



Childhood injury prevention

Dr. I. Barry Pless examines how injury prevention among children and adolescents is (or is not) addressed by our federal government in the article "Childhood injury prevention: time for tougher measures" (*Can Med Assoc J* 1996;155:1429-31). He advocates that we establish a national centre for injury prevention and control and "provide it with strong teeth," plus, of course, money. Is that what we need?

An unpublished statistical profile of child health was released in British Columbia in 1979. The Child Health Profile showed that, in 1961, the social causes of child and adolescent mortality in the province began to outstrip the traditional medical or biologic causes. Among adolescents, 85% of deaths were due to injury. This report caused a great stir in the province and influenced subsequent provincial injury-prevention strategies. Indeed, the rates of injury-related hospital admission and mortality for children and youth in British Columbia have shown important improvements since then.

I believe that this experience speaks to the importance of regionally and provincially based strategies and suggests that a national centre may not be the wisest or most effective approach.

Pless is correct in stating that the Canadian Hospitals Injury Reporting and Prevention Program (CHIRPP) is a world-renowned statistical base on childhood injury. But is it effectively used or adequately plugged in at the local, regional or provincial level? I suggest not, and I propose that such systems be encouraged to be more locally relevant before new, national centres are advocated. Without a locally or provincially based system to pressure them, the "sporadic

nature of the interest of professional bodies" will continue. Our federal system and the geographic size of our country dictate the need for a strong regional approach if we are to respond rapidly enough to safety issues such as drawstring-related strangulations. After all, Ms. Jackie Petruk and associates' article "Fatal asphyxiations in children involving drawstrings on clothing" (*Can Med Assoc J* 1996; 155:1417-9) emerged from such a strong, provincially based injury-prevention program.

Pless' editorial makes many important points. He is correct in stating the need for a national child and adolescent injury-prevention program but incorrect in emphasizing it without having adequately addressed the need for tougher measures at the regional and provincial levels, which must form the foundation of a national program.

Roger S. Tonkin, MD
Gabriola Island, BC
Received via e-mail

[The author responds:]

Although Dr. Tonkin and I agree on many points — perhaps many more than he realizes — his fundamental criticism is that government action is needed at the local (presumably, provincial) level, not at the national one. To buttress this argument he cites the landmark BC Child Health Profile that showed the importance of injuries, especially among adolescents in British Columbia, and the provincial government action that followed. He also notes that the injury statistics subsequently improved. Although I do not want to rain on his parade, so did the injury statistics for almost every other province, with or without provincial action.

Having said this, I hasten to add that I firmly believe that what British Columbia has done in this field is exemplary and that all provinces should quickly follow its example.

The central issue, however, is not regional or provincial versus national, as Tonkin suggests. I am sure he would agree that it is both. Where we disagree, I suspect, is over which should come first. Perhaps Tonkin thinks that the provinces really can do it alone. If so, let us examine some of the examples he gives. The first is CHIRPP, which he believes is not "effectively used or adequately plugged in" locally. The system was not designed primarily with local needs in mind. However, many researchers have made excellent use of local CHIRPP data for several important projects. Nevertheless, I agree that this system, or any other like it, should be made more locally relevant, but not necessarily before a national centre is advocated. What Tonkin must acknowledge is that there is immense symbolic significance in having a national focus, especially when the issue is universal. If all provincial health ministries took on this issue with the same commitment as some have shown, it would be reasonable to argue that a federal role was less important. But most provincial governments do not view injuries as a health problem, and many of the most important powers to control and prevent injuries lie with national bodies such as the federal departments of transport and justice.

Concerning the drawstring-related strangulations highlighted in the article by Petruk and associates, it is true that the findings emerged from a commendably strong provincial program; regrettably, neither this program nor the provincial government has the power to regulate the indus-



try responsible for the problem. That power remains in Ottawa with the Product Safety Bureau of Health Canada. Unless and until there is a national centre breathing down the neck of this branch, or similar pressure from many of the provinces, it will continue to pussy-foot around this problem and others like it.

