

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Friday, November 17, 1972

[The House met at 1:00 pm.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Agri-mart Site

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last you informed me in the House that the petition which I filed before the House the previous day was, in fact, addressed to the Government of Alberta rather than to this legislature. Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with your interpretation in this regard; in fact, I concur. Nevertheless, I feel that we, as responsible members of this House, should not overlook and treat lightly the sincere intentions of the signatories whose names are attached to the said petition, and that the intention is, of course, to lodge before the legislature, as well as the government, legitimate concerns on the matter of the Agri-mart proposal.

I therefore subscribe to your suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that this petition should be, in fact, lodged with the government. Since the subject, however, has been discussed on numerous occasions before this House, I therefore ask, Mr. Speaker, if I might, through the courtesy of your office, bring to the attention of the government, as well as to the hon. members of this legislature as soon as possible, the concerns of the people. May I, sir, follow your suggestion and table this for the government's consideration.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. member would like to --

MR. HO LEM:

I did hear agreement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

All right. I'll see that it is passed on to the government.

November 17, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

77-29

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. DOAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to the hon. members of this assembly, 50 students from West Park Junior High School in Red Deer. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Ray Brown, and Mrs. Phyllis Anderson, and they are seated in the public gallery. I would commend these students for taking time off to attend the procedures here today. I would now ask them to stand and be recognized by the assembly.

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to introduce to you and through you to the hon. members of this House a prominent couple from my constituency of Bow Valley. They have been up here attending our municipal convention. They are Louise and Tom Musgrove. Tom Musgrove is Reeve of the County of Newell. They are in your gallery, Mr. Speaker, and I would like them to rise and be recognized.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure once more in introducing to you and to the members of the assembly a group of students from the Alberta School for the Deaf, Edmonton. Today they are accompanied by their interpreter, Mrs. Ryan, and three or four other teachers, including deaf teachers, who came along. The classes represented today are parts of classes A, B, and C, as well, I believe, as classes F, and G. I just wanted to say to them, Mr. Speaker, that we very much appreciate the interest they are showing in the democratic process by coming here today, and in particular to express our admiration for them with the difficulty they have in hearing our proceedings, in attending and still showing their interest. I would ask them to rise now in the gallery and be recognized.

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce 50 students from the Rose constituency. These students attend the Camrose Composite High School, and their teacher, Mr. Bob McLean is with them. They are seated in the members' gallery and I would ask them to stand please.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Farming Incentives

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Is the government, through their Farm Purchase Credit Board, making loans available to non-farmers?

DR. HORNER:

Part of the program, as I think I have mentioned, is to make loans to part-time farmers, but not to non-farmers.

MR. STROM:

. . . owning some land, or do they have to own any land at all? What I am really concerned about, if I can pose the second part of my question to the hon. minister, does the minister feel that there should be encouragement to get more people into farming at the present time? I think this is really my concern.

DR. HORNER:

This is our objective, Mr. Speaker, to get more people into farming, particularly in a younger age group. As the hon. Leader of the Opposition I'm sure is aware, the rising average age of farmers in Alberta has been of some concern to us, and so we decided, in setting up the regulations, that we would make a particular effort to include those people who were considered prior to this as part-time farmers. We are, quite frankly, hopeful that through our programs we can develop them into full-time farmers and so set up some incentive that this is, in fact, what will happen. I'm sure that I don't need to say to anybody in the House that when a province like Alberta continues to import such things as dairy products, we have to take every measure we can in a variety of ways to increase the number of young people coming into farming.

77-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 17th 1972

---

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Does the hon. minister then feel that it is necessary to bring more into farming, or is there a problem related to getting help to farmers who are presently there? I'd be interested in his comments on this.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I think there are two problems really there. Question No. 1, of getting people into farming, and more particularly of keeping our young farmers on the farm, particularly those who are living on farms as sons of our present farmers. In relation to that, we are developing additional programs for our young people on the farm. I hope to be able to make some announcement about that when it is finalized, after further discussions with my colleague in Culture, Youth and Recreation.

In relation to finding help for farmers, one of the programs that is being developed under the PEP Program, as the Minister of Labour and Manpower has said, is the retraining or the apprenticeship idea in agriculture. We are also tying this into our concerns with regard to the native co-operatives and their activities in agriculture.

My colleague, the hon. minister in charge, Mr. Adair and I had some discussions and we are going to make a very active attempt this winter in the apprenticeship programs, both under the federal manpower program and under our own manpower program to bring more of our native people into apprenticeship positions in which part of the wages that the farmer will pay are taken up by the governments at either level under these programs. This will give some of these people some training in the agricultural pursuits. As I have said, this not only applies to our native people but to other people generally. We are continuing to work in my own department under an expanded manpower policy, and with the Minister of Manpower and Labour, in developing more closely apprenticeship programs for the specialties that are in agriculture -- a variety of programs to do just what I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition is suggesting -- more input of manpower into the agricultural industry.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a last supplementary question. Is there a classification as far as the terms that are applied for those seeking loans? In other words, is it the same to everyone or are there different terms arranged for the borrowers?

DR. HORNER:

At the moment, Mr. Speaker, the interest rate is higher for the part-time farmer, but this would automatically go down to the 7 per cent rate as soon as he starts to receive more than 50 per cent of his income from his farming operation.

Agricultural Development Corporation

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister advise the House whether all the agricultural development committees have been appointed as yet?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker as of Wednesday morning at 9:00, all of the agricultural development committees have been appointed; orientation meetings are taking place now. There is one in Morinville this afternoon in relation to, I think, eight of the different committees in that particular area. These orientation meetings are going on for the balance of this week and next week and they will be fully operative within a matter of a couple of weeks.

MR. NOTLEY:

One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Just by way of explanation, the minister will recall that last spring I raised the concern of the number of farmers in the Manning area who were asking for a moratorium on farm debts. One of the points you made was you felt that the agricultural development fund could be used to refinance these debts. My question to you is, can you report any progress as yet on refinancing some of these mortgages held by federal farm credit?

November 17, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

77-31

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have already done some refinancing through the acting board of directors of the Agricultural Development Corporation. We have had good co-operation with farm credit in relation to refinancing the general credit situation of farmers. We will be continuing to do this and I hope that in addition, as the hon. member knows, the part of the program for this winter is a meeting with the financial institutions which is set for next week in relation to the crop damage that has happened in that area for the coming year. We are also making available rehabilitation loans in a variety of programs. We hope to have finalized the entire package by the middle of next week.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The last 'supplementary' which the hon. minister answered was definitely not a supplementary. The mere fact that the Minister of Agriculture is answering a question as originally put by the hon. Leader of the Opposition does not mean that any question regarding agriculture is a supplementary.

The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Livestock Pavilion - Calgary

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Mr. Minister, is there anything more you can do to stop the intrusion of a livestock sales pavilion close to the residential district of Calgary McCall? In view of newspaper reports, the developers are hanging tough despite the government's generous offer of relocation.

MR. YURKO:

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are many things that the government can do but it also must be recognized that business people who, in all honesty, are proposing business enterprises must be given a fair hearing. The Agrimart people of course, have approached the department and spent a day with the department to convince the department that they should in fact get the necessary permits and licences under The Clean Air Act. This is an attempt to get licences and permits on a purely technical basis with respect to meeting our requirements for air pollution and odour pollution. I do not want to indicate at this time whether the Agrimart will meet or comply with the requirements under The Clean Air Act; however I do want to suggest that under The Department of the Environment Act, the government, through the Minister of the Environment, is responsible for environmental matters in total, rather than just the specific element of clean air.

Agrimart Site

Under section 12 of The Department of the Environment Act, the minister can recommend to the government that a project which involves complications in the total environment including possibly such matters as transportation, future considerations with respect to odours, air pollution, water pollution, aesthetics, and so forth, should not proceed. And it is my intention in this regard to give very serious consideration to the possibility of recommending to government after the Agrimart officials have had a fair hearing that this project not be located where it is because of total environmental considerations.

MR. DIXON:

I have a question, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my question regarding this same problem because I think the hon. minister will probably come in as a last resort. My question is, I would be interested in knowing what was the actual proposal that the Government of Alberta gave the Agrimart officials, apparently just as clarification following up from the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill's question. Apparently it seems that the site at Airdrie would not be available in time. So I wonder if you would enlighten the House on what was the actual proposal, and has the government any further proposal to give them before we call in the Minister of the Environment to close down the operation?

77-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 17th 1972

---

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, a very attractive proposal has been placed before the Agrimart people and notwithstanding yesterday's announcement I am still of the mind that they have it under consideration, and that is to participate in the development of the new agricultural industrial park adjacent to Airdrie.

I met two days ago with officials and some of the directors of Agrimart. We went over maps of the area, showed them what the raw land costs would be, indicated when our option period expired, and told them that I would be delivering further details to them with respect to the servicing costs to the site. They told me they were interested in receiving the servicing cost details and I can understand their situation. They have got a case before the court, they have got a site that needs to be settled; they have a site in Calgary, and they are proceeding with that application as per the way the Minister of the Environment outlined. In the meantime they are still asking us to supply further information with respect to the Airdrie site, and that is what we are doing.

MR. DIXON:

One further supplemental question to the minister. Has the government indicated to Agrimart that, if they did change, they would work in co-operation with the city to reimburse them for any expenditures that they have made up to date on the present Calgary site?

MR. RUSSELL:

There has been no indication given of that kind, Mr. Speaker. I think the City of Calgary has discussed the possibility of purchasing the site from them, but as I understand it there are two costs involved, (1) the actual cost to Agrimart of the site, and (2) their actual investment to date which includes all sorts of things like the development work they have already done on the site, their legal costs and all sorts of other things. I think the two parties are talking about two different sets of figures, but it is my understanding that the City of Calgary, at least once, had considered the possibility of helping take the one site off their hands if they were to move to another site.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

University of Calgary

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the hon. Deputy Premier. Has the government changed its position on a University of Calgary law faculty?

DR. HORNER:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WILSON:

Is the government intervening in the dispute regarding financial support for the final year in the four-year-term Arts and Science program?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, now the hon. member is starting to talk about detailed administrative things that are the responsibility of my colleague in Advanced Education, and I suggest that we will take them as notice and the hon. Minister of Advanced Education will reply.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the question is a true supplementary, then it must be so closely connected to its predecessor that it would also require attention from the hon. Minister of Advanced Education.

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican, followed by the hon. Member for Vegreville.

November 17, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

77-31

Rundle Lodge, Calgary

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. the Deputy Premier. Yesterday when I questioned the hon. Minister of Youth, Culture and Recreation he promised the House that he would bring in the report on the Rundle Lodge situation in Calgary. I was wondering if someone from the front bench was going to table that report today because a lot of people are anxious to hear about it.

MR. HYNDMAN:

The hon. minister spoke to me and mentioned that he would not be in the House until about 2 o'clock, but at that time he wished to revert to Tabling of Reports. We will do that and he will table the report at that time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vegreville, followed by the hon. Member for Camrose.

Municipal Waste Disposal

MR. BATIUK:

I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Environment whether he is considering any assistance to the smaller urban municipalities who are burdened with the acquisition of land for the solid waste disposal?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable difficulty on the part of municipalities to acquire land for such things as land fill sites, sewage disposal systems and even water plants, as well as water sources. My department, in connection with the Department of Municipal Affairs is giving some serious consideration and examination to the study or the possibility of whether or not government could involve itself in the purchasing of land for such purposes, either on behalf of the municipalities or, in addition to that, through some type of assistance whereby some government input of funds could actually be projected in this direction.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Camrose, followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River Fairview.

Rural School Committees

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is your department giving consideration to the imbalance of representation on school committees by towns and villages in my constituency?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I believe that is a question that applies to most rural constituencies, especially those that are involved with the county system of government. The hon. Minister of Education and myself are, of course, considering possible amendments to The County Act for an early future session of the legislature to deal with the problem that the hon. member raised.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West.

Automobile Insurance Board

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Attorney General. Can the hon. Attorney General advise the House whether the Alberta Automobile Insurance Board is, in fact, operational, or has it ceased to function?

77-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 17th 1972

MR. LEITCH:

It is optional, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Are complaints regarding insurance rates dealt with directly by the board, or alternatively by the supervisor of insurance?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, it would depend on the nature of the complaint.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the hon. Attorney General advise the House whether any insurance rate by any company was, in fact, reduced because of the operations of the insurance board?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I believe I indicated the other day that that's an item I want to check. I suggest the hon. member put it on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge West followed by the hon. Member for --

PEP Program - Lethbridge

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. It is regarding the PEP program and more specifically the Lethbridge Community College as it is affected. The last year -- I just need a little bit of latitude, Mr. Speaker -- the PEP program at Lethbridge was without a doubt the most widely accepted of any in the province with 757 students being enrolled there with a budget implication of approximately \$700,000. Now the problem is this; this year I understand from the president that the budget implications from the government will be about \$165,000 only, which will satisfy less than 130 students and there are about 500 --

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. Member please get to --

MR. GRUENWALD:

Right on, Mr. Speaker, you just caught me in time! This will give the hon. minister a chance to formulate his answer as well. Will the minister consider reopening negotiations for further financial assistance to satisfy approximately 500 unsatisfied applications for the Lethbridge Community College for PEP program?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the question is a happy one, a proper one. As you recall, sir, in the report on the PEP program we spoke of training, retraining and upgrading as a major priority of government. Now what happened last year was that there was an allocation of about \$640,000 to the Lethbridge College, and it is happily true that most colleges, particularly this one, did an amazingly excellent job of responding to the applicants for training. A major criterion, Mr. Speaker, with respect to allocation of funds for this year's program, is the state of unemployment in a particular community.

Lethbridge, if not the least unemployed area -- this is a happy circumstance -- is certainly one of the areas with the least unemployment in Alberta. This is one of the factors. So last year's money in Lethbridge of \$640,000 trained, I believe, 693 people. Our report for the college this year is that there are approximately 150 applicants, and with an allocation of funds of \$170,000. This seems to be consistent with the number of applicants. However, I will certainly review the situation; the gentleman from Lethbridge asked would we consider it? Certainly, within the limits of budget, which at the present time is \$1 million for training and retraining. Within the

November 17, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

77-35

circumstances of unemployment in Lethbridge and other areas, we will certainly look at it.

Let me mention just one thing that will be of interest to the hon. Member for Lethbridge. We get many calls from across the province to try to get help for job openings. The representative for a particular trailer industry in Lethbridge was in our office two weeks ago, asking for assistance to get 500 workers to assist in the trailer industry. I might point out that there are a total of 1,500 vacancies in the trailer industry, one-third of them in Lethbridge, two-thirds elsewhere in the province. We are meeting with representatives of the trailer companies next week to see what we can do to assist in that particular circumstance. But I will, sir, review the college training circumstance as requested, and report back to the member.

