

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Monday, February 19, 1973

[The House met at 2:30 o'clock.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

Leader of the Official Opposition

MR. SPEAKER:

On Friday afternoon the Chair was remiss in not saying to the House, and welcoming to his new position the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc. I did receive in due time, in fact before the opening of the House, a message from the secretary of the caucus of the official opposition stating that the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc is now the Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, being known in this Assembly as a man of few words, I will simply say that I commit myself to making the job for the government as interesting as possible during the next few years.

Clarification by the Speaker

MR. SPEAKER:

Also, if we might advert for a moment to Friday afternoon, in the course of dealing with a matter under the rules, I referred to citation 100 (3) of Beauchesne and I should have referred to Section four. May I add one final confession, and that is, as the House was closing on Friday afternoon, for some reason or other, probably absent mindedness, the motion of the hon. Member for Drumheller registered on me as a motion to adjourn the House and not a motion to adjourn the debate.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to members of this Assembly, some 31 students from Irma Junior High School at Irma, Alberta. They are accompanied by Mr. and Mrs. Proland and by Mr. Cartier. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that their attendance here today will enable them to play a bigger part in their communities, their province, and their nation in the years that lie ahead and I would like you to welcome them at this time, if they would please stand.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce through you, and to the members of the Legislative Assembly, four gentlemen who are sitting in the members' gallery with whom I have some association in a slightly different context -- in the context of Chief Thunderbird. I would like to introduce to the members of the Assembly the chiefs and the representatives of the chiefs of the four bands in Hobbema and ask all four of them to stand.

First, Chief Maurice Wolfe of the Ermineskin Band; Chief Arthur Potts of the Samson Band; Chief Peter Bull of the Louis Bull Band, and Mr. Louis Rain, Councillor, representing Chief William Standing-On-The-Road, of the Montana Band.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you in the members' gallery and, through you, to all members of the House, some 30 junior high students of Grade 9 at St. Paul's School. They are accompanied by their principal, Mr. R.J. Semkow. I would ask that they rise at this time and be recognized by this Assembly.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce 32 very keen Grade 4 students from Kensington Road School in Calgary. They are accompanied today by their principal, Mr. Dutnall, Mrs. Perry, Mrs. Lyster, Mrs. Dunsmore, and Mrs. Cannon. They are in the public gallery, Mr. Speaker, and I commend them to your care.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to file Return No. 250 [1972].

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Urban Policy

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may direct a question to the hon. Premier. I wonder if he could advise the House as to whether the government's no-growth policy for the cities of Calgary and Edmonton has been discussed with those two cities?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the interpretation obviously put on my remarks by the hon. Leader of the Opposition regarding a no-growth policy is not accurate. What we have said is that we feel we have a responsibility, as a provincial government, to assure some degree of orderly growth within our metropolitan areas, in consultation and in co-operation with the municipal governments. We mentioned that we have a responsibility as a provincial government to assure that there is some balance of the provincial government operations throughout the province and we have taken some steps to do that.

I have recently written a letter to the Mayor of Edmonton to assure him that we are primarily talking about new operations of government, and in the course of the remarks I made on that particular matter I stressed pretty clearly the steps we intended to take with regard to the City of Calgary. I was delighted to receive from the City of Calgary and their council a notice of commendation indicating that they understand we are recognizing the very important priorities involved there.

Provincial Parks

Mr. Speaker, if hon. members would agree, I think it might be appropriate now for us to explain -- although we were going to do it under Orders of the Day -- about the provincial park, since this matter has been raised.

We made the announcement this morning in Calgary, but we say to the hon. members that we are aware of the need to make these announcements within the House. However, we do think that when we run into a situation of a particular item with a geographic location outside of the capital, particularly when we have worked in consultation with the City of Calgary and with people in Calgary, that announcement can be made in another location outside the capital. So this morning we held a news conference, and with representatives of the Mayor of Calgary announced a new provincial park for Calgary.

In answer to the question which deals with the matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition, I would like to call upon the Minister of Lands and Forests to elaborate upon it.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

We haven't finished answering the question. Has the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests permission to make this announcement during the Question Period?

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, since we are apparently mixing up Orders of the Day, might we have the opportunity of responding briefly at that time?

MR. SPEAKER:

Quite.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, if there is some concern among the hon. members, we will make the comment with regard to the details of the park under Orders of the Day, and they can ask their other supplementaries now.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the announcement about the park in Calgary, I wonder if the hon. Premier can tell us whether there has been any estimate or any idea as to what the cost of acquisition for land for that park will be?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I will refer the question now. We'll have to deal with the matter during the Question Period. Perhaps I could call upon the Minister of Lands and Forests to describe the project and to answer the supplementary questions by the hon. member.

DR. WARRACK:

I appreciate this opportunity to clarify and beg leave of the House to elaborate on this important matter -- the announcement of a new provincial park on Fish Creek in Calgary. This announcement coincides with the thrust and clearly new direction as stated in the Speech from the Throne.

It will comprise the area between the Sarcee Reserve on the west, along Fish Creek, all the way to the mouth of Fish Creek where it flows into the Bow River. We have already, Mr. Speaker, obtained a large parcel of land. The province has bought this land for provincial park purposes, covering a total area of some 1,250 acres. This has been purchased and that is complete.

There are two additional large parcels of land along the shores of the Bow River currently under option, and the provincial government is negotiating for the release of that option. If that should be successful, and we think it will, then we will be in a position to acquire that additional land. That covers the area of some 2000 acres east of the Macleod Trail through to, and along the shores of, the Bow River.

In addition, the area along Fish Creek west of the Macleod Trail to the Sarcee Reserve has, as of this morning, been placed as a restricted development area under Section 15 of the Department of the Environment Act, and in this way it has been reserved for future park development.

Basically the planning is this: having acquired most of the land necessary east of the Macleod Trail towards the Bow River, and optimistic about acquiring the rest in very short order, we will be in a position to begin immediate planning upon that land acquisition. We will plan for a park with public input through 1973 and into 1974 whereupon physical work should begin.

West of the Macleod Trail it would be a long-term proposition in terms of land assembly. But when appropriate amounts of land have been assembled, it will then be possible to expand continually into the future that provincial park west of the Macleod Trail until ultimately it covers the complete Fish Creek area to the Sarcee Reserve on the west.

With respect to the specific question posed by the hon. member, the cost in what has been acquired so far is roughly \$6.25 million, which works out to be

just about \$5,000 per acre. In addition, at the price agreed once the option can be taken care of, we will be purchasing an additional 600 acres in the area between the Macleod Trail and the Bow River. When that is complete, then this will round out to roughly two thousand acres at a little more than eight million dollars expenditure for land acquisition.

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe the hon. Premier wishes to supplement the answer.

MR. LOUGHEED:

On a point of privilege with regard to the preamble of the question raised with me by the hon. Leader of the Opposition when he talked about a no-growth policy, I have before me my statement of January 20, 1973, and in the statement, just so the record is absolutely clear, this is what we say:

We sense the citizens of our large cities want us to take action, not to stop growth, but to assure that it is more balanced and more orderly in that our cities do not lose their particular, unique sparkle and vitality through traffic snarls, the sheer ugliness of hurried development, pollution hazards, soaring crime rates and loss of privacy and personality. I am convinced the people of Calgary and Edmonton want their new provincial government to move in this new direction.

Policy re: Government Announcements

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I hope it would be in order just to respond very briefly to the statements made about the park situation in Calgary, particularly the hon. Premier's words relative to the procedure of announcing it outside the House as opposed to in the House. Then I would like to address a supplemental question on my original [question] to the Premier.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that when the Throne Speech contains a statement that a new parks policy will be developed and announced during the current session, it would be preferable that the policy be announced as a policy within the House, as opposed to a piece-meal announcement inside and outside the House. I don't wish to make a major issue out of it at this time but I have difficulty following a hypothesis that something of a geographical nature should be announced elsewhere in the province when the House is in session. That would restrict any announcements in the House to just what is going on in the confines of the City of Edmonton or immediate vicinity which I don't think the Premier really suggests literally. I can't help but wonder when the Throne Speech contained something specifically on this particular item that any statements on it, as a matter of courtesy should, I think, be first forthcoming in the House.

Urban Policy (Cont.)

The supplemental question that I would like to ask the Premier relative to the original question about government policy of no-growth, is what priority does the government place on their current practice of diverting private enterprise and of taking this away from the two major urban centres?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all I think that the hon. Leader of the Opposition came right back to a reference to a comment of a no-growth policy when I specifically said that is not the policy.

Secondly, in answer to the matter of privilege, so that there isn't a misunderstanding, we take the view, and we will continue to take the view -- and let it be raised in the House again at any time even if the House is sitting -- that if we deal with a matter that is a geographic situation outside of this area, and if there has been involvement with the local citizens, we will feel that that announcement will be made there.

I am not suggesting for a moment that would restrict our announcements to merely dealing with matters regarding the capital city here. It would, naturally, when it is a matter that covers the whole province or is province-wide policy, and the House is sitting here. But if there is a geographic decision to take a step regarding the City of Lethbridge, or something of that nature where we have had consultation and cooperation with local government and they have been a party to it -- as they were with the provincial park -- we

intend to make that statement with them, because they worked on it with us. I want to make very clear that that is our position.

There is no intention, as I thought has been made clear on many occasions by this government, to divert from the metropolitan areas. What there is an intention to do, is to try to assure that the story, the great story and potential of the smaller centres of the province, is also presented to people who are looking to invest in this part of the world.

Private Enterprise Diversion

MR. HENDERSON:

An item for further clarification, Mr. Speaker, and a supplemental. Does the Premier say that his government is not pursuing the policy of diverting private enterprise investment away from the two major urban centres?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I thought I was fairly clear in my answer. The question is not one of diversion. The question we are looking at, is to assure that the story of the smaller centres of this province is effectively presented to all of the people; in these days there are ever-increasing numbers who want to come and invest and live in the Province of Alberta.

MR. TAYLOR:

I would like to ask a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary? We have spent a good deal of time on the issue of parks. Then perhaps we can come back to this subject if there is time left. We have taken up a good deal of question period already on this topic.

Urban Policy (Cont.)

MR. HENDERSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that, in all due respect to you, we have not taken up a great deal of time. Two things got mixed up here. I asked a question about no-growth policy and a diversionary tactic concerning parks got into this. There have only been two questions, an original and a supplemental, that I have really asked on the question of urban growth. Neither one is related to parks, sir, and I think it was unfortunate that we got into an exercise mixing Orders of the Day. I am not being critical of it, but there has really only been one original and one supplementary asked on the basic original question of urban growth.

MR. SPEAKER:

I accept the observation of the hon. Opposition Leader and would ask the hon. Member for Drumheller to continue with his supplementary.

Provincial Parks (Cont.)

MR. TAYLOR:

Yes, a supplementary on parks. Will the cities be required to pay a portion of the park costs -- any of the capital? And secondly, will the same policy be applicable to other cities, such as the beautiful City of Drumheller within the confines of the canyon of the Red Deer?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to this question is yes. The province will be taking care of the land acquisition, and the park development, planning and design costs. The parks will also be operated by the parks division of the Department of Lands and Forests of the Government of Alberta.

The answer to the second question is with respect to the City of Edmonton, the other metropolitan centre in Alberta. It is our intention to continue, as we have been for some time, working toward alternatives for a metropolitan park, perhaps in some 18 months from now to have the same kind of announcement to make with respect to the City of Edmonton. I would not go further than that with

respect to other centres, and having some regard to the nature of the debate on the resolution as originally posed on this matter by Mr. Roy Farran, MLA for Calgary North Hill and seconded, as I recall, by Mrs. Catherine Chichak, MLA for Edmonton Norwood.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation, followed by the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake.

MR. SORENSON:

Are the comments by the hon. Member for St. Albert that a \$200 million park will be established at the Athabasca University site a statement of government policy?

DR. WARRACK:

I haven't had the opportunity of having the additional vision attributed to me, but I shall do so and you may wish to discuss the matter with Mr. Jamison.

MR. SORENSON:

Is the hon. minister aware that a \$200 million park would result in a cost of some \$200 thousand an acre, or three times as much as the original cost of the university?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is stating information rather than asking a question. The hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall, and might this be the last supplementary on this topic.

MR. BARTON:

With the hon. Premier's sixth sense, will there be an advisory planning committee or board so that local autonomy can be protected and a little bit of local input in the park in Calgary?

