

November 10, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

73-25

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Friday, November 10, 1972

[The House met at 1:00 pm.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 126 The Elections Statutes Amendment Act, 1972

MR. HYNMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill being The Elections Statutes Amendment Act, 1972. By this bill the duties of the Clerk of the Executive Council in respect of election proceedings are transferred to the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly. This involves minor consequential amendments to The Election Act, the controverted Elections Act, The Electoral Boundaries Commission Act, The Legislative Assembly Act, and The Liquor Plebiscites Act.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 126 was introduced and read a first time.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce 100 Grade IX students from Parkdale Junior High School in Calgary Bow. They are accompanied today by their principal, Mr. Brian Targett, teachers Mrs. Cockle, Mr. Murray, Mr. Blanchard, and parents, Mrs. Ellison, and Mr. Mrakawa. They came in three buses from their own transportation system, driven by the teachers. Mr. Speaker, they are in both galleries and I now ask them to rise and be recognized.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

Government Advertising

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. members in the House have expressed an interest in government advertising and concerns for the weekly newspapers. I have advised them that I would compile the information and report. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to advise the House that I have had the report prepared by the Bureau of Public Affairs and there will be a copy distributed to each member of the legislature shortly from the Clerk's office.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wish to advise the House that I am placing the question on the Order Paper concerning this issue also, that we may appreciate the information the hon. minister is advancing, but I think we will require more than he is giving.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Narcotics In Correctional Institute

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the hon. the Attorney General. I'm shocked at the reports, hon. minister, of the availability of

73-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 10th 1972

heroin at the Fort Saskatchewan Correctional Institute and I'm wondering, Mr. Minister, is heroin readily available in that particular institute?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, the question of the hon. Leader of the Opposition raises a point that has been of concern to us and a matter that I have been aware of for some time. There are really two parts to it. Some time ago, within the Fort Saskatchewan Correctional Institute, they were dispensing narcotic drugs for use in treatment purposes in capsule form. As a result of that, we learned that there was some, what we call, intramural trafficking, within the institution, by these capsules or pills being acquired by one inmate and being given to other inmates. We have remedied this by changing the practice so that now within the institution any narcotics that are given out by way of treatment are given in liquid form so that there cannot be this intramural trafficking.

With respect to the availability of heroin there have, in the past six months or a year, been two instances that have come to our attention where heroin has gotten within the institution. One of the ways in which it can go into the institution is by visitors. People can drop it on the perimeters of the institution in cigarette packages and chocolate bar wrappers or in many other ways. Inmates then, when they are out exercising or for recreation and doing things of that nature can, as a result of being advised of what to look for and where, pick it up. It's an extremely difficult area to police completely. As I say, there have been two instances of that nature in the past six months or a year.

Those are the only ones that I am aware of today. We have considered ways and means of stopping that but it is exceedingly difficult. One time we canvassed the possibility of excluding visitors, and that we are satisfied is not the right step. It is far too drastic a step to take, because of the relatively small size of the problem, to deprive the people that are there from visits from their friends and family.

We have in that institution, and also in other institutions, a system whereby people who are out on temporary absence permits, when they return, take their clothes off and change clothing from their street clothing into their institutional clothing before going back into the institute. So that possible source of supply has been cut off. There still remains the problem I talked about; visitors and people dropping things around the perimeters of the institute. In the short answer, there is no serious problem there, to my knowledge. The only instances we are aware of are the two that I have mentioned earlier.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question and I would say at the beginning I wouldn't expect the hon. minister to detail how it is being done, but can he assure the House that every measure possible is being used to try and track it down and to place further curbs in the way of it coming into any of these institutions?

MR. LEITCH:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be able to give the hon. Leader of the Opposition that assurance. We have been aware of that potential problem for some time. We have reviewed it a number of times and we are taking all of the steps that we feel can reasonably be taken in light of the size of the problem.

I should point out that in Fort Saskatchewan one of the difficulties we have is that I think in recent weeks there have been over 200 persons held there under federal charges, most of which would be narcotic charges under the federal legislation. A number of those people undoubtedly are addicts or traffickers and have been charged with those offences, so we have a very significant number of people who are involved in one way or another with drugs. That leads to a lot of pressure to have their friends and people on the outside get something to them. We are very conscious of it and we are continually reviewing it to ensure that we are doing all that can reasonably be done.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Is the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission tackling the drug abuse problem on a preventative and frequent level at this time?

November 10, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

73-27

MR. CRAWFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, for some time the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission if not directly involved themselves in the area that the hon. member speaks of, has had important liaison and provided a leadership and goal-setting role with the agencies that do this. In particular, in the City of Edmonton, the College of Physicians and Surgeons is most directly involved with work in the liaison function with the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, and in Calgary my memory is that it's a private agency with which the commission is working there.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Attorney General, in severe cases of addiction, particularly of hard drugs, are drugs supplied to some of those patients legally, at least to assist them to recover, or is this ever done? What is done to the very severe addiction cases?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, there are several things that are done. The answer to this question specifically is yes. Supportive medicines, some of which may be narcotic drugs and some of which are non-narcotic, are given to people within the institutions who are in severe distress as a result of undergoing withdrawal of narcotics.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, has there been any check kept on these cases that have been treated in this way to see if they did withdraw from drugs, or if they remained addicts or even became heavier users after release?

MR. LEITCH:

No, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe we have any mechanics or mechanism for checking on them, but I would like to confirm that. I am sure at the moment we don't have any method for checking on them in a regular way. But we would get some information as a result of some of these people coming back into the institutions on the second or third time. But certainly, the program of giving out drugs within the institution is very carefully controlled by medical people to ensure that it provides relief and doesn't add to the problem.

MR. TAYLOR:

One further supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker. Since there is quite a controversy about the treatment of drug addicts with drugs for the purpose of withdrawal, do you think a good project for the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission would be to follow this up for a year or two to see what actually happens to these people who insist on using drugs for the purpose of withdrawing -- if they actually do withdraw? I would personally like to see some results of whether this does result in a person leaving drugs alone, because there is considerable evidence that they become even heavier users after their release.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member's suggestion is well worth considering and one that I will discuss with the Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. SPEAKER:

We have covered this policy matter at very great length. A good portion of the question period has been used. It is undoubtedly an important topic, but perhaps if it is going to be gone into in further detail, we might get further information from the minister by way of the Order Paper.

The hon. Opposition House Leader followed by the Member for Calgary McKnight.

#### Purple Gas Abuses

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Attorney General. In reply to Question 227 the other day in connection with the illegal use of purple gas, it appeared that 530 were convicted in a nine month period, and of these it would appear that 378, including 49 truckers, would have

73-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 10th 1972

no right to have an "F" licence plate. Would you know whether there has been any investigation as to how these people secured an "F" plate?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I don't. The question to which the hon. member refers was answered, as I recall it, by the hon. Provincial Treasurer. The issuing of licence plates is, of course, within the Department of Highways and I would think that either of those ministers might be able to add something.

MR. TAYLOR:

I have one supplementary then, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. the Attorney General. Do you recall whether there have been any convictions of the people who sold the purple gas to these people, apparently illegally?

MR. LEITCH:

No, I don't, Mr. Speaker, and I don't want to leave that answer implying that there haven't been. I simply don't know. I would have to check.

MR. MINIELY:

I would like to supplement that question. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should be aware that people must sign an affidavit swearing that they qualify as bonafide farmers for the purpose of purchasing purple gas. So the responsibility lies with the individual, and that should be taken into consideration with respect to the question you asked.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. It is that very thing that worries me and my question is: of these people who are signing affidavits and those who are accepting them, sometimes the Commissioner of Oaths is the bulk agent himself, which indicates some 'getting-togetherness', and that is the thing, I think, that should be carefully investigated because I am sure that the hon. member agrees this is unfair to the bonafide farmers, to the taxpayers generally, and the government.

MR. MINIELY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought I made it clear the other day that we were aware of a certain amount of this going on, but we have to be concerned as a government that we don't overdo enforcement, that we don't simply add red tape and bureaucracy. Certainly we are aware in many fields of administration of government taxes or government revenues, including income tax, that there are abuses in the system. But certainly, what I would not want to do and what I would hope no one in this legislature would want the government to do, would be to carry it too far to the point where the enforcement is encroaching upon individual right. So I think we must move cautiously in this area. I thought I had indicated that the other day.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You're quite wrong.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McKnight, followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

#### Wildlife Filming Control

MR. LEE:

A question for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Is it true there are difficulties involved in the movement of wildlife in Alberta for wildlife filming purposes? I refer to the recent report in the Calgary Alberta in which an American film maker has commented about what he referred to as over stringent control regulations in your department.

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that article did appear in the Calgary Alberta and subsequently appeared in other newspapers, including The Edmonton Journal. I have since been in communication with the person quoted, Mr. Speaker, and the

November 10, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

73-29

-----  
source of this problem is a mystery to both of us. As a matter of fact I had a letter yesterday from this gentleman, indicating that so far as he is aware he has had no problem of that nature and he is checking out with the media to see where the story originated.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Insurance Review

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Can you advise the House when the review on insurance conducted by Mr. Morley will be concluded, and whether or not that study will be tabled in the House when it is concluded?

MR. MINIELLY:

Yes, as I indicated in the answer yesterday, we do have a review going on. However, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's question we hope it will be concluded before too long. I would not want to tie down a specific date to it.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Provincial Treasurer advise the assembly what basis was used to determine the firm of Reed Shaw Osler Ltd. to be supervising insurance broker, and further, can you advise the House what the cost of these professional services will be?

MR. MINIELLY:

Mr. Speaker, this matter was dealt with quite extensively yesterday in an answer that was tabled in the legislature. If the hon. member is not satisfied with the answer I would ask that he place his question on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Freight Rates

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Industry. He had made some statements in the province in the past that he is very concerned about the freight rate situation in the west. I would like to ask him if he has made any progress in dealing with this problem?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, it is a long and involved, detailed, question and what progress we have made is a matter of judgment. I would suggest, if the hon. member of the Opposition would like to have our progress in regard to our negotiations with carriers, the railroads, air and other modes of transportation, that he put it on the Order Paper and we will see that he gets some answers.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. minister. Could he tell us briefly what his objective is in this particular field, so that when I put the question on the Order Paper I might have some idea which way he is aiming?

MR. SPEAKER:

If the question is going on the Order Paper then it would seem that the supplementary might also go on the Order Paper. The hon. Member for Calgary Millican, followed by the hon. Member for Lacombe.

73-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 10th 1972

Inquests

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question today to the hon. Attorney General. The Provincial Coroner has just recently announced major changes in the conducting of inquests as proposed for a future date. He announced quite a few major ones and he said there were a number of other major ones that would be announced. I wonder if the hon. Attorney General would announce what the other major changes are going to be in inquests in the coming years in Alberta?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that the hon. member is accurately quoting the coroner. I understand that he said there were a number of major changes that he was going to recommend to the government to make. Until I have reviewed those recommendations, I think it would be inappropriate for me to offer now a view on what changes might be made in the future.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the hon. members and myself are very interested in the change that is proposed where inquests for people who have been badly injured but have not died. I wondered if we would be the first province to consider such a change as this?

MR. LEITCH:

I am sure we would not be the first to consider it, Mr. Speaker. That kind of inquiry I would be reluctant to see called an inquest, but the difficulty occurs in these cases where someone may suffer very serious injuries, particularly injuries that put them into a coma or something of that nature, yet they continue to live for some appreciable time. The practice at the moment is to hold an inquest, of course, only after the death occurs. But that may be two or three years after the incident which led to the death, and by that time witnesses have disappeared and things of that nature. So what the coroner was talking about was a vehicle that would enable us to hold a public hearing, which is really what a coroner's inquest is, shortly after the incident occurs where it appears that because of the injuries the person has suffered, he is likely to die, but might linger on for some appreciable time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lacombe, followed by the hon. Member for Stony Plain.

Containers

MR. COOKSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the hon. the Attorney General. Is your department responsible for size or shape of the containers? I'm thinking in special reference to soft drink bottles, liquor bottles, beer bottles, and such things.

MR. LEITCH:

No, Mr. Speaker, although we have some involvement with of course, liquor and beer bottles, they're not wholly unconnected with pop bottles. There has been in the province recently, a problem which is not restricted to Alberta it's occurred in other provinces as well where pop is sold in bottles that look very much like beer bottles. This is really a form of echo advertising of breweries. It hasn't been a problem until now in Alberta, since the brewing industry has co-operated with the policy that there shouldn't be that kind of echo advertising. We are looking at the problem. One of the possible solutions is sale in cans, but that is heading in an opposite direction from that of the hon. Minister of Environment, and that we endeavour to avoid, on this side of the House at least. We are exploring the possibility of requiring distinctive labelling or coloring to distinguish the two. What we certainly want to avoid is someone going to the fridge and by mistake, getting a bottle of beer instead of a bottle of pop, or vice versa.

MR. SORENSON:

A question to the Minister of Environment. Is it the government's intention to ban the pull-tab can?

November 10, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

73-31

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asked me what the government's intentions are. I think the government's intentions are pretty clear in this area. We've had a pretty major fight on our hands getting a workable system going. We think that by January 1 of next year, we will have indeed a workable system; there will be something like between 150 and 200 depots available throughout the province to handle all types of containers that are re-cycled by the public. As I've said before, the government has not at any time, taken the approach of banning something directly. We have used the approach of incentives, and the approach of discussion with the various companies has been to convince them that our way is the right way. And in fact, I think we have been quite successful but I would say if in the future we have to consider the approach of banning, it will be considered. At this time it has not been considered with respect to the pull-tab can.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Stony Plain followed by -- is this a supplementary?

MR. DRAIN:

A question to the hon. Minister of Environment. I was just wondering if you ever made a study in your department on the length of time it takes Mother Nature to re-cycle a tin can?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, we haven't made a study of that but I believe I did see some figure in regard to an aluminum can which is something like a hundred years.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Stony Plain followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

Hoselaw Lake Provincial Park

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Because of the extensive damage done at Hoselaw Lake Provincial Park -- which is in the Stony Plain constituency -- by vandals on Halloween night, will any consideration be given by the minister to utilizing this park year around, instead of the present system of only daylight hours in the summer time?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, some considerable damage did occur, basically, I guess, as a Halloween prank on October 31st, where extensive damage was done to two of the sanitary units. The two johnnies-on-the-spot were moved to be johnnies-off-the-spot, and one of them was totally demolished, and the other salvageable.