If you will let me, I would like to suggest that possibly every one might take a look at the employment and unemployment circumstances in their own constituencies and give the information to me, so that we can keep our finger as close to the situation as we can.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is there any evidence that registration in the other normal training courses at NAIT and SAIT is down as a result of the PEP program? The difference is that in the fall courses, Mr. Minister, you have to pay for your enrolment fees and so on, whereas when you register in January it is free and you also get paid for going to school.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, this is a problem and a real one. However, the criteria for entry into regular programs and updating programs are quite different. The unhappiness comes when sometimes the updating program can be taken as a unit of a regular program and then two people can be sitting side-by-side, one paying the full fee from January on, and the other one getting paid by the government.

The other factor is that in most cases, fairly and squarely, the people who are in throughout the whole year are likely in for a one, two, or three-year program, and are from homes and families that can meet the fee requirements without too much discomfort. They also have the academic qualifications to enter into a long-term program, while the unemployed don't have to meet the institutional academic requirements for enrolment on long-term attendance. They are there for a short time. But it is true that sometimes the same unit satisfies both requirements and therein lies that very human problem. We have talked to parents who have been affected by this and they're unhappy about it. We're trying to work this out as best we can.

MR. HENDERSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder, in view of the statements that the hon. minister has made about the employment opportunities in one industry, namely the trailer manufacturing industry, what on earth are we doing talking about spending \$5 million on a winter unemployment program? Would the hon. minister please comment on it? The statements seem to be completely contradictory.

HON. MEMBERS:

Order, order!

DR. HOHOL:

No, I would like to comment, sir, if you will let me. The matter of unemployment is a complex (I'm finding out) kind of business. You can have a feast by having over-employment in one kind of industry and under-employment in another. It could be that we have to have training programs for some who are unemployed who simply haven't the skills to work in the trailer industry. It is just a complex business. You can have 500 people unemployed in an area and have 500 jobs and maybe fill only 100, because the people haven't got the skills or competence that those particular vacancies require.

It goes back to the major point I was trying to make in the PEP report; that is, we have to, on a long-term basis, get an inventory of the kinds of jobs we will need in the next five or ten years and then work with colleges, high schools, and other training institutions, indeed the universities, to make sure that we rationalize these two kinds of needs and these two kinds of supplies. We have never done it. It seems to be against the ideal of the North American



77-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 17th 1972

approach to freedom to choose an occupation for which we know there will be no work, while there are others that go begging. So it is more in this area than the easier assumption that if you have 500 people unemployed and 500 vacancies you can reach a zero circumstance.

MR. HENDERSON:

May I ask a supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary? We have spent a good deal of time on this subject considering the lengthy answers that were required. We have a number waiting to ask questions?

MR. HENDERSON:

Did I gather I could ask this last question, Mr. Speaker? I think it is significant as a matter of public policy, Mr. Speaker. In light of what the hon. minister said -- and I realize the problems that exist -- doesn't it seem more logical that instead of using public money to create artificially employment opportunities for the unskilled worker, that the initiative should go in through Manpower to upgrade the skill of these people? Would the money not be better spent in that direction?

DR. HOHOL:

On the face of it, one might feel that way. The record doesn't bear it out, though. One of the interesting things about the Lethbridge application is that a large number are applying for the second round and I think this is very, very important. When a person applies for upgrading once, it may be a desperation choice. He has no job anyway, he might just as well improve himself. But if he finds the program useful and usable in terms of his life career plans, and comes back for a second round in the same area to reach a higher level of competence, I think you really have something. On the face of it you might say yes, but the fact of the matter is that it doesn't work that way because the Canada Manpower Program works from the base of the employer's need to fill a specific single job, or any number of jobs, using a 'slip approach' to get out to try to get them. The training program is quite unrelated, in most cases, to a person's long-term life career. What we are trying to do is to synchronize a person's aspirations, his background, his ability, to the kinds of things that we know Alberta will need down the line. So, yes, but it doesn't seem to work that way.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Slave Lake, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo.

#### Tax Recovery Sales

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Through fall and winter of last year I understand you negotiated a welcome freeze on the sale of northern farm property for tax recovery purposes. Was this freeze given difficulty, or are the northern farmers still under this effect?

DR. HORNER:

According to the statute, Mr. Speaker, we can only put off the recovery sale for a certain length of time. With the very able co-operation of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, we were able to help the farmers in northern Alberta last year. We are going to be asking the Minister of Municipal Affairs to co-operate with us again this year. The net effect was that it gave our farmers more time to help to bring their arrears into line, and it generally worked well.

MR. BARTON:

Supplementary question. Is it true then that the government is supporting the sale of 117 parcels in the Smoky River area?

November 17, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

77-37

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the local officials have to go through the process of putting these up for sale in that sense. But the final approval has to come from the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and this has been delayed and will be delayed again this year.

MR. BARTON:

Supplementary then. I understand you are looking into it and it will be extended.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, we are looking into these matters that relate to the farmers of Alberta, all over Alberta, all the time.

MR. RUSSELL:

I'd like to add to that, because the hon. member brought up quite an important item. We did delay the tax recovery sale -- the last possible date for advertising last year in the area the member is talking about -- and I was pleased that of more than, I believe, 600 parcels that were to go to tax recovery procedures, by delaying sale till the last possible minute, about 50 per cent of the parcels involved were able to make up their taxes. We've done the same thing again this year in the same area, and it's a gamble on weather and on crops, but hopefully it will help the farmers.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona.

Canadian Football League

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. My question arises out of reports to the effect that the very nature of a uniquely Canadian institution, the Canadian Football League, is in jeopardy. Can the hon. minister enlighten the House as to whether or not there is any truth to the report that four eastern professional football teams in Canada wish to expand the Canadian Football League to include American teams?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, while this is something that governments don't normally get particularly involved in, there was and is a disturbing situation that has been brought to the attention of the government by the football organizations in Alberta. For a little background; they have been faced, in fact, by an ultimatum from the eastern part of the Canadian Football League to agree to expanding into the United States. The teams that have been mentioned have been New York; Tampa, Florida; Birmingham, Alabama; and Detroit. Mr. Speaker, the concern of the Western Football League teams was, how do they fight this? Would the government support them, and must they be faced with, for instance, the prospects of the Grey Cup being played in Tampa, Florida? Would the Tampa team, or a Birmingham team really want to play Canadian rules? Would they agree to have 17 or 18 Canadian football players? Could they even find those players? Would they wish to change the rules to American rules? When you consider those possibilities, I think, Mr. Speaker, you could see that it would become probably the beginning of the end of the Canadian Football League as we now know it. It certainly would cause terrific damage to the possibilities of Calgary, Edmonton and Regina to participate in that league and would be, I think, something we would hate to see happen.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member who asked the question might have his supplementary, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View and then the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

MR. GHITTER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the hon. minister. I don't particularly want to see our Grey Cup Game played in Tampa, Florida between American teams. Would the hon. minister undertake to communicate with other governments in Canada to

77-38

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 17th 1972

determine whether or not something can be done to ensure that this uniquely Canadian institution will remain that way?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this matter with our Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation and the Premier when it was brought to our attention. The government happens to think that the Canadian Football League is a unique part of Canada. It contributes in its own way to Canadian unity. We think the Grey Cup event is a particularly Canadian event.

So, Mr. Speaker, when this information was brought to our attention, we contacted the Premiers of each of the provinces that have Canadian Football League teams. We have contacted the federal government; we have asked them to bring the influence and prestige of their offices to discourage this expansion.

We think the Canadian Football League is on the verge of tremendous success within our country. There are people with considerably more dollars and time for leisure activities; there are new stadiums being built, and therefore we think that really the league could expand into such places as Halifax and Quebec City and not need to expand into the United States. We believe that the reasons for expansion are, in most cases, money. We don't think everything in Canada should be for sale to the United States. We think, Mr. Speaker, that we can marshal the support of governments. It has been our assessment over the last year that the leaders in Canada are strong Canadians and will support the Canadian Football League.

The other area of support has to be the public. I am pleased that this is now no longer necessary to be treated in confidence, and I am hoping that the public of Canada does exert pressure themselves because I hope that this expansion can be killed as quickly as possible.

MR. LUDWIG:

A supplementary to the hon. minister in view of his remarks. Is it true that Canadian football is by and large a commercial venture, and also by and large staffed by American players?

MR. SPEAKER:

We have gone a long way in using the question period. Now we are going to get a 'sporting' opinion from the minister. I think we had better get the supplementary from the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

MR. LUDWIG:

... by the hon. minister. I fail to see the reason for this question being ruled out except that the minister probably caught himself in his own speech.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would like a defence of the Canadian Football League as an unique part of Canada, I think it is. I think while it has influence from the Americans to the south of us, Mr. Speaker, I hope we can resist it always. I was disappointed when they removed one Canadian player from their rosters without a ripple of interference --

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. Member for Clover Bar a supplementary?

DR. BUCK:

In view of the fact that the MLA in Quebec comes out of retirement, is the hon. minister considering coming out of retirement if the league is expanded?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

November 17, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

77-39

Institute of Law Research and Reform

MR. KOZIAK:

I have a question to the hon. the Attorney General. In the spring session I inquired about the report of the Institute of Law Research and Reform on expropriation and expropriation procedures. I wonder if that report has now been completed and submitted to you, and if not, has the Institute given you any indication of when they hope or expect to complete the report?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, when I spoke to the Institute about that matter in the spring, they advised me that they expected to have a report in my hands by the end of this year.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View followed by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc.

Impaired Drivers on Highways

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question, I believe to to the Minister of Highways and if not, then to the hon. the Attorney General. Recently in Calgary the program of dealing with impaired drivers and drunken drivers has been stepped up considerably with apparent success. They have been arresting a great many more impaired drivers than previously. Has any corresponding action been taken with regard to the highways patrol?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated during the spring session, the problem of the impaired driver on the highway is one that we regard very, very seriously and there isn't very much doubt that they contribute to a very substantial number of accidents within the province. Since the spring session I have been reviewing the matter with the senior police officers, and the police commissions. I am also holding discussions with people outside the province and anticipate developing an overall province-wide program in the near future.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

National Energy Board Offices

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. He seems to be neglected these days. I wonder if the minister would outline to the House, I think in keeping with the government's well stated policy yesterday on energy as to what effort the government has taken and what efforts they are continuing to take to see that the National Energy Board offices of the Government of Canada are located in the Province of Alberta?

MR. DICKIE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs has answered that as to what action was taken, and I am particularly pleased to advise the House of the action taken by the Chamber of Commerce in Calgary to do just exactly that, and to make sure at least, if they can't locate the offices in Alberta, that they have hearings on a rotating basis. I would think the hon. member would appreciate that because of the events that have been occurring in Ottawa recently, further steps have not been taken within the last month, but as soon as a continuation of discussions is commenced, that is one of the items that we will pursue.

77-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 17th 1972

MR. HENDERSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate knowing that the Calgary Chamber of Commerce is doing, but I was really interested in knowing what the government is doing.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is that a supplementary?

MR. DICKIE:

I have been in the House since the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs has given very direct answers on that, and I thought that the hon. member would be aware of those answers.

MR. BUCKWELL:

To the minister. If these offices are going to be moved to Calgary, is there any chance that they might be located in Airdrie?

MR. DICKIE:

We are pursuing that question of moving them to Alberta, at least having them rotate so that there will not be as great an inconvenience as there has been in the past with Albertans who have to pursue their applications to Ottawa, and particularly last year around December when the traffic conditions were difficult to get into Ottawa, and almost impossible to get out on Christmas Day; this brought to the attention of the people in Ottawa the great benefits that would be derived by having the office located in Alberta.

Gas Policy

MR. DIXON:

I have a question to the hon. minister regarding the National Energy Board. Further to the policy statement that was made by the Premier tomorrow -- [laughter] -- yesterday rather -- well, I understand that he is going to make another policy statement tomorrow, I am just ahead of my time. Regarding the gas policy, Mr. Speaker, the great burden on that policy will be after the gas leaves Alberta, and as far as Trans-Canada Pipeline is concerned, if they are hit with a price increase, the only way they can get an increase is by --

MR. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. member please come to the question.

MR. DIXON:

I have to outline a bit so that the hon. minister will have a chance to come up with the answer. My direct question then, Mr. Speaker, is this. Is the Government of Alberta getting into immediate negotiations with the National Energy Board so that the higher price that is going to be paid to Albertans according to their policy, will be able to come into effect, because the National Energy Board has to approve any price increase that Trans-Canada Pipelines or any other transmission company passes on to their consumers outside of Alberta?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, in answer to that the Government of Alberta has not been in touch with the National Energy Board, particularly in respect to the policy statement that was presented to the House yesterday by the hon. the Premier.

MR. HENDERSON:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the hon. minister if the government is taking the desirable step of trying to see that Trans-Canada Pipelines is declared a common carrier and alleviate a lot of the problems that the hon. Member for Calgary Millican asked about?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, that submission has been under discussion and I can't advise the hon. member the exact status of that situation, but it has been involved in the discussion of the question with the federal government.

November 17, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

77-41

Federal Transport Office

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. The other day the hon. the Premier mentioned the excellent results that would accrue if a branch office of the Canadian Transport Commission or the head office was located in Alberta. I was wondering if the hon. minister has made definite representations in this regard, and if he has received any encouragement from the Canadian government?

MR. GETTY:

No, Mr. Speaker. I think we should wait a little bit longer before doing that. Premier Lougheed and the Government of Alberta were the first to suggest -- when it was understood that there was going to be a new chairman of the Canadian Transport Commission -- that, in fact, that chairman be a westerner. The federal government, as I'm sure all members know, did not consider that to be a wise move and, in fact, appointed a former federal Cabinet minister to the post. As part of our request we had that the chairman be a westerner, that in fact, they would then be moved back and forth between eastern and western Canada. We have not made a formal presentation on the statement mentioned by the hon. Premier that it would be nice to see the CTC in the west.

Highway Speed Limits

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this question to the hon. Minister of Highways just in case he thinks he is being ignored. I would like to know, hon. minister, has there been a change in the Department of Highways policy in relation to speed limits on four-lane divided highways? Has this policy been changed? Has there been an altering of speed limits?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, there has been no change in policy regarding the speed on four-lane highways.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the hon. minister advise me why the speed limit on Highway No. 14 and 15, which are both divided highways, is only 60 miles per hour?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, these highways are under construction and they have not been turned over to the Department of Highways as yet to establish a standard speed limit.