DR. WARRACK:

As a matter of fact, this has already occurred in the consultation that we have had on a very extensive basis, both with the City of Calgary and through their MLAs, the hon. member Bill Dickie and the hon. member Merv Leitch, with citizen's groups in Calgary. I might say, moreover, that in response to discussion that was held at the news conference this morning and particularly pointed out by Roy Farran as well as Mayor Sykes, that this is a contribution to the entire --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! The hon. minister is going considerably beyond the point of answering the question. I would like to refer him to annotation 181 of Beauchesne.

DR. WARRACK:

I'm just so enthused!

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, another supplementary on the parks. Will there be a further announcement by the government regarding the development of smaller parks in the City of Calgary in the immediate future? Of course today's announcement is very welcome, particularly by those --

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please come directly to the question?

MR. HO LEM:

My question is will there be any proposals for the east and northeast sections of the city, say around Chestermere Lake where the bulk of the Calgary working force resides? Do you not think that perhaps --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! The hon. member has asked his question and he is now asking the minister to acknowledge reasons for supporting the answer.

MR. HO LEM:

Would you agree that the area of Chestermere Lake offers an unlimited potential for development?

DR. WARRACK:

Would you believe that we didn't rehearse this? The hon. member now gives me an opportunity to complete my brief answer in which I was suggesting that the Fish Creek Provincial Park provides this park recreational facility to the people of Calgary. We have been assured that it will be accessible from all areas within Calgary and it leaves the City of Calgary in a position that is much stronger -- to deal with other areas they might wish to develop.

With respect to Chestermere Lake, I represent that area and I doubt that it is really where most of the workers in Calgary live. In any case we are talking primarily in terms of the major 2,800-acre provincial park developed for Calgary, an initiative not taken before by any provincial government in this province.

MR. WILSON:

Another supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

We have already called an end. Perhaps the hon. member could revert to the matter again if there is time left. The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill.

Urban Municipal Assistance

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, my question deals with assistance to municipalities and is directed to the hon. Premier.

What assistance can other urban municipalities, other than Calgary and Edmonton, expect in the field of special recreational help in light of the announcement made in Edmonton on Friday and in Calgary this morning?

MR. LOUGHEED:

I am pleased that the hon. member asked that question because, of course, it reflects our attitude toward the fact that a large portion of our population lives within the two metropolitan areas.

The decision on Friday with regard to the Commonwealth Games, shows our support for the City of Edmonton but, of course many citizens throughout all of Alberta will enjoy those facilities, and the same with Calgary. We focussed on those two large metropolitan centres with regard to provincial urban parks.

I think that the hon. member is well aware that with regard to the whole matter of parks, there is a great deal more accessibility to the parks for citizens in other parts of the province relative to the population. We are planning to bring down a parks policy.

It is also our intention, if I understand the hon. member's question, to deal with the question of recreational facilities. I don't know whether the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation would like to respond at this time or later, but I have no doubt that he would like to respond.

Canada Winter Games 1975

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, with pleasure. First of all, of course, it is well known to the House that the hon. Mr. Lalonde announced that the Canada Winter Games will be held in 1975 in Lethbridge, and for this reason I would like to propose to cabinet, as soon as possible, the amount of capital assistance required for the recreational buildings that will have to be built by 1975.

Urban Municipal Assistance (Cont.)

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The question directed to the Premier was, is there going to be any assistance to urban municipalities in the province, other than Calgary or Edmonton, for recreation?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I just mentioned that Lethbridge would be one of the other cities that will most likely receive immediate grants. Also, of course, as the hon. member may be aware, we are looking to additional capital assistance grants for all the other municipalities in Alberta after the present formalized expiry on March 31st.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Youth, Culture and Recreation, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. minister satisfied with the decision that was made by Ottawa regarding --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! The hon. minister is not required to express an opinion concerning the decisions of other governments.

The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

DR. HORNER:

To supplement the answer to the member for Olds-Didsbury, because I wouldn't want him to feel that the other areas of Alberta had been left out, I would point out to him that substantial increases in grants to the exhibition associations in Red Deer, Lethbridge, and other smaller cities in Alberta were made last year. In addition to that, \$1 million was made available to rural agricultural societies a year ago, and another \$1 million is being made available this year in conjunction with a joint program with my colleague, the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation.

MR. LUDWIG:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Town of Barrhead also going to get something?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Correctional Institutes

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. the Attorney General. There was a recent incident in Spy Hill Gaol which led to some people being charged with homosexual acts. What is being done to prevent that kind of thing happening in the correctional institutions?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member indicated in his questions, there are some outstanding charges with respect to that incident, and for that reason I am somewhat restricted in the things I can say about it.

I can perhaps make a general response to the question of what has been done and what is being done in an effort to prevent that kind of thing. Incidentally, immediately after we were advised of that incident an enquiry was ordered under the regulations which govern the operations of the correctional institutes.

Essentially, there are two ways in which we make an effort to control this kind of activity. First of all, when the inmates first come into the institution they are held for a time in segregation. During that period, which is three weeks or a month or so, the institute staff assembles and assesses

information in an effort to decide what work the inmate might want to do, or is able to do, and what rehabilitation programs he might wish to become involved in, or is able to become involved in.

They also try to make some assessment of the level of security under which live while within the institution. In that area they have to make two decisions. First of all, they have to decide what will be safe for him; and then, in addition, what will be safe for the people with whom he may be living. If, during that assessment, some information comes to light indicating an inmate might have homosexual tendencies, that is called to the attention of a doctor who examines him as part of this assessment. On some occasions the doctor then refers the person to a psychiatrist for assessment. After that is done, of course, the matter is a question between the doctor and the inmate, and the inmate is treated on a professional basis.

The other safeguard we have within the institutional system is, of course, that a correctional officer is always on duty to supervise the inmates while they are within dormitories and so on.

First of all, I should say, Mr. Speaker, that the first safeguard is not always effective, because we often don't have information indicating that an inmate might have homosexual tendencies. The second safeguard isn't as effective as it ought to be in Spy Hill Gaol, and the real problem there, is that we have dormitories housing, I think, 76, 86, and 96 inmates. It is very difficult to supervise adequately that number of people.

That institution, Mr. Speaker, is presently filled to near capacity. As I said, these dormitories are simply too large. Our plan is to reduce them so they are much smaller. We would then have much greater segregation, with regard to age and so on, within that institution. But we can't --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. I wonder if the hon. minister might come directly to the answer. The question was: what steps were being taken, and could the hon. minister describe those steps. The answer is getting to be of the nature of a statement which might be made during debate or on Orders of the Day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please allow the minister to complete the answer.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, those are the two steps we have taken. As to the future steps, they involve reducing the size of the dormitories, and we will do that as soon as we are able to complete the Calgary Remand Centre, which will take about 150 people out of the institution.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the present custom of using correctional officers as drivers for inmates who are being transported around the city contributing to the lack of required supervision in the institution itself?

MR. LEITCH:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is there any good reason why correctional officers, rather than civilians of different skills should be used as drivers?

MR. LEITCH:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the people who are used as drivers, in my view, should be correctional officers in most cases. In fact, most movement of persons or

inmates of correctional institutes before the courts is done under the supervision of policemen, and we have been studying a program to change this practice so that inmates will be moved by correctional officers staff. That would then free the policeman for work for which he is more suitably trained.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

There are two other supplementaries waiting. Perhaps the hon. member would yield to the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview who also has a supplementary.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Attorney General. In view of his explanation of the fact that there was a serious incident in Spy Hill Gaol, has any action been taken to provide additional security there particularly for young offenders 16 to 18 while these other facilities are being prepared? This might take quite some time before these facilities are available.

MR. LEITCH:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are some additional steps being taken. As I say, I do not want to get too close to commenting about the actual incident because it is currently before the courts. As to timing, we are hopeful of completing the Remand Centre in Calgary toward the end of this year.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary: in view of the fact that the crime rate in Alberta has been growing very rapidly, is the hon. Attorney General recommending provision of additional facilities for housing the prisoners other than the remand centres?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, the estimates given by the members of the department are that we anticipate no growth, and perhaps even a reduction, in the number of people within the correctional institute system in the immediate future. That in part is due to the new bail reform legislation involving fewer people going into the remand centres than went there under the old system. So we really do not anticipate any significant increase in the numbers of people within the correctional institute system in the immediate future.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General mentioned the Remand Centre in Calgary. Can he advise the House what the status is of the proposed remand centre in Edmonton?

MR. LEITCH:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, when we first came into office a discussion arose over the propriety of locating the remand centre near the new court house. I reviewed that with a number of people and learned it would cost -- to redo the architectural work already done, and to acquire an alternate land site -- in excess of a million dollars to make the change. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, we decided not to make the change in location and to proceed with the remand centre at that location. Subsequent to that, we were approached, as I recall it, by the City of Edmonton and were involved in some discussions about the possibility of a new location; perhaps the Minister of Public Works can supplement my answer in that area. Certainly it is my hope and expectation that we will proceed immediately with the work necessary to build the remand centre in Edmonton.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, can the Attorney General advise the House as to the target date the government has for completion of the Edmonton Remand Centre?

MR. LEITCH:

I could not, Mr. Speaker, without consulting the Department of Public Works.

MR. SPEAKER:

We have covered this subject with quite a large number of supplementaries. The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, followed by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

Works Programs

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the announcements by the government and the press of the terribly high unemployment rate in this province at the present time, I wonder if the hon. Minister of Public Works could announce whether there are public works construction projects, in the offing, particularly in Calgary and Edmonton?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Public Works, and most of the other departments, have made quite a number of make-work programs, and programs to provide employment this last winter. There are no particular major works. Most of these are of a minor nature because they are required to be brought into action quickly. As far as any major works are concerned, these will be announced during the discussion of the estimates.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member -- Is this a supplementary?

Highway Department Shops

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. minister could inform the House as to whether his department, in conjunction with the Department of Highways and Transport, is going to move the maintenance shops in Calgary outside the City of Calgary? I understand, and rumours have it -- I don't want you to confirm the rumours for me -- but there are rumours circulating that it is going to be moved, and I wonder if the employees have been forewarned of this move?

DR. BACKUS:

The question of the establishment of the Highways Department shops is, at the moment, in the process of negotiation, and I therefore wouldn't like to commit us completely on this until a final decision is reached. However, the employees working in the shops have been given as much information as can be given at this stage.

Student Part-Time Employment

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the Department of Public Works considered hiring high school students on a part-time basis in disadvantaged areas where it is necessary that the students have part-time employment in order to maintain their studies?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, I don't think I can say that anything specific in this direction has been undertaken. During the summer months programs were brought in for high school students in all departments, but we have not gone in at the present time for part-time jobs for high school students. This does involve quite a complicated procedure, and would, by necessity, aggravate the unemployment situation amongst those who are looking for work on a full-time-employment basis.

Works Program (Cont.)

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to either the Minister of Public Works or the Minister of Manpower and Labour. Has the government commissioned any study to determine the loss in jobs that will be occasioned by the cut-back in capital grants to the universities?

DR. HOHOL:

No, Mr. Speaker, not that specific kind of study.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Little Bow, followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

Government Investigations

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Premier. What assurances can the government give to the House that the government actions, as represented by the Attorney General and the Minister Without Portfolio Responsible for Northern Development and Native Affairs, in investigating private citizens by the RCMP will not happen again?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Attorney General has given his full assurances to the people of Alberta and to the members, and I certainly would endorse the assurances he has given.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Supplementary. Will the government of Alberta be setting up an independent commission to study all the aspects of human rights and abuses or possible abuses thereto?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, we would hope that the Human Rights Commission would be underway by about midsummer. We are in the process of seeking suggestions -- and we welcome them from members of both sides of the House -- as to the makeup of the Human Rights Commission. If any members have any suggestions as to people who should be involved in this commission, we would welcome them. One of the suggestions that has been made to us, and I think a very good one, is that a representative from the native people of Alberta be one of the five members of the commission. We certainly feel this is a valid suggestion. If there are any others that the hon. member, or any hon. member, would like to give to me, I would welcome them. We would like to make a decision with regard to the make up of the Human Rights Commission by midsummer.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, either to the hon. Premier or to the hon. Attorney General. Could the hon. Premier or the hon. Attorney General advise the House whether the government has developed any over-all policy with specific guidelines concerning steps on acquiring background information on individual Albertans; and secondly, how many files containing background information on individual Albertans does the Government of Alberta now possess?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I refer that question to the hon. Attorney General.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member refers to an overall policy about gathering background information, as I have indicated earlier, this kind of information is gathered, I would think in the ordinary course of administration, by pretty well every minister within the government. Also, as I have indicated, the only persons about whom I am aware information was gathered in this way are the three persons we have been talking about.