The vandalism occurred, really though, as a matter of the steel gate at the park being left open in order that fishermen could have access to the lake for fishing in the fall and subsequently in the winter.

Hoselaw Lake is one of the five presently, totally undeveloped parks that exist in Alberta. They had been declared, but no planning, no budgeting had gone with those hastily established parks at those times prior to the last election. One of these is Hoselaw Lake, and we do intend to have an additional development at Hoselaw Lake in the coming year, and hope that in that way we can not only take care of the need for such a park in that area, but also to prevent this kind of damage.

MR. PURDY:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Have the RCMP from the Stony Plain detachment laid any charges in regard to this vandalism?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I don't know that. They would only be reporting to us if we could get compensation for the damage. So I am not sure that unless that is possible, whether they would be reporting. But the answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

73-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 10th 1972

---

MR. RUSSE:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the hon. minister. Does the minister consider disestablishing some of these hastily established parks?

DR. WARRACK:

That is a very difficult thing to do, Mr. Speaker, and that is the kind of question that ministers of Lands and Forests should have been asking themselves before they established these parks.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

Alberta Communications Network

MR. WYSE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Premier. Is it the policy of the government that no partisan-political material will be transmitted over the Alberta Communications Network?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WYSE:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. the Premier aware of the fact that during the recent federal election campaign, rears of Conservative Party propaganda was transmitted over the network?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure there was no such thing as propaganda. They were just clear hard facts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Three members rose at once.]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. Would the hon. member resume his seat, please? The hon. Member for Calgary Bow with a supplementary.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary question to the hon. the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Were those so-called hard facts via the free government route, or via the paid private enterprise route?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I will have to check, and ask the minister who is responsible to give the hon. member an answer.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, that's the second case of pre-judging the answer today. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. members would agree to get the information now, since they have raised this issue several times. I promised to report back, particularly to the hon. Member for Calgary Bow, regarding the Alberta Communications Network; I was going to deal with it at the end of questions today.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

November 10, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

73-33

MR. GETTY:

All right! Mr. Speaker, I'm giving just a bit of detail.

One of the first things that the newly formed Bureau of Public Affairs did, Mr. Speaker, was to visit many parts of the province to find out, first hand, what problems of communication existed. Such areas as Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, Red Deer, Drumheller, Grande Prairie and similar centres --

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe that there had been a previous ruling by the hon. Mr. Speaker that any lengthy and gratuitous remarks are not to be entertained in this House. That's what Order Papers are for.

MR. SPEAKER:

It was the understanding of the Chair that the hon. minister had the unanimous consent of the House for making this statement at this time.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, the opportunity was there and there was no one offering an adverse comment, so the opportunity has passed him by.

MR. GETTY:

I'm at your service, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Under the circumstances, we can't revoke the unanimous consent of the House. I would suggest the hon. minister proceed.

MR. GETTY:

I don't understand why he doesn't want to hear it.

MR. LUDWIG:

I don't expect very much from it.

MR. GETTY:

In these areas, Mr. Speaker, such as Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, Red Deer, Drumheller, and Grande Prairie and similar centres, one of the most often repeated complaints which the bureau received was that official government statements were not reaching the news outlets until one, two, three, or four days after they had already reached the major media in the major metropolitan centres.

It was also true that the centres throughout the province subscribed to Canadian Press and its electronic version, broadcast news. But the news outlets in the rest of Alberta felt they should be able to compare original government statements with rewritten wire stories, and use what they consider to be the important facts for their own area. They also wanted a chance to do it when the news was news, not four days later when the message often arrived in the mail.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Public Affairs attempted to assist in this task. They tried to determine how they could distribute the statements equitably from a time point of view to all parts of the province, and how it could be done in an economical practical way.

We're all aware that Alberta Government Telephones is a wholly-owned Crown corporation. Any monies that any branch of government pays to AGT is largely a payment from one pocket to another. So the bureau asked AGT to study the problem and come up with recommendations. The result was ACN, the Alberta Communications Network. It is a joint venture utilizing teletype service providing simultaneous and instant dissemination of official government statements and departmental information to all radio stations, television stations, and daily newspapers outside of the City of Edmonton.

Now there was the question of the weekly newspapers. The Bureau of Public Affairs talked to them. In conversation with the Alberta Weekly Newspaper Association, we were told that the overwhelming majority of weeklies do not want or need daily transmission of news. All of the weeklies can have a regular

73-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 10th 1972

mailing of the Alberta Communications Network releases; currently 27 of them now do that.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe that there was a hard and fast ruling made when I tried to read my speech in this House, and the hon. minister is reading every word of what he is saying. I'm just asking for consistency, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister is not making a speech in the ordinary sense. As I understand it, he is giving some prepared information to the House.

MR. GETTY:

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, 27 of the weekly newspapers are now availing themselves of this service. In Edmonton one chain of weekly newspapers picks up the ACN releases every day. The same service is provided out of the bureau office in the J. J. Bowlen Building in Calgary.

We now have to deal with the question about guidelines and controls in existence regarding the joint venture of Canada News-Wire and the Government of Alberta. The question was asked why Canada News-Wire was there tendering. There are only two public relations wire services in Canada; one is Canada News-Wire and the other is Tel-Bec, which is tied in with the Quebec government. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we did not use Tel-Bec and went to Canada News-Wire.

The question was asked, why have the private sector in the venture at all? The greatest use that could be foreseen for all government information service is something in the order of four hours a day. Since the 'machinery' would be there 24 hours a day, Canada News-Wire was invited to make proposals to utilize the equipment for the 'down' time, and thus bring additional revenues to AGT. That the taxpayer interest is thus protected can be demonstrated in this way: the original quotation by AGT to the Bureau of Public Affairs was in the order of \$50,000 per year. The bureau now pays about \$37,000 a year, yet AGT, wholly owned by Albertans, receives additional revenue of approximately \$5,000 a year, all from the private sector.

There were two other questions, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Member for Calgary Bow wanted to know about the provision of office space and secretarial service. In negotiating with Canada News-Wire, certain agreements were reached. Canada News-Wire, for their own service, provides the expertise and technical 'know how' to operate the machinery. The bureau, for obvious reasons of convenience and control, insisted that the transmitting end of ACN be located in the bureau. So the bureau provides space, a desk, a typewriter, and is training at its own request a back-up operator who belongs to the bureau. Rather than going to the expense of installing separate phone lines, ACN is on a local extension of the bureau's telephone exchange. But Canada News-Wire pays for a separate telephone installed in the office for the Alberta Communications Network.

As far as material is concerned -- and this answers the Member for Medicine Hat -- only bona fide departmental information or official government statements have government access to ACN. No political statements are accepted for government releases. Every effort is made to ensure that the releases are short, valid as news releases, or departmental background information. These are the same guidelines that must, presumably, have always applied to government news releases in the past -- we would hope so -- when they were disseminated through the mail instead of electronically. As for private sector messages, they are arranged through ACN in accordance with published rates, and must be from recognized and responsible news sources. All stories, from any source, carry the name, address, and phone number of the person who accepts responsibility for the story and for any additional information which the news gathering organizations may see fit to require.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that provided most of the information the members have been looking for.

MR. WYSE:

Two supplementary questions, Mr. Speaker. I'll direct the first one to the hon. the Premier. Since the federal P.C. party had the privilege of using the network during the last election to outline their platform policies, why was not this service extended to the other political parties in the province?

November 10, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

73-35

-----  
MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the service is there for anybody to use. You merely make a deal with the Canada News-Wire service and they are pleased to do it. You pay for it. It's a commercial venture.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. The hon. minister just said that you usually make a deal in this matter. In this case, did Stanfield make a deal with the Premier to use this network?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member for --

MR. GETTY:

I'm not sure whether that question should be allowed to go by. I'm going to let it -- recognizing the source -- but normally I wouldn't.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliffe with a supplementary.

MR. WYSE:

I'll ask a last supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the Alberta government is using the Alberta Communications Network at public expense to outline its policies to the news media throughout the province, don't you feel it is only fair that the opposition party should be given --

MR. SPEAKER:

Please, the hon. member's question is clearly out of order on at least three grounds.

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow with a supplementary, followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. WILSON:

Is the news release service of Alberta Communications Network available to opposition members the same as it would be to government members? Here I am referring to the four hours that are free service.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the news service is not available to government members. If it is government or departmental information, then it is used. Government members are like any other M.L.A.'s -- if they want to put something out, they would make a commercial arrangement with Canada News-Wire service.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Due to the fact, Mr. Minister, that the guidelines are contained in your report, was any notification sent to other political parties that they could, in fact, use this service on commercial rates?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, notification was sent to no political parties. Some may have been sharper than others and recognized --

MR. SPEAKER:

We have had a great number of supplementaries. May this then be the final supplementary?

MR. DIXON:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary to the hon. minister. Regarding the contract, I would be concerned in the case of a charge of dissemination of false

73-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 10th 1972

-----  
or malicious information going over the wire. In the contract who is held responsible, the government or Canada Wire-Service?

MR. GETTY:

I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, if he wants a legal interpretation; if he would like one I will try to obtain it.

MR. DIKON:

My question, Mr. Speaker, I take it it is not covered in the contract?

MR. GETTY:

I'm not sure of that either, Mr. Speaker. I suppose if anyone was malicious he would be charged just like anyone else; I'll get the contract and table it in the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

Vehicle-In-Transit Permits

MR. COOPER:

This question is directed to the hon. Minister of Highways and Transport. Is it true, Mr. Minister, that vehicle in-transit permits are no longer available from the R.C.M.P. in towns such as Vermilion?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I would have to check with the traffic department. I would be happy to do so and relate that information to you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Minister, have you received no complaints from automobile dealers regarding this change in services?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COOPER:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Have you read your mail in the last day or two, Mr. Minister ...

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright followed by the hon. Member for Drayton Valley.

Migratory Bird Damage

MR. RUSSE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. Earlier in this session it was indicated that discussions had taken place with the federal government relative to compensatory payments by the federal government for migratory bird damage. My question to the minister is: what agreement has been arrived at with the federal government in this regard?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, we have signed an agreement with the federal government regarding compensatory payments. The full details in the agreement I would be happy to get for the hon. member, should he wish further details.

MR. RUSSE:

Supplementary question. Would the minister be prepared to table that agreement for the members?

November 10, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

73-37

MR. GETTY:

Yes, I would consider it, Mr. Speaker. I would have to get the agreement from the federal government, but right off the top of my head I can't think of any reason why they wouldn't agree.

MR. RUSPE:

Just a supplementary. If the session is over before you get that concurrence, would you have it sent out to the members?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member asking to have this reproduced for 75 people or for his own particular interest? Perhaps he could tell me either now or in a note.

MR. RUSPE:

I would suggest that it is of interest, particularly to those in rural areas, and I would think that all members would be interested in that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drayton Valley followed by the hon. Member for Taber-Warner.

Timber Quotas

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Small timber or lumber operators seem to find it difficult, if not at some times impossible, to get timber or a timber quota. Can you give any reason why?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, there is a very great acceleration and interest in timber bursts because of the very attractive lumber prices that we have today, and this is a very happy situation, not only insofar as the total industry is concerned, but also for the smaller operators to whom this can be a very important winter and supplementary source of income.

We have gone to some considerable extent, beginning in the fall of 1971, to accelerate cruises, as our surveys are called in the timber area, in order to 'free up' additional opportunities in small timber bursts for smaller operators. I might add that on burnt timber and small roundwood we also have adjusted the dues there to make that economic, at the same time making it more attractive for small timber operators to operate. This does tend to alleviate the fire problem.

A third point that comes to mind is that currently a deposit system is necessary in order to get access to timber supplies. These have become very high because of their proportionate relation to timber dues, and for this reason we are looking at adjusting that and making it more possible for the smaller and medium-sized timber operators to get access to timber supplies in Alberta.

MR. STROM:

A supplementary question. Have stumpage rates been reduced within the last month or two?

DR. WARRACK:

No, they haven't. There has been no change in the timber dues structure and as I explained a week or perhaps, ten days ago there was some equity adjustment to get fairness so that the cost calculation applies at exactly the same time period as the price applies, when the net basis on which timber dues are calculated is arrived at.

73-38

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 10th 1972

-----  
Censorship

MR. D. MILLER:

I have a question for the hon. Attorney General. Is the hon. minister planning any new legislation at this session, as a result of the Select Committee's recommendations on censorship?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is no. I should also draw to the hon. member's attention that The Amusements Act under which the censorship board operates is not within the Attorney General's Department.

MR. SPEAKER:

The time for the question period has elapsed.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the leave of the House to revert back to Tabling Reports and Returns because I had a report to table today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table a report by the Department of the Environment on the City of Calgary Flood Study, Volume 2, The Fish Creek Report.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask leave of the House to revert to Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees in order that the member for Camrose, Mr. Stromberg, can table the interim report of the Select Committee on Crop Insurance.

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. Government House Leader leave of the House to revert as requested?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Interim Report of the Special Committee on Crop Insurance and Weather Modification.

MR. CLARK:

In light of the comments made by the Minister of Agriculture the other day concerning the crop insurance program, at that time I raised the question to the minister, and was advised by you, Mr. Speaker, that I should wait until now to raise this question. Will there be an opportunity for us to debate the committee's report during this session of the legislature?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I will have to consider that. I think, Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday we could give an answer in that regard. This is an interim report, not the final report.

November 10, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

73-39

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, just speaking to the point of order. It is the interim report, and I say this as a member of the committee, but it is the committee's final report on crop insurance, and the committee made the presentation at this time so that legislation could be prepared for the spring session so farmers could get the benefit very early.

MR. RUSIE:

Mr. Speaker, probably mine was answered in part in that it is a final report on crop insurance. Is that correct, is that the understanding?

There is an interim report -- well maybe I could ask the member who introduced it, the hon. Member for Camrose? Just a question. I want to know whether this is -- the member in introducing it said it was an interim report -- my question is, is that the final one? Interim would indicate it isn't.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is a provision in the rules for asking questions of members who are directly concerned with business of the House. Perhaps the hon. member could raise this question with the hon. Member for Camrose at the next question period.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. YOUNG:

Could I have leave of the House to revert to Introduction of Visitors?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, you may have noticed in the members' gallery, a group of students arriving rather recently. There are 24 students from the Brightview School, Grade VII, from my constituency. Mr. Speaker, I would ask them to stand and be recognized by the House.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the appropriate minister when we could expect the answer to Return No. 214 on irrigation?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, as is usual when correspondence between the provincial government and the federal government is requested, a letter must be sent to the federal government to request permission to table such correspondence. A letter has, in fact, been sent and I have no idea when a reply will come back indicating a favourable reply with respect to tabling that correspondence.

