

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
December 9, 1982

EVENING SESSION

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Berntson that Bill No. 46 — **An Act to repeal The Land Bank Act and to make Certain Temporary Provisions for Lessees** be now read a second time.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned debate the other day I had just finished speaking about a letter from the land bank lessees' association which had been delivered to all members of the Assembly and I read that letter into the record. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure all members, at least in the opposition, and I'm sure many of the people who have been watching the debate for the last couple of days will say that it is indeed a sad day for Saskatchewan and a sad day for the 2,700 lessees.

They find themselves in a very precarious position, a position where I don't know if they know exactly where they are going to be a year from now, six months from now, Mr. Speaker, or even a month from now. Because what is happening with the abolition of The Land Bank Act is that the security that all of these people had in the past is being done away with. Mr. Speaker, it's not only the 2,700 lessees but their families and spouses who will be very much directly affected by the alienation of The Land Bank Act.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder why the government feels so firm about moving so quickly with the abolition and removal and the repeal of The Land Bank Act, when it's well known that many of the 2,700 lessees and their spouses in fact voted for the Conservative Party on April 26. Mr. Speaker, I know that because a large number of them in our area came to me during the election campaign, and in fact said that they intended to do that. When I asked them why, when they also admitted that the land bank had been a good deal for them, they said that it was simply because the Conservative candidates were promising that they would be able to purchase the land at the price that the department had paid for it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that was a fine example, but what is the story now which is coming from the minister in charge of agriculture? It's quite different. He is now saying that if the lessees buy their land, and many of them, I think, as the rates increase will have very little choice, Mr. Speaker, these farmers will not get their land for the price the department paid for it. The minister is now saying that it will be a price arrived at by the department, and a price that will reflect the fair market value of that land.

The land bank lessees are telling us now that while they took a chance on April 26, they're certainly wishing that they hadn't.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who told you that?

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that if the member for Saskatoon would like to check with some of the people who have been upstairs the last couple of days,

and I'm sure will be upstairs tomorrow listening to the debate on this very topic, he can go and ask them himself. I'm sure the press is asking them, and I'm sure that they will admit very readily that the price that was promised by many candidates was the price the department had paid for the land. What I'm saying is that that promise to those people of security of the lease as well as a promise to purchase their land at the price the department paid for it is nowhere to be seen at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose it's not surprising that we would see the government attempting to sell off the land bank land, for a couple of reasons. One, I think that fundamentally they do disagree that the farmland should be owned by the government. They believe fundamentally that farms should be owned by the individual farmers. I think it is interesting to note that there are several members of the legislature who lease land from the government, from the very government that they are now operating. They seem to have no qualms about the fact that the land and the land titles are held by the government. In my area of the province (and the members for Swift Current and Maple Creek, in their areas will be very cognizant of the fact) a large number of individuals have earned their living from lease land, where the titles have been owned by the government for many, many years.

Mr. Speaker, from the simple fact that the land is owned by the government — on the one hand the lease land and one hand the land bank — it seems hard to understand why the government would have one policy on lease land and one policy on land bank. One, where they accept it completely, dealing with ranch land, they seem to think that's all right, but with land bank land they have a very great difficulty in accepting that kind of proposition, that part of the land could be owned by the government and used as a roll-over mechanism to start young farmers.

It's not an unusual plan or an absolutely new plan. The land bank program is in place in other parts of the world, and it works very well.

AN HON. MEMBER: — In Russia.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — No. In Russia it definitely is not in place; there are many things that are not in place in Russia that the members keep referring to, and I think you have to look at comparisons to the political party that we represent to make that kind of comparison. You can look at Sweden, Denmark and West Germany, the places where the economies are strong, look at the mixed economy method of government to realize that those systems of government do work, and the red tactics and scare tactics that the members opposite attempt to introduce in this House are nothing but that, merely red herrings.

I think a system of a mixed economy where private and public money works very close together is not unusual or startling or in anyway meant to take rights away from people, but many will say that the rights of people are increased in those countries where you have a mixed economy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a moment about why the government is in such a hurry to sell off the land bank land. Why do they want to get rid of The Land Bank Act? Well, I think it's very simple. There are 101.2 million acres of land which are basically debt free, with not a lot of debt against them. The government would very much like to get its hands on that money. I suppose it will be in the area of \$400 million if they were to sell it all to help for their election debts.

Mr. Speaker, I say that in all seriousness because it's fairly obvious that the titles to that land which they have, and which they hold, would mean the difference between introducing their new farm policy or not introducing it. Therefore, Bill 45 and Bill 46 fit together like hand and glove. Bill 45, Mr. Speaker, will offer up some money and I make the case that Bill 45 will help more people on the upper end of the scale than anywhere else. It will be used and will be affected by Bill 46, that being the sale of land bank land.

And I think it's not surprising either when we look at other areas where they are attempting to get money to pay for their debts which were incurred by election promises. You can talk about the \$3 million saved in home care programs, or the \$3 million which will be saved by increasing the nursing homes on 8,500 residents at \$324 a year, and I think, Mr. Speaker, it's fairly obvious that another area where they can get some quick cash is a sale of land bank land.

Mr. Speaker, members say that nothing in the act would indicate that they are going to sell any of the land, but I think that statements made by the minister that people who farm land bank land are nothing but peasants and dudes, as he would call them, would indicate his lack of respect for a number of individuals. I say a good number of individuals, farming families of Saskatchewan, attempting to do a good job on what is a starting-out operation in farming, facing a cost-price squeeze . . . I think to be insulted constantly by the Minister of Agriculture and by members of the government is a very tough thing for them to have to take, especially in light of the fact that many of them voted for the party which now forms the government.

Mr. Speaker, I really think that those people who are saying that Tory times are hard times are certainly being well represented by the people who have come to the legislature the last couple of days, many of them lessees, to listen to the debate on this bill . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I think most of them have been lessees, and many of them were very startled when the minister referred to them in a very negative way. As has been mentioned by other speakers, most of them are not merely renters of land bank land but many of them rent from their neighbors. Many of them have two or three quarters of their own land that they have managed to purchase as the years go by. Many of them will admit that the reasons they have been able to purchase land is because of the fact that they had land bank land to start with, which has given them the opportunity to have some capital available, and yes, in fact, go to the credit union and because they have three quarters of land bank land be able to use that in some way as security.

Mr. Speaker, I hear members mumbling about the National Farmers' Union, and here again in a negative manner, but I would say that I would much rather find myself aligned closely with the National Farmers' Union than as members opposite with the Palliser Wheat Growers' who are very much in line with attempting to get rid of the crowrate and attempting to open up the marketing system and I just say that I have no problems at all associating myself with the National Farmers' Union. I have been one for a number of years and in fact I am quite proud of it.

Mr. Speaker, I think that another mistake that government is making is assuming that land bank was unpopular in rural Saskatchewan during the election campaign . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I am sure that the members did take a poll on it and I think that they should take a poll again on Monday and see whether or not there is a little bit of dissension where they thought there was solidarity in the past.

Mr. Speaker, the land bank lessees and their families are in fact very upset with Bill No.

46 and they are asking for the government, in letters to the members, to withdraw the bill. We, in the opposition, are very adamant that the government look closely at withdrawing the bill at this time and look at it one more time in terms of running the two programs simultaneously. I think a case can be made that a farm purchase program will serve a purpose and can serve a purpose, but I think that the whole farming operation would be much better served if the two plans were to be in place and run as a unit. I think that the example of the young farmer who is starting out at 20 or 18, who has a father who has 30 or 40 quarters of land, and who will be eligible under the farm purchase program — I think that does serve one purpose. It serves the purpose of assisting people who in many ways, I suppose, could already get started but if that is the way the members of the government see that a large amount of taxpayers' money should be spent, then that's fine. But on the other end, there are a large number of farmers who cannot in fact put down three or four titles to land in order to secure land through a banking system or through a purchase program . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Pardon?

Mr. Speaker, I hear members muttering from their seats and I am sure that it's the only time in this session that the member for (I believe) Regina North West has spoken. He's a great speaker from his seat, but yet when it comes time to debate, the member for Regina North West as well . . . I hear another member for Saskatoon, otherwise known as "Squeaky" because that's the only time we hear him, muttering that he will get up immediately after I sit down. He said that.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order please. I would ask the hon. member to return to the subject of debate and debate is on Bill No. 46, second reading.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes, Mr. Speaker. I did get sidetracked there a little bit. It was getting a bit noisy; members from the government side were speaking from their seats. I will return immediately to speak for a few more moments on this most difficult and troublesome bill, Bill 46, an act to eliminate the land bank act.

Mr. Speaker, the obvious attack on this group of people by the government of the day is one which I think will haunt them for many, many years. I think that the 2,700 people who will be directly affected by this bill will be coming to see the Minister of Agriculture and the Premier of the province to let them know exactly what they think about the elimination of contracts and the elimination of protection and, in fact, elimination of rights which they have enjoyed in the past.

One area of the bill which concerns a good number of them is the fact that properties that they have built on the land they lease, there is no security. In fact if the land was to be sold away from them, there is no security of establishing a price on their house or barn or Quonsets that they may have built on that land, Mr. Speaker. I think that I would agree with them and I am sure that all members in the opposition would agree that the lack of security in that area is of great concern. I think it's obvious that if any of us were leasing land and had built a \$50,000 or \$60,000 house, which is not an elaborate home in this time, that if a government introduced a bill that took away the security that you had on your home, you would be concerned as well.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the members in government will look very closely, as the pressure grows over the next few days in the farming communities, will look very closely at not only making amendments to this bill, but, Mr. Speaker, I think we should encourage all members of government to pull the bill, to take another look at it, possibly

put it in a committee that can be taken out into the country to get some opinions from farmer groups and farmers (because I don't think that has been done) and see what the farmers have to say and let them have an opinion on it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will definitely be voting against this, what we consider to be, very regressive bill — an attack on farmers. And I would encourage all other members to do the same.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LUSNEY: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm also pleased to get into this debate. I would feel a lot better about this bill if I saw some of the government members getting up and speaking on it. As my colleague has mentioned, they do very well from their seats but we don't seem to see any of them getting up and defending the bill that their minister has introduced.

Mr. Speaker, that's sort of puzzling to me as to why they would say it's such a good bill and yet refuse to get up and say anything about the bill.

When the Minister of Agriculture introduced the bill, he complained real loud and long about the failures of the land bank. Well, Mr. Speaker, when you've got a very weak argument, then the one thing you do is complain real loud about something that would somehow try to cloud the issue, and get people to try and believe that something was real bad because you were so loud on it. Well, Mr. Speaker, the minister has a very weak argument, and I think what he had to do was probably put a few notes for himself beside his speech there, every time he had a weak argument, to make a lot of noise out there.

The minister complained about the low number of people that purchased land bank land. Only 152 farmers that purchased land bank land, he said. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is probably a reason as to why more than 152 farmers didn't purchase the land. Because they knew that farming land bank land was a lot better for them than trying to purchase that land at the cost of land today. They knew that they were better off, that they would be able to improve their farming operation by leasing it from land bank at the rate that it cost them than it would be even if they had to pay 8 per cent interest that was being proposed by the government opposite.

