

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
December 10, 1982

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

NOTICE OF MOTION

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Tuesday, December 14, 1982 move first reading of a bill — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act.

QUESTIONS

Guidelines for Public Service

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. In this House some days ago I understood the government to say that guidelines would be forthcoming shortly. In this House a couple of days ago the Minister of Finance indicated that guidelines, or at least the full statement, would be available shortly. Would the Premier kindly advise us, and everybody in Saskatchewan, and particularly public servants in Saskatchewan, when guidelines may be expected and who will issue them?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, the minister responsible for the public service commission will be providing the guidelines and any additions to the guidelines in due course as quickly as we can put them together. I might add that the general guidelines that apply to the public service here and across the nation are always there for professionals. We will be carrying on with them as has been carried on in the past and will be carried on in the future. We will provide specific guidelines for this administration through the minister responsible.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker and Mr. Premier, the guidelines have been radically changed. The guidelines have been radically changed by you, sir, when you say that you have a right to decide who is in a sensitive position without any prior information to the public servants. Would you kindly as quickly as possible advise public servants of their rights and what rights you intend to deprive them of?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned several days ago in the legislature, it's a question of judgment. It's always a question of professional judgment. These individuals, regardless of where they are working in the public service, have to make those judgments. The individual involved in the discussion has admitted that these judgments have to be made and that will always be the case regardless of guidelines.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary. The new element is that it is now the judgment of the Premier and not the judgment of the guidelines which have prevailed elsewhere in Canada. What we want to know, Mr. Premier, is: on what basis are you making your judgments that public servants can no longer speak their piece as members of city council?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, the guidelines will be provided in due course.

Sewer and Water System in Sandy Bay

MR. YEW: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my question to the minister responsible for northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Minister, on Wednesday of this week, 189 students out of 334 were absent from school in Sandy Bay with infectious hepatitis. It is obviously an epidemic. One of the causes for the epidemic could very well be the current state of the sewer and water system in Sandy Bay, which was built for 500 people and now has to service about 1,000 people. My question to the minister is this: what is your department doing to correct the problem, to fix and resolve that problem in Sandy Bay?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — First of all, Mr. Speaker, I believe the question in regard to the incidence of hepatitis at Sandy Bay is something for my colleague the Minister of Health. But, as it relates to the water system, I should point out that it hasn't been established that the water system is responsible for the problem that's there at the present time. But, your question as it relates to what we're doing about the problem right now: as you well know, there's little you can do about changing the water and sewer system right now, but I would say that there have been some alterations made this week, some slight alterations to try and ensure the system is able to serve the community until spring when something much more drastic can be done.

MR. YEW: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I understand the health staff in Sandy Bay is non-existent today, whereas in the past we've had three health nurses looking after the community. Can the minister advise the House what he intends to do in regards to staffing the community of Sandy Bay with health professionals?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — If it is acceptable, Mr. Speaker, I will answer the question regarding health in Sandy Bay. I will deal with the hepatitis, and then with the staffing.

It is correct that there is hepatitis in Sandy Bay. We have flown in extra vaccine. Dr. David Allison, the field epidemiologist has been there. Dr. Bob Naismith, the medical officer of northern Saskatchewan, has been there. We understand that the hepatitis is within the young school children. I wouldn't want to say it's directly connected to the water because if it were one would wonder why it wouldn't be in the adult population as well; it's basically within the school children. We're addressing it. We're vaccinating the immediate members of the families so that there would not be a spread of this. Everything is being done that could possibly be done to contain this outbreak of hepatitis in Sandy Bay.

As for the staff, my associate deputy minister was in northern Saskatchewan yesterday looking at the situation and I think the very fact that Dr. Naismith and Dr. Allison and these people have been to Sandy Bay within the last two or three days, indicated that Saskatchewan Health is very concerned with the situation, and I can assure you that the replacements for the people in the nursing stations will be forthcoming as quickly as possible.