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS  
(Committee of the Whole)

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the assembly resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for consideration of bills on the Order Paper.

[The motion was carried without debate.]

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair 1:55 p.m.]

\* \* \* \* \*

73-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 10th 1972

-----  
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair.]

Bill No. 1: The Alberta Bill of Rights

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could re-open the discussion in committee of this bill. I think there was one outstanding matter raised by the hon. Member for Fort Macleod. I gave it some further thought and certainly from a personal and private point of view I was respectful to the point he had placed, that we should have some reference in the preamble to the bill comparable to that of the Canadian bill. Certainly, as I say, from a private and personal point of view I concur with that. However, in thinking about it from a public point of view, I think when we talk about freedom of religion within the bill that that, of course, means freedom not to have religion. That might -- and I just say 'might' -- in a multicultural, multireligious society such as we have in Alberta, have some reflection upon our view of the freedom of religion set forth in Section 1. I would, however, hope that perhaps all members, including the hon. member, would give further thought to some way, other than through The Alberta Bill of Rights, we might give some further consideration to the general point the hon. member has raised. There may be a more appropriate way, other than in this bill, to do that. I think there should be a greater recognition perhaps than we have today within our statute law.

I wanted to make two things clear that may have been misunderstood in reading reports of the discussions at the committee level. I hope, in answer to the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury on this bill, that I didn't create a misunderstanding. If I understood the discussion with regard to legal aid, the position we were taking was that not anybody who sought a case based on The Alberta Bill of Rights would automatically receive legal aid, but that he would receive it only if the director of legal aid was in the process of rejecting an application for legal aid when The Alberta Bill of Rights was involved. The director of legal aid would be directed and obliged to bring that rejection forward to the Attorney General for review and then consideration; it wasn't going to be an automatic acceptance of it, because there could be some frivolous cases -- frivolous and vexatious if that is the proper terminology.

There was another point, and though I don't think this was misunderstood, I just wanted to repeat it to get it clear. The question was raised, I believe, by the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen and also by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, as to what bills did we now in our preliminary process think were contrary to the spirit and intent of The Alberta Bill of Rights. We mentioned two, being The Sexual Sterilization Act which was repealed in the spring session, and The Communal Property Act which is before the House now. There were not any other bills in total, but we certainly recognize that, within the statute laws that exist in Alberta, there are a number of amendments we are aware of in our preliminary review -- that we are in the process of reviewing -- and we have given an undertaking to bring that forward by way of amendments in the first session in 1973. We didn't recognize that there weren't a number of statutes -- I didn't want that misunderstood; the whole area, if the hon. member wants to spend some time on it, on the question of no discrimination as between age and sex, is going to come up in Bill No. 2, and is going to be a very extensive challenge for the legislative council's office and the Attorney General's office, as I am sure the hon. member is aware.

Those are the only preliminary remarks that I had, Mr. Chairman, and the process in which we have been proceeding on this bill, is to deal with the legislation generally in committee, and then start to move on these specific sections.

MR. NOTLEY:

When we get to the title and preamble, perhaps I will make some general remarks on the bill. I know, Mr. Premier, that this was discussed last spring, but I've been bothered about it over the summer, the decision of the government to receive briefs through the cabinet. I feel as I felt last spring, but I feel more strongly so now, that it would probably be a better route if we had a legislative hearing.

Now first of all I'm not convinced that it's absolutely necessary to proclaim the Bill of Rights on the 1st of January. I don't believe that it would be a serious error in judgment to defer it for three months or six months, or even until the 1st of 1974.

November 10, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

73-41

The reason that I suggest that public hearings by the legislature would be useful is from the experience we had during the oil hearings, even though I strongly disagreed with the government's final conclusion. Nevertheless I think most of us who took part in those hearings felt that they were useful. We had an opportunity not only to read the briefs and the submissions that were made, but more important, to pose questions. I think that through that questioning there was a lot of useful and valuable information which came before the legislature which might not have come forward had we just read the briefs.

I submit -- and I am not trying to make a political speech here -- but I submit that when you look at the relative importance of the two decisions, both decisions are important, but the question of the Bill of Rights, to me is more important. We're talking about a statement of aims and objectives which is not just a statement for the government, but is a statement for this legislature, and more important really, a statement for the whole population of the province. I'm just wondering if we couldn't at the end of committee stage, hold this in abeyance so that we could perhaps arrange public hearings either sometime during the session next spring, or perhaps even not proroguing the session at the end but recessing it until a few days before the opening of the session next spring so that we could have public hearings.

I read through many of the submissions and the submissions, I'm sure you'll agree, range all the way from those that were not too well thought out to some that were pretty penetrating in their analysis of the implications of The Bill of Rights. And I couldn't help but feel that if we had an opportunity, in three or four days to pose questions to the people who have gone to the trouble of making these submissions, that it would strengthen our total effort and help us to make a bill here -- Bill No. 1 particularly, but Bill No. 2 as well because the two are really tied hand in hand -- to formulate legislation which can really stand as bench-marked legislation which will be a credit to all of us, and something which would command the respect of the people of Canada.

I'm not saying that this won't be the case with the two bills because by and large, I agree with them. But it seems to me the process of involving people here in discussion of the Bill of Rights, is probably more important than the decision that we made with respect to the oil hearings or in 1969 when legislature had public hearings on the Big Horn Dam.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Responding to that matter, certainly it's always a difficult question to decide the degree of participation in public hearing in any particular matter, but I've given it a great deal of thought. I think it is important that this bill proceed through the first session of The Alberta Legislature and become the law of this province. I think there has been a great deal of opportunity for the public to make their views known, and I am delighted they have. We generally advertised, I think, pretty effectively. We went along with the suggestion by the Opposition House Leader in the spring, that we hold the bill at second reading stage rather than at committee stage so that we would have the opportunity to have the free exchange we are having right now. It has been no secret, I am sure, to the people of Alberta, that we have had this Bill of Rights in our mind for many years, not just the one year, but many years. It follows fairly closely the bill I presented twice in this House, once in 1970 and the other time in 1971. I looked and reviewed the record of the Canadian House of Commons, in terms of that particular matter, and I'm satisfied. I'm inclined to return to the view that the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen put, that we have a responsibility in here as 75 legislators.

We are talking about a bill that has had full and adequate consideration by the public in my opinion and, I think, by the hon. members too. I think it is unfair to suggest that it has been, in any way, hurried through this legislative assembly if that is implied by the hon. member's suggestion, because it hasn't been.

The members on both sides of the House have received copies of the submissions made by various people; we have met with various groups and I have attended numerous meetings throughout the province where I have been asked about The Bill of Rights, and been obliged to make an explanation in regard to it.

Further, I think that in matters such as this, if you are looking at a bill like this, you can tell by reading the submissions, (and I am not trying to down-play them), that it is obvious you get the views of either full endorsement of the spirit of the bill, or some broader views with regard to how it should be expanded. I think the nature of a public hearing, in my view, would not serve any particular interest. I think we are charged with a responsibility here in this assembly to make a decision, and I would like to accept that.

73-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 10th 1972

---

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Premier, in your remarks in Hansard the other day, before tabling the letter from the Indian Association of Alberta, you stated the Metis Association hadn't submitted a submission, and I was quite concerned. When I received the correspondence you tabled this morning, I noticed you wrote the Indian Association of Alberta two letters, one on October 30th, and the other on November 30th, receiving a reply on November 6th. Was this process used with the Metis Association, and did the hon. member, Mr. King, contact that Association for background? That concerns me. Firstly, Mr. Cardinal, whose reserve is in my constituency, is having problems with a very important organization that has made a lot of miles in the last few years and the dissension is great. I would hope that there aren't any political advantages to this particular episode.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Well, Mr. Chairman, it is the latter part of that question that would bother me. I think we clearly answered in all good faith at the last discussion of the committee, that there was a very broad representation as Mr. King explained, by the Indian Association. I think the first part of the hon. member's question is very much in order and I think we should try to explain it, but I would have to take issue with the latter part of those remarks.

MR. KING:

Mr. Chairman, could I just reply to this please because I would like this to be very clear. Letters were sent to both the Indian Association and the Metis Association during the summer, along with something in excess of 100 other groups within the province. Both the Indian Association and the Metis Association received a specific letter inviting them to make a submission, and it happened at approximately the same time that the advertisements appeared in the newspaper, and that the press releases were made on radio and T.V.

Now, subsequent to that, the Indian Association came to the government, and as a result of having received this letter they indicated a specific interest in meeting with us in response to which the hon. the Premier asked that I meet with the Indian Association. When I met with the Indian Association, they asked if we had received any representation from the Metis Association, and I said that we had not. They said that in that case they would get in touch with the Metis Association and advise them how important they felt this was. Now, as a result of that I received two telephone calls from someone representing the Metis Association. In both calls it was indicated that they were working on a submission and they would make a submission to us with respect to the act. Aside from those two telephone calls, we have not received a submission from the Metis Association, nor have we received any further written communication from them at all.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the hon. Premier regarding the remarks I had made the other day. This Bill of Rights and Bill No. 2 are actually, in some respects, taking the place of The Human Rights Act which was passed in 1966. The preamble is very similar and possibly Bill No. 2 goes into more detail than probably the former act. The fact that, to date, there have been some 800 cases under the Bill of Human Rights, which was passed, in 1966, which have been settled without being brought to court, shows there is a need for such an act. There is also interest in such an act.

As I mentioned the other day, we're asking that some source of power, other than human, be placed in the preamble. I think the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury put it quite correctly; that in setting out the preamble of The Alberta Bill of Rights, we should have in mind some goal or some objective or some principles, other than just the mere freedoms and rights for each and every individual; that we, as a government and a legislature, in laying the path of our traditions and principles, also should give recognition of from whence we came. I am quite concerned that in The Human Rights Act, we had the words that our nation is founded upon principles that acknowledge the supremacy of God". In Bill No. 1 we use "Whereas the free and democratic society existing in Alberta is founded upon the principles fostered by tradition", etc. I see no conflict here by adding the words "that acknowledge the supremacy of God", after "it is founded upon the principles".

If we were to get into the Christian ethic, then I could say that possibly we are going to offend many people. But in saying "the supremacy of God", we take in all those who believe in the Christian religion, we take in all those

November 10, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

73-43

who believe in the Jewish religion, all those who believe in the Mohammedan religion; in fact, we cover practically every ethnic group that we have, or could conceivably have, within the province -- other than those who are atheists, who actually don't believe in anything at all.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, very strongly on this point, that in debating The Worth Report in which Dr. Worth points out where our society is heading -- and I don't doubt he is correct if we are not going to do something about it -- for the breakdown of marriage, for the breakdown of the church, and for the breakdown of social and moral values, these come primarily because adults have given a very poor example.

I'm not suggesting that by adding words to a Bill of Rights we are going to change the course of history. But I do feel, Mr. Chairman, that as legislators, as examples for the public whom we govern, we should not be ashamed; we cannot hurt anyone's feelings and if they are hurt, I'm sorry, but if anyone is to come into this country and settle in Alberta and not know that we acknowledge the supremacy of God, I say God Almighty have pity on that person, because I believe our nation today was founded on traditions and principles that we believe that there is a Deity higher than ourselves.

In reading this preamble, I am very concerned that all it is concerned about, and all the impression it now conveys is that we are a humanist society and that we are no better than the principles and the dignity and worth of human people, that all we are going to put into it is the common man's objective.

I feel today that this Bill of Rights -- I may be way out on this -- but I feel that this Bill of Rights today in legislation is actually, in a sense, the Christian ethic of "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." This is the whole basis of our society if we are going to build a society of dignity and worth.

So therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would like to move, seconded by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, that following the words "upon principles", the following words are added, "that acknowledge the supremacy of God."

I do feel most sincerely that we would be remiss if we let this opportunity go. I realize I may be putting the hon. Premier on a spot. In fact I know, that in his heart of hearts he really feels that these words should be in there, but he is worried about how it is going to affect this bill. Frankly, sir, I would have to say that I think you would add stature to yourself and to your government if these words were added.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to be able to second the amendment that my hon. colleague has just proposed. In rising to speak to the amendment, it is not my intention to repeat the things that have already been stated by my hon. colleague. I think they have already been acknowledged by the hon. the Premier.

I would simply want to say this, that I am very much concerned about our readiness to water-down our attempt at stating what we believe as far as our relationship to God is concerned. I say that today we find ourselves in the position that if one objects to it wanting it, we say, let's accept the thinking of one. If that is the situation, then I say we are wrong.

We, as a legislative body, ought to be prepared to stand up and be counted to see whether or not we really believe this as a principle. I say that if this is not the way we see it as a province, then I would be the first to agree that it should not be placed there. But I say that it is my humble opinion that there are many, many people who will recognize that this is a principle that they want to have stated, and it is a principle to which they would be glad to adhere. So I say to my hon. colleagues on both sides of the House, let's place it in there. I think it is a good amendment, and I think it is one that places us in a position that can be defended anywhere throughout our province.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Chairman, I think these are not matters that one can respond to without some considerable thought. I appreciate the views expressed and the fact that a specific amendment has been made. I would suggest the committee be given the opportunity to consider the nature of that amendment over the course of the weekend, and that we try to proceed with the rest of the bill.

73-44

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 10th 1972

---

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is that agreed upon by the members of the Assembly?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

We leave this portion, the preamble, and then we will come back to it.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Chairman, I just want it to be clear that it was the first preamble that this amendment was in, was it not?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Yes.

MR. TAYLOR:

There are two or three remarks I would like to make, in connection with the bill. While it's very important legislation, it's a type of motherhood legislation too, that nobody opposes. I do think, though, there are some underlying principles that should be mentioned when this bill is being debated. In the first place, we have in Canada political freedom and as a Canadian citizen, I believe I have that political freedom and I question the right of any provincial government, irrespective of which province in which I live, to take that from me. I think I have freedom of speech and freedom of assembly and association and we have freedom of the press; all these things are connected with political freedom.

We have, through association, the right to belong to the party of our choice, the party that comes closest to the things in which we believe, and so it is proper that people throughout the province align themselves with certain parties. This is in accordance with this bill, and I think more so in accordance with the Canadian Bill of Rights. The one thought that comes to me in connection with some of these items is, that what a government can give, a government can take away. I question the right of any provincial government to take away anything that I hold as a Canadian citizen. I wanted to mention that, because while I support the bill, I don't support the fact that a provincial government, whether I live in Newfoundland, or Alberta, or Nova Scotia or British Columbia, has any right to take away from me the rights I possess because I am a Canadian citizen.

