

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, February 11, 1975

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

## PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. Having given notice to you one hour in advance, to bring to the attention of the hon. members the small discussion we had last evening, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read from Hansard. Mr. Speaker, quoting from section 1666 of Hansard:

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Camrose, in light of the fact that he's got so many roads built, can he tell us if the road between Kingman and Camrose is going to be finished next year.

MR. STROMBERG:

Yes, the minister has indicated to me that the road will be finished only up to the boundary of Clover Bar. We've never had any representation from that constituency. We've asked for representation ...

Mr. Speaker, I interject and say:

The hon. member is sworn to tell the truth. That is a mistruth and I would like the hon. member to withdraw that because that is a lie.

Mr. Speaker, I have apologized for the use of that word. But I would like to say that I would ask the hon. member to withdraw the section that says we have never had any representation, Mr. Speaker, because the hon. member and I have worked mutually for the benefit of the people in our areas. The hon. Member for Camrose and I have met at least twice with the delegations in our area with representation to the hon. Minister of Highways.

So Mr. Speaker, I would be very pleased if the hon. member would withdraw that statement.

MR. SPEAKER:

I did receive the required notice from the hon. Member for Clover Bar. However, the sections of Hansard were not quoted in the notice. I would like to check them carefully when the final edition of Hansard is available.

I would therefore suggest that the matter might stand over until tomorrow, the member having raised it at practically the first opportunity although it could perhaps have been raised last night. Perhaps I might deal with the matter further tomorrow after I have checked the text in the official version of Hansard.

DR. BUCK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Hansard was not available last evening. That's why I could not bring it up at that time.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

## Bill 5 The Senior Citizens' Benefits Amendment Act, 1975

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 5, The Senior Citizens' Benefits Amendment Act, 1975.

Mr. Speaker, the principal provisions of this bill are for the purpose of giving legislative effect to the government's program in respect to the Alberta Assured Income Plan.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair has not had an opportunity to see the bill. I am not sure whether or not it's a money bill and if it is, of course reference would have to be made to the recommendation of His Honour.

If the Assembly agrees, I would propose to put the motion for first reading conditional upon the matter being dealt with again, in the event the bill is found to be a money bill.

Subject to that condition do you all agree to the request for leave for first reading?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Leave being granted, Bill 5 was introduced and read a first time.]

## Bill 11 The Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation Amendment Act, 1975

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 11, The Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation Amendment Act, 1975.

Mr. Speaker, this is a money bill and being so, His Honour The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor is aware of the contents of the bill and recommends it for the consideration of the Assembly.

The principle in the bill, Mr. Speaker, is to increase the borrowing capacity of municipalities in Alberta by \$200 million through the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation.

[Leave being granted, Bill 11 was introduced and read a first time.]

## Bill 219 An Act to amend The School Act

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 219. It's An Act to amend The School Act. This bill was introduced in the fall session of 1974.

The bill in principle states that an Indian band within any school jurisdiction may have representation on the school committee if the pupil enrolment is over 10 per cent. This bill was first asked for by the County of Parkland and the Enoch Band Council of the Enoch Indian reserve.

[Leave being granted, Bill 219 was introduced and read a first time.]

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you and to the members of the House, some ninety young ladies and young gentlemen from the St. Gabriel school in my constituency. They are Grade 9 students. They're here with their teachers, Miss Loretta Foley, Miss Marie Woytiw and Mr. Paul Stewart. Also with them are some of the mothers who are interested not only in school matters but political matters: Mrs. Polturak, Mrs. Meyer, Mrs. Nykyforiak and Mrs. Klassen.

Sixty of the students are seated in the members gallery and thirty in the public gallery. I would ask them to stand and be recognized by the House - they're already standing.

MR. TRYNCHY:

Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you and to the members of the House, three distinguished farmers from my constituency representing the Sangudo NFU Local 740: President, Mr. Neudecker; Communications Chairman, Mr. Chayka; Director, Mr. Erickson.

I would ask the members to rise and be recognized by the House.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly, a group of five farmers from the area just west of Olds who met this morning with the Minister of the Environment. They are in your gallery, Mr. Speaker: Mr. Odersky, Mr. Yoos, Mr. Kreese, Mr. Goddard and Mr. Holmes. I'd like the members of the Assembly to welcome them in the usual manner.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce a second class of students from the "golden" constituency of Gold Bar. They are from the Gold Bar school, Grade 6. There are 30 here with their teacher, Mr. Muzyka. They are seated in the public gallery, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask that they stand and be recognized by the House.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to introduce seven members of the National Farmers' Union from the Warburg area, Local 739. They are seated in the members gallery: Mr. Knopp, Mr. Belozor, Mr. Szepeszy, Mr. Zurek, Mr. Broadbent, Mr. Walker and Mr. Reimer. I would ask them to rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

#### TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table a return requested by the Assembly regarding copies of correspondence regarding the Syncrude project.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table two documents [as required under The Financial Administration Act] under Chapter 142, Section 82 and under Chapter 142, Section 38.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file with the Legislature three documents: the first being the review of the Alberta Hog Producers' Marketing Board organization that was done by P. S. Ross & Partners in conjunction with the hog marketing board; secondly, to file the third annual report of the Surface Rights Board, and in addition to that to file the paper that outlines the tax implications for farmers in relation to certain government programs.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file the annual report of the Alberta Research Council and also the annual report of the Alberta Department of Industry and Commerce.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to file the annual report of the Public Utilities Board for the year 1974, as required by statute.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file the first annual report of the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How many pages?

MR. CLARK:

It shouldn't be that thick.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Just a paragraph.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

## Department of Education

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce today some new school grants which will provide significantly greater equity to a large number of Alberta school systems. Those systems with low assessments will benefit; and also, those school systems with disproportionate property assessments will benefit.

Over 80 per cent of the school systems of the province will qualify for the new grants. The cost to the government of these new grants will be in the range of \$11 million.

In its simplest form the formula for the new grants will involve: first, the local equalized property assessment per resident pupil; secondly, the number of resident pupils enrolled in local schools or under tuition agreements, and thirdly, the mill rate levied on local property for supplementary requisition by school boards.

The formula provides higher proportional support for school systems with low corporate and residential assessment. The added dollars should substantially relieve the problems of some low assessment school systems more equitably than added dollar increases under the School Foundation Program fund.

The basic elements of the formula for the new grant have now been established; and in the light of experience and after consultation with school boards over the weeks ahead, the final stages of refinement will be completed. The formula will be implemented by administrative regulations and will not require any legislative amendments.

A number of regional meetings throughout the province are being scheduled now for the course of the next few weeks in order to fully explain the plan to school trustees and their administrative officers.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

## Petrochemical Industry

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the first question of the Minister of Industry and Commerce. In light of his comments to the House yesterday, when can we expect an announcement on the government's policy as far as the petrochemical industry is concerned?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned yesterday the government is proceeding and in consultation with industry, determining to obtain a world-scale petrochemical industry in Alberta. Just as soon as it's ready we'll certainly make an announcement.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. The comments the minister made outside the House yesterday regarding a \$200 million investment in the petrochemical industry - is that now the government's official position as far as a first step in this area is concerned, and why wasn't the statement made inside the House rather than outside the House?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, in the conversation in regard to "outside the House" as far as the requirements of industry and finding themselves in a shortfall of debt financing, or because of the circumstances as I explained in the House in regard to the equity market in Canada at the present time, and because of the liquidity some of the companies are finding themselves in at this time, I suggested there might be as much as \$200 million that would be the shortfall or difference which these companies requiring to come into Alberta might have or find necessary to raise.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister. Where in the Budget that was brought down Friday night do portions or all of this \$200 million that the minister referred to outside the House appear?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I made it abundantly clear in the House and outside the House that the \$200 million they are talking about is through the Alberta Energy Company and hasn't got anything to do with us.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Where is the Alberta Energy Company going to get the money? Is it going to use part of the \$75 million you passed by special warrant?

MR. PEACOCK:

I also suggested, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member read it, that part of that would be debt financing and part of it would be equity financing. Therefore, it would be obtained from borrowing.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary to the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Go ahead.

MR. LUDWIG:

If the hon. minister states that this will be a decision made by the Alberta Energy Company and not by him, how come he is making the announcements, Mr. Speaker? Who is misleading the House?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister advise the Assembly whether or not he made a specific recommendation that the capital financing be based on up to 75 per cent of the capital cost outside of the major urban centres, plus a flexible interest rate of 3 per cent under prime as one of his recommendations?

MR. PEACOCK:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister, regarding this new petrochemical industry. Is Alberta Ethylene which is a branch of Alberta Gas Trunk Line - is Alberta Gas Trunk Line or its subsidiaries going to be the front for government takeovers from now on?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Let's hear the answer.

MR. DIXON:

A question then, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Could the minister inform the House if there are any negotiations, or any discussions, between Alberta Gas Trunk or any of its subsidiaries regarding either participation in, or takeover of, Alberta companies already operating in our province?

MR. PEACOCK:

Not that I know of, Mr. Speaker. But maybe it might enlighten the hon. member to understand that Alberta Gas Ethylene is a vehicle for putting together an Alberta presence for a world-scale ethylene plant. It would, in general purposes, offer part of its equity position to Alberta companies.

MR. DIXON:

Another supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Am I correct in saying then that Alberta Ethylene is really a branch of Alberta Gas Trunk Line Company?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, while there might be a relationship between Alberta Gas Trunk and the initial formation of the company called Alberta Gas Ethylene, the Alberta Ethylene corporation as such will have offered, as we stated before in this House, the opportunity for Albertans to participate, whether that be through the Alberta Energy Company or through other companies.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question. I wonder if the hon. minister can enlighten the House as to who are the major participants in Alberta Gas Ethylene Company, the one which was mentioned by the hon. minister yesterday outside the House?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I just mentioned that Alberta Ethylene will be offering the opportunity for the Alberta Energy Company, as well as other producing companies, to be part of Alberta Ethylene that are Alberta-incorporated.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. minister misunderstood my question. My question is: who are the partners in Alberta Ethylene corporation or Alberta Ethylene Company, whichever you want to call it?

MR. PEACOCK:

I just got through saying, Mr. Speaker, that the initiation of the company - to get the idea - the concept started with an incorporated body of some of the principals of Alberta Gas Trunk, by which they have offered the Alberta Energy Company, as well as other Alberta-incorporated companies, [the opportunity] to participate on an equity basis.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. minister is getting a little closer to my question. My question is: who are the participants other than Alberta Gas Trunk and the Alberta Energy Company?

MR. PEACOCK:

I just told you.

MR. DIXON:

No you didn't.

Well, Mr. Speaker, just so we can get the record straight apparently the minister doesn't want to answer. There's no one else interested in Alberta Ethylene Company but Alberta Gas Trunk and the Alberta Energy Company?

MR. PEACOCK:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's a private company and the interests of the Alberta government have been reflected in the fact that it's an Alberta-incorporated company affording opportunities for Albertans to invest in the petrochemical industry. That's all Alberta Ethylene is all about. Who can come into it, are citizens of Alberta.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, is the hon. minister in a position to say if the Dow-Dome ethylene plant will or will not be allowed to proceed in Fort Saskatchewan?

MR. PEACOCK:

Well, Mr. Speaker, what is being attempted is to get in the question period answers to a very complex problem.

Now [whether] the Dow-Dome, whatever that Dow-Dome means, will proceed in Fort Saskatchewan - I don't know whereof they speak. If we're speaking in terms of Dow expanding its vinyl chloride monomer plant in Fort Saskatchewan, yes.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. minister. I think if he'll recall, the hon. Premier made the announcement about the project - was asked if it could proceed.

So, Mr. Speaker, the question again is: the Dow-Dome project which the hon. Premier mentioned in his speech last fall, the proposed ethylene plant?

MR. DIXON:

A final question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister.

Do you want to answer? Oh, go ahead, I'll catch mine later.

MR. PEACOCK:

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that Dow is permitted as far as this government is concerned to expand its facilities at Fort Saskatchewan in the vinyl chloride monomer, and that's what it requested.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary question to the hon. minister then is: have there been any discussions, Mr. Speaker, either by the minister or the Government of Alberta, with the federal government as far as participation in this so-called \$200 million scheme, either by petrocan or by other federal money?