Guidelines for Public Service

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I want to congratulate the Premier and call this . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — You call what you ask of the public servants a question of professional judgment. I want to congratulate you because you are all alone. Everybody else thinks it's a question of fundamental freedom. I want to repeat for your benefit some of the things that the Canadian Civil Liberties Association has said about the transfer. It's called politically dangerous witch hunting and an unacceptable meddling in municipal affairs. My question is: do you not understand after all the uproar that has been caused, that what you have done to public servants is unacceptable to the society that has elected you? Do you not see that?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, I can just reiterate that further guidelines or additional guidelines will be coming in due course, and I have nothing more to add.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The Premier may have had difficulty hearing me, and I don't doubt you did because of the bellowing that was going on behind you. Let me repeat my question; you avoided it entirely. Do you not see after the city council in Regina, the city council in Saskatoon, the city council in P.A. have condemned what you have done, after the civil liberties association has condemned what you have done, do you not see that it is unacceptable to the society that elected you?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned several days ago, it's a question professional judgment and performance, and that will always be the case within the civil service, whether it's in Saskatchewan or any other province. The guidelines with respect to the judgment and consequences will be coming in due course.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, my new question, Mr. Speaker, on Human Rights Day. I may say that for this government to proclaim Human Rights Day the day after you transfer an alderman must set some sort of a new standard in hypocrisy. My question was directed to the Deputy Premier yesterday, and I ask it again today because it's the last day that it will be relevant: is this the one day out of the 365 on which Saskatchewan public servants may speak their minds freely without fear of reprisals?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, I have nothing more to add with respect to the guidelines. I said before and I'll continue to say that the individuals have the right to free speech. They have all the rights and liberties that we have under the Diefenbaker bill of rights, and all the other rights and freedoms. But there always is a question of professional judgment. It was stated clearly by Mr. Van Mulligen, and he says it is always a question of professional judgment, and that's the case. And the guidelines with respect to those judgments will be coming forth.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — A new question. The Minister of Finance said they would be coming forth shortly. You have categorically refused to give us any time limit within which you will give them. Is this backpedalling to be interpreted as an indication that you cannot defend the guidelines which you intend to issue?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, I believe that we will be able to defend the guidelines. We defend the guidelines as they exist today; and other administrations defend their guidelines.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Have you vanquished? You have sent Mr. Van Mulligen to P.A. because apparently his position as an information officer was too sensitive. Mr. Cholod, who was a public relations director, was not sent to P.A. for voting on the same

issue. Is it fair to assume that Mr. Van Mulligen was sent to P.A. because he was a New Democrat as has been repeatedly suggested by your Minister of the Environment? Is that why he was sent and Mr. Cholod was not?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I ask you how you distinguish the two positions. Two men both work for crown corporation. Both voted on it. One went to P.A. One did not. One opposed the government. One did not. How is Mr. Cholod . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I find that this question is repetitious. The identical question has been asked in the Chamber, and I would ask the member to either ask a new question or to leave it alone.

Loan to SCCC&A

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Social Services. Last March we had an arrangement, the previous government had an arrangement, with the Saskatchewan Council for Crippled Children and Adults whereby a loan had been arranged for \$450,000. At the time of the election, \$250,000 of that had been disbursed, and the council had been waiting for seven months, I believe, for the next \$200,000 instalment had been approved. I wonder if the minister can tell the council and the Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan whether or not that money has been paid out or will be forthcoming very soon.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Speaker, if it was a contract that we have with SCCC&A, the contract is binding and the guidelines within the contract are being followed. I am assuming that the second \$200,000 is within the contract. I have not received any notification from SCCC&A about what you call a late payment, and I would ask that perhaps, if that's what you think it is, a late payment, maybe SCCC&A get in touch with me on it.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. I have here a letter which was sent out to over 300 handicapped individuals who are in the centres from the council which explains how their salaries have been cut from between 25 per cent to 50 per cent, I believe as a result of the lack of funding. Mr. Speaker, the letter states that clients' salaries at SCCC&A have been tripled between 1979 and '82 but as a result of the lack of funding their salaries as of October have had to be cut in half. What I'm asking the minister is whether or not she will ensure that the \$200,000 that's pending in payment to the SCCC&A will now be paid.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Speaker, a study was done with the permission of the board of directors from SCCC&A, and it was to look at the whole organization. That was done within their own ranks not within government, who I believe at that time the study was even commissioned was the administration across the floor. It was for greater efficiency and the results of the efficiency that SCCC&A is taking were based on that study, based on that study. That was their study, not my study.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I think it's fairly obvious that the reason that the salaries have had to be cut in half is because the \$200,000 is not coming forward. Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister. I have two stubs here, one from the month of September for an individual, and one from the month of October. The payment to this