MR. NOTLEY:

A question to the hon. the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker. What policy does the government follow with respect to this background information? Are the files kept? Are they destroyed? What protection is there for the individual Albertan to be able to check in case this background information is inaccurate and may jeopardize his position vis-a-vis the government?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, any background information within a provincial government file is kept confidential. Certainly I am confident that if any such background information might jeopardize any request or position of any person, he would be told about that background information and be given full opportunity to refute it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Calgary Mountain View with a supplementary.

MR. LUDWIG:

Due to the public reaction to the incident and the subsequent apology by the hon. the Attorney General, I wonder if the government is proposing any legislation which would ensure that this kind of thing cannot happen again, or are we still to rely on his word in this matter?

MR. LEITCH:

We are not proposing any legislation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member --

MR. HENDERSON:

Could I ask a supplementary, as a point of clarification, to the hon. the Attorney General? I want to be sure I heard him right. Do I gather from his earlier remarks that all departments are involved in gathering background information, one way or another, about citizens? This is the way I interpreted his answer and I think it is important that we have this clearly understood.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that's a matter one can be definitive about. When you use the phrase 'background information', I suppose that includes almost anything. Certainly it would include the kind of thing, say, where a deputy minister was giving a report on how programs the provincial government might be involved in, were being accepted within a community, and how they were functioning. I would regard that as background information. I am sure, although each minister would have to answer that type of question for his department, that that kind of thing is done in virtually every department.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Wainwright with a supplementary.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. In light of your reply, does this mean then that if I were to obtain a traffic ticket, went before a magistrate and said I was sorry -- "case dismissed"?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question to the hon. the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker. Can the hon. Attorney General advise the House whether any more people were asked for background information by the RCMP, other than the three in question, and if so, why were these three selected and not others?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I have earlier indicated that these were the only ones I was aware of. As to the second part of the question, Mr. Speaker, I think that should be directed to the hon. Minister without Portfolio Responsible for Northern Development and Native Affairs.

MR. NOTLEY:

Could I direct that question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister without Portfolio?

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, yes, you certainly can direct that question to me. First of all, I think I should point out there was no investigation, and that I was simply requesting some background information relating to programs in the area. Now I would like to just emphasize that particular point. The programs in the area related to the special area itself and co-operatives working in the area. The three particularly picked out related to a co-operative working in the Faust area, and to some articles being written by the editor of the Slave Lake Oiler at the time. In relation to that, Mr. Speaker, I felt that in order for me to assess what my future role would be in the office under which I operate, was to determine exactly how knowledgeable this gentleman was in this particular area, and whether I could take the articles he had written seriously. I say that I could take them seriously.

In relation to the gentleman from Wabasca, the Wabasca Logging Co-op was one I was reviewing. I was aware he was involved in that one at some time previously, and that he had moved away from the area and had recently returned; therefore, I wanted to know exactly who he was, and what connection he had with that previous co-op.

MR. TAYLOR:

I would like to ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

I would like to ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Clover Bar with a supplementary.

[Interjections]

Sorry, we are just about out of time. I think we have one supplementary from the hon. Member for Drumheller.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. Minister Without Portfolio Responsible for Northern Development and Native Affairs. In that case, why were you sorry and why did you apologize about it?

MR. ADAIR:

In reference to that particular point, I might say I stated at that time that what the Attorney General had said was sufficient for me and I concurred with that.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Calgary Provincial Park

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, on Orders of the Day, I just want to make a brief summary statement with regard to the park in Calgary. We think it is a responsibility of provincial government to take action with regard to the recreation and outdoor enjoyment of our citizens. This is a very large expenditure (we recognize that, as has been pointed out earlier by the minister) some \$8 million.

We were delighted to receive the response this morning from the City of Calgary that they certainly welcomed the initiative we had taken with regard to the park. They agreed in every way to work in co-operation with us to see that the maximum number of people enjoyed it. There was a matter raised by the Member for Calgary McCall today, and we did get the specific assurance from the Mayor of Calgary that the transit system in Calgary would be developed in such a way that the citizens in the entire area would be able to use the facility of the park. I think this is a very important condition.

We, in general, feel that this is something needed in our two metropolitan areas. As far as Edmonton is concerned, we are looking at various options there. As the minister has mentioned, we hope, within at the latest, 18 months, to be in a position to designate a provincial park in Edmonton or in the Edmonton area.

Limited Liquor Advertising

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the government has for some time been assessing an outstanding request from the Broadcasters' Association of Alberta to permit advertising of liquor on radio and television in Alberta. After having weighed the factors involved in this matter, the government has agreed in principle, to permit a restricted form of advertising of beer and wine only, on radio and television stations in Alberta.

Two of the most important factors in reaching the decision were as follows: the fact that Alberta radio and television stations are now discriminated against because presently other news media are permitted to carry not only beer and wine advertising, but all liquor advertising as well; and that cable television, now reaching an increasing number of Albertans, carries all forms of liquor advertising. It is the government's view at present that we have no jurisdiction over the advertising carried on cable television.

The government must still work out with the Broadcasters' Association a set of guidelines for beer and wine advertising, since it will be a restricted form of advertising which might be referred to as brand-preference advertising as opposed to that which might lead people either to drink more, or convince those who do not now drink, to drink. This decision to restrict the advertising on radio and television to beer and wine, is consistent with our over-all policy which encourages those people who do prefer to drink, to drink lower-alcohol-content beverages. It is noted that current pricing techniques include lower mark-ups on low alcohol content drinks.

Throne Speech Debate

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to extend the customary congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne. Both of the speeches were very short which is quite understandable. There was so little in the Speech from the Throne that they didn't have much to talk about.

As a matter of fact, when I read the Speech from the Throne it seemed that the government had missed the sole purpose of the Speech from the Throne. The Speech from the Throne is not to review past policies and tell what the government has done. It is supposed to forecast the government's policies; but three-quarters of it is taken up with things that have happened in the past. So what is new?

In the Speech from the Throne there is nothing for the working man, and not a glimmer of hope for those who are genuinely on welfare and living on a dollar a day. There is nothing for the young people of our cities or province who want to build a home; nothing for the poor. It indicated to be more for the wealthy; it gave a hint of more borrowing. It promises tax reduction, but even there we have to wait and see the whole picture. The interest on the borrowing, the increased municipal taxation, and the increased cost of gasoline, et cetera, et cetera, are going to use up the benefits that have been given in the way of tax reduction.

The story is a sad one. There are people in this province today who have boys and girls being raised with an inadequate amount of food -- the working people of the province, the poor people of the province and those on welfare. Meanwhile they look at the government raising the subsistence of members and saying "the members cannot live on \$15 a day, we have to raise it to \$30 a day,"

and see there is nothing being done about raising the amount where people have to live on one dollar a day. Ladies and gentlemen, there are a lot of sad people throughout this province in homes in the cities and in the country who are living on one dollar a day. If the hon. members on the other side, with a grin on their faces, think this is funny, try living on a dollar a day yourself for a little while and see. You couldn't live on \$15 a day, but you laugh when people are forced to live on one dollar a day. Ladies and gentlemen, this is no laughing matter. The people of this province expect to have some consideration given to those who are unable to help themselves.

As a matter of fact, when I look at this Speech from the Throne, I can find little in it to speak about at all, so I am going to speak about the government record as we have seen it, and as it has come out. There are three words that describe that very, very adequately: 'bungling', 'arrogance', and 'contempt'. I want to show now, Mr. Speaker, definite illustrations of this bungling, this arrogance, and this contempt shown by the Lougheed government in this province.

The very first thing they did when they formed a cabinet was to bungle it. They placed 22 ministers in their cabinet, as many as they have in the whole Province of Ontario with several times the population; more than they have in British Columbia, almost double; more than they have in Saskatchewan and Manitoba. Does it take two Tories to do the work of one NDP minister? Well, it appears that it does. It takes 22 of them to do the work of 17 Social Credit ministers before. No wonder the ministers don't know what to do with themselves. No wonder they have to find out ways and means of "investigating" private citizens. It is just something to do. They haven't got enough to do on that side of the House. If the hon. Premier would cut back five of them, save \$100 thousand and give that \$100 thousand to the people who are living on one dollar a day, then I would commend him for it. It would be a wonderful thing and I would like to see that done. Bungling even in the formation of their cabinet! And then --

MR. COOKSON:

Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on one condition, that I don't lose any time. I can't lose one minute in this 40 minutes, so if they want to use up my time, absolutely not. So if you give me extended time, okay.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair has no authority to change the rules.

MR. TAYLOR:

Okay then. I'll hear the questions at the end of my speech.

The second place where the government bungled was in usage of a section of The Legislative Assembly Act to pay their own members. The \$15 a day wasn't enough for them as members of the Legislature. They decided they would give them an extra amount of money for appearing on caucus committees -- not applicable to all members of the Legislature, as The Legislative Assembly Act would indicate. The Legislative Assembly Act was set up for all members of the Legislature. Nowhere in it does it differentiate. But here we have the Premier seizing on one Section, never intended for that purpose, and paying his own members. Maybe it was an election promise -- I don't know -- but he was paying them with public money to do caucus work.

Ladies and gentlemen, last year in our budget there was at least \$4,000 in social development, and under \$10,000, according to the hon. Minister of Agriculture allotted to pay the members extra amounts for caucus work. Talk about bungling and arrogance!

Ladies and gentlemen, let's look at their big tax deal to the people of this province. There was supposed to be some assistance given to the people. Local autonomy was supposed to be strengthened, as it says in the Speech from the Throne. Well, what ppcpycock! The local autonomy is not being strengthened; it's being weakened.

Hospitalization? Sure they are taking over the cost, but they are also taking over some of the authority.

Social development? They are paying a little bit more of the cost, but take my word, Mr. Speaker, there will be more and more abuse at the local level. It should be going the other way -- not centralizing but decentralizing, with a local authority to look after it making there is no abuse of social development. But that wasn't the worst. With regard to removing the restrictions, they still treat the municipalities as little children, as immature people, to run their own affairs. They say to them, "We won't let you do what your people want. We won't give you the grants that logically and properly belong to you because you can't go above the 7 and one-half percent."

Mr. Speaker, I implore the government to review that decision. It's not sound, it's not sensible, and it's not fair. Take the Village of Standard, for instance, where the people are fighting bravely to keep their village alive. In this village, like any other under 500, they are trying to do everything possible to keep their village alive and virile. They need more houses. Well, if they build ten houses this year they are going to lose the grant properly belonging to them. Twelve housing lots with water and a sewage system must be charged against the property. They can't do it by . . . [inaudible] . . . the Department of Municipal Affairs tells them, so it is charged against the property. Right there it's a foregone conclusion as to who is going to pay \$15 or \$20 for a per-foot frontage in a village of under 500 people. It makes it impossible to operate, and so the only other way to do it is through the general revenue.

There the village owned lots, and if they are going to make these available they lose their grant. They are trying to stay alive, which was one of the promises of this government before the election -- to keep villages alive. Now because they are trying to stay alive, and put houses in their towns, they are going to lose their grant because of the 7 and one half percent area.

Take a county. The County of Wheatland, for the last five years, has held its mill rate so that it wouldn't have to increase taxation. I call that mature thinking, and they should be commended for it. Last year they dipped into their savings to the tune of about \$150 thousand in order to save putting more taxes on the people, and they have very little savings left. Now they are going to be penalized because this year, in order to carry out the things that the people want done, they have to go beyond the 7 and one half percent. So they lose their grant. They lose their grant! Is this fair? Is this fair to the people of the province? Ladies and gentlemen, this is completely unfair. It is another case of bungling -- trying to make the people think that all the glory is on the provincial government, and all the blame and abuse is on the municipal councillors.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this province want the municipalities treated as equals. In this province we should have two levels of government: municipal and provincial, and then work to The BNA Act to make it three levels of government of equality in this country: municipal, provincial, and federal, each with their own revenues to carry out the responsibilities of their people.

