

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Thursday, April 12, 1984 2:30 p.m.**

[The House met at 2:30 p.m.]

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill 209****Alberta College of Art Autonomy Act**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 209, the Alberta College of Art Autonomy Act.

Bill 209 would have the effect of establishing the Alberta College of Art as a separate public college, thus removing it from its current position within the administrative framework of the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology.

Mr. Speaker, I note that the Minister of Advanced Education is meeting with a delegation from the Alberta College of Art tomorrow, and I just want to help the minister out with his duties.

DR. BUCK: Do something, Dick.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member wish to have a motion of gratitude attached?

[Leave granted; Bill 209 read a first time]

**Bill 34****Corporation Statutes Amendment Act, 1984**

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being the Corporation Statutes Amendment Act, 1984.

In keeping with the philosophy of our government's desire to privatize sections of various departments where the private sector can do at least as good a job, if not better, than the departments presently are, we are privatizing the name search function of Corporate Registry. This statute accomplishes that.

[Leave granted; Bill 34 read a first time]

**Bill 212****Tax Refund and Provincial Grant  
Intercept Act**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce Bill 212, the Tax Refund and Provincial Grant Intercept Act.

This Bill is aimed at allowing the government to collect moneys owed it as a result of paying support for single mothers, children, and single women who have court awards of alimony and maintenance, yet their husbands refuse to pay. The Act will assist the government by allowing it to withhold provincial grants, which include tax refunds, from debtors who refuse to honour their responsibilities to their dependants.

Mr. Speaker, this is a parallel Act to the one that will be debated today, the Criminal Compensation Intercept Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 212 read a first time]

**Bill 258****An Act to Amend the  
Matrimonial Property Act**

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 258, An Act to Amend the Matrimonial Property Act.

The purpose of this Bill is to ensure that any future pension rights earned by either spouse during the marriage will become property to be distributed in a divorce action.

[Leave granted; Bill 258 read a first time]

**Bill Pr. 4****Dino Alberto Knott  
Adoption Termination Act**

MRS. KOPER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 4, the Dino Alberto Knott Adoption Termination Act.

The purpose of this Bill is to terminate a court order dated May 19, 1972, by which Dino Knott was adopted. In view of the fact that he was returned to the permanent care of the director of child welfare two years later, and now being an adult, he consents to this termination.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 4 read a first time]

**Bill Pr. 9****Jewish Community Centre of Edmonton Act**

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 9, the Jewish Community Centre of Edmonton Act.

The purpose would be to exempt the centre from municipal taxation.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 9 read a first time]

**Bill Pr. 5****Alberta Savings & Trust Company Act**

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 5, the Alberta Savings & Trust Company Act.

The purpose is to incorporate and establish a trust company.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 5 read a first time]

**Bill Pr. 3****Foothills Christian College Act**

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 3, the Foothills Christian College Act.

This is an Act of incorporation for what was formerly known as the Berean Bible College, located in the fine constituency of Calgary North Hill. It was formerly incorporated under the religious societies Act. As well as changing the name, this Act will allow the college to grant degrees in divinity.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 3 read a first time]

**head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, in view of the private member's motion being debated this afternoon, I thought it might be useful to file for the Legislative Assembly the letter I received from the chairman of the Edmonton Area Hospital Planning Council, regarding the matter of a children's hospital for Edmonton. I'm making extra copies available for all members of the Assembly.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you and to members of this Assembly an alderman from Ward 11 in the city of Calgary, former president of the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association, and a good personal friend, Alderman Craig Reid, who is seated in your gallery. I ask that we give him the usual welcome.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I also would like to introduce three gentlemen in your gallery: Mr. Dick Papworth, reeve of the county of Lethbridge; Mr. Smokie Jones, with the county of Vulcan; and Mr. Larry Helland, member of a road committee in southern Alberta. I ask you to welcome the gentlemen.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in introducing to members of the Assembly the president of the Municipal Districts and Counties of the province of Alberta and reeve of the municipal district of Willow Creek, Wallace Daley, and his wife, Melva. Would you please welcome them to the Assembly.

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Speaker, I'm very delighted to present to you, and through you to members of the House, 90 grade 6 students who came all the way from Holy Cross school in Calgary to be here with us today. At this time they're studying the levels of government. They're accompanied by their group leader, Lorelei Scribney; the [vice-principal] of Holy Cross school, Tony Gray; teachers Shaun Hanrahan, Sandra Blaine, and Ken Rivard; and five parents. They're in the members and public galleries, and I'd like them to stand and receive the traditional warm welcome of the House.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I also have some visiting school students that I'd like to introduce, again regular visitors from the Earl Grey elementary school deep in the heart of Calgary Elbow. The 30 grades 5 and 6 students are accompanied by group leader Paul Hoff. I ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you today 75 grade 5 students from Delwood school located in the constituency of Edmonton Belmont. Most of these students are in the Ukrainian bilingual program. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Horpyniuk, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Chebuk, and Mr. Chupka. They are seated in the public gallery. Would they please rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

**Interest Shielding Program**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the hon. Minister of Tourism and Small Business, and ask him what plans the government has to cope with the continuing wave of individual and small-business bankruptcies in the province.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, in clarification of the question asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I should point out that there isn't any question that a number of bankruptcies are occurring in Alberta as well as in other provinces in Canada. But on the positive side, the number of small businesses starting up in this province should be counted as well. We've got a

rough figure of around 14,000 new businesses that have come on the scene.

Now, one is obviously a part of the overall problem that has occurred, where you see some businesses going down. We have analysts and business development representatives available in the Department of Tourism and Small Business to assist, at their request, anyone interested in starting a small business.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has this government developed any special plans to announce with respect to the expiration of the heritage fund small business and farm interest shielding program, to take up the slack?

MR. ADAIR: Two things, Mr. Speaker. The interest shielding program for the small business and farm community is probably one of the most successful programs we had. The deadline for applications was February 29, and to date some \$67 million has been paid out to the farm and small-business community.

In the budget presented by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, one of the other exciting aspects of the Department of Tourism and Small Business will be the program for formation of venture capital corporations in the province to assist in the creation of equity pools of capital, because one of the problems we had brought to our attention is the extremely heavy debt loading of a number of the businesses in the province.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Given the evidence of rising interest rates, why did the government not choose to extend the small business and farm interest shielding program for another period of time?

MR. ADAIR: At this particular point in time, Mr. Speaker, the interest rates in the private lending institutions are running around 12 percent, 12.5 percent, 13 percent, to 13.5 percent, and that is under the actual rate we were shielding the program down to. So there was no need to provide additional assistance, other than the fact that we had the other programs coming on Stream and in place to assist them as well.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Given the minister's federal compatriot's concern about higher interest rates, will the government of Alberta give an undertaking to have contingency plans, which would include the continuation of this program, should his federal confrere's predictions about interest rates prove true?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to state that this particular government keeps a very close eye on what the future may hold, and that nothing we have is written in stone. We'd be prepared to adjust should something occur in the future that has not as yet occurred.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, does that openness include, as a policy option at this stage, the continuation of the two programs I mentioned?

MR. ADAIR: The deadline for the interest shielding programs was February 29, 1984, and the interest rates at this particular point in time are lower than the protection rate that was there for the small-business and farm community. Having said that, as long as they are lower, we wouldn't be moving to create an additional program, but we are watching it very closely.

### Economic Strategy Paper

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the Premier or the hon. Minister of Advanced Education — in any event, whoever is supposed to be developing this economic strategy we've heard about for the province. I gather it's the hon. Minister of Advanced Education. When are we going to hear from the government on this proposed policy?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, for about the fourth time in this session, I think, we'll clarify that. We said the spring. That was mentioned in both the throne speech and the budget speech. It is not a document prepared by one minister. It will be presented as a government white paper, if you like, when the time comes to make it public.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier or the Government House Leader. Since I gather it's going to be in the spring and since the Premier just indicated that it is a white paper, will there be a government motion on the Order Paper to allow full debate of that white paper this spring?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, probably not in the spring, but I'm sure an appropriate time will be found in House business to discuss the matter during the fall session.

### Education Quality

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Education is with regard to a recent study, completed in March 1984, which looks at the effects of the economic recession on the quality of education. One of the alarming findings of this report is that because of the economic recession, Alberta has experienced the greatest increase in student problems and, along with British Columbia, has shown the greatest deterioration in terms of quality of education in the last two years. I am wondering if the minister is aware of the report. What investigations will the minister be taking to either confirm or clarify these findings?

MR. KING: We are aware of the report, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question — a very obvious one, from the answer. What types of actions will the minister take, or does he feel at this time that the findings of the report are incorrect?

MR. MARTIN: He just believes in awareness.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, there are no findings in the report that weren't previously known to the community. There are no new discoveries. There are observations about situations and circumstances in the province. There is no conclusion that those are related to the circumstances in the educational system, and in fact the evidence offered is that the circumstances are derived from conditions in the community beyond the responsibility of the Department of Education or of the local school boards.

So the question is whether or not the school system, as such, should accept responsibility for remedying conditions in the community that are beyond the terms of reference of the school system. I think the position of the government — and I would have thought the position of the hon. member opposite — is that the responsibility for dealing with those conditions lies with everybody in the community, particularly the private sector, business, voluntary organizations, and the family.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, that was certainly quite an answer. It is indicated in the report that the cutbacks — the restraint in terms of budget — which affected classroom sizes and support for professional development, have had a direct effect on the morale of the teachers. I would think that's under the purview of the Department of Education as well as local school boards. What is the minister doing with regard to that concern, or does the minister agree with the concern?

MR. KING: We don't agree with the concern, Mr. Speaker. In our view it is a *non sequitur*. The conclusion does not follow from the evidence that is offered.

### Water Management — Battle River

MR. FISCHER: To the Minister of the Environment. What is the status of the Environment studies to increase the water supply in the Battle River?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise that the department has recently completed its phase two studies, which looked at the possibility of a reservoir in the Battle River system at the Gwynne site. The original studies started in 1977 at the request of the local community, with Department of Economic Development interest, to augment supply in the Battle River system, to supply not only municipal needs but future industrial needs. The latest phase two studies ruled that it was too expensive to look at a reservoir at the Gwynne site due to complex geotechnical conditions and that, because of the small watershed area in the Battle River and the uncertain water supply there, a reservoir would not meet the longer term supply needs.

What was recommended in the Battle River phase two planning basin studies was not to proceed with the Gwynne reservoir but to look at augmenting flows from the North Saskatchewan River system. That would basically involve a feasibility study to see whether or not we could augment flows to meet community and industrial needs in the Battle River system from the North Saskatchewan. It would involve a very small pipeline, looking at flows from 35 to 100 cubic feet per second. That is what is planned in the phase three studies.

Mr. Speaker, I should note that what is planned is intrabasin transfer which is spelled i-n-t-r-a, and not interbasin transfer, spelled i-n-t-e-r. Intrabasin transfer, i-n-t-r-a, basically means transferring within a river basin system. Any augmented flows from the North Saskatchewan system into the Battle system would then end up back in the North Saskatchewan River system.

MR. FISCHER: A supplementary. Are we going to proceed with implementing these recommendations?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is our plan to proceed with the phase three feasibility study.