individual in September was \$95.80; in October it was \$50. I would like the minister to explain if this is the new recovery program that the province is talking about, where EAs get a 50 per cent increase, where government employees are asked to maintain 1 per cent below inflation, where people on minimum wage get no increase, and now we have people in workshops being asked to be cut by 50 per cent in salary. I think that the people of the province are getting a little tired of this kind of attitude, and I'd like to know whether the \$200,000 will be forthcoming.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any of our EAs getting a 50 per cent increase — our EAs. As to the stubs he's referring to, I have no idea what they are. If they're referring to clients, that information is strictly confidential and I wouldn't begin to comment on them.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. Mr. Speaker, the handicapped people in many of the workshops in the province have had their salaries cut by 50 per cent. These people who are getting \$50 a month, Mr. Speaker, are now receiving \$5 per month because I have here a receipt for their transportation which amounts to \$45. Will the Premier intervene in this case and see that the funding for these organizations is forthcoming?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if I understand the financial statements recently, we increased our budget in social services something like \$40 million to \$50 million, over the previous administration, which is a considerable amount. I've been personally involved in providing additional cheques to handicapped organizations, one in my riding yesterday, on behalf of the minister. They've been delighted with the performance to date. I have ever confidence in the minister, and with respect to additional details beyond that, I'll defer to her.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. I am well aware that the juggling of numbers in social services has resulted in an increase in the total budget. Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Does the member have a supplementary? I have been a bit tolerant. Each time you get up for a supplementary you have a long lead-off statement first. That is not permitted in supplementaries, but rather you're to get directly to the question in a supplementary.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I hadn't finished my first sentence in my preamble, but I would like to finish that and then ask a question, with your approval.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I hadn't finished my sentence in my preamble, but I would like to finish that and then ask a question, with your approval.

My question to the Premier: in light of the fact of the shift in the budget from DNS and a shift in the budget of social services of \$35 million, out of such programs as home care, family income plan, day care, into welfare — \$35 million — will you ensure that the \$200,000 that SCCC&A is waiting for will be delivered to them before Christmas, so that people who are in those workshops will have a Merry Christmas, as well as their families?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, as I said, the increases in the Department of Social Services have been substantial and it's far more than the jiggery-pokery that you're

referring to. Fifty million dollars is a very significant amount of money; \$15 million is a significant amount of money. Any specific details beyond that I have full confidence that the Minister of Social Services will be handling them, and do an awful lot better than the previous minister of social services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Farm Loans Criteria

MR. ENGEL: — I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. It was drawn to my attention last night that yesterday a proposed recipient of your new plan went to visit a regional office and that the criteria was available down there on what basis the loans would be available and on what basis they could get their 8 per cent rebate. Can the minister tell me if there is a set of criteria like that or discussion like that that have been made available and they have that in writing?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — No, I can't tell you that. If it's been made available to them, it's been made available through the officials of my department and I have no first-hand knowledge of whether in fact they have those kinds of guidelines available there.

MR. ENGEL: — Are you saying that you have no personal knowledge of whether there's some criteria spelled out as to who will be able to qualify for an 8 per cent loan?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — No, that's not what I said at all. If you were listening, I said I have no knowledge of whether farm credit has access to that information or not at this point. Quite often these programs aren't put in place until they're past this legislature and you've been doing everything possible to prevent that from happening.

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, a new question. The point I'm trying to raise is: have you got two sets of standards for people applying for loans? Information has been drawn to my attention that draft provincial regulations specify, number one, that farmers will qualify for interest rebates only if they first buy or dispose of any land bank lease that they have in their possession. Is that true?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — No. I don't know where you get your information. Quite simply, Mr. Speaker, when the regulations are made public and gazetted, one of the regulations will include the provision that anyone who holds qualifying public land will be obliged to buy that land before they can go on the open market under our program.

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you for that information.

I'd like to ask a new question, Mr. Speaker. You have been talking quite openly and all your literature and everything indicates that the maximum loan will be \$350,000. Who is going to make the loan for the additional \$50,000? The farm credit corporation will loan up to \$300,000 for an individual. You're saying that your program goes to \$350,000. Where are they going to get the extra \$50,000?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I tried to point out in the past in this legislature that there is a new spirit of co-operation in Saskatchewan. We have in fact negotiated at length with people at farm credit corporation. The limit set by farm credit is set by internal regulation and that limit can be adjusted with an internal regulation adjustment. In fact it will (if it hasn't already) be adjusted in Saskatchewan to

accommodate this program and I think in about half an hour you should be hearing an announcement out of Ottawa.