MR. PEACOCK:

No, Mr. Speaker. Briefly, although the provincial government and this House are well aware that the stand the province has taken regarding world-scale petrochemical development of hydrocarbon resources, as identified in Petrosar's program in Sarnia, is at a subsidized price of \$6.50 a barrel of crude, we in Alberta have always maintained that the federal government should have some empathy about affording Alberta an opportunity to expand world-scale industry here.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In the light of his remarks yesterday and the reported remarks after the Legislative session, can the minister advise the Assembly or can he assure the Assembly that there will be a statement of guidelines as to equity or debt financing, either through the Alberta Energy Company or directly through the Alberta government, tabled in this House at some point in the future?

MR. PEACOCK:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is confusing the issue a little. First of all, as I attempted to explain yesterday, the presence of the Alberta government is mainly catalytic ...

MR. CLARK:

Catastrophic.

MR. PEACOCK:

... It's an attempt to develop an environment so the free enterprise system can perform and function and move into Alberta of its own will and accord.

[Interjections]

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, in light of the minister's comments about up to \$200 million in the form of loans, will we have tabled in this House a position paper which would at least disclose the guidelines, on what basis these loans will be made?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I thought I answered that in stating that when the negotiations between two private companies or two public companies are made, they will use the same procedure in disclosure as they would under any other circumstances. If the Government of Alberta is involved in it in any way, shape or form, that will be made known to this House.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has the government considered the impact on the practicality of a world-scale petrochemical industry in Alberta as a consequence of the price going up - in other words, the competitive position of a petrochemical industry in Alberta if the price rises to the international level?

My question is: has there been an investigation of the competitive impact and if so, what is it?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, that once again is indeed a very complex question. But to answer it simply: yes, we have monitored and related the position and the economic impact in relation to Alberta regarding the world-scale petrochemical identification in this province today at today's prices and in future projected prices.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question. Is it true that as the price of oil rises, the degree of assistance or subsidy or cushioning by the people of Alberta will have to increase to offset the decline in our competitive position as a result of higher prices?

MR. PEACOCK:

No, Mr. Speaker, because the relationship ... If we reduce all energy into a BTU common denominator, we relate the identification of what we use as a feedstock, whether it be gas, condensate or whatever, on a competitive basis to the value of the BTU breakout on a barrel of oil, whether it be east coast, United States or eastern Canada.

#### Community Corrections Program

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Solicitor General dealing with remarks in the Budget, page 16, where it talks of \$337,000 for a new Community Corrections Program.

I'd like to ask the Solicitor General if she sees a portion of this money being directed to the community involvement programs that the City of Edmonton and the City of Calgary police forces have become involved in in the course of the last number of months?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, no. That particular item in the Budget relates to the community residence portion of the correction system which we discussed at some length in debate during the last session I believe.

We have entered into contract agreements with a number of community agencies whereby those who do not necessarily need to be kept in maximum security are able to live in a community residence and proceed about education or employment in the local surrounding communities.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Solicitor General. Where in the Budget then, under the Solicitor General's department or perhaps the Attorney General's

department, would we find funds that could be earmarked for assistance to the City of Edmonton and the City of Calgary police forces as far as their community involvement programs are concerned?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of the fact that we've given any undertaking to be involved in any funding for that particular project of the police forces, although we're very interested in that particular method of policing that is being discussed.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has there been any discussion with the federal government regarding the takeover of all prisoners? The way it is today, "two years less a day" is a provincial responsibility. Have there been any discussions to lower that to, say, six months and over becomes the federal government responsibility?

MISS HUNLEY:

A year ago in December, that would be December of 1973, Mr. Speaker, all solicitors general or ministers responsible for corrections met with the Solicitor General of Canada in Ottawa. That was one of the topics raised at that time, but it was not resolved. I don't have the feeling that it's very high on the priority list of the Solicitor General of Canada.

#### Highway Contracts

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, my question relates to a statement that was made last night in the House by the hon. Member for Camrose. I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Highways. The statement was that new road construction ends at the border of a constituency represented by an opposition member. My question is: is this actual Department of Highways policy?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether that's policy or not but I noticed prior to the last election the same thing happened in my constituency on 922.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is: what the hon. member said last night then is not true?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I was not in the House last night. I don't know what the hon. member said.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, on a supplementary. I wonder, once the hon. Minister of Highways has a chance to read Hansard, if he would explain to the House the questions I've asked him?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I'll peruse Hansard when it comes out.

MR. LUDWIG:

For purposes of clarification, did the hon. minister answer that he is not sure whether it's government policy to stop highways at the constituencies of opposition members? Is that what he said?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain to the House that we usually let contracts out in units which are economical for the contractor to construct. If those units happen to fall on a border line between municipalities or between constituencies, you know, it happens. But I would think there is not a member on the other side of the House who can accuse me or my department of showing favoritism in any way in any of the constituencies.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Correct.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary. An hon. member of the other side accused him of that, Mr. Speaker, not anybody on this side.

[Interjections]



---

Health Care Insurance Commission Report

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the hon. Solicitor General. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if the hon. Solicitor General can indicate to us when the report of the Alberta Health Care Commission will be brought in.

MISS HUNLEY:

I tabled that last week.

DR. BUCK:

My apologies, Mr. Speaker.

---

Beef Industry

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture in response to a letter to all MLAs put out by the National Farmers' Union regarding assistance to the beef producers. Could the hon. minister inform the House whether the government has changed its previous policy, or is he considering changing it?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, we are at the moment involved in detailed discussions with all aspects of the problems in the beef industry. It is not our intention at the present time to change our cow-calf advance program which has worked well and has seen \$40 million put into the province.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister of Agriculture contemplating a meeting of the other provincial ministers of agriculture and the federal minister, say to come up with a national policy?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously the need in this country is for a national policy in regard to livestock. As a matter of fact, part of the communication that we are making to the federal government almost daily is exactly along those lines. We are hopeful that Mr. Whelan's statement that he was coming out with some new national programs for livestock will be speeded up and it will be a meaningful program as compared to what those programs are at the moment.

MR. BUCKWELL:

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister, in submissions he has made to the federal government - is there anything that could be tabled in the House or sent to these farm groups to assure them that the government is working on their behalf?

DR. HORNER:

I'd be delighted, Mr. Speaker, to table those letters. I can certainly table the letters that I've written to Mr. Whelan and Mr. Lang. I would have to get concurrence, of course, to table some of their replies, but I'd be delighted to do that if the hon. member would like to put it on the Order Paper.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Can the minister advise the Assembly whether or not the government is reviewing at this stage, or has under assessment, the proposal made by the National Farmers' Union to buy lower plain grades of cattle and whether or not, in view of the fact that the federal government has made \$10 million available to the program, the Alberta government is actively considering participating in it?

DR. HORNER:

Well, we've offered our assistance to the federal government in their so-called low-grade or plain cattle program. I would point out to the hon. member that the problem at the moment is with the higher grades and the depressed prices that are now in effect on them.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has the Department of Agriculture investigated the scheme in Quebec where cash payments are made per head to livestock producers?

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact I have in my notes here somewhere a complete run-down of the programs in every province in Canada and I can report to the House that

Alberta is doing as much as and much more than a great number of provinces. I believe that our program is in fact better than the one in Quebec.

MR. COOKSON:

A further supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't sure whether he gave the figure, whether he has a figure, on the guaranteed loans that the province has loaned ...

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Put it on the Order Paper.

MR. COOKSON:

... both for purchase of cows and for retaining calves amongst the cow-calf owners?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the latest figure I have with regard to the calf advance program is slightly over \$40 million, with an average of about \$3,200 per farmer.

#### Boundaries Commission

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Could the hon. minister inform the House if the commission appointed to study the boundaries of counties, municipal districts and school divisions is still active?

MR. RUSSELL:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. Hon. members will recall when the commission was appointed they were required to submit three reports. They are well into the work involved in submitting their third report which is due at the end of this calendar year.

MR. COOPER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Have there been any changes to date in the boundaries as a result of their studies and recommendations, or does that come at the end of their third report?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, it's becoming fairly obvious as the commission proceeds with its work that it would be better to leave boundary changes or adjustments until the final report, which deals with the entire province, is received.

#### Syncrude - Cost Write-offs

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, and ask him whether or not he has investigated reports that the three private partners of the Syncrude consortium will be able to write off the development costs against the respective incomes of the three participants?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member would have to clarify whether he's talking about the write-off of costs as related to the federal Income Tax Act or whether he's talking about the write-off of costs under a general agreement which, in the case of the province, has not been defined in a definitive agreement or accounting manner.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, to clarify the question: the question does not relate to the profit-sharing arrangement with the province, which I realize is up to the accounting manual. The question relates to federal corporation tax of which the Alberta government receives a share.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. member, the Province of Alberta under corporate income tax - although we have served notice to accomplish incentives that we intend designing a corporate tax to suit Alberta's purposes, we are nevertheless at the present time subject to the rulings and regulations of the federal department of national revenue and the federal income tax rules and regulations.

The specific item the hon. member refers to would be defined normally in the federal Income Tax Act. I would have to check the federal Act to see whether or not it applies in the manner the hon. member has indicated.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, while the hon. Provincial Treasurer is checking that matter, my follow-up question would be whether or not the Alberta government, in recent days since the release of the Foster report, has assessed the magnitude to the provincial treasury of the provisions which I refer to.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I think that's one of the great advantages of the royalty return to the people of Alberta, coming 50 per cent right off the top of profits before any corporate tax applies - either federal or provincial - because normally in our income tax system in this country, the provincial income rate is slightly less than one-third of the federal tax rate.

So the corporate tax system has a much greater magnitude in the case of the federal share of taxation than it has in the case of the provincial share of taxation and, of course, only applies after the people of Alberta receive 50 per cent share of the profits as a joint-venture royalty.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Can the Provincial Treasurer advise the Assembly whether or not he has been able to determine the depletion allowance arrangement for Syncrude? Is it true that it will be the old basis - one-third depletion allowance - or will it be an earned depletion allowance similar to the conventional industry?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I really think the hon. member should be examining the federal Income Tax Act in order to determine these arrangements. I don't think it's my position in this House to answer for the federal Income Tax Act and for federal policies under that Act.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. In the light of the fact that provincial money is accruing as a result of the taxation arrangements, my question is: is this matter now being studied by your department to assess the impact of it and to advise the Assembly accordingly?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member doesn't seem to understand the arrangement that was made. As I indicated in the position paper presented on corporate tax, the Province of Alberta shares very little in corporate taxation. Part of that is because the federal government takes a much larger portion of the tax room in the case of corporations. The second reason is that the income is allocated among provinces, even the 11 per cent. So the amount the hon. member is talking about is a very very minor, small percentage. It's certainly one that we assess, but of far greater magnitude is the fact that the Province of Alberta receives 50 per cent of the profit before any income taxes.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, the final supplementary question is just simply that. Is this matter now being assessed and is it being studied and will there be a report given to the Legislature on it?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated in the House we study a great many matters related to income tax. This matter related to a Syncrude arrangement and how it might accrue to Alberta on the tax portion is one that certainly is under consideration.

But I repeat again that until such time as we serve notice, and if we do serve notice that we are no longer going to be a part of the tax collection agreement which every province in Canada is a part of with the exception of Quebec in corporate tax, we are subject to the policies - we can make representations - but we are subject to the policies of the federal government in the national corporate tax system.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if for clarification I could make one statement in respect to the Foster economic evaluation of the Syncrude project. For the purpose of their report, they did use the new depletion rates and not the old depletion rates.

#### Auto Licence Plates

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, my question today is directed to the hon. Minister of Highways and Transport. Can the hon. minister advise this House what instructions were given to certain staff members in his department instructing them to withhold public information in regard to the 1975 Alberta licence plates?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would repeat the very end of the question. I didn't catch it as he sat down.

MR. HO LEM:

Seeking information, Mr. Speaker, on the 1975 Alberta licence plates.

MR. COPITHORNE:

What was the question?

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, may I run through the question again? The question is, hon. minister: can the hon. minister advise what instructions were given to certain staff members in your department instructing them to withhold public information in regard to the 1975 Alberta licence plates? That is the question.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what the hon. member is driving at but there is no information being withheld that I know of.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the hon. minister advise this House where the 1975 auto licence plates are being produced? This information was refused me this afternoon.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I think I spoke of where they are being produced at the time the contract was let. They are being manufactured in Saskatchewan and painted here in Edmonton.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Interprovincial trade.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. Can the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker, advise this House whether there are firms in Alberta capable of producing the licence plates?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question would have to be phrased somewhat differently to qualify for the question period because he appears to be asking for information that might be not peculiarly within the possession of the government, but rather be available to general ordinary private research.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. What Alberta firms now established can produce licence plates?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is repeating the same question in the same way, although in a different form.