Although Tonkin is correct in bringing me to task for not emphasizing the need for tougher measures at the provincial level, he is wrong in implying that I failed to do so because I think the federal government holds all the answers. The reality is that the power to take the tougher measures needed resides for the most part in Ottawa, not Victoria. If, and when, the provincial governments take this problem seriously and place it within the public health area, where it belongs, then there may be less need for a national centre of the kind I propose. However, in light of the US experience, there will always be a critical role, if only that of a standard-bearer, for the federal government.

I. Barry Pless, CM, MD

National Health Scientist
Professor of Pediatrics
and of Epidemiology and Biostatistics
McGill University
Montreal, Que.

Any of us who work in trauma treatment inevitably react emotionally to the issue of prevention of needless injuries. As Dr. Pless so clearly states in his editorial, a central structure is required if effective measures are to be taken in a way that affects all types of injuries.

Injury prevention provides an interesting paradox, because it is an area in which grassroots support is necessary. For example, the use of seatbelts and child seats in cars would have gone nowhere without social awareness, education in schools and the central prescription of standards requiring the use of seatbelts. The

legislative change has been made on a province-by-province basis because motor-vehicle legislation is a provincial area. None the less, standards for seatbelts are mandated federally. Finally, the circle is closed by a high rate of compliance with legislation, which has been encouraged by the grassroots approach.

The BC Injury Prevention Centre was started in 1987 as the Spinal Cord Injury Prevention Program because of our concern about the avoidable spinal-cord injuries we treated. The centre's strategies for prevention include research, education, legislation and enforcement. Legislation needs to be at the federal and provincial level. However, the field of injury prevention has been burgeoning in popularity and needs a measure of coalition and confederation. The multiplicity of injury-prevention bodies reflects an interest at the grassroots level that may not result in enhanced effectiveness.

We therefore suggest that a federal agency be responsible for ensuring standards, as Pless outlines in his editorial. National organizations such as the Smart Risk Foundation (formerly the Canadian Injury Prevention Foundation) may be best employed in providing common curricula and materials that can be used in all of the provinces. Provincial government agencies such as the BC Committee for Injury Prevention may be best suited to linking the legislation and enforcement at a provincial level with the implementation groups. Groups such as ours are best able to support local bodies such as schools or organizers of events that need presentation materials and supportive speakers. We can also monitor injury trends because we work within a major trauma centre, and we may therefore be the best group to prepare public service announcements to enhance social awareness of the need for injury prevention.

Peter C. Wing, MB, MSc

Medical Director
BC Injury Prevention Centre
Director, Spine Program
Vancouver Hospital
and Health Sciences Centre

Mary Ellen Lower

Director of Programs and Development
BC Injury Prevention Centre
Vancouver, BC

[One of the authors responds:]

I agree with Dr. Pless' editorial wholeheartedly, but I am confused by the letter from Dr. Wing and Ms. Lower.

The field of injury prevention is anemic, and this anemia is chronic. To be effective, practitioners of injury prevention must join the mainstream and become part of a true injury-control system. Injury control encompasses injury prevention, emergency medical services, acute care (trauma) and injury rehabilitation, all working together. Obviously, we must try to prevent the injury in the first place, but if we cannot, then we need a proper emergency-medical-services system that can respond rapidly and that has appropriately trained providers who can treat children as well as adults. Patients whose injuries threaten life or limb need to be taken to a facility that can deal with trauma, and these patients need rehabilitation from the moment they are injured. The system must include the ability to collect injury data and analyse it to better develop programs to prevent future injuries and to improve the outcomes for those injured.

As it stands, anyone can say he or she is an injury-control specialist, injury-prevention expert or injury consultant, and no one can dispute such a claim. The injury-control field needs accredited practitioners, leadership at the federal and provincial levels and appropriate resources to match the billions of dollars spent on injuries each year.

What we do not need is yet an-