In the cities again, the same thing is going to hold true. The cities are unable to do the job the people want them to do, or they lose their grant. Their rights to a grant have disappeared. Talk about losing local autonomy. Like in the Communist countries of the world, the way they get the people to submit is, let them go hungry. They can't have any food and then they gradually give up their security. They give up their freedom, so that they can have a little bit of food, a little bit of security. This is the same technique being used with the municipalities in this province.

Then it comes to another item -- snowmobiling. I have so many of these I can't get them all in, but I'm going to get as many in as possible -- the government bungled the snowmobile legislation, the snowmobile insurance, and they also, in my view, broke the law. In the first place they were supposed to have a pre-checking of premiums, not a post-checking of premiums. According to the legislation, the premiums should have been checked by every insurance company in this province before they were permitted to charge them. But that wasn't done. Right now -- now -- several months after the thing happened -- the insurance board is checking on the premiums. This government is to be condemned for that type of thing.

Secondly, they let them tie it in with automobile insurance. There is no relation between snowmobiling and automobile traffic on our highways; and neither is there the same record. The record is bad on the highways. The record is good on the snowmobile trails. So they tie in the record of Eastern Canada where they permit snowmobiling on highways and roads, which isn't permitted in this province, and there they get their high premiums. Mr.

Speaker, it is completely a bungle the way the insurance is handled in connection with snowmobiling in this province.

Take the Opportunity Fund. I supported the Opportunity Fund last year. I thought the department would carry out a job and give our small towns a chance to survive. But did that happen? No! No! How can a village under 500, or a small town, or a small city, pay eight per cent interest, amortized over ten to fifteen years? It makes it completely impossible.

I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce that he bring the act back to this Legislature, provide for a graduated interest rate of eight per cent, perhaps, in the large cities where they have a large clientele, and where they have a good chance to sell -- if they want to sell their business -- seven, in the smaller cities, six per cent, in the towns and five per cent in the villages. There you would have some incentive for people to invest their money in the smaller places.

Today there is no incentive, and that is why it is falling flat on its face. The legislation isn't permitting the flexibility that should be allowed. There should also be a forgiveness clause of 15 to five per cent in the final payment of the premium -- that worked well with the federal government legislation -- and, say, five per cent in our major cities, up to 15 per cent in our villages, and it should be amortized over 25 to 40 years. Mr. Speaker, the Opportunity Fund itself, which is a good concept, was bungled in the way it has been handled. Consequently it is falling flat on its face.

Then, the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities bungled the matter of Calgary Power's application. He stood in this House and answered a question telling us that this was the first application that Calgary Power had made for a number of years. Why was it his function to justify the application of Calgary Power? It is not his function at all! If anything, he should be an impartial judge of the whole matter, not taking the side of Calgary Power! Then to make the people think they are getting something, he says: "we'll lend them money." "We'll lend them money with low interest rates, and if that is \$25 thousand, or \$50 thousand, or \$100 thousand, they have to pay it back."

The Public Utility Board was set up to protect the consumer. Why should the consumer have to spend money to bring their case before the Public Utility Board? The Public Utility Board should make it its function to find out the consumer's case, not make the people come in and grant increases.

And if Calgary Power didn't have an increase over all those years, there were many years they were overcharging the people, because their costs have been increasing; and if they charge the same rate and can make the same rate pay today, they have been overcharging the customers for many years, and they should be brought to account. We should not be holding them up as an idol, saying, "It's a first stratification they have made, for so many years."

Again, even their application is bungled. They are given an increase before they have even proven their case, an interim increase. They needed that like I need a hole in the head. Mr. Speaker, Calgary Power does not need the benevolence of the Government of Alberta. Surely they are able to look after themselves, or they should be able to look after themselves.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what about energy reserves? We have no over-all policy here. What we need is a provincial energy policy in this province. We protect our gas by saying there will always a number of years, a 30-year reserve. We make no such prediction for the oil. As our hon. leader of the Opposition mentioned the other day, no provision is made for the oil and what might well happen? Well, we will get rid of our conventional oil, the low-cost oil, and leave the high-priced oil from the far north and from the tar sands for the people of Alberta. Mr. Speaker, that is not protecting the people of Alberta. That is not protecting the people. We need a provincial energy policy, just the same way we need a national energy policy. In that policy I am going to deal specifically for a couple of minutes with this matter of coal.

Here we chased to Japan, and the only result I have seen of the trip to Japan of how many people was it? Two hundred or something -- a mass of people anyhow, led by our hon. the Premier. The only result I have seen is cancellation of coal contracts. Heaven help us from any more trade missions around the world, if all we are going to get is cancellation of coal contracts. We can go to South America, but I hope we do not get cancellations now that the trade mission has come back.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we have markets right in this country for coal. You do not have to chase to Japan. There is nothing wrong with the

Japanese market, or South American market. Sure, let us supply all we can. But let us look at home. Charity begins at home. Mr. Speaker, we have coal in this province, we have 2,200 people, in the last results, depending for a living in this province on coal mining.

What are we doing about getting into the Ontario market? Last year the Ontario market imported a minimum of 15 million tons of coal from the United States. We are keeping the American miners at work. What are we doing about the Canadian miners? Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of things to be done. There is a wide gap in utilizing this resource of coal and the government here should be on its toes looking after the coal interests of this province. We have tremendous deposits of coal and it should form a part of that provincial energy policy.

Take the Drumheller coal alone; at the present time there are only about 60 families getting their living out of this coal business. There should be 200 families. If we just got a small percentage, five per cent or ten per cent of that coal being brought into Ontario from the United States, we could put another 100 men to work in the Drumheller valley. Minister of Labour, here is a wonderful opportunity for you to get your employment situation on the way and on the road with an abundant resource, with just a 10 per cent input into that Ontario market. The Premier of Ontario is a personal friend of our premier here. Couldn't they get 'buddy-buddy' together and say, "Let's get some Alberta coal into that Ontario?" It is the best coal in the world!

Well, Mr. Speaker, we need a provincial energy policy and we need it badly.

I now want to go on to another matter dealing with several items of The Bill of Rights where the government has bungled. Some of these items are where the government has made a mockery of their own Bill of Rights.

I refer first of all to the Slave Lake episode. Throughout the province people have been greeting each other lately by saying, "Have you been investigated yet?" As they get to the coffee counter, as they go to the women's meetings, the common saying is, "Have you been investigated yet?"

But it is going to be worse than that when the hon. Minister without Portfolio in his TV appearance -- as he did in the House here today -- apparently thinks the people of the province are so gullible they will accept his explanation that he asked the RCMP to investigate these three men so that when he met them he could say, "Hi, Bruce; Hi, Al, how are you? I just had you investigated so I would know all about you." How gullible can you be? How gullible can the hon. minister be? "Hi, Bruce. Hi, Al." He could have found out their first names by going to them, by asking them what their first name is, if that is what he wanted. Mr. Speaker, it is a mockery of The Bill of Rights when a minister asks the Attorney General of the province to investigate private citizens. The investigation was bad enough.

The second item I want to mention where the government has bungled with The Bill of Rights is in connection with the Hutterian Brethren. They prepared a bill before the report was in. They spent \$16,000 of the people's money to find out what the people thought about Hutterian Brethren buying land without restrictions. Eighty two per cent of the people who made representations said, "We want some restrictions." But the government knows best. The government knows better than the people. They will tell the people what's good for them. So they prepared a bill before the report was even tabled, and they said, "We'll repeal The Communal Property Act. We'll have no restrictions on the Hutterian Brethren. They'll buy land like anybody else in the province."

Now we hear a different story. The Hutterites took the government at its word. They want to buy land. They've got options all over the country. Some of the best land in the province they now have under option. The committee is now saying they are going to set up a committee. What is this committee going to do? This committee is going to cost the people more money. What is it going to do? It has no legislative authority. Is it going to take the Hutterites behind the barn and beat them over the head until they submit? Are they going to have political pressures put upon them so they have to submit and not buy land where they want to buy it, but where the government wants them to buy it? If that's the case, why don't you be honest and bring these restrictions out into the public so the Hutterites and everybody else know what they are?

The government wants the rights of Hutterites protected. We all want the rights of Hutterites protected. But the government forgot all about the rights of the people who live next door to a Hutterite colony, forgot all about their rights. That is a different thing. They forgot all about the rights of the merchants who have invested their money in an area. They forgot all about the

rights of the Hutterites who work without wages for their keep only. There are no minimum wages in the colonies; completely contrary to our way of life. There are no minimum wages. Let any other farmer -- a farmer living next door to the Hutterite colony -- try to get by without paying his man wages and he'd be jailed. He'd be pulled up before the courts and fined or jailed. But the Hutterites can do it. They forgot all about the rights of the individual Hutterites who work without wages.

What about the Hutterites who want to leave their colony? They do so now with only the clothes on their back. In any other corporation in this country, if someone wants to leave they have a rightful claim on what they helped to produce. Not the Hutterites. They leave with the shirt on their back only, and they have no right to anything they have worked for. Is this Canada or is it Russia? They are living in Canada, they are not living in Russia. It is not fair at all, and it is completely contrary to The Bill of Rights.

What about the rights of the Hutterian children? They get to Grades 5 and 6. Let other parents in this province take their children out of school in Grades 5 and 6, or let them dilly-dally all the way through till they are 15 or 16 years of age -- they quit at 15 now, while the rest of the province goes until 16 -- but let them dilly-dally so that they are only in Grade 5 or 6 by the time they reach 15 or 16 years of age. Don't tell me the Hutterian children are of low mentality. They aren't. They are the same as the rest of the young people of this province. There are bright ones, there are clever ones and there are some dull ones, but they could get through too. They supply no doctors, they supply no engineers, they supply no dentists. They make use of them all, but they supply none of them. What about the rights of those children? Don't they have the right to an education? Not under the present Bill of Rights.

That is another place we have bungled, and bungled badly. The people of our province are gradually finding out about it. I urge the government to forget about proclaiming that act. Bring it back and write out the restrictions you want your committee to enforce. Put them out in the public. Be men and be honest about it, and let the Hutterites know where they stand. Let the rest of the people in this province know where they stand.

Now we come to another instance in the Bill of Rights. I'm going to read this section of the Bill of Rights, the first section:

It is hereby recognized and declared that in Alberta there exist, without discrimination by reason of race, national origin, colour, religion or sex, the following human rights and fundamental freedoms, namely: (a) the right of the individual to liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property, the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law;

And then on to the right (d) to freedom of speech and (e) to freedom of assembly and association.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the government has investigated people in Slave Lake. They have made a bungle of the Hutterian Brethren. They have committed a terrible error in incarcerating a citizen of this province in a mental hospital who is completely sane -- picked up by the RCMP and put in a mental hospital and kept there for a number of days. The government seized its first political prisoner, picked him up in a government building and placed him in a mental hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to this case. This man is completely sane; every one of his actions will show he is completely sane and he is fighting for his own rights. His back was injured, his knee was injured, and he wanted justice from the Compensation Board. When he was knocking on doors for the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs at the last election trying to help the Tories to get elected, he was given lots of promises. "Sure, we'll look after your cause. We'll see you get justice." But what a difference when they get into office! They can't even bother with the man. The man even goes to his own MLA, the hon. the Provincial Treasurer, MLA for Edmonton Centre, and the Provincial Treasurer tells him he doesn't want to be involved. Doesn't want to be involved in helping a man who is having difficulty with the Compensation Board!

Mr. Speaker, this man was determined to get justice, and a measly pension isn't going to fix up his back. He fought with doctors and the Compensation Board and made visit after visit to the Premier's office, to the minister's office, trying to get justice. Mr. Speaker, he is entitled to that. He's a tenacious fighter for his own rights. He's not wanting anything that's not coming to him. He wants his back to be corrected, close to the way it was

before. He wants to be able to go out and earn his living. He's a surveyor; he's lost hundreds of dollars because he hasn't been able to work and the Compensation Board says, "Find some employment. Go out and find some other type of work." How many hon. members have ever had an injured back? I've seen scores of them in the Drumheller Valley and I know what it's like; I've had one myself, but I've seen scores of men - it affects their whole life and their whole attitude. It frustrates them.

And here is this man fighting for his own rights and getting nowhere at all. He goes to the various ministers, he asks for help, and what happens? They put him under surveillance. He can't even come into the Legislative Building without having security men follow him. He goes for coffee, they follow him; he goes to the library, they follow him. What kind of freedom is this in this country where you can't even go to your own parliament buildings and speak to the government member without coming under surveillance?