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Minister, I think these answers are very vital to what we are doing as far as passing this legislation. IF these details are available, when are you going to make them available to this House so we can make a decision on the proposed legislation?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Well. Mr. Speaker, it's a well-known fact that regulations, once they have passed the regulations committee, are gazetted and that's when they're published. That's been the tradition of this House, I suppose, since 1905.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Minister of Agriculture. In a previous question, I believe I understood him to say, for example, if a young farmer who has one quarter of land bank land and one quarter of his own which he has title to, goes out to purchase a neighbor's farm, he will not be allowed to but will be forced to buy the land bank land that he leases. Can the minister confirm that?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — He will not be forced to do anything. It's a different attitude that this administration is bringing to government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — And if he has a quarter of land bank land and a quarter of his own land, and there are 25 quarters of other land out there for sale, under our program the qualifying public lands must be purchased first.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — So, what you're saying, Mr. Minister, supplementary, is that he will have no choice. He'll have to buy the land bank land before he buys any other land, using the program.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — He doesn't have to buy any. But if he's going to qualify under our program he must buy the public lands first.

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, I have one more question. When you introduced this legislation, you were talking about 5,600 or 5,500 new farmers in this program. How can you justify, say 5,600, if there's going to be 2,700 who are already actively engaged in farming who have to make an application for the loan? And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to specify by naming one farmer who phoned me from the Moosomin constituency this morning. He has five quarters of land bank land which he is leasing now. He has purchased some additional land, and he would like to get an extra quarter so he would have a nice economical unit down there. Are you saying that he cannot . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who is it?

MR. ENGEL: — I can give you give his name. Are you saying that he cannot purchase that without first buying the five quarters that make up his economic base? Is this what you're saying?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know. Obviously, we're having a little trouble filling the clock this morning because this is the fourth time that the identical question has been asked. If you want to come in with a question for every land bank tenant out there, I'm prepared to spend the time. I prefer to do it in estimates rather than in question period. But quite simply, your last question, where you laid out the

scenario of a fellow with five quarters of land bank land plus deeded land, and he wants to buy more land, I have no objection to that. I hope he does. But qualifying public lands under the farm purchase program must be purchased first.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Premier's Visit to North Dakota Legislature

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to inform you and the Assembly that the visit with our neighboring legislature in North Dakota was a successful beginning. Governor Allen Olson of North Dakota treated us not only with respect but also provided us with first-class hospitality. Similarly, Governor Bill Janklow of South Dakota also provided us with extremely valuable information on resources.

The discussions with Governor Olson focussed on the development of informal committees of the legislature to discuss mutual areas of interest such as water management, tourism, trade, regional economic development, agricultural projects, cultural exchanges and sports. The discussions with respect to water management and weed control in agriculture were particularly useful for this province. I want to add that the Deputy Premier, Mr. Eric Berntson, and a former member for Estevan, Mr. Bob Larter, were largely responsible for developing the strong spirit of co-operation over the years, and they are commended for this participation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — It's my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that it was the first time in the Dakota history that a premier of Saskatchewan had addressed the Legislative Assembly. I am proud to have had that honor. I will be making arrangements to have Governor Olson address the members of this Assembly.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that members on this side of the House welcome the announcement by the Premier, and the relations between our province and the state of North Dakota, as indicated by the Premier's statement.

The Premier represents a riding adjacent to the United States border. I think it's the first time in the history of our province that a premier has sat for a riding adjacent to the United States border. I think it's the first time that the premier and the deputy premier together have been in riding adjacent to the United States border. I think it's perhaps the first time that any premier in Saskatchewan has had such close United States connections. So, accordingly, on this basis, he has used this opportunity to develop these good relations, and we welcome the fostering of such relations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Saskatchewan Police Commission

HON. MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform this Assembly that I have sent a letter to Mayor L.H. Lewry of the city of Moose Jaw asking for the support of the new city council in providing adequate funds to implement a number of the recommendations of the Saskatchewan Police Commission after the inquiry that was held last summer into policing services in that city.

