

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Thursday Evening, March 15, 1973

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at 8:00 o'clock.]

ORDERS OF THE DAY

1. Dr. Horner proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Topolnisky:

Be it resolved that the Legislature require the government to set up an Alberta Land Use Forum consisting of three Albertans and appropriate staff to hold public hearings and report to the government thereon and to make recommendations regarding land use.

Further, that the Forum consider, but not be limited to the following matters:

- (1) The family farm;
- (2) Multi-use of agricultural land;
- (3) The use of agricultural land for recreational purposes;
- (4) The use of agricultural land for urban expansion;
- (5) Future land needs of Alberta agriculture;
- (6) Corporate farms, foreign ownership of land, absentee ownership and communal farming;
- (7) The common ownership of land, agricultural processing and marketing facilities;
- (8) Land use as it influences population distribution in Alberta;
- (9) The extent, if any, to which the historical right of a land owner to determine the use and disposition of agricultural property ought to be restricted.

[Adjourned debate: Mr. Strom]

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's very often that I get crossed up on orders that come my way, if I may call them orders. I have to confess tonight that this did happen yesterday afternoon. I am not sure, however, Mr. Speaker, that it's all bad. I couldn't, of course, have predicted that the government wouldn't have called an evening session had I seen fit to talk it out, but if they had decided that they wouldn't and that we would have been doing something else, then all I can do, Mr. Speaker, is to apologize partly, just partly, for having brought them back. Because I did, in fact, have some other points that I wanted to make before closing my talk on that particular resolution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I was speaking to the motion as amended yesterday afternoon, I stated -- and I want to emphasize again -- my support for a land-use study. I don't want there to be any misunderstanding as far as I am concerned in making my position clear. I am not opposed to a land-use study. I want to state again that I consider it is most urgent in the light of the developments that are taking place in my own constituency. I certainly don't want to cry wolf unnecessarily, I don't want to make it appear that I am trying to single out one group in society for special consideration because of their

way of life, but rather what I would like to point out is that the situation we are presently facing is a serious one. And it is one that I believe did not need to happen if certain things would have been done.

I think, as far as setting up the forum is concerned, that the government would still have total control as to how the work of a forum should be conducted. Certainly I think the moves that we make in no way are contradictory one to the other, as I stated yesterday afternoon. It seems to me that we brought them in in a chronological order, and we recognized that the government is not going to accept them. We had to bring to the attention of the government that it was most necessary that all aspects of land use be considered. But this does not hinder the government from taking immediate action or in bringing some phases of the study along faster than others.

Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that an application was made by the Hutterian Brethren to The Communal Property Board for the purchase of the Dave Penner Jr. Holdings at about the time the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs released The Communal Property Board from their responsibilities and placed a freeze on any land use. It may have been shortly before that -- I am not sure -- but at least it was somewhere around that time.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that that is when the first mistake was made by the government, when they permitted an act of this Legislature to be placed in limbo at the decision of a minister. Furthermore, the decision of the government to repeal The Communal Property Act, prior to the committee that had been set up by this Legislature to study The Communal Property Act was also another mistake. Bringing in the Act to repeal this Act, even before the report was brought in was certainly placing the cart before the horse. And I think that this is most unfortunate.

I'm sure there are those who are going to say to me, can I prove that a land deal had, in fact, been consummated prior to March 1? I say that I do not consider that at this point in time it is my responsibility to prove this fact. I suggest that the circumstances are such that the government should feel obligated to investigate; that they should, in fact, check whether or not the law was broken. I think there was a point of law involved at the present time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some of the concerns I have are these. Dr. Platt suggested that Mr. Penner had difficulty in selling his land. I would ask the government, is this going to be one of the criteria of whether or not the liaison committee will recommend that a sale be made -- if a person has difficulty in selling his land? Shall the committee then give special preference that it be sold to Hutterian Brethren? He also suggested that this land was not prime, and for that reason they would buy more than what the former regulations would have permitted.

Again, I would have to say then, are we being told now that there will be no relationship between the size of an operation that they may be purchasing and the former regulation? Let me make it clear, Mr. Speaker, I certainly recognize that there is no law, there is no regulation that will, in fact, force them to do anything. But it has been my understanding all the time while this matter was being discussed, that there was a mutual understanding between the Hutterian Brethren and the government that they would be adhering as closely as possible to the recommendations that have been made by the committee that had been studying the problem.