DR. BUCK:

The last supplementary, Mr. Speaker. When a road has been in use for a year and a half is this still considered being under construction?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, it is quite a large project in the area and it is still under construction, yes.

DR. BUCK:

Just get the screwdriver out and change the signs.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, at this point could we revert, with leave of the House, to Filing Returns and Tabling Reports so the hon. Minister of Youth, Culture and Recreation could table a report?

77-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 17th 1972

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table the report of the Independent Committee to study the preservation or demolition of Rundle Lodge in Calgary.

MR. BATIUK:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House to revert to Introduction of Visitors.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. BATIUK:

Mr. Speaker, we have three distinguished guests with us today. Mr. Don Mazankowski, Member of Parliament for Vegreville; Mr. Stan Shellenberger, Member of Parliament for Wetaskiwin; and Mr. Jack Horner, Member of Parliament for Crowfoot. All three are representatives of the Conservative Party.

MR. BATIUK:

Mr. Speaker, it may be worthy to note --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member has completed his introduction.

DR. BUCK:

Are you paid up members?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS

Bill No. 120: The AGT-Edmonton Telephones Act

CLERK:

The AGT-Edmonton Telephones Act -- Hon. Mr. Werry.

MR. HENDERSON:

I think we, on this side of the House, would be remiss in our responsibilities if we did not arise once again, to bring to the attention of the members of this assembly, and the citizens of this province, a number of concerns we have regarding this particular piece of legislation.

I have to say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, I think the whole manner, the way in which it has been handled, creates a great deal of confusion and concern. The action that led up to the bill and is now before the House concerns a commitment on the part of the Conservative Party to allow the City of Edmonton Telephone System to expand, in keeping with the growth of the corporate boundaries of the city. Well and good. The only thing that's unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the bill doesn't really make plain, is that this is the policy of the government. In view of the long-term nature of this problem, and the number of times it's come back to this assembly, one way or another, it would seem to me that it's highly desirable there be a clear statement of policy in this legislation as to what is the future of the Edmonton City Telephone System. The only thing that has been stated which hasn't been hedged upon in so many words, isn't reflected in this bill, is the question of the decision to allow the city to expand in this particular instance.

As I examine the bill, in view of the question of the amount of money that's to be paid in the transaction, the manner in which it has been handled, the refusal of the government to incorporate the essential policy matter within the legislation, -- I suggest Mr. Speaker, that notwithstanding the prerogative of the government to carry out its campaign commitments in this particular manner -- it's highly desirable that we examine just what's going on.

I find it rather difficult to find out what is going on in the matter. When the Minister introduced the bill, he read into the record at the time of second reading, or this is the debate on second reading, a critical statement which I will read into the record again, regarding the sale of AGT facilities:

November 17, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

77-43

"This precedent, when it is set, will be used to evaluate equipment as the city system or the city boundaries expand, and as part of the agreement we reached with the city last July, that they will be able to acquire those areas as the boundaries expand."

That is the crux of the issue. And the bill says everything but that. The bill has completely, largely, irrelevant matters so far as legislation is concerned, such as AGT can't talk to the city about long distance toll revenues. And it has the additional irrelevant matter in there which says that the city doesn't have to pay to put in a telephone system outside the city boundaries. And I say that's completely foolish, completely irrelevant. Nobody in this province is under the assumption that the City of Edmonton Telephone System pays to put in telephones in the town of Leduc, the City of Calgary, or any place else in Alberta. I'm at a complete loss to know, when the government insists on including frivolous and peripheral issues in the bill, why the bill doesn't contain anything relating to the essential problem, that is, the long-term policy of this government relative to the right of the city telephone system to expand in keeping with the growth of the city.

We've dealt on this issue at length during second reading of the bill and in the committee stage. I asked the hon. minister a number of times to confirm, and hoped the hon. Premier would stand up and confirm, that what they stated as an election promise and what the hon. minister stated in second reading, was a commitment as to long-term policy of the government. The hon. Minister of Telephones himself declined to do it, the hon. the Premier declined to do it; and we subsequently, on this side of the House during third reading, introduced an amendment which, in itself, was completely innocuous, but hopefully, would clarify the issue so far as the city is concerned and the people of the province of Alberta. This also was turned down by the government.

I would like to read the amendment again:

"Nothing in this act precludes the right of the City of Edmonton to purchase such additional AGI facilities which may come within the city corporate boundaries as the result of expansion of the corporate limits of the City of Edmonton."

The government refused to put this in the act. Of course, this is the whole essential issue -- it has been and it is going to continue to be in the future.

I, quite frankly, can only conclude that the government is reluctant to put it in the legislation because it really doesn't constitute the policy of the existing administration, notwithstanding their election commitments, notwithstanding the words of the hon. minister. That is the whole crux of the whole issue. Yet, the legislation is completely devoid of any words on this matter.

We also asked the question of whether the \$10 million was relevant or not and, in committee, asked that the bill be held in committee until the information was made available to us as to the investment costs of the AGT facilities on a year-by-year basis. We informed the minister at that time in the House that we were placing a question on the Order Paper asking for the investment costs, on the part of AGT, year-by-year, within the limits of the City of Edmonton, and the parts that were now under discussion relative to sale to the City of Edmonton, so we might evaluate the cost factors involved and the bill which spells out \$10 million plus some unknown amount. We were assured by the hon. minister at that time that the information would be forthcoming. We asked at that time in committee that the bill be held in committee until the information was available. The hon. minister stated at that time that the information would be made available; the government House Leader suggested that there was no need to hold the bill in committee; that we could go to third reading on it; if the House then so chose, they could refer the bill back to committee for further consideration.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what the government should do, because the Return tabled in answer to question 233 raises even more doubts as to exactly what the government is proposing to do -- not only as to the policy, but relative to the financial transactions between the city and the Alberta Government Telephones.

There was an amendment introduced in committee to the bill to make it plain the subject of \$10 million isn't under examination by the committee; that that was fixed; that what was under examination by this committee (if there is indeed one called the Price Evaluation Committee) is the question of "the costs reasonably incurred by AGT in connection with the transfer referred to in Clause



(a), "The evaluation of AGT's local exchange business and any proceedings" under Section 3 before a price evaluation committee. Section 3 says that the price of \$10 million paid pursuant to subsection (4) shall be deemed to be paid on account of the compensation payable by the city. Clearly, I was left with an impression from the hon. minister that the subject of \$10 million isn't under negotiation with the city; that that is fixed; that what is under negotiation with the City of Edmonton is the cost incurred relative to the transfer, completely aside from the matter of capital costs.

Yet the last statement in the return, the answer to question 233, says as follows: -- (this is \$13.5 million figure quoted as an original rough estimate of the cost of the facility) -- since these figures are estimates only, a round figure of \$10 million was mentioned in the bill as a reasonable amount to be paid to AGT pending finalization of the evaluation.

As I read the bill, this subject of \$10 million is not under consideration by the committee. It's spelled out in the act. Yet the Return leaves the implication that the committee is supposed to consider the \$10 million evaluation. I quite frankly don't know what it is the committee is supposed to consider now. The bill indicates that it is not subject to evaluation by the committee; the Return says it is. So what is under evaluation by the committee? I don't think we know, Mr. Speaker.

I also asked in the Return that the information be provided relative to estimate year-by-year, so one could arrive at an intelligent evaluation as to the present book value of what the AGT facilities would be. In the Return, all we get is a lump sum figure as to what AGT spent in total in the system throughout the period of time leading up to this point, and there is no breakdown year-by-year.

The minister knows full well that there is no way one can intelligently arrive at an assessment as to what the present book value of AGT is -- taking into account depreciation, inflation, and replacement of equipment -- without a year-by-year figure as to how much money was spent on the system. A dollar spent ten years ago on the system is worth a lot more than a dollar today. So in the absence of any breakdown as to the years in which the money was spent, it renders the Return absolutely useless. We still have no basis on which to decide whether the \$10 million figure is relevant and is a reasonable one so far as the transaction is concerned.

So, I look at the entire manner in which the government has handled the bill: the refusal to frame in the legislation the principle of their election commitment -- to allow unlimited expansion of Edmonton City Telephones, in keeping with the growth of the corporate boundaries of the city; the refusal of the government, basically, to make available in an intelligent manner, the information, factual data, that is really required on which to base a reasonable judgment as to the cost of the facilities and what the city should pay for. The confusion that continues to exist as to exactly what it is this evaluation committee is negotiating -- the bill saying one thing, the minister in his Return, tabled in the House, saying another thing -- I suggest Mr. Speaker, that it is in the public interest, without quarrelling or disagreeing or agreeing with the government's prerogative to proceed with the sale at this point in time. But the bill, as proposed by the House is completely ambiguous; it doesn't give anyone in the City of Edmonton, or outside the City of Edmonton, any assurance as to what the government's policy is. It leaves completely confused the question of what the financial figure is to be, the amount of money that is to change hands in the transaction. It leaves completely confused the question of what the evaluation committee is supposed to do.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the government really wants to have a clear statement of policy on this matter, if they are really intent upon establishing a policy that deals with the long-term settlement and future problems relative to the growth of Edmonton city and the growth of Edmonton City Telephones, I think the government is well advised to return the bill back to committee, put a clause in the bill which states unequivocally what the policy is, that the City of Edmonton telephone system can expand with the corporate boundaries of the city, and also clarify exactly what it is the committee is negotiating. Because the bill does not make it clear what the committee is negotiating.

The return confuses the issue. The return is basically lacking in any data which is meaningful in the sense of placing a dollar figure on the cost of the system. One is forced to arrive at the conclusion that the government simply plucked the figure of \$10 million out of the air, hoping that the city would buy that, that the legislature would buy it; it will sweep the issue of Edmonton City Telephones under the rug, and they can conveniently forget about it until the next time the issue comes up of the expansion of the city boundaries -- what

November 17, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

77-45

the status of Edmonton City Telephones is. At that time if the policy isn't in the bill they can say, "We didn't make any commitment to allow the city to expand their city telephone system with the growth of the corporate boundaries. There is nothing in the bill about it."

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the bill is nothing but a mass of confusion. It doesn't solve anything; it doesn't clearly demonstrate what the price is to be. It doesn't make any commitment to the future. It doesn't spell out clearly what the function of this committee is, and it's a complete mass of mumbo-jumbo which nobody can intelligently understand.

I recall one of the Calgary members saying, "Why don't you suggest what the price should be?" That is what we put the question on the Order Paper for, to get the information. What do we find? We find in the Return that the minister says, the information as to the year-by-year investment of AGT in the City Telephone System, now inside the city limits relative to the local dialing system for the City of Edmonton, is not available on a year-by-year basis. And yet the bill, in clause 2, states that the function of the committee is the evaluation of AGT's local exchange business and proceedings before the price evaluation committee. It goes on "For the purpose of determining the fair and reasonable compensation to be paid pursuant to subsection 1 clause (c) assets forming part of AGT's local exchange business shall be evaluated on the basis of reproduction cost new, less depreciation."

Now how on earth does one know what that means without knowing what the year-by-year breakdown is? After a year of belabouring the issue, debating the issue and discussing the issue with the city, and all the staff that is available to the minister and AGT, to put in a return that says, we don't know what the investment was year-by-year of AGT within the city boundaries and therefore we don't know what the thing is worth, and we expect the legislature to accept the \$10 million figure they've plucked out of mid-air with no basic data to substantiate it. ... I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, if we proceed with the bill, it really will be nothing but a true demonstration of political power by the government members in this assembly.

I thought we asked as reasonably as possible that a clause be put in the bill to clarify the position of the government as to its policy. I had accepted in good faith in committee the statement of the minister that we were going to get the information in the Return that would enable us at least to decide, and let the public decide, on a reasonable value that the system and the facilities that the City of Edmonton should pay. And yet, Mr. Speaker, the government refused to frame in legislation what their political campaign promises were. They have refused to produce meaningful data on which one can verify the \$10 million figure, plus whatever else the committee is supposed to do.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is in the public interest that the bill return to committee and the government put the amendment in to clarify and frame in legislation what its Premier and the minister has said the policy is so that the people of Edmonton and the people of the province know what the future policy is; and also, Mr. Speaker, that the minister take whatever steps are necessary in the bill relative to the \$10 million figure, the negotiation on the cost of transferring and the responsibilities of the committee to make it abundantly clear exactly what it is the committee is negotiating. Because right now it is apparently negotiating the whole question of what the entire cost of the system is supposed to be, the replacement costs and what the depreciation is and so forth.

It's a mass of confusion, it hasn't solved anything. It simply has added more confusion to an already confused situation, and to proceed with the bill at this time certainly, Mr. Speaker, is not in the public interest. For the government to proceed with it, in spite of all the confusion that exists, I suggest will demonstrate nothing other than a government grown arrogant with power in a period of less than a year. It is not concerned about the principle contained in the bill, but rather a partisan matter of dealing with an election promise, sweeping it under the rug and saying, we hope to hell that doesn't come back to bother us as long as we are the government.

MR. BARTON:

I have a few concerns with Bill 120. I haven't said too much about the legislation but I think any rural member in this legislature should look at this bill with sincerity, because I don't see where the city can accept the bill, or whether the rural people of Alberta could accept it. Where does the city expand? Does it include St. Albert, Spruce Grove, Stony Plain, Leduc, Barrhead, Calgary?

77-46

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 17th 1972

---

AN HON. MEMBER:

Warburg!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Jasper!

MR. BARTON:

It's not here! It's wide open! And as a rural member I have a poor constituency that has many miles of underground cable with maybe two or three hookups on it, and I want to know from the hon. minister if he can guarantee that our rates will stay the same for the next 10 years.

Secondly, I don't think it is a good deal for the city and they are not going to accept it. And I'll see in the future, in the next election, that it will be an election issue, and whether or not the hon. Minister for Rocky Mountain House says balderdash, it is going to be an issue; it is an issue today in the government of the City of Edmonton, and it will continue to be an issue.

So I feel that any rural member who is sitting in this Legislature should vote against this bill. It is the most irresponsible bill brought into this legislature.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, when I listen to the hon. members, and I listen to the press from Edmonton and I listen to people elsewhere, it appears that nobody wants this bill except the Conservatives, and they have not given us a good reason why it should be supported. There is no doubt that we are witnessing a political solution to a problem that should really be put to the people. I am rather surprised that at one time when this bill was debated, and we are dealing with alienation of Crown assets which sometimes is done by plebiscite, and the facts given to the people, that at one time I witnessed only three Calgary M.L.A.s, that includes ministers in the House, and that to me spells out indifference or perhaps they have given their votes as proxy and they know which way it is going to go.