DR. BUCK:

Supplementary to the hon. Minister of Highways or the Solicitor General. Can either hon. minister indicate to the House what was done with the licence plant equipment that was in Fort Saskatchewan jail?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain to the House - and the hon. gentlemen opposite don't seem to understand - that contracts of the magnitude of making licences or making roads are tendered, and quite often we accept tenders outside the province. I don't think it would be in the province's interest to be completely limited to accepting contracts from contractors only within the province of Alberta.

As a matter of fact there were, as well, submissions and bids made by contractors in the United States to make those licence plates. The lowest bidder was the one from Saskatchewan who makes the plates in Saskatchewan and for Manitoba. He was the lowest bidder and received the tender.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the hon. minister inform the House whether the plates will be on hand in good time to facilitate distribution, taking into consideration the large number of rejects that were returned as a result of poor workmanship?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, it appears at this time that the plates will not be ready by March 1. We are disappointed in the quality of the plates and have required those plates to be redone. Because of that, and the problem the company had in acquiring steel, which was very short

not only in Alberta but all over North America last year - then it was also in a train wreck; it seemed to have some disasters.

Anyway, the licence plates will be a little late this year, but they will be of good quality when they come to the general public.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, for a point of clarification. Do I take it then that the minister has indicated that the manufacturer produced a poor product?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, in the initial stages, yes he did produce a poor-quality product.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask, if my question could be answered now, what happened to the licence plate printing equipment in the Fort Saskatchewan jail?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, the equipment in Fort Saskatchewan was sold to the present manufacturer of the plates.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh no.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They must have got ...

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, that's a beautiful example of the Conservative free enterprise system.

Mr. Speaker, my question is: has the hon. Solicitor General, and the hon. Minister of Highways, considered possibly buying the equipment back and putting it back in Fort Saskatchewan jail?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Rural development.

MR. HO LEM:

One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Oh, I'm sorry.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, no we have not considered that, because at the beginning we didn't feel that was a very worth-while project. Once trained on the licence plate manufacturing machines, there was not an opportunity for employment once the inmates left the prison setting. That was one of the reasons we felt it wasn't worth while.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Keep bringing them back.

MISS HUNLEY:

The second reason was: in our opinion we either needed to become much larger or get out of the licence plate manufacturing entirely. It was purely the employment value we were considering when the decision was made and the Department of Highways felt that we were too small an operation to produce the magnitude of licence plates that we require.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, for a point of clarification. Did the hon. minister say the plant was sold to the person in Saskatchewan who is manufacturing the plates for Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, and the plant was inadequate?

[Interjections]

AN HON. MEMBER:

The plates were inadequate.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, may I ask another supplementary ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

The product was inadequate.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member - I know he has a surplus of labor out there in his constituency, but the equipment that was there, for the most part, was obsolete. There was some equipment that had some value. It was sold to the present manufacturer.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the minister checked to see, is it because of this obsolete equipment the manufacturer is now using that you got the poor product?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I wish we'd kept the machinery in Fort Saskatchewan. There might have been better equipment on hand.

MR. SPEAKER:

Perhaps we might have the final supplementary on the licence plates.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, is the hon. Minister of Highways in a position to indicate to the Legislature if the cost per unit of the licence plates is higher under this system than it was being produced in the Fort Saskatchewan jail?

MR. COPITHORNE:

That's a little hard to estimate. I presume that it is a little higher, but the quality of the plate is a much better plate.

[Laughter]

DR. BUCK:

You just told us it was ...

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, if the honorable gentleman would just remain in his place until I have finished an explanation, I would be happy to give him the information so he doesn't have to be jumping up and down like a jack-in-the-box to make an answer.

The quality of the plate is a fully reflectorized plate and will be a multi-year plate. We think the quality is better, so it has cost more to produce than the other ones - as well as the cost of steel.

MR. HO LEM:

In view that I did initiate the licence plate question, may I finish up with a final supplementary?

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member proceed with the supplementary?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Minister, in view of the number of rejects and the inconvenience caused, will you be pressing for compensation?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, at the present moment I'm pressing for the best quality of plate that can be produced. Many of the plates are being done over again, so there won't be any rejects when they're completely done.

MR. HO LEM:

A point of clarification to the minister, Mr. Speaker. I'm not talking about the rejects in quality but the inconvenience and the time delay.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I don't think the general public will be sorry about the delay because they are usually asking for extensions of time to buy their licence plates.

#### Highway Contracts (continued)

MR. WYSE:

My question also, Mr. Speaker, is to the hon. Minister of Highways and Transport. It's regarding last year's construction on Highway No. 3 between Seven Persons and Bow Island. Is the minister aware there are still numerous outstanding bills on this particular highway since last June?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, as far as the contract is concerned, the contractor is bonded and the job is completely bonded. So if the subcontractor has outstanding bills, it will be up to the contractor to collect from the subcontractor and have those bills cleared up.

MR. WYSE:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I brought this to the attention of the minister last fall. The mess still isn't cleared up and ...

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's announcement would have to be a little more querulous to qualify for the question period.

MR. WYSE:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the government any responsibility in this matter?

[Interjections]

MR. WYSE:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Has the government any control over subcontracting on highways in the province?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, the honorable gentleman doesn't seem to understand what a bond means. The contract is let out to a contractor and he has seen fit to leave part of the contract open to another subcontractor. This is a common procedure. The contract is fully bonded, so the debtors should certainly be well protected.

MR. WYSE:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister understand when these people don't get their money? Is he aware of that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member asked that question to begin with. That could hardly be a supplementary.

MR. WYSE:

Supplementary ...

MR. SPEAKER:

We're running short of time and perhaps we should get on to another topic. Would the hon. member just see if we have further time; otherwise we might come back to this question tomorrow.

#### Big Game Stocks

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Concern is being expressed in our neighboring provinces concerning dwindling stocks of big game. Has the hon. minister assessed the situation in Alberta as to moose, deer, elk, sheep and goats?

DR. WARRACK:

Yes we have, Mr. Speaker, and that is a good question. The fundamental basis on which the hunting seasons are established each year, more than anything else is on the wildlife populations, big game or otherwise. This is part of the assessment that goes forward at this time of year and then is also reviewed by the Fish and Wildlife Advisory Council as to proposed hunting seasons and regulations in the spring.

So the answer to that important question, Mr. Speaker, is yes.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplemental, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. As a result of these studies, will there be a limitation or further restriction as to the time in which hunting is permitted?

DR. WARRACK:

Well, Mr. Speaker, that of course depends on the result. As a matter of fact, if there were no reason to have any limitation, there wouldn't be any seasons and it would simply be open all the time.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will this limitation of restraints be enforced upon the Native people of Alberta?

DR. WARRACK:

I'm surprised that the hon. member is not aware of how the law stands in this regard. That is a matter of federal law and is a matter of the aboriginal rights granted under treaty to the Native people, not only of Alberta but other provinces as well. It is strictly a matter of federal law and a matter over which the province has no jurisdiction.

## Auto Licence Plates (continued)

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Highways and Transport. It's relating to the 1975 licence plates. When will these be available to the public?

AN HON. MEMBER:

When they're ready.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, we had hoped to have them ready for the public by April 1, but to be safe I would suggest it would probably be May 1 before they would be ready.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. In view of the exceptionally long list of supplementaries we had with regard to the licence plates, and the fact that some other members are waiting, perhaps we should get on to another topic.

## Glenrose Hospital

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. It is regarding the opening of the new addition to the Glenrose Hospital. Who authorized Baker Lovick advertising and gave them a contract? Was it the government or the hospital board that authorized it?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what involvement Baker Lovick has had, but I'd be pleased to check into it. I've seen no advertising personally.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Clover Bar followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, my question has been answered. Thank you.

## Highway Contracts (continued)

MR. WYSE:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the hon. Minister of Highways. Is this government considering any changes in the procedure of tendering on highways in the province?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, we have already made some procedures of changes in tendering that have made it easier for contractors to operate on their jobs throughout the province and yet assure the province complete surety of the job being finished in a satisfactory manner.

MR. WYSE:

One last supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, regarding the construction on Highway No. 3 last year. Does this government have any more commitment to Dawson Construction in terms of dollars for construction on Highway No. 3 last year?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, that has not been brought to my attention. But quite often there are different calculations as a construction job goes along and extra materials are required beyond the call of the original contract signed between the government and the contractor. In those cases, there is a further payment made.

As I recall, the job is not tendered to be completed until next year, and I'm just repeating these off my head. It would be better to put it on the Order Paper if you want the exact figures, but I think it is to be finished sometime this year, and it is appraised at that time.

DR. BUCK:

A further supplementary to the hon. minister. Can he indicate to the House what changes the hon. minister's department has made to the system of public tendering?

MR. SPEAKER:

If that question permits a brief answer, which the hon. minister would know better of course than the Chair, it might be dealt with now. Otherwise it perhaps should be done by means of an announcement of policy or perhaps sought by a question on the Order Paper.



MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, it would require quite a lengthy answer and if the hon. member requires the changes that have been made, if he would put it on the Order Paper I would be happy to do that.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is it a change in philosophy? I mean, is it basically the same, that it goes out to public tender? This is the point that bothers me.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, the basic philosophy of tendering the jobs is still the same.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I don't ... [inaudible] ... .

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### WRITTEN QUESTIONS

122. Mr. Notley asked the government the following question:

1. What is the amount of monies paid by government to W.J. Levy and/or his firm to date.
2. What purpose was W.J. Levy and/or his firm contracted by the government?
3. Is Mr. Levy or his firm presently retained by this government; at what cost to the people of Alberta?
4. On what basis is Mr. Levy or his firm being retained; that is, is Mr. Levy or his firm acting as consultant on general petroleum industry question/policies, or solely in the area of development of oil sands procedure?

123. Mr. French asked the government the following question:

With respect to foundations under The Senior Citizens Housing Act.

- (1) What is the deficit or surplus incurred by each foundation in the province for the year ending December 31, 1974.
- (2) What is the average occupancy for each foundation for the year ending December 31, 1974.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, we accept the question but it may take some time to answer, in that we are waiting for many of the audited financial statements from the foundations.

#### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, may I move Motion No. 111?

111. Mr. Drain proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

For each of the years from 1965 to the most recent year for which statistics are available on Highway 3 between Sentinel, Alberta and the British Columbia border:

- (a) the number of accidents involving property damage, but no personal injury,
- (b) the number of accidents involving personal injury and the number of persons injured,
- (c) the number of accidents resulting in fatalities and the number of fatalities.

[The motion was carried.]

116. Mr. Notley proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

Copies of all studies, reports or documents undertaken by or received by the Department of Highways with respect to its assessment of the relationship between highway speed limits and traffic fatalities, particularly in the United States.

[The motion was carried.]

117. Mr. Notley proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

1. Copies of all agreements showing stumpage dues, chip prices, reforestation practices and leasing commitments between the government of Alberta and
  - (a) Procter & Gamble
  - (b) North Western Pulp & Power Ltd.
2. Copies of all agreements showing stumpage dues, reforestation practices and leasing commitments between the government of Alberta and Canfor Ltd.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to accept Motion for a Return No. 117 but two or three comments would be useful for clarification inasmuch as the agreements in question do not contain the matter of chip prices, nor do the agreements include a description of reforestation practices. These are rather under the timber management regulations.

Thirdly, with respect to part 2 of the question, the agreement is actually with North Canadian Forest Industries but I believe that is what the hon. member means with the Canfor company, since it is a parent company. With those clarifications, Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to accept Motion for a Return 117.

[The motion was carried.]

120. Mr. Benoit proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

1. How many senior citizens homes and additions to existing homes will be built out of the 1974/75 estimates and special warrants;
2. The sizes of the homes and additions;
3. The locations of the homes and additions;
4. The projected completion dates of the homes and additions.

B. The same information as above but with reference to self-contained units.

[The motion was carried.]

121. Mr. Barton proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

1. The programs under which the Department of Agriculture purchases cattle, for the fiscal years 1971-72, 1972-73, 1973-74, and from April 1, 1974, to the present date.
2. The numbers, kinds, ages, purchasing price, purchasing dates and origins of cattle purchased under each such program for the fiscal years 1971-72, 1972-73, 1973-74, and from April 1, 1974, to the present date.

3. The persons, companies, or agencies which care for these cattle; price per day per animal charged by each of these persons, companies or agencies; and the total amount of money paid to each of these persons, companies or agencies for such services for the fiscal year 1971-72, 1972-73, 1973-74, and from April 1, 1974, to the present date.
4. The numbers of each kind and age of cattle sold, including the average sales price and the name of the purchaser, for the fiscal years 1971-72, 1972-73, 1973-74, and from April 1, 1974, to the present date.
5. The numbers of each kind and age of cattle maintained at present by the government of Alberta.
6. The method of selling and distributing such cattle.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order before we proceed, I may have missed this, but I don't believe Question 122 was called.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes, it was.

