooks generally, but in the context of the problem as I've summarized it, there are a great many individuals for whom reading yet another guidebook is a pain in the rear end. It affects the balance sheet negatively and hence gathers dust along with other guidebooks on the shelf.

I then looked at the heritage grant program grants and awards guide, and possibly the reason we're not getting relevant small business research is that it isn't solicited in the guidelines issued by the program. Nowhere in this material is there a reference to that very pragmatic, very realistic problem. I wonder if I could then ask the minister, Mr. Chairman, if he would be prepared to consider, or is he considering, some renewed emphasis, some re-evaluation of program criteria to shift the research away from what appears to be somewhat esoteric into more pragmatic areas, with particular reference to small business, where the problem is.

MR. DINNING: Representation accepted. I would suggest that my review of the same document shows that there is one other small business related project on page 4. The Faculty of Medicine of the University of Calgary has been allocated \$31,000 for a study on occupational health and the small business owner/manager. It's not enough, and I would tell you that the grants and awards guide, as the member read, Mr. Chairman, is not designed to be limiting in any way. Those kinds of projects are encouraged, and I suppose it's a matter of going out and drumming up the business. I would welcome and encourage that kind of small business research.

I've gone to the Occupational Health and Safety Council and said, "Look, one of my major concerns is small business and the ability of small business to deliver an appropriate safety awareness and accident prevention program." That is one of the priorities of that council in the year ahead, and I await their advice and continue to receive and welcome representation such as the member's.

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the minister for overlooking what appears to be a potentially very useful study: the reference on page 4. I overlooked that in my quick scan of the titles. It seems to me that if the substance of that report delivers what is implied by the title, it might be a useful springboard into a broader gauged examination of the problem.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Minister, has the capital projects in any way funded research into the area of the development of a registry for accidents and the evaluation of procedures, equipment, and safety regulations for the oil industry?

MR. DINNING: Perhaps the member could repeat the question, Mr. Chairman. If I understand it, it's a registry of accidents.

MR. McEACHERN: Yes, so you can keep track of all the accidents in the oil industry. We know the oil industry is one of the more dangerous industries in our province in terms of accidents.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Chairman, I can tell all members that such a registry is certainly kept. A record of virtually every single accident in this province is to be kept by all employers. That is certainly subject to review by our people in the occupational health and safety field, but equally as important, it's got to be there to provide for workers' compensation. Whether it's oil related or manufacturing or any other incident in the province, a record is definitely kept.

MR. McEACHERN: You have a compilation of it, in other words. It's all in one place where you can get hold of it.

MR. DINNING: Yes. I'd refer members to a

very good document for that purpose, the most recent annual report of the Workers' Compensation Board, which spells out a number of statistics relating to claims, which are of course directly related to accidents.

MR. McEACHERN: Have you also considered not only the accidents themselves but the near misses? I was talking to a fellow the other day — you may know of him — Dan Taylor, who is suggesting starting a near-miss program. He maintains that if the people in the field kept track of their near misses, that would also tell you a tremendous amount about which pieces of equipment are safe and which are not, which procedures are safe and which are not, and you could cut down on the number of accidents tremendously. Have you heard of him or heard of that idea?

MR. DINNING: I haven't heard of the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, and I haven't heard of the idea. Frankly, I think there are an awful lot of productive Albertans out there who are working too darn hard to be writing down near misses. A near miss is very fortunate.

MR. McEACHERN: It didn't happen; that's right.

MR. DINNING: But were Albertans to be documenting every near miss, they wouldn't be nearly as productive as they are.

MR. McEACHERN: I'm not so sure. For instance, in occupational therapy — my wife is one, so I know. She is expected to account for every five-minute unit of her day, which is totally impossible and bloody ridiculous.

MR. DINNING: Indeed.

MR. McEACHERN: We've heard a lot about accountability. Near misses don't happen that often, but if you kept a wide registry of not only accidents but also near-miss accidents, it would give you a tremendous amount of information. Mr. Taylor has looked at trying to set up something like that. I can't help wondering if it would be better done by the department, but perhaps I'll swing to another question.

MR. DINNING: May I respond to that, Mr.

Chairman? I believe it's also the responsibility of employers and employees to be conscious of safe work practices. No, I don't believe it is the government's responsibility to be the number one promoter of safety, whether it's a near miss, a miss, or an accident. It's got to be the responsibility of all of us in the province as workers, employers, managers, or whatever. I would suggest that it is not government's responsibility to keep that kind of registry, which would be exponentially greater than the one we keep today.

MR. McEACHERN: I'll change my third question then, because of what you've said.

MR. GOGO: A near miss could be a program that is working.

MR. DINNING: That's right.

MR. McEACHERN: It's a possibility, but you would know. I think it is an important responsibility of government. The accidents that occur, particularly in the oil industry, are much higher than in any other industry. I don't remember the exact numbers, but the rate that oil employers and contractors have to pay to have their people covered by workers' compensation is much, much higher than in any other industry in the province.