### Native Publication Grants

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister responsible for Native Affairs. Can the minister confirm that his officials have told *Kainai News*, of Stand Off, that that newspaper must include up to four pages on the minister's department in each issue if they are to continue to receive provincial grants?

MR. PAHL: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that allegation.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, if he checks with his department, I am sure he will find it's true.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Why ask the question?

MR. MARTIN: My question is: would the minister indicate to the Assembly the reason for this type of policy decision? [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: I have great difficulty with a question that asks the reason for something that apparently isn't happening.

MR. MARTIN: I'll try to find a minister who knows what's going on in his department. I will try the minister of propaganda, in charge of the Public Affairs Bureau. My question to the minister: is it now the policy of this government that these sorts of propaganda strings should be attached to all provincial grants to native publications?

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I guess I could characterize that question with a couple of, I hope acceptable, adjectives, one of which would be tendentious. It really is provoking debate. But rather than respond in kind, let me remind the Member for Edmonton Norwood that the word "propaganda" has a very interesting root. It in fact originated with the Vatican several hundred years ago and implied the spreading of the faith. [interjections] Mr. Speaker, I am more than happy to acknowledge that I am prepared at any time to spread the faith.

MR. MARTIN: I'm glad that you're ready to spread the faith, but please do it with Conservative money rather than government money.

Mr. Speaker, my question is, has the minister been developing government materials for inclusion in native publications?

MR. PAYNE: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Is the minister aware of any other departments that the Public Affairs Bureau is looking into for use in a similar manner, spreading government propaganda?

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could supplement the answer. I was really hoping for a question that I could answer. That might have led to my hesitance.

MR. MARTIN: I didn't have all day, Milt.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the concern the hon. member has raised, and I think it is probably from a news report that I have had available.

I simply remind the Assembly that the mandate of the native affairs secretariat is to ensure that native people have access to the same level and quality of services as other Albertans. It's also to enhance the level of functioning of native communities, organizations, and individuals within Alberta society.

On that basis, the contract that the secretariat engages in with native communications — newspapers, organizations — was changed, to try to remove some of the strings involved in their funding relationship, to provide them with more of a contractual relationship, and also to provide an opportunity to respond to the concern I have had expressed to me by native people that they weren't really aware of the programs available to them. Surely if we have two native newspapers, one in the

north and one in the south, they should have an opportunity to better provide that information.

So there has been a change. I think it has been for the better, Mr. Speaker. But certainly if there are concerns by the native organizations — I believe one has signed a contract and views the changes positively; the other apparently doesn't — I guess it's something we would be willing to negotiate further.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister responsible for Native Affairs. I am glad his memory came back. Has the minister reviewed the option of taking out paid ads in this publication instead of directing what sort of news the paper should publish?

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, we were trying to follow a model that I understand is fairly common in the private sector, wherein an advertiser will contract for so many pages a month, a week, or whatever, not necessarily taking advantage of using that space. What we hoped to do was provide the native news organizations with an opportunity to develop the information about government programs in a way that would be the most effective communication to their readers. In that sense we were willing to work with the native media groups to develop those stories. Failing their lack of interest in that, or lack of resources, it could indeed be in effect a paid advertisement but in reserved space. So the hon. member is almost being caught up in the free-enterprise system here, and I compliment him for his perceptions.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you very much. I always appreciate a compliment.

I'd like to direct my next supplementary question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. It has to do with the answer from the minister without portfolio about spreading the faith. What review is currently under way of the suggestion made by this minister in this House on October 25, 1978, that we should erect a statue of the current Premier on the Legislature lawns?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will read that particular *Hansard* ...

MR. MARTIN: I have. I've got it right here.

MR. HORSMAN: ... he will understand that the premier to whom I was referring on that occasion, in the days when I was a private member, was the premier of the day who was responsible for bringing the Natural Resources Transfer Act to Alberta, which was in 1930. The premier of the day was the hon. Premier Brownlee.

I don't know how much that relates to my current ministerial responsibilities, Mr. Speaker, but I certainly welcome the opportunity to assist the Member for Edmonton Norwood in his reading. I think he will find that I at no time suggested that we erect a bronze statue to the current Premier. We shall leave that to future generations.

#### Education — Exceptional Children

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Minister of Education has to do with the \$20 million budget allocation for learning needs in handicapped, gifted, and other special programs. Is the minister in a position to indicate what proportion of this budget will be available for gifted children — just an approximation?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, it will be in the order of \$1.5 million. I'll be able to provide the hon. gentleman with more detail tomorrow, during consideration of my estimates.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that that is the approximate figure, does the minister consider that this is going to be adequate to cover the entire province for all the schools that have gifted children?

MR. KING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Bearing in mind the fact that since this is the first year in which provincial government support is being provided for programs for the gifted and talented, there are a number of other things that must be done by way of preparation before programming itself can actually be provided in schools throughout the province. So, mindful of the fact that we will be undertaking a lot of other initiatives this year, I consider it to be sufficient funding.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate to the school boards and the Assembly if these funds have to be applied for or will automatically be going to schools throughout the province?

MR. KING: Provided that school boards meet certain very general conditions, the assistance will be available to boards throughout the province. The department has been working on the mechanics for the provision of the financial assistance, and decisions have now been made respecting the delivery of this financial assistance. Representatives of the department will be meeting with boards tonight and tomorrow in communities across the province and describing to them the detail of the program. Written material will be going out to all boards in the province the week after next, I expect.

#### University Entrance Requirements

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to the Minister of Advanced Education. The University of Alberta board of governors is to meet tomorrow to settle the question of quotas for first-year university students. What plans are being considered by the Department of Advanced Education to monitor the effect of a quota system on freshmen?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, that's a fairly contemporary question. I must advise the House that we did spend some time on this particular question in my estimates on Monday.

But for clarification and to address the question specifically, I want to advise that, as I said in my estimates, we will be putting in place an informal co-ordination process which will take advantage of the information flowing to all the institutions and record the numbers showing up through various applications to these institutions. The point is not to direct the way in which students enter various institutions or to really deal too much with the autonomy question but, first of all, at least to have some idea as to what the student numbers are and, secondly, to attempt to eliminate the duplication of applications from the numbers in the pool of students, so we have some very good numbers as to what might be expected in terms of enrollments this year.

I should go on to say that we're doing this simply because of the view that there may be a shortfall of student spaces across Alberta, a point with which I disagreed and gave reasons for in my estimates. But I want to go on to say, Mr. Speaker, that they do not intend to centralize the process, as you find in other provinces; simply to monitor.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, if significant numbers of students are turned away this year, would the department consider setting up a central agency that would receive applications from univer-

sity students and route those students to an institution that has spaces available?

MR. SPEAKER: Might I suggest that the hon. member's representation involves something hypothetical? Perhaps he'd like to deal with it if the eventuality comes to pass.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Might we revert briefly to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

#### head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

(reversion)

MR. McPHERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I notice the arrival in the public gallery of some 40 grade 10 students from Lindsay Thurber Comprehensive high school in Red Deer and, through you, I would like to introduce them to all hon. members. Our students are accompanied today by teachers Mr. Al Epp, Mr. Jack Friesen, and Mr. Kelly Goheen. I ask them to rise and receive the traditional welcome of the House.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I don't know who stood up before when I introduced the Earl Grey elementary class, but apparently they're here again, in a different gallery. Just to make certain that they are properly introduced, I'd like to introduce, through you, to members of the Legislature the grades 5 and 6 students from Earl Grey elementary school in the Calgary Elbow constituency. They're accompanied by Mr. Dan Scott, Mrs. Jane Geier, Mrs. Loraine Renwick, and Paul Hoff. I'd like to ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that questions 165 and 168 and motions for returns 160, 161, 162, and 167 stand and retain their places on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

#### head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

169. On behalf of Mr. Notley, Mr. Martin moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing copies of the market assessment development plan, 1984-85, prepared by the corporate planning and analysis section of the program services division of the Alberta Housing Corporation in October and November 1983.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I request that hon. members of the Assembly not support Motion 169. The document referred to is an internal document, a compilation of information that is used both by the Alberta Housing Corporation and by me in the development of policy. The document in itself is not a reflection of policy but advice to the government. Consistent with the treatment of internal discussion papers, I request that members of the Assembly reject Motion No. 169.

[Motion lost]

### head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

219. Moved by Mr. Martin:

Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the government, as a matter of urgent priority, to undertake the planning and budgetary processes required to provide for the construction and subsequent operation of a northern Alberta children's hospital, to be situated in the city of Edmonton and to open no later than January 1, 1987; and, in undertaking the required processes, to liaise closely with the Northern Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to bring forward Motion No. 219. It's a rather clear-cut motion, and I'm glad that the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care is here.

In bringing forth this motion, we've heard varying viewpoints about the need, if you like, for a northern Alberta children's hospital. First of all, I'd like to look at that particular need — whether or not we do need it and how high a priority it should be. I see that the minister of hospitals said in this letter — I've had time to browse through it quickly — that he still feels it is probably a low priority.

Mr. Speaker, the minister is well aware that there is a lot of debate about that particular resolution — whether it is a low priority or whether it should be a higher priority. The minister is well aware that we on this side believe that it should be a high priority. I have a number of reasons, and I don't want to bore the House. But if we're going to demand a children's hospital, I think it's important that there be a legitimate reason. I would agree with the minister about that.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to a couple of studies. One is the RPM Planning study. I was rather amazed when the minister said the other day that he wasn't sure where this study came from. I believe he indicated in *Hansard* that he had sort of heard about the study but it wasn't fresh in his mind. It's rather ironic because, on February 8, 1983, the minister sent out a news release about this particular study. So I'm just jogging the minister's memory about that.

More important, Mr. Speaker, is what is occurring, what the study says. I hope the minister is now aware of what it says. They have a number of points that I think we should lay out here in the House, so that at least *Hansard* records it and the minister has a chance to talk about it. It's a big report, but I'll nail it down to about eight points that I think are relevant to this debate. Number one, it says that "Edmonton ... lags behind other cities which have a children's hospital" with respect to the availability of paediatric subspecialists. Number two,

the lack of paediatric subspecialists will continue to have a negative impact .... the only change that can be made to improve upon the existing quality of paediatric research, teaching and service, is to attract more ... subspecialists by consolidating most of Edmonton's paediatric beds into one [central location].

Number three, they go on to say that a children's hospital would create

a volume of tertiary care patients that would be sufficiently large to challenge and maintain the skills of a variety of paediatric subspecialists.

And they go on to list them.

Four — and I think this is a key point — there is the need for autonomy for those who treat children. ... if paediatrics is to grow and develop, it requires

greater ... funding ... this is not possible within a general hospital environment.

And, as acknowledged by the minister, "there are presently too many pediatric beds in Edmonton." By the question I asked, I understand that now, with the Mill Woods hospital, there will be more. They say that "consolidation and reduction of paediatric beds is desirable". Certainly just that aspect of it would be a cost-saving method.

They go on to say that

small viable paediatric units of 20 to 25 beds should be maintained in each of the general hospitals ... to provide primary and secondary levels of care.

They talk about approximately 250 to 300 pediatric beds in one facility.

Then the key point:

... a Children's Hospital, free-standing or otherwise, would become the tertiary care paediatric facility in Edmonton and Northern Alberta. ... critically ill [children] brought to the emergency area of a general hospital, would be stabilized and then transported to the Children's Hospital.