MR. NOTLEY:

Ch. Okay.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question 122 was in fact accepted. The hon. member may not have heard perhaps.

#### MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Mr. Taylor proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government of the province to make representation to the Government of Canada to amend the Criminal Code to provide that:

1. A sentence of death passed by a judge which is not reduced on appeal shall be duly carried out unless a recommendation for mercy or clemency is given by the judge or jury in which case His Excellency the Governor General in Council shall have the authority to commute such sentence.
2. A sentence of life imprisonment shall mean imprisonment for the remainder of the individual's natural life.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, this is not a resolution on capital punishment. It wasn't my thought at all that capital punishment should even be discussed in this resolution. The whole purpose of this resolution is that we try to maintain the sanctity of our courts and when the law provides for the death sentence, it should be carried out and not commuted.

In order to deal with the matter, I'd like first of all to define the terms of what the law actually is now. In the Criminal Code in Section 214, "Murder is capital murder or non-capital murder." There are no degrees like there were at one time; we now have murder as either capital or noncapital. And,

Murder is capital murder, in respect of any person, where such person by his own act caused or assisted in causing the death of

- (a) a police officer, police constable, constable, sheriff, deputy sheriff, sheriff's officer or other person employed for the preservation and maintenance of the public peace, acting in the course of his duties, or
- (b) a warden, deputy warden, instructor, keeper, gaoler, guard or other officer or permanent employee of a prison, acting in the course of his duties, or [counsels] or procured another person to do any act causing or assisting in causing the death.

All murder other than capital murder is non-capital murder.

Now while to a degree I disagree with the definition of capital murder, it is not my intention at this time to ask that that be changed. I frankly think that the murder of a child or a woman is just as serious as the murder of a policeman or guard. Policemen are

in a particular category because they're risking their lives in order to make the lives of the rest of us safer in the community, and in that particular category they do stand out conspicuously. My own conscience says that murder is murder. Whether it's a child or woman, a man or police guard, in my view that's murder.

But I'm not pursuing that at this time. I'm simply giving you the way the Criminal Code sets it out and there are two classes of murder: capital murder and all other murders, noncapital murder. Capital murder is, in brief, the murder of a policeman, police officer, or prison guard.

Now having defined the term that we want to deal with, I'd like to deal with the sentence. The sentence for capital murder under the act is death. It is the only section in the Criminal Code where the penalty for committing it is death and we're not asking that that be changed. When we deal with the actual facts of the case we find that while the law of the country says that death when ordered by a court should be carried out, we find that that is not happening at all.

I don't want to deal at this time either with whether or not the death sentence is a deterrent or otherwise. I frankly doubt whether we could come to a conclusion based on statistics. Whether the death sentence is a deterrent to others, it is certainly a deterrent to the person who is executed; he'll never commit murder again. But whether or not it's a deterrent to others, I think is open to debate and that doesn't come into this particular resolution either.

Really all this resolution is asking is where a court does order the death sentence that that death sentence be carried out unless the jury or the judge recommends clemency or mercy, in which case commutation can take place by the Governor General in Council.

I'd like to deal with the commutation section of the act, 684 of the Criminal Code, and I quote: if the Governor in Council, the cabinet of Canada, so directs in the instrument of commutation,

..... a person in respect of whom a sentence of death has been commuted to imprisonment ... shall

notwithstanding any other law or authority

not be released during his life or such term, as the case may be, without prior approval of the Governor in Council.

So we have the courts in some cases where they do not order execution, where they order life imprisonment and then life imprisonment comes under this commutation, because life imprisonment generally in this country means 7 years or less than 10 years. This is a part that is worrying too many people at the present time. It's with these two points only that this resolution deals.

I'd like to deal with this matter of commutation. I have a lot of misgivings when I look at the record since 1962 and realize that in spite of the law, and I say in spite of the law, the Governor General in Council, or the cabinet of the Canadian government, has been commuting sentences. This is the part that is very worrying, because it's actually making a mockery of our courts.

I'd like to just check and see how serious this problem is. I've taken statistics for a few years out of the statistics prepared by the Canadian government. I'm going to do it in 10-year periods up to 1962. In 1930-39 there were 125 persons executed and 42 commutations - in other words almost three times as many were executed as were commuted. All these cases of course were sentenced by the court to be executed, but one third were commuted.

Between 1940 and '49, 95 persons were executed and 46 were commuted, or a little less than half were commuted out of that total. When we come to 1950-59, we find that this trend is moving towards more commutations and fewer executions. In 1950-59 there were 72 executed and 70 commuted out of 142, so they are almost even in 1950-59. Then between 1960 and '62 there were 5 persons executed and 23 commuted. In other words, now the pendulum had gone the other way and there were far more commutations than there were executions, bearing in mind that all these persons were sentenced by a court to be hanged for the murder of some other person.

Now this trend, if it's done within the law, I think is something we can like or dislike and argue for or argue against, but again that isn't my purpose in this particular resolution. The part that worries me in this resolution is that the law states that for capital murder, that is the murder of a police officer or guard, the sentence is death. When the courts have ordered the death sentence, it has not been carried out since 1962. It has simply been commuted, not by the court but by a political body, the cabinet of the country.

Now I don't want to change the authority of the cabinet of Canada to make commutations. I want them to have that authority, but I want the Government of Canada to act within the law. We have too many cases where governments act outside the law and then we bemoan the fact that our laws are decaying and people are becoming demoralized; people aren't obeying the law and don't have respect for the law.

Well we have an example here where the Government of Canada doesn't have respect for the law. If the Government of Canada is unable to persuade the House of Commons to change the law that there be no executions, and the House of Commons passes a law - part of the Criminal Code - that where that person kills a police officer or guard [and] upon being found guilty is sentenced to death, that death sentence should be carried out. If the

Government of Canada can't persuade the legislators, who are the voice of the people of Canada, to change that and make no hangings or no executions the byword in Canada, then the government should be carrying out the law as it's set out in the Criminal Code of Canada, just as every other person in every other field of activity should be expected to try to carry out the law of the country. Certainly the government should be setting that example.

But since 1962, there have been no executions at all in spite of the fact that there's been a large number ordered by the courts. That is the point I'm trying to make in this resolution. I don't want to argue capital punishment although I feel very strongly in regard to it. I don't want to argue that in this particular resolution. I don't want to cloud the facts of the thing I'm trying to bring home to the people of Canada - well I don't think it's necessary to bring it home to the people of Canada, but to the Government of Canada and to the members of the House of Commons. I don't think it's necessary to urge the Government of Alberta. That word is in there because we changed certain words after the resolution was accepted. But I do think it's necessary to bring to the attention of the Government of Canada and the House of Commons that the law as set out is not being carried out. That's the point I'm trying to make in this resolution. In other words we have a mockery of the courts going on at the present time in regard to this matter.

I don't think it's a question of whether we believe in capital punishment or whether we don't. The thing is: the law says that in capital punishment the court has the authority to order executions. And if the court orders execution with no mercy or clemency recommended, in my view that execution should be carried out. I don't think the Governor in Council should take unto themselves the authority to change the law of Canada, take it into their own hands and carry out a commutation. If the commutations are to be carried out, let's change the law. But as long as the law says that the penalty for capital murder is death, that is the way it should be carried out in this country.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to belabor the fact. I'm simply saying that the whole tenor of this resolution is to do away with the mockery of the courts that's now going on in this country. It's a shame that that mockery is being carried out by the government of our country. As a free citizen in a free country, I feel it is my responsibility not to accept it, but to speak loudly against it. In my view if a court sentences a person to death for capital murder and the jury or the judge does not recommend clemency or mercy, that death sentence should be carried out. The Government of Canada should not take unto themselves the authority to change the law as set out by the representatives of the people of Canada.

Secondly, in regard to the life sentence, we have cases where a person has committed a serious crime, has been in prison for life and then is let out and has committed the same crime again - which doesn't show much rehabilitation. I believe in rehabilitation. I believe in making every attempt to try to persuade people to live within the laws of our country. But when life imprisonment means 7 years or 10 years or less - most of the time 7 years - life imprisonment doesn't really mean that at all. If we intend people to have only 7 years in prison, why doesn't the law say 7 years and not life. Anyone knows that life is not 7 years and if we mean life, let's say life.

Now I'm not dealing with the other provisions of the code that make appeals and bring other authorities into action. That's a different matter. But without those other instruments in the code, a sentence of life imprisonment should mean just that - life. The law today is being far too lenient in simply taking the term life to mean 7 years when it's not so defined in the Criminal Code of Canada.

The point in summing up is that I would hope this resolution would be unanimous. I think it represents the thinking of the vast majority of the people of our province, many of whom do not believe in capital punishment, many of whom do believe in capital punishment. I'm sure the vast majority believes that when the law is set, that law should be carried out and the Governor in Council should not have the authority to change that law by commutations, unless we provide for such in the law and unless it's going to apply to cases where mercy and clemency are recommended by a judge or a jury.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. Member for Stony Plain followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

MR. PURDY:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think that the motion put forward by the hon. Member for Drumheller is timely. We may have more input from the discussion in this Legislature for federal members, as it is a federal statute we are looking at.

The debate on capital punishment has been around in the limelight for many years, and it was even in the days of the Bible. Biblical quotations have been put on both sides of the issue. We can look at Numbers 35:31, "You accept no ransom for the life of a murderer who is guilty of death, but he shall be put to death." But then you can look at the Ten Commandments and the Ten Commandments say, "Thou shalt not kill."

As was stated by a noted Presbyterian church executive:

The law of capital punishment must stand as a silent but powerful witness to the sacredness of God-given life. Words are not enough to show that life is sacred. Active justice must be administered when the sacredness of life is violated.

Some people argue that the death penalty is far worse than punishment for any crime for which it is imposed. As a general rule, a man is undone by waiting for capital punishment.

As pointed out by the hon. Member for Drumheller, the Criminal Code was amended to classify murder as capital and noncapital. Generally speaking, capital murder is when it is planned and deliberate. On studying the Criminal Code, we see it is not always necessary, in order to constitute capital murder, that the accused actually intended to kill. The Criminal Code states that a person convicted of capital murder, who was under of 18 at the time of the offence, is sentenced to life imprisonment.

The code also provides that upon the accused being convicted for capital murder, the judge shall ascertain whether the jury wishes to make any recommendations for or against clemency, for consideration by the Executive Council in deciding whether or not the death penalty should be commuted.

I believe all police forces in Canada are in favor of capital punishment, not only because of deaths within their own ranks, but because of all others. Police have said that no other deterrent is as effective. Fear of death is a greater deterrent than fear of punishment by life imprisonment. Capital punishment has two kinds of deterrent effects, either special or general, depending upon whether it relates to the offender himself or to other offenders. Special deterrent is completely effective, since the death penalty does away with the criminal forever.

A number of specialists maintain the best deterrent is still the certainty of being discovered and arrested. For the full-time criminal the penalty is one of the risks of the trade, if he is prepared to run that risk. Nor does the death penalty deter the mentally ill. It is therefore doubtful whether capital punishment adequately meets the object of the deterrent.

People have argued that rehabilitation is the object that could be reached. The rehabilitation process consists of readjustment. It is based on faith in human worth and dignity, and society's awareness of the importance of devoting time and energy to the rehabilitation of the offender. The imposition of the death penalty physically destroys the criminal and any possibility of rehabilitation.

Both the supporters and the opponents of the death penalty have one common concern: the protection of society. The former feel they can achieve this by doing away with the offender, both to be rid of him and to deter others. The latter see the rehabilitation of the criminal as the best way to achieve this objective.

I think I have to support the remarks made by the hon. Member for Drumheller in regards to life imprisonment; that once a life imprisonment sentence is handed [down], it should be for life unless a rehabilitation program can be worked out where they can be brought in and be useful to our society.

As I stated earlier, Mr. Speaker, this debate on capital punishment is not new; after members from this Assembly are gone, and after members from the federal House of Commons are gone, the question will not be resolved.

Thank you.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I too wish to support the motion. I believe that raising it in this House is quite timely. Although we haven't got the jurisdiction to deal with the problem, we certainly can let those who have know where we stand.

I took the trouble to write every Member of Parliament and received a very good response. The majority of the members who responded, and I believe most of them did, favored toughening up the penalties in dealing with crimes of violence and in executions for capital murder. Some made the distinction as to whether they should just execute those who kill a prison guard or a policeman; most stated that the time has come perhaps when a conviction for capital murder would mean that the convicted would be executed, unless as this motion states, that there would be a special recommendation of clemency by either the judge or jury.