When we agree to this, it appears we agree to the fact that governments may take this away from us and with that I disagree. I would vehemently oppose any thought that a provincial government can take from me the rights that I have as a Canadian citizen under the Canadian Bill of Rights. Now I have no objection to the provincial Bill of Rights Act, affirming my rights as a Canadian citizen. But I certainly don't want ever to be accused of agreeing that a provincial government, of whatever stripe, could pass legislation that would be held *intra vires* -- if it denied me rights that I had as a Canadian citizen.

Now, when it comes to economic rights, the hon. the Premier, when he introduced the bill, mentioned that this was not dealing with the matter of economics. In our last war it was recognized by great men like the late Mr. Churchill and the late Mr. Roosevelt, that economics is at the basis of all other freedoms. So, in the Atlantic Charter, they placed very conspicuously freedom from want; this was something that appealed to the masses of people who were being downtrodden. We can all very well say that the economic freedoms are separate, but they are very very closely allied. As a matter of fact, in some of the communist countries they have taken away the political freedom from people; it's been done only because those people were hungry and wanted bread and they gave up their political freedom in order to have something to eat, and so the economic freedom, I think, is equally important to my right to have freedom of religion and my freedom to have political freedom of association, assembly and so on.

As a matter of fact, I don't think there is any finer example of how closely hunger and religion goes together than that which is included in a book by Harold Begbie, entitled 'Broken Earthenware'. It tells there of the early days of William Booth, the founder of the Salvation Army, who tried to preach to the people in the skid row of the slums of London, and had no reception because

November 10, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

73-45

the people were hungry, and they were crying for food. They wanted something to eat, so the religion did not predominate the pangs of hunger of their stomachs. And so he conceived the idea, which later developed into the great social work of that splendid organization, of giving them a bowl of soup, of giving them a sandwich, and then preaching to them, and hundreds of those people became converted and became a tremendous influence, not only in England and Scotland and the British Isles, but throughout the world, because there was a close connection between religion and economics.

And so, when we think of economics we think of money and land and hunger, and I just wanted to emphasize that in my view, any real Bill of Rights in this country, should contain that freedom that was so prominent in the Atlantic Charter, freedom from want. Now, I realize to put that into the act at this time, without the proper means of fulfilling it, would be hypocrisy and mockery, but I think that we as legislators, should be continually working towards that objective, where we can obtain economic freedom in this country, because as long as any man is hungry, the value of his other freedoms is reduced. As long as any mother is crying for food to feed her hungry children, the value of her freedom of association, and her freedom even of religion, is reduced. And, so I emphasize, while I realize I am not going to make any amendment because it would not be possible unless we have the means of fulfilling it, and with that part I agree with the hon. Premier. But I think we should hold it conspicuously high as one of the objectives, if our Bill of Rights is going to mean anything to those who are on skid row, those who are in low income brackets, those who are having a difficult time with economics.

The next point I would like to raise in connection with this -- and I want to thank the hon. Premier for making the mail that came to his office on this bill available to all of us -- I found a great thrill really, in reading some of those letters. With some of them I disagreed with some of them I agreed, which is obvious. I suppose the hon. Premier is in the same category. But as I looked at the ones with which I disagreed, I couldn't help but think under whose standard am I setting out this right? I look at some of the extremes. For instance, the Christian Scientists who claim that part of their freedom of religion is not to practise medicine but to take a very definite stand on faith healing, on the intrusion of mother's blood into their bodies and this type of thing. This is, they claim, their standard, part of their religion, not a practice of medicine.

So, when we say freedom of religion, does this mean freedom of religion to us, who are not members of the Christian Science sect, or does it mean freedom of religion to everybody? I think this is a standard. If it is only according to the standards with which we agree, then it is not really a Bill of Rights for all individuals in the province. It is not a Bill of Rights for just the majority; it is a bill of rights for individuals, and each individual is looked upon as an entity, as a sacred vessel created by God just like any other individual. There are those of us who believe in the Christian faith or those who believe in the Jewish faith. An individual is an important entity, and because I don't agree with the Christian Science people in refusing maybe to save the life of one of their sect through the application of blood, I have to ask myself; "Is this the standard that I am setting?" This is their religion and have I any right as a legislator, when I'm talking about freedom of religion, to say that they can't have that particular freedom of religion? I think this is an important item in connection with this Bill of Rights. Because all of us agree when the majority is involved about freedom of religion. There is not an hon. member of the House who would not stand up and fight for the right of a Roman Catholic, or the right of a Salvationist, or the right of a Pentecostal, or the right of a United Church member to worship in the way in which his conscience dictates, or the right of a member of the Jewish faith to worship in the way his or her conscience dictates. But are we just as prepared to fight for the rights of a group like the Christian Scientists -- of which I am not a member and actually with whom I disagree -- but it is their religion and I think we should have some understanding on this when we are talking about freedom of religion. It bothers me in connection with this setting of standards according to our thoughts when we are dealing with the individual rights of other people.

Now there are other groups that made representations too, that are maybe further out in right field, and we disagree with them, but their rights that they claim as an individual, if they are not contrary to some law in the land, have we any right to deny them having their rights? I don't plan on going through those 94 briefs, but perhaps 10 or 15 of them have some very important items in this regard.

That brings me to the point I want to emphasize, that when we are talking about this freedom of religion and freedom of speech and freedom of the press,

-----  
and particularly freedom of the right of the individual to all these things, and freedom of religion, under what standard are we setting? Is it really what it says it is, freedom for every individual even if he is way out in right field or left field as far as we are concerned?

That brings me to the next point I want to make, and that is a lot of people -- 94 groups of people -- have gone to the trouble of writing letters, which is not an easy thing for many people to do, setting out their thoughts on this bill and sending them to the first citizen of the province, the Premier. Now I think we can't simply read those and say well, that's it. I would like to hear from the Premier what action has been taken in connection with every one of them, every one of these individuals or groups. Are we simply going to read them and say, we disagree with it, so that's it? These are individual rights and I think we have to do more than say simply it is not in accordance with the standards that we are setting and we have the right to set the standard. I think this is worrying a few people -- very small minority groups, there is no doubt about that -- but still composed of individuals, and I think that if this Bill of Rights is going to mean anything it has to acknowledge that particular part.

The other point that I wanted to deal with particularly, and before leaving that I hope the hon. Premier will let us know what is happening to the various amendments suggested in this massive correspondence. It will take time, but this is an important bill, and we are recognizing individual rights or we are not recognizing them. And I think we have to have a very valid reason for saying that this is not going in the bill, not simply the reason that it is an item with which we personally do not agree.

The other point I wanted to speak on briefly, and I want to deal with it in more detail when the Communal Property Act comes before us, is the rights that were denied the Hutterian Brethren under the Communal Property Act. I'm having difficulty in finding out what that right is, why this bill has to be repealed because of this Bill of Rights. Now I know there is disagreement with their thoughts of communal land holdings and purchasing land, but I know of no disagreement of any part of the Province of Alberta with their freedom of religion. I know of no one that bothers them when they worship. I have lived among the people and many are personal friends, and I know of no one that has any more freedom of religion than the Hutterian Brethren. Some may argue that the buying of land is part of their religion, the same as healing is part of the Christian Science religion, and if that is valid, it is an argument. But I certainly don't think anyone should say that that bill is being repealed because of freedom of religion, because they have just as much freedom of religion as any hon. member of this House, and have had for many years.

When I was a boy I remember seeing a sign in Montana; "No Hutterites permitted in this store". Now I've never seen any such thing in the Province of Alberta, I've never seen it anywhere, even at the height of bitter fights on this matter, I've never seen that. And I'm glad I haven't, because I personally would say that I would fight for the rights of the Hutterian Brethren to have freedom of religion.

Consequently, I have some difficulty in following the arguments that have been advanced about the repeal of that legislation in order to fit into this bill. It's claimed that we are talking about the rights of the individuals, but are we not talking about the rights of a sect, rather than the individuals? The individuals have their right to be a part of that colony. Nobody's denying them that right, and if this is going to start recognizing the rights of organizations and sects, then of course it gets away from the individual thing. And I think this is a point that has to be carefully analyzed and carefully watched, or we're going to get into difficulty in the administration of the bill. The rights also, when we say to some people we are going to guarantee your rights, we have to be very careful that in doing so we don't take rights away from other individuals. And we have to think about the rights of those who will have their lives affected, who live on the fringe of the colony, who find themselves isolated from their own church because the artificial wall has been built around the colony and it affects their religion, their school, their rights. So I want to say that in our zeal to protect the rights of every individual, let's not take rights away from other individuals by so doing.

There are just two other points that I would like to mention in the matter of discrimination under item 1, and that is we say there will be no discrimination because of religion or sex. Now in connection with these items, I would like to mention two that bother me, and that is the discrimination of men and women, particularly men over the age of 50. I don't think there's any hon. member of this House who can go to any large part of the province of Alberta without finding men who are discriminated against because of their age.

November 10, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

73-47

Not because they can't do a job, but because people of today think that they can't compete with those who are younger. Now maybe this is verging on the economic, and I admit it does to some degree, but again I say there's a very fine line between the economical and the political aisle in connection with this. And also the discrimination sometimes against children. I have argued at times with members of the Hutterian colonies about the rights of their children in regard to education, that their children have a right to education.

But I always have to come back to the point of one of the fundamental things in which I believe, and that is the right of the parent to decide what school a youngster should go to, and the right of the parent to decide on the philosophical approach to the education of their child. So really, the only argument I have when I talk to the Hutterian Brethren about education is their low standard of education. One of them said he wants his boys and girls to learn how to read and to count money and to be able to write, but he doesn't want them to understand science. He doesn't want any science; he doesn't want them to know the why or the wherefore or why things are happening. Now I acknowledge this is the right of a parent, but there is another question that comes in. Does that standard come up that decreed by the Department of Education for other boys and girls in the Province of Alberta? And if it doesn't, there is a conflict between the right of a parent to decide to what school his child will go, and the philosophical approach with the standard set by the rest of the province in regard to the academic standards, and I hope the Department of Education doesn't set the philosophical standards. But in the academic standards, I think there is a requirement that is necessary for every boy and girl. Perhaps there is a conflict there too, a conflict with the parents who don't want their boys and girls to go beyond grade VI, which many Hutterian Brethren do not.

Now, these things aren't easily resolved I acknowledge. But there is sometimes discrimination against children, and those who are up in years, over 50, not because they can't do a job, but simply because of something over which they have no control - their age. They had no choice of when they were born. When I used to have to deal with many people in the coal mining industry who found that they were no longer wanted because they were 60 years of age, when they could load coal better than hundreds of people 30, this is a difficult thing to do. This is discrimination. I think it should be based on what they can do rather than on the age they happen to be.

Well, I realize that that is not a major point of the bill. But in closing I would like to say again, that the freedom from want is very closely allied to the basic foundation of these other rights. And I would like to know from the hon. the Premier exactly what we are going to do with the submissions that came to his office and which he was good enough to let us all read, even though we don't agree personally with the requests.

MR. LUGHEED:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to some of the points the hon. Opposition House Leader has raised. The first point, the specific question is, what to do with the submissions? It's been mulling through my mind, that particular question. I felt it was very inappropriate, until the matter had gone through the legislature for me to, in any way, respond beyond an acknowledgement, because I had no idea, and have no idea, what the legislature's ultimate decision will be.

However, once the legislation is passed through the House, it would be our intention to do two things. We would try to answer every single one of the 90 odd letters, and deal specifically with the matter that was raised in terms of my response to the letter. Then we would add to each letter the full Hansard transcripts of the committee discussions, that have dealt with the matters that have been raised here. We might add second reading, but at least we would add and pass on to everybody who has taken the time and trouble and effort to make a submission on this important bill, the full Hansard proceedings so that they could read the discussions back and forth that are being made today and other days.

On the question of economic want and economic freedom, I believe on this one, the hon. Member for Drumheller and I are in full accord. It is an objective, it is an objective of our administration -- I am sure it would have been an objective of the previous administration, but to place it as something within a bill, much as we would like to do it (and I would very much like to do it), I think it is just simply -- with the capacity that man has today -- hypocrisy for us to do it; that is our feeling and I concur with that.

73-48

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 10th 1972

On the matter of age 50, though, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the government has taken some very significant initiatives in that regard in Bill No. 2. That is a good question as I notice the hon. member refers to age 50. We are talking in Bill No. 2 about age 45 and that is strictly an arbitrary age. I do know this, that every age one goes on, one is prepared to adjust that figure.

The one point, though, that I don't understand from the hon. member's remarks is his very first comment, because if I understood him correctly, then either he or I do not understand the bill. There is no question but that under the parliamentary system and in the authority vested in the legislature, the legislature can, in fact, take fundamental freedoms away from people. Unfortunately, that is the nature of the motivation that brought us to bring Bill No. 1 forward as a basic bill. Perhaps the hon. member might want to clear up what he said, so that we're not at odds. Section 3(1) of the bill says that this, in no way, affects any existing rights of anybody. That is fundamental there. But there is no question that without Bill No. 1, this legislature, at any time, can pass a law that can take fundamental freedoms as enumerated therein away; in fact, can still do it with a 'notwithstanding The Alberta Bill of Rights' clause. Nobody is suggesting they will do it, but the power is there to do it, and that's the basic concept of Bill No. 1. If the hon. Member for Drunheller is not in accord on that, I don't know how he can be in accord with the bill. But it just could be that I misunderstood the point that he was getting at and would appreciate his response.

MR. FAYLOR:

Under The Canadian Bill of Rights, as a Canadian citizen, I am given certain rights. My point is that no provincial legislature has the right to take from me the rights given to me by the Parliament of Canada.

MR. LOUGHEED:

That's fine. There's no way the provincial legislature can take away from a citizen of this province, any rights granted to that citizen within the exclusive authority of the federal jurisdiction of the Canadian bill. That's fine, I feel better about it. But I did want to make sure the record is clear, that within the area that is solely and entirely a provincial jurisdiction, we do and we can, and we still can, with a 'notwithstanding' clause, pass a law that would, in fact, take away and, to some extent, curtail those basic rights.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this particular bill. One point that I would like to bring out that there hasn't been too much emphasis on is, I feel, this bill will do a great thing to unify our Canada.