He delivered a letter to the Premier's office on December 14; he was so outright and honest and fair about it that he told the front desk, so that the surveillance men wouldn't have to work out any system of following him. He told them he was taking a letter to the Premier's office. What did that letter do? The letter is simply asking for justice. He was even prepared to pay for his own operation. He said, "Instead of my pension, give me a lump sum settlement." This is done for hundreds of workers in this province. "Give me a lump sum settlement and then stop the pension payments for a number of years until it catches up." But no, the Board wouldn't do that. The new Board has still refused to give him a \$5,000 advance, money that would come to him over a period of years, so he could go to a doctor of his choice and have his back repaired. No, they wouldn't do that.

The man delivered a letter to the Premier's office and said that he wanted some justice in this. If he didn't get it, he was going to campaign against the government just as hard as he had campaigned for the government in the last election. On December 15 he comes to the government again and is escorted through the building the day after he delivers that letter. He can't go anywhere without the surveillance crew following him. Is this Canada or is this Moscow? Well, I wonder.

On December 19, he came into the building to deliver a letter to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development in regard to medical and hospital care, and told the minister also that if he didn't get some justice, he would campaign against him in the next election. He was watched by the security crew.

On December 19, the fateful day for all Albertans, a day that is going to go down as a rape of civil liberties in this province, he went to the Workmen's Compensation Board to discuss rehabilitation with the vocational rehabilitation director. When he came out from that discussion, who was waiting for him but a Dr. Dorran from the mental hospital, with five plain-clothes policemen, three RCMP, and two city policemen. The doctor asked him to come to Oliver for three days; they talked for fifteen or twenty minutes. There was no fighting. Nobody's life was in danger. There was nobody being threatened. The man looked, saw the policemen and said, "Yes, I will go." What other choice did he have? He went to the car and he was so sane that he even noticed a parking ticket on the front of the car.

Every item here shows that he was completely sane, and yet he was incarcerated, picked up like someone who is a threat to the life and limb of other people. He was taken to the mental hospital at Oliver. They had the certificate signed before he even got there, and that can be proven too.

On December 27, one of the doctors there, a Dr. MacDonald, told the patient he had told his colleagues that "The business about him being potentially violent or dangerous was a bunch of nonsense." One of the doctors tells him that he is trying to persuade his doctors, but another doctor says, "Well, we are under political pressure to keep you here." What kind of a province is this? What kind of a government is this that we have in the Province of Alberta? The doctors were under a lot of political pressure to keep him there longer -- words from one of the doctors in that particular area.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say I term this the rape of civil liberties, a mockery of The Alberta Bill of Rights, a mockery of the thing that, held up as the great protection for the people of Alberta, is now being used to incarcerate the same people, putting them in mental institutions.

When the man in question said to the people out there, "What about Bill 83, what about the new Mental Act you are talking about?" Oh, and they laughed that off. The said, "Oh, we got you before that". This is in December, and the act

didn't come into effect until the next month. So, they said, "Oh, we got you before that." This is a joke with them. Mr. Speaker, it is no joke with me. It is no joke to the people of Alberta.

And they even bungled that. I wrote to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. I got a letter back about the wrong man, so I wrote him again on January 25. I still haven't had a reply to that particular letter. But I did get a letter from the director of the Oliver Hospital. I wondered under what authority this man was taken to Oliver. He said, "Section 7 of the Mental Health Act". This is what section 7 says:

Where in the opinion of one examining physician, (a) it is essential that a mentally disordered person (i) for his own protection or welfare, (ii) for the protection of others, should be placed forthwith under care, supervision and control, and (b) where it appears to be impossible to obtain certificates of two physicians within a reasonable time.

Well, I want to say in the first place that there is no danger to himself, there is no danger to anybody else. There was no urgency that they couldn't get two other doctors. But where it appears to be impossible to obtain the certificates of two physicians, the one physician is arranged to be in the compensation building to pick him up contrary to the act -- breaking of the very act that we have, let alone the new act. This is done by a government that prides itself in bringing in a Bill of Rights to the people of this province. I call it the rape of civil liberties in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a few questions I want to know about. Who directed that this man be put under surveillance in the Legislature Building? Was it the Premier? Was it the Premier's office? It appears from what I have read that it was. I don't know for sure. Who directed that this man be picked up and taken to the mental hospital? Was it the Premier; was it the Premier's office? Was it the Attorney General, or his office? Was it the Minister of Health and Social Development or his office? I want to know. Where did the complaints come from? The danger to himself -- who complained about the danger? The director of the hospital said he knew of no complaints in his letters; danger to others -- he knew of no complaints. If there were complaints, from whom did they come? What rights has any citizen who complains and fights for justice in this province if he can be picked up and confined to a mental hospital? These questions have to be answered. Were the doctors in and out of the hospital under pressure? Were they under political pressure to do this? Were they acting on the direction of some minister? Why was the answer given when Mr. Davy asked about Bill No. 83, "We got you before it came into effect."

Yes, I'm referring to Mr. Frank Joseph Edward Davy who is sitting in the gallery today, as sane as any member of this House, completely sane, and yet he was incarcerated, made a political prisoner, and his only fault -- no danger to others, no danger to himself -- his only fault was that justice; he wanted his body to be repaired so he could go back to work and live a normal life. And so he was taken and shoved into a mental hospital like somebody completely insane.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day for the Province of Alberta when this type of thing happens. I say that because I am asking for a judicial inquiry. I am asking the Premier of this province to set up a judicial inquiry immediately to get the answers to these questions. I want to know; surely every hon. member of this Legislature wants to know; surely the people of this province want to know who is giving directions to pick up sane people and incarcerate them in a mental hospital, and the other questions that I have asked. A judicial inquiry and nothing else. An apology is not going to answer the question; this man needs more than an apology. Number one, he needs to have proper medical attention to his back, and number two, he wants the proper actions taken over what came about through his incarceration in a mental hospital.

Yes, The Bill of Rights has been raped by this province. It has been sounded out to the people of Alberta -- "Do what we say, not what we do. Don't look at our actions; just look at our legislation." It is a shameful day indeed when the people of this province are incarcerated in a mental hospital because they are fighting for their own liberties and their own rights.

Mr. Speaker, my time is practically up so, with respect to the address and in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I move, seconded by the hon. Member for Little Bow, Mr. Ray Speaker, an amendment thereto that the following words be added in the said address:

We respectfully submit to Your Honour that this Assembly regrets and deplores the actions of the Alberta Government in violating the spirit and intent of The Alberta Bill of Rights.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, in seconding the remarks of my colleague, there are a few comments that I would like to make. In my term of government I always felt that government had the responsibility of not only showing direction, but showing and setting an example in their performance, once that direction was established. There must be a congruence between performance and objectives.

With anticipation, following an election, the people of Alberta waited for direction and objectives from the Conservative Government. Finally there was a re-write of the human rights legislation to produce The Alberta Bill of Rights and The Individual's Rights Protection Act. A few months later, Mr. Speaker, we are observing the performance of that government.

Mr. Taylor has briefly covered one of the subjects with regard to freedom of speech by the Hutterian Brethren. I think, in my estimation, whether they are a group, an individual or no matter what, their opinion should be their own opinion, and people in government have no right in any way to direct that opinion.

In Alberta we have always had freedom of speech, freedom of opinion at any time, and the right to make our own decisions, and with the Hutterian Brethren there should be no exception.

I believe, possibly with all good intention, the minister requested that the Brethren not make certain public statements. However, to all of us here and to the citizens of Alberta it is very obvious that that action was a violation of the spirit and the intent of The Alberta Bill of Rights.

The second instance, the Slave Lake investigation, which has been raised here today a number of times, also leaves much doubt in the minds of Albertans and much concern about their personal lives and their private lives. The purpose of that investigation has never really been made clear, except that the hon. Minister without Portfolio Responsible for Northern Development and Native Affairs has said it was for his own purposes, and those could have been political.

The question of the power of the hon. the Attorney General and his office over the police force has not been clear and could have been cleared by a special debate last Friday. However, the House Leader and the Deputy Premier felt the matter to be of no significance but could only be debated during the Throne debate amongst a flurry of self back-slapping and praise. A time when they could drag red herrings through this House to divert the attention of people who wanted to look at a matter that is of much concern.

To me, Mr. Speaker, there has been an attempt to avoid the priority of an important question of this session. That question is as follows: how the Conservative government has and will perform in light of The Alberta Bill of Rights. That question is the key to this session.

I am sure we all agree that the RCMP are not in any sense instruments at the personal disposal of ministers or of government as a whole. Any tolerance of this kind of action certainly is serious and should be dealt with by the leader of the government, dealt with by his actions. That the RCMP operate strictly within the powers of the legislation given to them without political interference is our only hope as citizens for objectivity and no state control or interference in our lives. Good or bad in the intentions, as they may have been, the ministers involved, the people involved, have used the RCMP in the Slave Lake case. The use of the RCMP is derogatory to the mission and image we expect of that fine group of officers. Using them as political hacks is the ultimate debasement of the democratic process where individuals can criticize their representatives. Whether these people can be judged in anyone's mind as bad or good or not living up to certain values or criteria in a community is not the matter for us to really judge. Their rights -- no matter who they are -- must be protected. And the real question raised in my mind -- and this is directed personally to the hon. Minister without Portfolio Responsible for Northern Development and Native Affairs -- is why, as an individual, did he not go to those people, those three individuals and others that he was interested in, to talk with them, and ask them the questions that he had to ask? If there was information, or details in which some criminal or civil case could be raised, then at that point in time he could bring in the officers of the law. I feel that there was a complete neglect of responsibility in those actions.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly view the Conservative actions with alarm. This to me is nothing less than a knife plunged into the vitals of freedom and democracy in the Province of Alberta. This debasement and trampling on The Bill of Rights

has besmirched the name of the Conservative government, and has made the high aspirations the Premier established for this province worthless scraps of paper.

That, Mr. Speaker, is all that I believe is left at this time. These acts possibly can be relegated, along with some of the respect that has been lost, to the wastebaskets of Alberta. We have only had a few months to observe the performance of this government, and Mr. Speaker, if this is a sampling of things to come in the future, then as private citizens we certainly are faced with some real difficulties.

I believe, as an MLA, our relationship to ministers and people responsible places is a very important one. The first responsibility, as I have already said in this case in Slave Lake, lies with the Minister without Portfolio who made the request. The second certainly lies with the hon. minister, and in turn with the Deputy Premier, and the deputy Deputy Premier who dragged their feet in coming to grips with the issue when it was initially raised.

But, Mr. Speaker, no matter how you cut the pie, the spirit and intent of The Alberta Bill of Rights has been violated. There are many questions asked in the minds of Albertans today. Who else is being investigated? As my hon. colleague has certainly indicated, this is one of the primary questions. Many citizens who felt they had a free life, and that this matter was not of significance, are concerned and worried.

Today the answer from the hon. Attorney General was very unclear. I think he has a lot of clarification to make in the days that lie ahead. I'm not sure what his answer said. Did it really say that there are many other reports going on? Did it say that we have protection as private citizens? And where does it give us some indication where we are going to go from here to clear the air and clear the matter? To me, Mr. Speaker, there have been no answers to those questions.

Today I feel that doubt can be cast on the Conservative government. They have reached their first milestone of doubt; the doubt that people can have in their credibility.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to support the motion proposed by the hon. member, Mr. Taylor, and I will attempt not to repeat any of the remarks made by the two previous speakers. I do believe that all the hon. members in this House have a serious concern and a serious problem confronting them. I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that we ought to do something to ensure that what has happened will not happen again, or, if it does happen again, will not be treated as lightly as some members opposite feel that it perhaps ought to be.

I believe that this issue deserves to be thoroughly debated, particularly in the light of the fact that The Bill of Rights was proclaimed on January 1, not more than six weeks ago. And it also deserves special attention because of the glowing terms and the great promise made by the hon. Premier and all hon. members here as to the future of this type of legislation and its benefit to the people. For this reason I believe that no hon. member in this House ought to treat this matter lightly and feel that an apology has been made, and that is sufficient. That certainly is a step in the right direction, Mr. Speaker. The apology by both hon. ministers is a step in the right direction but it doesn't convince me and the people I represent that that is all that ought to be done. I think the public is looking at all hon. members, not only the opposition members to ensure that we have better treatment of our laws, and better respect for the rights of people than has been shown by the Conservative government in the last few weeks.