MR. DINNING: And why is that?

MR. McEACHERN: Because the accidents are higher.

MR. DINNING: Yes.

MR. McEACHERN: So to throw away the idea of a near-miss program as being totally frivolous is a bit offhand. It's a responsibility of not only the government but all the people, as you said, and we are in fact the ones who pay for it. Where else in the world . . .

MR. DINNING: Who pays for it?

MR. McEACHERN: We the people, in terms of our health care program and the Workers' Compensation Board.

MR. DINNING: Yes.

MR. McEACHERN: It's a cost to society. Where else in the world do you have an oil industry that is so concentrated in one area, that has the kind of infrastructures and communications that we have to be able to do that kind of program and to gather enough useful information that would not only help to cut down accidents in this society but perhaps actually be able to become an exporter of information about safety to the whole oil business in the world. It sounds as if this fellow has a tremendous idea, to my way of thinking. He's talked to a number of government officials and has not found any interest in his project. Maybe I should ask him to call and talk to you about it. Of course, he's an expert in the field and knows about it in much more detail than I do. I think it's worth taking a look at.

MR. GOGO: Did he apply for a grant?

MR. McEACHERN: Yes, he did apply, but not under your program. Perhaps he has tried the wrong places.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister a couple of light questions for openers. First of all, it seems that we always tend to bang away at the government, some agency of the government, or some well-intentioned agency or people to suggest that they've got to be the be-all and end-all for safety and what have you. We sometimes tend to remove the worker, the employee, from their responsibility too. At the same time, maybe we need to better educate certain people. Life is not without risk. Some of my Commie friends seem to think there shouldn't be any risk in life and that big, bad government . . .

MR. McEACHERN: I'd be surprised if you had any Commie friends.

MR. NELSON: . . . should create a nonrisk society, which I don't know how you're going to do. However, I would suggest that everybody is responsible for safety, including those who are purported to be in danger.

Mr. Chairman, last year I put forward a proposal suggesting that

the Occupational Health and Safety Heritage Grant program expand its mandate to encourage funding to postsecondary educational institutions to

teach occupational health and safety to students,

especially those who are going to be coming out in a risk industry, to prepare them for the risk they themselves have chosen so that they are better equipped to deal with that risk as they enter the work force in industries such as construction, logging, mining, or whatever, to assist them in that way, and they can be the creators of their own misguidance. I would like to ask what the minister has done in addition to the area he identified earlier with so-called good strides at NAIT, with additional programs at NAIT and SAIT, to add to that teaching of health and safety within those organizations.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Chairman, as the member has mentioned, I spoke of NAIT. I can tell you that right now we are discussing with SAIT the possibility of a chemical-risk management course, along with others that I mentioned, including Lakeland, Westerra, the University of Alberta, as well as the Banff School of Advanced Management. I cited those. The other ones that we have done under this program, completed projects, would also include a grant to the University of Lethbridge that provided funding for three courses as part of their occupational safety training program, a grant to Mount Royal College in Calgary to develop an occupational hygiene technician program, and a grant to the University of Calgary to fund a visiting scholar in the industrial hygiene field for one year. As a matter of fact, that funding lapsed after one year, but the University of Calgary has continued to fund out of its own funds the ongoing presence of that scholar at the university. As well, I mentioned a chair at the University of Alberta, Faculty of Medicine, in the occupational health and safety field, and that was the subject of some discussion last year. That's a half million dollar program, half of which was funded by this heritage fund program and the other half by business, labour, and other organizations, so that Professor T. Guidotti can continue to hold that chair and provide the information that I think is very useful at the University of Alberta.

MR. NELSON: I guess I'm a little concerned that we still haven't really addressed the concern I have. Certainly I know that some people I have discussed this with related to the

area of something definitive as far as how to better use some of the equipment. The examples I used were the construction, mining, and logging industries, where there are high risks. I notice that a study has been done on sawmills — at least the saws they use for cutting down trees, whatever you call them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Chain saws.

MR. NELSON: Chain saws — which is certainly a start in that respect.

Maybe I should address that type of area and that type of question. Once these studies are concluded, the paperwork, films or whatever is included in these things is done, what happens to them? Does the worker in fact have the opportunity to be given that information through safety programs at the workplace or some of these larger companies or through the educational facilities that are available at SAIT, NAIT, and the universities? How are these things followed up? If they're not followed up, obviously there's a helluva waste being put here. I will get into another area in a moment. Unless they're actually given some instruction on health and safety at the technical college, for example, how are they going to be followed up with some of this money that's been put out there for these studies to maybe just keep somebody in the workplace who really doesn't function properly afterwards?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Chairman, as far as I'm concerned, probably the most crucial question in this program is taking the results of research, education, or training and applying them to the worker at the worksite. Frankly, we can do an awful lot better job. As I said, I would encourage somebody in the communications business to team up with some researchers in the field and come back with some whiz-bang new idea to promote awareness and safety, because clearly we can do a better job.