I would like to leave this suggestion with the hon. Premier. I'm sure that after this bill is passed, it will probably go out to a lot of our schools and a lot of our institutions showing that we have a spelled out Bill of Rights in Alberta. I'm not opposed to that. But I think we want to take a forward step as a province. I think we should, when we send these things out, try and come up with a plaque, or whatever we use, that would show, not only the Alberta Bill of Rights, but also the Canadian Bill of Rights at the same time. We're not accused of trying to get a Bill of Rights to try and embarrass the federal government. We are Canadians first. I'm sure the hon. members, and the hon. Premier in particular, would be interested in doing just that. I think this is what we should do because I think the greatest freedom of all is the freedom that we can work together as Canadians to build a greater Canada. Of course, Alberta to us, is probably the most important part of Canada because we live here.

I would like to go back to the thought that we can do a lot towards helping to unify this nation of ours, by showing that we are not only anxious to underline, but I think, as the hon. Member for Drunheller was trying to point out, what the Alberta government is doing with The Bill of Rights to guarantee something they can't take away. I think what the Alberta government is trying to do, at least my interpretation of it, is to underline the basic rights and to extend wherever possible to Albertans, any extra protection that would make our bill more practical to apply, and at the same time do the basic thing which we want it to do; that is, expressing our freedom and guaranteeing our freedom.

I believe, as far as the Hutterite Brethren are concerned, their problem is not discrimination in actual religion. Where they are being discriminated against is that they can't buy land like any other person in the province if they are going to farm it communally. This is what the old act said, in effect.

November 10, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

73-49

-----

It held them down to that. It didn't say that they couldn't meet on Sunday to worship God, or on Saturday, to worship Him, if that's they way they picked -- but it was the discrimination of land purchasing against them. Doing away with The Communal Property Act will, of course in effect, take away that discrimination and take care of the objection they had to it.

I was noticing that in Saskatchewan, as far as religious freedom is concerned, they have a good clause that we could give consideration to. I notice that the hon. Member for Drumheller picked out the Christian Science movement, and I think if any Christian Science member heard him give his speech he'd be sort of confused, because he talked about blood transfusion -- that would be the last thing a Christian Science member would be advocating. So there is no problem there. I think this is where we have to examine the Alberta Bill of Rights because there is no stipulation as to how far the limits or boundaries to freedom are allowed to go. Liberty without any limits sometimes can be worse than no liberty at all. I think we have to try and bring the two together.

Somebody mentioned the fact that we must be careful when we are catering to just the small minority groups. I think you will find in history it has been proven to be the small minority groups who have done more and have been more alert to our freedoms than any other group. I think they have been responsible, in many cases, for maintaining the freedom that we have today.

I believe in talking about this religious freedom we should follow through Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, where it states, "Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. This right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom either alone or in community with others, and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship, and observance." Section 3 of the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights boiled it down into a shorter version which I think should be seriously considered in our bill: "Freedom of conscience, opinion and belief, and freedom of religious association, teaching, practice and worship." I think this could probably take care of a lot of the objections that we may have.

Another suggestion I'd like to leave with the hon. Premier is that maybe during the course of the next two or three months, after the bill has been passed, and people have had an opportunity to look at it -- particularly those who have taken the time out to write to us and object to or point out the different things that they would be interested in -- then I think it wouldn't be a bad idea for the legislature to extend to those people an invitation to come to a meeting, after the bill has been in effect, and see if it has really affected them in the way they thought it might. I think this would help overcome the problems the hon. the Premier mentioned the other day in his speech when he was talking about, "Maybe the problems will arise, but let's wait till they arise and do something about them then, by changing legislation." This may help to avoid that situation and give us some really good guidance as to where there are legitimate objections to where their rights may be interfered with by the passing of this bill. Of course, I know that the last thing this bill is intended to do is to interfere with the rights of people interfered with very often. That's why we have it here.

I believe that we have to be careful of making general statements. If somebody else wants to do something different, I think we have to be careful and take time out to study and analyse what it is they really want. As long as they are not interfering with the rights of the vast majority of Albertans, then I think we have to give serious consideration to the requests. In particular, this right of religious freedom, which I think most of the people that have written to me have pointed out that they have been most concerned about. So I think if we can come up with a broader definition -- something like they have in Saskatchewan -- that will probably suffice for many people who are showing some concern. But basically I believe, as I started out in the first of my talk, I think we should also talk about freedom and also look at ways to unite this great Canada of ours. If we can show by example that we as a province are interested, not only in what we are already guaranteed under the Canadian Bill of Rights, but we also are interested in whatever legislation that might interfere with the rights of our own particular province. I am sure by amalgamating the two together, and if we are going to send them out to our schools, it will show our students, and whoever else wants to read it, that we are interested in being Canadians and that Bill of Rights, and also as Albertans in our own Bill of Rights which is only strengthening the basic freedoms that were guaranteed to us under the British North America Act.

73-50

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 10th 1972

MR. LOUGHEED:

I would just like to respond to some of the remarks made by the hon. member. First of all, essentially his first and last point. I think that's a very valid position, the idea of tying together -- because that's what we are trying to do -- the Canadian Bill of Rights with the Alberta Bill of Rights. Perhaps in our communication of the passage of this bill we can do that. I think it is an excellent idea. I think it also fits with the declaration we have made in this assembly that if we had our preferences we would prefer that the matter be something that was within a constitutional charter, provided it was adequately done within a constitutional charter, but it would reflect the view of Albertans that they are Canadian first. I think that is an excellent idea.

The question on the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights relative to the question of freedom of religion, Mr. Chairman, that is a very difficult question. We have spent a lot of time thinking about it. We start to vary in any significant way in the wording in the Canadian Bill of Rights and this bill of rights and we lose one advantage that we have got with regard to these bills being close together, and the closer we can get them together, the better certainly the people of Alberta have as to the way in which this bill will operate. I don't take away from the argument made by the hon. member, but when it comes down to the actual legislative position that's why we have striven to take that particular position.

On the matter of liberty as described by the hon. member, I really tend to feel -- although it is difficult to respond in a specific way -- that except by due process of law, that deals with that question of liberty in the sense that liberty is liberty within the question of due process of law. I certainly appreciate the comments made by the hon. member.

I would, at this time, like to go back if I could to the amendment -- just so I have it straight -- to the hon. Member for Macleod so I can be thinking about it. When the hon. member raised his comments in the House the other day, he raised it on a general basis about a recognition within the first paragraph. I may have been misled at second reading, because we did deal with that particular matter in our own minds as I am sure hon. members agree -- in setting our views forth on the wording of the first preamble. Although we were not in the committee stage, we were certainly alert to the views made at second reading by the hon. members opposite.

The hon. Member for Drumheller at second reading refers specifically to the first preamble and stated, "The first preamble of the bill, I think, is an excellent one, touching on the worth of the human person. Many people in our society, in our province and in our country feel they are not worth anything, they are not valued by the community, that they can make no contribution. I like to think of the importance of every individual, that he is a human being and that he is worthy of respect." Then at the bottom of 15-28 in Hansard the hon. Member for Drumheller suggests "The first preamble I think is excellently written and is basic to almost everything else." So that probably is a matter of our interpretation to the response of the members generally but as I reading clearly so I can be thinking about this matter over the weekend, that the desire is to use the same wording as within the Canadian Bill of Rights and to bring the reference to "and acknowledge the supremacy of God" in after the provision, "is founded upon principles"? Am I correct in that, because it's important to an analysis of the situation? [Mr. Buckwell nodded]. Thank you.

One other question I forgot to answer the hon. Member for Calgary Millican. Did I follow that the hon. member is saying that what you thought we should do is go back to the people who have taken the trouble to make submissions, in a year or 18 months from now, or at some stage in the future, to try to make some communication to them, and say; "Now you have seen the act in operation for a year and a half, are your fears greater, less, or the same?" Is that the point?

MR. DIXON:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is my idea, but in particular, to those people who have been asking about how far this freedom goes. So, in other words, we may not have to go over them all because I think three-quarters of them are more or less routine. They are not asking for anything going beyond what the bill is already guaranteeing. But, for example, if we do away with the Hutterite legislation completely they probably wouldn't be interested in coming in. We have considered the practising of their religion, not only to worship but also to practise their religion, because of something they felt they could add to it, which would help without harming the bill or affecting the mass of the population. Those are the type of people I had in mind. I don't think we need

November 10, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

73-51

to go to all of them, just those few who are still showing concern after they have seen a copy of the bill.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Chairman, we will certainly give it some consideration.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I feel very privileged to say a few words today on this bill. I can remember -- this being my fourth session and I believe I have had something to say on human rights during every session that I have been in the House -- and one of the main reasons was because some of our regulations in legislation did, in fact, discriminate in a number of different ways. Therefore, it was necessary to speak on this matter.

I stood up today to speak particularly because of the remark made by the hon. Member for Drumheller, and I do not wish to attribute to him my interpretation of his remarks. But he did make the remark that "what government gives, government can take away". And I want to address my remarks more specifically to the idea of what government gives, because it is very, very pertinent to this bill.

I agree that there is a very substantial section in regard to this bill which suggests that you shouldn't take certain things away. But, again, I want to come back to what government gives, and particularly refer to item No. 1 in the bill. I refer to the actual wording, because I think it is extremely important to recognize that government is not giving anything to anybody. What No. 1 says, is: "that it is hereby recognized and declared that in Alberta there exists without discrimination by reason of race," so and so, and so forth, "the following freedoms". Now I want to suggest very strongly that government doesn't say that government gives or the legislature gives any type of freedoms at all. We have simply arrived at a point in time -- I think most of us in this legislature, by virtue of whatever base we had, and that base may certainly differ between one and another of us -- but we have arrived at the point where we recognize these freedoms. We know they exist. We know they are there. No one gives them to us. The government doesn't give them to us, the legislature doesn't give them to us, they are there. And one of the fundamental needs of this bill -- and the fundamental reasons of this bill, and I know that the Premier has recognized this, perhaps better than anybody else in this House is this, that when a society reaches a point in terms of its evolution, when it can, in fact, get up before all of its people and the people of the nation and the world and say that these freedoms exist, then surely we have reached, in our thinking and in our existence, a state of excellence which is vital to project. And it is very vital that we project this state of excellence to the world and to our own people, and say, as this says, that these freedoms exist; they are not given by anybody; they exist for everybody on an equal basis. This to me is what this bill does. I pray that this bill will be looked at and will be used and will be in the courts as often as it possibly can be, for the simple reason that when it is brought into the courts it will be a reaffirmation of the fact that we know these freedoms exist. They are not given to anybody by any legislature -- they exist. So by doing this we enshrine this excellence. We, in fact, say that this is goodness in itself, and if we don't say it to society, then surely we will start to slip and will go in the reverse direction. So, in fact, we do say this in this bill.

Now I am not saying that everybody arrives at this conclusion, at this realization of excellence in the same way that I necessarily have arrived at this conclusion. It may be that some people have a different path and have had a different road leading to this conclusion. Mine, I know what it is, it is a personal thing and I know what it is for me to arrive at this particular conclusion that these freedoms exist. But it is important to note, I think, that there isn't a single member in this House, regardless of how he has arrived at this realization, that recognizes and has the full recognition that, in fact, these things exist for all people, regardless of whether they are male or female, Ukrainian, Romanian, English people, black or white, or whatever they are. This to me is the most fundamental part of this bill.

MR. KING:

Mr. Chairman, as the Premier has indicated, it was our hope that during the course of discussion in committee stage we would make some kind of public reaction to some of the more common features of the briefs that had been considered. Since a number of them have been raised this afternoon I thought that just briefly I would give a reaction to a couple of the points that had been made.

73-52

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 10th 1972

---

The Premier has indicated the preference to enshrine the contents of The Bill of Rights in a constitution, and for a variety of reasons that is not possible in our particular situation at the present time. But the briefs submitted by a number of organizations and individuals ranged all the way from the suggestion that The Bill of Rights should be enshrined in some more permanent document, i.e. the constitution, to the idea that The Bill of Rights should not be enshrined at all, because as soon as you committed it to paper you were lessening its impact.

I think the reaction would be that the contents of a bill of rights can be impinged upon legally or illegally by government at any time that it can choose. We all acknowledge in this legislature, the power of the legislature at a subsequent session to repeal this Bill of Rights if that is the decision of the majority of the members of the assembly. We would have to appreciate, as well, that the constitutions in many countries in the world come, and constitutions go. The fact that bills of rights are enshrined in constitutions is not in itself a protection. The protection of the contents of a bill of rights is the attitude of the people of the society towards it. We have called upon tradition in our Bill of Rights, perhaps because we are conservatives and perhaps because in our experience a tradition of 500, 600 or 900 years has indicated that it is a valuable and, indeed, a very strong protection of human rights. It is a fact that many of the human rights we enjoy today are the result of an evolution that began with a particular piece of legislation, such as our Bill of Rights, and it is not proper to demean a specific piece of legislation on which to base our rights simply by virtue of the fact that it is specific.

The Magna Carta could have been repealed, subject to the conditions of the time; the English Bill of Rights could have been repealed. The thing that has given it value today, 400, 500 and 700 years after it happened, is that it was not repealed, that it continued to be accepted in the society which had originally passed it. The same thing can be said over time with this Bill of Rights. Its existence in time is what will give it strength.

There is another thing which will give it strength, and which I think is important as well, and that is that the Legislative Assembly makes no pretense that it is going to define explicitly the rights which the members of this society understand themselves in their own minds, to have. The courts will determine that. And I think there are two good reasons for this course having been taken.

The first is that the judiciary is a court of recourse to which anyone can go, regardless of what might be said or done in this assembly. It is a well known fact that the judiciary is an independent body with what I would call an independent language of its own in many ways markedly different than ours, and as the Premier has suggested, regardless of how we may word something in this assembly, there is a very real possibility that the wording could be disagreed with by the judiciary if we use words here which have not been commonly used and which have not developed a common definition over a period of time in the judicial process. So I think one of the things that we are anxious to do is to use the kinds of words to express these freedoms which have been dealt with in the past by the judicial system in Canada. I think for greater certainty -- as the lawyers would say -- this is very, very important.

The second important aspect of this is that recourse is to an independent judiciary, as opposed to a dependent assembly. It is a fact that as society changes, the manner in which we exercise our rights must change. The degree to which our rights can be exercised, vis-a-vis any other person or organization in this society must change. The way in which words can be used will change. Whether we like it or not, the assembly is composed of people who are here by the will of the majority. In this assembly, business is done by the action of the majority, and in point of fact, a bill of rights exists to serve, in my view at least, more the protection of the minority than the majority. And I think it is correct and proper that the explication of the contents of The Bill of Rights should be done, not by people who are dependent upon the whim of the majority, but by a judiciary which is independent and has the power and the resources to defend the rights of the minority.