So really, the question that comes before us now is, are we to believe that these matters will no longer be considered? Are we going to be moving ahead without any regard to the recommendations of the committee? I have them here before me, so it is not my intention to go through them at this time because I think every hon. member is well aware of the recommendations of the committee.

The next question I would have to ask is, will there be any consultation held with the counties and municipalities as to whether or not it is advisable to have a colony established? Again, I think the recommendations are very clear in that regard. In this particular case there has been no consultation with the municipalities. No one has had any discussions with them whatsoever. I checked that point out today, just to make sure I was right.

Therefore, I can only conclude that when the minister suggested to me that he felt that these recommendations would be followed as closely as possible, that really he must have recognized that they weren't going to do it. Because in the very first case that has come up for attention, there has been no regard for these recommendations whatsoever. I suggest that it would appear now that the government tries to sweep everything under the rug simply by setting up a study. I don't think it's good enough. It is certainly my intention to vote for the

resolution, but I have to point out that there is an urgency that this matter be looked at as quickly as possible. Are we going to be given some assurance by the government that they recognize that there is an urgency, or are they simply going to say, we have now set up a study, we are going to permit it to run its course and whatever happens we will, of course, abide by it?

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that is good enough. I would hope that when the hon. Deputy Premier closes the debate on this resolution that he will give some indication as to whether or not the government recognizes that any urgency exists, and also that they will advise us as to whether or not they will try to respond to that urgency that we believe exists at the present time. Thank you.

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a comment or two. I had the opportunity of speaking a day or two ago, which the Deputy Premier referred to as a harangue. Well, perhaps, this will be harangue number two but I will make it short; it will be a mini-harangue.

I think if the bridge has gone out someone should get excited and warn people of the impending danger, and if anyone should be concerned I feel that it should be myself and my constituency. We have no booming towns such as Red Deer or Stony Plain or Medicine Hat, and then there's Camrose. The rose city is being kind of hardhit now, but it still is a great booming city. But I feel that my communities are in danger.

In the whole area of corporate farming and absentee land and communal farming land use, I would have thought that perhaps The Department of Rural Development would have been given this assignment, and I would have liked to have seen him in this area, perhaps travelling the province, just finding out what the situation is. I would still like to see him perhaps on that forum. I like his quiet, humble way of doing things.

I think it is imperative that we be given a firm date when the forum will report its findings. If the studies are allowed to go on and on I feel that development will slow in the rural areas. I feel that small business will hesitate to expand while the studies are in progress. I know it has been a real test for the Conservatives and we are going to have to give them a D, a D for delay; the whole operation has been delayed. They came in with the idea of a forum at 10:30 one evening and surprised everyone. And a D for discouraging because the small communities are discouraged. We noticed it the other day when Vulcan came, a discouraged group of people, and my letter file will attest to it. There will be disputes, we have heard that tensions could explode and a number of us could attest to that. I imagine there will be discord and dissatisfaction.

Well, I want to close in saying that it is serious and the people of Alberta are not singing. The only song that the Conservatives are singing is one and the line goes like this: "Oh, if God could but grant us the power just to turn back the pages of time" and I am sure if they could turn back the pages 14 months they would do it. But we can't do that. We are in it and we've got to salvage what we can. We will have to go ahead with the forum and I hope we will set a date when they will report.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, the motion before us tonight, of course, is a motion that has been before many legislatures. I understand Ontario has had such a motion, they have had studies made and they have had studies to study the commission and they are still studying it. And the studies are going on and I understand they are going to continue on until after the session breaks up again. Because really, I think in all fairness to all legislatures, there is really no answer to the particular problem we are trying to resolve tonight by setting up this so-called forum. Wherever there is a willing buyer and a willing seller, it is awfully difficult to lay down rules that would prohibit one person from doing something that someone else is willing to take over.

We have gone over the years here with the Hutterite problem. I think the hon. Premier and his government felt everything would be satisfactory, and I supported them whole-heartedly, and still will, in doing away with the Hutterite legislation. I do think they made a mistake by going into this commission to talk to the Hutterites before they could make a purchase because I am a great believer that if you are going to give people the right to buy property it should be a right without any ifs, ands or buts. So I think all we have created by setting up the commission is confusion in the eyes of the public of Alberta, because they really don't know what the commission is all about. The commission

has no teeth in it to prevent any sale, and therefore I think it will never solve the problem.