Mr. Speaker, if it wasn't for land bank there would be at least 2,700 fewer farmers on the land today; 2,700 fewer farmers there would have been because many of these young farmers that got started got started only because of land bank. And when they got on land bank land, they were able to save some of their money that it would have cost them in interest, and they were able to improve their farmyards, they were able to get into some better equipment. And Mr. Speaker, that is what kept these young farmers on the land.

But the Minister of Agriculture is so blinded by the hatred for land bank that he was prepared to destroy these young farmers that are out there. He was prepared to move all of these off if he had to because he wants to get rid of land bank.

And why is he doing that, Mr. Speaker? Well I suppose maybe the Minister of Agriculture comes from an area where he has a lot of larger farmers, and maybe amongst them are some land bank lessees. And these large farmers would like to get hold of some of that land. And I suppose maybe they encouraged the minister to go ahead with a program that would make it very difficult for

these lessees to stay on their land. That would give some of the larger farmers an opportunity to acquire even more land than they have now.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Minister of Agriculture read the letter that was sent out by the land bank tenants' association, and he has been around this House so seldom lately that I'm not sure that he did read that letter. But I think if he was around here, and if he looked at some of the mail on his desk, I think he would have seen that there was a letter from the tenants' association, and that letter would have indicated to him exactly how the land bank lessees . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . point out, Mr. Speaker, that this letter from the land bank tenants' association was not written lightly. It was written after getting some legal advice and, as they state in their letter, the legal advice has made it clear to them that the minister's words about protecting existing leases don't really tell the story. They don't tell the true story. The minister's statements, in other words, are quite misleading. Quite? Very. And it's not good enough to say that the land bank farmer will still have a lease and that he can still pass it on to his heirs, his wife or his children. It's not good enough for him to say that he won't change any of the terms of the lease. In that bill, Mr. Speaker, the minister can, if he so wishes, through regulations, raise the rents as high as he feels he can get away with or as high as he feels will make it difficult for some of these young farmers to continue farming, where they are forced to either purchase the land or give it up, cancel their leases completely.

Mr. Speaker, if the minister at any time decides that he wants any farmer in any area of this province off a certain parcel of land bank land or crown land, he has only to move him off there through the regulations. And the lessees have no recourse. According to the bill, they have no protection whatsoever. They can't go to court. The minister made sure that he protected himself on that side. They have no recourse whatsoever. They either have to accept what the minister says or they just get off the land.

This is the kind of legislation this is — the most vicious piece of legislation that has ever been introduced in this province, Mr. Speaker. And the minister can protest all he likes that he's not the kind of individual who will do this, that he is not going to do anything that nasty to these young farmers. But, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that the land bank lessees will not believe him. Why should they? Everyone knows that this government wants to raise the rents. They want to raise the land bank lease rents that are out there. The lessees are aware of it. And, Mr. Speaker, in their vindictiveness this government cannot be trusted simply on their word alone.

All of us in this House, as legislators, regardless of which party we belong to, should remember that we have a responsibility to pass legislation that is fair and equitable. Mr. Speaker, land bank rents are fair now. They are written into a contract. But what is this government going to do? It proposes to break those contracts. And I thought even any self-respecting Tory would not allow this to happen. Mr. Speaker, I said any self-respecting Tory and maybe as my colleagues say, there is no such thing. I would hope there is. I would hope that on that side of this House there are some self-respecting Tories that would not allow this kind of legislation to go through. They should really be ashamed of what they are doing to lessees of land bank land.

It's not just the rents that are an issue here; it is also the question of improvements. None of these are protected. Everything is being thrown open to the mercies of the Minister of Agriculture and his colleagues. And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, they can hardly restrain their glee in their eagerness to get at these land bank lessees. The minister comes on with his best poker face and he says, "Who, us? Oh, we would never do anything like that. No, never. But we want the power in the legislation to do it anyway." Why

would they want the power in the legislation to do something that they don't intend to do?

Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides no protection for the farmer's home or his chattels or improvements. And if they are not going to do anything that nasty as take something away from them, then why don't they just put an amendment into the legislation that would protect the chattels and all the improvements of the lessees that are out there now. Just a simple amendment, that's all it would take.

Members should not forget that this legislation doesn't just deal with the business of giving the minister powers and setting up a program, a program that may deal with providing some form of land to a young farmer, or deal with some new applications. No, Mr. Speaker. I think it could be said and it could be argued that everybody that goes into an agreement should know what's in that agreement. They should know what they're getting into, be it good or bad. This government should at least let the individuals know what it is that they're getting into. What are we dealing here . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — State your point of order.

MR. YOUNG: — The member opposite is talking about Bill 45. He's talking about what members should know getting into leases. That's definitely the subject matter of the earlier bill. Bill 46 is the repeal of the Land Bank Act and accordingly, I'd like the Speaker to rule on the relevance of the comments for the last few minutes for the member opposite, as it deals with the repeal of the land bank and not with Bill 45.

MR. SPEAKER: — I've been listening very carefully to what the member has said and The Land Bank Act does cover the leases of all the people who have leased land from the land bank and I find that the member's comments are in order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LUSNEY: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, what we are dealing here with is a situation where the farmers made a deal with the land bank commission. They made a deal knowing what the rules were, what the requirements were, and they made deals with the commission knowing what they were getting into. They knew the rules. They knew the regulations. They knew what it was going to cost them, and that is the kind of agreement that they signed, Mr. Speaker. And that, Mr. Speaker, we could say, is a good kind of legislation. It's legislation that allows the individual to get into an agreement knowing for a period of time what it's going to cost him. And surely at this time the land bank lessees with the repeal of The Land Bank Act and Bill 46 should be aware of how it's going to affect the improvements that they have purchased from land bank (their homes, their chattels). That is what they should know. This government is asking us to approve a bill that gives no protection whatsoever to the lessees.

Let us remember that we are not talking about some large multinational company, not someone that can afford to take a loss. We're talking about some young farmers out there, ordinary hard-working people that got into a program that was beneficial to them, got into a program where they realized that they could make a living and get into a way of life that they felt they wanted and enjoyed, and they knew what this was going to

cost them over a long period of time. Most of these had long-term leases to the age of 65. And that was a good deal, Mr. Speaker. And I can say that this government, if they do not make amendments to this bill to protect the rights of these lessees, will one day regret this kind of legislation.

Not only are the rights of these lessees being taken away, Mr. Speaker, but everything is being taken away from them. As I said before, they have no redress. They cannot at any time take the government or the minister to court on a decision made by the minister regarding the appraisal of their property, their homes, or their chattels, or any improvements that they made on the land that they have. They have no way of at least receiving the fair value of what they put into that property. The minister has fairly well covered himself in the bill, where he is not responsible for any of the losses that these lessees may suffer.

The letter, Mr. Speaker, from the land bank tenants' association says:

Our legal adviser has informed us that section 4 has stripped us of any legal options to defend our rights and to protect the terms and conditions of our present leases. Our ownership and all improvements on the land and our security of tenure is all gone.

Furthermore, he advises us (and this is legal counsel that has advised these people) that Bill 46 has effectively confiscated all the property that we won on the land, in the form of buildings, improvements or chattels; has stripped us of the protection we previously enjoyed through the act, regulations, and most importantly through the terms and conditions of our lease agreements which will be completely obliterated with the passing of Bill 46.

Mr. Speaker, I think that statement by the land bank tenants' association fairly well describes the total bill. Section 4 of that bill demonstrates just how vicious and determined this government is to drive the land bank lessees right into the ground with a vengeance. Mr. Speaker, that is not comparable to any government.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote clause 4 of the bill, just to let everyone realize the cruel impact of what the land bank tenants' association is saying, so they would know what they are saying that regards basically the whole bill. That one little clause is that act could mean a lot of things to a lot of people out there. It says:

No action lies against Her Majesty in right of Saskatchewan, any member of the Executive Council or of any officer or employee of Her Majesty in right of Saskatchewan for any loss or damage suffered by any person as a result of the repeal of The Land Bank Act.

That, Mr. Speaker, is why the tenants were seeking legal advice and why they came out with a letter like they did to all the members of this legislature.

That one clause I think demonstrates exactly what this government is trying to do, and that's a very strong bill. That one clause, Mr. Speaker, says that this government is going to make sure that every one of those farmers out there — ordinary, hard-working young farmers — do not have a chance to get any justice, even in the courts, against this big government. Like they used to say before, a big government of this province with their heavy hand. And I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a government in

this province that used a heavy hand to try and hold down the ordinary hard-working people of this province, this government is doing just that. It was evident in Bill No. 45; it's evident again in Bill No. 46. This is the big government that has let this power go to their heads and they are using that power to the fullest.

Mr. Speaker, in this act, the minister made sure that he covered himself very well. But what did he do with the lessees? He left them standing out there, right out in the coldest wind there is, with no protection for them whatsoever. Sometimes it makes a person wonder how the minister would feel if another government was in place and introduced legislation that would make him and other members of his government responsible for what happened in the House while they were in government. I am sure they wouldn't like that, Mr. Speaker, but this is what they are doing in the land bank lessees of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, it also occurred to me to wonder whether the bill as presently drafted runs counter to the Canadian Charter of Rights. I wonder if this so-called freedom-loving government that we see out here, as they spoke during the election last April, have looked at this matter because it appears that that freedom that they so often used, the freedom of the people, the open government and government not making decisions until they have consulted with all the people . . . this government somehow seems to have forgotten about all that freedom, Mr. Speaker. That freedom no longer exists out there for the public. It is nothing more now than freedom for the government to do what they like. They have the majority; they can do it, agreed. But it's surprising how quickly the attitudes of these people change. Before they had the power they believed in freedom; when they've got the power, freedom no longer is a word of their vocabulary.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether the minister considers himself as being a person that still believes in this freedom. I would hope that he does and if he does I would hope that he makes some changes to this act because that one clause in that act seems to suggest that there is no fair play or justice of the land bank tenants, the land bank farmers of this province. There is no fair play or justice from this government. There is going to be no justice for them, either through the legislation or through the administration of this government, Mr. Speaker, because they will be not be responsible for any loss or damage that these young tenants, young farmers may suffer.

Mr. Speaker, he protects his interests; the minister protects his interests, but he has no protection for the farmers whatsoever. And, I was amazed to look at the part in the bill that looked at regulations where you might expect some protection for the farmers, where you might see some protection for those farmers, but nowhere in that bill does it have anything that would even come close to allowing these young farmers to at least indicate to the government what they thought the values of their buildings were.

Everything is left to regulations. And the minister has the power through the regulations whatever they will be, whenever they will be put into place, to do just about anything he pleases. All he has to do is, through the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, set the regulations to suit whatever direction he thinks that they want to go in. We haven't seen his regulations; we haven't seen a draft; we haven't even heard any comments on what these regulations are going to be.