I am rather disturbed about the fact that the minister sits there as if all is well with the world. He couldn't care less. He not only doesn't hear the voice of Calgary; I'm not sure that he even hears the voice of Edmonton. He sits there with a vague look on his face, perplexed -- and I am not sure, it could be stupidity -- but he tries to pretend that he knows it all, all is well, let them talk --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! Would the hon. member please address himself to the debate rather than to the personal attributes of the minister.

MR. LUDWIG:

With all due respect, I think something ought to be done to escalate the minister or at least give us some information. He is sitting there in silence and in contempt of the people of this province I believe, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh! Oh!

MR. LUDWIG:

And, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we talked at great length in this legislature recently about freedom of speech and there are some members opposite who don't believe in what they have just enacted a couple or three days ago. I believe that we are entitled to a full and complete disclosure. We cannot vote on this bill, Mr. Speaker, unless we know all of the details. It has never happened before, and we had to get a Conservative government to have it happen for the first time.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill is fully entitled to stand up and support the bill, and he will, like the Minister of Telephones, go to Calgary and tell them, well we got rid of a white elephant, we sold them a money loser. So much for the integrity of the Conservatives, Mr. Speaker. And if you feel that I am making a political address, this is a

November 17, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

77-47

political issue, Mr. Speaker, and nothing else in my opinion. They made it that way and I think we have to treat it as such. What did you make it?

I believe that when we look at the facts of the issue before us there is no doubt that a certain portion of the income of AGT is going to be alienated to Edmonton Telephones. I believe that is hardly debatable. It is a fact that they are going to be picking up revenue after this bill is passed that previously was paid to AGT. The amount that is going to be paid for that benefit has not been disclosed by the minister. I am rather surprised that in view of the fact that this bill affects most constituencies in a different way -- in fact many of them in a different way -- the hon. members opposite should all be talking with one voice, and it is a commitment. It is a commitment to bail this issue out as best as possible. Don't deal with the facts, don't worry about anything, the Premier has spoken, we are committed to support him, what else matters. I believe this is tantamount to turning your back on your constituents because I doubt whether any Conservative M.L.A. has raised this issue in his constituency and come back and said, my people are rejoicing, this is good legislation; this is the legislation of a government with a forward look and all is well because the Premier said so.

But when the hon. Premier said so he did not have the support of the Conservative caucus, he didn't have one at the time. He made this at a time when none of the hon. members opposite, at least not very many, knew whether they would be dealing with this issue or not. I believe that is one of the things that ought to be brought to the attention of the people, that this was a promise made in the heat of an election campaign, rather political -- in my opinion -- completely improper and now they are going to justify, they are going to try to make the Premier look good.

One of the main reasons why I believe this will be an election issue -- when the people get the facts -- is the fact the Conservatives have been very careful with all their new services and all their speeches and all their addresses. They have been careful not to let the people outside of this area know what is happening in this particular area. If they do -- if anybody wants to challenge that remark -- I would like to ask the hon. minister of the hon. Premier, who is not interested in this very much, he's made up his mind, to table all the news releases that the government made on this issue since they got into office. It would be interesting to table the thing and they are keeping it quiet, hoping nobody finds out. But the news is beginning to leak through. The AGT people are incensed in many regards to this bill; the people are beginning to ask questions, and the people of Edmonton who have had a commitment from the Premier are now not happy. When I look at the hon. members opposite there is only one happy person; he is bursting with joy and that is the hon. member, Mr. Koziak. The rest of them are not rejoicing.

MR. ASHTON:

Do you want two-bits for that, Albert?

[Interjections.]

MR. LUDWIG:

I have drawn a response, why don't they save their billions and make their remarks on behalf of their constituencies, Mr. Speaker, instead of cutting in on my time?

MR. MINIELY:

[Inaudible]

MR. LUDWIG:

Well you haven't made very many since you have been in this House as far as I can recall either.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Having a little trouble are you?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Speak on the bill.

77-48

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 17th 1972

---

MR. LUDWIG:

I hope, Mr. Speaker, this goes into Hansard, all these speeches and impromptu speeches, because that is about the best they have done in a long time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, it will make good reading.

DR. HORNER:

Just trying to improve yours!

MR. LUDWIG:

-- At least I wrote it myself, which is more than you can say for the ones you

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! Would the hon. member proceed with his speech.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, the dispute between the City of Edmonton Telephone System and the Alberta Government Telephones was in the process of mediation.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You read that one last week.

MR. LUDWIG:

No I didn't. You people have the arrogance to stop me and this time I believe the Speaker is with me so I would appreciate it, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. minister kept quiet while I am finishing my remarks. --[Interjections] -- You hear one hee-haw at one end of the floor and goes all through --

MR. FARRAN:

Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! Would the hon. member please continue with his speech. The proceeding is getting somewhat out of hand. With regard to the question which the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill wishes to put, I believe the rule is that if the speaker declines to sit when the questioner rises, that indicates a refusal of permission to answer the question.

MR. LUDWIG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The dispute between the City of Edmonton Telephone System and Alberta Government Telephones was in the process of mediation when the situation was disrupted by the 'then' Mr. Lougheed making an election promise in Edmonton to the effect that a Conservative government would allow Edmonton Telephones to expand to the natural boundaries of Edmonton. This would require the transfer of a great amount of assets of AGT and subscribers of AGT to Edmonton Telephones. I submit that this is one fact that has to be looked at, that it means a transfer of income from one system to another. What amount ET gains AGT loses. There is no doubt that AGT is publicly owned. There's no doubt that the people of Alberta have an interest in AGT, and there's no doubt also, Mr. Speaker, that part of the assets of AGT are being alienated in favour of Edmonton Telephones.

Though the dispute may appear local, Mr. Speaker, the stakes in my opinion, are very high, and in fact, affect all the residents of this province. I do not at all understand the reasoning from some of the members opposite, that this is the kind of thing that's going to make everybody happy tomorrow. As I stated before, it's making nobody happy, except that it will clear the fact that Mr.

November 17, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

77-49

Lougheed, the hon. Premier, got himself hung on a hook and he's going to rely on his members to get him off.

I'm submitting that when Mr. Lougheed made the promise to Edmonton, the people of the province were not aware of the fact that there was, in fact, a political commitment made, and of such significant proportions. This was kept quiet and I'm challenging the hon. ministers and members opposite to table all the news releases they made. They are in the habit of making many. But they kept this one as quiet as they possibly could and that is all the more reason when the news does come out -- it's coming out here and there, there have been editorials, the press has mentioned it -- that it is going to raise eyebrows and it's going to raise questions. What is there to this thing that it's being kept rather quiet? I think that the opposition wouldn't be worthy of sitting on this side if they did not raise this thing at every instance to determine what did, in fact, happen. What was the motive behind the thing?

The subscribers of telephones throughout the province, both commercial and private, Mr. Speaker, will ultimately be penalized by increased rates, or by AGT having to borrow more money. Yes, in my opinion this is also a fact that if you lose revenue in an operation like AGT that has tremendous debts, tremendous liabilities, is providing a good service, that those losses have to be made up somewhere, either by increases or by increased borrowing, which ultimately means that the public of the province is going to have to carry perhaps even a greater burden because increased borrowing makes increased costs of financing and the public will have to bear it.

In any case the future operation and success of AGT, in my opinion, have been seriously handicapped by the 'then' Mr. Lougheed's promise. I'm surprised that not a single Conservative M.L.A. can see anything wrong with what's taking place. In my opinion, the people of Alberta are being had. If this was a private deal, someone in the bigger corporation would have to wonder whether the directors were acting in the best interest of the shareholders or whether this was a sort of swindle pulled off on the shareholders. I believe that the people of this province, as a whole have been placed in a subordinate position to that of the political stand taken by the hon. Premier, and it's rather regrettable that particularly among the Calgary M.L.A.s, the Conservative M.L.A.s, not a single solitary one of them has the decency to stand up and at least speak for it. They are going to keep quiet and they will, as the minister has done, tell them, well fellows we sure unloaded a bad one, Edmonton got stuck and we picked up a bundle. When I hear this, we'll have to tie a can to somebody's tail because this will be downright misleading the people.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, Edmonton Telephones and the City of Edmonton have made it clear that they have a preferred position now with regard to this issue. They have a preferred position; they have statistics which they submitted to us that in the last five or six years they paid almost \$20 million net profit into their revenues to reduce their taxes. And I don't take issue with the people of Edmonton at all, because if I were there I would be fighting for all I can get too. After all, when you get a politician who becomes Premier to make a promise, they shouldn't let him off the hook if they're doing their homework. And I'm of the opinion that when you look at the negotiation and the kind of a deal that we're getting, I'm quite convinced that the City of Edmonton negotiated from a position of strength with strong people, determined people, to get a good deal for Edmonton. We negotiated from a position of weakness because a commitment has been made and we sent people there who become emotional the minute you attack this bill. I wonder who on earth spoke for Calgary. I'm saying that nobody did, and it is corroborated by the fact that even in this House, the only voice that the people of Calgary have heard on this issue is from the Social Credit side, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it would be in the public interest to have this whole issue aired in the legislature. I am of the opinion that the Conservatives would not dare have this thing in the matter of a public hearing, to invite people from Red Deer, from Medicine Hat, from Calgary, from Lethbridge to see how they've been 'had' by this government. I don't think they would want that. You won't hear a single request from them. When they were on this side, anything we did they wanted a public hearing. But now, "we're just selling AGT assets, we're just selling the people down the river; why tell them, they'll find out in due course."

There is the possibility, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this province are being misled. I'm suggesting that they are being misled by the Conservative government and they will be misled, unless the issue is cleared in this House, and we have facts, figures, and details. I don't think that any lawyer here would subscribe to signing important agreements in blank. In fact, no type of agreement ought to be signed in blank, but there are many blanks in this

agreement that are not filled. I suppose that one can rationalize and say, "Oh yes, we've got good people negotiating." I wouldn't have them negotiate a candy bar sale, let alone this, if that is the best they can come up with. They're telling us, "Everything is fine; we're negotiating; we're going to appoint an Edmonton engineering firm to appraise the thing." I suppose they couldn't appoint a Calgary firm because Edmonton wouldn't go for it. I'm surprised that they have five hon. ministers from Calgary in the front line and Calgary has a dead voice in this whole issue on the Conservative side.

I'm recommending, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this province should demand, through their M.L.A.s, that before this bill is passed their M.L.A.s take this to their people and get their instructions. The press, the chambers of commerce, municipal councils, etc. ought to be involved because they're being sold down the river and they don't know it yet. I haven't heard a single Conservative speech on this issue in Calgary in over a year. Not one pronouncement! Not one invitation for opinion! They want input on insignificant matters like, perhaps, whether we should change the size of beer parlours, whether we should have liquor in the cafeteria in the Legislative Building or in the auditorium. They send a committee sniffing out the political wind to see which way that thing should go, but here they're selling an asset of all the people. Everyone is going to be penalized -- no committee on this one -- hush, hush! Keep it quiet! "We want to get this over with," as the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc has stated, "and hope that it will go and we'll hear no more about it."

If they can't see that this is an issue, I doubt whether they're really fit to govern because they can't see very much, Mr. Speaker. Only the legislature, in my opinion, can sanction alienation of Crown assets. If the hon. Premier can make a promise, without a caucus decision, to alienate a portion of the assets of the people of Alberta, then what is to prevent him from selling the whole pie? He said, "We were just selling 25 per cent of the pie." The rest, let the people do the best they can with it; maybe in the years to come (15 or 20 years) they will make up the losses. What is to prevent the hon. Premier from stating that they'll sell the rest of it, if it suits their purpose? Nothing at all, as far as I'm concerned.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that judging from the performance of the hon. members here today opposite, I doubt whether one voice will be raised in defense of the people of their constituencies. There have been no facts, no argument submitted to this House to indicate it is in the interest of the people. If it is not, Mr. Speaker, then where are the M.L.A.s who should be speaking for the people they represent? I believe if the public were here witnessing this thing, they would have grave doubts whether they have not misplaced their confidence in many of the hon. members.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, I will when I'm finished, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK:

We're waiting for your speech.

MR. LUDWIG:

Only the legislature can sanction, as I stated, the alienation of Crown assets of a corporation for the benefit of any particular area or municipality, Mr. Speaker. I'm saying that it is almost an infraction of The Legislative Assembly Act for me to go -- if I want to canvass -- to Calgary and say to them, "Look, fellows, you elect me, I'll sell you AGT." Is this a responsible position to take? That is what has got a lot of the country into trouble federally. They had one politician making a promise in B.C. and one in Ottawa, and they are trying to compete with each other by giving things away; then they come and cry about inflation.

AN HON. GOVERNMENT MEMBER:

That's Liberal policy, Albert.

AN HON. OPPOSITION MEMBER:

That's what the P.C.'s think.

November 17, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

77-51

MR. LUDWIG:

I'm submitting, Mr. Speaker, that, before a decision of this magnitude, and I believe it is an extremely important decision, we should have the input from the people of this province. Although I object to these political committees running up and down the province, I'd support one for a change; let them go and get some input. This is not selling a two-bit operation, this is selling a multi-million dollar matter and the only sad part is that we don't really know how much is sold, what we are losing, and how it's going to hurt AGT.

I believe that, notwithstanding the indifference of the hon. members opposite -- particularly those from Calgary -- the challenge has been made. The hon. the Premier should come to Calgary, where he was elected, and tell the people what has happened. I think that when the Calgary M.L.A.s go back to Calgary, they should be asked "Where did you stand on this issue when it was debated in the House?" They could stand up and proudly say, "I stood exactly where the hon. Premier told me to stand." There is no other difference. He should hold his head up high and say, "I'm going to come to you for re-election, I hope you forget about this by the time this is done."

They are underestimating the wrath of the people if they find out that they have been 'had,' and they are underestimating the fact that we don't intend to keep this issue quiet. I'm saying in this House that I believe that my constituents are being swindled by this deal, Mr. Speaker. I'd like a true explanation to show that they are not.

I'm taking the position, Mr. Speaker, that an injustice has been done to the people of the province through the political promise of the hon. the Premier -- I'm saying the hon. the Premier, but I think the whole issue is somewhat dishonourable, that a politician can commit a part of the --

MR. GETTY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker --

DR. BUCK:

Just listen to what he's saying and you wouldn't have to point.