The Government of British Columbia, of course, thought that when it got elected it had all the answers, and all it would have to do would be to bring in a bill --

DR. HORNER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is talking about a commission. I would appreciate knowing whether he is talking about the liaison committee or the commission that is proposed under the forum.

MR. DIXON:

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, and hon. minister. The first commission I was talking about is the one Dr. Platt is on -- committee, I'm sorry -- anyway the hon. minister knew what I meant -- committee or commission, there is not too much -- but anyway, the hon. Deputy Premier in his usual good manners has brought to my attention that I am using the wrong word. Well, anyway, the committee is still no more effective than the commission, as I called it. So the hon. minister can use whatever term he wishes.

What I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members is that where you try to give state control -- which is the only answer to this land development. This is a decision this House is going to have to make, whether it favours state control or whether we want to go along with the free, competitive, private enterprise system.

Now land, because it is limited and is an essential resource, will eventually come under control, but not the kind of control we are talking about -- control by purchase. It is going to be controlled by planning, and we have had that already, especially in our urban areas throughout Alberta. There has been control on our land.

But I think we are talking about two different things when we start talking about whether a man can dispose of his family farm or not. I think we should all remember that the family farm really is a pension or savings plan for the farmer. We are in effect jeopardizing his pension if we suggest that legislation be brought before this House which would prohibit him from selling his land. So I think that Section 9 of the resolution is the most important part of all the other numbered sections. Section 9 reads:

The extent, if any, to which the historical right of a land owner to determine the use and disposition of agricultural property ought to be restricted.

Well, I think we should be the last province in Canada to be talking about restrictions on the disposing of agricultural land, because agricultural land is basically used for the production of food. I don't think there is anyone in this House or outside this House who can convince me tonight that Alberta is in any danger of not having enough land for food production. We are blessed here in Alberta with a great deal of arable land -- I think over some 50 million acres of arable land -- and so I think we should be the last province to be worrying and trying to set up a forum to investigate whether we should put restrictions on the sale of agricultural land.

I would urge this government not to fall into a trap as they have in British Columbia, because if we think we have an explosive problem with the Hutterites in Alberta, it's only a firecracker compared to the bomb that is being let off in British Columbia at the present time.

Right at the present time in British Columbia they had one of the largest protest meetings in the history of the Legislature. It was people who owned private land who were opposed to the government taking it over, without any recourse through the courts. Now if we want to bring in something like that, then we should set up forums, and maybe that is what they will make recommendations for.

I think we should be taking a stand now until such a time as the food production in Alberta is going to be put in jeopardy; then that's the time we should be talking about restricting the sale of land.

You can talk about the family farm -- nobody in this House has ever been able to tell me just what exactly is a family farm -- but I think the overall question of this whole matter is the fact that we are going to have to decide,

as members -- as politicians, if you want to call it -- whether we want to go to the state-control system of land, or whether we want to have the free, competitive, private enterprise system which has built this great province, and will continue to build it. We have many examples of where governments have come in -- we can bring it right close to home, Mr. Speaker. This government and the previous government, the previous government first -- put up the money to buy land in Edmonton because they said it was going to reduce the cost of lots in Edmonton. We put a lot of the taxpayers' money in. The lots in Edmonton are no cheaper than in the city of Calgary or anywhere else in Alberta. So the government has not been able -- even with the taxpayers' money -- to reduce the cost of land.

I think if we want to start the production of our agricultural products on a downhill slide, then we should go along with state control, telling farmers when and when they can't sell their land. Sure, there may be the odd American that buys the odd bit of land, there may be the odd city slicker who goes out and buys a lot of land. There have been great statements made about how much money has been made by speculators, but I think if you take everything, and look at it realistically, that isn't the problem we are trying to build it up to be. You are not going to prevent people from buying small holdings outside our two major cities, because this is a way of life. We are in a changing society and people have decided they would like to be on five acres close to our city.