I believe that at one time the pendulum started swinging away from harsh penalties - remember in the olden days when they used to hang you for stealing a cabbage - the pendulum swung to where we became quite lenient. With the involvement of reforms, sociologists got into the act and humane judges, humane administrators and lawmakers so that we have swung away from severe punishment to where the public has now become concerned.

In dealing with an issue like this, the matter of deterrents is always raised, whether it is a deterrent to execute someone, and I mean a deterrent to someone else committing a similar offence. But the only study that was conducted, or poll or review of this issue that was made, was made in the State of California. Although the majority of criminals who had been convicted of crimes of violence had stated that they had not used weapons in the commission of their crimes because of fear of causing death and thereby getting themselves executed or going to the gas chamber, those who analysed the study felt that this was not a reliable type of study because most prisoners apparently were anxious to answer questions in the manner that the person asking was hoping they would answer.

We deal with the matter of retribution. In days gone by when someone who had suffered, or someone whose family had suffered wanted vengeance; they wanted retribution.

The issue of justification for penalties is also a very well discussed and well written up issue, but I believe that the time, especially in the U.S. now and becoming more so in Canada, has come when we have to consider public safety; we have to show concern for the aggrieved, for the one who is killed and [for] those close to him, related to him, but primarily for public safety. This kind of debate would focus attention upon the fact that we have perhaps to do something to prevent the rapid rise in crimes of violence. I haven't got statistics before me; I haven't got the material with me, but the increase in armed robbery, beatings, assault, rape and murder in the U.S. has rocketed. We know that the increase in crimes of violence even in this province - we are rather isolated from many things here, but not from crime - the increases have become so large that people are apprehensive.

When we deal with an issue like this, it isn't just a question of what we would like; no one really wants to take life. There are many arguments in favor of the state not taking life, but the state has responsibility through its Members of Parliament to protect the public. That is the main concern now. Many people, many elderly people often feel, in a place like Calgary, that the next time somebody gets it, it could be me. Therefore we are looking at the morale of the police; we are looking at public safety. So the more this issue is discussed, the more input people have and the more Members of Parliament know as to the people's thinking, the sooner we will get some type of action.

As I stated, I received a tremendously good response from all the Members of Parliament. I sent them a form letter in which I indicated my views on it. There appears to be a lot of support for the matter of increased penalties for crimes of violence - stiffer penalties, that is, and execution for murder. I believe that as public opinion brings itself to bear on its representatives, perhaps it will have to go that way. Many MPs and public representatives are reluctant to shut the door entirely on the right of the Queen to pardon someone who has committed a crime. But the problem with our federal government is that it appears to be the rule rather than the exception. It is not a matter of reviewing a meritorious case, or some case where there was perhaps some problem that the courts or the jury did not quite catch, some fact where the state believed that maybe we should not execute this person. It has become a practice where, in recent years, the person convicted and having gone through all his rights of appeal and finally condemned to death, the state has without exception pardoned the criminal. This is where the issue stands now.

I believe the public view has to be recognized. Their own safety - the safety of the people - is paramount in their minds. We are spending a tremendous amount of money in providing police protection for the public. It's one of our top priorities in spending in this province. We're spending tremendous amounts of money in the administration of justice. Then the police, and quite justifiably in this day and age, feel that perhaps a lot of their efforts are futile. The police are not all unreasonable. They're not all for the execution of swift justice in the manner that each one thinks. They know the law and they know their job and responsibility. But when police organizations throughout Canada are taking the position in some instances, well what's the use - I believe that report came from Ontario recently - what's the use of doing anything because we turn the man loose and we have to risk our lives again very shortly to apprehend the same person. These are the matters that the public is concerned about.

I believe one of the Members of Parliament conducted a poll in Calgary - I won't mention the area he did it in - but he received rather overwhelming support from the public, from the people, for his view that a convicted murderer has to be executed unless there are special circumstances of clemency recommended.

One can moralize on this issue to determine what kind of person would agree to take life. Some of the most devout religious people, the clergy, the leaders in this field who deal with morals and with human conscience, have taken a very strong stand in support of execution for murder. One mustn't blame the lay people if they follow this lead and believe that their advice is sound and acceptable. Many people just don't know what to do, except that their prime concern is their own safety.

For that reason, I believe that this motion is timely, and that this issue should get a good airing. We should advise the Members of Parliament that we are concerned, and perhaps some of them may change their minds as they have indicated to me in their correspondence. Some who had previously supported the present policy of the government in virtually automatic clemency have written to me stating that they will be taking a second look at this issue in view of the development in this field in recent years, and in particular in view of the fact that police have been killed from one coast to the other, including Calgary.

I would urge hon. members to express their views on it. I am sure that we could not expect unanimity, but on the other hand it would help those in Ottawa to make a decision if we told them what we think of the issue.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate, I certainly agree with those who have argued that the issue is timely in view of the ongoing controversy that it has aroused, both in our own province and throughout Canada.

I would have to say at the outset that my personal conviction is that we should not only carry on the present situation but extend it to cover the entire field. In my view it's a little difficult to distinguish, as the hon. Member for Drumheller pointed out, between the killing of an innocent child on the one hand or the killing of a policeman or

prison guard on the other. Because I believe in abolition, I think that abolition of capital punishment should go all the way.

However, as the Member for Drumheller pointed out, the purpose of this resolution is not to discuss the pros and cons of capital punishment itself, but rather to deal on whether or not there should be commutation where mercy has not been recommended by the jury. Mr. Speaker, the resolution, while the member - I think perhaps quite fairly - suggested it didn't deal with the question of capital punishment per se, cannot really be discussed outside the context of where one stands on the issue of capital punishment. I would certainly acknowledge that the prevailing public opinion in this province is probably in favor of capital punishment, extending capital punishment from those areas of capital murder now classified, to at least where it was before the change took place in 1962. But, Mr. Speaker, in my judgment the evidence that we have to date just doesn't bear out the argument for expanded capital punishment.

Setting aside the various arguments all the way from Biblical quotations on, it seems to me the strongest argument for capital punishment is: does it represent a real deterrent? It seems to me that that has to be the argument that the retentionists must focus on and must demonstrate clearly to the people of Canada, that in fact capital punishment does represent a deterrent.

Mr. Speaker, there aren't that many statistics available. We do have some statistics prepared by the Department of the Solicitor General in Canada that review the increase in crimes of violence between 1962 and 1970, and we find that the increase in criminal homicide has been 35.3 per cent. This would have been considered a capital offence before 1962. Rape, 52.6 per cent.

But the largest increases of violent crimes, Mr. Speaker, have been in those areas which would not have been previously classified as capital crimes. For example, attempted murder, the increase is 180 per cent; wounding and assault, the increase 125.1 per cent; armed robbery, 94.7 per cent. So the statistics that have been compiled by the Department of the Solicitor General would indicate that while crimes of violence are increasing across the board, the largest increase has been in what we might call the noncapital type of crime.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would just have to argue that there is certainly not, to my mind anyway, sufficient data before us to argue the case for moving back to full-scale capital punishment. It seems to me that before we make that kind of move, the retentionists have to compile more information than they have to date.

Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this subject I'd like to quote from the Rt. Hon. John Diefenbaker, who as most of you know is one of Canada's leading abolitionists, the man who has dealt as a defence attorney with many cases in various courts across the country. I'd like to quote, Mr. Speaker, page 3793 of Hansard, dated April 4, 1966, because Mr. Diefenbaker in this particular comment deals with perhaps the most troubling aspect of capital punishment for those of us who oppose it, and that is: what happens if we sentence to death and hang an innocent person. Well the argument is, that really doesn't happen; our judicial system, our legal system is such that it won't really happen. Here is what Mr. Diefenbaker says, and I quote:

From my experience at the bar I say that anyone who says an innocent man cannot go to the gallows is wrong, because I know differently. It is a frightful thing when a man you believe to be innocent and whose attitude is, Don't worry about me, God will not allow it, walks to the gallows and months later the truth comes out. These are the things that exercise the mind and heart of those who from time to time without remuneration act for the defence.

Well I think, Mr. Speaker, everyone in this Assembly would recognize that throughout his distinguished career, Mr. Diefenbaker has been willing to take up the cause of people who have been accused of capital crimes, or other crimes for that matter, and has pleaded their cases with ability and with skill.

But, Mr. Speaker, the point he makes is one that we would do well to ponder because it surely is a commentary on the type of punitive system we have, if we have a man, probably the most distinguished Canadian in this field, saying in a very categorical way that innocent people can be sent to the gallows.

Mr. Speaker, as I think one of the members pointed out in this debate today, the capital punishment of an individual, the hanging or the electric chair or whatever the case may be, is a final solution. There is no way of rectifying it if we've made a mistake.

So this is the concern that in my view remains unanswered by those who argue the case for capital punishment. They have not been able, in my judgment anyway, to cite clear-cut evidence that capital punishment represents a deterrent. On the other hand, there is the possibility of the innocent being sentenced to death.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the resolution of course before us does not argue the case directly as far as capital punishment is concerned. But it does say that there should not be commutation. My quarrel with that provision in this resolution is that it seems to me there has to be, even in the case of capital murder, the slaying of a prison guard or of a policeman, there still has to be that prerogative left with the Executive Council. New information comes forward. Perhaps not the kind of information which would be substantial enough to give a full pardon. But if new information comes forward that makes the case just a little less than airtight so that the jury did not recommend mercy, there has to be that latitude so the Executive Council can commute the sentence.



Mr. Speaker, I know there is frustration among many people in Canada at what appears to be an attempt on the part of the federal cabinet to circumvent the spirit of the law by almost an automatic commutation of sentences. But, Mr. Speaker, that really is a judgment of the Executive Council at the time. I would hate to see us in any way take away that latitude because it is so vital that we ensure that if there is any possibility of the wrong person being sentenced, especially in the case of a capital crime, that possibility is eliminated.

Now the final point the Member for Drumheller makes is one that quite frankly I am somewhat sympathetic to. I wouldn't argue the case that the life sentence should be one's natural life. But Mr. Diefenbaker suggests 20 years, a minimum of 20 years. That strikes me as being probably a more reasonable figure. I can appreciate the concern of people who see life sentences being no more than 7 years and then out comes the person free and clear.

So I would sympathize with that particular section of this resolution although I would not want to see it mean the natural life of the individual. If a person is convicted at the age of 18, at the age of majority, that would mean perhaps a 50-year sentence and that in my judgment, especially with a rehabilitative penal system, would not serve the public interest.

There's the old argument of course that the punishment must fit the crime. If a person commits murder, the state has the right to take that person's life in return. Mr. Diefenbaker's answer to that in his debate in 1966 is interesting too. And I quote:

But I say that the doctrine of an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth and a life for a life, if carried out literally, would mean that nobody would have eyes to see with; and there would be nobody with teeth.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. Diefenbaker's comments are probably valid in that respect.

The other observation I would make on this subject, Mr. Speaker, deals with the views of various church leaders. Again I recognize that there are some people, some of the clergy, who are in favor of capital punishment although it's my understanding that the major denominations in this country are not in favor of capital punishment. But I thought just to conclude my remarks, again referring to Mr. Diefenbaker's speech, he refers to a convention resolution adopted by the Baptist Church. It reads as follows:

Because the Christian believes in the inherent worth of human personality and in the unceasing availability of God's mercy, forgiveness, and redemptive power, and

Because the Christian wholeheartedly supports the emphasis in modern penology upon the process of creative, redemptive rehabilitation rather than punitive and primitive retribution, and

Because the deterrent effects of capital punishment are not supported by available evidence, and

Because the death penalty tends to brutalize the human spirit and the society which condones it, and

Because human agencies of legal justice are fallible, permitting the possibility of the execution of the innocent,

We, therefore, recommend the abolition of capital punishment and the re-evaluation of the parole system relevant to such cases.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, that particular passage, that particular resolution sums up the views of those people, including myself, who favor abolition of capital punishment.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. It is only with a great deal of self-restraint that I do not spend a lot of time speaking about a number of things that aren't related directly to the resolution. I had hoped maybe I might have the opportunity of using this for a springboard for a rather lengthy discussion, but I'm going to follow the advice of the one who moved the motion and stick closely to this subject itself. I respect the mover's explanation and I congratulate him on moving this particular resolution.