MR. GETTY:

Can't the hon. member say exactly what he means? Is he saying the hon. Premier's actions in this area are dishonourable or not? If he is, withdraw it.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, whatever I'm saying, I think that I mean what I'm saying, even if the hon. minister doesn't like it. It's too bad if he doesn't. I didn't expect him to applaud me, Mr. Speaker. In my opinion, if the hon. the Premier Lougheed's promise to Edmonton is permitted to be implemented, then the loss of revenue to AGT would make it impossible in the future for AGT to continue its expansion, its high standard of service and to be a viable operation. It's heavily in debt, and is going to have to borrow more. Maybe the hon. Provincial Treasurer can say that with a loss of revenue they will get along better. I'm not buying that at all. That doesn't sound like good business at all. The hon. Minister of Telephones has stated shortly after I questioned him in the House that rates will not go up in AGT. I meant subscribers' rates and I meant service rates. He had hardly got through talking when we learned via the press that rates went up. I'm saying that in the future if rates go up -- and he said they won't -- there should be a subsidy to every subscriber in the province to the extent of any subsidy that Edmonton got as a result of getting this advantage over the rest of the people of the province.

I believe that this issue can only be reversed if the hon. members stand up and be counted. It's rather a waste of time to ask a Conservative M.L.A. on that side to stand up and take an issue with something that the Premier has said is so. We've witnessed a display of integrity on this side of the House last night where our members got up and spoke with differences of opinion on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker. That is something that you never see on that side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member's speech, contrary to the rules, is frequently lapsing into castigations of various people's conduct without



77-52

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 17th 1972

discussing the merits of the bill. Would the hon. member please confine himself to the subject matter of the third reading.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I am almost finished with my remarks and I believe that it is my privilege to try to get some of the Calgary M.L.A.'s to stand up and be counted. It's part of the job of the Opposition. If you are asking me to talk about the merits of the bill, Mr. Speaker, I haven't found any to date. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we are asked to sign a blank cheque; I refuse to do anything like that. I think that it is a dereliction of duty to pass a bill of this nature when I believe that this will be probably the first time in Canada that an incomplete bill, a bill that started off as a pay-off in a political promise is turning out to disappoint the people to whom the promise was made.

I don't think that the MLA's of Edmonton could stand up and tell me that their constituents are happy. We are standing up and saying that Calgary isn't happy; other members are standing up and saying that other constituencies are unhappy. Who is happy besides the minister? He doesn't look too happy either. I would like to see this bill given the treatment it deserves, sent back to committee and let's find out what's going on in this bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DP PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member will permit a question now? For the record and for clarity, is the hon. member aware that the Edmonton M.L.A.s of Jasper Place, Strathcona, Ncrwood, Edmonton Kingsway, and St. Albert have spoken on this bill?

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware they have spoken, but since they have spoken there has been a tremendous hue and cry from Edmonton stating that "we are not happy with this thing." Let them speak again. The press is full of complaints and the people are complaining, unless you don't know what's going on in the city. They are not happy with it. Unless I'm wrong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

You're wrong!

MR. HYNDMAN:

We haven't heard from your Edmonton member.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member for Calgary North Hill --

MR. LUDWIG:

You're an Edmonton member; why don't you get up and say something?

MR. SPEAKER:

-- followed by the hon. Opposition House Leader.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am just hoping that the hon. Member for Mountain View will now pay attention. People might have believed all those crocodile tears from the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View -- who claims he is the only voice from Calgary on the Social Credit side -- if they didn't know the record. What sort of a voice did he speak for Calgary when he actively promoted --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order Please. Is the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View raising a point of order?

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes I am, Mr. Speaker.

November 17, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

77-53

---

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member will please state his point.

MR. LUDWIG:

The hon. Member for Calgary North made an improper reference to the remarks I made. I stated that the only voice on this issue from Calgary is the Social Credit voice. There are four members here; they were in the House all the time and so he is misleading, he is misquoting me. The hon. member should try to be a little honest in his remarks, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FARRAN:

I think the trouble is he's a compulsive speaker, but just let's listen. With what sort of voice did he speak as a compulsive speaker for Calgary when he actively promoted the construction of the AGT Tower in Edmonton despite protests from Calgary? His breast beating on behalf of Calgary is as phony as a three dollar bill.

MR. LUDWIG:

Point of Order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Sit down.

MR. LUDWIG:

I did not actively promote any such thing. I opposed it with all the power I had at the time --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. There is no way the Chair can be expected to rule on conflicting statements of fact.

MR. FARRAN:

It is in the interest of Calgaryans to stay with AGT and let Edmontonians go to the devil in their own sweet way and pay a 16 per cent increase to Edmonton Telephones if they want it. We feel in Calgary that AGT will not escalate its prices at anything like that rate. The double talk on the other side is the thing that really astonishes me, because they talk out of both sides of their mouths at once.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please confine himself to the substance of the arguments on the other side.

MR. FARRAN:

I'm sorry for the unparliamentary language, Mr. Speaker, but the other day the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View voted to amend the act, to give Edmonton the tolls from long distance calls. He voted to amend the act, to give them a blank cheque to expand their boundaries in any direction and take over the AGT system. Today he is crying another tune, because the other day he had his Edmonton hat on, now today he's got his Calgary hat on. How do you justify that when you get back home?

MR. HENDERSON:

On a point of order. I think for a matter of record, there was no amendment before this House to my knowledge that had anything to do with amending the bill so far as the question of long distance tolls is concerned. I think it is important that this be made clear because this side of the House did not introduce such an amendment; to my knowledge it was never voted upon. It was an amendment which I introduced which was turned down and did not relate to the question of long distance toll rates.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He wasn't here.

77-54

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 17th 1972

---

MR. FARRAN:

Well, perhaps if the hon. member explained what he was relating to -- perhaps he doesn't remember himself.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, to read into the record --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. It must have been something that happened in committee. It should have been dealt with in committee; there is no way in which the Chair can be expected to adjudicate on a matter of that kind.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether this is a Calgary-only fight, or if anybody can get into it. I would like to say that the bill, in my view, deserves to be very carefully debated, and I think the bill has been ill-conceived for many reasons. Some of the reasons may even be conflicting. I think it was ill-conceived in the first place because it doesn't really settle the matter that has been in abeyance now for about three or four years -- it has gone on another year since the present government has taken over -- and I am not surprised that the matter isn't settled, it is not going to be settled too easily. But this bill as a means to settle it, I think has been ill-conceived.

In the first place there is practically everything in this bill that can be done without legislation. You don't need legislation to give the city the authority to turn down the agreement or not enter into the agreement. You don't need the bill to give AGT the authority not to -- or the stipulation that it must not -- even discuss the matter of long-distance tolls. You don't need the bill to say that the boundaries are going to be extended to their present position, because that isn't finalized and it is still resting upon the acceptance by the City of Edmonton. So what the bill really accomplishes is very difficult to understand.

The two amendments that were suggested would have made the bill more meaningful to the City of Edmonton and to the people of the Province of Alberta. In the first place, I think the government has enunciated the policy that it will expand the boundaries of Edmonton Tel in accordance with the annexations by the City of Edmonton. If that is government policy, then I think the people are entitled to know that. And, as was discussed in the City Council the other night, surely if that is a firm policy, it should be in the bill. It would at least then be meaningful, and I haven't heard any arguments, while the amendment was turned down. It would appear to me that it was one item for which a bill might be required to declare policy to all and sundry -- AGT subscribers and the people of Edmonton -- what the policy of the government is. I am not quarreling with whatever the policy of the government is at this time. The government has the muscle to put through any item it wants to in this regard. But I think the people are entitled to know that if we are going to pass legislation it is a declaration of government policy that is not going to be used as a club to do something indirectly that the government doesn't want to do directly.

I frankly disagree with the legislature saying to one side in a dispute; "You cannot negotiate in good faith." And that is what we are doing when you say you cannot under any circumstances discuss the matter of long distance tolls. Because that is part and parcel of the telephone issue. And if we are going to set out in legislation, a denial for even the negotiation of one of the main items that is causing the difficulty in the first place, then I wonder what the bill could really accomplish.

So I say again that the bill has been ill-conceived, and in my view, will not do anything to help solve the problem or get things back on track again. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I must vote against the third reading of the bill. On saying that, I want to set out the reasons why I cannot support the bill. In the first place, this bill involves all the people of Alberta, not just the people of Calgary and Edmonton, but all the people of Alberta who are telephone subscribers and really those who are not telephone subscribers because the system is owned by the people of Alberta, whether they have a telephone or not.

It also concerns, in a second way, the people of Edmonton who are also Alberta citizens, but who are citizens of the City of Edmonton, and consequently the people of Edmonton have a double interest in this matter. They have an interest as Alberta citizens and they have an interest as taxpayers in the City

November 17, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

77-55

of Edmonton. I think that should be the basis of our discussion if a bill is needed, not to try to force an issue one way or another. I don't agree in saying the government should expropriate the Edmonton system, I don't agree with that at all. The Edmonton system is there and until the people of Edmonton -- through their council -- want to sell that system then I would fight vehemently against any legislation or any muscle or power to try to force the people of Edmonton to sell what they considered an asset. I think this would be wrong to use legislative authority because the municipality is a child of the provincial government.

So if the matter is going to be settled it is going to be settled by the government and the city council. I don't think it's right for the government to try to get extra muscle in order to overrule what some of its citizens -- citizens of Alberta -- might well want to accomplish. I think this is wrong in principle and I think it is morally wrong. Consequently that is the first reason why I can't vote for the third reading of the bill.

The second item, or probably the third considering the points I have mentioned under the 'ill-conceiving' part, is the fact that I am not sure yet that the people of Alberta or the people of Edmonton really know what the long-term ramifications of this whole thing are. I think they are entitled to know. It's their money; we are the servants of the people. I think the people are entitled to know even if it takes another year to settle it. I think the people of Edmonton, for instance, are entitled to know what the long-term effect of operating their telephone system is going to be. If this deal did go through, one of the hon. ministers mentioned that the \$10 million -- if that was the sum -- would have to be borrowed on the open market. I wonder how the people of Edmonton will feel about going on the open market at present interest rates to borrow \$10 million, which will also interfere with its credit that it may need for other vital subjects too.

I would also like to see a statement, as a taxpayer in the City of Edmonton, of exactly what the profit of the Edmonton City Telephones is. And I would like to know the expenses; I would like to know what expenses are being charged against the Edmonton City Telephones. Are the trucks and the transportation items being charged against utilities or by other methods? I don't know, but I think the taxpayers of Edmonton are entitled to know. What is the balance sheet now of Edmonton Telephones, and what will it be after this deal, and say 10 years down the road as far as auditors and planners can estimate?

MR. RUSSELL:

Ask your aldermen.

MR. TAYLOR:

Yes, I am asking the aldermen, Mr. Speaker, because I think there is a responsibility when the mayor and the aldermen of the city have debates about this issue of disclosing to the city -- the rate-payers -- all the facts about the profit, the losses if any, the conduct of that business to the people of Edmonton. I'm not asking the government to do that, and I think the government is at a disadvantage until they have that picture too, in trying to reach any amicable settlement.

And on the other hand, I think the Alberta government does have a responsibility, too, to issue a very clear statement on what it will mean to the AGT, to give up part of the system now, and what it will mean now and what it will mean a few years ahead in the overall picture of telephone communication, and on the financial basis too. I think this is important. Now if both parties know what the total financial picture is of both systems and where it's apparently heading over the next few years, then I think the matter of settlement will be much easier, and a solution will be much more easily arrived at. And until that information is made available, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how you can expect to reach an agreement, whether it's this government, the last government, or the next government. These things are important because we have to remember that we are the directors of a corporation, the largest one in the Province of Alberta, and that the people of Alberta, every last one of them, is entitled to know what we're doing with their assets and what the financial picture is going to be, now and as far as we can estimate in the years to come.

A third point I want to make regarding the stand that this bill is ill-conceived, is that this information has not been made available by the city to the taxpayers of the City of Edmonton, nor has it been made available to the taxpayers of the province, including the people of Edmonton, by the government or the Alberta Government Telephones.

77-56

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 17th 1972

The only other item that I would like to mention in the third reading -- another reason why I feel that the bill is ill-conceived -- is that it makes no reference and provides no protection for the people that I think every taxpayer and telephone subscriber in Alberta and in Edmonton would like to see, and that is the protection for the people who have spent a good part of their lives in working for AGT and/or the city, but largely for AGT because it's these people who are worried because their future is involved. I think they have some reason to worry, there's nothing in the bill to give them any assurance that they're going to be protected.

The hon. minister the other day was very vague in answering the four cardinal points that I felt the workmen are entitled to know about, and I'm going to mention them quickly once more because I think this is a very important part of this whole deal. The employees who transfer as a result of any agreement on sale are going to have their rights protected. The AGT personnel want the opportunity to fit in, but secondly the AGT personnel should not lose any benefits whatsoever nor should they lose any seniority. I think this is fundamental and basic to this whole deal and I would urge the hon. Minister, as the negotiations proceed, that emphasis be placed on the benefits and on what's going to happen to the AGT employees who are transferring. Maybe there are only 44, and maybe we can overlook whether they lose benefits or not, but I don't think we should. We should be vitally concerned that every last man or woman who transfers is not going to lose any benefits they have now under AGT or any seniority they now have in the AGT organization.

Thirdly, the AGT personnel should have an opportunity to return to AGT if the city does not honour that part of the agreement, and it should be part of the agreement to make sure that AGT personnel do get their proper benefits and their proper seniority as they would have secured them if they stayed with AGT.

Lastly, I think the government will be in a much stronger position if they will place their confidence in the electrical brotherhood who are the spokesmen for the workers in AGT. These are responsible men and their sole interest is to look after the interest of their membership, and properly so. I think they should be taken into the confidence of the government and the negotiators to make sure that the benefits of those workmen are going to be honoured.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I find that I cannot support the third reading of the bill.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, after hearing all the voluminous offerings from the hon. members opposite about open government and the freedom to vote as an individual and 'people before party,' I am appalled. I sincerely am, because to sit there in silence is a dereliction of duty of the highest degree, as far as I'm concerned.

Even if the hon. members in the back benches would stand up and support the bill, I would be a bit happier. At least we would know where they stand. But to sit there in silence like a bunch of puppets, Mr. Speaker, is appalling.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Where were you on seconding reading?

MR. HYNDMAN:

The puppets are over there.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of legislation is to try to solve problems, and it seems that when we are bringing in legislation such as this, we are not solving problems, we are only delaying and creating more problems.

I would like to hear from the rural members. I would like to hear from the hon. Member for St. Albert. I would like to know from him what the people 30 miles from the outskirts of Edmonton say when they have to pay long-distance calls. I would like to hear from the hon. Member for Vegreville and find out what the people in his area say when they have to pay long-distance calls. I would like to know from the hon. Member for Stony Plain what his people think when they do not hear anything from him in relation to this bill.