On August 11, 1982 Moose Jaw City Council passed a resolution rejecting the findings

of the Saskatchewan Police Commission. The matter was then referred to me in accordance with the provisions of The Police Act. After assessing thoroughly the views of Moose Jaw council and the police commission, I have asked the city council for their support for the following:

- (a) Provide for three constable positions which the report indicates were to be utilized for specific services which would contribute substantially to an improved policing service for the residents of Moose Jaw.
- (b) Provide for two special constable positions required for the supervision of persons held in custody. I believe there is an obligation in all police forces to provide adequate supervision over persons detained. It appears to me that this duty does not require the services of a fully trained police officer, but can be performed by a responsible person hired for this specific duty.
- (c) Provide for a civilian court liaison person to attend to the . . . [inaudible] . . .

The report indicates the city was fortunate in having a competent person to perform these duties which would otherwise be required to be done by a regular police officer.

- (d) Take steps to replace at least seven motor vehicles which the report indicates will have reached approximately 100,000 kilometres during the current year.
- (e) Provide for the acquisition of sufficient body protectors for police members, as required by the municipal police equipment regulations.

With respect to the recommendation of the Saskatchewan Police Commission regarding funds for overtime. I believe that this matter becomes academic at this time in view of the fact that overtime incurred would be subject to compensation by this . . . [inaudible] . . .

As for reports that indicate that the city council is looking at the matter of adequate facilities for its police force, I am confident that council will discharge their obligations in this area once they have the opportunity to assess the situation.

Mr. Speaker, before continuing I want to assure you that I recognize the importance of municipal autonomy, and that I have confidence in urban councils to direct their own affairs. At the same time, as minister responsible for the administration of justice in this province, there is an obligation on me to ensure that all residents of Saskatchewan are provided with a reasonable level of policing services.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would just like to say that it is my impression that neither this board of police commissioners nor the Saskatchewan Police Commission view the process as a means of requiring the council of the city of Moose Jaw to comply with the views of the board. In my view it was primarily a case of the board soliciting the views of a third party as to whether they were being unreasonable in their view of policing priorities, or whether the council was being unreasonable with the imposition of budgetary restrictions which affected the policing services to the city of Moose Jaw.

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that we on this side welcome the recommendations that the minister, the Attorney General, has put forward. I want to say that I think that the matter took considerable time in its deliberation, and might have been handled with a little more speed. I think also that it really clearly emphasizes the

worthwhileness of the police commission which was established by the former attorney general. I want to welcome the steps that have taken place, and the recommendations of the Attorney General.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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. ENGEL: — Before you called it 10 o'clock last night, Mr. Speaker, I was doing my best to convince this arrogant government that the bill that's before us should be withdrawn. I believe I was a little bit less than successful because the attitude that they are displaying this morning indicates that we need more time to get information.

Last night after this House adjourned and I got back to my office I had several calls to return. These people are concerned with what this bill is doing. A lot of talk has been around that the land bank has driven away people from the farm, that the land bank hasn't been successful in attracting young people to farm. I just thought there are a few extra things I need to draw to this House's attention that haven't been mentioned and nobody has raised yet. And one of them is: what is the age of a farmer? What is the average of a farmer?

I just touched on it when I got elected in 1971 the average age of the farmer was 57 years of age. When you take a breakdown of these percentages, and just look at how old were the people . . . Let's take age 35 and under (and that excludes both the Speaker and myself). That age group of 35 and under is a successful and a good age to be at, and I sometimes wish I'd have a chance to go in that age group just one more time.

In 1961 in all of Saskatchewan only 19 per cent of the population on the farm, 19 per cent of the farmers were in that age group. In other words about 18,000 farmers were under the age of 35. By 1971 that had declined. During the Thatcher years, during the years of a free enterprise government that number went down from 19 per cent (because of the kind of programs that were in place) down to a low of 16 per cent, Mr. Speaker. Only 12,430 of our young farmers living and farming in Saskatchewan in 1971 were under the age of 35 — a paltry 16 per cent of the population.

What happened after 1971? Here we have a government that wants to rip up The Land Bank Act. Here we have a government that wants to destroy a program that has done something for the people. Let me give you some Canadian statistics from StatsCanada. In 1976 things began to turn around. In 1971 there were less than 12,500. In 1976 there were 16,161 farmers under the age of 35. What happened, Mr. Speaker? Why did these guys decide to go back on the farm? . . . [inaudible interjection] . . .

In 1971 the young people in Saskatchewan realized there was a change of government, there was a change of attitude toward farming, and there was a whole new

approach to what's going to happen. Young people started moving back on the farms. Families like — I could mention a family name from south of Woodrow. Mr. Filson, who had five sons. Four of them are back on the farm. Not one of them was farming before that time, and these people had some faith in rural Saskatchewan. They had some faith in our program, and they decided to come back.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Those are my constituents.