I'm glad you asked, Stan. I can point to this manual, Chain Saw Safety Manual for Alberta, that was funded by the program and developed by Woodland Resource Services Ltd. and the Logging Safety Manual and the Metal Trades Handbook. I never knew a handbook could fit in your pocket and be 454 pages long, but this does it. That kind of material is provided. I suppose one success story is that I'm told that in a number of retail outlets in this province every

time somebody buys a chain saw, they're given one of these manuals, whether it's for the fellow who's working at the Blue Ridge forestry nursery outside Whitecourt or you, Mr. Chairman, cutting down all those big oak trees in your backyard. That kind of material is there.

We're making some strides, but we've got a long way to go. We have that material with all the information provided in our libraries. The research work is distributed throughout our library system. Its application — that is, the education side — is coming, but we've got a way to go.

MR. NELSON: I guess the problem I have with this type of program is that it's a very nice thing to go out and try to find out how to remove a potential hazard, but at the same time, once you assess that evaluation, does it sit on the shelf and become useless except for those people who are practising the role of inspectors or other people who may or may not utilize that information, if they looked at it at all?

I guess that gets to my third question, talking about developing these materials. I look at one here on recycling and disposing of chemical wastes. I assume there were five studies done in different phases. According to this thing, I'm looking at the fifth one. I can find two more in here, one and two, but I couldn't find three and four. There has been a considerable amount of money expended on that particular program by the University of Alberta.

Going back to the original question of the Member for Cypress-Redcliff about having a number of these pieces of work done by the universities or other educational facilities in this manner rather than the private sector, which is disposing of chemicals on a day-to-day basis and probably finding ways and means to do it more efficiently and more cost-effectively, why would we not offer, rather than waiting for somebody to come in and say, "Look, we've got a proposal"? If our experts in the occupational health and safety field feel there should be some surgery done in a specific area that relates to health and safety, why would they not be asked to find the most appropriate way to develop a study that relates to the particular program they are interested in finding some information from, rather than sitting back and waiting for proposals to come in from the

private sector, the universities, or whatever? As you know, the universities always have their fingers in the pie, and they want more and more all the time to do whatever.

MR. DINNING: To be fair, Mr. Chairman, to say that's not being done now is stretching the truth, fertilizing the truth. That's not the case at all.

MR. NELSON: I don't fertilize it. You're fertilizing it, not me.

MR. DINNING: I suggest that a lot of the educational institutions are very much involved on the research side. All you have to do is go through pages 2, 3, 4, 5, or whatever and you see research being done. But the education side, the application of that research to practices right there at the worksite, is being done by the Forest Products Association and groups like that through that kind of mechanism. Whether it's done with NAIT or by Interprovincial Pipe Line or any of the people cited in this document, it is being done.

I take this suggestion not as a criticism but as a good suggestion that we should be going out to companies and businesses that are handling and having to recycle those chemical wastes and saying: "Mr. XYZ Company, you do have a challenge on your hands there. Would you be willing to be part of an exercise with the University of Alberta chemistry department or some NAIT or SAIT faculty in working together to come up with a better way of doing it?" They could come forward with a proposal for this program, and I think we would look very favourably upon that.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, the minister kind of jumped in before I really asked my question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You've already had your supplementaries.

MR. NELSON: He got rather excited while I was ...

MR. DINNING: With all due respect, Mr. Chairman, it was taking him so long to get it out.

MR. NELSON: On a point of order, I would just like to indicate to the minister that I was not

suggesting it wasn't being done. I was suggesting that maybe we should do it in a little more open fashion so the private sector could obtain a little more input into some of these things that are happening rather than these learned colleges from time to time. They always have their fingers out.

MR. DINNING: May I just throw one more out, Mr. Chairman? I've got to have the last word. We have the Occupational Health and Safety magazine that goes to every single employer in the province.

MR. NELSON: Yes, I know.

MR. DINNING: You're familiar with that, I'm sure, Mr. Chairman and members. That kind of information is in that magazine on a monthly basis.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Minister, there is an area that's causing businesses a major expense factor in lost hours, and it's also costing the taxpayer a lot in the hospital system. That is the area of back injuries. It's a major deal with workers' compensation. I think we all realize that, especially we who are MLAs and hear feedback from those who are injured. I see that we only have one small research project directed toward this area, yet it is a major loss of time and productive hours in the private sector. Is there a reason for that? I would think that employers and employee groups would be very interested in following this through, yet we don't see it. I just wonder why we don't see it coming through in research projects. There's one in there on page 4: \$76,000.

It concerns me that we haven't got more dollars and energies directed to that. Is there a reason, or is it just that they think it's one of those things that happened and they have to live with it?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Chairman, I agree that on page 4 you see that back injury research project, and I would also point the member to page 14, where there is an additional project.

MR. R. MOORE: I didn't look that far.