November 17, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

77-57

MR. DOAN:

How about Drayton Valley?

AN HON. MEMBER:

How about the hon. minister?

DR. BUCK:

Yes, and they're hearing from the man who represents the mystic hon. minister. We're expecting a call from you any day to find out what your policy is going to be in that area. If you are trying to blackmail me sir, I will not be blackmailed.

But it is really unbelievable when a minister of the Crown is acting on behalf of all the people of this province, when he brings in a Return and cannot supply the answer to the hon. member's question on the costs and what basis he used for his negotiations. This is almost unbelievable, because surely when you are responsible for the trading-off -- in this instance of \$10 to \$13 million of the taxpayers' money -- you must certainly have some reason for arriving at a figure of \$10 million, \$13 million, or \$15 million. There must be some figures. Surely these can be available. If they're not, who are we to believe that that figure is valid and is justifiable? I would like to hear from the hon. minister later on how he justifies this, because if he can't justify it to us, surely he can't justify it to a million and a half people of this province.

I would like to say, when the hon. members opposite are trying to browbeat us into this, we have only one defense. And the only defense we have is words. We are going to use these because you have the weight of numbers over there. We know you're going to steam-roller this; we know that the men in the back benches have been told to be silent on this issue. Let's just try and smoothe the waters, let's quiet it over because we made a bad election promise; let us get out of this as gracefully as we can. That's not good enough for the members on this side of the House --

AN HON. MEMBER:

Come on, Leader No. 1!

DR. BUCK:

-- and we will not accept that type of a method of trying to get the will of your party through this legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Premier No. 2, or 3, or whatever the batting order is, listened -- I'm sure he did -- when I said that I thought the previous government was derelict in its duty by not getting a settlement. But this government is more derelict in its duty because it has come in as a new government which is supposed to be able to solve new problems --

AN HON. MEMBER:

New problems? This is an old problem.

DR. BUCK:

I am really amazed that the Minister of I.G.A., which is really short for that other department, or the minister of propaganda over there, whatever you want to call it -- we haven't seen these big gloriouse press releases going throughout the province from the propaganda mill saying what a beautiful job we have done for you. What a beautiful piece of legislation this is. What a great, great, great thing on your behalf that we have sold part of the province out to the City of Edmonton.

So Mr. Speaker, just in case I get too worked up, I would like to move, seconded by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, that this bill be now not read, but be read six months hence.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, as seconder of the amendment --

77-58

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 17th 1972

---

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure, on a point of order, if the amendment is in order. The words indicate that there are now two motions on the floor. If he wants to insert the word 'not' and then some words at the end -- I'm not going to write it for him and deliver it in three copies -- then we may consider it in order.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Dixon, the M.L.A. for Calgary Millican, that Bill No. 120 not now be read, but be read six months hence.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You've got to word it as an amendment to the motion on the floor, not move another motion.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, it is not an amendment; it is a new motion.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I would have to treat this, hon. Member for Clover Ear, that this is a new motion you are interjecting.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sloppy!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Treat it any way you want, it's open government. Open government - don't worry about it!

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, "To postpone to a specific time - a variate of a motion is known as a 'six months hoist,' which is used from time to time in the House of Commons. The six months' hoist, by virtue of ancient usage, can be applied only to motions for second or third reading of a bill." We are on third reading of this bill, so this motion, in my opinion, is in order. It has been used in this House on a number of occasions.

MR. APPLEBY:

Point of Order. Would the hon. member state his reference?

MR. DIXON:

Yes, I am reading from Bourinot's Rules and Orders. You can also look it up in the book.

MR. APPLEBY:

We're not going by that.

DR. HORNER:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am rather surprised that my hon. friend from Calgary Millican, who has held the Chair for a number of years, doesn't appreciate it has to be an amendment to the present motion. We can't be discussing two motions at once.

MR. DIXON:

In my honest opinion, and I can say without fear of contradiction, this motion is in order. In effect it is giving a six months' hoist to a bill before the House; this is the only action this House can take at the present time in postponing this bill. I don't know of any other motion which you could bring up where you could change it, other than what is before us at the present time. Mr. Speaker, I think you should give a ruling to the hon. member and me, because he thinks, since he sat in the House in Ottawa for eight years, he knows all the answers. But you know, sometimes we don't know all the answers -- that includes the hon. second Premier. I think it's up to you, as Speaker, to rule whether

November 17, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

77-59

-----  
this is in order. We, on this side of the House say it is; hon. members on the opposite side say it isn't, but I think if you take time out to look it up in the rule book you will see that at any time a six months' hoist can be given to a bill on second or third reading.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, that's not the point. I agree the six months' hoist is the proper way to do it, but I also suggest the hon. Member for Clover Bar has to make the motion that it is an amendment to another motion, making the six months' hoist. Surely the hon. Member for Calgary Millican will appreciate that.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, speaking on the point of order, the motion before the House is that the bill be now read the third time. As I understand it, the motion by the hon. Member for Fort Saskatchewan -- [Laughter] -- for Clover Bar is, that the motion be amended --

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Ah, now!

MR. TAYLOR:

-- by striking out "be now read the third time" in favour of "be not now read a third time, but be read six --"

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Order.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the fact he came to the rescue of the hon. Member for Clover Bar. We have a motion before the House that the bill be read a third time, moved by the hon. Mr. Werry, seconded by another member on this side of the House. If they want to amend that motion, they are perfectly free to do so. We are very pleased that they are starting to learn some of the rules of the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

As I indicated earlier to the hon. Member for Clover Bar, I, in my opinion, feel that is a new motion. I would have to state to the hon. Member for Clover Bar, please continue with the debate on this motion, if you have it to present before the legislature now.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I believe you are right. I would like, seconded by the hon. Mr. Dixon, to move an amendment to the motion, that Bill 120 be not now read but be read six months hence.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, now that we have got all the matters straightened out and the fact that we can give the bill a six months' hoist, I shall now start debating the motion.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, let's be perfectly clear. There was no denial of the ability of the member to make an amending motion at any time, but if they don't have enough knowledge of the rules of the House to know that they have to make an amendment, then we can't do very much for them.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Agriculture who, I am sure, is more acquainted with bulldozing things through the House than anyone else, should worry about a little mistake being made by the hon. member. The hon. member has been caught on so many occasions -- all he's doing is kicking around a few words. The word amendment was mentioned and I think, for clarification, that would have gone by. I think that all of us in the House



77-60

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 17th 1972

---

wouldn't be listening to the motions before the House unless you are actually reading them -- I think you can get up and think the motion is in order. Of course, it can be reversed if it hasn't been read out properly, which was the case today. I don't think anyone in this House is under any illusion that we're not trying to get a six months' hoist to this bill, including the hon. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How can you claim to understand the amendment better than the Speaker?

MR. DIXON:

Well, speaking to the six months hoist amendment, Mr. Speaker -- so that we know what we're talking on -- I believe there are several reasons. I am not going to go into them all because I think they have been fairly well covered today by members opposite and members speaking previously on the motion. But I think there are two or three things we should take a serious look at as a legislature and in investigation.

I'm not happy about pushing any bill through the House when you have an unwilling buyer and maybe a willing seller, in the case of the government, but it is unwilling as far as this part of the legislature is concerned -- the opposition. I think the employees are not sure just what is going to happen to them; the parties involved are making statements that they are unhappy about the procedure, so I think in a case like that, in all fairness, it should be postponed until a lot of unanswered questions are answered on this deal.

The thing I am mostly concerned about though, is giving away crown assets and say, well if it's fair for Edmonton to expand its boundaries, I don't see how you can force AGT, who cannot expand its boundaries. We're not talking about private enterprise versus a government enterprise. We're talking about two governments competing for the same customers. I feel very strongly that if anything can be done to make one unified telephone system in Alberta -- that is my main objection to this bill. This bill is going to do nothing but bring confusion; there has been nothing settled, as has been pointed out today.

MR. YOUNG:

How is the argument and the debate presently being advanced to us going to be changed by giving this bill a six months' hoist, and reconsidering it in six months? The same boundaries will exist etc. How is that relevant to the amendment to the motion?

MR. DIXON:

The same boundaries won't exist unless we pass this bill authorizing to do it and to take over the assets. This is what I am talking about. We are in argument here; I am sure the hon. member himself has been in many negotiations. When he went to buy a house or something else his wife probably said to him, "Well, let's leave it for a week or two, dear. That is a nice house, but let's look around and maybe we can get a better deal somewhere else." That is all we are saying. I really believe that if we are going to do a job as a legislature, we should have a bill brought in here where both people are accepting it and happy to accept it. But all we are doing here today is bulldozing a piece of legislation through, that in my opinion, is detrimental to all AGT subscribers in this province. From press reports and from interviews that I have had with city officials, they are very unhappy with it. So I am simply asking Mr. Speaker, for this legislature to reconsider their action today, and let's have six months for a cooling-off period to see if we can't come back with a negotiation that will be much more satisfactory to the people concerned. As I mentioned earlier, my ultimate concern as a member, is to have one telephone system within our Province of Alberta.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question!

November 17, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

77-61

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

On the amendment as presented by the hon. Member for Clover Bar, seconded by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, that Bill 120 not now be read, but be read six months hence.

[The Deputy Speaker declared the amendment defeated; a number of members rose, calling for a recorded division. The division bell was rung.]

MR. KOZIAK:

It has been a good show, fellows!

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided as follows:

For the amendment:

|           |           |            |             |
|-----------|-----------|------------|-------------|
| Anderson  | Dixon     | Mandeville | Speaker, R. |
| Barton    | Drain     | Miller, D. | Strom       |
| Benoit    | French    | Nctley     | Taylor      |
| Buck, Dr. | Henderson | Ruste      | Wilson      |
| Buckwell  | Ludwig    | Sorenson   | Wyse        |
| Cooper    |           |            |             |

Against the amendment:

|               |              |                |              |
|---------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| Adair         | Dowling      | Hyndman        | Purdy        |
| Appleby       | Farran       | Jamison        | Russell      |
| Ashton        | Fluker       | King           | Schmid       |
| Backus, Dr.   | Getty        | Koziak         | Stromberg    |
| Batiuk        | Ghitter      | Lee            | Topolnisky   |
| Chambers      | Gruenwald    | Leitch         | Trynchy      |
| Chichak, Mrs. | Hansen       | McCrimmon, Dr. | Warrack, Dr. |
| Cookson       | Harle        | Miller, J.     | Werry        |
| Copithorne    | Hohol, Dr.   | Miniely        | Young        |
| Crawford      | Horner, Dr.  | Paproski, Dr.  | Yurko        |
| Dickie        | Hunley, Miss | Peacock        | Zander       |
| Doan          |              |                |              |

Totals:           Ayes - 21           Noes - 45]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I declare the amendment defeated. May the hon. minister close the debate?

MR. WERRY:

Just very briefly, Mr. Speaker, there hasn't been anything raised today that hasn't been raised in the last three or four weeks by the hon. members opposite. But I would like to table a certain document here. There is some correspondence between the city and myself with respect to certain provisions of this bill and there have been some statements made today that this bill didn't encompass everything. Mr. Speaker, if such a bill were to be prepared, it would just be unworkable because of the many items that form part of the basic understanding between the two parties.

As I indicated earlier there are two basic principles in the bill, or in the agreement that was reached by the city's negotiating team and the province's negotiating team. One was that the City of Edmonton would be allowed to serve the residents of Edmonton within the boundaries as they may be from time to time, and the second part was that the City of Edmonton system was to receive no portion of the long-distance toll revenue. Within that framework, then, there was a whole host of other things that were agreed to and I would like to table for the record, the correspondence which indicates those other points which we have touched on from time to time during the debate.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I move that Bill No. 120 be now read a third time, seconded by the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

[The motion was carried.]

[Bill No. 120 was read a third time.]

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS  
(Committee of the Whole)

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and that the Assembly resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole to consider certain bills on the Order Paper.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

\* \* \* \* \*

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair at 3:27]

Bill 119: The Communal Property Repeal Act

MR. R. SPEAKER:

I was away last evening from the House and didn't have the opportunity to make a few remarks on this bill. The commitment I had was long standing and certainly one I had to meet.

I feel Mr. Chairman, that in supporting The Bill of Rights, and the logic of The Bill of Rights, that if there's any discrimination that could, if possible, exist in such a bill as the Communal Property Act, then the act certainly hasn't a place on the statutes of Alberta. I think, in that light, the only rational point of view, would be to support the repeal of this act.

I'd like to say though Mr. Chairman, that in supporting this logic, there are certainly some concerns that my constituents have with regard to it. First of all a number of them are concerned regarding real estate agents who will certainly be assembling land in various parts of the province of Alberta. The question that they raised with me -- and I'd certainly like the Minister to comment on this -- is what happens when a real estate agent assembles land? The sellers are not aware of who will purchase the land, and when they find the purchasers are the Hutterite Brethren, at that point the sellers will say, "No we are not prepared to sell." Is the land owner at that point in time, creating a discriminating act? That is number one.

Number two; the thought of a liaison officer certainly offers some difficulties. I think he has difficulty because he hasn't really any authority. He is totally a man who will have to negotiate, a man who will have to try and bring two parties, the community, the Brethren, and other factors together in a harmonious manner.

I think there is another side to this story and it is this -- and I don't think this was raised in the House last evening -- I asked the question, what about a liaison officer from the side of the Hutterian Brethren? What is their responsibility in this particular area? I would suggest to the government, and certainly to the hon. minister, that this is one of the areas you do pursue, with the Brethren and with the various elders, to ask them to move out and face the problem that certainly is theirs specifically in the province of Alberta, specifically in relationship to their expanding into various areas and taking up a communal type of living.

The third point I would like to make, Mr. Chairman, is with regard to the procedures that are to be followed. I don't want to sound rather pessimistic, but from my number of years of experience with this particular situation, there certainly have been problems and I feel in the future there are certainly going to be problems. I am looking at it very realistically. I know there are going to be situations where there is a complete deadlock between the community and the Hutterian Brethren who are going to form a colony in that area.

The questions I raise with the hon. minister for his consideration, and I think our consideration at this time, are: What position will the government take? What will I do as an M.L.A. in my representation? Who do I make it to? What role do I play as an M.L.A.? Will the government, the cabinet, or the minister say, "Because of The Bill of Rights we're not really involved in this at this time, and this is a matter at the community level which must be settled at the community level." What about the RCMP? Do they move in as the local peacemakers? What is the attitude at this point in time of the hon. minister in

November 17, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

77-63

government on items such as this? I feel these are things that will have to be dealt with, and are certainly things which cannot be taken in any casual manner at this point in time.