Mr. Speaker, it makes me wonder why we can't see at least a draft of those regulations to see if they would be acceptable to the land bank tenants. Because if they are not acceptable to the lessees, then that should be considered a bad bill, because that bill

affects no one else but the lessees who are on the land bank land. There is no cause for this government to go ahead and to push these bills through the way they have been without at least giving the tenants' association a chance to give their opinions of the bill, and to make sure some suggestions as to what they would like to see in there.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that I don't want to be held responsible for anything in this bill. If the Minister of Agriculture has any sense of fair play, he wouldn't want to be responsible for anything that's in that bill either. And the members say that they will hold me responsible if I hold the bill up. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think this is about the first opportunity we've really had to deal with Bill 46, and if that is called holding the bill up, then I don't know what keeping this thing going for about two weeks will be called, because I believe everybody should have the opportunity to say what they think of the bill, and not only the people within this Chamber, but the people outside of this Chamber should have that same opportunity.

One of the members from across (and I didn't see who it was) said, "They had the opportunity to say it on April 26." Well, Mr. Speaker, true enough. On April 26 we got defeated as a government, and the Conservatives got in as a government. But I don't think that they got in because they told the public that when the got in, "We are going to pass legislation where we are going to have total control over you, and you will have no rights or no recourse left to you whatsoever." That is not what they were telling the people at that time, Mr. Speaker. If they had said that, then I'm sure they wouldn't be sitting on that side of the House. They would be sitting back on this side of the House again.

Mr. Speaker, they say that rent charges will be set by regulation. And everything will be put into regulation. The selling of land and the chattels, and the payment, the rent on the land, the form of payment to be made will all be set by regulations. Mr. Speaker, there are new rules being applied to this. These people have made contracts with the previous government, contracts that they thought would be honored by any government that would ever be in power. It was a legal document. They went into that agreement fairly well assured that that would be the case.

But what do we see today? We see that those contracts will not be honored. We see nothing in the bill that repeals the act under which these contracts were drawn up that says that every contract would be honored as it was, that the rental rates would be as stated in the contract, that the lessees would have nothing to fear of the contracts they had, that nothing would change but they would continue to be able to farm that land on a lease basis if they wanted to, or to buy it if they wanted to. There is no recognition of any previous arrangements in this bill. All the powers are taken away from the contract, the lessees, and placed in the hands of the minister, with no appeals, So the decision of the minister is what the lessees will have to live with.

And speaking of appeals, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the totally unfair aspects of this bill. The only action of the minister of this government that can clearly be appealed is the decision of the roll-over rights, when the land is passed on to a family member. And no one will care too much about that matter. After this government has put the squeeze on them through, every other avenue that they have left to their discretion, these young tenants will very likely not get to the point where they will be able to pass that land on to their heirs.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a product of the hatred and viciousness of this

government. This legislation is an approach to self-destruction, gentlemen. And if you continue on that route, that is exactly what you are going to do. Not that it would concern me that much. But at this point I am concerned about the land bank lessees because whatever happens to the government opposite, I'm sure they can very well look after themselves.

But I would like to see them at least have some consideration, some consideration for the lessees, the young farmers that are out there. But there is no consideration for them whatsoever, and it is a sad and a sorry day for the people of Saskatchewan when this government decided that on their behalf they would impose legislation of this nature. Impose legislation on that little group, 2,700 farmers, ordinary hard-working people. Impose legislation that is unfair, vindictive, and as mean as it could ever be, Mr. Speaker.

There are 2,700 farmers out there, 2,700 farmers who didn't get on the land necessarily because they wanted to purchase that land, that they wanted to own that land. Some of them maybe have land of their own. They went into a contract with land bank so that they would have some additional land to farm, some land that was reasonable in rent and could provide them with a source of income which they didn't have previously.

That was the purpose of land bank, and that is why these young farmers got into an agreement with land bank. With their land bank leases they could buy some new equipment or they could even, if they wanted to and felt that they saved enough money, purchase some additional land to make a viable unit. Some of them did. Rather than buying the land that they had already leased, and they had a long-term lease on it, they could purchase an additional quarter instead and they would own some land. And they had a guarantee that they would have some additional land through land bank to farm as long as they kept in agriculture.

And that was a security for them, Mr. Speaker. A security that the land bank lessees enjoyed. It was a security they enjoyed because they had a rental rate on that land that was cheaper than the 8 per cent that this government across is suggesting the young farmer should be purchasing their land with, and the subsidized interest that they are willing to provide them with. They had their lease at 5 per cent of the value of that land and that was a much better deal than the 8 per cent. So why would someone want to buy that land when they already had it at 5 per cent? They had a lifetime agreement at 5 per cent.

But this government decides that they would come up with a program that would get some of this land away from these lessees, would put them into debt, a debt for the rest of their lives, which they may never be able to pay off. If the economy gets any worse, 8 per cent will be most difficult for some of these farmers to pay. It would be almost impossible for them to pay 8 per cent interest, Mr. Speaker.

So the land bank lessees would not benefit from Bill 45, and yet through Bill 46 they are being told that they may have to lose the land that they have, and they may have to give it away. There were many members, there were even candidates — the former candidate in the Pelly constituency, who believed the land bank was not that bad . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please! The hon. member on his feet cannot be heard. I'm sure he can't hear himself, and I can't hear him, so I would ask for order.

MR. LUSNEY: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, land bank was not all that bad, because the former candidate for the Pelly constituency — the PC candidate — believed it was good. He believed it was good because he applied and he received some land bank land; and he's still farming that land. So it wasn't such a bad program. It's difficult for me to understand why the members opposite feel that it's such a bad program. They want to cancel that program; they want to repeal The Land Bank Act.

I think, as my colleague had mentioned, they are not concerned about what the benefits are to the land bank lessees. They are more concerned in being able to sell off some of this land so they can benefit from the revenues accrued from the sale of that land and be able to pay off the deficit that they have run up so far this year in the past seven months and so they can pay off the deficit that is more likely to be evident in the March budget. That is why they would like to see The Land Bank Act repealed, and all of the land bank land sold. It would give them a couple more years so they could continue operating and continue to pay for their April promises.

What happens to the land bank lessee who has nothing else than land bank land? There is nothing in the bill which says that this lessee will somehow be able to qualify through the FCC to purchase the land. All he has is land bank land, and the members say he can continue in his lease. Well, this is all fine, and I would sure like to believe that that is true. But, I would like to see that in this act where it will give the lessee that protection so he can continue to lease it. If he does not have the assets to qualify for a farm credit loan he would have the protection within the act to continue his lease, and he would be able to stay as a farmer, continue farming, and produce food for the world. But, Mr. Speaker, this act does not provide that assurance to that lessee. So, it does not appear to me that this government is very concerned whether they keep the young farmers on the land or whether they're off it. They have one concern and that is to repeal the act to get rid of land bank regardless of what it does to many of these young farmers out there.

And I suppose, because of their numbers, they're going to be able to do just that. But, I think I can say that there are going to be many of those young farmers out there that won't appreciate that. Maybe you got their vote this time because you misled them totally in what you said you were going to do. With what you are doing now, you will not have those same young farmers with you next time.

It would be very interesting for me to know just who this government consulted with. You hear them saying that they have talked to farmers themselves out there regarding these bills. From their discussion they decided that this is the way that they should go, that they should put together a bill like Bill 46 that would strip these lessees of just about every protection they had and strip them of the land that they farm. They consulted with the farmers.

Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting to know who the farmers were that they consulted with. Did they consult with any of the farm organizations? Did they ask them what they thought of Bill 46? Did they ask the pools, the farm unions, the lessees? From the letter that the Saskatchewan Land Bank Tenants' Association wrote, it appears they didn't even bother to ask the lessees about it. So who did they ask; who did they talk to? Was it Palliser? Or, maybe, was it Cargill? Or the stock growers? Or who was it? We have no idea, but they do say they talked to some farmers who told them this was the kind of bill they should bring forward. Well, I'm sure the lessees would also be interested to know just who those farmers were that they consulted with that gave them the idea to put together a bill like Bill 46.

Mr. Speaker, I see no reason why this government should continue to push and deny an adjournment on these bills that would give an opportunity to the farmers of Saskatchewan — the farmers that are aware that this bill is in the House now — give them an opportunity to look at it, and give them an opportunity to give the government some advice on what they think this bill will do, how it will affect them. I think if the government did that — if they allowed these people to meet with them and tell them how this bill is going to affect them, and how they can improve it — maybe then they would take a look at it and say that they should put some amendments to the bill that will provide some protection for those land bank lessees.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose a person could continue to go on this bill for hours, but I know that many of my colleagues would like to have some input into this bill.

AN HON. MEMBER: — No, keep going, they're listening with rapt attention.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You got their attention. Go ahead!

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Speaker, it seems that the members don't want me to quit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LUSNEY: — I wouldn't want to quit, especially if they asked me not to. If I thought for a moment that some of them would get up and speak on Bill 46 and tell us how good it is, Mr. Speaker, I would sit down right now — if I thought some of those members would get up and do that.

Mr. Speaker, I see a member standing, but if that member will assure me that he is going to speak on Bill 46, I will sit down.

Mr. Speaker, from what we have witnessed in this House the past couple of days, I think I would be quite safe to say that we will not have one member on that side of the House that will get up and speak in favor of this bill, especially the farm members. Some members on this side of the House, the opposition members, are saying not to forget them. Well, if they're willing to get up and speak on Bill 46, I know that the people of Saskatchewan and the farmers of Saskatchewan would be interested to hear what they have to say on it, how they feel that this bill is going to benefit the land bank lessees.

That, Mr. Speaker, is what the question is here — Bill 46 and the effect that it is going to have on the land bank lessees, the land bank lessees that are concerned, that are concerned about the effect that it's going to have on them. They have met. I know that they have met with members of the government. They were around the Legislative Building and I am sure they have talked to the government. I'm sure they have put their views across to the government members and the members say that, yes, they have met with them and they listened to them.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if they said to the members opposite what they said to some of us regarding Bill 46, I think the members would know that they have a real concern out there regarding this bill. They want some time to talk to their members to discuss this bill. They want the time to be able to meet with the government to tell them what amendments they would like to see in it to protect them as young farmers out there — 2,700 of them that we don't want to lose. These young farmers probably wouldn't be on the land if it wasn't for the land bank — young farmers that will continue to stay on that

land and continue to be good Saskatchewan citizens.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to say that I am very, very disappointed that this government would go through with a bill like this; would continue to push this bill through without even considering any amendments to it, without considering to wait a while to meet with the farm organizations and discuss the bill with them. I see no reason whatsoever that they should try to get this bill through within the next day or two. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, because I feel that the farmers of Saskatchewan should have the opportunity to look at this bill, I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 8

Blakeney
Thompson
Engel

Lingenfelter
Koskie
Lusney

Shillington
Yew

NAYS — 33

Muller
Birkbeck
Taylor
Andrew
Sandberg
McLeod
McLaren
Garner
Klein
Katzman
Currie

Smith (Swift Current)
Boutin
Hampton
Weiman
Hodgins
Sveinson
Sauder
Petersen
Glauser
Meagher
Parker

Smith (Moose Jaw)
Hopfner
Martens
Caswell
Young
Domotor
Maxwell
Hepworth
Myers
Zazelenchuk
Baker

MR. SPEAKER: — I declare the motion lost and the debate continues.