MR. DINNING: Again, Mr. Chairman, we're guided by that which comes to us, and that has been the practice in the past. Some of the



projects that come to us are simply not well put together, such that they should or could be funded. But the member is bang-on right. One need only look at the Workers' Compensation Board annual report to note that the number of new claims related to the back are far and away, almost on a two-to-one basis -- in this case, in 1985, it was over 14,000. The next one on the list was for fingers at 7,400. So it's almost two to one. We could and definitely should be going out and soliciting more in the way of research in that field.

MR. R. MOORE: This isn't a supplementary question; I want to keep my other two questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh yes it is.

MR. R. MOORE: Has the Workers' Compensation Board approached this and come to you at all and said, "We're having a lot of problems"? They are totally involved in that area. Do they do any soliciting out there with employer/employee groups, saying, "Let's do something about this"? Or are they just taking the claims and processing them? They could be the catalyst to bring those two groups together and do something.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Chairman, the Workers' Compensation Board has not made application for a grant under this program, but it certainly is concerned and works with our occupational health and safety division to identify this as a major problem area.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Minister, industrial disease, a thing we never thought about 15 years ago, is certainly surfacing in the workplace. We hear it a lot. Lead poisoning in radiator shops: you see things like that coming up, which are diseases that are really from the workplace, develop there, and so on. We can see that. Again, I think we should be seeing more research in that area. You can come down to the other extreme -- and I say the "other extreme" from lead poisoning -- and that's smoking in the workplace, Member for Lethbridge West.

MR. GOGO: We could say that, Mr. Chairman, if this were our workplace.

MR. R. MOORE: Smoking in the workplace could eventually come into play as causing what we call industrial disease, yet we aren't stressing that. I don't see industrial disease when I look through all these very worthwhile projects with our research dollars. That is one of the things that's looming on the horizon and is going to be a big thing for us to face down the road, because it's coming back more and more that this happened because of exposure for 10 or 15 years in the workplace.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to walk through this document. In that one area, a certain amount of work has been done that's not necessarily specifically related to the general area of industrial disease. My colleague from Calgary McCall spoke earlier of recycling and disposal of chemical wastes. Proper management of those wastes reduces the exposure to a potential industrial disease. It's the same with hydrogen sulfide effects. I know that there are a number of projects like that in here.

I go back to last year's recommendation by this very committee, which spoke of a need for the medical research foundation to do that kind of research on industrial diseases, and I welcome it. As a matter of fact, in the last few days in preparing for this appearance, I've asked the question: what is that foundation doing in occupational health or industrial disease research, in mental health -- and that's an area of real interest to me -- and in public health? I won't comment on what my gut feeling is. Clearly, whether it's in the area of asbestos, which is a real problem today as an industrial disease, exposure to solvents, whether dry cleaning or in a paint shop, exposure to gas, or just plain, ordinary stress in the workplace, which is an industrial disease, there will never have been enough work done in an area like that.

MR. CHERRY: Mr. Minister, just touching first of all on agriculture and the family farm for a minute, I think the education that was put into burying overhead lines around the farmyard was very beneficial. Although not everyone has done it, through finances or just plain poor education, I think it certainly has been a big benefit and a great safety factor on the farm. So I commend the education that was given, whether it was through Agriculture or in

partnership with your department.

The other question I have is: in view of the recent accidents we've seen in the oil industry, has the department taken any new initiatives to again try to educate the workers on better safety methods?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Chairman, I can say that from the point of view of the occupational health and safety division in our department, we are constantly moving into the oil and gas field and into other fields where the highest risk of accident and injury and fatality takes place. So it's an ongoing activity.

As it relates to this program, quite by accident I've had the opportunity to agree to a research contract on protective work clothing. You'll see it on page 1 of the status report: \$50,000 allocated for a one-year study. Clearly, that is an area -- particularly, say, after the Edson incident -- where we have to have more information; we've got to know more. What we could be doing right now is saying to oil and gas operators: "Hey, don't be foolish at a worksite or on a drilling rig or a service rig; don't be wearing nylon or polyester clothing. When you get in a fire with that kind of clothing on, the severity of your burn or injury is tripled. You should be wearing cotton or wool; you should be wearing far better, more sensible clothing."

A general safety concern in the oil patch is always there. Again, Mr. Chairman, we can never do too much.

MR. HERON: Mr. Minister, I'd like to solicit your reaction to some comments, and I'd like to start by saying that I have the greatest difficulty including this program -- and I realize it's been around for some time -- in the heritage or rainy day fund. I say that noting that around this table this afternoon -- and the record will indicate it -- the comments varied between "investments" and "expended." I have this difficulty because it's so different, say, from the heritage fund for medical research, where there is actually a \$300 million pot paid out, earning interest, and it's endowed. The same for the heritage scholarship fund: the \$100 million is there; it's endowed; it's self-sustaining. This one is drawing on a reserve set aside.

Again, in the interests of soliciting your views, I would say that today you underscored

the word "investment" as opposed to "expended." When I look at an investment, I like to measure return in real rates, not in new tiles or some qualitative measure of social benefit or, for example, books. I thought I would solicit your views on that statement before looking at the long-term future of the fund.

