

*The Budget—Mr. Fane*

(c) The railroad company can coldly and contemptuously run a railway through a barnyard or 200 feet in front of your home.

(d) Prices offered for this land have been ridiculously low. There is no understanding of the irreparable damage to be inflicted on land of this value.

This plant is being built seven miles south of Redwater, which has railway service.

As I said, the C.N.R. runs through Redwater. The letter then states:

It is in a depressed area and has been given a 5 million grant by the federal government. Not one of us is against industry to further the economy of a district. But we do resent the manner in which it has been done. We all understand English and feel that a dealing in land, rather than a stealing of land, would not have been such an insult to our intelligence and personal rights.

Their date of expediency was well timed, for the month of May is a busy one for farmers. But they have the advantage. Every act concerning railways gives them the legal right to do what they please and to whom. What's more, they use it to the hilt. The construction is going on at another important time to farmers. While the railroad crew is on the land, combining will be at its height. Granaries will be cut off by the right of way. It could mean driving three or four miles to empty a load of grain, because as yet no crossings have been discussed.

When time is of the essence for the railroad, they use the term "expediency"; but when the farmers' bread and butter is involved there is no reciprocal expediency. Such good public relations!

This is not a case of complaining farmers griping about a few acres of land. This could mean you—any property owner from coast to coast.

The present laws are 100 years out of date. A change in these laws would restore my faith in our so-called traditional freedoms. Which one of our so-called leaders has the courage and integrity to use the means at their disposal to see that these laws are examined and changed so that when they speak of human rights, they mean all Canadians in every way.

That is a letter that Mrs. Madeleine Lamoureux wrote to the *Edmonton Journal*, which published on September 12 of this year.

I should like to take a few minutes to read a letter I received from Mr. Pickersgill in reply to a letter I wrote to the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson). The Prime Minister, being the gentleman he is, wrote me a very nice letter telling me he was compelled to hand over my letter to the Minister of Transport. He said he had done this and had asked for a full report. This reply was apparently dictated on August 30. I received it on September 19 at my home in Vegreville. The letter bore no date stamp from Ottawa or at the post office in Vegreville, so I do not know when it was posted. Mr. Pickersgill informed me that he had received previous representations.

[Mr. Fane.]

With a little more indulgence on the part of hon. members I should like to read this letter to illustrate the kind of attention the minister gave to these situations. This attitude cannot be construed as a political reprisal against these people, because this is the only polling division from which I have not received a majority vote during the last three elections. This division gave a majority to the Liberals. Apparently these people did not realize the champion they had in the Conservative member, probably because they did not make use of his services in time. Because they came originally from Quebec they were probably still voting for Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The former minister of transport went on to say in his letter:

● (5:40 p.m.)

The provision of transportation and communication facilities generally—highways and roads, canals, railway lines and terminals, airports—to a considerable extent involve use of land which might otherwise be devoted directly to agriculture. This also applies to the provision of manufacturing plant and commercial facilities and also to residential developments, all of which tend to use considerable areas of good agricultural potential. This is naturally a matter of some concern to all of us.

"This is naturally a matter of some concern to all of us,"—indeed. The letter goes on to say:

The railway reviewed the various alternatives before arriving at a decision as to the most practical route for this new line.

I would go to the mat with anybody who said that anybody used any judgment in routing that line. The letter continues:

A prime consideration in selection of the route was opportunity afforded to open up for future industrial development a substantial area along the north bank of the North Saskatchewan river—an area well located with respect to the river, situated downstream from and near Edmonton, on good highway, and enjoying good access to certain industrial materials and to western Canadian markets.

I am informed that, bearing in mind this consideration of opening up an area having promise of future industrial use, the conclusion was that the route finally selected is the most practical one, all factors considered. Had the location of the rail route been governed only by location of the industrial project now under construction south of Redwater, a different route somewhat roundabout but involving construction of less new railway line, could well have been chosen.

I am advised by railway officers concerned that a letter was dispatched under date April 27, 1967, to all property owners involved; that survey crews did not go on any private lands until May 2, 1967;—