The hon. Premier made such a big play concerning this bill. He impressed many people, and he spoke many times in the House. In the introduction of his bill on March 2 -- and this was quite a great day in the House -- he made one particular statement. He said, "This bill deals with the protection of the individual in relation to the power of the state." That is what we are concerned with. We were certainly obliged to take him at his word, but what happened since indicates that the hon. members of the opposition, particularly, have a responsibility to discharge here. Whether they wish to attach blame to the actions of the hon. ministers or not, they nevertheless have to do their jobs properly.

I would like to quote a little further from speeches made by the hon. Premier with reference to Bill No. 1. He said -- and I'm quoting from Hansard, November 15, 1972 -- "If this Third Reading motion is approved by the Legislature, it will, in my view, be an historic occasion for the Alberta

Legislature." It was an historic occasion for the Alberta Legislature, Mr. Speaker, but we have had three or four historic occasions ever since the bill was proclaimed in the flagrant violation, the breach of the intent and the spirit of the bill, by ministers of the Crown.

One can even forgive them, but the hon. the Premier who introduced the bill, who complained that it was not given enough recognition and publicity, appears to condone the action of the hon. ministers. If the hon. the Premier feels that he had not received enough publicity on this bill, I am of the opinion that he is going to get a lot more publicity now than he wishes.

I would like to quote further from his remarks from Hansard, November 15. He states:

There will be no turning back from this particular occasion, in my view, because even though we, in no way, can bind future legislatures, any consideration of a repeal of The Alberta Bill of Rights, is, I think, beyond the comprehension of all members.

Nobody is thinking of repealing the bill. The hon. members on this side spoke very favourably in support of it, and we voted for it. It is the bill of the people; but repealing it and violating it or ignoring it, or treating it with contempt is another matter entirely. Further to quote the hon. the Premier, he stated on that day:

I would like to repeat again that there is no doubt that The Alberta Bill of Rights will cause difficulties for both this government and future governments.

It apparently happened sooner than he anticipated.

He further stated:

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, also that the mere passage of any bill, important as it might be, will not eliminate discrimination. But I think it will -- I hope it will -- pass on to the people of Alberta the spirit and intent that we have in this Legislature towards the freedoms that are enunciated within the bill, towards the traditions upon which this province has been built and which the pioneers brought to this province.

It rings rather hollow when you listen to these words and when you judge them in the light of what happened. So there is a considerable gap, in my opinion -- a credibility gap -- between the hon. Premier's pronouncement in this regard and the bill, and the intent of the bill and performance, Mr. Speaker. This is a serious allegation, but I feel we can perhaps recover and redeem some of the terrible position the government finds itself in by doing the right thing now.

I believe that the hon. Premier ought to muster all his support from his side and from the people who did such extensive studies, and co-operate with legislation that will prevent this from happening. I believe the people who made such a tremendously large input into this issue before the bill was passed would like to have something to say about its enforcement from now on. Perhaps the hon. Premier and his government might choose to ignore this issue. I'm sure that public interest has been aroused over this to a pitch never before on an issue of this type in Alberta, and that we cannot ignore this issue any more. We must come to grips with it. We must do what is needed.

I believe that proper legislation which would impose penalties for any violation of The Bill of Rights would have to be passed and I believe that the government would be very ill-advised to oppose any such legislation. In fact, it ought to show the leadership that it states it has, and propose legislation that will prevent this from happening. I have one statement in mind here. I believe every individual has the right to seek and obtain remedies in the courts of the province against acts that violate or threaten to violate fundamental rights granted or recognized by The Bill of Rights or any other act of the Legislature. That certainly is a statement that nobody opposite would like to argue with or at least would wish to contradict and say that individuals do not have that right. I think that we will believe the hon. Premier and his Conservative ministers when they show us what they can do to put this beyond the possibility of happening again.

I had the opportunity of writing to a very outstanding authority on these matters in the Province of Saskatchewan, and he advised me by letter that he believes that ministers ought not to be given any special recognition or any dispensation with regard to the laws of the province. In fact, they should be

singled out, perhaps, for stricter penalties and harsher treatment than individuals because the ministers of the Crown are appointed to protect the individuals from the violation of laws and not to subject the individuals to broken laws by the ministers. I would like to quote from this letter; the gentleman states: I would like to quote from this letter. The gentleman states:

The cabinet, comprising Ministers of the Crown, derives its authority from the Legislature. It seems to me that if a Minister happens to breach a statute of general application, he should be treated no differently from any other citizen. If he violates The Highway Traffic Act, he should be prosecuted, and if found guilty, fined. If he violates a provision of the Criminal Code, he should be dealt with under the law as any other citizen.

But if, in his ministerial capacity, he acts in a manner that deserves condemnation, then his resignation should be called for from the floor of the House. If his resignation is not forthcoming, that is to say, if the Premier does not request that he resign, then, of course, it may be taken that the Government itself adopts the questioned conduct of the Minister.

I don't want to make any allegation against any minister because there is a mystery in this House and in the province as to what actually happened. But we are entitled to know. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the Premier can defuse this issue by calling an impartial inquiry -- possibly a judicial inquiry -- to clear the air. I feel that it ought to be done voluntarily and as graciously as possible under the circumstances.

This ought not to be a case where the opposition must harangue and browbeat the government into doing what is right. If they don't know what is right under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I question their propriety in remaining in office. I'm saying that unless the Premier can stand up in this House and say, "I condone what they did, it's all right, forget it," or unless he stands up and says, "I am going to take action and see that my Bill of Rights and the Bill of Rights of the people of the province is not violated," and asks his minister to resign, then we will take it from there.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I feel that justice will not be done -- or at least the people will not feel that right was done by anybody -- unless there is a full and thorough investigation of this issue, to the satisfaction of the hon. members and the people.

We can only talk in generalities, and I have not made an allegation of wrongdoing against either of the ministers. Nevertheless, I heard them apologize. As the hon. member, Mr. Taylor stated, that if you didn't do anything wrong, what was the apology for? The apology clears the air only to the extent that it is an admission that there was something wrong.

When I am making these remarks, I wish to make it clear that I have a great respect and admiration for the hon. the Attorney General. I find it rather difficult to make these remarks in view of his stature and his ability.

But I must also face the facts and wonder, "What am I sent here for by the public?" Can we just sit down and keep quiet? If we do that, we have no business sitting in the opposition at all. We might as well all go home and forget about it. We have to discharge our responsibility in this House and demand that the right thing be done.

When I say that I have a tremendous regard and respect for the hon. the Attorney General, I am also aware of his responsibility in this regard, a particular responsibility as the minister appointed to enforce the law. Without enforcement of the law in this province we'd all be carrying weapons. It is his responsibility. I believe he is capable of doing it, and I believe the hon. Premier chose the best man he could find on his side of the House to do the job. But I say, because of these special qualifications and abilities, and his special responsibility, if there has been a violation of The Bill of Rights, and it appears to me that there has been, that there is also a further responsibility to do the right thing, to stand up and be counted, and call for an inquiry to clear the air.

I believe that when the inquiry results are produced it might even absolve him, in particular, or someone else, but it might warn the people and the government that you can't go around doing these things with impunity. Nobody can. I would feel very surprised if anyone on the other side of the House stood up and said that we must drop everything; enough has been said, they have apologized. I appreciate the apology, but I also state that it is an admission.

I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that we ought not just to focus attention on the Slave Lake incident. There are other incidents. I believe that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, when he stood up in the House and stated that The Communal Property Act was suspended, showed the most flagrant contempt for the Legislature that has ever been expressed in any Legislature. I can't recall, or I can't trace in Hansard in Ottawa or here, any minister having the gall to stand up and say that legislation is suspended. I believe that a minister like that ought not to sit in the House, he ought to be reprimanded and put in the back seats of the Legislature.

But there was no such action taken and no apology. In fact, the hon. minister tried to justify his action, and that deed is still on the record in this House. It's still on record in Hansard and we have it to raise at every instance possible.

I don't think legislators come here merely to collect their pay cheque. They have a responsibility. The people send them here to defend their rights. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. the Premier appointed the hon. the Attorney General to enforce those rights. So we have come to the situation, what are we going to do? I believe that the Conservative government has brought itself into serious contempt with the people of the province; how far they can recover this deed will depend on what they do now to ensure it never happens again.

I have picked up an article dealing with the Watergate affair in the United States where some people went and bugged a convention. We think this is a pretty foul deed; it was a sneaky kind of an act, but it meant that one group wanted to spy and find something on somebody else. The analogy between what happened in Slave Lake and Watergate is very good, except in magnitude of offence. But I believe that when you violate a bill of rights it does not matter a bit whether you violate it slightly or seriously, it's a violation and I, for one, do not believe that my constituents want me to stand up here and say "We will condone it, we will forget about it; drop it, you've said enough, the proper explanations have been given and you've served your purpose."

I don't believe we have that alternative. I believe we should have a major statement from the hon. the Premier on this issue, particularly that if he doesn't want a judicial inquiry that it is up to the Opposition to do its job and insist that we have a judicial inquiry.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we can clear the air and save some of the embarrassment that befell this Legislature, because it is the act of every member here; not only the hon. the Premier's Bill of Rights. It is as much my Bill of Rights and the hon. Deputy Premier's, as anybody else's. So, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we all ought to stand up and speak on this issue and vote for a condemnation of such action, vote in support of a judicial inquiry and propose legislation at the earliest possible date to see that this thing is never done again. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to the amendment, I also regret and deplore the actions of the Alberta Government in violating the spirit and intent of the Alberta Bill of Rights. I think that The Alberta Bill of Rights, in itself, although I feel it has a weakness of expression, the spirit of it is wonderful and it ought to be as binding upon government as it is upon other individuals in the province.

The Alberta Bill of Rights, or any bill of rights is not of any particular value so long as there are only rights stressed without responsibilities acknowledged also. As has been said a number of times in this Legislature, I strongly feel that what is needed is a bill of responsibility as a complement to the bill of rights in order that all people might recognize not only their rights but also their responsibilities, for rights without responsibilities makes for irresponsibility and unfortunately fall hard on the victims of the situation. You can't have all rights without responsibility.

Dealing with the Bill of Rights I find there are a number of gaps, including a real big credibility gap that now exists so far as the people's minds are concerned. That is not being really responsible. I appreciate the fact that we can't always guard against all credibility gaps, but there are some areas where we could.

In speaking of this matter, I think that the Hutterians have been greatly offended by the gap created by the existing government's actions. I can't help thinking that the gap of one year that was made by suspending the Communal

Properties Board without repealing or amending the act, was an injustice to all concerned, not only to the Hutterians, but to those who wanted to deal with the Hutterians in the exchange of land and, also, the rest of the people of the province who did not know what was going on. For a full twelve months or more there was a suspension, or a vacuum, and this was most unfortunate.

Today there is still a gap, because The Bill of Rights and the repeal of The Communal Property Act, were not to take place until the first of the year. At the first of the year The Bill of Rights was proclaimed, but The Communal Property Act has still not been repealed, and if The Communal Property Act was in violation of The Bill of Rights, then it is now definitely in violation, by staying in effect. This is again most unfortunate. Three months after The Bill of Rights was proclaimed, The Communal Property Act is going to be repealed. If the act is indeed contrary to The Bill of Rights, this makes a real credibility gap.

The previous Human Rights Act proclaimed in 1966, from which the present Individual's Rights Protection Act has been taken in primary substance, made provision for all kinds of exigencies, but the existing Individual's Rights Protection Act has not made provision for every exigency. We see, in examples that have come up from the Roman Catholic School Board, the fact that there are some areas that have not been properly covered in spite of the fact that the opposition did everything they could to encourage their coverage. This includes all aspects of the previous Human Rights Act which had been exercised for some six years. Under this act no one had been taken to court, but some 600 to 800 people who might have been considered in violation had been dealt with by the administrator in such a way that no court action had to be taken.

Now The Human Rights Act of 1966 has been repealed and, as a result, the administrator who was looking after affairs now has no authority to act. He has no authority because under the new Individual's Rights Protection Act we have a situation where we must have a Human Rights Commission. This Human Rights Commission has not been set up, and so we have an Individual's Rights Protection Act without any teeth in it. It is in the period of time from the first of January until whenever The Human Rights Commission is appointed and set up, that we have an Individual's Rights Protection Act with no teeth in it.