They make the point, I think an important one, that fundraising for a children's hospital is an easy task since the public is sympathetic to child health care. Mr. Speaker, that's the crux of one report.

We have another one that I know the minister is aware of, done by Harry W. Bain, a professor of pediatrics at the University of Toronto. I believe this report was commissioned in 1979 by the Northern Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation. They come to some similar, though slightly different, conclusions. Three or four of them are worth repeating here.

Number one, they say that it is imperative to create a first-class pediatric intensive care unit with the necessary backup resources, including pediatric surgeons. They clearly say:

There should be an administratively autonomous children's hospital.

This should be situated adjacent to, and physically and functionally attached to, an adult hospital for certain key functions.

Interlocking, if you like.

They also go on to say, agreeing with the previous report, that 250 to 300 beds would be ideal. They talk about an age limit of 18, to also provide services for adolescents. They say that the "research facilities must be an integral part of the new development, both physically and functionally". They make the point that Edmonton has no separate emergency facility for children in any of the general hospitals. They say:

The most compelling argument for a children's hospital is that by a process of natural selection of staff, everyone ... is 100% dedicated to children.

... centralization of facilities [makes it] easier to recruit staff with the necessary expertise to look after children.

I think that's a very important point.

They also make the sociological point, if you like, that children's hospitals are looked at as a community resource, with pride.

They become the focal point for the [meeting] of standards of child health ...

Mr. Speaker, those are the two major studies. I believe both of them clearly lay out the need for a children's hospital in northern Alberta.

The minister has referred to the Edmonton Area Hospital Planning Council, and we seem to get conflicting advice from them. I recognize what the minister is saying. It's in the letter of February 20, where they're basically saying that it shouldn't be a priority; it should be directed to the addition of long-term

acute care. But there seems to be some confusion, because we recently saw some publicity — and maybe the minister can update us as to what conversations he's had — that the head of the Edmonton Area Hospital Planning Council, Dr. Cameron, said that gains in extended care and acute care hospitals in Edmonton mean a children's hospital is now a higher priority. Perhaps at some point we'll find out what that means. I hope it means it's now the top priority, because that is certainly a statement since the letter of February 20, which was distributed in the House today.

When we go back to a letter of October 28, 1982, from the then chairman of the Edmonton Area Hospital Planning Council to the hon. minister, Mr. Russell, there seems to be some confusion as to what they're doing. Two key points were stated:

... the Edmonton Area Hospital Planning Council supports the concept of a Children's Centre, emphasizing tertiary care, research, and teaching.

That the Centre be located adjacent to a general hospital. I'm confused. They seem to change their priorities. Maybe the minister can update us on that particular point.

Besides the studies and the documented evidence, there are other reasons I believe we do need a children's hospital, either separate or interlocking, whichever is the cheaper; I'll go along with that. Let's look at what's been happening in recent times. Number one, we're losing subspecialists in this province. They are moving away. The University of Alberta hospital lost a pediatric intensivist, Dr. Katz, in December. In March the U of A hospital lost a neonatologist, who moved to the Ottawa children's hospital. Currently there is no pediatric cardiac surgeon. There are only two pediatric cardiologists, whereas at least four are needed for the population served. There is no pediatric intensive care unit.

Mr. Speaker, there are some other points that have to be made. The minister said — and rightfully so; we've referred to it in these reports — that we have too many pediatric beds. But in the next breath, the minister indicated to us that Mill Woods will probably add to that number. That does not make sense. What they're saying is: cut down, but put it in a smaller facility. It seems outrageous to me that we're flying some 300 children per year out of the province to children's hospitals in Toronto and other jurisdictions. I would point out — and I will come back to this point — that that in itself is very expensive, and it goes on year after year after year.

There are some other points we could refer to. In 1983 the Education Health Environment Study of Open Heart and Cardiovascular Services in Alberta recommended:

That the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care give priority to the planning of a pediatric care program to serve the whole province. This program should be separated from the adult program due to the demonstrated unique requirements of pediatric cardiac care ... It is also recommended that the pediatric ... care program be located [to] a major teaching centre and that the teaching centre be one of those located in Edmonton.

I could go on and on with points trying to make the case for having a children's hospital.

I know the other part of it, besides the loss of subspecialists. I think that when this government campaigned on open government, one of the things we politicians and legislators are supposed to do is listen to the public. It seems to me that in Edmonton it's overwhelming that people are prepared to spend their taxpayers' money on the Northern Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation. As people go around their ridings, I think there are examples of that. At least, people tell me that, unless other Edmonton MLAs are getting a different perspective.

But I think the most recent evidence, Mr. Speaker, something I and other people in the city were involved in, was the telethon: a tremendous reaction showing community support for the Northern Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation. It's my understanding that they have now collected nearly \$1 million in donations. I commend them. I know the minister is pleased with that, and so am I. But it's going to take a long time. I might point out that the recent telethon resulted in some \$565,752 in pledges.

So I'm suggesting that in terms of priorities of government spending, Mr. Speaker, this is something the people of northern Alberta want. They're prepared to pay for it.

DR. BUCK: Don't worry. They'll promise it before the next election, Ray.

MR. MARTIN: The next election might be too late for some people, but I expect that might be it.

The question that always comes back with this government — and I think we should answer it — is: how are we going to pay for it? Besides going through, as we do from time to time in this Legislature, the amount of frivolous spending that this government puts out — and I won't embarrass them again by talking about Kananaskis park and trips and all the rest of it. I went through the budget and tried to show them where they could cut half a billion in extra expenses they don't need. But I won't even go into that. What I would like to do is take a look at some recent developments right in the minister's own department.

I suggest to the minister that there are a couple of ways we can look at paying for this hospital, and paying for it quickly, along with the operating costs. If we don't want to get into these silly fights with Ottawa over transfer payments and our rights to have user fees and double billing, it seems to me that now — and the minister seems to be acknowledging it — the \$14 million to \$20 million we were talking about for extra billing is somehow perhaps up to \$60 million. We really don't know how much it's going to cost in the long run. I take it about \$58 million or \$60 million on those transfer payments. It would not take very long, a matter of three or four years, to build a hospital with those transfer payments. I think the people of Alberta would accept that much more than a government fighting to keep user fees and extra billing — a much better way to spend our money than that.

I also look at one other item that deals with this whole area. I look at the budget, Mr. Speaker, and find that there's some \$22 million going out of province, mainly to fly children around, the 300 I was talking about — some \$22 million a year. If you put that \$22 million with the possible \$60 million, you're up to about \$72 million. That's not even talking about the other range of government expenses. So what I'm saying is that there is a will.

I know that in the last election — and I talked to the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry and he said that he was misquoted, he really didn't mean that. But I know that all of us, whether this was true or not — if that was true, they certainly didn't indicate that they weren't going to put this as a high priority. They certainly left it with the people in the province, and especially in Edmonton, that there was going to be a children's hospital. If you ask the voters in this city, in northern Alberta, and in the riding of Clover Bar, almost all the people thought this government was committed to a northern Alberta children's hospital. But now we have the minister saying that it's a low priority.

DR. BUCK: It'll be like Grande Prairie: every four years they promise it.

MR. MARTIN: That's right. The hon. Member for Clover Bar says that maybe it will be like Grande Prairie.

But people get tired of hearing promises election after election. They're not necessarily going to hear that there's going to be a northern Alberta children's hospital next time and rush out to vote Conservative. I expect that, as the Member for Clover Bar said, there might be some announcement again for the election; just might be. Maybe it won't be an announcement from the minister. Maybe some other backbencher will sort of muse about it. But nobody will clear up, as happened in the last election, that it isn't a high priority. If the government were honest, and if the minister saw this in the news — it was front page in the election. If he was being honest about it, he should have sat down and said: no, it's not a high priority; we have other priorities. He said that immediately after the election, when it was safe and they had their 75 out of 79 seats.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the minister and to members of the Assembly that it is very clear that people want this hospital. They expect it. They expected it from the last election, and we as legislators should get on with it. For the government to plead poverty, when we're spending money on all sorts of other frivolous activities — and I've just pointed out that we could save perhaps another \$72 million — the people of Edmonton and northern Alberta are not going to accept that argument any more. I think it comes down to this, Mr. Speaker. I think I've shown the need. If the minister wants to talk to people in the area, he will know they think there's a need. The AMA thinks there's a need. Almost everybody but this government thinks there's a need for a northern Alberta children's hospital. If the government refuses and pleads poverty, it is just not going to wash with people any longer. It's a matter of priorities. It's not that this government is not spending money; they are spending lots of it. But what people are questioning is where they are spending it. They get very angry when they see money being wasted on golf courses and sand and all the rest of the things, yet we don't have the money for a children's hospital that is so vastly needed in this city and this area.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, if the government wants to continue with this stalling on something desperately needed in this community, we as one in the Official Opposition will take them on head to head in every riding in Edmonton and northern Alberta in the next election and make it a major election issue.

Thank you.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, I can't help but rise to the occasion of Motion 219 and the invitation to take this issue to the people, because the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood suggested in his remarks that Edmonton Mill Woods general hospital wasn't needed and wasn't a priority.

DR. BUCK: He didn't say that.

MR. PAHL: That's the way I read it, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: You just hear it the way you want to hear it.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, I would first of all point out that the hon. member is acting like we're in Committee of Supply. When he reads *Hansard*, I hope he will appreciate that the Mill Woods general hospital responds to the need for acute care in the southeast part of Edmonton, as well as to the need for auxiliary care beds in the Edmonton area.

DR. BUCK: That area's been promised four times too.

MR. PAHL: If the hon. Member for Clover Bar hasn't received an invitation, I'll take this occasion to invite him out to the

ground breaking ceremonies for the Edmonton Mill Woods general hospital next Saturday at 1:30. If he wants to come around and visit the beautiful constituency of Edmonton Mill Woods about August or September, he will start seeing steel going into the ground.

DR. BUCK: Let's hope so.

MR. PAHL: That will create some employment, and I hope it will spill off into his constituency as well as the rest of them.

DR. BUCK: You weren't even here when they started Grande Prairie. It's a good thing the Queen came, or you would have never started Grande Prairie.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, I guess the establishment of priorities has been well considered in the Mill Woods case. It meets the Edmonton Area Hospital Planning Council's priority, pointing out that there's a need for acute care beds in certain areas of our region; it also addresses itself to the need for auxiliary beds. I note that the construction of the Mill Woods general hospital and the closure of parts of the Edmonton General hospital will result in a total increase of 150 acute care beds across the city.

Mr. Speaker, just for the hon. members who raised the motion, the pediatric beds planned for Edmonton Mill Woods general hospital will be 20. Out of 500 beds, that's less than 5 percent of the beds. The obstetrical newborn bed capacity . . . [interjection] I'm not a statistician, and I'm not a doctor.

DR. BUCK: You're not a speaker either.

MR. PAHL: I'll keep practising.

AN HON. MEMBER: We'll listen to you when you get up, Walt.

MR. PAHL: There are 50 beds planned for that; that's 10 percent of the total. I would hardly submit that given that design and advice from the experts, the \$140 million dedicated to the Mill Woods general hospital, which will create 1,150 man-years of employment that is badly needed throughout the Edmonton area, and once it's in full capacity will require something like 1,500 staff — that's support staff, administrative staff, nurses, nurses' aides, technicians, and doctors. Mind you, some are going to move over from the General, so those won't all be new positions but they will certainly respond to the lack of employment in our area as well.