MR. ENGEL: — Yes, They are constituents of the member for Shaunavon. Mr. Speaker, from '76 to '81 — and last night I went into great detail on the price of land, and how the price of land increased during that period of time. During '76 to 1981 you would have thought it impossible for any more young farmers to get into farming because of the drastic increase in the cost of land. Land prices went from \$75 to \$380 an acre, and what happened? The percentage of farmers under the age of 35 didn't drop because of those increased prices of land. The percentage of young people out on the farm didn't decrease, but it went from 22 per cent to 26 per cent. Over a quarter of the farmers in Saskatchewan in 1981 were under the age of 35, and that's because we had some programs in place, because we believed in helping young people, not putting restrictions on them.

Today I find out that you are locking in and bullheadedly introducing a piece of legislation that says, "You can't qualify for our program if you have land bank land. If you are a sucker and have bought some land bank, that's tough. That's tough. You are not going to get our 8 per cent program." That's what this government is saying to the 2,700 young farmers.

In 1981, of the 17,700 farmers, or 26.3 per cent, that are under the age of 35, 2,700 are there because of the land bank program, exclusively. A fellow from Moosomin, and I'm glad the member for Moosomin is not here because at least I can talk without shouting that loud, a young fellow phoned me from the Moosomin constituency, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This young fellow phoned me from the Moosomin constituency and he told me that he'd picked up five quarters of land bank land. He's been leasing that land. He bought the 20-acre parcel where the yard is. He built himself a \$35,000 house. He added onto that unit an additional five quarters of land, and he's operating an economical unit. The unit is fine-tuned. His rent on the first five quarters is costing him about \$9,000 a year. If he takes those five quarters and now has to buy them (and increase that \$9,000 payment to \$30,000 a quarter and times by five) it's \$150,000 that this young fellow is expected to pay, instead of \$9,000. And you say that that's going to put more young people into farming? That's a bunch of baloney.

These figures are going to start going backwards, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I can guarantee you that by 1985 the figure won't be 26 per cent under 35. I'll make you a wager on that, your farm against mine. I'll make you a wager that that figure isn't going to be 26 per cent. It'll be more like the sorry 19 per cent it was in 1961 or, even worse in 1971 it was 16 per cent — a loss of 10 per cent of the population under 35 years of age. This is what this new program has spelled out and these are the factors that are contributing to it.

The land bank was the key factor to instil a degree of hope in all the young people in Saskatchewan. They said, "Here's a province that cares for the young people. Here is a province that is putting up some programs and isn't afraid to put in a gas tax rebate, isn't afraid to leave the purple gas in place, isn't afraid to help them with a FarmStart and all kinds of programs so that they can stay on the farm." But you're saying, "We don't

care about the young people. We don't care if only 16 per cent . . . just so the wealthy can survive."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think things should change and I think you should be one of the leaders in your caucus to impress on your fellow colleagues: maybe we're making a mistake; maybe we're being a little too vicious in tearing up this bill; maybe we shouldn't be tearing up The Land Bank Act.

AN HON. MEMBER: — We'll take it as read.

MR. ENGEL: — I imagine you'd love to. I imagine the member for Regina Lakeview would like to take it as read. He would love to sweep it into *Hansard* and hope that nobody ever looks and nobody ever watches and listens and that nobody will see you during the dark of the night sneak in a bill, jam it through and not put up a single speaker in support of it. But there are young people Saskatchewan who are saying, "Hang on. Hang onto this piece of legislation as long as you can. Hang on until we can make our point and till we can convince the guys from Spiritwood and different members who have a lot of land bank land in their area." Maybe when he goes home this weekend his land bank tenants will come to him and say, "Is it true, is it true that you've excluded me expressly in a beautiful, unique, neat piece of legislation?"

The minister used some fancy words to describe this bill, and I couldn't believe what he's talking about. And I'm beginning to realize it's a first in Canada. It's a first in Canada where a party would get together and selectively design a piece of legislation that will cut the heart out of people under 35 years of age.

This piece of legislation is one where the minister said, "The land bank legislation was bad legislation. It was bad for the farmers; it was bad for the taxpayer." And how bad was it for the taxpayer? The young farmer from Moosomin told me how bad it was for the taxpayer. The young farmer from Moosomin told me how bad it was for the taxpayer. They paid his father \$50,000. They paid his father \$50,000 — \$10,000 a quarter in 1974.