MR. DINNING: The whole notion of deemed assets is a debate that's gone on a number of times well in advance of my coming here today, and I'm sure the debate will continue. But I do believe that any kind of research, whether it's dollars allocated to a separate medical research fund or a heritage scholarship fund or an ongoing draw on an allocation set aside over an eight-year basis, will pay earnings, dividends, and rewards in the days to come. I believe it is now. It will pay those rewards in a better, safer worksite. You're right; it's difficult to quantify. It's even difficult to qualify. But I believe that the returns are there now and will continue well into the future.

MR. HERON: If we look at the fund over the five years it's been around now, \$4 million has been expended. Do you see any problem in expending the \$6 million by the year 1989? Is the momentum now there to take down the balance of these funds?

MR. DINNING: I don't know the answer to that.

MR. HERON: I asked the question very deliberately, because if the Treasurer's machete comes out -- the other day he spoke of the possibility of capping these funds or maybe even not directing the 15 percent of revenues to the fund. Given that this fund is not endowed, could the \$6 million remaining be one source of his stopping expenditures?

MR. DINNING: Some of it could be, Mr. Chairman. First of all, let me underscore my commitment to the work we're doing and to improving on it in the days ahead. Clearly, were the Treasurer to come and say, "Okay, you don't have any new dollars; tell me how much it's going to cost you to fulfill the multiyear commitments you've made," then I would be able to go back to him with a number that would be less than the unexpended total balance in the fund. Having made a commitment to

ongoing multiyear projects, I would hope that we would be able to fund those. I would be prepared regrettably to turn off the tap on new proposals.

MR. HERON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to commend the minister and his former minister in terms of developing this program. I notice a number of initiatives which impact directly on constituents of mine in the logging industry. The minister mentioned safety manuals which have been developed and are very useful, because that's a very high accident-rate industry.

MR. DINNING: The worst.

MR. BRADLEY: I also note research being done into effects of coal dust in storage silos and load-out facilities. Having worked for Coleman Collieries one summer in their coal processing plant and load-out facility, I'm very much aware of the amount of dust that's there. I realize, of course, that we don't have very much underground mining activity, but that's certainly a concern. Black lung, which used to be developed by coal miners, is now recognized as a compensable disease under the Workers' Compensation Act. This is very worthwhile research.

Going on to the work that's being done in terms of exposure to sour gas in the workplace, there seem to be about four research initiatives under way looking at sour gas and the low level effects of  $H_2S$  on the workers. This is very useful.

I'd just like to go a little bit further in the area relating to sour gas. We've had a major medical diagnostic review of health effects of sour gas in my area with some conclusions from the Spitzer study about those effects. It has been very relieving to the community that there haven't been any identifiable disabling diseases resulting from that.

Getting back to workers in sour gas plants specifically and the research that's going on, in terms of this program does the minister see a need to do further work with regard to exposure of workers to sour gas in the workplace? Is there a need for a major epidemiological study in that area? Following up on that area, has this program received requests to do that type

of work?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Chairman, I'm looking for some hydrogen sulfide type studies, and they are in here: hydrogen sulfide effects on — this is why I find it awfully difficult — cardiorespiratory variables during exercise, page 15.

MR. McEACHERN: Page 1.

MR. DINNING: And there are others, as the member mentioned.

MR. BRADLEY: There's one on page 7.

MR. DINNING: Page 1: a multidisciplinary assessment of low doses of hydrogen sulfide.

As I read it here and in our other activities, not only is the effect of hydrogen sulfide monitored, but I believe it continues to be researched. I would expect that kind of research to continue.

As for a major epidemiological study, I feel we've gone through just that with the study conducted by the McGill University research team headed by Dr. Walter Spitzer. That study has concluded with some very strong, positive scientific evidence that people in the Pincher Creek study area do not suffer major health problems in any way on a relative basis with other Albertans. Quite frankly, I was relieved with those results and am very impressed with the weight of the scientific evidence Dr. Spitzer and his team brought to his conclusions. As it relates to hydrogen sulfide, that subject will continue to be studied as it is now and as it should be in the days ahead. As for another major study, I repeat: no, I do not believe that is something we are heading towards.

MR. BRADLEY: Then the minister is not aware whether any group has come forward under this program proposing that this type of work be undertaken.

MR. DINNING: It's my understanding that no group has.

MR. BRADLEY: On an unrelated subject, something which I believe you raised in your opening remarks, with regard to the right of workers to privacy in terms of health

information or testing for drugs and the other question of safety of the public in general in terms of people who are in direct control, say, airline pilots or others, is the minister suggesting there is a need for a research paper looking at those two contradictory viewpoints: the right of the public on the one hand and the right of the individual to privacy? Is the minister suggesting we should look at research in that area?