It is during this period of time that the Slave Lake fiasco took place, and there is no one to appeal to and no one to enforce The Individual's Rights Protection Act. We have a situation where individuals were investigated, or whatever term should be used, it makes no difference, but they had no one they could appeal to. They shouldered a burden that they could not bear.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it is time that some of these gaps were closed up. If The Bill of Rights is going to mean anything we should be able to take some examples from the bills of rights that have existed in this province since 1946 where we have experience to draw from. We have bills of rights at the provincial level, the federal level, and the international level from which to draw experience. It is unfortunate that we have to have these gaps of time until we get the currently-existing provincial Bill of Rights effectively working. It really does not need to be so. We could have either waited awhile and let the existing bills of rights and human rights acts function until we got The Bill of Rights functioning effectively, or else we should have stepped in and filled in the gap when they proclaimed all the other appendages necessary to make it effective.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I feel very strongly that if the government and civil service do not obey the provincial statutes there must be a horrible credibility gap. I think it is necessary for us to remind the government at this time, and on behalf of the people of the Province of Alberta that if there is going to be an effective Bill of Rights, government, as well as the people for whom they make these laws, obey the statutes and the laws of the province. There should be no exception in this area, otherwise there is a credibility gap.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on the amendment, I recall the discussion at third reading of Bill No. 1 last fall. One of the hon. members opposite, if I recall, rose and suggested that perhaps we should have the entire debate published, so that it could be sent to school children across the province. I think most of us concurred with that suggestion but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it might well be worthwhile to have this debate also published, because this is the first time that The Alberta Bill of Rights has been brought up in this legislature and discussed from the view of being violated, or at least the suggestion has been made that it has been violated.

I suggest that the issues that are before the Legislature today strike at the very heart of whether or not we have a meaningful Bill of Rights in this province at the present time.

As I take part in this debate I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that I neither allege nor infer any impropriety or dishonesty on the part of either minister concerned in the Slave Lake investigation. Their personal integrity is not at stake in this issue, at least as far as I am concerned. I don't question their motives, but I do most definitely question their judgment and I take issue with the government's role in the entire affair.

It is important, Mr. Speaker, that we divorce the principles at stake from the personalities involved. A bill of rights is necessary to protect the individual from the arbitrary action of government. Too often we look for ulterior motives behind those actions which violate The Alberta Bill of Rights. While this is occasionally true most breaches of civil liberties occur not as the result of some devious or sinister plot, but rather as a result of some over-zealous public official overstepping the bounds of his responsibility.

If we are to protect people under The Alberta Bill of Rights, we must get away from the proverbial 'cops and robbers' or 'good guys and bad guys' debate. In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, it is just as important to protect the individual citizen from, as I suggested, an over-zealous public servant who for the best reasons in the world oversteps his bounds, as it is to defend that same person from those who would trample upon his rights for corrupt or sinister motives.

Against this background, Mr. Speaker, let us examine The Bill of Rights in Alberta. The Bill of Rights that we passed during the fall session, and that was proclaimed on January 1 of this year, sets out inalienable rights in this province. In Alberta we are guaranteed freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom of association, freedom of the press, unless we are deprived of these rights by the due process of law.

Let's take a look at the facts, or at least as much as we can ascertain, of the Slave Lake case. In the first place, had there been any evidence at all, Mr. Speaker, that any of the three men had either broken a law or were suspected on reasonable grounds to have broken a law, no one could have taken issue with the investigation.

Mr. Speaker, there is no evidence to suggest that any of these three men broke a federal law, a provincial law or even broke a municipal ordinance. Nor is there any evidence to suggest that they were suspected on reasonable grounds to have broken a law.

In the second place, the February 1 press release of the hon. the Attorney General refers to these investigations as background checks. But again we have got to ask ourselves, "Why these three individuals?" I listened to the answer of the hon. Minister without Portfolio Responsible for Northern Development and Native Affairs today, and I must confess that his answers are no more satisfactory today than they were on national television three weeks ago.

Why were these three people singled out for this investigation? Why was a background check obtained on Mr. Thomas, for example, and not on the local town council members that he was charging with a conflict of interest? Why was a background check obtained on Mr. Burger, and not on the businessmen and civil servants he was charging with centralizing the benefits of the entire special area program in the Town of Slave Lake? Why was a background check obtained on Mr. Griesbach, and not on the Department of Lands and Forests people that he was quarrelling with?

Until the government can provide answers to these questions, many people in this province, and I suspect the majority of Albertans, will continue to contend that a breach of The Bill of Rights has, in fact, taken place.

In the third place, the hon. the Attorney General stated in his February 1 press release that the government proposed to spend a large amount of money in the area, and that therefore background checks were necessary. But does this mean that background checks are obtained by the government on controversial Albertans in every part of the province where large amounts of money are spent? If this is indeed so, we are going to be doing a lot of checking on individual Albertans, because we spend \$1 1/3 billion annually in this province.

More important, what happens to these checks once they are completed? What happens to the files? Are they kept in government departments? Are they allowed to poison the attitudes of future civil servants, and even future cabinet ministers? What happens if a background check quite incorrectly labels

someone as a trouble maker? Does he have any right to find out what his file says? Does he have any right to clear the record?

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the whole question of background checks, in my judgment, is more frightening than the very question of the RCMP investigation in the first place.

It seems to me that the government must clearly state what its policy is with respect to background checks. Albertans should know what rights they are entitled to in order to find out what the government has in the files, because, as we all know, a file containing derogatory information can so easily prejudice the relations between an individual Albertan and his government for some time.

There are other troublesome questions that have to be answered as well. One might be able to justify some form of character reference on these three people. Were they applying for a government job, or were they tendering on an important government contract, or were they being considered for appointment to a high office of public trust, or even were they running a concern that was seeking some kind of subsidy or grant from the government? To my knowledge, at least, none of these three people were asking for a job, tendering on a contract, or being considered for appointment to a position of public trust. And so, again and again, Mr. Speaker, the question arises, why were these three people singled out for background checks, or investigations, or whatever you want to call it?

One of the most disturbing aspects of this entire case concerns the manner in which Mr. Thomas, the publisher of the local paper in Slave Lake, found out that a background check was being conducted into his life. Mr. Thomas depends for his livelihood, as all local newspaper publishers depend, on the sale of advertising. I listened very carefully to the hon. the Attorney General when he answered my question today, and he pointed out that the confidentiality of files is very important to this government. But I should point out, for the record, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Thomas found out that a background study was being conducted on him, not from the Attorney General who advised him of that, but rather from a local advertiser who came into his office and said that rumours had been sweeping around town that "you are being investigated by the RCMP." Well, Mr. Speaker, I need hardly say, in a chamber composed of 74 free enterprisers, that it hardly does things for your business to have it rumoured around that you are being investigated by the RCMP.

I'd like to know how that leak occurred. I think that either the Attorney General or the Minister Without Portfolio Responsible for Northern Development and Native Affairs should tell us how it occurred. Because if this kind of thing is going to happen again, are people to be victimized by rumours whenever a background check is conducted on them? It isn't good enough, Mr. Speaker, to sort of fob this question off and say, "Oh well, small towns will be small towns. Gossip is gossip -- we're above this sort of thing." The fact of the matter is that when these investigations were being conducted; somehow that information leaked out and did a great deal of damage to three Albertans. It is not a good enough excuse for any member of this Legislature to hide the fact that these people have been offended, and their rights in many respects eroded because of the rumours that took place. One can't talk about confidentiality on one hand, and justify by inaction the invasion of privacy caused by common gossip, especially, as the evidence would seem to indicate that this gossip originated from civil service quarters.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there is the role of the RCMP in the whole affair. Clearly the force should not be used in the future for this sort of information gathering. I don't think that any member of the Assembly would argue that particular point, and indeed, both the Attorney General and the minister in question made it quite clear, when they publicly apologized, that the RCMP should not have been used in gathering the information.

But I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that all the correspondence relating to this matter be tabled so that members might ascertain whether the security checks were, in fact, authorized by the agreement that we have with the federal government over the use of the RCMP.

Mr. Speaker, where does all this leave us? Unless the government can supply additional answers to the questions that have been posed, not just by me, but posed by students at the University of Alberta law faculty, posed by people in the North, posed by other members of the Legislature, posed by thousands of Albertans who are concerned about civil liberties, then I say that most Albertans will come to the conclusion that there was, in fact, a violation of The Bill of Rights.

And I repeat in the Legislature what I said in the press. The ball is now in the Premier's court. The Premier introduced The Alberta Bill of Rights; the members of this Legislature quite properly supported that Bill of Rights, voted for it unanimously, both in the spring session and also when it was given third reading this fall. It is important, if his credibility on this matter is to continue, that he deal promptly and firmly with the question. The public apology of both ministers confirms the fact that they are gentlemen. That is not a question in this debate. But it does not answer the questions which have been raised. And as the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View pointed out, as an opposition we would be remiss in our duties if we did not insist that these questions were answered. But I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Premier himself will take the occasion of this debate to make a statement, a full and complete statement on the Slave Lake affair.

Sometimes the consequences of a bill of rights are minor. Sometimes just inconvenience is caused. But occasionally these consequences strike at the heart of accepted practices, and occasionally they may jeopardize the continued contribution of valued colleagues.

Last fall many members of the opposition side of the House had to reconcile the feelings of their constituents against repeal of The Communal Property Act on one hand, against the provisions of The Alberta Bill of Rights on the other. In many ways, Mr. Speaker, the repeal of The Communal Property Act marked the Rubicon for the opposition on the Bill of Rights question.

I submit, and I say this very respectfully, that in many respects Slave Lake marks the Rubicon for the government. If the government cannot answer the questions raised, it must not assume that the public apologies will suffice. We politicians, regardless of our political stripe, are creatures of precedent. If a minister can breach the Bill of Rights one day, then apologize the next and all is forgotten, then the Bill of Rights will degenerate into little more than puffy rhetoric, which will earn the scorn, rather than command the respect of Albertans.

So I close, Mr. Speaker, by once again throwing the challenge on this matter to the hon. the Premier. If he can prove and demonstrate clearly beyond all doubt in this Legislature that, despite all the circumstantial evidence to the contrary, there was in fact no violation of The Alberta Bill of Rights, then Albertans of all political persuasion will, I am sure, be glad to let the matter drop. But if he chooses to consider the wilfully inadequate answers to date to be acceptable, then my demand for the resignation of the two ministers and the demand of the opposition for a judicial inquiry will be strengthened by many more voices who, until now, have been waiting for their Premier's response on this vital issue.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, The Alberta Bill of Rights passed last year is to be a primary piece of legislation. Its provisions must be upheld, and if there has been a violation of those provisions, then the Premier must act quickly and firmly. But in this debate it is vital that a full statement of his position on the Slave Lake incident be made.

MR. BARTON:

I, too, would like to speak to the amendment on the human rights issue, but maybe from another point of view, a point of view from a town that was torn apart by accusations, a town where these accusations have never been proven in the law but by the power of the press. Mr. Thomas had accused the councillors of conflict of interest; today none of these charges have been proven in court. I do not think there ever was a conflict of interest. It reminds me of a family party where you go out and have a pretty good time. But you say a few things to get at your relatives and these things get carried away, and they become headlines in the weekly paper.

This has torn apart a community, a community that had spirit, that worked for seven and a half years to get the program that they have today. During those seven and a half years, I have worked with many people within this constituency who put many hours, much devoted time for the betterment of our area and the people within our town. This is a human right, too. This is a right that, I think, the Bill of Rights has to protect in a way.

I am talking as a member of Lesser Slave Lake with mixed emotions. Some of the actions I personally do not agree with; some of the actions I do, because I am speaking for the people within my constituency who have, over the last 18 months, had a pretty rough time, trying to sort out the facts.

But the point is, there is one minister in this government on whom the responsibility solely falls, and he is the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. His leadership, his arrogance and his juvenile approach to the Lesser Slave Lake program has caused the hon. the Premier's situation today. He does not understand it, never will. His emissaries go to Ottawa; they pave the way; they come back. "We've made a deal." They are laughing -- believe me they are. He does not understand it and does not care to learn.

We have worked seven years. There are many problems in that. It's a powder keg. You walk with a program of that magnitude with very tender toes. The community starts from a small, small nucleus, and it has turned into a major centre now of 2,500 to 2,900. There have to be hard feelings. There have to be decisions made. But most of all, it was on January -- better get my notes so I don't get censored -- I think it was January 29, 1973, where he left another part of the human rights, a shadow of a doubt on the Human Resources Authority personnel, that there was a little bit of hanky-panky. If CBC can get away with it, I can too. Now that is a right that the civil servants of that particular organization should have cleared up. I'd like his comments as to what he meant by that. If any minister in this House takes 16 months to clear up a mess, regardless of what government made it, he should resign. Thank you.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make just a few remarks today in regard to the amendment that has been moved on behalf of the opposition by the hon. Member for Drumheller, and in particular, in regard to the portions in which, in his supporting remarks, he referred to responsibilities within the department of government that I hold.