How much is land today? How much is land in the Moosomin constituency today? You go out northeast of Regina — and I see the member is doing his exercises over there — and tell me how much land is in your area. Can you get it for . . . The member is speaking from the seat of his chair. He's afraid to stand up and speak from his feet. He's afraid to stand up and speak from his feet. He does his thinking on his seat, Mr. Speaker.

Today this young fellow from about 200 miles away from Regina, Mr. Deputy Speaker, tells me that his land would sell for \$300,000. It was bad for the taxpayer? The taxpayer bought a parcel of land for \$50,000 that today he can sell for \$300,000 and that's bad news for the taxpayer? That's bad news for the taxpayer? A \$250,000 capital gain and you call that bad administration. Bad legislation. It's bad for the farmer.

This young fellow, in 1974, a single young man in the Moosomin constituency, went to land bank and got a father-son transfer on five quarters of land. He bought the 20 acres of his yard, he built himself a house and he got married, and he's on the way to raising a beautiful, happy family. His wife taught school for a number of years to help him with the financing. With the \$9,000 that they pay for their rent a year, they were able to sell about \$45,000 worth of grain a year. Over the years it's averaged \$45,000 a year on those five quarters of grain a year. Over the years it's averaged \$45,000 a year on those five quarters of land. That is as much money as was his income. With that \$45,000 a year he budgeted wisely and added onto his unit where today he has added

an additional land base. Now all of a sudden he's tied into long-term leases on loans of over \$120,000. He's tied into some long-term payments. It's balanced and matched up pretty good, because if the price of wheat goes up he can afford to pay a little more rent. If the price stays stable, he'll continue to have a guarantee of rent at that rate.

He's saying, "They can't break my contract. I've got a contract — I've got an agreement with the land bank. Yes, the land bank was a slow starter, it didn't get on, but, it put me on to a solid financial base that I'm a prominent citizen in my community. I drive a good car, I have a decent income. The adage that's around that farmers are cash-poor and die rich isn't applicable to me. I have a comfortable living. I can support my family, but I'll likely die poor."

Now which do you want? Do you want young people doing what they enjoy — farming and living on the farm, not real wealthy, but comfortable — or do you want to set this young guy in with an additional \$300,000 loan which will cost him very, very close to about \$48,000 or \$50,000 a year repayment. That money is not there. There's no earthly way he can get \$40,000 to make those payments on an additional \$3,000 loan when he can rent it and lease it for \$9,000 a year. Is his contract any good? Is he secure in his rental agreement? I'm quite sure there's going to be a young fellow in here on Monday asking his own member, the member for Moosomin, some of these questions. He'll say, "That situation applies to me," because those are the details he honestly shared with me this morning on the telephone.

I didn't solicit that information, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I didn't solicit this information and come to you and say, "Here is an example of a fellow that got established." He is one of 2,700. There's 2,699 more success stories like this. The minister stands up in this House and says, "We're going to put 5,500 new farmers into farming." Challenge him and say that in five years time the average age of the farmer isn't going to be 26 per cent under 35. I guarantee you that it will be more like 16 per cent like it was in the days when the Thatcher Liberals messed up this province. And they messed up their rural programs. And this is what you are going to Saskatchewan today.

Young people don't want to go through that tough and miserable and hard time again. They like to have some hope. And they like to have a carrot out in the future saying, "This is what I've got to look forward to." And here you're taking it away from them. Please reconsider your stance on this and don't destroy and don't dismantle the land bank. And don't discourage these young people any more. You can introduce your new piece of legislation. You can even leave the regulations in place saying that you don't qualify for 8 per cent if you're renting some land from the land bank. Do that if you like. I don't care. But leave the land bank there. Leave them some security and some assurance that they know they can continue farming. Don't destroy something — that's going to discourage young people even more.

The minister, in answer to the question when I was pressing him, said that he will table regulations and agreement with FCC in due course — in due course. The regulations are out in the country. People all over are going to farm credit corporation regional offices and the regulations are there. Why doesn't he make them available to this House so we can see what kind of program they have? Why can't we see what we're going to get into before we're stuck and before we're down the road with this legislation that's gone too far . . . [inaudible interjection] . . .