The last thing by way of a general comment that I wanted to make, was that in dealing with religion, I think there's a compelling difference between denying or compelling a person to do something because of his religion, and denying him something or compelling him to do something in spite of his religion. There is a difference between forcing someone to do something because he is different than the rest of us and compelling someone to do something or denying him the opportunity to do it in spite of the fact that he is different from the rest of us.

November 10, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

73-53

-----

That also was an active consideration of ours when we reviewed the briefs that dealt with the question of religion. The courts have considered the statements of The Bill of Rights not narrowly, but broadly -- the Attorney General himself gave a couple of examples, freedom of expression extends to topless dancers, freedom of religion may or may not extend to people who want to use marijuana in pursuit of religious perfection -- but I think it's desirable that these kinds of decisions should be less emotional, more detached, and certainly more independent of the public pressure process that exists in the assembly. These were some of the thoughts that we had at the time we were considering some of these submissions.

MR. TAYLOR:

. . . the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, and for the record I would like to say that when I was referring to Christian Science I properly referred to healing, and when I was referring to blood transfusions I should have referred to Jehovah's Witnesses, which is another minority group.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Strom.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, a few thoughts that I would just like to bring out at this point in time. First of all, I listened very carefully to the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands. He refers to the signing of the Magna Carta, and raises it as a parallel to the need of 1972 and our Bill of Rights. I somehow or other am getting totally lost because I would hate to think that the situation we are facing today in society would be even the wildest stretch of the imagination, have any similarity to the situation that existed at that point in time. I am sure that the hon. member was not suggesting it. I did gather though that we left the impression that there is a real need at this point in time to have a Bill of Rights; an Alberta Bill of Human Rights, in order to take care of the rights of individuals.

It seems to me that we need to give some consideration to the democratic process. It is in this area that I would like to make a comment or two. I am one of those who firmly believes that it is my responsibility to try and reflect the will of the people in my constituency and, in the broader concepts, the will of the people of Alberta. And I say that I think my responsibility is really to the people of Alberta first, not because of the position, but as a resident of the province, and as such, I do not think we can think in narrow terms of regionalism first, but rather second. And so my responsibility secondarily is to the people of the constituency I represent.

Now, I have always been concerned as to whether or not we do reflect it in the manner in which we ought, I am sure that all of us at times have had to ask ourselves the question: are we, in this position we are taking at this time, truly reflecting the people who have sent us here? But it seems to me that nearly all who have spoken on the Alberta Bill of Rights recognize it is a bill that can be amended, can be repealed, and can be handled in any way that a following government or legislature would decide to do. It boils down then, that the best protection we can have as a province, and as a nation, is an alert, and informed electorate, one which realizes what their legislature or their government is about to do for them.

We have heard a number of members express concern about rights being taken away. They suggest that a legislature can take it away. I say, "yes, they can; up to a point." For example, if bad legislation were passed at this first legislature, it could conceivably be enforced for the length of time we would be in office. But at the first opportunity that the public has to reach the decision by their vote, they are certainly in the position to control the action of a government. Having said that, it seems to me we have to recognize that we are not here to try to take anything away from anybody. We are here to try to provide for the people what we believe is in their best interests. If the day ever comes that the objectives outlined in The Bill of Rights, or, in a more general way, is in opposition to what the majority of people want, then of course, I say that the government that attempts to do that, will be quickly out of office. It seems to me that government is really just a reflection of a majority rule. It seems to me that in a sense this becomes a statement of objectives that only can have meaning as it is supported by a majority of people.

I'm sure all of us recognize that law enforcement officers will tell you that law is no better than the support it receives from people, or the extent to

73-54

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 10th 1972

which we are prepared to live try it. If it is a poor law, of course, then we can expect that it will not be adhered to too well.

I thought it was rather interesting, Mr. Premier, to hear that there are only two pieces of legislation up to this point in time in our history as a province, which seem to infringe, to any extent, on anyone's liberty, or, in any way conflict with The Alberta Bill of Rights. For that reason, I would like to think that the men and women who have passed through this particular legislature have recognized, to a much greater extent than we might like to think, what most of the people have desired, by way of laws of the land.

I know the hon. Premier suggested that if we were opposed to the legislation, we could then vote against it. But I suggest to you that that would be just a little bit like trying to vote against motherhood. I don't think any of us are really against it. [Interjections] If the hon. Premier would just wait, I would be prepared to finish. I don't think there is any need of having that kind of a demonstration; I'm merely expressing a point of view. If the hon. members don't like it, they can express a different view, Mr. Chairman.

All I'm saying is that I, for one, have no intention of voting against it because it expresses a view that everybody holds. I suggest that if it were not on the books, it would still be the principles that would be guiding this House in its deliberations and in the kind of legislation that it would be bringing in. I, for one, am not prepared to admit for a minute that this is going to change my feeling as to what the rights of the individuals are. I think it is only fair to say that I have recognized them and that I have tried to follow them up to this point in time. That's why I mentioned at the beginning, when the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands brought up the example of the Magna Carta, that he left the impression that we have a similar situation to that which prevailed at that point in time. I say that if that's what he was trying to lead us to believe, then it's a pretty ridiculous situation.

But, Mr. Chairman, all I am saying is that this legislature is supreme, and whether or not this becomes the law of the land, we still have a responsibility to try and carry out the will of the people. I certainly expect that the majority of you desire the very things which are expressed in this bill.

MR. LOUSHEED:

Mr. Chairman, I find the remarks of the hon. Leader most disappointing, and yes, Mr. Bowker's too.

I really was alarmed at second reading of the bill that the hon. Leader of the Opposition really felt that there was no need for this bill. That's certainly a justifiable position, but in my view the bill has such magnitude and such importance that if he doesn't think there is any need for it, I don't know how he can vote for it. He refers to the fact that there are only two bills, although I thought we were clear there were two bills plus a number of amendments. One of them was The Sexual Sterilization Act, and that had been on the books of this assembly, if my memory is correct, since 1928. So to talk about the fact that the very next legislature is going to find itself in a position where it is going to discover legislation against the rights of individuals certainly isn't something that is borne out by the facts.

As far as I'm concerned, members can take their position on this bill. They should take the position that there is a need for the bill, that there is a need for an Alberta Bill of Rights to protect the people of the province from the largeness of government, from the vastness of government, to protect the individual -- just the way Mr. Diefenbaker felt about the Canadian Bill of Rights -- to protect the individual from the power of the state.

Certainly it's true that the bill can be repealed or amended in the future, but as I said in my remarks in second reading -- I thought there were members on both sides of the House that understood and concurred with this -- that this was the sort of bill that was going to be very, very difficult indeed for anybody, no matter who was sitting in this seat or on this side of the House, to come back to, or even for somebody who was sitting on the other side of the House to propose an amendment to it. That's why I thought we should take the care with the bill that we are taking. I think it's the sort of a bill -- and I'm not suggesting for a moment that it can't be amended -- but I am suggesting that it's going to be difficult to amend, difficult for a government of the future to amend, and certainly difficult to repeal.

That isn't to say that there aren't going to be cases where the government brings forth legislation that says, 'notwithstanding the Alberta Bill of

November 10, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

73-55

Rights,' but I haven't any doubt that whoever brings it forth from this side is going to find a very alerted opposition on the other side making this government, or any future government, really toe the line on why should that bill be notwithstanding any right. I think that's going to make it very difficult for government in the future.

Sure, there is nobody urging this bill. I said that in second reading. We were bringing it forward and we were going to have lots of headaches with it, but we were bringing it forward because we thought there was a need. As far as I am concerned, if the hon. Leader doesn't think there is a need, then he should vote against it.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, while I was on my feet, I forgot to mention one important thing to the hon. the Premier. There was a doctor in Calgary by the name of Dr. Holman who was one of the professors of medicine at the university, and he was quite concerned about the children -- and I remember the hon. Member for Drumheller pointing out people over 50 -- and he suggested an amendment in Bill No. 1, that perhaps the words 'or age' might be added after the word 'sex' under item (i). I was wondering whether the Attorney General or someone on the government side of the House had given any consideration to this request? They went out to all members as well as the Premier. I was wondering what is the stand of children on the Bill of Rights as far as Alberta is concerned?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Chairman, that is a very difficult question and I would like to ask the hon. the Attorney General to respond to it. We were really puzzled about that particular problem and yet, on the other hand when one starts to think about the implications of putting it in, there is a great deal of implication there by adding that provision within Bill No. 1 which, as you know, is within Bill No. 2. Perhaps the Attorney General --

MR. LEITCH:

I am not sure, Mr. Chairman, if I can add much in the way of detail at the present moment. That is certainly something which had been thought about, and when one comes to children, I think there are some areas in which it may be very difficult to provide for them the same kinds of freedoms as are guaranteed in the Bill of Rights.

There are things we do with children in which they are treated differently than adults. Some I can immediately think of are education requirements; there is treatment in hospitals and things of that nature where they are treated differently from adults and without being able to point to a great number of instances, I am sure they exist, because children come under parental control. For example, parents may insist at a certain age that their children go to church, do this, or that, or the other thing. I suppose if one had a freedom of religion in there and tied it to age we might be in a position where a child would be entitled to say, "Under the Bill of Rights, I don't have to obey my parents, and my parents say I must go to Sunday School." He's nine or ten years old. That, I agree, is not very likely to happen, but we do have provisions where children's interests are looked after independently of parents. I suppose, conceivably with that kind of provision you could find someone taking up on behalf of the child, that question. It's not likely to occur but it's theoretically possible. And that's only one example, I can think of a great many others where we may find a problem, putting in a reference to age, because of the fact that people of tender years do come under the control of their parents for most of their activities.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman...I was interested particularly -- and this has to do with the parents more than the children -- but for example, in the Hutterite problem we have had, some Hutterites have even gone to jail after being convicted of taking their children out of school at 15 while The School Act calls for 16. The type of legislation I like to avoid is what is going on now. We have the legislation, but if you read the Hutterite Report, it says that the superintendents are looking with a blind eye at the legislation and aren't prosecuting under the act. I was just wondering how we take care of a situation like that, because they could argue under religious freedom; "He becomes a man at 15." This is the type of thing I had in mind as well as the youngster that needs protection but I understand, as you have pointed out, that we have certain laws now that protect youngsters' rights. I was just wondering on the school issue.

73-56

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 10th 1972

MR. KING:

Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General might want to speak to that, but just to clear up a misconception with reference to that specific situation. The superintendents are not turning a blind eye. There is a provision in The School Act that allows them to allow students under 16 to leave school for what I think is termed -- well, there is a phrase for it in the act and the superintendent is allowed to let them out of school early so that the superintendent is not turning a blind eye. I know that is not the essence of the question that you are raising, but I wanted to clear --

MR. DIXON:

...but one man was convicted and spent 12 days and another superintendent can use discretion and a parent isn't charged. Now this is the type of legislation that is discriminatory; that's what I meant as far as age was concerned.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member is really touching on an area that is not intended to be covered by the Bill of Rights. He is really touching on the area of how much control should the parents have over the children, because there is no law that prohibits the child from going to school. It is a matter of the parents not making a provision for them to go to school and directing them not to go, and certainly that is an area that isn't intended to be covered by The Bill of Rights.

MR. NOTLEY:

May I ask a supplementary question on this matter of age? This is from the other end of it, because as I recollect your speech introducing the bill last spring, Mr. Premier, you mentioned that one of the things we might look at is age from the viewpoint of the senior citizen. Quite obviously there are examples of discrimination in our province on the basis of age. I am wondering whether or not you have been able to assess the implications to that question and if you have anything to report?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Chairman, I think we have. Again we are struggling, as the Attorney General mentioned, with that particular problem. I dislike finding ourselves in this position; I think we are almost in the position of putting in the bill as it sits without age, and it may be that instances then come to our attention in a more direct way where people allege that the spirit, at least, of The Bill of Rights -- and by the way, we might deal with compulsory retirement or something of that nature that perhaps the hon. member is thinking about, that we might be in a position where we have to give some consideration to how we deal with specific legislation. It may be very much something that we should include within Bill No. 1, but we have got it within Bill No. 2 and we felt that Bill No. 2 was where the majority of the problems would lie. But it could be that we, as a legislature, find ourselves endorsing legislation that might, in fact, create that sort of a discrimination on the basis of age that we would have to take into consideration.

I would sense in many cases, and I would just be guessing, that we would find people relying on The Bill of Rights in terms of questioning our legislation, and we may find that that is a very healthy exercise in itself, even though age isn't within the bill. Do you want to add to that?

MR. LEITCH:

Well, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing to add.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, on the question of age, the Premier just pointed out that the question of the matter of age is in The Individual Rights Protection Act. I can appreciate that putting in a Bill of Rights may create the matter of a few more 'notwithstanding's', but I was going to bring up the point of the elderly that the Member for Spirit River has brought up. Very clearly, there are many ways that the elderly are discriminated against, and I think of my experience as Minister of Health and Health Insurance, an elderly person trying to get supplemental insurance for drug insurance programs and so on and so forth. It is only through Blue Cross that they can get this, because the private insurance companies, in effect, are set up to cream off the low risk consumer and leave

November 10, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

73-57

-----

this age bracket sitting way off by itself. They are clearly discriminated against. I can't help but think maybe we might err on the safer side and I think we have to put a few 'notwithstandings' in, to add the matter of age to the bill as well. In view of the fact -- and I use the Premier's argument, he points out it is in Bill No. 2 -- I agree that we might be able to approach the problem through Bill No. 2, but it seems to me that since it is in Bill No. 2, there is some logic in putting it in Bill No. 1 as well, because it would very clearly, I think, require quite a number of organizations and institutions immediately to examine what their policies are. I realize that it creates some more 'notwithstandings'.

I mentioned The Age of Majority Act the other day, the Attorney General brought it up, and I expect there will have to be a 'notwithstanding' clause go in there. And in my view, rightly so. I have no qualms whatsoever about seeing it go in there. If there are places where the age question in The Bill of Rights doesn't apply, and the question of retirement, I think it may be one place it should be exempted from. Again, it might be better, in the interests of fairness to all concerned, to put it in. It is in one bill; I don't really see where it is significant and why it can't go into the second bill. If it weren't in No. 2, I could see where the argument is logical; I can see some pitfalls, but I wonder if we wouldn't be erring on the safer side by putting it into Bill No. 1.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to that. I think there is something to this that we should give some more thought to if we have to deal with and consider what the hon. Member for Macleod has raised over the weekend, also the point raised by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview and the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin Leduc -- because I am not so concerned with it in terms of the younger people. I think the hon. Member for Calgary Mallican and the hon. Attorney General have aired that one well. But I think in terms of the elderly people it just might be something that we should give some more thought to, and then if we find that we are facing a number of 'notwithstandings' -- well maybe we are going to face it in Bill No. 2 in any event.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I am rather impressed with the hon. Premier's response to some of the things that are being said. I always like to hear him make an address because I am quite convinced -- like on that point I raised about Dean Bowker -- that if he talks long enough that he will come around full circle and tend to agree with you. Now he has just made a point, I believe, very strongly in favour of what I am going to advocate and I am interested to see if he will disagree with me because I am supporting.

