



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-