But I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier this is not going to jeopardize food production in Alberta. I urge this House to try to bring in the recommendations of this forum as soon as possible. I'm sure if the forum and its members take a realistic look at the situation in Alberta they will recommend to this House that we take no action at all as far as the restriction of agricultural land in our province is concerned. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I just have a few very brief comments I would like to make, and I certainly don't want to belabour the past so far as this issue is concerned. I think it has had a pretty thorough thrashing over in the three runs or more that we have had at the matter.

I'm certain many of the members may feel that it has been over-belaboured by a number of the members on this side of the House. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, there is some danger in a member assuming -- if he does not have a problem with this matter in his constituency -- that it is not a problem elsewhere.

Quite frankly, I have no problem in my constituency. I can't say that I have had a single personal representation on the particular matter of communal properties, which has been the main concern expressed on this side of the House.

But I do have to say, Mr. Speaker, in listening to my colleagues on this side of the House who do have a problem, that it is certainly my conviction that we would not have fulfilled our responsibilities as members of this Legislature had we not made every effort to stress to the government that there is some sense of urgency on the matter of communal property.

I hope, on the other hand that experience will prove that our assessment of urgency is wrong. I would like to come back to that later. But I think our real concern that has led to the debate that has taken place, Mr. Speaker, is that the terms of reference for the forum are so broad that they defy the wisdom of Solomon himself. And as the member for Calgary Millican has said, some of these issues will never be resolved. I'm sure if this country survives a hundred years -- and I hope it does -- in a democratic sense some of these issues will still be debated once again, continually in this Legislature.

I certainly urge the government not to conclude, as it has indicated thus far in the House, that really there is no problem in this regard in this area, that the forum is just really something that is a bit of a sop to placate a few people who have some rather bigoted views on some of these subjects, and that the problem will go away and won't bother them.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if that really is the conclusion of the government it is fraught with a very serious pitfall. Because if they are wrong in that approach, and the liaison committee does not satisfactorily deal with the problems that have received a lot of attention as they relate to the southern part of the Province of Alberta -- if they are wrong in assuming that the liaison committee is going to do a satisfactory job, the situation is going to be far more difficult to deal with sometime in the immediate future than it is even now.

And certainly, I think, Mr. Speaker, it can be argued very logically that the urging and the emphasis, being placed on this side of the House and directed towards the government, that they establish a priority regarding the forum's responsibilities on Item 6 should be viewed as insurance in the event that the work of the liaison committee does not deal effectively with the problem. I say, Mr. Speaker, I am confident when I say that I think every member of this House sincerely hopes that the liaison committee that has been appointed to deal with this issue is successful. If it is, I would be the first to admit that we may have overstated the case in our concerns on this side of the House.

But very seriously, Mr. Speaker, we certainly hope that the course of action the government has set its sails on proves to be the right one, that the question of communal properties doesn't develop into a heated issue in certain parts of the province. Certainly, I urge again that the government give some instructions regarding priorities to the land forum on matters they should first devote their attentions to.

I suggest this, Mr. Speaker, because the terms of reference are so broad I think the committee could sit forever and some of them they couldn't resolve. But this one particular one is fraught with too much emotionalism in some parts of the country to ignore. I don't in any way, shape or form suggest that the concerns expressed by some of our citizens are logical, but unfortunately on this particular matter we are not talking about logic, we are talking about emotions, right or wrong, that members of this Legislature have to face up to dealing with in one way or another.

So, Mr. Speaker, while the members opposite may think this exercise has been a waste of time, I hope that some of the comments that have been made are of a frivolous nature and I appreciate the spirit in which they were offered and don't criticize them about the amendments that we introduced as being unnecessary, and so on. I none the less suggest, Mr. Speaker, it was certainly incumbent and remains incumbent upon all members of this House who have any awareness of this problem, and the emotionalism that is attached to it, to urge the government to prioritize the matters that the land forum will investigate and report back as early as it is humanly possible, just in the event the work of the liaison committee does not prove as satisfactory as all members of this Legislature hope that it will. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. Deputy Premier close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment briefly on the contributions to the debate on The Land Use Forum.