I believe very sincerely that legislatures and parliaments make laws to be observed by the people of the country. I believe that when they make these laws, they make them to the best of their ability and hopefully they make them in accord, not only with the wishes of the people, but with the higher principles of life so that men may live with men, free in a society in which we have chosen to live.

If this be the case, I believe very sincerely the basic principle of this resolution that governments, which are the servants of the legislatures or the parliaments that make the laws, should themselves keep the laws as well as make certain that the laws are kept by individuals or groups in society. For that reason, I think a great deal of emphasis needs to be put upon the primary principle of this particular resolution.

So I speak my word in that regard, not only with respect to the points that are brought out here with regard to capital punishment and not commuting that particular sentence or the idea that if you are sentenced to life imprisonment, you should keep the entire sentence, but also with regard to a number of more minor details - what we might consider less important laws - that governments should keep the laws which are made by the legislatures and parliaments as well as other individuals.

Without saying any more, Mr. Speaker, I will leave it at that and hope that each member will be able to apply for himself this principle in everything that we undertake, not only as government, but as individuals in our private lives.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Whitecourt followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

MR. TRYNCHY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I too would like to say a few words on this topic, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Member for Drumheller has presented a timely resolution urging the provincial government to make representation to the federal government to have some changes made.

I would like to say first, this will probably be the first time the federal government ever listened to the Alberta government, if we did make such recommendations. It's a good move but what changes do we really want, what really can we expect, and what really will we get. We have heard a number of members talk on what we should be doing to the ones who are in our penal institutions now.

I'd like to go right to the beginning and find out why we have these people there. I'd like to talk about the first offenders and how we can avoid having them there in the first place. The protection we talk about, I'm sure we all agree, we need. The RCMP and all our police forces should be strengthened, and are doing an excellent job. But how do we arrive at so many of our young people and some of our other people [being] in these institutions. I ask myself, and I'd like to ask the rest of the members to think, where does the fault lie? Is it in our society? Is it in government regulations? Perhaps it's in our schools. Does it come here from other nations - people immigrating to Canada, to our province, bringing with them crime and other items contrary to our laws in this province, and Canada of course.

I would say that if we could strengthen ourselves in the beginning, probably improve our surroundings - the province of Alberta, the society we live in is tremendous and yet we have crime. Now why should we have it? I've asked myself this question and I can come up with no answer. Is it ourselves who are to blame, as parents who do not teach our children the right things? What I want to talk about are the young people who could become the offenders that we talk about in this resolution.

First, myself personally, it's pretty hard to take this issue and stand on one side of the fence or the other because I've never given it that much thought. And as a representative of a constituency that has 20,000 people I haven't had their opinions. So surely as a representative we each must say to ourselves, is this what our people elected us for, is this the decision they would make. Surely I think we should give more thought to this than just rushing into it. I would say we should ask the people of this province to make their voices heard to the federal government and let them be more responsive than we are ourselves.

Yes, I agree we must punish the guilty and we all agree with that, every one of us. But we also must protect the innocent. We have heard that sometimes innocent people do get the death penalty and it's not until some time later it's learned that they were innocent.

I could mention, if we go back to the beginning and work with the young people, we should be able to teach them in some way, give them some training, lead them in the direction of right and justice, make adjustments for them if we can, and work towards elimination of these young people arriving at the courthouse, standing before the judge and possibly ending up with a death penalty.

Mr. Speaker, briefly, this matter is very complex. Surely it should be discussed by every member here more thoroughly than we've given it this afternoon.

I must say in closing that there is no easy answer to this, as I've mentioned before. I think if we work hard with our young people and be really serious with them as parents, as governments, as societies, and as communities, possibly in the future we will not have these people in the courthouses or in our cells or before a judge who declares a death penalty.

Thank you.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, just a few words on this motion. It's a very timely motion and yet at the same time I hesitate to see a motion at this time before the House because of the circumstances that have happened in Canada recently. There is a very emotional condition as far as capital punishment is concerned in Canada and in Alberta in particular.

The thing I'm always so proud of in Canada is that we followed the British justice. We still carry out British justice, and I believe the hon. Member for Drumheller used some very strong language today that I can't altogether agree with when he said the federal government is making a mockery of our courts. We have at the present time in Calgary quite a controversy. One of the honorable judges there is saying that you should not criticize sentences or you are going to be in contempt of court sort of thing. The public there is quite concerned. I notice several editorials on the matter: that they feel our courts, for all that we have all the respect in the world for them, are not above the people.

I think we have to take this matter into consideration when we are thinking of the prerogative the federal government has exercised in the last few years. It's a well-known fact that the government has commuted every death sentence in Canada for the last four or

five years or maybe longer. The hon. Member for Drumheller had some statistics that bore this out. I didn't mark them down but from memory in the last eight or ten years there have not been any executions carried out even where the law says it should be carried out - in the case of the murdering of policemen or guards. But here is a great school of thought in Canada that says, well why should a policeman or a guard be singled out. He's better able to protect himself than some innocent lady or innocent child. Why should they be singled out. So I think we have to weigh - if we are going to carry out capital punishment, carry it out for every type of murder rather than just singling out two categories. I think there is a lot of school of thought within our Dominion that feels that really the law is backward, the policeman and the guard are better able to protect themselves than anyone else.

However, Mr. Speaker, what I'm mainly concerned about is any thought we have to take away the prerogative of any parliament, because the last resort an individual has is to his elected body. The courts interpret the law as the parliament spells it out. So I say it's not a mockery of the courts because if the people of Canada did not like the way the present Liberal government is not carrying out the death sentence as far as murders are concerned, well everyone in Canada had an opportunity to vote them out. But the majority of people have voted them back in. To me the safeguard in our British system is that an individual, no matter how lowly he is in life, has still the final prerogative to appeal to his elected body, the people who represent him in either the parliaments or the legislatures of Canada.

I can remember a few years ago, shortly after I came in this House, we had quite a controversy right here in our own province of Alberta. We had a young man who was accused of shooting up his family in the constituency of Stettler. He was convicted and sentenced to be hanged. The sentence was carried out at Fort Saskatchewan jail. Yet that young man maintained his innocence right to the last, that he did not commit this crime he had been convicted of. I spoke to one or two of the people who witnessed the hanging as needed by law, and they felt the next day that they had some second thoughts about whether this man really was guilty of the crime that he paid the supreme sacrifice for.

I've also talked many times to people who have been convicted of murdering, as I have visited Fort Saskatchewan and some of our mental hospitals throughout the province. But in particular, I think of crimes of passion - I can think of one particular gentleman who shot his wife in a duplex not too far from this Legislature Building. He was sentenced to life imprisonment. I had the opportunity to talk to him before he went to Prince Albert, and I am sure I would say he would never commit another crime.

So what do you do in cases like that? Do you say, well you shouldn't have any compassion for him. I think if the average person here caught his wife with someone else, unless he was trying to get rid of his wife ...

MR. LUDWIG:

It's cheaper than a divorce.

MR. DIXON:

... would say, as the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View said, it's cheaper than a divorce.

In any case, what I'm trying to establish, Mr. Speaker, is that we're all human. I think the hon. Member for Whitecourt was trying to touch on a thing I'm greatly concerned about: what is the cause of the present situation we have with violence in our nation? The hon. member was saying about young people and how we can get to them. Well I think we can relate our present violent crime, especially in modern times, to our very permissive society which is overrun with drugs and alcohol. Many of these serious cases are directly related to the drug and alcohol situation and our permissive society as it is today.

Mr. Speaker, I guess you could class me as an abolitionist. I'm something like the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview and he pretty well said a lot of the things I'd planned to say - and was going to quote Mr. Diefenbaker and others.

But I still feel this Legislature should give some second thoughts before we try to encourage the federal government to change their prerogative, because I believe the Queen and parliament should always have the prerogative to commute a sentence. We do the same thing, Mr. Speaker. A man gets sentenced to 10 years, but if he comes up before the parole board and they feel he's done a good job of trying to rehabilitate himself and he's ready to be let out into society and in their good judgment, he's let out. So we should either go all the way - in other words, do away with any parole board so that anybody gets 6 months sentence or 60 years sentence that is carried out to the nth degree.

I'm always amazed, Mr. Speaker, at people who are always talking about capital punishment. I think the real test would be: would they themselves [be] willing to spring the trap they seem so anxious for the federal government and others to carry out. This is, I think, the real question in this thing.

I have no statistics to prove it, Mr. Speaker, but if drugs or alcohol are not connected to some of these violent crimes, it's usually some sort of mental illness. I'm not using that, in many cases, as a cop-out, but I think you'll find that on occasion. In the trial at Moncton, the killing of those two policemen, I think you'll find that the young fellow mixed up in the crime in Moncton has a history of feeble-mindedness.

Now if we're going to carry out the death sentence, maybe we should carry it out on a lot of our people - and I'm not advocating this, Mr. Speaker, but trying to rationalize. We have many people in our mental homes who have been charged with very very serious

crimes and were found not fit to stand trial. Maybe we should have got rid of them. Save the taxpayers a lot of money.

But I'm trying to put across to this House, Mr. Speaker, that this Legislature has to do some real soul-searching, I think, before they start advocating that the prerogative of the elected parliamentarians of this country is taken away and that the courts have the final say in the carrying out of punishment.

I'd like to go on record, Mr. Speaker, as saying that I am opposed to the taking away of any prerogative of any parliament or legislature when it interferes or has anything to do with human rights. I think this is the place for the last appeal, whether it be for murder, in the case of the federal parliament, or for the case of human rights as far as Alberta legislation is concerned, because the people can get at us. If they don't like the way we're doing things, they can vote our parliamentarians out of office, they can vote our members of the Legislature out of office. It's been a long-standing tradition.

British justice may seem slow and cumbersome. It may seem at times not to be quite fair. But I think it's stood the long test of time. Before we start making any drastic changes such as saying that once the judge decides, this is it, the sentence is going to be carried out with no appeal to his peers - and his peers are the people, not the judge - they're the ones in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, who should have the final decision.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Clover Bar followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would just very briefly like to bring an opinion to the hon. members of the Legislature and this is to do with the so-called mad dog killers.

I believe there are certain segments of our criminal element who are basically incapable of making decisions as to what is right and what is wrong. It is these people who kill without conscience, who mutilate and desecrate other people. They're the ones who cause me great concern, Mr. Speaker. These psychotics should never be released. They are people who have not the ability, they have no value in human life, they are basically animals. These people are the ones who concern me much more than the crimes of passion; these I can understand.

Maybe some of the hon. members can recall the Edmonton report of a week or two ago when three young men from the Edmonton area were picked up in Las Vegas. The crime they committed to obtain, as far as I can remember, very, very little as far as money went, was a crime which to me - I just couldn't really understand how three young men who have any conscience at all could commit a crime as dastardly as that one.

So, Mr. Speaker, in discussing life sentences, for animals such as this, life sentence should mean that - life. They should be put out of circulation for their own protection and for the protection of society.

Mr. Speaker, I was appalled when I was listening to an officer in the RCMP indicate to a chamber of commerce group that the National Parole Board has the power to commute a life sentence to one week shortly after the sentence has been handed down. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope the information given to me is correct. I assume it was because this man is in a position where he should know. Now in an instance such as that, the parole board has the power even to usurp the power of the cabinet and the power of the House of Commons. That power they have had given to them is an awful power. It is a power that possibly I'm not sure they should have. But it is there.

So in just these few words, Mr. Speaker, there are people who can be rehabilitated and should be rehabilitated and released. But on the other hand, people who are no more than animals should not be turned loose in society. To them, life sentence should mean that - life imprisonment, period.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I have certainly enjoyed the discussion. I suppose it's because many have participated. I guess I'm one who believes that there's far too much talking and that most of it is too long, when you think that the Gettysburg Address was under 300 words, and the Shepherd's Psalm, and so on. So we can learn a lesson.

But the subject before us today is a very unattractive one, although not quite so unattractive as the assorted villainies it was designed to discourage. The question of putting felons to death will be with us for a long, long time.

I wish to only make one or two points. First of all, I think capital punishment will deter some from committing murder, just the same as prison walls will deter some bank robbers from robbing the bank. However, we don't dismantle all our prisons because their presence failed to dissuade all robbers.

I do question the means used in capital punishment and I'm wondering if a more humane way couldn't be found. I remember, as a boy, listening to one of the pioneers - and he's still living today in my area - in this group. He told of a man who had committed murder and was sentenced to death by hanging. He was led up on the scaffold and the trip was put into motion and the man fell, but it did not cause his death. He pleaded for mercy. They were unable to take him up on the scaffold again and the way that he was put to death then was very inhumane. So I'm wondering if perhaps more humane ways could not be found.