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, have I got the floor? Thank you. The minister told us that he was prepared to set up and stand his Bill 45 up against land bank any day and I think the minister doesn't know what the land bank is all about. So tonight I thought before we destroy something that become an institution to about 2,600 families or more . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Somebody maybe calls it a penal institution. If that means that you're locked into a program and you're guaranteed a land base, you may call it a penal institution. Your minister, the man you set up to represent agriculture in Saskatchewan, called the people on the land bank dudes and peasants and all kinds of other names. I think they're farmers. I think they're farmers and these people that the Minister of Agriculture calls land peasants aren't land peasants at all.

During my budget debate, I said that if this new bill is so wonderful, why not let the two stand side by side. Why not introduce your new bill and let it run alongside of land bank and let the people decide which bill they'd like to support. Give the farmers the choice. Don't take their choice away from them. Don't dictate to them. Let them decide.

I intend to point out tonight that the land bank was a successful operation of about 2,700 families. If you take out the annual report (and may I say if you're successful in introducing this legislation, this book will be quoted many, many times in the future because it'll likely be the last annual report for the next three years or so) and you have a look at it, turn to page 20 of the land bank report. It talks about a little bit of the record of land bank. And there's a word there at the bottom of page 20: "terminations" — "terminations" — how many people couldn't make their payments. I heard hints that there is a backlog and a great big caseload of unpaid rent by farmers. Terminations here total four: upheld, two (some were appealed); changed, one; and pending, one. Out of 2,700 farmers, two — two farms, two land bank farmers — lost their land. I wonder what the record of the land bank purchase plan is going to be. I wonder what the record of the land bank purchase plan is going to be. Ten years down the road — summary of appeals. Look at it; page 20. Ten years down the road after land bank's been going. I wonder how many of these young people, after paying 8 per cent for five years and 12 per cent for the next five years, if that's assured, I wonder how many of these, Mr. Speaker, are going to be . . .

If this is such a bad program, why is the government so anxious to can it, kill it, bury it right now? No time for adjournment. Two days into the discussion of this bill, can't take time to debate it, no time for adjournment, we've got to get it stamped out right now. I wonder why they're in such a hurry, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if you've thought about that from your independent seat. What is the government really scared of? Are they afraid that if they leave this in one more year that they won't be able to jiggle with the rents? Is that what the problem is? Do they say that the formula for rents is so unreasonable that they have to get rid of the formula and they can't, so they want to fix the rents? Maybe if it's not the rent, maybe there are some farmers farming that land that they'd like to ship out of the area they are in. Maybe they're anxious to break a contract or a lease or two. Maybe that's the question; I'm not sure.

Or, we could ask the question: are they using it as a weapon? And I think this is where it's coming down. I tried to make my point as emphatically as I could a little while ago before supper on the bill to introduce your new legislation to purchase land. I tried to make the point that that bill was going to be a political weapon. Maybe because this is designed in such a way that you can't use it as a weapon that that's why they want to destroy this bill. I don't know. I don't know.

Another problem: if they leave this kind of operation in place, they're going to have an awful lot of trouble trying to force these tenants to buy their land or to even get off the land. This piece of legislation, like I said when it was first introduced, is the most vicious piece of legislation that I have ever seen since I've been an elected member, and since I have been interested in politics. And I first ran way back in 1967, Mr. Speaker. I would like to have any of these members get up and find a piece of legislation that was passed in 30 years of CCF and NDP government that viciously, with one stroke of the pen, dealt with 2,700 families — not 2,700 people, 2,700 families — in the same way as they did with this.

We did it when we introduced it, he says. Let me read you just a few objectives. Page 9 is a section in the land bank's annual report that talks about the objectives:

The principal purpose for the establishment of the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission was to provide provincial assistance in the allocation and utilization of the agricultural land resources of Saskatchewan.

The involvement is by what? By coercion? By force? By resolution? That's not what it says here.

Involvement is by the free will of those who wish to sell their land, and by those who wish to obtain control of land through long-term leases offered by the commission.

Mr. Speaker, if this legislation were left in place, if somebody has an option to go to the farm purchase plan, and is farming down in Weyburn and wants to expand his unit, he can go and get his money from the farm credit corporation. But if that person hasn't got the resources to borrow that kind of money, by free will, no coercion, he could put a bit in or apply to rent some land.

Allocation is based on the individual applicant's need, practical ability, current resources, proximity and age. These factors are related to the establishment and maintenance of viable farming units.

And you are attacking these people and saying that that program is no good. I think your reasons are hidden deeper than that. I think your reasons are hidden a lot deeper than that, and clause 4 of this bill says why they want to get rid of this land bank land:

No action lies against her Majesty in right of Saskatchewan, any member of the Executive Council or any officer or employee of Her Majesty in the right of Saskatchewan for any loss or damage suffered by any person as a result of the repeal of The Land Bank Act.

There's the reason, there's the reason why they need this piece of legislation.

You leave the objectives of the land bank in place and you can't cancel . . . (inaudible) . . . the crown is protected, the minister is protected, the employees are protected, everybody in this bill is protected except the farmer and the tenant. Everyone. This clause just shows how mean and vicious this piece of legislation really is . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I maybe wish yours would go dry. I haven't heard of any source coming from that side. Mr. Speaker, that isn't dry. None of them have had a word to say, they've all been muffled on this bill. None of them have told us why the government is doing this. Nobody got up and told us why they have intentions of dissolving a good program like this.

You take the 10th annual report of the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission and when the then minister of agriculture tabled this report, in the foreward he says:

1981 marked the 10th year of operation of the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission. Establishment of the program in 1972 introduced another option for people who could not afford to purchase land to begin farming or maintain an economic unit.

What are you doing? What are you doing for the young people of Saskatchewan? Are you introducing a new option? Are you introducing a new way for young people to start farming? What is it? Stand up and tell me where this option has improved over what we had before in 1971 or 1972. Show me where you've got a new program.

... in 1972 introduced another option for people who could not afford to purchase land ... It also provided a sales opportunity to retiring farmers in a time when buyers of farmland were scarce.

In 1972 that was a problem. Today that isn't a problem, Mr. Speaker, from the insight he had when he wrote this, he must have been aware of what was going to happen.

Although economic conditions have changed drastically since then, the difficulties faced by beginning farmers have intensified.

I intend to cover that in just a very short order. The difficulties have intensified and instead of allowing an opportunity for a young person to get in without expanding all his capital, they're cutting off that opportunity; they're cutting off a program that was allowing young people to get started in farming.

The idea of a provincial government operating a leasing and purchasing program was a new concept for many people in Saskatchewan, Canada, and other countries.

Over the last decade we have watched the land bank gain widespread acceptance and an international reputation ...

What do we find the government doing? Here is something that's got a good reputation all over the world and I'd like to see the minister for Moosomin deny that — the member for Moosomin. He'd like to be a minister and he should be a minister and I think he'd make a better minister than some of the people who aren't filling the seats here, because he's usually in the House, and he respects this institution.

Show me any place where there's a better reputation than what land bank has received all over the world. They are coming up and looking at our program from down in the States and North Dakota and different places, and they think it's a good program for people to have an opportunity to lease land. And you're taking that chance away from them.

In times when the future of the family farm faces technological change and many economic uncertainties, the land bank commission can look forward to making an important contribution to the preservation of a way of life that is essential to retaining Saskatchewan's rural communities.

Here's where you people fall down. You don't give a rip about the rural communities in Saskatchewan. You don't care if there are young people on the farms or not. The main focus of the minister's speech was that 152 farmers were the only ones who purchased their land. 2,700 were ignored; 2,700 successful operations were ignored because of 152. Those were the only ones who were successful, he says, the ones who purchased their land.

Many of these 2,700 could buy if they decided to, at a reasonable price in relation to today's market, but they didn't because they recognized the merits of this program. The only reason these 2,700 didn't buy their land is because they, before tonight, had security. They had stability. Now what have they got? They're in fear. They're in fear of losing their land. They're in fear of what's going to happen to them. They know they can't pass this land on to their descendants. Their dad sold the land to the land bank in good faith, thinking that the son was going to have it for the rest of his life. And what are

these people doing to it?

The minister tried to suggest that the expressed aim was to enable young farmers to eventually own their own land. The expressed aim of this new farm purchase plan was that young people could eventually own their land. It wasn't just that. The minister should know that very well. Let me refer members to the stated objectives of the land bank commission, as outline in the recent report.

The program has six general objectives:

1. To facilitate the establishment of viable farm units;
2. To encourage perpetuation of viable units through transfer of possession to direct descendants;
3. To enable those individuals who have the desire and practical ability to begin farming independent of substantial farm assistance;
4. To allocate land based on a fair and unbiased selection between applicants;
5. To provide counselling services to the lessees who indicate a desire for assistance in either farm management or financial management;
6. To provide a continued sales opportunity to the people who own their farmland in Saskatchewan.

These objectives help to maintain a viable agricultural industry and to provide for a transfer of farms from generation to generation. If you wouldn't have these objectives, what would you have? Larger farm units. They'd be absorbed into larger farm units.

In case that doesn't convince you people, in case that doesn't convince the minister, he hasn't looked at land bank closely enough. I'd like to draw attention to this act. Clause 3 of The Land Bank Act reads: the purpose of this act includes the provision of assistance: (a) to increase the opportunity for persons to establish or maintain family farms in Saskatchewan, and (b) to increase the opportunities for owners of farmland in Saskatchewan to dispose of their farmland at fair and just prices.

If that still hasn't convinced you people, you still haven't looked closely enough. Let me quote from a pamphlet, "The Saskatchewan Land Bank." This was distributed widely in 1972. I don't know how many of you saw this.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, before we introduced The Land Bank Act or the land bank commission, what did we do? Did we come in with a piece of legislation in the dark of night, after supper, when we thought nobody was listening and sneak in the legislation, not allowing any adjournments and railroading it through in two days of regular sittings? Is that what we did with The Land Bank Act? No, we didn't. Once we had a reading of the bill, we published a little booklet. We went out across the province and we talked to people all over the place. We gave them a chance to look at it. It says right in the front of this book: "This book has been prepared to inform farm people and the general public about the basic nature of the proposed land bank."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: — How many quarters of land have you got? Al? How many quarters do you own?

MR. ENGEL: — I believe in the land bank program and if you want to get it out of your thoughts, and you want to get away from it . . . I don't blame the member for wanting to get us off this question. He doesn't want to hear what a socialist will do when he introduces a new program. He doesn't want to hear that. You want to talk about what a big farmer I am, as though that says I couldn't believe in a land bank program. That's not the case. My dear friend, listen to this:

We want to inform the general public about the basic nature of the proposed land bank and to simulate discussion.

We were not afraid to listen to what people had to say. We wanted to simulate discussion about alternatives, about alternative methods of operating a number of aspects of the program. And we were looking for alternative methods. What are you doing about it? . . . (inaudible) . . . Oh, sorry about that.