Some other items that my constituents are concerned about -- and I'm certain they were raised last evening in this assembly -- they asked the question about what effect will future colonies have on their social and economic conditions in their particular community? The towns in my constituency are some 20 and are all rural towns. Each and every one of them is faced with the rapid inflation of costs along with a continual decrease in population. I feel, and I must say many of them feel, very strongly that introducing colonies into any of those areas certainly will have an added effect on their businesses and their way of life in the communities.

The next concern they raise is the fact that once the Brethren purchase land, it is held by them for a good number of years. They are concerned about that.

The third item they are concerned about it is large corporate farms, and certainly that has been covered in the report and I'm sure in the discussion last evening.

Myself, Mr. Chairman, I feel that protecting the rights of the citizens of Alberta, whether the rights of a majority or a minority, is one of the highest responsibilities that we have as legislators. I think at this point in time, that is the real decision that we are making. I can only suggest to government that they should not be casual, as I have mentioned before, about the potential problems which lie ahead by repealing this act. Much understanding and public relations must exist. Therefore, the procedures for potential conflict, the general, 'gentlemen ground-rules' that have been agreed to by the Hutterian Brethren and by the committee, should receive constant attention and much commitment of the hon. minister and certainly the government.

These are unwritten rules, and rules that will require much integrity and much honesty in application. Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that in my mind repealing this particular act will be the test of The Bill of Rights, not only for us as members of this legislature, but certainly it will be the test of The Bill of Rights at the grass roots in the Province of Alberta.

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks on Bill No. 119, the bill to Repeal The Communal Property Act. I'd like to say that it's one of the best debates that I have heard in this legislature in this session. Everyone who spoke on this particular bill spoke with sincerity and was very convincing. I want to say that I have certainly appreciated the debate on second reading of this bill.

As a member of this legislature, my actions are guided by the consensus of the constituents of my constituency to a great extent. However, there does come a time sometimes when I know that my constituents like me to uphold the principles that I believe in, -- I have to live with my conscience. Mr. Chairman, surely there have got to be other methods than this type of legislation that is definitely going to be contrary to The Bill of Rights that we just got through assenting to. There is no doubt in my mind that there would be a conflict here.

I think the idea of having a liaison is a good one. I think we have to have a liaison office.

I think we have to have a committee, and I think we have to be very selective in the committee that we establish to handle the situation that we are going to be faced with, and I'm sure that in the end we will have a better relationship with everyone concerned. I don't think we can stop with just a committee. I think we've all got to play a part in legislation as important as this. I can look across the floor, and there are many of our members on the front bench who can play a big role in handling situations such as this, not only in this area but in many other areas.

In our rural areas, I'm thinking of our hon. Minister of Rural Development who, with planning and with supervision, I'm sure, can help in many, many areas. Also our Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation can play a big role in these areas. I think our youth department can get involved with our Hutterian Brethren and can work in these areas and get the Hutterian Brethren to be on committees to work with our young people. I'm sure that this can be worked out.

77-64

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 17th 1972

---

As I look across the floor I can see our hon. Minister of Education, and certainly there are many areas in here that will work successfully. I can just think of one. We amended The School Act here several years ago, regarding 15-year-olds, making it compulsory for 16-year-olds to go to school. I'm sure our Hutterian Brethren are very concerned with vocational training and practical training, and maybe we could come into their schools with a vocational program that would work for their 16-year-olds. That, I think, would be a very good step in the right direction.

Our Minister of Labour could possibly get them involved in our PEP program. The Department of Agriculture -- our Hutterian Brethren are all rural-orientated -- could possibly get them involved in the programs that we have.

Get them in on our committees; get them involved in programs that we are dealing with in all these areas.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that this bill is going to cause a lot of conflict. There is going to be lots of controversy. There is going to be protest and there are going to be tensions. But I can assure you that I am going back to my constituency and I'm going to play my part and do what I can to make this so it is compatible with The Bill of Rights.

MR. TAYLOR:

Did you finish Item 1?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

No, I haven't.

MR. BENOIT:

Because the report does not play a part in the bill, I would like to raise two questions in conjunction with the bill. The first question is: Does the government propose, in the interim between the time the bill is read and given assent to and the time it comes into effect, to replace The Communal Property Act with some other type of instrument for dealing with this situation? Knowing that the report suggests a liaison officer, if such an office is established, is it the intention of the government to have the liaison officer deal only with the Hutterians who are purchasing land, or will the liaison officer be dealing also with others also who purchase similar sized tracts of land? Because if the liaison officer is dealing only with the Hutterians in a connection like this, I would consider that this could be construed as being discriminatory also. So the same treatment would have to be dealt with in both cases.

I also have one other question. Does the government look with favour upon implementing the other three recommendations that are made in the report as well as the recommendation for the repeal of The Communal Property Act?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Chairman, I am encouraged, even more so than after last night, by hearing the additional comments that have been made during the day in committee. Some of the concerns and worries expressed by the hon. Member for Little Bow, I think were dealt with last night, but perhaps the members wouldn't mind if I went over them again.

I would like to say that I think the hon. member, Mr. Mandeville expressed very well again today what seemed to be the consensus of the House last night, that there is going to be a difficult time ahead; there is no doubt about it. We would all be naive if we believed that simply the repeal of the act would be the solution to the problem.

I was really interested in the list of very positive suggestions he went through, department by department of the government almost, suggesting ways in which liaison and public relations and understanding might be improved. I know all three of the members, as a matter of fact, come from constituencies in Alberta where communal properties are a matter of intense interest and a matter of some controversy.

Dealing with the hon. Member for Little Bow's question; I don't know if I quite understood the question about the discrimination by real estate agents against sellers. The only experience I have had in this field in the last period of just a year is that the real estate agents who are involved in assembling land holdings for the colonies seem extremely anxious for the government to get on with the job, and either give them permission to buy or

November 17, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

77-65

remove the existing prohibitions. That is reflected also by the sellers they represent. I think a couple of the speakers touched on that last night. You can't really make a deal without a willing buyer and a willing seller. The only experience I have had in this situation in the past year is that there are certainly willing sellers. I am guessing at the situation the hon. member was referring to. I suggest that perhaps under Bills 1 and 2, if the situation he described ever arose, there may well be a cause for legal action, but experience would indicate that probably that situation wouldn't happen. In fact, the opposite would.

Two of the members indicated quite an interest in the possible functions of the liaison office. I must submit that since the report was tabled and because the House is in session, the government hasn't really had the opportunity yet to give detailed attention to the recommendations of the report. I would have to say that the specific recommendation and the proposed guidelines for the liaison office seem very excellent to me, and I think it goes without saying that unless someone from the Hutterian Brethren themselves, possibly an elder, is involved in this function, that its chances for success are lessened.

Insofar as the role of the individual M.L.A. is concerned, we did discuss this last night and it is not going to be easy. It is going to be tougher on our rural members. It is easier for the urban members or members from the northern part of the province to say the responsibility is there, but it is going to fall on the central and southern rural members to take the bulk of the load. I think it is the responsibility of government to back them up and to do whatever we can insofar as understanding and liaison is concerned.

I did meet early last spring with spokesmen for the Hutterian Brethren and they did indicate at that time a willingness to proceed with whatever might happen with caution and with a sense of co-operation. I didn't realize until the hon. member, Mr. Drain spoke last night, that in some cases they had been very active in programs that involved community endeavour or helping one's neighbour. If that sort of thing can be encouraged, perhaps some of the things the hon. member Mr. Mandeville talked about, perhaps if government can really effectively make the liaison office work with the co-operation of the Brethren we might just get somewhere. But I am not kidding myself; I think there are going to be several instances in the next year or so when we will have difficult situations that call for understanding and tolerance.

I have been quite surprised with the mail I have received since the government announced its intention to repeal the act. There was very little mail for the rural areas but proportionately quite a bit from the City of Calgary. Most of the people, I suppose, who wrote me perhaps wouldn't see a Hutterite once a year, and yet they expressed the same kind of misapprehensions and doubts and fears that some of our concerned rural residents have. So I think there is a great deal of work to do.

I had an interesting discussion with the Minister of Industry and Commerce last night after the House adjourned. We were discussing really the value of the report that had been written and compiled by the Select Committee of the legislature. Because it is really quite an extraordinary report, Mr. Chairman. The suggestion was made by Mr. Peacock that this might be a good thing to put in every school library throughout the province as an Alberta written and an Alberta researched reference source on the Hutterian way of life.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. RUSSELL:

So, maybe if some of us adults don't completely understand it, perhaps we could help children coming up to understand and have access at least to the factual statistics that are involved in the problem.

I guess what I am trying to say is that the repeal of the act is only the first step. The suggestions and comments that have been made by many members on both sides of the House is a second step. I agree entirely with the concerns shown by the hon. Member for Little Bow, and I hope in these general comments I have outlined some of the things we hope to do.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, the minister has answered almost totally the question that I wanted to ask, but I want to just raise the question again. Last night I believe it was, when we were discussing the bill, I raised the question as to

77-66

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 17th 1972

---

what the guidelines would be, and I thought I understood the minister to say last night that there would be a recommendation by the committee and I refer to the suggested guidelines that we find on page 29.

My first question is; am I correct in assuming that the Hutterian Brethren have accepted those guidelines? Secondly; am I correct in assuming that the government would like to impcse all of the guidelines as listed in the recommendations?

Now let me say that I realize that the hon. minister did say in his remarks that he just made that he liked them; he was prepared to give serious consideration to them. My only reason for raising it again is that to me they are very impcrtant, simply so that we can allay the fears of both sides -- not only the Hutterian Brethren -- as to what our understanding is, but to those people who may be concerned that there is a new problem that is developing that can be just as serious as it was before. If there is anything that I can do to assure any of my people who are going to be concerned -- and I think the hon. minister is aware that I have an area that is under consideration, that would have been brought to the board had there been a board in operation. This is why I am asking it. I am serious in wanting to know so that I can tell the people when it comes time.

MR. RUSSELL:

Because we have only had the report such a short time and because the House has been in session I regret that the government has not given detailed consideration to all the recommendations. I am assuming, from the comments I have heard -- and I'm saying this myself as the sponsoring minister -- that I think the idea and the suggestion and the proposed guidelines for the liaison committee are excellent. The suggestion that the Hutterian Brethren be involved in the functioning of the liaison committee -- that was suggested today -- I think is one that is almost a matter of necessity if the thing is going to be successful.

I can only say generally that the guidelines appear, at first and second reading, to make a great deal of sense and obviously they have been given a great deal of attention by the committee. If we can improve them or the experience of a few months shows how they might be altered or changed, then I hope we would do that. Certainly I agree that it is important that before the bill is proclaimed the government give the citizens of Alberta some indication as to the organization and commencement of work of the liaison committee. Of course, I am saying that in the House with reservations, I said earlier that we haven't officially considered the recommendations. Does that answer your question?

MR. STROM:

Yes, but may I just try to make my point as strongly as possible and suggest to the hon. minister that there is a degree of urgency. There was another group that I didn't mention and I would like to mention them now, that is the real estate people who, I believe, are just as guilty of creating problems as either of the other two involved parties -- the seller and the buyer. I know of groups who have been travelling about the country and picking up land under false pretences and I use the word advisedly. But I suggest that when there is no way of the seller knowing who is going to be the buyer, this creates a new problem. I know of a number of cases that have been brought to my attention in previous years that could have been avoided had there been an opening in the acquisition of land, and having it held not saying what the purpose is. And so I say to the minister there is a degree of urgency here.

I realize that my position in trying to explain it to the people who will be raising questions with me is going to be most difficult if I have to say; "Well, I think that the government recognizes that these are important." Or if a real estate man comes along and I say; "Well, I don't know what you have to do, go ahead and pick it up." I am not going to say that because I think that is one of real problems. So I just want to suggest that urgency; there has to be a decision made as quickly as possible. I am inclined to assume, at this moment, that the gentleman's agreement will work, providing we know what the gentleman's agreement is. But if they don't know what it is, then I say I can expect a number of things to happen and I really wouldn't want to try and enumerate what they are but I know that they can create problems rather than solve them.

November 17, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

77-67

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate the problem with respect to real estate agents but I don't know how you overcome it. In fact that's a technique that the government itself uses -- we used it in acquiring the Airdrie site for the proposed Agrimart -- that is to send agents in and try and obtain an option without revealing who the buyer is. This happens in many instances and the reasons are very, very obvious. All sorts of land buyers do this in the private sector, right from the petroleum industry through everything. Many departments of government do it, I believe, at all levels of government. So I don't really know how you protect the buyer against anyone who may come around on any given day of the week, with an offer to purchase, or waving an option under somebody's nose. But with respect to the liaison office, I understand that the Hutterian Brethren have agreed in principle to the outline of the liaison office as it's been proposed and have indicated that they'd be willing to participate in trying to make the thing successful.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, may I just bring to the attention of the hon. Minister that . . . did deal with the activities of land agents. I'm well aware of the point that you make and of course, we are well aware of the fact that if there is a group of people that discover that the government's the buyer, for example, the price goes up just like that, and I know that. The same situation, almost, exists so far as Hutterites are concerned, and I raise it simply because it's in here and I wasn't sure what the committee had in mind as to what they meant when they suggested that land agents should be consulting with the liaison officers before they start the assembly of land for this particular purpose. I think that it has some merit because what we are really talking about here, in my view, is to develop a mechanism that will lead to a minimum of difficulty in a situation that has existed in the past so that it doesn't happen again in the future. I go along with it, I think that the recommendations here are reasonable. It is my considered view that the Hutterian Brethren will be prepared to live by it. I would like to think that most real estate people would be prepared to live by it, recognizing that if they don't that it can create some problems.

I certainly don't want to pursue the argument but I just draw it to your attention again, because it's listed here and I say yes I know how it operates in the other area, but there is a suggestion here that this one should be handled maybe differently. While I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, let me just say this, I'm not going to leave the members of the legislature with any false impressions as far as I'm concerned. I will state that it is my understanding that the government will be looking favourably upon the recommendations that are made in the report, in the suggested guidelines for the operation under the new arrangements when the bill is passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Section No. 1.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I think one of the notable features of the debate last night was the debating of the issues rather than the debating of personalities, and I think this was good. While the report left much to be desired as far as I was concerned, and while the legislature bucked the report almost unanimously, there are still items that I think are of great concern. The repealing of the act is not going to solve those particular problems. I'm not going to enumerate the problems today except for one or two. When the act is repealed, immediately the Hutterian Brethren or other communal groups may purchase land where they wish, other than some type of agreement that is held and apparently there is no signed agreement and no written agreement other than some suggested guidelines. There is nothing to stop the communal groups from buying land anywhere. And I think this leaves in conspicuous position, one of the very grave concerns of people in municipalities as well as the officers and the counsellors of the municipalities.