MR. DINNING: I welcome the comments of the Member for Calgary Buffalo. Whether it's a research study or a debate — because clearly it is going to become a debate as to the right of the individual as an airline pilot sitting in front of a 747 driving 200, 300, or 400 people from point A to point B and the right of those 200 to 400 people to know that that airline pilot doesn't have funny things floating around in his blood which affect his judgment or his ability to fly the plane. It's an interesting debate, and it comes down to occupational health, the fitness of the individual to pilot that plane. I don't come to the table today with any solutions or answers, but I throw it out as something I think we should debate in the days ahead, whether here or more likely in the Assembly.

MR. CHUMIR: The minister certainly does raise a conundrum with respect to what I assume he is alluding to as the civil liberties implications related to drug testing. However, that's a difficult question. I'm more interested in action on the more obvious and easier issues. It's obvious that research and action are inter-related. The benefits of research are lost if we don't act on them. The rhetorical question is: why expend heritage fund money on research and studies if the government is not going to do anything with respect to them? I'd appreciate the minister's general comments with respect to any departmental policies he has to ensure that the department responds to the needs as established by ongoing research with respect to occupational health. In particular, I would appreciate his comments with respect to one issue of which he is aware from my questions and the comments in the House, which have been alluded to here earlier, an issue on which I am a hawk, and that is the right to clean air and smoke-free workplaces. Although direct research doesn't appear to have been done in the literature that has been

presented to us here, there is massive evidence of that problem. I am wondering what the policy of his department is to encourage the government to implement a clean air policy in its own workplaces and throughout the province generally.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Chairman, my inclination, my philosophical bent, is to lead by example, I suppose.

MR. McEACHERN: How many would follow? You're sitting beside a smoker.

MR. DINNING: I can't tell you how many government departments. I think there are at least two and likely more that operate a nonsmoking workplace in the province today.

MR. NELSON: It would be nice.

MR. DINNING: Our own Department of Community and Occupational Health is heading towards one, effective June 1987. Being the impatient chap that I am, I find that progress very slow.

MR. PAYNE: You could end up a patient.

MR. DINNING: I could end up a patient. I know the hazards, from sitting beside many a smoker. I think that that kind of policy leads to . . .

MR. R. MOORE: Careful. He speaks next. [laughter]

MR. DINNING: I would suggest that the more government departments get involved in it, the more likely it is that all government departments will adopt that policy. As for all workplaces in the province, again, my philosophical bent, likely unlike your own, is not to dictate or mandate that thou shalt not smoke on a worksite.

MR. CHUMIR: The minister raised very provoking and interesting questions with respect to occupational health in his opening comments. There is one area, however, in which, from my experience from exposure to the public and to workers, there is a tremendous gap in the information, and that relates to the actual manner in which the workers'

compensation system is working. I have received and continue to receive volumes of complaints from workers with respect to the operation of the system, complaints of delays, arbitrary behaviour, too rigorous standards, particularly with respect to back injuries, absence of independent appeal, and the need for assistance in working one's way through the bureaucratic maze of the Workers' Compensation Board. I have been pushing for an independent study of the system to see how it is in fact working and how it compares with other jurisdictions, and I'm wondering whether or not the minister might be philosophically inclined to be supportive of some form of review of that nature through this fund or otherwise.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Chairman, there will be established in the next sitting of the Legislature a select committee of the Legislature to study the Workers' Compensation Act. It would be my recommendation to my colleagues that we establish such a committee, that the committee carefully review and come to understand what we have now — good things and bad things, warts and all — travel Alberta, visit with a number of constituent groups throughout Alberta to hear their concerns and comments, brickbats and bouquets, and, following such a review, make a report to our colleagues in the Legislature. It would not be a reinvention of the wheel. I believe we've done that a number of times, and we needn't do it. I think the Workers' Compensation Board needs to be seriously looked at, and although as the minister I am doing that on an ongoing basis, as recently as this morning having had quite a thorough discussion on the matter, I believe a review by a select committee of the Legislature would be a very useful exercise. It will be done.

MR. CHUMIR: I would just like to state that while it's nice to have a review by a select committee, it is my view that there is no way a committee made up of members of this House, with the other obligations placed on the time and energy of an MLA, can possibly do justice to the need for a review of the system. I seriously suggest to the minister that we need to commission some people who have the time to really do a thorough job and advise us, and then the Legislative Assembly . . .

MR. DINNING: Mr. Chairman, I can tell the member that in discussions with a number of my government colleagues, I and a number of others consider it such a priority that we're willing to commit that time. If the hon. member doesn't have it or isn't able to, then perhaps there are others on that side of the House who could. I believe that we as generalists, as representatives of all Albertans in our individual constituencies have that responsibility to go out . . . Just as you buy a lawyer or a lawyer's advice — one or the other — you go out and buy those consulting services. That may be part of the committee; I don't know. But I think it's important for a group of six, seven, eight, nine, or 10 of us to do that kind of thorough review.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, it's easy to say we will, but in my experience the realities are otherwise. I know that the workers I have talked to would like to see an independent review by some outside people.

MR. DINNING: Is there someone more independent than you, Mr. Chumir?

MR. CHUMIR: Be that as it may.