Perhaps I could say initially in regard to what the Leader of the Opposition has just said, that we should consider very carefully the fact that the problem most of the members opposite have been concerned about is an emotional problem. I ask all hon. members to address their minds as to whether or not you can settle emotional problems by legislation. If somebody can answer that question in the affirmative, then I suggest he is going pretty far. And I also suggest that when we are dealing with an emotional problem as we are, that a great deal of understanding, a great deal of patience, a great deal of restraint is required from people in public life so that they do not fan the flames of emotionalism. Sometimes that emotionalism may not be well based and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest all hon. members consider for a moment whether or not they think that a Legislature or any type of parliament can really legislate about emotions. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, they can't, that basically when you are talking about individual rights, you're talking very much about the question of emotions of individuals.

I want to suggest to all hon. members over there that when they ask the government to solve the problem by The Land Use Forum coming in with an immediate report with regard to the Hutterite problem, they haven't thought it out, they haven't really concerned themselves with the problem itself and how it best can be solved. This is not a problem that can be solved by speeches, it cannot be solved by legislation. It's a problem that can be solved though, Mr. Speaker, by understanding, patience, and being willing on both sides to sit down and discuss, compromise, and be able to meet that middle road, to do the things that we always talk about so glibly in a free country.

I want to say to the hon. gentlemen that I have been a little bit disappointed. I would like to say again what I said on the steps of the Legislature. I don't think the impact of the problem of land-use regulation or legislation has come home to them.

There is nowhere in a country such as Canada and in a province such as Alberta that we can continue to have discrimination, one from the other. Don't confuse that with the emotionalistic problem of how people live. Surely we live in a free country, Mr. Speaker, and that right is there.

I have been, as I said, concerned with the question of land use and with the question of how you legislate land use. I would have hoped that we would have had many more constructive ideas or suggestions in regard to that particular problem. It's not good enough to suggest the land-use forum will only, even in a very minor way, rehash the emotionalism of the Hutterite problem.

Surely in this day and age, Mr. Speaker, we should be willing to take a positive approach as to how we can help rural Alberta, and how we can help our towns. That has been the policy of this government, Mr. Speaker, and it is starting to pay off in relation to the processing plants that we have been able to establish across Alberta. But to suggest by some means or another that we can bring back some sort of discriminatory regulation or legislation that is going to affect a certain group of people because of the way they live -- Mr. Speaker, that is not possible today in Alberta.

There have been some suggestions with regard to the question of the use of planning commissions. And, of course, any responsible people who are going to operate The Land Use Forum are going to take advantage of the experience of the planning commissions throughout Alberta. They are going to need the advice of all of the people who have been involved in this problem. It is not, as we have said before, a simple problem. It is one that is going to take some wisdom and, again, some patience. I was impressed with the speech by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican. He said the problem was insoluble and then went on to prove his point. I don't really think that contributed very much to the proposition that we do have a problem and that we do need to make an approach in regard to that problem.

It's all very well, it's very easy and I've spent some time in the opposition benches making irresponsible statements about why governments do this or that, but the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that this government has at least had enough courage to address itself to the problem and to try and come up with a solution. And that solution surely cannot be based on discrimination or by saying to some people, "We are going to have rules for you but not for the others."

I was intrigued by the contribution of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. Mr. Speaker, when an hon. member who represents a rural riding has to go to California to find out what is happening in his own riding, then I think it is time he had a look back home. I have never heard a speech that was so self evident before in my life, particularly to those of us who have spent our lives living in rural Alberta.

And so, Mr. Speaker, hon. members opposite have asked for "quickie reports" in the hope that they can get out of their responsibilities as MLAs in their individual ridings. We as a government are accepting our responsibilities. I think that every hon. member in this Legislature has some responsibilities in regard to this particular problem, and how they measure up to those responsibilities, Mr. Speaker, will be the measure of them as responsible public servants.

DR. BUCK:

You're really waffling now.

DR. HORNER:

With regard to the question of the -- well, the hon. Member for Little Bow has probably more responsibility on him as an individual MLA than many of us, and I would suggest to him very sincerely, Mr. Speaker, that he accept those responsibilities with a sincere, patient and responsible attitude, and have some concern for the problems of rural Alberta and not to grab at the first scapegoat to hang the problems there. He was a member of a government that had plenty of opportunities to do something about it and never did anything.

With regard to the liaison committee, I am personally very pleased that a man of the stature of Dr. Platt would take on this very difficult and onerous job. I am also very pleased by his first action in regard to the colony at Grassy Lake. Anybody who has been interested in the problem knows the history of that particular area -- knows the situation there. And in fact, Mr. Speaker, that is the replacement of a half of a family farm by a whole number of people in rural Alberta.