I've heard of innocent people being put to death, and I'm reminded of course of one who was innocent. He had never committed any wrong and it seems to me that our whole Christian church is built around this man.

I think capital punishment is inevitable and the killing of policemen and the heavy drug traffic will be contributing factors to bringing it back. Many countries today are employing the death penalty for drug traffickers.

I think society must shoulder a great deal of the responsibility for the rise in crime. Families must realize that they too are not blameless. Parents are leaving their little families to fend for themselves. The clergy, in my opinion, must be speaking out as forcibly as possible. There is a saying: "The family that prays together stays together." I think the Sunday school is a wonderful way of teaching our boys and girls to respect human life. I don't doubt that there is rape being committed, when you see the magazine stands in practically every drugstore.

When the next hanging is carried out in Alberta, I think perhaps we can all say well, we helped put him there.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like from the outset to congratulate the hon. Member for Drumheller for bringing this particular motion before the Assembly at this particular time in 1975, and of course it applies in 1974 - very much so - and the years before that.

Mr. Speaker, the issue is so contemporary because of the items that we've talked about and which have been mentioned by the hon. members. Each one of the hon. members should be congratulated for their contribution because it is a very highly emotionally charged issue. Murders, attempted murders, rape, robbery, drug charges, break-ins, entry, thefts have all increased in 1974 over 1973 in Edmonton and this is also true across the province, across the country.

Mr. Speaker, the statistics need not be repeated. Murders have doubled since 1973 to 1974. Rape has increased by 30 per cent. Robberies have increased. Drug charges doubled. Breaking and entry have multiplied to the extent of 25 per cent. Thefts at the level of 18,743 in 1974 and motor vehicle thefts have increased by 28 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, such statistics and information surely reflect to this Assembly the increased population in our country, the increased mobility of people, and the influence of our environment upon humans, causing them and provoking them to carry out these unusual and extraordinary activities. Mr. Speaker, I suggest this is a most distressing situation and as quickly as I say this, Mr. Speaker, I must add, so there be clarity in this area, that the vast percentage of our society is good. Men and people, women and children, are good and this is a human trait and a mutual human trait. But, Mr. Speaker, in 1966 the government, under the Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson, sponsored and Parliament enacted Bill No. C-168. It aimed at abolishing death penalties for five years on a trial period, except for capital murder and this was of course directed towards police officers and prison guards. Treason and piracy continued to be punishable by death.

Mr. Speaker, the arguments presented in 1967 are documented well in the Hansard of the House of Commons and I suggest to the hon. members - those who are interested in this issue - I think it's worth-while reviewing, and I highly recommend this. As a matter of fact, even if you're not interested, you should be interested, and I suggest you review it. Mr. Speaker, the bill received royal assent on December 21, 1967 and came into force December 25, 1967. At that time and since that time, Mr. Speaker, in reference to this motion, even if we zero in on the very specifics of this motion, capital punishment certainly circumscribes the whole area.

We had the abolitionists at that time, we have them now. We have those who advocate capital punishment and we have them now. The abolitionists have stated, Mr. Speaker, that murders can be classified as borderline between ordinary and capital murders. And this is an extremely tenuous situation. Mr. Speaker, the advocates say if it's okay to protect police and prison staff, why not ordinary citizens, as has been stated by one of the members.

Mr. Speaker, the abolitionists have stated if we restore capital punishment the state lowers its values of human life in the minds of citizens. Mr. Speaker, the advocates say voters are in favor of capital punishment, and I sense this is the mood of this country at this juncture, with the recent murders of the police officers. And police want capital punishment. Why not a referendum? Mr. Speaker, to quote just one more: statistics do not clearly show, so the abolitionists say, that the death penalty is truly a deterrent. And the advocates of course state that statistics are not accurate.

Mr. Speaker, abolitionists say that capital punishment is cold-blooded murder. Well, it's quite simple for the advocates to also say: so is murder in itself. And then the religious people come into play, Mr. Speaker, and they say: the Bible says, "Thou shalt not kill." And then the advocates come along, Mr. Speaker, and say self-defence is necessary in society, and the Bible says we have the right to abandon hope for these men and women that murder. And so on, and so on, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, on goes the argument through the '50s, '60s, '70s and the hon. Member for Drumheller has brought out that statistics keep changing. And it's been marked - there's no question about it - by a worldwide increase in crime. A worldwide increase not only in crime, but murders. Indictable offences, Mr. Speaker, from 1954-1966 have increased from 57,000 to approximately 80,000.

Mr. Speaker, the so-called Ceylon Committee on Capital Punishment made two or three points. If I may Mr. Speaker, there are only one or two sentences. One is that "the Canadian provinces show homicide rates which suggest that these rates are conditioned by

other factors than the death penalty." Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very important point to remember because it's been alluded to by a number of the members, especially the Member for Whitecourt, because he indicated why do people murder, and touched on the central issue that I believe is the most important that is: let's find out the fault. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, we know the fault. What we have to do is acknowledge that we know the fault and act on it. And I'll come to that, Mr. Speaker.

Number two, the Ceylon report indicates: "Nothing emerges from the study of trends in violent crimes in Canada that would support or even suggest the proposition that the suspension of capital punishment has caused an increase in the homicide rate."

Mr. Speaker, in summary this report states that the murder rates preclude the disproof in any one of the country of possible margin of lives saved by the retention of capital punishment. "Since one can never know the possible successes of capital punishment as a deterrent when it is in force, one can never be sure, with abolition, that the murder rate would not have been lower had capital punishment been retained." Mr. Speaker, [these are] very interesting points, very vital points in a consideration of this motion, in a consideration of capital punishment as a whole.

But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, there is a buffer here if the motion were passed by this Assembly and the federal government did in turn accept the direction proposed in this motion. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the latter seems very very unlikely in view of the highly charged emotional issue that it is across the country, not only in this Assembly, and in view, Mr. Speaker, of the disharmony on this motion by the hon. members in the House of Commons, with all due respect to my older brother. Mr. Speaker, even some of the members, and I'm not referring to my brother in this case, ignore, as I understand it, the majority view of constituents on this issue.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Shame.

DR. PAPROSKI:

It's difficult to understand, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest this crosses party lines, a moral issue.

Mr. Speaker, a few questions and responses regarding the motion specifically. I would like to ask the question and maybe the mover could respond when he closes the debate, if he does either today or on another day. Does the mover mean, regarding Section 1, the sentence of death passed by a judge in the first instance? What type of murder does he really mean? The prison official and police officers? Or does he mean to imply citizens at large? I hope it is for all citizens.

In the second instance, Mr. Speaker, on the appeal not being reduced as stated in the motion, Mr. Speaker. The motion says: "... unless ... recommendation [of] mercy or clemency is given by the judge or jury ...". Mr. Speaker, the question here I would ask the mover of the motion is: why can't the judge in the first instance say this also, mercy or clemency? If the judge can, then I am in support of this portion of the motion, otherwise I would require clarification.

In the third instance, Mr. Speaker, "... His Excellency the Governor General in Council ..." as it states in the motion, "shall", and that is the operative word as I see it, "... shall have the authority to commute such sentence." I feel this portion is good, Mr. Speaker, because it allows a latitude and discretion based upon the review of the facts so that innocent people can be protected. The criticism of this section, Mr. Speaker, is that I would hope that all cases of murder flow to the level of the third instance; that is, going to His Excellency the Governor General in Council, and not only when mercy or clemency is in fact recommended. Because, Mr. Speaker, to take a life - the hon. members I'm sure can appreciate this - has got to be a most difficult decision by our society and by those involved.

Mr. Speaker, I speak here with some degree of experience. I had the experience of working in Fort Saskatchewan during my early years of medical practice and had to visit the jail there and examine an inmate who was about to be hanged. Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that there are very few things in my life that I have experienced that were more dejecting.

So, Mr. Speaker, [it is] a decision that only those involved in the decision-making process can appreciate when we say, you shall or shall not hang. So, Mr. Speaker, I ask for amplification and clarification and I feel this is very necessary. I think a lot more debate should go on regarding this motion.

Now regarding Section 2, Mr. Speaker, in this motion, I can understand the mover's feeling regarding this section when he states, "A sentence of life imprisonment shall mean imprisonment for the remainder of the individual's natural life." Especially, Mr. Speaker, I can understand it when we as a society too often recently and in prior times have seen repeated serious crimes and repeated murders by those sentenced to life for brutal killings or otherwise, and I don't know how killing can be otherwise really. They should be brutal; all of them are brutal. Then they are temporarily or permanently let out and again repeat that act. Although, Mr. Speaker, the percentage is small, I think that percentage is too high.

Mr. Speaker, the motion is a difficult topic. I appreciate and recognize that; the hon. member opposite who introduced the topic recognizes this. I'm sure the hon. members who have spoken recognize this. [It is] a difficult issue that strikes, Mr. Speaker, at the heart of our society and its related problems of crime, violence and murder. Mr. Speaker, the issue of these features of society, that is crime, violence, murder and abuse

of sex, must be dealt with in the context of the many causes for these acts due to heredity and environment.

Mr. Speaker, it is odd that we as a group, a group of presumably elected members - and we are elected - leaders presumably in our society, in this Assembly, allow excessive violence and sex in all our media. We allow pollution of our brains; condition our brains to an unfavorable direction in many ways. We allow society's stresses to increase which provide many many of our members the nidus, if you wish, to unfavorable acts. And worse than that, Mr. Speaker, it involves our children and our future generations. Then we deal with the problem after the fact, just as we do in the House of Commons, capital punishment versus noncapital punishment and so forth.

So, when I get back to what the hon. Member for Whitecourt mentioned, which I think is again the central issue, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that in the next few years - and I mean the next few years, I don't mean 10 or 15 years, I mean the next 1 to 5 years - we seriously address our minds and our actions to this particular area of violence, crime and its associated problems; the area, Mr. Speaker, of prevention and education on an ongoing basis. For what? For a wholesome, strong society. Does that sound corny? Well, people, parents, society knows what this means, based on values that our youth, our parents, our leaders, our religious leaders know very well. If these values can't be defined, Mr. Speaker, I suggest we talk to them because they know and you know, our wives know very well in their living-room they can discuss the issue very well and know the values clearly.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow destructive forces of values of our basic pillars of our society. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that maybe the central problem here is the impersonal corporations. I speak here, Mr. Speaker, of the media and those who feed the media when they cry, censorship; when they advocate false values of dollars and sell without due regard to the central values that we have and which we have been brought up with. Mr. Speaker, these same corporations also have their youth, their children, their parents and they have religious members, they have leaders of our society who know and want a good life but the machine, the corporate machine, is inhuman, depersonalized and it ignores pollution. It ignores poverty in many instances, Mr. Speaker, and values and this is what the Assembly must come to grips with. The machine, Mr. Speaker, the corporation - I call it the second phantom government - must be redirected for the individual and family by a vigorous, equally hard-sell program by beginning, Mr. Speaker, yesterday and not today.

So, Mr. Speaker, this so-called second phantom government is a product of us humans and it can be directed, buffered and modified to serve not the machine itself; but serve everyone of us.

These are my comments, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

Mr. Speaker, may I adjourn debate?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has made a motion to adjourn the debate. I'm obliged to put the motion.

Would all those in favor of the motion, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

I'm unable to tell from the voices, which way the preponderance ...

Would all those members in favor of the motion please stand?

Would all those members against the motion please stand?

[The motion was carried.]

MR. LUDWIG:

What a sad performance.

2. Mr. Stromberg proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

Be it resolved that the Department of Highways and Transport consider using the names of Alberta's pioneers and explorers as an alternate designation to all major highways in the province.

MR. STROMBERG:

For a number of years, Mr. Speaker, a great number of Albertans and Canadians alike have expressed a concern that our youth and our schoolchildren are ignorant of the basic great history of our province and the course of our nation. Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that the majority of our youth are more familiar with Davy Crockett, Daniel Boone, and some gun-slinging sheriff appearing on Gunsmoke. Fortunately, due in part to our RCMP Centennial Year and the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation, a number of Albertans now realize that we have heroes in our history of Alberta far superior to any south of the border. It is really a tremendous Alberta story, the story of Jerry Potts, Twelve-foot Davis, and Father Lacombe.