Before proceeding to do that, I did want to congratulate the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View today, because in my period of sharing some of the same time with him in the House, up until the present time, he has frequently given the impression -- and I don't want to say, perhaps, unwittingly -- but the impression all the same, of being a very excitable speaker. Today his remarks were so restrained, and so well tempered as to their volume and the rate at which he spoke, that I thought that he did deserve some congratulation, even though it may only have appeared to be that way because of the excesses of the hon. Member for Drumheller, when he spoke.

The hon. Member for Drumheller had another fine day, again honing his prejudices to a fine sharp edge over the Hutterite issue. Mr. Speaker, I would surely be the last to deny, as I'm sure no hon. member would deny, that the matters of which he spoke in regard to the repeal of The Communal Property Act, and other matters related to the Hutterite question, are matters that are not free from difficulty. The difficulties for those who are most directly affected by them will perhaps still continue for some time in the future, although we expect them to become less.

What that issue needs, at the present time, in order to promote the best interests of this province, is not less understanding, and more attacks on the attempts that are being made to bring that particular legislation where it belongs, within the overall context of the civil rights of all mankind as declared in The Bill of Rights. What is required, of course, is a great deal of understanding and a great deal of patience on behalf of all of the people involved. When hon. members involve themselves in creating, if they can, greater difficulty for the difficult process that has yet to be carried out in regard to achieving the liaison which will be necessary between the people most directly affected, then that hon. member is not making a contribution to the solution of this difficult problem in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I must go on for just a moment, now, to the point on which I rose to speak. The hon. Member for Drumheller has made certain statements with regard to a gentleman he named, and in regard to the conduct of representatives, I gather, of the department, or of one of the provincial hospitals. The remarks he made are ones that no one could make without having gone into the matter fully and satisfied himself of the truth of the statements, and, without satisfying himself of the good faith of the gentleman whose case he was advocating today.

I have no comment to make, Mr. Speaker, on either of the gentlemen named or upon the manner in which the hon. Member for Drumheller brought the matter forward, except to say that clearly when such statements are made, the hon. member would know that every member of this House is going to feel a very deep concern that some miscarriage of a procedure has in fact taken place and that some wrong was done. The hon. Member for Drumheller certainly declared that a wrong had been done, if I interpreted his remarks correctly.

Because of that, Mr. Speaker, I thought that I would say that it is well known to hon. members that this province, as all provinces do not have, does have a special institution which is specifically designed for the inquiry into the possibility of abuse in the administration of government departments, and the people who are employed in provincial institutions. Of course I refer to the well known office of the Ombudsman whose role and office have been the subject of debate and discussion in the Legislature, and who reports to the Legislature from time to time in accordance with his statute.

Since I have, as I am sure every hon. member has, every bit as much desire to see the matter dealt with properly and fairly for the gentlemen concerned as has the hon. Member for Drumheller or anyone else in the House, I would like to suggest to both of them that they give consideration to taking the matter to the Ombudsman and relating the circumstances, if that has not already been done, directly to him.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, in the attitude of the government, regarding the steps that must be taken, and the great caution that must always be shown, to assure that the procedures under which the servants of government carry out their duties are performed fairly in every respect, then the assistance of my office and my officials will certainly be readily made available to the Ombudsman in any inquiry that he wishes to make. I say that to all hon. members, that they may, if they wish to pursue the matter, do so on that basis; do it in that context along with whatever other basis they may choose; at least do that so that if there is something that should be known and some recommendation that should be made by the Ombudsman after due inquiry, that can be done.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I just want to reiterate that I hope no hon. member will ever doubt that any member of this government, who holds the position that I now hold, in similar circumstances would want to say the same thing -- to say that the fairest and best assessment of it that can be made by such an independent party is what we, with everyone else, share in wanting.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all members have listened with more than, I hope, casual -- at least everyone on this side has -- with more than casual interest to this debate on this particular matter, because I think it is particularly significant to bring into rather sharp perspective the number of statements this government has made before coming into office and since coming into office.

I don't know whether everything has been said or not at this point in the debate, but I think one or two things are worth touching on again. I think the significance of the point, so often said about the courts, that justice must seem to be done as well as be done, is of major significance as far as The Alberta Bill of Human Rights is concerned.

I was somewhat relieved Mr. Speaker, to see one of the ministers opposite finally stand up and say a few words on this particular matter. Thus far in the debate all I witnessed was a rather casual disinterest in the proceedings before the House. After all the glowing statements made and the tremendous expectations created by the government and the Premier on The Bill of Human Rights, after we have witnessed what has happened in three or four instances since then, it brings into very sharp focus what the intentions of this government really are. They seem to be of the opinion that running around the country handing out parks, and raising home-owner grants and so on and so forth, is a sop which is supposed to alleviate public concern over some rather fundamental issues.

But it isn't the specific elements of the cases that have been mentioned thus far in this debate that are themselves in question. It isn't the question of the Hutterite legislation itself and the views of the Minister of Health and Social Development on the remarks of the Member for Drumheller. That is incidental to the basic issue -- the manner in which the government has chosen to completely ignore the spirit of their own Bill of Rights in the three cases that we have before us. I think it is quite a record for a government that has been in office for such a short time.

We also have to add the Craig case. There has been no satisfactory explanation forthcoming from the government as to what caused that particular debacle, one that has cast a lot of reflection on the reputation of the gentleman involved. I have no doubts that the gentlemen seated opposite are conscious of it.

But what bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is the attitude being displayed by this government today as compared to their actions in this House some two or three years ago when they were seated on this side: the tremendous change in their attitude that has taken place in the ensuing period of something like less than a year and a half. I think the members in the Assembly all know the incident to which we refer. I have to say quite frankly my reluctance to come out and make a political statement demanding the resignation of the ministers is based somewhat on that particular experience. I am amazed, Mr. Speaker, to sit here and listen to the studied silence of the Premier, and listen to his words outside this House and inside this House, to the effect that the apology of the ministers closes the issue. What on earth has happened to his thinking in the last two years? There is something fundamentally wrong when the government thinks that it can casually dismiss this matter.

We went through an exercise in here where we could have said when we were on that side, "We are not going to use our 55 to 10 majority to deny a thorough investigation and examination of the actions of the minister of the Crown" at that time. And I suggest now, to hear the Premier say that the apologies of the ministers suffice so far as he is concerned, dealing particularly with the matter of the RCMP and the Slave Lake incident, in my judgment is a far more serious matter than the question of welfare payments to a citizen of this province.

When I contrast the action now with the action in that particular case, obviously, Mr. Speaker, there is a serious question of credibility that this government has to answer for. They seem to be of the opinion, and I can only conclude this is the infusion of the legalistic brains into the government side of the House, that they can play games with the spirit and intent of legislation such as this -- as long as they don't violate the letter of the law, they should be immune. As other speakers have said, it is up to the individual citizen himself; he has to adhere to the letter of the law.

I haven't really felt that pursuing a vendetta against the two ministers would accomplish any particular end, and I still don't, Mr. Speaker. When we introduced a motion for an urgency debate in this House last week the only thing that I really hoped we could accomplish would be to bring the contract relative to the operation of the RCMP in the province before a Committee of the Whole Assembly, and simply see that some nominal clause is inserted into that particular contract to assure that this type of thing isn't going to happen again.

The RCMP should be allowed some discretion so that they are not put in the embarrassing position that developed in this particular case. I think it has been a significant embarrassment to the RCMP and, unlike the gentlemen seated opposite and the hon. Premier, they can't go on TV, issue a press release or stand up and say that the hon. ministers have apologized and that is the end of it. If it were one incident by itself we might be able to let it pass, but when we look at the four incidents that have come to light I think the average person in Alberta must be wondering how many more of these incidents took place in the last 14 or 18 months that he did not hear about.

I had hoped that last week we could have simply gone into committee and that one could have had a rule about the arguments. There was nothing to preclude this House going into Committee of the Whole and examining the contract. If, in its wisdom, the Legislature felt that some action was necessary, they would put something in the contract to assure the people of Alberta that the police forces of this province are not going to be used for political purposes.

Though I haven't heard it said publicly, I've heard it on the grapevine that the only offence the gentlemen of Slave Lake committed was belonging to the wrong political party. I don't know if that is right or not. I don't know if they belong to the Social Credit Party -- I haven't checked -- but I assumed they meant the NDP. I don't know if that is right. The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview did not elaborate on that point, but as far as I can see that is the only possible connotation one could attach to the investigation -- they belonged to the wrong political party. So the action of the government has to be called into question in this regard.

Notwithstanding the comments about the desire of the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development to see justice done, the procedure followed in incarcerating a citizen of this province in a mental institution under the guise of a piece of legislation -- a legalistic manoeuvre simply to, I gather, get rid of the gentleman who is making a nuisance of himself with some of the ministers -- is also completely unacceptable, as is the suggestion that the thing be swept

under the rug by passing a hot potato to the Ombudsman. Obviously, this is not good enough.

I'm surprised at the gentlemen seated opposite, particularly when it comes to this last incident, the incarceration of a citizen in a mental institution, because he is a nuisance to the province. I'm surprised that, in their wisdom and presumably their background in public life, they are not able to have a better appreciation of this.

Mr. Speaker, I recall one instance when I came into my office and saw a gentleman sitting there in a rather beaten-up coat and hat and with a sizeable coil of yellow propylene rope in his hand. I walked by into my own office, called my executive assistant in and said, "What does the gentleman out there want?" He was going to hang the Minister of Health and Social Development because the minister deprived him of the labour of his sons on his farm when his wife left him. If the government didn't pay them welfare he wouldn't have a labour problem. In his mind the interest of justice would be served if he simply disposed of the minister responsible.

It sounds funny and quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I treated his levity by telling my executive assistant to direct him to Health and Social Development across the hall because that wasn't my responsibility. But can you contrast that particular exercise with this particular exercise?

I don't mention this just in the interest of levity, but as an example where a citizen of this province, in a free and democratic society, who believes that he has a complaint about an injustice, is treated in such a manner. I think the record of the government over the last few months has indeed been dismal, and it certainly would have been a miscarriage of responsibility of the opposition members of this House if we did not introduce a motion of non-confidence to bring this matter to the public's attention, particularly when the Throne Speech itself was nothing but a re-hash of old press releases.

This is what bothered me to no end on Friday, having the matter treated so lightly. There is a need for an urgent debate. The rehashing of old press clippings, press releases, and campaign promises, was more important than an objective analysis of these particular issues.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the whole Bill of Rights, upon which this government built such hopes and aspirations for the people of the province, was going to be a tool of tremendous use towards the achievement of elementary social justice to the people of this province...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. This is the second time in this debate that reference has been made to the fact that the request under Rule 23 last Friday was denied. I think that for the record it should be stated this was done on the responsibility of the Speaker rather than on the responsibility of anyone in the House because there was no vote on it.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, if I have in any way cast any reflections upon your judgment I retract them. My comments were primarily directed to the gentleman seated opposite in the front row who spoke on the particular motion. We accepted the decision and I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that it is not out of order simply to state at this time what we hoped to have achieved because this exercise would have been avoided, and I hope something practical accomplished.

But, Mr. Speaker, I simply rose saying that I in no way want to go through the details of the four incidents for which this government has to answer to the people of Alberta. Previous speakers have dealt adequately with them.

I simply close in saying Mr. Speaker, the casual indifference of many of the members seated opposite, the attitude and actions of the government, and in particular of the Premier of the Province of Alberta on this matter, contrast very sharply with actions and statements of the gentlemen seated opposite prior to election to office, and in the House during the last session when The Alberta Bill of Rights was under debate. I think it is incumbent upon them in their wisdom to make it evident to the people of Alberta that the Bill of Human Rights of the Province of Alberta is going to be adhered to in its current intent by the government itself above and before everybody else.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I move adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. the Attorney General leave to adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER:

It has been recommended by the hon. Government House Leader that we call it 5:30. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the motion by the hon. Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[The House rose at 5:23 o'clock.]