I'd like to speak to the fact that in the Edmonton area we have some 530 pediatric beds, whose average historical occupancy rate has been about 55 percent. Another way of turning that around is to say that at any point in time 45 percent, roughly 225 or 250, of those beds are empty. The Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care made the commitment that when the children's hospital is needed here in Edmonton, it will be built. He is relying on the advice of the experts to do that, and that's really what has been provided in the letter the minister tabled today. Just so the information can be part of the record, with the indulgence of the Chair and the Assembly, I would like to read this letter into *Hansard*. The letter is addressed to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care.

MR. SPEAKER: Surely it could be tabled, but I think it might be slightly irregular if it were read into the record. I think that is a custom that obtains south of the border.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, without reading the letter into the record, I would simply like to highlight two essential points



from the communication. It says the priorities of the department should be directed to the addition of long-term care beds and to the upgrading and redevelopment of existing acute care facilities within the Edmonton area. The second point they make is with respect to a specialized children's hospital. They indeed say it should be considered at an appropriate time, in relation to the construction of the new acute care facilities I spoke of earlier, and "combined with a rationalization of the existing pediatric facilities and programs". That is a point I would like to emphasize somewhat.

Mr. Speaker, I support, as I know my colleagues do, an acute care children's hospital for the Edmonton area when it is justified. I do not support a children's hospital at the expense of pediatric obstetrical newborn facilities in Edmonton Mill Woods, or in fact any of the other general hospitals in the area, for the noncritical medical needs of young Albertans. I refer to the normal breaks, scrapes, and bruises of childhood and, I suppose, noncomplicated births.

It's very important to be able to have family nearby. I submit that a drive across town when the family is available after work or during the rush hour is every bit as great a problem as having your loved ones in a hospital in Fort Saskatchewan when you're driving from Two Hills. The time frame would be about the same. I think that has to be kept in mind.

Mr. Speaker, I am also aware of the unique needs of children and what a specialized children's hospital can bring to them. Certainly the prospect of medical treatment in a strange place outside the home, the hospital, can be quite traumatic. There are also the concerns for having facilities that are of the scale of the patient. For example, my understanding is that for acute medical problems, when you're sampling and analyzing blood, if you take samples from a young child and have to use facilities designed for adults, it can be a draining experience — I guess that's the best way to say it in layman's terms — and very difficult.

I also support the undertakings of the Northern Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation, particularly their undertakings with respect to providing funding for a research unit. In fact Superman, who arrives in Alberta by helicopter, and I turned the sod a couple of years back on a Smart home located in Edmonton Mill Woods contributed by Nu-West homes in support of their efforts. Certainly that's an appropriate response, and it's good to see volunteers involved in the activity. But I think you have to make sure you're in the right time frame.

I would like to close with perhaps a few personal observations. In speaking to the motion, I point out that it might be well motivated, but I would certainly question how well considered it is. The motion completely ignores the reality of the number of beds, in effect the five competing facilities for tertiary care within the city, and the fact that until that is rationalized, what we do with the existing facilities is not addressed. Do we add another 300 beds to 532 beds? Do we say we'll build a new one and have the Royal Alex, the University of Alberta, the Glenrose, and the Misericordia all providing the same levels of care?

Mr. Speaker, I would also submit that a building alone does not make a children's hospital. Certainly the tragedy of the Hospital for Sick Children in Toronto points out that you can't say that every person inside a children's hospital is there in the interests of the children.

Mr. Speaker, we also have to think about the idea that a children's hospital, the building in itself, will contribute to the subspecialties that have been needed as pediatric subspecialties. I think there's a reality we have to consider here. The population of Alberta is — let's round up — 2.4 million, and perhaps we could add another 600,000 people as the service area. Assuming

we had a children's hospital in Edmonton, we would have a population of approximately 3 million available to be serviced by two children's hospitals. In order for a subspecialty or a sub-subspecialty to become effective. I would assume they have to have some reasonable prospect of practising their trade or their specialty on a fairly frequent basis. I don't know what the illustrative examples would be in that regard, but I'm sure my colleague could help there and perhaps he will. I think we have to make sure we don't delude ourselves into thinking that providing a building will automatically solve all the problems.

Mr. Speaker, I also find a little bit of a problem with the motion in the sense that, as I said, he hasn't addressed the surplus beds we have now. He hasn't, in effect, belled the cat with respect to the realities of having five hospital boards in the city who have competing interests. Perhaps I could make the personal observation that when we're dealing with the provision of hospital services within urban areas, perhaps we have more hospital boards than we need. I'm pleased to see that with respect to the Edmonton Mill Woods hospital, it will be managed by the existing Edmonton General hospital board and of course managed and operated by the order of Grey Nuns.

The other thing I found a little bit surprising, inasmuch as there hasn't been an identified need by the specialists' body that has the mandate to undertake the hospital, is that there hasn't even been the plan, location, or identification of the group that would undertake the hospital, and the mover of the motion is planning for a 1987 completion date. In the business of organizing and planning hospitals, I think there's about a two- to three-year lead time in terms of all the things you need to do before you start construction. If I could just take the Mill Woods experience again — the hospital that's going to be built for sure — it will take about 36 months to construct from the time the ground is broken, if you will, until the ribbon is cut. Even with the best of efforts, the hon. member who proposed the motion has addressed a goal that has been accepted and supported by this government, given the right time frame and the appropriate time, yet he's avoided all the steps in between. There are many, and they're important to be addressed.

Mr. Speaker, I summarize by saying again that I take some umbrage to the idea that the Edmonton Mill Woods hospital could in any way be characterized as having a frivolous spending element to it or that it is not addressing the well-defined needs of the Edmonton area with respect to hospital services. I would therefore urge all members to defeat this perhaps well-motivated but certainly ill-conceived motion.

Thank you.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to briefly take part in the debate this afternoon. I'd like to say to the hon. Member for Edmonton Mill Woods that this typifies to me what the average, ordinary Edmonton MLAs do in this Legislature: they forget their constituents. They don't listen to Edmonton Telephones in the dispute between Edmonton Telephones and AGT, and they don't listen to what the people are telling them out on the streets and out on the hustings. They're just putting earplugs in their ears and merrily following the leader. Whatever the priorities council tells them, they go along with it. That's not what members are elected to do in this Assembly. They are elected to stand in this Assembly and do what the people ask them to do.

I find it very distasteful to have this government, before the last election, dragging the red herring in front of the people in this province, inferring they were going to build a children's hospital.

MR. HIEBERT: Never.

DR. BUCK: Never, the hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar says. They certainly did.

They have done it in Grande Prairie the last four elections. They have inferred, they have promised a hospital in Grande Prairie. As I said in heckling the hon. member, it's a good thing the Queen came to Alberta for the Commonwealth Games; otherwise we would never have had a ground turning ceremony at that time. So all you anti-monarchists at least be glad the Queen came, because we're going to get a hospital in Grande Prairie.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I take exception to that remark.

DR. BUCK: Go ahead, take exception. You can get your chance to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to tell this Assembly they're playing follow the leader too much. They're not listening to what their people are telling them. Hon. member, you can get up and debate right after I've sat down if you wish to.

AN HON. MEMBER: Go ahead, you're not doing a very good job of it.

DR. BUCK: I can say the Legislature's loss was Calgary's gain when we made that switch.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that what we're trying to tell this government, what the people are trying to tell this government, is that we don't have to go first class, Cadillac class. A specialized children's hospital can be built in stages. Let's start. Of course all doctors and professional people who are opposed to this have a vested interest. We're not going to take all the children's hospital beds out of the general hospitals. The ordinary procedures will still be done in hospitals. The hon. Member for Edson knows that. That's been done historically for years; it will keep on being done.

I'd like to say to the hon. Minister responsible for Native Affairs that the hon. Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park and I have been fighting for a hospital out in the Sherwood Park area for years. It's been promised to the hon. Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park for the last three elections, 12 years. We're not arguing the fact that that facility is needed. It certainly is needed. It will serve a need in that part of the city, and I'm sure all members of the Assembly and the people of Edmonton welcome it.

I'd just like to say to the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood that the hon. Bob Clark, Leader of the Opposition at the time, brought a resolution to this Assembly basically stating what the resolution states today. At that time we wanted to have that as a gift from the people of this province to themselves for the 75th anniversary instead of frittering away \$75 million the way the government did.

MR. MARTIN: Good idea.

DR. BUCK: What monument do we have? Are there any monuments? At least the good government in this province built the two auditoria, one in Edmonton and one in Calgary, that people are proud of. So that same thing should have been done in Edmonton and area. The northern part of the province's share of the anniversary should have been put in a children's hospital. We could have bronzed the Premier on the front steps if the hon. Member for Medicine Hat wanted, and said: look, this is what we did for you and for the 75th anniversary present.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the hon. Member for Edson will be able to tell us the difference. I've read his speech from 1975 when he was waffling around, trying to defend the indefensible,

about why we should not have a children's hospital. So I want to see if his philosophy and his ideas have changed since he became the minister and a servant of the Crown. I'm sure he's probably more concerned about looking after the wishes of the people than he was at that time, but maybe not. We will hear from him the difference between a specialized pediatric facility as opposed to the general hospital. I'm sure the member can give us that information.

A specialized facility, Mr. Speaker, does one or two things that are distinct from a general hospital. It gives highly specialized people an area of focus. They are specialized things. I'm sure even the member who has brought the resolution in knows that there still will certainly be specialized areas for which we're going to have to ship children out. We're going to have to ship adults out to other very, very specialized facilities. So that's not going to mean there isn't going to be another child or adult taken out of this province for highly specialized services.

Mr. Speaker, I promised I was going to be very brief, because I just want my position absolutely clear. If we rearrange some priorities, rearrange some hospital beds, we will still be able build not the entire but a portion of the highly specialized children's hospital using the modular concept. The people of Edmonton have indicated through their support of the telethon that they want it. At that time, the hon. Bob Clark filed a petition with 5,000 names of Albertans wanting a children's hospital to serve this part of the province plus the north. I'm sure we're going to have support from the Edmonton MLAs. The people have spoken, and now we want to know what their representatives have said. The hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry was dragging that red herring right across the old election path as quickly as he could go, telling everybody: oh yes, we need a children's hospital; there's just no doubt about that. So now we're going to see how he's going to pussyfoot around his promises of 1982.

Mr. Speaker, I want it on the record that I support the resolution and I support the concept of having at this stage not an entire package but the start of a modular hospital. We have the brains in the department; they can look at phase one of a specialized children's hospital. I want to rise in my place and say that I have always supported the concept of a specialized children's hospital, I have not changed, and I certainly support the resolution.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Clover Bar said he would like to hear my opinion, so I guess I'll have to give it to him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Stainless Walt.

DR. REID: I haven't read it, Walt, but I will read it again afterwards and see how it compares.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood has introduced a motion, and perhaps in doing so he rendered the people of northern Alberta a greater service than he thought. That's provided the media give a fairly factual and rational report on the debate we're having this afternoon. In bringing the motion forward, he made some remarks I would tend to classify as inflammatory and unintentionally — I presume unintentionally — having the effect of undermining the security the people of northern Alberta have in the pediatric care for their children. There was a lot of rhetoric in what he said but not much really in the way of fact, except for quoting isolated sentences from letters, articles, and reports here and there.