Mr. Speaker, to get back to the intent of the motion, it's rather confusing to me and also to a great number of other Albertans as to the location of some of our numbered highways. No. 63, to us who live in central and southern Alberta - not many people know that is the new highway to Fort McMurray. No. 17 - I believe the only member in this Assembly who ever heard of it would be the Member for Lloydminster; Highway No. 47, that beautiful stretch of road from Edson to the southwest; Highway No. 6 - I've had the opportunity to travel that one time - what a scenic highway from Fincher Creek to the south. There's also Highway No. 22 - I don't think even the minister is aware of that highway. Of course it hasn't been built yet, but I would suggest that it go ahead. It would be a highway from Calgary running down some of these abandoned or closed roadlines through the Copithorne ranch, and it should be named the Ludwig Road or the Ludwig Way.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Stromberg Alley.

MR. STROMBERG:

Or we could call the freeway that I come in on quite regularly to the south here, the Ashton Road that runs out to Sherwood Park; or the one that goes to Fort Saskatchewan the Dentist Trail.

But, Mr. Speaker, we all know of the David Thompson Highway, Highway No. 11, or the Mackenzie Highway, No. 35. Another example, Mr. Speaker, of course is the Yellowhead. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the members of this Assembly would give their support to this motion to inject a little style in our highway signs as well as interest in and awareness of our pioneers and explorers.

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker,

I phoned the emergency number  
And asked for the rescue squad  
For I was a travelling plumber  
Out there in Alberta broad

Rescues of course are expensive  
But I wasn't concerned with cost  
A fellow gets mighty pensive  
On a black night when he is lost

I gazed at the map before me  
The thing was useless as ... well,  
It said the highway was number 3  
But the sign said "Ottewell"

The map showed a junction with No. 9  
But there at the corner I saw  
Only an arrow that bore a sign  
Which simply said, "McGraw"

With some misgivings I drove on south  
Though I feared it might be risky  
My heart came up to fill my mouth  
When the next sign said "Jovenski"

Mile after mile the signs came up  
Milliken, Browley, Manning, Loughheed  
Hargrave, Edwards, Parlby, Crupp  
Flaherty, Henderson, Dupenoff, Sneed,  
Burns, McDoughal, Higgins and Jones,  
Smith, then Leboeuf, von Pappen, O'Neil  
Jamieson, Dutton, de Mills, Katrone,  
Thomson, Farnsworth, Mills, Sam Steel  
Romanchuk, Bentley, McGrath & Kwong  
Desjardin, Johansen & Whitney Bodard  
Fontain, Bradley and Short and Long  
Parker, Miller, Rasmussen, Lepard



Then in a flash it all came clear  
They were naming each road for a pioneer  
And I said to myself "Get with it, man.  
Get out of Alberta as fast as you can,

This road naming business will be a curse  
As time goes on it's bound to get worse  
Of names of course there's loads and loads  
The danger is they'll run out of roads

Using pioneer names is no solution  
It's bound to cause a revolution  
For man, you know, is a jealous lout  
Who'll start a war if his name's left out.

Well, Mr. Speaker, unless the hon. Member for Camrose has better roads than I have, I would hesitate to have the roads in Sedgewick-Coronation named after pioneers. Roads of course have a habit of deteriorating, and this is especially true in the last three years. But to be fair, just to be fair, we did have major floods in '74, and they've got a way to go yet before they're back to 100 per cent. Four years ago we possibly could have entertained the idea of naming some highway the Taylor Highway, but I'm not so sure we could do that anymore. Then with the carnage on the highways today, I wonder if some of our great pioneers would really care to have their names associated with the highways.

Also, there are those who are now attempting to have some of these names changed. I was reading the other day where they want a mountain in the Rockies changed, and it was named just 20-some years ago. People get tired of named roads and mountains and so on.

While I would not want it said that I look with disfavor on the naming of all highways, because that is not true, I would just like to say that I hope the trend doesn't accelerate any more than it now is.

The Greenhead highway, which cuts through my constituency, also cuts through the constituency of the hon. Member for Camrose. It draws attention to one segment of our precious and priceless heritage, our wildlife. I hope the naming of this highway, the Greenhead route, will mean more to people than just let's get out in the area and bag as many greenheads as we possibly can. I hope it will prompt countless thousands to head out in their automobiles onto the beautiful Greenhead highway and enjoy the wonders of our wildlife, especially the greenheads which are in practically every pond between May and October. I know the boards of trade in our towns in east central Alberta are all for the Greenhead route, the Greenhead highway, and I think this is a good idea.

I wonder though about implementing a plan all over Alberta, if the cost wouldn't be prohibitive, just too great. It seems to me that there are more important problems at the present time than just naming. You know, I think the Class of '71 has been in charge for the last three and one-half years, and we still have many problems, Gordon, and maybe we'd better deal with those first.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, just a few words on the resolution that came before the House on the naming of highways. Perhaps when we look at the naming of some of our pioneer highways, perhaps one or two, maybe three, but I am certainly not in favor of naming all of our highways. When one travels through the province of Alberta, if he knows the number of highways, they're very easy. You start in the south, most of them as they go further north, the numbers grow higher. Truly we have a good network of highways.

But the confusion that enters my mind is the time that I came into the province of B.C. some years ago. I was supposed to look someone up on Walton Road in Kelowna. You know, I ended up asking every service station owner in the town to find out the name of that road. I passed Beaver Road. I passed every known road that is named after every tree in the province of B.C., every shrub, almost every animal, but I couldn't find Walton Road. Finally I thought I would circle the northeastern stretch of the town and I finally came on Walton Road, in about two blocks.

To the known traveller on the North American continent, the confusion that exists in cities that are using names of animals or shrubbery or trees, let alone the pioneers of the province, certainly - unless he has a map of the city, he is in utter confusion. Not knowing where the Beaver Street starts and where the Marten Avenue begins, he is hopelessly lost.

I would urge hon. members that if it's going to be a wholesale naming of the highways of the province of Alberta we reduce somewhat the main pioneers, as was mentioned by the hon. Member for Camrose, at least maybe to one or two of the highways. I think I like our highways the way they are numbered now. I wouldn't like to see them changed. There's no way that ... I think the resentment of the people in the communities we live in - there would certainly be resentment in the communities if we didn't choose the proper name, if we didn't choose the proper pioneer from that area. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I think we should leave well enough alone as to the numbering of the highways that exist in the province of Alberta.

Really, with due respect to the city of Calgary, I think the city of Edmonton probably has one of the best numbered streets on the North American continent. I think if we have the numbering of our highways as exists today, that we not embark on a wholesale program of renaming our highways to honor the pioneers. As the hon. member who has just spoken

has said, maybe when the roads become in disrepair some of the picneers would turn over in their graves if they saw that their name was used on the road which was not fit to travel on.

With that I would conclude, Mr. Speaker, that I believe we have one of the finest highway numbering systems on the North American continent. The traveller who comes into our province has to only pick up a map. It doesn't require great knowledge to find the location he's looking for. Especially since the numbering of our secondary highways has now become possible, I think we should leave well enough alone. If we're going to name pioneers, Mr. Speaker, certainly it should be minimal and designated to highways that are short and not confuse the motoring public in the province of Alberta.

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, I was watching a very interesting program on Sunday evening with both my sons. It was a program I used to watch regularly every Sunday evening when I myself was a youngster. It was The Wonderful World of Disney. Sunday evening was the second, I think, of a two-part series on the inception of the American revolution. It was about the Sons of Liberty in Boston and the New England states. It was about the ride of Paul Revere to warn that the British were coming.

It reminded me of a great many programs I had seen produced by Walt Disney when, as I say, I was a youngster not too many years ago. I can remember being aware that Daniel Boone was the first permanent settler west of the Appalachian Mountains in the United States. I can remember having become aware of the contribution Davey Crockett made to the independence of the republic of Texas from Mexico, and eventually of course the role that Sam Houston played in Texas becoming a state of the American union. I can remember in school learning about the Lewis and Clark expedition in the United States. I can remember learning that the Union Pacific Railroad was the first crossing of the continent by white man's technology and industry. I can remember learning about the terrible misfortunes of the people who were going to Oregon, the American settlers in 1841 and 1842. I can remember realizing when I was in Grade 11 that I had learned all of these things about the United States before I had learned anything of substance about the history of my own country. I had learned all 50 American states and their capitals before, in the curriculum, we were learning the names of the 10 Canadian provinces and their capitals. I was learning about American explorers and American presidents before I was learning about Canadian explorers and Canadian presidents.

Now Mr. Speaker, I was of some assistance in drawing this resolution and I thought that we had been quite careful about it when we suggested the use of "names of Alberta's pioneers and explorers as an alternate designation to all major highways in the province." I did not suggest that the highways should be renamed and that the numbers should be dropped. My parents live in Victoria where all the streets are named, where none are numbered, and I know exactly whereof some of the hon. members speak when they say that if the streets are named and not numbered it's impossible to find either where you've been or where you're going. That's become particularly difficult generally throughout British Columbia since 1972, but it was bad enough prior to that time.

What we're proposing is not that the numbers should be dropped. We're not even proposing that the numbers should not continue to be predominant along highways. We are simply proposing that as an alternative to the use of numbers, and perhaps in a significantly subsidiary way, names should also be provided along highways. Because something has got to be done outside of the curriculum, outside of the classroom experience, to make not only young people but all of the residents of the province aware of the heritage which is a part of this province.

Because the hon. Member for Camrose came to me and asked me about this resolution, I did a little bit of research. I think there are some significant names in the history of this province, names which we would like to make our young people aware of and names of people of whom we should be more aware ourselves. I don't know how many people appreciate that the white man first arrived in this province in 1754. Right now, in spite of thinking of ourselves as a young society, we have a written history which is more than 200 years old. I don't know how many people appreciate that the first permanent establishment in this province was founded in 1778. Surprisingly enough it was Fort Chipewyan in the very northeastern corner of the province, founded by Peter Pond, who was an explorer for the Hudson's Bay Company.

I don't know how many people can attach significance for Alberta to the names David Thompson, who was here in 1787, or Peter Fidler, who surveyed vast areas of the province accurately in 1792. Alexander Mackenzie went from Alberta to the Arctic Ocean in 1789. In 1792, from Alberta, he was the first person to cross the continent completely, north of Mexico. Captain John Palliser and his associated expedition in 1857 accurately surveyed almost 100,000 square miles of Alberta and Saskatchewan, not only as to its topography but its geology, plant life, the prospect for settled agriculture and for settlements not related to agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, when we're in school we very early learn about the difficulties that faced American settlement when they came into contact with native Indians in the western parts of the country. We learn about Custer's last stand at the Little Big Horn. We learn about the whisky trade, the free traders in the mountains of the American Rockies.

There is very little appreciation of the fact that the whole nature of settlement on the prairies in Canada and particularly in Alberta, the whole nature of settlement was entirely different because of the attitudes, because of the organizational skills of men

like John Rowand, who in 1803 founded Fort Edmonton and was for almost 50 years chief factor for the Hudson's Bay Company in the Fort Edmonton trading district.

John Rowand was a very interesting man. He established the first trail in Alberta. It went from Edmonton to Fort Assiniboine and in 1841 he was the first resident Albertan to winter in Hawaii. The Hudson's Bay Company had an outpost in Hawaii and he went there on a tour of inspection - I think that was so the company would pay for it - and spent January and February in Hawaii rather than in Fort Edmonton.

I'm not sure how many people are aware of the contribution made by Sir George Simpson to the peaceful development of this part of the country through the almost 40 years that he was governor of the Hudson's Bay Company in Canada.

Aside from the explorers, the traders and the organizers like Mr. Rowand and Sir [George] Simpson, you had the missionaries. It has been 150 years since the first missionaries came to stay in Alberta to minister to the white and to the Native population: Robert Tyrrell Rundle in 1830, Father Thibault in 1832, the McDougalls, Henry Bird Steinhauer.

Possibly the most interesting point was respecting the settlement of the province, beginning about 1885 and progressing through to approximately 1905 when the patterns of settlement in the province were firmly established.

It was very interesting to read about the first German settlers who arrived in Medicine Hat, stayed for three years, found it completely inhospitable - although I think that was a rash judgment on their part - and came up and settled both west of Edmonton around Stony Plain and Spruce Grove, and east of Edmonton around Josephburg. It was extremely interesting to learn that the Ukrainian settlement east of Edmonton was in fact a direct result of the German settlement. The leader of the German settlement was a man named John Krebs from Galicia and he had gone to school as a youngster with a man named Ivan Pylapow. And in 1891 it was Ivan Pylapow and Wasel Ilyniuk who came to Canada, came to Alberta, to explore the settlement possibilities in this country because of correspondence that Ivan Pylapow had received from the German settlers, from John Krebs, about the fantastic opportunities that existed on the prairies and in Alberta particularly.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the hour, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move the Assembly do now adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. SPEAKER:

The Assembly stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

[The House rose at 5:29 p.m.]