The other -- and I don't intend to get into that kind of argument other than to make that one particular point -- the other is, Dr. Platt said in his press release: "The other land acquisitions are primarily legalizing things that have been going on for a long time."

I say to all of the members in this Legislature that there are problems in rural Alberta with our communities. Don't, for a moment, think that those problems are all caused by the Hutterite situation. They aren't. They are a minor factor in what has happened over the years. I say to all hon. gentlemen that most of those factors have been contributed to, and indeed aggravated by, government action over the years that allowed centralization and rural depopulation --

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, come on.

DR. HORNER:

-- to continue without any intervention by government whatsoever. We expect that this land use forum will be a useful and very important contribution to future legislation in Alberta. For gentlemen to expect that they can take on this kind of a job and report in a matter of months is simply not being realistic, is not even appreciating the kind of problem that they face.

I don't object to the constructive speech made by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West when he talked about the interrelationship of urban land costs and agricultural land to be used in that area. That's why we accepted the amendment, Mr. Speaker. We appreciate that that particular amendment is going to mean that there has to be a much greater amount of study made on the interrelationship of agricultural land and urban land. That, of course, is something that's important to the Province of Alberta as we enter into a very exciting time when there will be a major pressure on agricultural land for residential needs. There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that this pressure will increase.

I hadn't intended, Mr. Speaker, to spend a great deal of time. In conclusion I want to stress again that there will not be, insofar as I am concerned, regulations or legislation brought into this House that will discriminate against one group or another. We must accept the fact that if we are going to have regulation on land use, that regulation shall be across the board, and that we have to be big enough, indeed not necessarily big enough but mature enough, to appreciate that the problems that have been created in rural Alberta can be solved in other ways. We should address our minds to that particular problem, rather than fanning any emotionalism or that kind of thing which will not help our province one little bit. So, Mr. Speaker, I urge all hon. members to vote for the setting up of this land forum, and to wish them well in a very difficult and complex problem -- a problem which requires some answers for the benefit of all Albertans.

[The motion as amended was carried.]

3. Hon. Mr. Hyndman proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by hon. Mr. Miniely:

Be it resolved that Rule 24a of Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly be amended as follows:



- 
1. Subrule (1) is amended by striking out the words "the sittings" and by substituting therefor the words "each sitting day".
  2. Subrule (2) is amended by striking out the word "is" and by substituting therefor the word "are".
  3. Subrule (6) is amended by striking out clause (c) and by substituting the following therefor:
    - (c) The Queen's Printer, the Provincial Librarian, the Provincial Archivist, the Law Clerk of the Assembly, the Ombudsman, the Provincial Auditor, the Public Service Commissioner, and libraries and news media approved by the Speaker shall each receive one copy.
  4. Subrule (7) is amended by striking out clauses (a), (b), (c) and (d) and by substituting the following therefor:
    - (a) Daily -- \$15.00 per annum
    - (b) Sessionally -- \$10 per annum
    - (c) Individual copies of a daily issue -- 25 cents per copy
    - (d) Bound volumes of a full Session -- \$15.00 per set
    - (e) The following may each receive a copy at costs set out in clauses (a) and (b) subject to a discount amounting to 50 per cent:
      - (i) A provincial university
      - (ii) A public college in Alberta
      - (iii) A provincial institute of technology
      - (iv) A board of trustees of a school district or division under The School Act
      - (v) A school committee of a county
      - (vi) A private school as defined in The Department of Education Act
  5. The following subrule is added immediately after subrule (8):
    - (9) Copies of members' speeches or portions thereof may be obtained, at cost of reprinting, by members upon written request addressed to the Clerk.
  6. Subrule (9) is renumbered "(10)".

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Mr. Hyndman, I'd like to move Motion No. 3 standing on the Order Paper, seconded by the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are you ready for the question?

[The motion was carried.]

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn till tomorrow afternoon at 1:00 o'clock. I might say before putting that motion that we intend to go into the Subcommittees of Supply as of now for further consideration of the Estimates.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the motion by the hon. Deputy Premier, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 1:00 o'clock.

[The House rose at 8:45 o'clock.]