Bill 45 was set up with its companion bill — the big axe — right beside it. We can't have any competition. The free enterprise boys who believe in competition kill it. That's the way to have competition. If you want to set up a chain store, you would kill all the others and starve them all out and then sell your product for whatever you can get. That's the free enterprise policy you believe in; you don't believe in competition. We wanted to stimulate discussion about alternative methods of operating a number of aspects of the program.

Interested individuals and organizations are invited to forward letters and submissions to my office containing comments and suggestions regarding the implementation and operation of the land bank. Feel free to be critical of our proposals.

This was right on the front page; written by the minister, "Feel free to be critical of our proposals." Here we have some people who have been in the gallery, and you'll see more around, and maybe still more on Monday, who might be a little bit critical of your new proposals. And what are you trying to do? Jam the legislation through so we get it out of the way by the time they get here. We'll fool them; we'll get this legislation done ahead of time. That's the way to act when you have the best and most imaginative bill that's ever been introduced in the country. That's what the minister said about it.

Slam it through. Slam it through. Don't let anybody say anything. Don't listen to any criticism. A minister who had a confident program and knows what he's talking about says, "Feel free to be critical of our proposals. I urge you to offer constructive forms of criticism to improve the basic proposals." And, you know, when he said, "I believe the land bank will be of great importance to Saskatchewan farm people," I know 6,000 or 7,000 people who are now living on farms today that say, "Thank God for guys like John there."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — That was just the title page. That was the introduction to tell the people what we're doing. It goes on to say, "The land bank will provide the retiring farmer with an opportunity to retire with dignity and financial security at a time of his own choosing." He doesn't have to worry when the market's right. He doesn't have to worry if

the case flow and everything's right. He knows he can get the money that his land is worth by an assessment, not by public bid. The land wasn't put up for public bid.

If you take and . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I know you're waiting to buy land. I understand that very clearly. And you likely are hoping and sitting there saying, "Boy, once we get this legislation jammed through, there'll be lots of land for sale." I hear that. Guys out in the country say, "Get rid of the land bank. I can't wait to get rid of those peasants so I can buy their land." There are greedy guys like that, saying that. I'm not sure that that's the kind of guys that made for a good rural community through. And if you're that kind of a member, I feel sorry for you.

Another thing the land bank proposed way back before we ever introduced it was that the land bank will create an opportunity for young, capable farmers to lease farmland, thus eliminating the necessity to raise large amounts of capital and to make commitments to burdensome principal payments over a long period. This will permit young farmers to utilize the capital that they would have put into land for investment in livestock facilities and other productive assets which will become the basis for the growth and development of the farm in rural Saskatchewan. "An important objective," the book goes on, "of the land bank is to create an opportunity for young farm people who might not otherwise have the chance to establish and operate an effective farm but who are capable of successfully farming."

I don't think that that is part of the Tory philosophy. If you can't put up the bucks, you're not a farmer. That's their philosophy. If you've got the bucks, that automatically makes you a farmer. Just because you know how to farm, and just because you come from a family that didn't have enough land to get you started, you're not qualified to farm under this new Tory philosophy. They want guys in there who have the bucks to get the down payment. You put up the cash, you show us you've got some bucks and we'll let you farm. That's the new objective. I don't think it's a good one. I think you'll find that the people are going to judge you, even in your riding, and the Deputy Speaker is going to be wishing he'd never witnessed the destruction of the land bank. I'll predict that you'll be sorry that you went along with seeing this bill passed.

If that still doesn't convince you, let me refer to a speech of the then minister of agriculture that he gave on April 21, 1972. He noted the work done by the farm credit corporation, but also pointed out some of the problems.

Number one, Mr. Messer said a farmer who purchases land risks loss of all his own lands should he not be able to meet his obligations. And I would like to see one of the members deny that. I'd like to see the smart lawyer from Saskatoon Eastview deny that. I'd like to see you deny that. Deny that.

Second one that Mr. Messer said, and that still holds more true today and I'll prove that in a little while: a farmer must put up all of his assets as security for land purchases, often leaving him with no security for loans for machinery, equipment, livestock and other needs. I'd like to see the members deny that. That was said in 1972 on April 21 in this House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the minister went on to point out the basic problem with any program that focuses on land purchase as the main emphasis and I quote:

Farmers wishing to purchase land to establish a farming operation or to

expand a small-scale farming operation find it difficult if not impossible to compete with owners of large farm units or persons with off-farm income.

And I can testify to the truth. He was right on. He knew what he was talking about. The farmer who is trying to establish a farming operation under our present system must acquire land, must acquire machinery, and in many cases livestock, buildings and all other implements necessary for agricultural production.

Mr. Messer went on to say in April 1972:

To acquire these assets he must borrow large sums of money. Such a farmer faces a tremendous cash shortage during the first years of operation. Such a farmer must pay all operating costs such as taxes, fuel, repairs, and cropping expenses.

That minister of agriculture was one that knew what farming was all about, knew what it cost to get into farming. Such a farmer besides raising that tremendous cash and shortages, he went on to say, "must pay all operating costs such as taxes, fuel . . ." And all that time fuel was 27 cents a gallon. I can remember in '72, fuel was 27 cents a gallon.

. . . repairs and cropping expenses. He must provide himself and his family with the necessities of life such as food, clothing, a decent home, transportation, and hopefully some entertainment. He must pay interest on the large amount of money he must borrow and in addition, Mr. Speaker, he must pay payments on principal. These payments on principal are in effect a forced saving. The members opposite will claim the principal payments will ultimately give the farmer title to his land, that the farmer is building up an equity for future years.

Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what is the point of forcing farmers to save money for the future if they cannot afford to live today?

That's what Messer said on April 12, 1972.

Did you think that was going to be that relevant today? Today the land costs aren't what they were back in 1972. You look at the table in the annual report and in 1972-73, for your information . . . Do you remember? Do you remember in 1972 the average cost per acre of land was \$53 per acre? At \$53 an acre we saw fit to introduce the land bank legislation because they couldn't get enough capital to get started farming. They had a problem with the farm credit corporation and qualifying for loans. The average age of a farmer in 1972 (and I can remember campaigning on that and visiting the people in my riding) was 57 years of age, 57 years of age. \$53.50, enough money to buy dinner for two, enough money to buy dinner for two, would buy an acre of land in 1972.

What happened over the years? Are you aware of the prices of land? Do you know what happened over the years? I told the members opposite that an acre of land cost the price of a dinner for two today. \$53.50 today! 1973 the price of land increased by 29 per cent and went up to \$69 an acre. In 1973-74 we witnessed a short crop, didn't we? You have things tough up north; we do down south. The price of land escalated by only 8 per cent; it went to \$74 an acre. From \$53 to \$74. In 1975 it went to \$85 an acre, a 15 per cent increase. In 1976, \$114.20, a 33 per cent increase from the year before — over 100 per cent increase in the price per acre of land from 1973 to 1976 . . .

(inaudible interjection) . . . the member will have his chance to get into this debate as soon as I am finished.

Mr. Speaker, when Messer made his statements in 1972 and things were tough, the price of land was only \$53 an acre. We had the foresight to know that things were going to improve after those lean, hungry years. When the Liberals were in power for seven years, Morris Rod-Weeder was ready to go under. Things were getting tough all over the country. I know it. I went over there to listen to their problems.

AN HON. MEMBER: — At that time a dime was worth one dollar.

MR. ENGEL: — A dime might have been worth 10 cents, and that's all your comments are worth.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in that 1975 campaign a senior old gentleman who I highly respect . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — I ran in that campaign . . .

MR. ENGEL: — So did I. In 1975, a senior businessman in one of my colleague's towns or was it my riding at the time . . . Probably Kincaid. He might have been a Ford dealer. But this old gentleman got his guys together in the little furnace room. You know what you do in furnace rooms in a shop. He got his guys together in the furnace room and he says, "Look, you fellows, if you support Engel, you'll be down the street looking for a job at the co-op." That's what he told those guys: "You'll be down the street looking for a job at the co-op."

You know, Mr. Speaker, that was '67. That was 1967. In 1971, I went back to that same dealership and the farmer and his son were there and only half as many guys because he had laid the other half off. He got us all together and he had me in joining them this time. He wasn't talking about me. And he was talking about . . . He said, "I've changed my mind. This is the first time . . ." That was 1971 when things got really tough and he got his guys together and he told those fellows, "I think I'm going to support Engel this time around."

And do you know what I told him? I said, "if you and your guys don't support Engel, your son will be down at the co-op looking for a job if things get much worse." Your son. Not his men; his own son would have lost his business. And now under your present free enterprise system I see things going exactly the same way. When I drive through my riding, I see more equipment sitting on dealers' lots than I did from 1967 to 1971. It's piling up again. The farmers have a harder time making a go than they ever did. And young farmers . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order! I think we should give the member a chance to let him debate his point and I think he should stay on the subject of Bill 46, not the election of '71.

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The point I was trying to make, by the time we went from '64 to '71 . . . I went through that period of time as a young politician getting started. I saw what was happening. And today 1982 is a repeat of 1964 and '65. Only you guys are going in high gear. That's the only difference. Thatcher went at a snail's pace. It took him seven lean years to make it really hungry. It took seven years.

I can remember our leader at that time talking about those lean, hungry years. You're driving us into those same lean hungry years by cutting off the farmers at their roots and cutting off the farm programs. You're afraid to let a program start that'll let a young fellow get farming without any money. You say, "Let the guy in with the big bucks. Let the guy get started that's got the big acreage." This program didn't need, to qualify, big acreages. I don't need land bank to start my son farming. I don't need land bank and I'm proud of that. But there's a lot of fellows that do. There's a lot of people that do. And that's the difference between this piece of legislation and filling it, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That's the point I was trying to make. And we're running into that kind of situation a lot faster than we thought we would.

The government thinks it's doing something big and great by repealing The Land Bank Act — a great big wonderful act. They may think that they have a real hot-shot program to put in its place and they thought of something original. Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's not true. This is not an original . . . I didn't know I was that dry.

The bill that is a companion bill to this, and the reason why you're killing this bill, is Bill No. 45. The reason you're killing the land bank bill is because you've got such a hot-shot program is what I am saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

That is an original, new idea — not true, not true! Saskatchewan and Canada have been through this same thing before. The same kind of program of interest subsidies were in place before, the only difference is that this time you are focusing all your attention on farm credit corporation rather than Credit Foncier. How much land do they have in your area? There is still a lot of land for sale in my area that they have put up. Cabinet probably will not listen. My friends across the way . . .

I'm sorry that there are so few people from cabinet there — just two of you left, three. I'm sorry. Just three of you left to hear my comments and take them back to cabinet for a special meeting tomorrow to decide to repeal this bill. I wish you all were here. I want to tell you that you haven't solved that program. You know you haven't. This isn't the solution and this isn't going to solve the problem for young people getting into farming.

This isn't going to help your former company out to sell more rod weeders and cultivators. Not at all because you're taking all their cash. I would have been sure you would have been my best colleague in defending leaving this in place, because they would have had some capital to buy some equipment. How in the hang are you going to buy any equipment if you've used up all your money buying land?