Mr. Speaker, when one looks at Motion 219, it really gives us the chance to discuss at some length the whole issue of the

delivery of pediatric health care in northern Alberta. It also gives us the chance to look once more at the difference between needs, wants, and like to have, those three wonderful categories that apply to so many things, be it on a national basis, a provincial basis, a communal basis, or individually. To address pediatric care, we really have to look at two types of care. I know nowadays that medical care is normally broken up into three levels: primary, secondary, and tertiary. I think in doing that we make a mistake.

We really have to look at community care and at what could be called specialist, subspecialist, or tertiary care according to the three classifications. Community care is something given in the community that one is living in. It is care usually initiated by the patient, or by the parent in the case of children, and is sometimes given by general practitioners, general internists, general pediatricians, or general surgeons. But essentially it's not the type of care given in a university or teaching centre. That care itself will be very different if you are talking about a 25-bed hospital in a relatively isolated area of Alberta or if you are talking about the pediatric ward in the general hospital of 500 beds. For one thing, pediatric care at the community level is sometimes given by general practitioners and sometimes by pediatricians, depending on whether one lives in a community of 10,000 or a community of half a million. Essentially the service is the same.

The other kind of care that is given is what one could call highly specialized referral care. As I said, it's sometimes referred to as tertiary care, although I like to think of it as the second level of care. When one looks at that concept of care, one is looking at the narrow subspecialties within the general specialty of pediatrics. One has to also look at the population base being served. Even if we take the wider referral area for a children's facility in northern Alberta, we are not looking at more than 1.5 million or 1.75 million people if we go right to the Arctic Circle and include northeastern British Columbia. That's not a large number to support many of the subspecialties.

We already have some excellent subspecialty pediatric care in Edmonton without a children's hospital. I'll just give one example. It's the two existing intensive perinatal nurseries: one at the Royal Alexandra with Dr. Neil Finer as its head, and the other unit at the University hospital with Dr. David Schiff. The one unique thing about the northern Alberta intensive perinatal care study has been the follow-up work done by Dr. Charlene Robertson. The results, as shown by her studies, are second to none. Neither Dr. Finer nor Dr. Schiff were trained in Edmonton. They were attracted here by the opportunity. Dr. Finer, incidentally, came from the Boston children's hospital.

So to some extent there is a fallacy in the concept that to attract world-calibre subspecialists one has to have a monument, as the Member for Clover Bar would have it. I forget where it was said — maybe it was Ecclesiastes — that the men make the city, not the walls. It is the doctors, in conjunction with the nurses and the ancillary help, who make the service, not the bricks and mortar. In Edmonton we have a very large number of pediatric beds. The units at the Royal Alexandra and University hospitals in particular have significant numbers, approximately 100-plus each.

When we look at the possibilities that have been addressed, we have to look at a complex problem. Do we put all of the pediatric beds in this city in one facility? As I have said before, there are two types of care: community and highly specialized. If we put them in one facility, it removes pediatric care from the general hospitals and the community hospitals: the new Mill Woods hospital, the Charles Camshell, the Misericordia, the General hospital, and to some extent the Royal Alexandra. I am not sure that really helps in the care of the vast majority of children's illnesses.

What it does is put the children all into one unit. It tends to put them in a unit which has no general practitioner coverage. It tends to put them into a unit where all the treatment is going to be given by specialists or subspecialists. Indeed it may result in overtreatment rather than what is really necessary. That is just a characteristic of specialists and subspecialists, and they will say that themselves. They tend to always look after the patient as if they have the most serious possibility rather than the less serious. It is just natural from their training and experience, and we can't change that.

The whole problem with pediatric care is that it is to a large extent an emotional one, and so it should be. Unlike adults, children cannot dictate and control their own destiny. They can't sign for or refuse treatment. To a much greater extent than adult patients, they are at the beck and call of the doctor. It is for that reason the treatment of children tends to be a more emotional issue. It is also for that reason that it is much easier to raise funds for children's hospitals than for adults' hospitals. That applies all over the world. It certainly applied in Aberdeen, where I spent a year working in the children's hospital.

When we are looking at any changes that could or should be made in the delivery of pediatric care in Edmonton, we have to really look at the status quo: five hospitals with pediatric facilities, and the Royal Alex and the University with subspecialist care. The second possibility is that we continue to provide community care in the existing hospitals and build a freestanding subspecialist hospital. The third possibility is the other one I mentioned, which is to build a freestanding children's hospital for all pediatric facilities in the community.

When we look at those options, we have to look at the results. Some of them I mentioned already. Mr. Speaker, we have to accept that the population base we have makes it impossible to render the total spectrum of pediatric care within the province, whether we have one children's hospital, the current Alberta children's hospital in Calgary, and convert that to purely tertiary care. Even that will not give us the population base to deliver the whole spectrum. So it doesn't matter what happens, we will still be flying a lot of babies needing cardiovascular surgery, some needing neurosurgery, and some needing treatment for cancer, to other centres within Canada and indeed elsewhere on the North American continent. That is not emphasized enough. The impression is frequently given that constructing the bricks and mortar will enable a service to occur that will cover the whole spectrum. It doesn't matter what we do; that will not happen unless we have a much larger population.

Of course we also get into the argument, when the facility is needed and when it is built, of whether it should be freestanding or attached to one of the existing adult care facilities. If it is freestanding, that means it has to have all the facilities — laundry, kitchen, CAT scanners, whole body scanners — things that would not be used completely or efficiently in a facility of that size. So the alternatives are to attach it to either the Royal Alexandra hospital or the University Mackenzie centre. I think those are the only two that one could attach it to. Even in doing that, one still has to make a decision whether it should provide total pediatric care or only subspecialist care.

Mr. Speaker, what I have been doing is trying to indicate that this is not an easy decision to make. The reason for doing that is that the motion put forward today by the Member for Edmonton Norwood has a time limit in it, and it is the most ridiculous, nonsensical time limit I've ever seen. Whether we build a children's hospital all at once or whether we use the Member for Clover Bar's suggestion of doing it on a modular basis, to have a hospital designed and built in less than three years — building a premature hospital would probably have

the same effect as premature babies; it would require much more nurturing than a properly planned facility.

I had experience in Hinton with the long time it took to design an expandable, modular, 44-bed hospital with the potential for growing to 150. I would just like to tell the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood that it took us four years to design, never mind three years to design and build. It took two years to build it after the design was finished. Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that one has to be very careful that the facility is really needed, that the facility will really improve pediatric care, and that the facility will really attract the subspecialists that are allegedly missing. I am not saying we have all the subspecialists in northern Alberta that exist in communities the size of Toronto, Boston, or London.

AN HON. MEMBER: Or Halifax.

DR. REID: Halifax, also. But it is a regional centre for an equivalent population and has a much longer history than northern Alberta does.

What I am saying is that the facilities in, say, Winnipeg have not attracted the subspecialists to nearly the extent that individuals have. As a medical centre, Edmonton has acquired a worldwide reputation in some areas. Winnipeg has acquired a worldwide reputation in some areas; one of those is pediatrics. But not every pediatric centre can attract a Harry Medovy or a Dr. Cheoun who did the discovery work on Rh immunization. Toronto's Sick Children has a worldwide reputation in some ways; so has the Montreal neurological institute with Wilder Penfield's work. It is people that make services, not bricks and mortar. And the bricks and mortar that exist in northern Alberta at this time are in many ways more than adequate. Certainly they're not fully occupied.

Although the member's motion may have been very well intended, what I'm suggesting is that it may very well be premature. The advice the minister gets is not just from the Northern Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation, admirable though their work and enthusiasm are. He also has to take advice from people like the Edmonton Area Hospital Planning Council. If you look at the advice he gets from the different medical groups and the different hospitals, you can see the political pressures because of the internal politics of those centres. It is not an easy decision. It should not be made prematurely. It should be made with care, so that when a northern Alberta children's hospital is needed, as opposed to wanted, what is built will be a facility that is suitable to the needs of northern Alberta and that will serve northern Alberta for a long period to come in the future.

Thank you.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, in the fall of 1982, a general election was held. During that campaign there was an election commitment made by the party I'm very pleased to be a part of and represent in my constituency. I had a town hall meeting in that campaign in October 1982. I reiterated the commitment of Premier Peter Lougheed, who said in a letter to the Northern Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation that if the Edmonton Area Hospital Planning Council recommended that a children's hospital be built, one would be built. It was a very clear pledge, and on that basis I campaigned, as did all of my Edmonton colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, the point is that we determined to follow the advice of people in the community who had more knowledge than we do or than the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood does, although perhaps the Edmonton Area Hospital Planning Council does not appreciate the politics as the Member for

Edmonton Norwood would in trying to seize an emotional issue and coattail onto it some additional support for the political party he happens to represent.

MR. MARTIN: Just like you did in the election, Rollie.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood is trying to take this opportunity to garner extra support by trying to hold himself out as the champion in the Legislative Assembly of a children's hospital. To that end I think he deserves the congratulations of all people who wish to seize opportunities — or opportunisms — that are available to hon. members to make that kind of pitch for votes.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Northern Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation is a very good organization. It has some very solid volunteers who have done a terrific job in raising almost \$1 million from the community to date. For that I think they deserve the praise and congratulations of all Edmontonians and of all hon. members.

Mr. Speaker, the population base of the area the children's hospital foundation proposes to serve is a little over a million people. In that population base, we already have a very large number of pediatric beds, in fact so great a number that only 55 percent of them are being used today. Forty-five percent of them are empty. In my brief research on this issue, I noted that about 300 youngsters were flown out of the area to Toronto and other places over the course of the last year, about one a day. I think one patient a day does not justify the financial priorities of building a large hospital for those children.

Mr. Speaker, I think I could go into the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood's constituency and talk to senior citizens who are waiting for auxiliary care facilities, and the parents of those senior citizens, and ask them if they would rather have a children's hospital built or have a facility built for the seniors who badly need the treatment, which the Edmonton Area Hospital Planning Council says is needed.

MR. MARTIN: So now we're playing seniors against kids.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, we as a government have a tough choice to make. We have to determine what the priorities are going to be, whether the financial priorities of government are going to be to provide services for seniors or youngsters. That choice is very clear in the letter to the minister, David Russell, sent by the planning council when they had this question referred to them.

I find it very interesting to think I could go into Edmonton Norwood over this next little while and talk to seniors and say: your member of the Legislature has determined that you're not very important; your member of the Legislature is disregarding the recommendation of experts.

MR. MARTIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I don't choose to yield the floor right now. Maybe the hon. member in summing up the debate ...

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps we'd better see what the point of order is about.

MR. MARTIN: I have not said anything about competition in Norwood or said to my seniors in that riding, you're not very important. I think it's rather small-minded of a member to even bring that up.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member is entitled to raise a point of order to deal with a perceived misunderstanding or misapprehension with regard to what he has said in debate. But a dispute as to facts or something ancillary of that kind really doesn't justify an intervention when an hon. member is speaking.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe we are talking about a children's hospital. The motion had nothing to do with seniors, and the member is totally . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member is debating the topic. He's not coming within an exception which allows a member to intervene where something he has said may be misunderstood or appears to have been misunderstood. That's the only basis for an intervention I know of, and anything else is just continuing the debate.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member hasn't read the letter that was tabled in the House today, but it deals very specifically with this choice. I suppose if I were in opposition I wouldn't have to worry about making choices, because I wouldn't have to worry about making decisions. I wouldn't have to be responsible for anything; I could be very irresponsible. But I know the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood is not irresponsible. I also know he's not in government and not likely to be.