MR. NELSON: Yes. Me.

MR. PAYNE: A number of employers would share that interest, incidentally.

MR. GOGO: Minister, I very much welcome the enthusiasm you are putting into this heritage grant program for occupational health and safety. Mr. Bradley raised a point I'm very interested in, and that's the question of drug testing. If we're to assume a couple of things — one, there's a labour legislation review committee under way now with its primary mandate, as I understand it, to come up with solutions to the over a quarter million lost manpower days this year alone in Alberta. It would seem to me then that as minister responsible for community health, one of your primary responsibilities would be to come up with solutions to the number of days lost in the year in terms of productivity related to health matters. Looking through the catalogue of projects that have been completed, I think a lot of them are related to that.

From that point of view, it would appear to

me that this whole question of safety on the job would impact on a lot of areas and that one of those would be those who are responsible for other people's lives and the whole question of drug testing. Someone made reference to a pilot. I believe — I don't know whether Dr. Buchwald would agree — that something more critical than that would be a surgeon who is opening somebody's belly. Should he or she not be subject to hallucinogenic agents and so on in the bloodstream? I would strongly support that kind of thing. That leads us obviously into matters affecting people like Mr. Petrasuk, because next to safety of body is obviously safety of finances. I don't know where you draw the line in terms of drug testing, but I do think one could strongly make a case that if we do enough of it, we'd spend half our days, like Mr. McEachern's reference to his wife, accounting for five-minute sections of every hour. I don't know.

Mr. Chairman, what I want to address, though, is that in the collective agreements in Alberta we see that people get time off for sick leave. I guess it's a phenomenon in Alberta, but people who take time off work because they're sick are always sick on Mondays and Fridays. It has always interested me why they never get sick on Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday. This was raised as a recommendation some time ago, and the medical research foundation, as you're aware, has launched a project dealing with pain control; however, it's limited almost exclusively to cancer.

I can appreciate that the status reports we receive are based on requests for grants. They're not initiated by the minister or his department. I'd be interested in your department's comments as to people who lose time from work and, as a result, the loss of productivity to Alberta, not from labour strife — strikes or walkouts — but health related. Let's say you get a day and a half off per month for sick time in the collective agreements. How many of those are self-induced or genuine sickness or, more important to me, as a result of pain either from arthritis or other kinds of problems? Other than the one on page 13 that relates to stress and that the minister mentioned himself, I don't see anything in here related to things like pain control as a result of illness incurred on the worksite.

I don't know if the minister would care to make a comment, but it would seem to me that

it would be very worth while, if we're talking about increasing the productivity in this province or reducing the number of incidents that prevent someone from working, to look at those very things. When I read the statistics, I happen to strongly believe that a tremendous number of Albertans are suffering pain as a result of many kinds of things, and no one seems to know what they are. I wonder if the minister would comment on whether or not he thinks the heritage grant program should be doing that type of thing.

MR. DINNING: Dr. Buchwald gave me an interesting statistic earlier. If I understood it correctly, it is that work-induced versus nonwork-induced injuries is in the order of one to five, which only backs up what the member has said, Mr. Chairman. I look at the annual report of the WCB, and therein it gives the number of compensation days paid by the WCB in 1985 as 1,541,942.

MR. McEACHERN: Did you mean one to five or five to one?

MR. DINNING: One to five. In other words, nonwork-induced injuries keeping people away from work is five, and work-induced injuries is one. That's an incredible statistic.

MR. PAYNE: We should spend more time at work is what you're referring to.

MR. DINNING: That's right. You should spend more time at work.

MR. PAYNE: And live longer if you do.

MR. R. MOORE: The moral of the story.

MR. DINNING: Indeed.

The representation is a valid one, Mr. Chairman, and I accept it.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Minister, based on child abuse, female assaults, and other things as a result of alcohol, which occur more in the home than in licensed establishments, the case has been made that the price of alcohol in liquor stores go up five times and the price of alcohol in bars go down by 80 percent. People then don't beat each other and so on, because that occurs at home. So one can do a lot of things with

figures.

The comment I want to make is related to the one on stress on page 13. I would tend to agree, Minister, that there are more people absent from work — I think you just pointed that out — for reasons other than physical injury. I would think there should be much more work done on the matters of stress and coping with today's society, certainly as much as on safety on the worksite.

The final comment is that I'm very satisfied, Minister, with your comments in Hansard on August 21 regarding the mandatory safety committees:

The bottom line is that one injury, one death, one fatality . . .

I was sort of led to believe that they're the same thing, but maybe death and fatality are something different when you get into the Legislature.

. . . on any worksite, is one too many.

MR. DINNING: It's my rhetoric.

MR. GOGO: I commend you for everything you're doing to reduce the incidence of work stoppage in Alberta because of injuries.

I'm finished.

MR. McEACHERN: A couple of quick comments before I get into my question. I'm certainly glad to hear you talk about a committee of the Legislature to investigate the WCB. Perhaps to address Sheldon's concern, one might think about making sure the committee would have the expert backup. I was glad to notice that you seemed to be implying some opposition members on that committee, which has not always been the case in committees of the Legislature.