You know there is a young fellow who brought his records into my office yesterday and he showed me on black and white, he sat down with his pencil and calculated for me in black and white, what it costs him to grow 25 bushels an acre . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll tell you, just hold your horses. If he has to pay 8 per cent interest on his loan, and he knows what the land is going to cost . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I know we are. Bill No. 46 kills — they have to go together, don't they? You can't talk about Bill No. 46 without mentioning the implications because it's been killed because of Bill No. 46 without mentioning the implications because it's been killed because of Bill No. 45, so I must refer to both. I have to tie them together. And you wouldn't kill this bill if you wouldn't have a program to put in its place. I'm sure you wouldn't. They must go together.

So you don't want to hear the story about how much it costs to grow wheat. He told me that he had a letter from land bank that he was going to buy the land from his dad. He

went to the credit union and borrowed the money instead, and he is hoping to get in on this new program. I hope they can. But at 8 per cent interest on that \$300,000 loan, paying just the interest, no principal at all, just paying 8 per cent interest and paying his fertilizers and his fuel costs. If he grows 25 bushels an acre it will cost him \$8.20 a bushel to grow that wheat.

Now in those three quarters of land he has to have four extra quarters to carry that three quarters paid for. You figure it out any way you want. The land costs \$125,000 a quarter, and that was a steal in the Gravelbourg area. I can show you a parcel of land that went for sale for \$800,000 and it was 60 acres short of a section. \$800,000 is what the people are paying and those are the big guys that have the bucks. That was a cash deal.

To get land around there these fellows put up \$300,000 for three quarters of land, and to carry that land — and I'll show you those figures. I won't even do that; I'll send him in to see you on Monday. Okay? Would you take the time to see him and listen to his story? Think about it. When you buy land, the price is based on future income expectations, not what it will earn you now. He has to look down the road and you didn't (that's what upsets me so much) even guarantee what the interest rates are going to be.

Just like when you buy a business or you buy stocks in the stock market. You pay for it. If you're rich you haven't got a worry in the world; you know you'll make your payments. If not, you're stuck with paying the debt or your children are, or they'll do like even some large operators who owned hockey teams and managed Gretzky. You've got to have the bucks to swing it, and these young people can't.

When they tie up their money in the land, they won't be able to buy equipment. More and more workers all over the country will be laid off because of this piece of legislation. You're forcing young people to pay interest on high amounts of money, instead of buying some new equipment. Then, they've got to earn \$35,000 on the side, which is a good thing, I think that had to be in place, because otherwise they'd never make the payments. There's no way you could make the payments if you wouldn't . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, where are they going to get jobs? That's the trouble.

Actually what that is doing to these young people is depriving them of a decent standard of living . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . They have all these stories. I'll wait and let you tell it yourself. Okay.

I think these people aren't very anxious to hear that cutting this bill is going to deprive young families of a standard of living. This young fellow that I know quite well told me it's going to cost him \$8.25 a bushel to grow wheat. I know it's going to cost him that because he does his calculations; he does his projections; he's an economist. Do you know what he did to get into farming, Mr. Deputy Speaker? He went up north and worked on the oil rigs and he brought in the money. He worked long hours and all winter in the cold to save up some money and he came back and he's starting to farm. What's happening to him because he can't get some land bank land? He's going to be spending eight bucks a bushel to grow wheat.

You know and I know that we're not getting \$8 a bushel. If he didn't have a land base and a family that's going to work together, so that he could farm with his brother and his dad and try to pool it all together and cover up his expenses for a while . . . He's hoping he can hang on for three more years. Mr. Deputy Speaker, just three years. If he could only

hang on for three years. Lucky he's even single.

The only ones I know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, who're going to do well with this piece of legislation and are showing it, are the families that are well established, those that are large, those that don't even need any more land. They're the ones that we're helping.

I had another constituent of mine tell me, and he was grinning and just as happy as could be about it, because he's got three sons over 18 years of age. They have just been farming as a great big family operation, these three sons each driving their four-wheel-drive tractor for their dad. They had lots of land. I've only got about 10 per cent as much land as they have.

They're going to be helped, because if his three sons qualify, they'd only give them a million bucks. That only gives them a million bucks: 350 times 3. Each of them are going to get . . . (inaudible) . . . You'll be able to set it up exactly right. And that man can get a million dollars and buy another 10 quarters of land. That's going to be tough because he'll only be able to increase his operation by 10 per cent. Those are the guys that we're helping with this bill.

Every district knows about land hogs. Every district knows about them. They bid everyone else up so they can get their hands on another piece of land. The magic number in my area maybe sells a lot of 60-foot cultivators. The magic number for the amount of quarters of land that everybody is gunning for in our area is 100 quarters. If you haven't got 100 quarters, you're not with it. You go down to the pub in Gravelbourg any time you want. You've been around. Those guys all want 100 quarters of land and they're moving into your area. They're moving into Vanguard; they're down to Mankota; they're down south and they're all over the place, but they're looking for 100 quarters of land. They're aggressive and they're vicious. Those guys that are my age that have 25-year-old and 28-year-old sons, they're the guys that are going to qualify. If my son wasn't a lawyer and wanted to farm, he would have qualified. He qualifies. But the guy that needs it, my other friend that came and told me it's going to cost him \$8 a bushel, he isn't going to qualify. No money for him. He can't make it into the farm credit corporation. They'll give him a quarter of land maybe. They won't buy it.

Members opposite know better, but they got on a little political gimmick. They read a study. They looked at some books and said, "What's hard to sell and what's hard to convince people, and if they will kill that land bank, we'll tell the people there are a few guys out in the country that got some cheap, easy, free land and they're on a free ride. We'll get rid of those guys." That's what they did. That's why they came up with this kind of program. What they are doing is breaking the backs of the family farm.

Eventually their policies in the long run will turn Saskatchewan into a group of industrial farm factors and then let me hear you talk about Russia. The only difference between your new province and your new image in Russia is that one's called a state farm and yours will be called a factory. That's the only difference. If you think that makes for a good rural community, you're not thinking on the same wave length that I am because for my kids to go to school, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and for my kids to take skating lessons, and for my daughter to take horseback riding or whatever, we have to drive her 25 or 30 miles because we don't have any neighbors. And you want to increase that? You want to take out the few young guys that are down there? Do you want to do away with the few that are there? Yes or no. Yes.

There are a lot of members across . . . I'll repeat what the member for Moosomin said:

Why don't I sit down and shut up. Those are the words from the member for Moosomin. That's their attitude about the land bank! That's their attitude about an operation . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order. I think we should quieten down a bit so we can hear the member.

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They don't like what they're hearing. That's what's wrong.

I'd suggest to the members opposite that you'd better stop and think before it's too late. I think rather than say, "Sit down and shut up," I'd say, "Sit up and start thinking." Get off your brains and start talking and telling us the advantages of this legislation. I haven't heard any advantages. This matter is too serious to be diverted by the kind of garbage dished up the other night by the Minister of Agriculture when he wandered from Soviet Russia to East Germany to Africa in an attempt to divert attention from his own inadequate program.

Why not leave the land bank in place, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Why not leave the land bank in place? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And tell my in-laws, "Why not leave the land bank in place?" Why not give the farmers a choice? You go back and you look at . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the program in your annual report, likely the last one of the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission — I hope not. I hope we have many more. I can assure you we'll reintroduce one three years from now. We'll reintroduce one three years from now. We might have a three-year lapse.

But in 1981 there was a year in which the commission did not have sufficient funds to purchase from all who wished to sell to the land bank. I wonder why that was the case? Were we out there forcing all these guys to come into land bank and say, "Hey, buy my parcel of land"? Is that what we were doing? We weren't advertising it.

Members opposite are saying that the only reason they won the election is because of the land bank. And yet 1981 was a year when they didn't have sufficient funds, and by the end of December they had over 250 applications to sell — 250 applications to sell to land bank that had to be held for inclusion in future purchase programs. That's 1981. By 1982 it was even worse. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I've been suggesting to the Minister of Agriculture how many young guys there were that were applicants.

We'll look at how many applicants there were. When we were going down the price of land, I stopped at 1975 when these turkeys diverted me, but the price of land went from \$114 an acre. For 1981 do you know how much it was? Three hundred and eighty-seven dollars an acre on average! And you're saying now that land that went from \$114 to \$140 to \$170 to \$230 to \$280 and then by '81 to \$380 — that that's the time to do away with rentals and tell the guys to purchase. Is that what you're saying? When it was \$53 an acre, they couldn't afford to buy. The average age of the farmer was 75.

What do you think it's going to be when we get to implementing this new program? How many new farmers do you really think we're going to get on farming? I'd make the wager that all we get is some bigger farmers. All we'll get is some bigger operations. All we'll get is some bigger operations. All we'll get a few more hundred-quarter operations, and once they find out how popular that is they'll even be doing that in Weyburn.

There's one more thing I want to tell you about the land bank. If some farmers decide to sell their land and they know they are going to retire, what do they do? What do they do? They get in there and they farm the life out of that stuff for the last two or three years — a lot of people do. They want to retire with a few bucks, so the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . What does the land bank do? I'm not saying that about all the elderly farmers. I'm saying it about the guys that are selling it. Get up and say that in the legislation. I've got to get you involved somehow. Land disposition when necessary . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And I can assure you if he's 72 years old and intends to quit farming he might seed it all the second last year.

Mr. Speaker, if you can hear me I'll tell you something. The land bank wouldn't rent land that was in a rundown condition; they wouldn't rent the land. And under land disposition in 1981, lease competition remained very high. There were 914 young people wishing to get into farming, and this is when I start to tell you why land bank isn't so popular.

Now I want to tell you that land bank isn't that popular, and I'll tell you why. Let me tell you why. Listen, Mr. Speaker, 914 applicants were in competition for — 914 parcels of land? 700 parcels of land? 500 parcels of land? There were 914 applicants. How many pieces of land were they going after? Seventy-four parcels. Seventy-four parcels was all that was up for competition in 1981, and there were almost 1,000 guys looking for it — 914 applicants . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I wish that big guy would go back to his own side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult when someone speaks behind you. Across the way I can take it because it's filtered through this table.

Members of the legislature, if only these guys had been at an NDP function on the Saturday night when our convention was on. We had a fantastic speaker. The president of our party talked about MLAs and their standing members on a committee.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I know the member may be running short of material, but I would hope that you would stay on the subject.

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, I was having trouble trying to keep their attention, so I was just going to tell them one little story about an MLA, and how you address the Table and argue with the Chair, but I won't bother.

Mr. Speaker, land in poor condition that was purchased by the land wasn't leased out. Did you know that? Land that wasn't fit to be rented when it was purchased (and they purchased land that wasn't fit to be rented wasn't put out of lease. They hired custom work. When necessary, custom work contracts are used to get land into condition prior to leasing it out. There were nine such contracts in the year 1981. Did you know that?