Mr. Speaker, the letter dated February 20 from the chairman of the Edmonton Area Hospital Planning Council and tabled in the House today has only three paragraphs. In the second paragraph, it says:

the priority [in] the construction of a Children's Hospital should be given in relation to the overall hospital requirements in the Edmonton area.

And the council particularly notes that despite the capital projects completed since 1979, there is a significant problem in the provision of auxiliary care for senior citizens. That is the choice the Edmonton Area Hospital Planning Council makes.

MR. MARTIN: We don't need the Kananaskis golf course. Where are these choices?

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, what we're talking about doing is allocating roughly \$125 million for the construction of a hospital, if we take the Mill Woods hospital as a model and assume that the costs are going to be somewhat similar, although the costs of the Calgary children's hospital are significantly higher than that. But if we take the choice of allocating \$125 million for hospital construction in the city of Edmonton, and we have a choice between the provision of senior citizen care — we have a waiting list of almost 500 senior citizens here in the city.

I would think that one could go through a mathematical process and come to the conclusion that if there are roughly 20 constituencies in the Edmonton area and the hon. member represents one-twentieth of them, then 5 percent of that 500 would reside in Norwood. But I suspect that number is even higher, because there aren't many youngsters in Edmonton Norwood. It's an older neighbourhood, where a lot of senior citizens are probably resident. In fact the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood probably represents a disproportionate number of senior citizens than almost any other member of the Assembly. He is choosing to ignore the recommendation of the hospitals planning council that recommends we build auxiliary care facilities for seniors. He is choosing to ignore the very real needs of the people in his constituency that the planning

council recommends be cared for. Why is he doing that? I wonder what the politics of his choice are.

MR. MARTIN: Rollie, we'd better not talk about Kananaskis park.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, compared to a children's hospital, the cost of Kananaskis park pales into mere insignificance.

Mr. Speaker, I think I could go through my constituency and find a lot of senior citizens, and perhaps the parents and families of senior citizens, who have asked me to have senior citizens placed in an auxiliary care facility. I've had to say: I'm sorry, there's a waiting list; I'm sorry, but we can't get your family member in right now. It's a cruel choice to make, but it's one that government members in Edmonton must face. I challenge the hon. member to go back to his constituency and see where the real needs are in his community.

Mr. Speaker, it would be very nice to have a children's hospital in the city of Edmonton. I support the commitment that the Premier made in October 1982: if the planning council determines that a children's hospital is needed, then we will build one. But the facts are very plain. Forty-five percent of the children's beds in city hospitals are empty.

Mr. Speaker, as an Edmontonian, another very basic question has to be asked. Let's suppose we built a 300-bed children's hospital facility here in Edmonton. Let's suppose we took the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood's suggestion and built it by 1987. What would happen to the children's beds in the general hospitals throughout the city? Here's another cruel choice that the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood is going to ignore because he doesn't have to be responsible for anything.

Is he going to close the children's hospital beds at the University hospital? Perhaps not. Would he close the children's beds at the Royal Alex hospital? That's in his constituency, Mr. Speaker. That's right in his area. His constituents are served by the Royal Alex hospital. Perhaps he would say: beggar thy neighbour, and we'll close the children's hospital beds yet to be built at the Mill Woods hospital, where there are a lot of youngsters. There are a lot of youngsters in Sherwood Park, and they're not being served by any hospital right now. Would he advocate that those beds not be built? How about the Misericordia in the west end? Which hospital beds will he close? We already have half the hospital beds for children empty, and he proposes to build more. Which beds is he going to close?

Mr. Speaker, I think this is fundamentally a question of priorities. When one does not have to make responsible decisions, one does not have to be responsible. I think the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood has demonstrated that by bringing a motion to the House today that calls for the construction of a children's hospital by 1987. It's an emotional issue. I think it's a choice between senior citizens and youngsters. The hon. member represents fundamentally far more senior citizens than any other population group in his constituency, and he's chosen to ignore them today. That's amazing.

I think that I will have a lot of fun this summer, contacting senior citizens' groups in his area and my area, and letting them know where the NDP stands on this issue, where the NDP stands in terms of putting scarce dollars into the system. I think a lot of people are going to be very interested to know they have made a choice to ignore the needs of 500 senior citizens who are on a waiting list for auxiliary care in the city of Edmonton. He has done that, Mr. Speaker, and he has to be accountable for that. He's going to be accountable in the city of Edmonton. The people are going to be informed in my

constituency — and if I can, in his — about this proposal he has brought, ignoring the letter of February 20 from the planning council, people who know far more than he does, on hospital needs in the city of Edmonton. Mr. Speaker, I think we've had an amazing display of opportunism today by the Edmonton Norwood representative.

I urge all hon. members to defeat this motion.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I support the concept of a children's hospital with specialized capabilities and the extensive research and diagnostic facilities available, I guess, in conjunction with the Walter C. Mackenzie hospital.

I'm of the firm belief that a children's hospital does not have to be a freestanding building. I believe the most effective method of assuring the very best care for our children is a specialized children's wing, ward, or pavilion — whatever you want to call it. I totally support the concept which would make Edmonton second to none in child care.

I was visiting with the member from Calgary, and she suggested that maybe the Edmonton area caucus members are not aware of the difficulties Calgary had when they opened their children's hospital and then closed the pediatric beds in all the other major hospitals. That caused a great uproar, where children only received emergency treatment in the other hospitals. It's still a bone of contention in Calgary, and I suppose would be even more so in busy traffic hours. I think the Member for Edmonton Mill Woods said it takes as long to drive across the city as it does to get from here to Wetaskiwin in the heavy traffic hours.

So we must consider prudent planning before we make a decision on a children's hospital. I'm not convinced whether it would be better as a freestanding edifice, which would either duplicate other research and medical facilities or would not have all the specialized equipment which would be available as a special children's centre, or whether it would be better as part of a major research facility and hospital.

I might say that I had the opportunity to travel to Toronto with one of our children, and I didn't find that the care of my child in Toronto was superior. In fact I did not think it was even of the same quality we were used to receiving in Edmonton. There were far more children in a ward. There were seven children, and there were many, many times when a nurse was not even in the ward. In that particular case, they were all very, very acute cases, flown from all over Canada, and in some cases North America, for specialized heart surgery. So it was not an ordinary hospital ward where some of the children were sick and some weren't. They were all very, very ill. My husband has mentioned many times that he felt the care we received in the University hospital in Edmonton was second to none and far superior to the treatment we felt our child received in Toronto.

I guess I've been advocating a children's hospital ever since that time, but we've got to remember that the population of Toronto is equivalent to the total population of the province of Alberta. Ontario's population is almost 8.5 million. So the question begs to be asked: can a province with a population of 2 million support the children's hospital physically and medically, even if it can financially? I think the Member for Edson pointed that out in his remarks.

I'd like to compliment the members of the Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation for their continued efforts for the children's hospital. I believe that kind of volunteer effort is important. I hope that I as a member can sit down and discuss their concept of a children's hospital, because I believe it differs from my concept. I know every member of the Assembly supports the very best care possible for our children and supports

whatever development, be it freestanding or a children's centre or pavilion in combination with one of the major hospitals. I intend to call Dr. Duncan, who's a member of the Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation and with whom I was acquainted years ago when he was one of the specialists who cared for my daughter. I would like to follow through on that communication.

For that reason, I move we adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Actually the debate is automatically adjourned by the fluxion of time.

head: **PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS**  
**OTHER THAN**  
**GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**  
(Second Reading)

**Bill 208**  
**Criminal Compensation Intercept Act**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly take pleasure in introducing and speaking to Bill 208, the Criminal Compensation Intercept Act.

One item of great concern I've had for a number of years not only as Minister of Public Welfare and Minister of Social Development a number of years ago but as a member of the Legislature representing one cross section of the Alberta population, as the Leader of the Opposition, and as the leader of the Independents, has been the fact that I've run into victims of crime whose property has been destroyed and who have suffered injuries for which they have had to pay. A number of various kinds of losses have occurred. The criminal or person who perpetrated the crime walks away from it without directly paying. At the same time, you see them receiving moneys from various sources. Some of these people have regular employment. I assume that most of them who are in good jobs pay income tax and if at the end of the year through their tax form they are able to receive an amount of money, they get it, or they're able to qualify for some of our provincial grants in terms of interest rebates or mortgage rebates. They get it, while the poor victim whose loss has occurred does not have any access to those funds. The criminal goes merrily, irresponsibly on and does not take action as he should. The purpose of this Act is to try to come to grips with that, Mr. Speaker, and I feel that it certainly can.

When we review some of the circumstances that face victims of crime, we see that they face a number of hardships. For example, we can have an individual who's a victim of a crime where for various legitimate reasons the police and prosecutors may decide that charges should not be laid, where criminal circumstances are difficult to prove in terms of the offence. In this case the victim is excluded from a provincial court restitution order. That's one case.

A second case is where the accused may be found not guilty on the basis of some type of technical defect that occurs. By a technical defect, we'd be thinking of such things as a defect in the formal information that's charging the person or as a result of the Crown asking for too many adjournments which aren't granted. Even though the merits of the offence haven't been litigated, the victim has no opportunity for a restitution order in a criminal court, as in the first instance I cited.

A third example of hardship a victim of crime may face is when the prosecutor may forget — and this happens in some cases, I understand — to ask for restitution in the criminal court, particularly when the victim is a working person or a

woman who couldn't take time off to go to court. For some reason or other, restitution is not requested or ordered. The victim again loses and faces hardship on a personal basis.

A fourth situation can occur when, although the victim may be awarded a restitution order, the criminal may not have the money at that time to pay within the time ordered. He then goes to jail, and the victim receives no compensation. The victim is certainly left out again.

The fifth item I'd like to raise is that in circumstances such as the ones I've just enumerated, the victim then has to go to small claims court or through the Queen's Bench division to get a civil judgment. It goes from the criminal court to a civil judgment. If we find the criminal has no money at that time, the victim again can receive no compensation and is further out of pocket with regard to court expenses.

In every one of those cases, the person who is really being punished is the victim of the crime, rather than the person who perpetrated the crime in the first place. Why this Bill? In my opening comments, I referred in a general way to the purpose of the Bill, but I'd like to emphasize the purpose of the Bill again.

First of all, I feel it will bring some responsibility back to the criminals. They're responsible, and they should pay. We should be making these people pay rather than throwing non-violent offenders into jail and burdening society as a whole.

What are some of the crimes that could be covered by a Bill such as this? There are numerous crimes and situations where individual victims are left out of the system, and this Bill could certainly fill that gap. Examples: theft under and over \$200, where restitution is sometimes made but not always; assaults which injure people and damage their property — restitution can and should be ordered but possibly payment is not made; public mischief and vandalism; white collar crimes. I'm sure the list could go on where the victim of the crime is not compensated or able to gain access to moneys the criminal has, in this situation, from public funds.