It is in Clause 2. The hon. Premier stated that no government in the future would be anxious to amend this bill. I agree with him, for whatever the bill is giving the people, but in Clause 2 it says; "Every law of Alberta shall, unless it is expressly declared by an Act of the Legislature that it operates notwithstanding The Alberta Bill of Rights." I say that the hon. Premier and I are now in agreement that that should be taken out. It has no meaning at all. No legislature, certainly nobody here, would want to legislate and say that this law is not subject to The Bill of Rights. We are going through a big exercise; the Premier states that he is on sacred ground. If you disagree with his bill, well vote against it. He has the right to tell the caucus what to do, and apparently does a good job of it, but it isn't his right to say well, if you don't like it don't vote for it. It's my bill, if you disagree with it, don't vote for it if you have the courage of your convictions.

I have the courage of my convictions; that is why I am speaking here, Mr. Chairman. But if the Premier has the courage of his convictions then take out that section; consider it in caucus; "Every law of Alberta shall, unless it is expressly declared by an Act of the Legislature that it operates notwithstanding The Alberta Bill of Rights." That is another typical kind of escape clause that we might want to disagree with our own Bill of Rights so let's leave that there just in case. So let's take it out. You made a vehement, impassioned plea that, or no, this is going to be it. Now that has no place in that kind of attitude, in my opinion. What kind of legislation are we going to have that says that The Bill of Rights is excluded? Can you give us a few examples if you feel I am wrong, Mr. Premier.

MR. LOUGHEED:

In answer to that remark, I worry about the position the hon. member is in, in voting for the bill. He clearly doesn't understand the bill, so he is going

73-58

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 10th 1972

-----  
to have a very difficult time deciding how to vote. If I follow the other part of his logic he is now suggesting that if he doesn't think there is a need for the bill, then he should vote in favour of it. Now that's interesting; I will have to think further about what that means.

MR. LUDWIG:

Man, are you confused.

MR. LOUGHEED:

There is no question in my mind that that clause is fundamental to the bill -- the clause the hon. member referred to.

MR. LUDWIG:

Why? That's just the point. Why is it fundamental to the bill, because it happens to be in The Canadian Bill of Rights and you are afraid to go away from it? Why is that fundamental? Just because the hon. Premier said so doesn't mean that it's fundamental. There has to be a reason for it and I would like just one.

MR. KING:

Can I ask the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View how he would propose to deal with the requirement that voters in elections be 18 years of age or over? If you put in an amendment forbidding discrimination on the basis of age, and then don't put a notwithstanding clause in either The Election Act or The Age Majority Act, or does he think that 6 and 7 year-olds should be able to vote?

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, how does that deal with it unless it is expressly declared by an act of the legislature that it operates notwithstanding The Alberta Bill of Rights? How does this tie in with the stand I took on this? I don't see it at all.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, in spite of the challenge, I am going to try to deal with an area of this that hasn't been fully explored yet. I think if hon. members will cast their minds back 10 to 12 years, to the time when The Canadian Bill of Rights was being debated in the House of Commons, they will recall that at the time a number of doubts were expressed about it and a number of shortcomings that it had were clearly defined by the experts of the day. The shortcomings that they chose to debate over were basically two in number. One of them was that they were fearful that by actually putting our rights down in so many words they would do away with some rights that we already had, and that the interpretation of The Bill of Rights would be so specific, according to its wording, that we might lose rights that we had built up in the case law of several hundred years in the British and Canadian systems, and indeed in other jurisdictions as well.

Well, of course, that's taken care of in the law, as it is in the Canadian Bill of Rights, in that nothing is to be construed to change any human right or fundamental freedom that may have existed at the time of commencement of the act. That was done in The Bill of Rights and it has been done here, and that resolved that argument at that time, although some people even then doubted the ability of that particular step being taken in the Canadian Bill of Rights to achieve that purpose.

The other great complaint the critics took, and there are all sorts of deans of law, lawyers, bar associations, various professors and other "experts" -- if some of them could have been called that. Some of them were and some of them weren't, let's put it that way. But the other big complaint was that The Canadian Bill of Rights invaded the provincial field. And the reason they said that was because -- and this has been referred to frequently in debate -- of the reference in the constitution to property and civil rights as being the exclusive jurisdiction of the provincial governments. And therefore, they said, if you're going to pass a bill relating to civil rights, what real effect can it have if you're passing a law which relates to the provincial jurisdiction?

All hon. members, of course, are quite aware that under our constitution there is no senior and junior government, the provincial governments are just as pre-eminent in the fields specifically given to them as the federal government is in the fields specifically given to it, and that the federal government by

November 10, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

73-59

anything that it passes, has no right to vary anything under the various areas -- property and civil rights being the one we're discussing -- but education, the regulation of municipal governments, and local licencing, all of the things, highways and so on that are referred to in the section that gives the rights that are given to the provincial governments. And it's equally true just to make the point, which I am sure is obvious, that the reverse applies; that the provincial governments have no right to legislate in the area say of external affairs, or in the formation of armies and navies, and matters that in the constitution belong to the federal government.

But the reason why I make that point is to illustrate and to underline the clarity of the Canadian Constitution in regard to the fact that the provincial governments are not junior in any sense. They have equivalent rights in their fields to the federal government's rights in its fields. And of course, it's in the fields of overlap where some problems occur. Typical fields of overlap relate to areas like agriculture, transportation, lands and forests, and that sort of thing, and you'll note that in some of the areas I've mentioned there are no federal departments under some of the areas for which the province has responsibility. In the areas of overlap both governments tend to have departments, and in the areas that are exclusively federal, of course, there are no provincial departments of those kinds.

Therefore, this was said to be the gravest defect in what is well known as the Diefenbaker Bill of Rights of July, 1960 -- that it was not a strong bill. It was not strong because it presumed to act in a field that was denied to the federal government, property and civil rights. Mr. Diefenbaker defended that at the time by saying we have large territories and we have many areas of federal jurisdiction; we have all of the north which is not formed in the form of a province yet, and we have all of the areas where the federal government has exclusive rights over -- where they may make regulations and pass laws that relate to people's rights in those matters, then those matters could be affected, and I am sure, are subject to, the federal Bill of Rights.

Those are the areas, and I know that no hon. member will think that the Parliament of Canada took the step they did without knowing the limitations of The Canadian Bill of Rights. What they did do though, was harbour the hope that the time would come when another step along the way could be taken. What Mr. Diefenbaker hoped for, was that the provinces would agree that the principles in The Bill of Rights were so acceptable to Canadians generally, and so important to be recorded on behalf of future generations of Canadians, that they should be in the constitution. And he was willing to go ahead and cause to be made -- but he needed consent -- cause to be made, an amendment to The British North America Act in order that The Bill of Rights would become enshrined in the Canadian Constitution. At the same time it was his hope to bring about -- a word often used is 'repatriation' -- he used to say, the 'patriation' of the Canadian Constitution because our constitution had never resided in Canada as it does not now. It is an Imperial Statute. But he would have settled for the enshrinement in The British North America Act, even without bringing the place where that statute resides here to Canada. He would have been very happy to have gained the consent of the provinces, which consent didn't happen to be possible at that time, and have gone ahead and have had The Canadian Bill of Rights enshrined in the constitution.

But there is a middle way, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Chairman, that is not as complete for all Canadians as enshrining it in the constitution. That middle way is open to any province that wishes to take that step. And that is to enact the same bill, or a bill which is on all major points the same, so much the same so that nothing is lost in the translation of the changing from one jurisdiction to the other, and you have each bill then speaking on all forces with the other in both fields. You can almost completely cover every matter of legislative jurisdiction of both the federal and provincial governments by enacting a provincial statute. This is the important link, and as at this point, there is only one province attempting to do this. When Bill No. 1 is passed, Alberta will have become the first province to take this step of linking the rights of Albertans to those rights of Canadians, and our people, being Canadians in Alberta, will have the benefit of whatever was conferred by the federal Bill of Rights 12 years ago, plus whatever is conferred by this Bill of Rights, and will be the only province to have that. And that will be a very complete documentation of the rights of the people of this province.

I just wanted to reflect too, Mr. Chairman, on a little bit of the criticism that was made on The Canadian Bill of Rights, prior to its coming out -- for the reasons that I have given -- and at the time of its passage, and immediately thereafter.

73-60

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 10th 1972

-----

One of the criticisms was that -- I mentioned it for various reasons, mainly because it was in the provincial field -- it couldn't readily be used for arguing in courts because so many acts that relate to people in their various ways and walks of life are on the provincial statute books, and therefore the area was denied to the judge. When somebody quoted him The Bill of Rights, he would say, "But I'm sorry, I'm dealing with a provincial piece of legislation." Little by little, though, at first the cases that came out of the courts were only maybe one a year -- I don't know how many -- very, very few. I remember one came out where it was argued and lost down in the Maritimes, but it was a beginning. This was the early '60's when lawyers were trying to start to use it. Then the case that was referred to in debate the other day and happened to be in the Territories; at last a case that related precisely and clearly to federal jurisdiction. The Bill of Rights was applied. The great principle in the rights of native peoples in the North was established, and it was established for the sole reason that the federal Bill of Rights was there.

Although the criticism began to wane somewhat after that, and people could see that the Bill of Rights passed by the Parliament of Canada was indeed a useful tool in the protection of the rights of individuals in this country, even though that was so, then we still have the side of it where the province enacts the same legislation, comes in and opens up the entire field. Twelve years after the federal act was passed, you may look at how many cases there were, where people were really and truly helped. Twelve years, or any other figure, after the passage of this bill, surely it will have been much more useful to citizens of Alberta and much more would have been accomplished for citizens in Alberta than could ever have been hoped for under the imperfect, although laudable, arrangements made in the Canadian Bill of Rights as passed by the Parliament of Canada.

I wanted to take a quick look at the period of approximately one decade. Is that really so long to wait for something worthwhile to happen? Sometimes it is too long, but if you take the whole scope of time, from when our parliamentary system and our system of justice, began -- the course we're still going -- and you go back 700 years as the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands spoke of, and quite correctly -- not in saying that the circumstances were at all the same, but in describing the length and the complexity of the process which has taken place and has been successful in all the difficult years that intervened -- of course, anyone who thinks that process is at an end must be mistaken. It is a process which is still going on and when that process of development toward freedom does stop, then indeed, it will be a sad day for this legislature and for Canadians. So we're talking about a process; something that is still continuing as it will continue in subsequent sessions of this House when the 'notwithstanding' clause is re-examined from time to time, looked at, the rights of the citizens weighed carefully, judged here -- the only place they can really be judged -- by the hon. members of this assembly and disposed of in one way or another; decisions in regard to the rights of individuals, consciously made and conscientiously made.

So the period of 10 to 12 years isn't really that important in the whole. If one or two years after today, we haven't had that much all of a sudden swell up, that improves the lot of Albertans -- although I think it will happen more quickly than it did under the Federal Act -- but even if it doesn't happen within one or two years, give it 10, give it 20 and try to say that is not important in the whole range of time, for the ones who come after us and will live in this province. Of course it is of great importance to subsequent generations. They perhaps will be greater beneficiaries of this legislation than we are, than we who are in this generation may and will be.

But, by not taking a step like this at this time, what is achieved? Of course, all that happens if such a step as the passage of The Alberta Bill of Rights is not taken, is that an opportunity has been lost and people who could have been helped in the years that follow, will not be helped. And, if that was the case, it would be that they were not helped as a direct result of the feeling, not that the members didn't approve of what was being done, but that they didn't think it was necessary or useful to do it. Of course, I know that when this bill passes, it will pass with a unanimous vote. I know that and the hon. members opposite who have spoken and questioned it, also know that it will pass with a unanimous vote. So there is no problem over that. But in speaking on this, of course the right to do so is there, and the right to try and improve it, a far more important one to exercise, is also there. But, in speaking against it, surely the point some of the hon. members have been trying to make, is that it really wasn't very important that we proceed in this way, if I can use the term "at this point in time". And I hope that by speaking here I can show you how important each point in time is. We have to take the responsibility for today. Those who had the responsibility in 1215 carried out

November 10, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

73-61

their duties; we expect our descendants to carry out theirs, and we know that we will carry out ours.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development, when you mentioned that we should link the rights of Albertans to the rights of Canadians, would you suggest then that there may be a need or even opportunities for a bill which would link the rights of, say, Calgarians to the rights of Albertans? Do you see municipal bills of rights coming in the future?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has raised the very interesting question of the role of the municipal government. But I think it is disposed of on this ground. The Constitution of Canada does not refer to municipal governments, it refers only to the government of Canada, and the governments of the various provinces. Those are the only governments there are in the view of the Constitution.

The one that was given the pre-eminent right in this bill was the government of the province. By saying what I did, that the rights of Canadians who live in Alberta will be built up through this linking process to a point that didn't exist before, is just saying that the federal government was only able to occupy a small corner of the field of civil rights when they enacted their act, good as it is, but that we can now occupy the balance of the field. That will be on behalf, of course, of all Albertans. The point raised by the hon. member is not one that, legally or constitutionally speaking, is of importance at the present time.

MR. LOUSHEED:

Mr. Chairman, I might just add to that answer to the hon. member. I'm not sure -- perhaps you weren't fully clear -- but the amendment that is before the House as part of this bill, Section 3(2), is an amendment that is intended clearly to show that the Alberta Bill of Rights applies at the municipal level. In other words, what we are doing here, if we pass this bill, is that all municipal by-laws are going to be subject to the Alberta Bill of Rights. We have consulted with them and have no adverse reaction to that. Even though we can't specifically answer the question that you raised to the hon. minister, I think that the ambit of The Alberta Bill of Rights does cover municipal governments.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask one question, but I'll just make a general remark or two that follows from the remarks of the Minister of Health. I certainly share his views that there is no concern whatever; for 20 years now, there has never been a challenge of legislation under the act. I think we are all looking for the proper preventative medicine, if you want to put it that way. One could effectively argue that there has been no cause for concern. To argue that the bill is of no use is like saying I bought a life insurance policy 10 years ago and I'm still alive today, therefore I didn't need it. I don't think there is any question about that.