Here land bank was trying everything so that when a young person finally leased the parcel of land, he had something he could make a go of. He didn't have to get stuck with buying that land and farming it for two, three, four or five years to get into condition in order to grow some crops. You know that land can be run down. I wouldn't rent my farm out without a condition on how it is going to be farmed to maintain the productivity of

that land. When land was purchased when the productivity was run down it was . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I'm having a considerable amount of difficulty relating the member's remarks to the bill that is before the House. I would ask him to come back to the debate on Bill No. 46, and the land bank commission.

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, What I am trying to point out is that we are passing legislation tonight and discussing legislation tonight that is going to destroy, to cut off the land bank. I am trying to convince the members opposite that they shouldn't do that because the land bank was a good program. I was developing an argument that the land bank's function was that they wouldn't force a young person to go into the land naked — like you would if you were to buy it. If that young person had bought this land, he would have had to farm it for three, four or five years to bring it into a condition where it would be productive to its full capacity. Under purchase agreement, when this parcel of land transfers from one body to the other, and the farm credit corporation picks up the note on it, that young person is going to have to make his annual payments . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I find that the hon. member is relating his remarks to a bill that was approved this afternoon. You are wandering far from the topic of Bill No. 46. I would advise the member to come back to the subject.

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Many land bank farmers, before Bill 46 finally passes, are still part of a family farm operation. I hate to see that change. I hate to see this bill being passed. I hate to see this bill being passed where they will not have a chance to rent land any more.

Once this bill is passed (and I'm talking about An Act to repeal The Land Bank Act which will cancel the contract that these young people have with land bank), then the land bank commission and the terms under which it operates, and the terms under the lease agreement, under the land bank lease agreement. And under this legislation, it refers to a summary of the long-term lease agreements. The total acres leased and the total new acres added in 1981 were 59,000 acres of land — 59,000 acres were brought into the land bank in 1981. Once we pass this legislation and destroy the land bank, that land will not be available for lease even if the lessees stay in the lands branch. There will not be any new land added. The minister is stopping the land bank program. He is cutting off the ability of this commission to go out and pick up new parcels of land. They're finished with it.

The average net worth of a farmer, from statistics that were available in 1981, was about \$88,000. With that net worth, if they turn around and go to the farm credit corporation, they're lucky if they can borrow \$40,000 — not the \$100,000 that the minister is bragging about.

He is destroying a program that has been created to help people. You're destroying with this legislation a program that's going to hurt a lot of little people in Saskatchewan. The larger farmer can survive it. The large farmer, Mr. Speaker — and you're aware of that even in your community around Beechy. There are a lot of large farmers that will appreciate this new loans program which we supported this afternoon to purchase land, but by destroying the land bank, you are cutting out the chances of some of those section farmers that I met in your church. I met some nice people up there. They're down to a section of land. They even have trouble transferring land to their children because they haven't got the back-up. The Minister of Agriculture . . . (inaudible)

interjection) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. Would you give the hon. member the opportunity to speak. I'm sure if any of you would like to have the opportunity, equal opportunity will be given to you.

MR. ENGEL: — I was thinking about this legislation after it was first introduced that night and when I got home, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that I had trouble going to sleep. I thought of this legislation a long time. I thought of the remarks that I put into record that'll be there for a long time. The point that we record in *Hansard* I take very seriously, and the remarks I made about this land bank legislation I take it very seriously.

I call this the most vicious piece of legislation that I've ever seen in my day. In fact that night I had a dream, and this is true. I saw the Minister of Agriculture, instead of being a big, strong guy like he is. I saw him dressed up like a Roman soldier, sword at his side, shaven bare head as mostly how he's portrayed in pictures. I saw him take a dish of water and wash his hands and say, "Don't hold those 2,700 farmers to my charge." That's what I saw. That's what I saw, Mr. Speaker. I saw a minister that says, "I can wash my hands of the land bank. I can set it aside and I can wipe them out and I won't remember them any more. I'm not responsible. I'm going to be innocent."

That maybe sounds funny to the Minister of Agriculture. That is the funniest thing the Minister of Agriculture — the Minister of Highways has heard all day. Let me tell you, when he drives up and down his roads across the province, he's going to find out that there's a lot of farmers who will agree with me, and they'll say that you fellows can't wash your hands of this deal. You can't shrug it off. There's no action in clause 4. Clause 4 says:

No action lies against Her Majesty in right of Saskatchewan, any member of the Executive Council or any officer or employee of Her Majesty in right of Saskatchewan for any loss or damage suffered by any person as a result of the repeal of The Land Bank Act.

They washed their hands and they passed it in legislation and said: "It's finished; it's done. You can't touch us. We're clean." You're not, and that is going to come back to haunt you year after year after year, I can assure. This admission that you aren't going to hurt people is going to come back to haunt you, because you are going to hurt a lot of people. There are 2,700 people out there who are going to be hurt, Mr. Speaker.

Do you know what I'd like to predict, Mr. Speaker? I would like to predict that three years from now we'll remove this little clause 4 from the legislation, just take out clause 4. And then we'll have the former minister of agriculture, we'll have the former executive and the former professor who will be up teaching at Saskatoon, and all of a sudden they won't be absolved of any responsibility and any hardship they cause. The young farmers, then, can get after these guys. Now the school teacher is going to have a little problem, but the other farmer might be able to share his with a few young farmers who lost their land because of this hurt.

I think I would give that some serious thought, because if you in one swoop can do away with The Land Bank Act don't be so sure that we won't be able to take out clause 4 three years from now. Now put that in your pipe and smoke it.

The minister has fooled a lot of people by his statements. He can go around and he can

call the young land bank tenants peasants. And he can say that their lease will be continued and that they will not be pushed around and why won't we protect them. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, clause 13 is installing in here the power to increase the rents. Clause 13 will give the minister the power to break existing contracts. Why don't they . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I have listened very carefully and time after time you come back and you read one clause and you debate that clause. I have cited to one member in your caucus after the other in the last two days, citation no. 734 from Beauchesne's that says:

The second reading is the most important stage through which the bill is required to pass for its whole principle is then at issue and is affirmed or denied by a vote of the House. It is not regular on this occasion, however, to discuss in detail the clauses of the bill.

I would ask the member to deal with the bill in second reading as the rules permit.

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will refrain from dealing clause by clause with the individual aspects of this bill.

Just let me say that The Land Bank Act wasn't costing the taxpayer any money. The Land Bank Act helped you people to finance your new purchase program. The total picture of the bill indicates to me that when you sell The Land Bank Act you'll be able to use those funds to purchase the land. All of these features . . . You're piggybacking the new bill on the feds. You're using the destruction of the land bank to finance the other program.

All these features demonstrated a vindictive drive of the Conservative government to destroy everything in their path regardless of who they hurt. They don't want to leave any semblance of anything that we built in Saskatchewan over 11 years of struggle after seven years of going back. They don't want to leave anything in there that was good, that helped the people in general and that helped a lot of folks. Let's do away with it. Let's destroy it. Get it out of the way and maybe in three years down the road people will forget that there are people that get elected to help people. They will forget that. That's their vindictiveness.

Why don't they have an adequate appeal provision in the act? Mr. Speaker, I am going to have to skip over some of my notes here because . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — No, don't. We'll stop the clocks.

MR. ENGEL: — I am going to have to leave some of my notes or I won't finish by . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — We'll stop the clock.

MR. ENGEL: — For the information to the member for Moosomin. I wonder . . . He hasn't stood up in this House to support this legislation to destroy the land bank. They hope they can destroy all those family farms in the dead of night. They hope they can ram this thing through and not allow any debate and not allow any adjournments. They hope and they are sure that that land will be grabbed up by the land hogs that I mentioned earlier before anyone knows what happened. All of a sudden everybody will wake up and say, "Hey, what happened to the land bank?" That isn't going to happen if

we can help it. We want to make sure that the people get a chance to find out what this bill does.

The only thing that can be appealed under this bill is the roll-over clause passing land leases to descendants of the family. They say they are leaving that general thrust in the bill. Who will care about that after this government has destroyed and seized everything the farmer ever worked for? The Land Bank Act had an appeal process set out adequately and I refer to it in The Land Bank Act.

Mr. Speaker, I am terribly disturbed that this is going to be the last financial statement and auditor's report that is going to be tabled. These guys think that's a wonderful thing. The auditor said of the land bank commission that he has examined the balance sheets, "(and) in my opinion these financial statements present fairly the financial position of the land bank." No questions asked about their financial management. Their management is sound. Gib Wesson, the chairman did a fantastic job of operating this commission. He was an excellent member of the land bank and here we have a piece of legislation before us that indicate that this is going to be the last annual report we are going to have. I think that is terrible.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I think the hon. member knows that the subject that he is reading from will be openly discussed in the crown corporations. You can use some portions of it, but we don't need you to read that in this Chamber. The crown corporations committee will deal with it thoroughly.

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you. I wasn't intending to read the whole book, Mr. Speaker, or we'd be here a very long time. There are pages and pages of land here that I could refer to that come from all the ridings so I don't intend to read that, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — State your point of order.

MR. KOSKIE: — You indicated that the land bank was referred to the crown corporations committee. It is my understanding that the land bank is not reviewed by the crown corporations committee.

MR. SPEAKER: — I was in error in saying that it went to the crown corporations; it goes partially to public accounts, and I think the subject has been dealt with in estimates, but the point that you're not to read large portions of the document here in the House still stands.

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, because while you were out and the Deputy Speaker was so ably looking after the Chair I read a paragraph here and there. I didn't try to break the rules and read large sections. I was going to refer to a section because of the financial management of this report. We come across reports in public accounts (and I enjoy my service there) where there are departments and agencies that don't have an adequate booking system in place, and the auditor will point out situations here and there that show some loose research. But the commission's chairman, Gib Wesson, vice-chairman Harley Olsen, Jacob Brown and Lyle Reynolds did an excellent job of administrating and managing affairs. So they aren't destroying the land bank because it was something which wasn't managed properly. I'm sure of that.

I'm sure that anybody, even the Minister of Labor, could take a look at the management

aspect of the land bank commission and he would realize that that was run as a sound business. Gib Wesson had good business experience. I got to know him when he was over at Co-operative Trust; he did an excellent job of managing funds. He knew how to run a good business, so the business was well run. The people who served on the board and the officers who were involved were dedicated public servants and did an excellent job of running it. So that's not the reason they're destroying it.

I don't know why they're destroying it. It didn't cost the taxpayers any money; in fact, it made them some money. When we look at the total number of acres here, we see that the price of land has escalated to \$300 and some an acre, and if you take that and multiply that out of the total acres we have well over a \$500 million asset.

We have a \$500 million asset here, and what are we doing? Just with one fell swoop we're saying that that 10 years of growth and development is something that Saskatchewan could be proud of, a model all over Canada and the world, as far as land use . . . I grant you it wasn't ownership. It wasn't ownership and it . . . (inaudible) . . . under ownership. But that young fellow who was operating his land bank land was just as proud of his farm (because he could buy the home 20 acres or the home quarter), was just as proud of his unit as the other guy who borrows hundreds of thousands of dollars to buy a quarter section and then is held up, strapped, and hasn't any more money to move. If I had to start farming today, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if you feel the same way or not, but if I had to start farming today and start from scratch I would love to have a chance to get in a land bank. I think you could pick up five or six quarters of land.