What are some of the principles in the Bill? First of all, the Bill allows victims of crime to intercept tax returns and provincial grants that may be made to the criminal. Secondly, it would allow the government of Alberta to enter into agreements with the federal government and other provinces to enforce these orders. Thirdly, it allows for appeals by the criminals themselves, if for some reason or other there's undue hardship on the criminal and his or her family. There is a very small limit of reasons for appeal but, if it creates undue hardship in terms of family circumstances, there can be exceptions made to this order. Fourthly, the Bill allows victims to apply to a civil court to have the same rights to intercept tax returns and provincial grants when a criminal prosecution could have been commenced in respect of the harm caused.

What about the cost that's going on in society at the present time and that we are not dealing with? Certainly we can all imagine the number of payments that are not being made to the victims. We look at the Crimes Compensation Board, for example. In this 1984-85 budget, we have voted \$1,027,950, which in turn will be allocated to various victims of crime. Why shouldn't the criminals be paying some of that money? When we hear of that sum of money, there are many victims that do not receive any type of compensation from the Crimes Compensation Board. I'm sure that sum of money is large; I'm sure it's larger than the \$1 million that is paid to the many victims in this province.

I believe this is a different idea and certainly new to Canada, new to the province of Alberta. The idea for this legislation is from one of the states in the United States where they have been using this type of concept to intercept taxes and grants

that could be paid to mothers who have been abandoned by husbands or common-law spouses. This is one way moneys could be intercepted, rather than going to the father who has abandoned his family. I feel the same principle can be applied in this Act — and that's the recommendation I'm making to this Assembly — to intercept any kind of government funding or grants or tax refunds that may have gone to the criminal. I believe that those items, if owed to the victim, should go to the victim.

First of all, this Bill is a new idea to Alberta, and I think it can be a new source of funds for victims of crime. Secondly, the Bill covers numerous groups of criminals, such as the ordinary working wrongdoer and the seasonally employed wrongdoer, as well as the middle-class, white-collar wrongdoer, right up to the upper-class, white-collar wrongdoer who has created some type of a criminal offence or an offence someone becomes the victim of, and compensation should occur to the victim of that crime.

I believe many people that have committed crimes receive tax returns in this province. As well, they have access to a number of government grants. I mentioned earlier two grant programs that would be available to people in this province who have committed criminal offences and the victims are not being compensated, such as the interest shielding program or the mortgage shielding program that were introduced in the last election here in Alberta.

Another merit to this Bill is that we could sign reciprocal agreements with other provinces and with the federal government to expand the sources of money to assist victims of crime. I think this Bill should not be a collection method extended to other types of creditors. I believe it should be restricted to the two purposes I have outlined: the purposes in Bill 208, which is before us, and the other Bill I have introduced in this Assembly, the Tax Refund and Provincial Grant Intercept Act.

I have had good support for this Bill from various members of the community. They feel the idea is good. They feel it's time we put in place legislation and regulation to have the criminal be as responsible as possible and to take his responsibility. When they don't, part of our purpose as legislators is to put into effect law where the victim of the crime is number one in our priorities, rather than the criminal that escapes his responsibility under the law seemingly being the number one person in our priorities.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope other members of the Legislature will examine the Bill carefully. I hope there could be support for the Bill. I think it's a little different. I feel the Bill is responsible. It's not of a partisan nature; it's a Bill that could be accepted by any member of the Legislature, no matter on which side he or she sits. It's the principle we're looking at. I look forward to the debate and, if government members and other members of the opposition can support it, I would be most pleased. I think the passage of this law would be a contribution to a better society in Alberta.

MR. STILES: Mr. Speaker, it's certainly the case in society today: I think the public has expressed concern in regard to victims of crimes who are left suffering a loss with no compensation whatsoever and also in the area of sentencing. I think part of that concern for the victim often arises from a concern that sentencing has not been adequate or sufficient. People see a victim who has suffered a loss and a perpetrator convicted and not particularly punished, or at least not sentenced in a way that is satisfactory in light of the kind of loss he has caused.

From the point of view of a victim, I think it's accepted that the victim really should be put back into the position he

was in prior to the loss, certainly with respect to the loss of property, whether it be damaged or simply gone. That should be restored to him in some way. In addition, if it's a matter of an injury or perhaps the loss of property with which he makes his living, the lost income should be restored. He should be compensated for that loss. In the case of injuries, I guess the other question that bothers us as a society is: should the individual who has been injured as a result of a crime be compensated for the pain and suffering in addition to the time he has lost from his occupation?

On the other hand, with regard to the sentencing aspect, I am sure other members of this House have heard from their constituents who feel the perpetrators of crimes today often get off too easy. Something I've heard time and again is that sentences are too light. I have spent some time in criminal courts as a defence counsel, and I have to admit that I myself am sometimes shocked at the sentences that are handed down. I think some people might want to go so far as to see us return to the good old days. I'm looking back quite a long way now to the ancient Anglo-Saxon times of trial by ordeal. I think some people feel that perhaps a thief might be better deterred from future crimes if, as a test of his guilt or innocence, he had to plunge his arm to the elbow into a cauldron of scalding hot water to pick out a cannonball. The arm was then bandaged, and a few days later the bandages were removed. If the arm had healed satisfactorily, he was innocent; if it had not healed, he was found to be guilty. It was certainly an effective deterrent and operated quite well in some instances. We don't like that kind of thing today, but strangely enough part of that Anglo-Saxon sense of justice included restitution to the victim. That's my point in bringing this up. They had pretty cruel and harsh methods, but they had a sense of justice. Included in that was the idea that the victim should perhaps be compensated for what he had lost by the perpetrator, not by society. I think the key here is that it is the perpetrator of the crime who should be repaying for the lost property.

I don't want to start a lecture on law, but I would like to cover just very briefly the purposes of sentencing in our system of criminal justice. One of the purposes of sentencing is deterrence: to create some sense of repentance in the convicted person, to enhance deterrence from committing the crime again or committing any crime. Naturally preventing repetition is one of the first considerations of sentencing. Sentencing must also address rehabilitation of the criminal so that he's perhaps provided with some means of finding a way to make a living. A third consideration is the deterrence of other members of the public from committing the same kind of offence.

With respect to restitution, it seems to me that a convicted criminal who is required to repay — certainly that would contribute to deterring him from repeating the crime or some other crime. It might be a more meaningful way than simply spending some time in jail where, in today's world, he is treated pretty well. I know there are ex-convicts who will argue with me about that, but I certainly hear that on all sides.

In addition, I believe that rehabilitation can often be accomplished by restitution. As far as I'm concerned, in many cases one of the problems with criminals is a something-for-nothing belief inherent in committing a crime, particularly crimes of theft, the acquisition of property or money that doesn't belong to you, or finding an easier way to get by. That belief is there. Many of the people I have had as clients in the past have certainly had somewhere in their minds the idea that they were getting away with something or getting something for nothing. If we have restitution enforced by the courts, I believe that would act as a deterrent to members of the public to committing crimes.

There's a great deal to commend restitution, and in fact restitution is part of our law. The Criminal Code provides for a judge to make an order for restitution. Under that provision in the Criminal Code as it presently stands, that order is made upon the application of a person aggrieved at the time sentence is imposed. I believe that is part of the problem the hon. Member for Little Bow referred to, in the sense that it's pretty hard sometimes to keep track of a criminal trial and determine exactly when it's going to happen; if the victim doesn't happen to be there when sentence is imposed and he hasn't made arrangements or if the prosecutor has forgotten about it, it may be that the matter of restitution is overlooked. By the way, the Criminal Code provides for compensation for loss of or damage to property. It doesn't deal with injury or lost time.

Dealing specifically with the Bill that is proposed to us, I have some concerns. One of those concerns isn't so much a concern with the Bill other than in the sense that it may be somewhat premature. The federal Parliament is presently considering the criminal law reform Bill, C-19, introduced in the House I believe in February of this year. That Bill contains clauses to amend and enhance the restitution provisions of the present Criminal Code and perhaps to encourage the courts to use restitution as a sentencing tool more frequently and with more effect. I won't go into those provisions specifically, but they are in the Bill and, if it is passed, we may see a change or certainly an improvement in the way restitution is being used in the courts.

With respect to people who are injured and entitled to compensation by reason of their injuries, the Crimes Compensation Board provides a source of relief. In my experience I have appeared before that board and know something about it. The board will provide nothing more than compensation for the time lost by an injured victim, other than perhaps some compensation for clothing that may have been damaged or destroyed — had holes or something punched in it by a sharp object — in the course of a crime.

However, the hon. Member for Little Bow is absolutely right when he points out that taxpayers are paying the amounts awarded by the Crimes Compensation Board, not the criminal. As I say, the Crimes Compensation Board deals with injuries and compensation for lost time; no consideration is given to pain and suffering, and no consideration is given to lost property other than clothing.

There is one aspect that was not covered in the earlier remarks of the hon. Member for Little Bow; that is, the matter of personal insurance. In the case of property, most people, if they value their property or have property of value, take out insurance to protect themselves against many of the kinds of things that can happen in the perpetration of a crime. Many times cars are a source of criminal acts. Both stolen cars and damage to cars are covered by the automobile insurance that is available in the province. Accordingly, a victim in those cases is compensated for his lost property. In the case of buildings, where there's damage done to the property from break and enter and that type of crime, in many cases the insurance covers that kind of damage also.

We really have rather a narrow area that we are addressing with this Bill. I'm a little concerned to what extent the Bill would be effective in that context. There are, as was pointed out, a number of people receiving grants. There are numbers who receive income tax refunds and others who receive rebates of one kind or another. Part of the problem with a tax refund is that it comes from the federal government. It would be necessary to persuade the federal government to adopt this kind of legislation. The province obviously cannot require the federal government to do anything by way of legislation.



One of the concerns I have with the actual Bill is the idea that compensation can flow when charges have not been laid. If charges are not laid, there is no means of determining whether the individual we are attempting to extract the restitution from is in fact the guilty party. If there hasn't been a trial, there is no way of determining guilt. Certainly if someone is acquitted of a crime by way a technical defect in the prosecution, he may have gotten off on a technicality, but the point is that he still has not been proven to be the guilty party. Our sense of justice would certainly not permit a person to be required to pay restitution if we haven't established his guilt.

On the other hand, if there has been a criminal or negligent act, anyone can take the perpetrator to civil court, whether small claims or the Court of Queen's Bench, and bring a civil action. One of the problems with that of course is that in many cases, if the damages are not sufficient, you can use up a lot of the money in legal fees that you might otherwise gain, and it makes the exercise very unsatisfactory in terms of where you stand at the end. I find some difficulty with the idea in section 2 of this Bill in having a certificate issued when there hasn't been a determination of guilt or the matter has not been the subject of criminal prosecution.

I believe the principle enunciated in this Bill is a good one in the sense that no one should be receiving funds from government by way of grants or any other way if there is an uncompensated victim of that individual's criminal acts. I agree with that principle. The difficulty is in creating an Act that will address that in a way that doesn't cause a great many other problems. Present provisions for restitution permit the victim to enter the restitution order as a judgment of the court, and there are collection proceedings available to that individual, including garnishee. It seems to me that there are solutions available to many victims without going to the extent of creating an Act such as this Bill contemplates.