I do think though, Mr. Chairman, in view of the exchange which takes place back and forth across the floor in the matter, that it is relevant to point out that in the exchange of views of members of the legislature, it is significant to me that in most of the exchange it is members of the legal profession seated opposite who are primarily expressing opinions on it. I think it's safe to say that the legal profession, because of their responsibilities and preoccupation with law, probably are more concerned about matters which many lay people take for granted. Certainly that isn't to say, however, that there is any suggestion, and any comments, that the act isn't a desirable one and it shouldn't be passed. But I think one should bear in mind in the exchange of views -- so we don't get off track in this thing -- that there is a difference in perspective and standpoint. I think myself, as a layman, I take many things for granted under law that the Premier may not and the Minister of Health may not, largely because I'm not that knowledgeable in the law.

I would like to ask a question that is really not related to those remarks but is a matter of definition. I gather that the question of security has come up previously in the discussion -- the Member for Drumheller brought it up -- and the Premier said that it's not the intention of the bill to deal with the question of financial security. I'm not quarreling with the point, but when I read the bill, clause (a) which says, 'security of the person,' then I presume

73-62

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 10th 1972

-----

that security is meant from the standpoint of security of protection from danger. I look at the dictionary and read the definitions in there ... As I say, one of the first definitions of security is a 'freedom from danger, quality of state of being secure.' I think that's the sense that the word is used in. But I also look at the question, down further it says, 'freedom from fear or anxiety'. There is no question that a lot of people have a lot of anxiety about financial affairs. I don't mention the matter in jest, one hears so much nowadays from all political parties about financial security. The average person of the country takes the matter of legal security almost for granted. I am really wondering whether, for the question of the definition, the manner in which the word 'security' is used -- since the Premier has indicated he will examine one or two other matters over the weekend -- there is any way of clarifying the fact that one is referring to 'security' or 'freedom from danger' in the intent in which the word security is used.

As I read it, I'm not really too sure that we couldn't effectively argue that the term financial security could apply to the act and while it would be interesting to belabour the government from the standpoint of partisan politics on the issue, I could think of some very shocking developments that could take place under the act should that interpretation of financial security apply to the word as it is now in the act.

According to the dictionary definition, I suggest maybe the definition is broad enough that it could be argued that it is a question of ...

MR. LOUGHEED:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all with regard to the first comment made by the hon. member; I hope it is clear, and I'm sure it is, that members of the House all feel on both sides that they have participated in this bill. Having read over just the other day the debate on the Second Reading, in which Mr. Farran, Dr. Paproski, Mr. Schmid and many others, Mr. Yurko today, and certainly Mr. King -- who may be becoming a locker room lawyer -- all participated, I think there is a general feeling of the importance of the bill by all people regardless of their particular occupation or other background. The point that the hon. member raises does show I think, the difficulty with a bill of this nature. For example, he makes me shudder; if the courts should interpret it that way then somebody could press a case for a guaranteed annual income against the province of Alberta and its government. We would have a very interesting headache dealing with that one, if the courts so interpreted. So, in hope that I don't have a further sleepless night, I will ask the Attorney General if he has the same sort of reaction to the question.

MR. LEITCH:

I am quite satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that in this kind of a document a court would not interpret the security of the person to mean financial security. In fact, while we're talking about property another argument could be made on the next words which are; "enjoyment of property" because in the same line of reasoning, that might lead you to questions of how much property you are entitled to enjoy and a division of it among the citizens of the province. You can say it is discrimination because someone has more property than I do. I am satisfied that in this kind of legislation the courts would not take such a word which is capable of several meanings and apply that large meaning that the hon. member gives to it. I am satisfied that they would not give that large a meaning to the word when there is nothing else in the bill to indicate that that is the word's meaning. They would give it a financial meaning if it appeared perhaps in some legislation such as securities legislation or where the legislation specifically was dealing with the movement or amount of a person's finances.

MR. HENDERSON:

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General is saying in light of the context in which the word is used, that from a general standpoint of legal precedence, it wouldn't be construed as a matter of financial security, in that the clause specifically relates to individual liberty, enjoyment of property, and security of person.

MR. LEITCH:

That is accurate, Mr. Chairman. In all these cases, the court looks at the context in which the word is used to determine its meaning.

November 10, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

73-63

MR. KOZIAK:

I would just like to get back for a moment to the train of thought that was being developed by the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. I too, am convinced of the extreme importance of this bill, and not so much from the point of view of what has happened since 1215, or since 1960 in the Canadian Bill of Rights, but from the point of view of what will happen in the future. I think that the layman does feel, to a large extent, that because he has enjoyed certain rights, he will continue to enjoy these rights and nobody really need take care of them in this respect. But when I consider the developments of the arguments in the Report on Educational Planning, "A Choice of Futures", then I can really see this bill in its proper perspective and in terms of what the needs of the citizens will be in the future. When you look at such social forecasts as the growing need for governmental regulation in interpersonal and intergroup relations, you can see that government is going to be getting a lot closer to where the people are, and a lot closer to those areas where rights can be interfered with. The report states, and I am quoting here on page 4 (and it is dealing with, more or less, the reduction of the influence of religion on a person's life and on the way he controls himself) and it goes on to state that in that view, "This likelihood when added to the growing complexity of modern life, will require government to play a more regulatory role in interpersonal and intergroup relations. Correspondingly, the responsibilities of elected authorities and limitations on personal freedom are expected to increase as the government mediation role is expanded."

Now that, Mr. Chairman, is extremely important, because as we go into the years and decades ahead, and presuming that the forecast is correct, this government and the municipal governments are going to be more and more involved with the rights of individuals. When they are going to be interfering with such rights, they are going to have to harken back each time to this Bill of Rights and say "Now, are we interfering with those rights that were enshrined in Bill No. 1?" And, to my mind, Mr. Chairman, it will be perhaps in 20 or 30 years that we can look in retrospect, as we now look on previous legislation, and say "Now that was an extremely important piece of legislation passed by the legislature of the Province of Alberta in 1972."

MR. BENOIT:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There are so many things that I want to say that I have to restrain myself and limit my comments to one point that I want to discuss with regard to what the Minister of the Environment said on the matter of these rights presently existing and not given by any one and probably therefore not being able to be taken away by any one. I see two realizations of this phrase when he says; "declare it that in Alberta there exist", not "exists" but "exist" -- as if in the future without discrimination and so and so and so and so. It's a matter of interpretation.

So far as the rights existing, -- it is my personal opinion without wanting to be argumentative -- nothing can exist without having been given by someone! Now someone gives, and if someone gives to someone else they can also clearly take away. When it comes to matters of this sort, some governments give, and some do take away. More than 25 years ago when a previous government attempted to spell out an Alberta Bill of Rights -- which it was called -- the courts of the land declared it to be ultra vires. That proposed bill spelt out these things that we have here today and more. But another court of the land said "You can't do that," and therefore there are certain restraints. Someone gives rights and no government can take them away. I respectfully state that because I believe that is part of what we should have involved in the bill. Someone has given us those rights in the past, rights that no government can take away. But certainly governments can curtail the freedom to express those rights by the laws that they enact. That is the thing that we do want to guard against. Hopefully this bill will do just that very thing. But the rights can't exist without having been given. That is why I think it is so important to acknowledge the source of these rights in the first part of the bill; to engineer on the part of those who would attempt to take way those rights or attempt to curtail the freedom to express them, a respect for the source of those rights.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, just this one other thought. We constantly express that this will be the first bill of its kind; I can't altogether agree. It is not really the first of its kind, just the first in this exact expression. So many times this has come up before and has come out -- as I tried to point out in the second reading of the bill --

73-64

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 10th 1972

MR. YURKO:

The only remark I will make is that my argument is based on the fact that government didn't give these rights. I started with the statement that the hon. Member for Drumheller made and I don't want to put any interpretation on his statement; he can do that himself. The statement was made that government gives and government takes away. I didn't want to deal with the part associated with government taking away. I just wanted to deal with that aspect of recognizing that the rights are inherent in our humanity; they exist and government doesn't give them to us.

Secondly, the one thing I wanted to recognize was that we have progressed and evolved to a point where, in fact, we now recognize and stand up before all the people of the world and say, "These things exist." That's the point I wanted to make.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Chairman, I was talking to Dean Bowker about Bill No. 1, The Alberta Bill of Rights last night and the consensus of our conclusion was that there was very little to argue about. I therefore have to give high marks to the members of the legislature for their ability to discuss this at such great length.

I think and I have been impressed with the discussion and I have come around from, I would say a rather negative viewpoint on The Alberta Bill of Rights because frankly as a layman I wondered what it was all about, what was all this big how-do-you-do. But after listening to the points made by the Minister of Health and Social Development, which were the points that I set out to talk about prior to his obtaining the floor, it is clearly within the purview of the province that this legislation should be passed. Clearly it amplifies and sets out the rights of the Canadian Bill of Rights. Clearly it enshrines that in the Alberta legislation and clearly it does fill a need.

There is only one particular section that I have even any cause for concern for, and that is section (f), "freedom of the press", and I was just wondering Mr. Premier, if you would give consideration to changing the word 'press' to 'communication' in order to get in tune with the 20th century and the years that lie ahead. Having regard for the fact that there are three media of communication and they are all equally significant, and I refer you now to radio, television, and, of course, the press itself, I would think rightly that this should be given some consideration.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Chairman, with regard to this suggestion made by the hon. member, I was a little concerned when he suggested that we make that change, keeping in mind the story of interpretation relative to expression that the Attorney General was telling us about the other day, but I am pleased that he has refined it as not including that sort of communication. Our problem is strictly a question of interpretation. Now that is the wording within the Canadian Bill 'Freedom of the Press'. There are, I believe, and the Attorney General could add to this, a number of decisions with regard to the phrase 'press', judicial decisions that do give us some help in making an interpretation. I have no doubt that a court is going to interpret that word in relationship to the time span that the hon. member refers to.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I have two quick points that I'd like the Premier to give some thought to over the weekend. They were brought to my attention by the Human Rights Association. The first is whether or not we shouldn't add -- this I believe was discussed during second reading -- whether we shouldn't add political belief in our section No. 1. I suggest that there's at least some evidence of discrimination on the basis of one's politics in the province, and when we talk about enshrining freedoms that most people normally take for granted, I think that the majority of our citizenry take for granted that there is political freedom in Alberta, as in most cases there is. But I believe that when we talk about codifying those things which we really do value, I submit that enshrining political belief in The Bill of Rights is worth noting.

The second point arises from a matter I raised last spring in the question period, when I asked about the Ku Klux Klan, which as you know was registered under the provisions of The Societies Act. There was some discussion in the press over this, and some general discussion over whether or not the group should be permitted to exist. There's clearly no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that such

November 10, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

73-65

-----  
a group should be permitted to exist as an association. I don't think you can argue that a group that holds unpopular views shouldn't be permitted to exist, but on the other hand it seems to me there's a distinction between that sort of existence on one hand and being certified or registered under a provincial act. It seems to me that registration under the company's branch or under The Societies Act should be based on that group coming within the bounds of this bill. It seems to me that if any group can't meet the test of The Bill of Rights, then it should not properly be registered, and I'm wondering whether or not the government has given any consideration in Bill No. 1 since it deals with relationship of government versus the citizen, whether you have given any consideration to a section which would simply state that for any registration under provincial laws, that the test of that registration must be meeting The Bill of Rights.

As I say, I think it would be a serious mistake for us to go on the witch hunts of the past and say to organizations which might have very unpopular programs and very unpopular objectives, no, you can't exist. So I think that in itself is in conflict with what we should achieve in a free society. But -- and I underline this -- there surely is a difference between allowing an organization to exist on its own, and giving them the benefit of whatever legislation does in the form of registration under provincial legislation. So, I am asking the government whether or not they have specifically considered that point, and if they haven't, whether or not they might do so over the weekend so we can perhaps consider it when we continue debate next week.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Chairman, it is a matter that has been very carefully considered. On the other hand, to respond to it now, I think we simply don't have the time to do so. Perhaps we can hold it over and also give some further consideration to it since the hon. member has raised it, and, in particular, discuss the specific alternate suggestions.

So, I think we conclude, Mr. Chairman, with three items. We have the suggested amendment by the hon. Member for Macleod; we have the question with regard to age, suggested by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc; and we have the last item raised by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report progress and beg leave to sit again.

[The motion was carried without debate.]

[Mr. Chairman left the Chair at 4.28 p.m.]

\* \* \* \* \*

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration the following bill, Bill No. 1, begs to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the report and the request for leave to sit again, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask leave of the House to revert to Introduction of bills so the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals may introduce Bill No. 124.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. Government House Leader have the leave requested?

73-66

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 10th 1972

---

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 124: The Mineral Taxation Amendment Act, 1972

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill being The Mineral Taxation Act, 1972. The amendments in this bill essentially cover the Energy Resources Conservation Board doing the assessment for crude oil. It also covers the procedure and appeals by the board.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals begs leave to introduce Bill No. 124, being The Mineral Taxation Amendment Act, 1972. Do you all agree?

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 124 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, concerning the availability of this bill, insofar as the House will be rising within seconds, copies of the bill, Bill No. 124 just introduced, will be available at the counter in the Clerk's office immediately following the rising of the House.

I move, Mr. Speaker -- no, you move, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

May I just take a moment? The errors appearing in the daily Order Paper are of considerable concern to the Clerk's office, and it has been recommended to me that the daily Order Paper become standardized in format. In this way the change from day to day of the business to come before the House would merely consist of addition, removal, or change of heading for the items of business in a standard format. At the present time, the system is overly complicated in that the daily Order Paper must be made up anew each day, after the assembly has adjourned the day's business. This increases the opportunity for error 200 or 300 per cent, in addition to which the work is often done late at night.

The Clerk's office has consulted with the Government and Opposition House Leaders and obtained agreement to compile the daily Order Papers in the same order every day for the sittings next week on a trial basis to see whether the anticipated benefits, in fact, materialize. Members will appreciate that this standardization will, in no way, affect the manner in which the business of the House is currently called and dealt with, but will give excellent opportunity to compare one day's Order Paper with that of the previous day and to see where changes of business have occurred.

The House stands adjourned until Tuesday afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

[The House rose at 4:33 p.m.]