Where the communal groups are spread among many municipalities, the effect is not felt too badly by school districts and municipal districts. But should an unwieldy large number get in to one municipality, because the land is good and because they want to be as close as possible to their friends and relatives, then there are going to be real problems created.

While The Communal Property Act is being repealed, I would like to see the situation created where there is a minimum of conflict between the Hutterian



Brethren and the outside world. I think this is in the interest of Canada and in the interest of Alberta, that we try to pin-point those problems -- and that was one of my complaints about the report, I don't think it pin-points problems -- and secondly that we try to accept the fact that there are problems there, not simply whitewash them away as was done in the language of the report.

Some people feel from reading the report that the report is very pro-communal way of life, and that the others who made representation against that type of life were simply glossed over and not given the recognition that they had real concern and real difficulties. Consequently, Mr. Chairman, I feel that there are one or two things that should be done in connection with this bill, if we're going to have a much more harmonious reaction and conduct in the future. One is, that the communal groups, whether they be Hutterian Brethren or what have you, will not form a large part of any rural municipality or county.

The other concern expressed by the report -- and it suggested some guidelines in regard to the large, rural land-holders -- I think this is one of the items of concern as well as the communal way of life, because many people today are looking askance at very 'large holdings'. I don't know how particularly large holdings might be defined, I suppose it varies with people, but I do think that anything over 10,000 acres held by one man, a group of individuals, or a corporation is a large rural holding. The fewer there are of this type of thing in the municipality or county, the better it is. The more family farms that exist there, the better the participation, the recreation, the social life, and the contribution towards a better Canada will be made. Consequently I think there is that view too, with which the legislature will have to come to grips.

One of the arguments against the present act was that there was discrimination against one group -- the Hutterian Brethren. The act does name the Hutterian Brethren: So Mr. Chairman, I would like to propose an amendment to the bill, (and I'll send it up with copies for the Deputy Speaker, the Government House Leader, and so on) which I think goes a long way towards meeting some of the objections that have been raised by people, by municipalities, by school districts, both in their submissions to the committee and, I think, probably to all members. I will read it first and then deal with a few items in it. First, the bill would be amended by renumbering Section 2 as Section 3, and by adding the following section after Section 1:

- 2(1) Notwithstanding The Alberta Bill of Rights, the sum total of all land held as communal property and as large rural landholdings shall not exceed four per cent of the total area of any county or municipal district.
- (2) In this section:
  - (a) "communal property" means land held by a number of persons as communal property, whether as owners, lessees or otherwise, whether in the name of trustees or as a corporation, or otherwise.
  - (b) "large rural landholding" means land held by any one individual, group or individuals, or corporation without the owner, lessee or otherwise in exceeding 10,000 acres in the area in the aggregate.

Mr. Speaker, I put in the amendment, 'notwithstanding The Alberta Bill of Rights,' as a safeguard. This will not discriminate against those who belong to the Hutterian faith. It will deal with all those who want to live in colonies as a communal form of life. It will also not leave out the other end of the scale, the large rural land holder who is also giving concern to people. The two put together, whatever their acreage happened to be, would not exceed the sum total of four per cent of the total area of any rural municipal district or county.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the amendment, if accepted, would do a few things. Number one, it would police itself through each municipal district. If there is already four per cent of the land in a municipal district or county that is held by those of a communal group and by large rural land holders, then there would be no room for any more. The Hutterian Brethren, other communal groups and large land holders would hold it. It would do nothing to interfere with those who are there now. I don't think anybody would want to interfere with those. In the municipalities where there is still ample room for communal groups, for large land holders, it could go up to the four per cent. It would be administered and policed by the municipal district itself. I think this would carry the judgment of most of our municipal people and most of the people at the grass roots in our municipal districts. It would make it unnecessary for the government to stand with a club over either group. The government would

November 17, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

77-69

then be in a position where it could deal with any group on the same grounds and do away with the feeling that some people have now, that the government is leaning too much towards one group.

The other thing, I think, that this would do, would be to do away with the necessity of hiring an \$8,000 or \$10,000 man as a liaison officer. The information type of work could be done without difficulty by a clerk in the department, when they don't have to deal with the various groups in public relations. I think one of the strong points about this amendment, if it is accepted, would be the fact that it would police itself, that everyone in the province would know that when a municipality or county reaches four per cent of the total, then there is no more room for large rural land holdings or no more room for more communal groups. This in itself would solve a great number of the problems of conflict that exist today and cause enmity and sometimes even hatred between the two factions.

I think we have to do everything we possibly can to get people working together, of whatever sect or group to which they happen to belong. I think by setting out some definite guidelines, such as four per cent of the total area of any county or municipal district, that we are going a long way towards solving some of those problems that do exist and that will exist after this bill passes.

Now whether the 10,000 acres is the final figure I am not prepared to say. I think it is a reasonable figure for large rural land holdings, but this may be open to debate. Whether four per cent is the final figure, I don't know. Four per cent has been suggested by municipal districts. Some have suggested three per cent, some have suggested four per cent. I think it is a reasonable amount of the total area of any municipality that could well be dedicated or made available to communal groups or large rural land holdings.

I now make this motion, seconded by the hon. Member for Wainwright, Mr. Ruste.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, in seconding this motion I believe that the mover has adequately covered the points that he has raised and the background for this amendment. I would like to say there is a definite concern in many of our municipal governments, school governments and urban centres about the increasing size of some of the units. I am talking of units generally now, not any specific ones. Certainly I think it has been indicated by members of the front row on the other side that they are concerned too with the extensive size of some of the agricultural units in this province. I think it goes back further than that. Concern has been expressed about the size of certain of our supermarkets in this city and steps are being taken to look at that.

So I would say this is timely and I think that many of our small urban centres are fighting now to hang on, and certainly if we get large, extensive holdings that subtract from the educational facilities and the community facilities, it will lead more to their downfall than ever.

I would suggest also that the government should look seriously in the field of the family farm, to press for changes in the federal farm tax laws so that there isn't this confiscatory article in there when the family farm changes hands. Certainly under the new rules and regulations this would be another nail in the coffin regarding the change in hands of family farms.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I believe Mr. Taylor covered it adequately, and with those points I mentioned I think this is timely and I would ask the members to support it.

MR. NOTLEY:

During my remarks in second reading I supported the principle of the classification system and I believe it is absolutely necessary, but with great respect to the mover and the seconder of this amendment I can't support the particular amendment that we have before us today for a number of reasons.

First of all, it seems to me that by striking a figure and inserting it into an act at this time, we are making a decision which I think would be premature, which we would be making not on the basis of all the available facts which we should now set out to try and obtain. There are many important things that should be raised when one looks at land classification, Mr. Chairman. There is a great difference between land classification in, let us say, truck gardening on one hand or wheat farming on another, or ranching, on still another. There is a big difference in land classification in different soil

zones in the province. There is a difference stretching from the counties in the south to the smaller municipal districts in the north, and what about the improvement districts? In my particular area, two of the three municipal districts are so small that 4 per cent, as defined by the mover and seconder, would effectively prohibit any Hutterite colony from establishing in that area. So it seems to me that moving it at this time would be premature.

There is one other point that I would like to make, Mr. Chairman, in opposing the amendment at this stage. It is my opinion that if we are going to embark upon a sensible land classification system and I earnestly believe that we must do that it should only be after the broadest possible consultation with the two major farm organizations in the province, with the association of rural municipalities, with the Hutterian Brethren, with the ASTA, with all the groups who are concerned with this matter. Had the hon. Member for Drumheller been able at some other point in our deliberations, to introduce, what many of us would perhaps have been able to support, a motion that the government merely proceed with some form of committee to study this in hopes of bringing back a reclassification scheme possibly next spring or at the latest, next fall....

But at this time to amend The Community Property Repeal Act, and insert certain stringent regulations without having had the benefit of consulting with the farm organizations and the people who are most directly concerned, it would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, a very unwise move.

And in conclusion, while I certainly concur with the spirit of the point he is trying to make, and the principle that he is attempting to establish, I feel that it would be extremely unwise were we to insert this amendment at this particular time.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, let it also be said that it is the responsibility of the government, not just simply to repeal this act and let things stand, but to announce as quickly as possible, what steps they are going to take in consultation with these other groups that I have mentioned, to set up some sort of committee to investigate possible land classification in the province.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, if I might, I think the hon. mover of the amendment defeated his purpose in his last paragraph or two when he said he didn't know whether 4 per cent was right or 10,000 acres was right. I appreciate the remarks made by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Land classification, or as I would rather call it, land utilization, is a very important matter. And as a matter of fact, as I announced to the Convention of Municipalities and Counties the government has already, and has for some time, been studying the question of land utilization in Alberta particularly as far as my department is concerned, in relation to the proper use of the agricultural resource that we have in that land.

The proper use of agricultural resource has a number of factors. I don't want to take a great deal of time now, except to say to the members of the committee, the government is and has been, giving very serious consideration to land utilization. Land utilization depends upon the size, farm practices, geography, climatic conditions involved in the various areas of Alberta. We are a very fortunate province in that we have a great deal of variety in these various areas. Land utilization legislation in Alberta will be a complex thing, not something that you can put in a small amendment in the repeal of The Communal Property Act. Therefore we have to reject this amendment because it just won't do the job that the hon. member wants it to do.

We will be looking at this question of land utilization. I recommend to hon. members the postscript in The Communal Property Report that adequately points out the problem here. I would also like to say to hon. members that the way to accomplish things sometimes isn't just by legislation but rather, by taking a positive approach in a variety of ways as outlined by my hon. friend for Bow Valley, in relation to what you can do for the family farms and how you can make them stronger, and this automatically does some of the things that you want done by legislation. It may well be that legislation will be required in land utilization, in regard to the family farm. Certainly some of things that we have already done have strengthened the position of the family farm. Some of the programs that we will be announcing from time to time will continue to strengthen their position vis-a-vis that of the large land holder. If legislation is required to ensure that the best possible use of the land resource in Alberta is made then this government will give the same kind of leadership it has given in other areas in making sure that it is moved ahead.

November 17, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

77-71

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a word or two about the proposed amendment. The first point is that I think the suggestion here has a lot of merit. Many of us are concerned about the control that is now falling into the hands of a few people as far as land is concerned. I would be very quick to say that I don't think we can limit it to communal property and I agree with the hon. Minister of Agriculture, if that was the point he was trying to make, there is a concern in size because of what it does to the total agricultural community in the long run.

DR. HORNER:

I am not restricting anything as far as communal property.

MR. STROM:

This I agree with. I am not sure it is the kind of amendment we would need at this point in time. I think it is covered in part with the suggested guidelines, although it does not state a limitation within counties as such. But what the amendment is doing is bringing to the attention of the House another method of reviewing the whole problem and of suggesting a means of controlling it. Again, I am firmly convinced the problem will have to be faced by governments as we go forward into the future. In the interests of a stable farm industry, we are going to have to look at it, not only as it affects communal property but, as it affects land ownership in general. This may be referring to foreign ownership, absentee ownership, -- there are a number of areas in which I think it will need to have a total review.

I certainly have some hesitation in supporting the amendment, not because I think it is an unreasonable one, but simply because I believe it will now fall into the hands of the committee we have been talking about -- the liaison officer, and general government policy, that I would like to see stated and, I would hope, would give some attention to this particular subject.

MR. HENDERSON:

I would just like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture a question. The hon. minister has stated that they are studying the matter and the ways and means of trying to deal with the problem other than by legislation. Governments have a habit of studying things for a number of years, you know. They get studied to death and hope the problem will disappear before they quit studying it. I'm not saying that is the government's intention, but I would like to ask the minister if he could give the House any indication (quite frankly I think it would be ill-advised to proceed with the amendment, but I think everybody is concerned about the basic issue) as to when we might expect there might be something forthcoming in the form of a policy or guidelines or something on the matter. I am not saying legislation, but some framework as far as public policy to deal with the problem -- within next session, next year?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, just briefly, the hon. member is still thinking back to that other government -- when you study and you study and you don't do anything.

MR. HENDERSON:

Time will tell.

DR. HORNER:

As I have said, we have a group in my department working on the problem now. They are getting views from other departments involved in land use within government. We intend, as we have done in other things, to talk to the farm organizations, to the municipalities, the counties, local government, the Department of Municipal Affairs, and other government agencies. We would hope that by next spring we would have, at least, a policy statement in this area.

MR. TAYLOR:

I would just like to make one or two comments. I would point out to the hon. members that there is a difference between this amendment and the guidelines. The guidelines have no force of law behind them. They are simply guidelines. And the Hutterian Brethren can follow them or not follow them as they wish to do. Neither do the guidelines meet the worries of many municipal districts and school districts of the province today. This would become actual

law and would not only be a guideline, it would be a requirement that would have to be met. And I can't see whom it would hurt, all the big effect would be that it would limit the amount of land in any area that would be dedicated or used by communal groups and large rural landholders.

The other point I think important to mention is that there are real problems there. The land utilization or land classification may solve many problems when it comes -- and may create others -- we won't know until we see what the land utilization plan is going to be. This may come the next year or the next year or the next year; we have no indication as to when it might come. In the meantime, I am suggesting to the hon. Minister of the government, and to the hon. members of the legislature that this type of amendment would go a long way toward solving some of the problems that are going to be very real in the few months after the bill is proclaimed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Any further question on the amendment? I believe the amendment is quite clear to everyone. I will just read it quickly.

2(1) Notwithstanding The Alberta Bill of Rights, the sum total of all land held as communal property and as large rural landholdings shall not exceed four per cent of the total area of any county or municipal district.

(2) In this section:

(a) "communal property" means land held by a number of persons as communal property whether as owners, lessees or otherwise, whether in the name of trustees or as a corporation, or otherwise.

(b) "large rural landholding" means land held by any one individual, group or individuals, or corporation without the owner, lessee or otherwise in exceeding 10,000 acres in the area in the aggregate.

[The amendment was defeated; Section 2, the title and the preamble were agreed to.]

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill be reported.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

It has been moved by the hon. Minister the bill be reported. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration the following bill, Bill No. 119, and begs to report same and begs leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

November 17, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

77-73

---

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[The House rose at 4:30 p.m.]