It's a very broad subject; it's not one that I want to go on at length. But as I said, I believe the Bill may be premature. I feel the Bill is perhaps somewhat narrow in its purpose and has not addressed all of the issues. I believe it has merit. I think the hon. Member for Little Bow should be congratulated for bringing the Bill before the House and permitting this debate, but I also believe that the Bill needs more work and may be somewhat premature.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take a few minutes to participate in the matter before us, Bill 208. I would like to thank the Member for Little Bow for bringing this to the House. I think it's a commendable piece of legislation that should be given every consideration. There may be some fine-tuning required for it to be passed along, but I certainly think it is worthy of proper consideration by this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, this issue of people being compensated for crimes against their person, their property, or some manner of activity that stops the normal functioning of their lives or their livelihoods has to be properly dealt with in this House. As the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury indicated, the federal government has some legislation before it that may assist in the matter of compensating victims of crime. I have some pretty strong feelings in this area, and I guess I garnered these over four years as a member of the Calgary Police Commission. I saw a number of activities happen and spoke to victims when they would come to us and ask for some relief for some act that had been caused against them.

When I was first thinking about running in the civic arena, we had an incident in one of the communities I subsequently represented and still do. We had an action in Pineridge where

a house was taken over by four people who had robbed the downtown branch of a financial institution, shot and killed a policeman in the pursuit of that activity, entered a home, and destroyed the inside of the property. In fact the police helped a little bit by shooting tear gas into the property. When the criminals were finally apprehended and taken out — one of them, near death, unfortunately was brought back to life or carried on with his life — the resident of the premise of course ended up having to have that place cleaned up. Who paid for that? As I remember it, some was through insurance, and there was a little bit of assistance from one level of government. I would like to recall whether it was the provincial or the civic government. However, it did not pay for all the damage because of the amount of damage that was actually caused within the premises.

I've had an opportunity to discuss activities of crime against victims in the community many times since that action. It's amazing to me how we as a community can continue to allow crimes against property and, in particular, against people to go on and on. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is the opinion of many, and many times I think it's my opinion also, that the laws we develop in this land are for the guilty. The victim of a crime may go before a court of law and is hammered — or in many cases maybe even what I determine is abused — and we treat the person who may have been the perpetrator of the crime against that victim with kid gloves, treat him like a proper human being should be treated. I suggest that maybe the victim should be given the same dignity as at least appears to be shown to the perpetrator of an act against that victim.

How do we do this? Possibly one way is through this Bill that has been introduced by the hon. Member for Little Bow or possibly by putting pressure on the federal government to enact legislation that will assist communities with their difficulties in dealing with crime and criminals. I don't know that we want to go to the activity that happens in some other countries, such as chopping a person's hand off because he steals something. But maybe that isn't a bad idea either.

A lot of people in the community think lawyers are to blame for our messed-up legal system. I am not going to suggest that in totality at this point in time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. NELSON: I hear some people over there saying "agreed". Certainly, legal minds tend to put together material that is very difficult for us laypersons to read in a manner that we totally understand.

Some people think small pressure groups of bleeding hearts tend to put pressure on governments so that they leave the victim alone and worry about the criminal too much. Notwithstanding all that, we have to remember that no person is guilty of an offence until proven so through our court system.

We had a bit of activity in Calgary this last week when we had a messed-up remand centre. The victim of course was the government. The people involved in that will ultimately be found guilty of creating a disturbance or a mess in that facility. As far as I'm concerned, they should have been made to go and sleep in their mess and their slop, walk in it, eat in it, and do anything they want, until they cleaned it up themselves. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think we need to not necessarily just encourage our courts and our lawmakers; maybe we should tell the courts what they are going to do. Some people might say that takes a little away from the judge or the magistrate as to the options he may have available to deal with a particular crime. Some people may deal with a particular individual; this guy is a little different from this one because he's been con-

victed 90 times and this guy is just a first-time offender — or the severity of the crime, and so on.

When it comes to some of the criminal activities and the conviction of some of these criminals, I can assure you that I'm not a bleeding heart. In fact I think the full force of the law should be placed on these people in the most severe way. Sure, we all buy insurance. Maybe we all buy life insurance; we should probably all have house insurance, property insurance, and what have you. But the perpetrator of a crime is the guy who makes us pay for that insurance and keeps increasing the cost.

Interestingly enough, we can go back and look at the area of prostitution. The federal government says let the municipalities worry about it. There are great costs to control prostitution and crime in that area — amazing. The municipalities do the best they can to pass legislation within their own area to look after the thing, and what happens? It gets thrown out in the federal courts. What does the federal government do? They sit on their hands with nothing; they don't worry about your community. When was the last time the federal government worried about your community and the people in it, and the victims of crime? I will be so glad after the next election when we have a caring federal government, like we have a caring provincial government in this province.

Mr. Speaker, when victims of crime, especially women, go through some of the abuse on the street, such as rape and assault, are sent into a courtroom and in many cases questioned in such a manner that they feel degraded, it is not only wrong but they should be given some opportunity for compensation for the hurts they have and the mental anguish they have gone through, just as any other victim who is injured or robbed, whether it be an individual or a commercial business. Let's take the gloves off on the criminals. In fact we should bring back the hanging law in this country; maybe that would help a little. Let's protect the victims. Let's compensate those victims. Let's stop degrading them in the public arena, in our court system. Let's show a little caring and feeling for those people who have become victims, not through their own course but through the intent of another.

I think it is time that we even expanded some of these fine option programs that were introduced in this House some years ago, especially when there is crime against the municipality, the province, or the state. Make them go out and fix their mess; make them repay in some manner. Jails are not the answer to everything. They don't rehabilitate too many people. In fact in many cases, they make the guy going in there worse when he comes out.

Maybe — just maybe — we should allow the victim an opportunity to participate in the sentencing of the individual. I'm sure I will get a hue and cry about something like that. A couple of columns that came out in *The Edmonton Journal* on February 23 and February 9 are somewhat contradictory in some of their substance. In one case it is stated by one of the columnists that many criminal activities are being done by people who are well-off. Well, those people who have some substance behind them should be forced by court order. Even if the court has to go in and take the compensation from those perpetrators — once they're found guilty, of course — they should be allowed to do so.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to show a little more compassion, a little more responsibility toward the victims of crime. I hope the introduction of this Bill will at least give us some awareness of the difficulties of some of these people who need some compassion, who need some assistance for loss of job, loss of income, loss of dignity, or some other loss and that we encourage some compensation in a manner befitting

the crime against that person or property or entity. I think this is a first step.

In doing this, I also feel we should pressure the federal government to wake up a little bit and consider our communities, consider the police officer who has to go out in those communities and clean up the messes that are created, who endangers his life going out to look after our communities. Let's give those people some protection through the courts. When we have someone come in who, although not necessarily proven guilty at the time — if something comes up, we all of a sudden tend to look on our police officer as the criminal.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, I have difficulty relating the sympathy he is presently expressing for police officers to a proposition which is the principle of this Bill providing for compensation to victims.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I'm trying to determine that police officers also become victims. I guess that could be a matter of interpretation of your legal books; I don't know. I'm trying to determine that the police officer in many cases becomes a victim, through the press or through being shot at in the matter of which he does his duties.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that I know of a police officer in his car in Calgary who was shot at with a shotgun not too long ago, within the last two years. Some short while previous to that, that particular officer had gone through a shooting incident where he killed a resident, justifiably so at the time. He's had double duty. So he became a victim. I think society owes it to him, as it does to other victims, to encourage compensation for crime against their person or otherwise.

I fully support our police services, and I have a considerable amount of feeling toward victims of crime. I commend the member for introducing this Bill. I hope the Assembly gives it its utmost attention. Hopefully we can see it pass through, either as is or with some amending formula, to encourage that our victims are looked after properly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ZIP: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise to speak to Bill 208, the Criminal Compensation Intercept Act, introduced by the hon. Member for Little Bow. First of all, I wish to congratulate the hon. member for introducing this Bill, the principle of which has considerable merit.

It certainly raises an issue which is on the minds of a very large segment of our population; that is, crime and its constant impact on all members of a community. There is a growing feeling of frustration across Alberta and across Canada, not only over the rising incidence of crime but over the increasing seriousness of crimes committed and what is quite often perceived by the public as a lenient and soft approach to the punishment and treatment of convicted offenders. This is particularly true of notorious cases such as that of Clifford Olson, who upon his conviction, in the minds of a multitude of Canadians, received not only minimal punishment in relation to the enormity of his crimes but, to add insult to injury, received a substantial cash reward from the justice system for his co-operation with the police.

There have been numerous other cases when the trauma and the losses experienced by the victims of crime and their families have, as in the Olson case, been well publicized by the media. These developments have focussed attention on the victim of crime and have reintroduced a principle of justice that has been with mankind since earliest times. That principle is restitution to victims of crime by those who committed them. Interestingly enough, the laws of Moses, as outlined in the Torah or the Old

Testament, focused a great deal of attention on this matter and laid down in great detail the amount of restitution the victim of each crime was supposed to receive.

In view of developments in recent years — and I have touched on them — it is certainly timely that serious questions have been raised as well on the larger matter of respect by ordinary citizens for the entire justice system, which can only be maintained if certain criteria are upheld with respect to upholding the law and punishment for its violation to deter the offender and others from continuing to inflict those crimes or offences on the community. Compensation to the victim of crime is one of the means through which not only concern is shown for the loss suffered by the victim but also the offender's attention is directed to the losses his criminal activity has inflicted on his victims. This acts as a further deterrent to the repetition of the crime. If it was added to the Bill, a further requirement of having to meet with the victim and discuss with him the losses and the amount or form of restitution that would be required would in itself have a telling effect on offenders, especially in the case of young offenders.

At the present time, punishment for crime is a highly impersonal affair, with restitution paid to the state in the form of fines and incarceration. Quite often there's little or no contact with the victim and, as a result, a minimum amount of awareness of the loss suffered by the victim exists on the part of the offender.

The sources of restitution by offenders to crime victims is limited only to those moneys offenders would have payable to them by the provincial government in the form of payment grants, refund allowances, or through any other basis. It would not compel the offender to turn over to the victim of his crime any funds from any other sources that might be available to him. In practical terms, the result is that the funds that would become available to victims of crime from the source outlined by the Bill would in most cases be very limited. It is significant

more from the standpoint of the principle of restitution it establishes rather than the actual amount it will make available to the victim of his crime or his family.

In effect, there is a negative factor to consider in this respect. In most cases, the financial means of the offender are very limited, and taking any funds away from him will likely leave him even more destitute and more directly dependent on the taxpayer for funds upon his release. As well, there is the administrative burden the implementation of Bill 208 would impose on a provincial court system that is already heavily burdened with its present caseload. It would make it a debt collector and add very substantially to the cost of collection and would attract civil suits that would not have occurred otherwise.

Despite these drawbacks, however, I recommend serious consideration of this Bill and possible passage, with amendments, from the standpoint of the important and time-honoured principle that it raises; that is, concern for and restitution paid to victims of crime.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is not proposed that the Assembly sit this evening. As hon. members will be aware, following question period tomorrow the Department of Education has been designated for consideration of estimates.

[At 5:30 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Friday at 10 a.m.]