MR. DINNING: On the contrary, we've always had representation from all sides of the House on that one.

MR. GOGO: Grant Notley made a major contribution.

MR. McEACHERN: I was thinking of the education task force committee, for instance, which was six Conservative MLAs. Mind you, I'll agree that we were kind of short of members in the House at the time.

AN HON. MEMBER: That wasn't a committee of the House.

MR. McEACHERN: Anyway, a quick comment actually following the line of something the Member for Lethbridge West said and something that came up earlier about industrial diseases. From your reply to that question about the investigation into industrial diseases, it sounds like the medical research endowment fund research is tending to be of the crisis-management type rather than long-term community prevention programs.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't want that to be the impression I left on the record.

MR. McEACHERN: Well, you did. The question was about what research is being done in terms of long-term industrial diseases.

MR. DINNING: I respected the recommendation of this committee last year, and I would be interested in what the medical research foundation is doing. But I'm not saying that they are doing crisis-oriented research.

MR. McEACHERN: But if they're not . . .

MR. DINNING: No, no. It's not black and white.

MR. McEACHERN: I realize that.

MR. DINNING: So I wouldn't want any member, especially this hon. member, to be putting those kinds of words in this mouth.

MR. McEACHERN: You did say that they seemed not to be doing the long-term research that perhaps needs to be done.

In any case, I'll get specifically to the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe the member can get on with the question.

MR. McEACHERN: That's what I just said.

With the reference to the research on the effect of the working environment on pregnancy, on page 14, it supposedly finished on February 1986. I'm wondering if you have some results from that study for us. Could you tell us some of the main points shown in that study?

MR. DINNING: No, Mr. Chairman, I can't, but I will provide that information to the chairman.

MR. McEACHERN: Perhaps I could just ask you, more as a supplementary than a question, if it dealt in any way with the use of computers, which seems to be one of the areas that has been raised a number of times in conjunction with pregnant women. If there are some results from that that are fairly specific, does the department plan some follow-up activity? Perhaps you could pass those on to us.

I had intended to take two or three questions for that particular section, but since you answered it so quickly, maybe I'll just raise another one or two on my supplementary. Many of the educational grants outlined in the document here are individual grants. I'm wondering if you'd give us a bit of an idea as to the effectiveness of giving what almost become like scholarships to individuals to finish some particular kind of training as opposed to a sort of research grant, which is to a project and may involve more people and perhaps has a more direct commitment to results for Alberta. The education of a single individual might not necessarily pay as obvious a dividend and return. I wonder if you could comment on the decisions that go into what kind of things to fund.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Chairman, could the member perhaps identify any specific examples or areas where he would have that concern?

MR. McEACHERN: There are a number of sort of scholarships for individual people. There is somebody getting his master's degree in occupational hygiene on page 10. Approved education projects really; some of them are individual persons. Back on page 9, training assistance to Peggy Szumlas: \$14,000 "to provide assistance to enable a student to complete her graduate studies." I'm not necessarily saying that some of these aren't good things to do; I'm just basically asking how you decide the merits of helping some single person finish his studies compared to, say, a group doing some medical research that we can perhaps get more direct benefit from.

MR. GOGO: I thought the selection committee determined that.

MR. McEACHERN: Yes. I'm just wondering about the criteria.

MR. DINNING: If all members would to refer to the grants and awards guide that was in your package, it speaks of the possibility of providing those kinds of awards and grants. One of the reasons is that there clearly isn't enough expertise in the field in Alberta. Whatever measures we can take within our means to encourage, cultivate, and nurture that talent and that capability I think is an appropriate way for us to be investing these heritage grant dollars. The Alberta Federation of Labour — and I use that as a good example — has a program in the order of \$300,000 or \$400,000, and they've trained untold numbers of their own people, workers on the worksite, in health, safety, and accident prevention. I think that's a very good use of those dollars, just as I believe that where it's appropriate, in a field where our talent is too thin, we should be nurturing and cultivating wherever we can.

MR. GOGO: I thought Lynn Hewitt answered that question last year in committee.

MR. DINNING: I think she did.

MR. McEACHERN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions from members, I want to thank the minister for his participation this afternoon and for his succinct answers. All members had the opportunity to participate in question period this afternoon. I also want to thank the minister for a very positive response to one of last year's recommendations. We appreciate that as well.

There being no further questions, I would call for a motion for adjournment.

MR. R. MOORE: I move that we adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. GOGO: Can we take a quick minute and review tomorrow?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe for those members who have any questions we can . . . Are there concerns that you want to bring in front of the whole committee, or can we . . .



MR. GOGO: Does everybody have the memo from Margaret Qually? It was on my desk. I just wondered if all other members got it. Are we clear about the hours and so on?

AN HON. MEMBER: Eight fifty tomorrow morning at the Delta Bow Valley.

[The committee adjourned at 3:35 p.m.]