When I look at the back here there are some places where there are parcels of land that have been put together and I want to take just one or two examples of the kind of parcels they bought.

Just right off the top of page 36. You go to page 36 and . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . that wasn't a hallucination, that was a vision. You go to page 36, R.M. 67, they bought 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 quarters of land for \$380,000. Now, in 1981, if the prices would stay the same under your new bill, you could almost pick up that whole package for 350. Here a guy could have had . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . the whole package . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Fred could come down south to R.M. 67 and he could go farming because he could have bid on and rented it.

When Freddie . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . (and I'm sure he'd be able to farm, Mr. Speaker,) the member for Athabasca —I'm sorry, I shouldn't have called him by his name. If a person would come down and bid on that farm, he'd get established on a land base that has . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Hold it. Can the hon. member indicate to me the relevance of what he is saying to the bill that's before us? I don't believe there is any relevance at this point and would ask you to come back to the subject.

MR. ENGEL: — Can I explain the point I'm trying to make? We are destroying the land bank commission. This piece of legislation says, "To repeal The Land Bank Act." Never again will a person be able to bid on . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm just taking one parcel. I'm not going to read from the book. There were about 294 parcels of land purchased that year. Now I'm just taking one parcel. I just picked the one at the top of the page, and what I'm saying is that once this bill is passed, that person won't be able to start. I picked it because it's \$360,000. The new replacement says you can borrow

\$350,000, so I was going to make a comparison of could a person buy that land under the other bill or should we leave the land bank bill in place and not repeal it at this time? I was trying to convince the members that that would be a good way to start farming because there's 1,200 acres of cultivated land and the balance is where they could grow some cattle . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and 1,200 acres is a joke to the member opposite who farms 17 quarters. That, or . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . 18, you say? Twenty? Mr. Speaker, that's too much. He should sell some to the land bank.

Mr. Speaker. I will get down to my notes and finish this off because some of my colleagues are anxious to get going tonight. I thought I had half an hour here.

All these features that I talked about demonstrate the vindictive drive of the Conservative government to destroy everything in its path regardless of who it hurts. Why do they not have adequate appeal provisions in the act? I suspect it's because they don't like and can't stand the heat. They hope they can destroy all of these family farms in the dead of night and then gobble them up by the land hogs in the area. The only thing that can be appealed under this bill in the roll-over position. The Land Bank Act has an appeal process in place.

I also find it difficult to understand why such a sloppy job was done of some parts of this legislation when the government had so much time to prepare it, Mr. Speaker. It looks as if it lifted some things from The Land Bank Act without recognizing that the situation is different. It looks as though The Land Bank Act set up a process for developing and signing agreements and leases. This act is being imposed on existing leases and contracts and changing them.

I found it curious, Mr. Speaker, that the residence requirements are left dangling in the roll-over aspect of this piece of legislation, and that they didn't leave that in there. I imagine that they had reasons. They said residence requirements were in this bill. They used the general terms. Suppose the father of your former leader, Dick Collver, had passed a land bank lease on to him. He could have, from his hideaway in Arizona, declared his intentions to establish a residence in Saskatchewan, so he could get the lease, but there's nothing in this legislation that will ensure that he actually does have to establish.

MR. KATZMAN: — Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — State your point of order.

MR. KATZMAN: — Beauchesne's 319 (3). The member has been making comments that section 319 (3) does not allow in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: — The member's point of order is a little hard to pick out of this (3), and I wonder if you would clarify what point you're raising.

MR. KATZMAN: — The unworthy motives that he is attributing to the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. SPEAKER: — I have listened fairly closely, and I don't believe that he's been unduly harassing the Minister of Agriculture. I don't think your point is well taken.

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker. I was trying to note: a prominent Saskatchewan person like

the former leader, Dick Collver, if he would have had land that his father would have passed on to land bank land. Dick could have come back from Arizona, and he would have declared his intention to establish residence, and they would have sold the land to him. And at that he could have gone back to Arizona without actually establishing residence.

That's the point I'm making: that aspect of the bill doesn't cover off those kind of situations. You can declare an intention, get your money, get your lease and then go back and enjoy the sunny South. So maybe that's who this bill is for. Maybe this bill is designed so that those that want to go and spend the winters in Florida can roll over into the farm credit corporation a quarter, or two quarters or even three quarters of land to a daughter or a son, pick up the money and spend the winters in Arizona or in California or whatever. Maybe that's what their plan is. Maybe the Conservatives don't want Collver back in Saskatchewan. So I'd suggest that that part of the bill be tightened up. But if he gets a lease back. I want him here so I can keep an eye on him. I wouldn't want him to have that land and farm it and carry it back.

This past week, Mr. Speaker, all of us have been approached by the Saskatchewan Land Bank Tenants' Association, and with these remarks, I want to wind up my debate. Here are 2,600 or 2,700 young farmers. A big percentage of them have banded themselves together and called themselves the land bank tenants' association. These people are very, very concerned about the new legislation. They set their hopes and they staked their hopes on the prospect of being able to farm.

One of those young fellows came and talked to me. He told me that last April he listened to the promises. He listened to the possibility that he would get 40 cents off on his gas. He thought it was going to apply to his farm. He thought it was going to apply to his farm, this young tenant did. And he told his wife, he said, "You know this time around (and there were some of my colleagues there in the presence of the meeting) I'm going to vote Conservative." So he did . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The fellows here say, "It's a wise decision." The poor young fellow . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You can clap and thump awhile, but on Monday I'll maybe tell you a story, if you listen to me.

This young fellow told me that his wife said, "I wouldn't if I were you. I'm still going to vote NDP and you had better reconsider." And, he says . . . You know, the bad thing about it, Mr. Speaker, is she told him, "If you vote Tory and you're on land bank land and our base is the land bank, what if you lose your land?" He says, "I'll never lose my land, those guys won't take my land away. They told us in the election campaign that they are not going to lose it." So, consequently, Mr. Speaker, He said "Now I'm losing my land, that's bad, but that's not the worst." He said, "The worst is I'm going to have to live with it the rest of my life, because she was right, she was right." That isn't a dream and that isn't a concocted story. I'll tell you and I'll introduce on Monday to the guy who is the author of that story, and he's bringing in his wife too. They'll both repeat that story.

You are, with one fell swoop, taking away their security, their hopes they had for the future — what they really thought was something they could hang their farm on, and they could live and enjoy themselves. They were happy, and they had some security. Now what have they got? They are in trouble, they are in trouble. They haven't got the base to buy this land; their rent is going to get up and if they don't get a divorce it's going to be a miracle, because she will hold that over his head. She will hold it over his head and say, "I told you so."

Mr. Speaker, the secretary of the Saskatchewan land bank association said (and I'm just

going to read one paragraph out of this letter). "I have been authorized by my board of directors to seek legal advice respecting the legal implications of Bill 46, the land bank and temporary provisions. Our legal advisers informed us that this bill is chipping away our legal options to defend our rights."

Is that what you want to do? Do you want to strip away the legal actions to defend their rights to their land? They are losing their rights to their land. They are worried about the condition of their present leases, and the worst thing they are worried about is the ownership of the improvements on the land, and the security of their tenure. Further, they were advised by their legal adviser that Bill 46 has effectively confiscated all the property that they own on the land in the form of buildings. Have you fellows read this letter? Did you read this letter?

Mr. Speaker, these young people are concerned about their land holdings, they are concerned about their buildings, and they are concerned about the improvements they made. Their chattels are being stripped away. The protection they previously enjoyed through this bill, the act, the protection they had from The Land Bank Act is being stripped away from under them and they are being made wards with no recourse. I think they have reason to worry.

I have been, and Chris Mewhort goes on to say, "I have been in contact with lessees all over this province for months and firmly believe that their reaction to this repressive legislation will be swift, consolidated, and they will be solidly opposed to it."

That's the reason for the hurry to get this legislation passed. That's why you're in a hurry to get this legislation passed, because you're afraid that those 2,600 guys are going to organize and, if their wives are as tough as the wife of the fellow that I talked to, you'll be pushed out there and told, "You'd better get out there and save our land."

We therefore believe that in the best interests of all concerned, you immediately, you immediately, not tomorrow, not the day after, you immediately reconsider Bill 46 and restore our rights.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure if they're going to do that. I'm not sure if these people opposite care. I'm not sure if these people opposite care if 2,600 farmers have their rights stripped away from them. I don't know if you care. I don't know how many you have in your constituencies. I can look through these, and I can go down the list and look at whatever these R.M.s are. I'm not sure if R.M. 194 is in your constituency or not, but it's getting close if it isn't.

In R.M. 194 they bought quite a few quarters of land last year. I'm not sure if these parcels of land are going to be guys who are going to be real happy with you stripping away because this land is being operated and farmed in R.M. 194. It's being farmed. These 12 or 15 quarters of land are being farmed by young land bank tenants who enjoy the security of tenure, and you're prepared to let it slip away. You're prepared to let it slip away and say nothing. No problems, just let it be taken away. I think this should let it slip away and say nothing. No problems, just let it be taken away. I think this should be a lesson to all of us tonight, Mr. Speaker. Once a program is in place, it doesn't matter who established it. It doesn't matter that this was introduced by the NDP or the CCF. It's a program that got in, was established, and it's working. It's working.

As I mentioned earlier, there are only one or two cases where they're up for grabs and where they haven't been able to make their payments. The land prices are going up. There are so many arguments in the book that indicate that we shouldn't be destroying

the land base in this province that affects so many young people.

Land bank tenants are saying, Mr. Speaker. "Failing acceptance of our first request, and at a very minimum, we believe our rights as Canadian citizens must be embodied in the act which would allow us access to the courts of this land." Why would we be passing legislation that in one swoop would take away their chance of access to the courts? I think the people have a valid argument."

As well, he goes on to say in another paragraph, "We have long believed that our contract — our contract — the lease agreement that each of us holds is a contract with the Government of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan." It's not a contract with the Conservative government, and you people seem to think that the mandate you got, which was big — which was big because you're using your power to steam-roll this bill through.

If this opposition would be close to half as many as there are in this House, you would have second thoughts about it. You'd have second thoughts about moving so fast, but you think, "We're got a great majority. The 55 of us can march on and nothing is going to happen and there's not going to be any difference." Mr. Speaker, we speak for the land bank tenants' association. We're speaking for and trying to present the case our friends from the farmers' union. They didn't get a vote yesterday, or we could have saved the day. We could have saved the day. Some of them are young farmers, some of them are even as old as I am. And I think that the members opposite should definitely take another look at it. I'm sure if that would be the member for Morse's real seat, he wouldn't have introduced this kind of legislation. He would have made sure, and he would have used his influence.

But the guy that called himself the man with the meat axe, he didn't care what he did. He didn't care how many people he over-ran and how roughshod he rode on the lives and farms of so many young people.

I think we have a piece of legislation before us here that we shouldn't pass, Mr. Speaker. I think this piece of legislation should be maintained and it should . . .

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 p.m.