The member says we're holding it up and we're . . . We are waiting and trying to give the minister a chance to table his regulations. We're not holding it up. We're not

holding up this legislation. You are steam-rolling the legislation. That's what you call it when there are 55 members saying that this is the best and most constructive piece of legislation in Saskatchewan's history, and not one of them will dare stand up and talk about it; that's what I call holding up legislation. That's not holding up legislation. That's steam-rolling. That's using your big heavy-handed government to try and jam something down the throats of all the people of Saskatchewan and arrogantly saying it doesn't apply if you've got land bank land. It doesn't apply. Okay.

There's another thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I raised in the question period this morning. And the minister said that he has confirmation and by 11 o'clock or 10:30 or whatever time, there is going to be press release from Ottawa and that is going to indicate that Ottawa has made some special concessions to accommodate your loan. The information I have is that he's talking about loans of \$350,000. Farm credit corporation says, "Not from us you don't; our ceiling is 300." And if you get a \$300,000 loan from farm credit . . . And if you are fortunate enough to get one of those you are going to sign a management agreement where one of them is going to come and look at your books and look at your operation and make sure you've got a management program in place that you can handle the \$300,000. It is just special cases when that's made. The average loan, and the general loan, runs around \$100,000. And yet they want to brag about \$300,000.

Now, if the minister is out by \$50,000 on the ceiling of the loan, how do we know that some of the members of the agriculture committee aren't right? He might also be out on the interest. How do we know he's right on the interest? We have no guarantee. Somebody from the agriculture committee told me that we can't give you a guarantee on statute. If the guarantee is for 8 per cent, and the base interest goes through a . . . If the base interest goes from 15 to 30 per cent, we can't guarantee; the province couldn't afford 8 per cent interest.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's why we need to see the regulations, and that's why we need to see the agreement with farm credit corporation before we can let this legislation pass. There are other hooks that are in this legislation that we have to find out about. Who would have thought that this government would be arrogant and cynical enough to pass some legislation and to write into the legislation that a farm tenant will not be able to apply?

When they used to come into farm credit corporation, a person that had a land bank loan got the top qualification as far as being able to qualify on his assessment and his credibility as to whether he is able to return a loan or not, because he had an economical unit that could return him a profit. And now you are saying . . . You had the security that you could return a profit if you had a farm credit corporation loan.

Now you are saying everything applies except those that have a secure base. Except young farmers like the one in Moosomin that spends \$9,000 on rent for five quarters of land that returns him \$45,000 income, that's not going to apply any more. That's not going to apply. They are going to say: spend \$300,000 and buy that . . . Hang a \$40,000 loan on your head, and then go and far, and then go and farm . . . [inaudible interjection] . . .

Yes, let's have a land description. You'll get a land description if you hang around on Monday. He'll give you a land description. He'll not only give you a land description, he'll tell you and bring his contract along and he'll say to that member: why did you lead me down the garden path? Why didn't you tell me this loan wasn't for me? Why didn't

you get up and brag and say we're going to destroy the land bank? We're not going to let a land bank member get a loan. Your figures don't jive. You've given us different facts in your advertisement than you have in your press stories.

That is actually happening in regulation, and the regulations that's tabled. I say table the regulations. The figures that are before us are not in the bill. We don't have any information as to where we're going, but it has an important bearing on a loan and a lessee, and how he's going to make out. And I think because of that important bearing, we cannot let you people introduce a piece of legislation without any amendments. There are so many things the matter with this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have made my point. I'm sure you understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I'm not going to support this kind of legislation that brags and says the land bank legislation was bad legislation, that brags and says it was bad for the farmer. This is good for the farmer. It was good for the province, and I think it would be good if we would leave it in place. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have listened to the agricultural critic. We have heard him explain in detail the many implications of the repeal of the land bank. I want to say though, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have heard little from the members opposite. We have heard little from the members opposite. The members opposite are afraid to get up and speak. They've been muzzled by the power of the cabinet.

I want to say that a land bank that was put in place was serving a very real purpose for the farming community in this province. But as with any program that benefits individuals who otherwise would not have an opportunity, that type of program presents a great deal of opposition, opposition by those who are wealthy, who are established. Those are the ones which are the enemies of this program. The enemies of land bank are not the lessees, not the individual young farmers attempting to get into land bank.

The enemies of land bank are the real estate people who want to have transactions of all the land, and they are opposed to this. I want to say that the enemies to the land bank are the large land grabbers. The sin that land bank committed was providing land bank to a group of people which other wise wouldn't have had an opportunity.

I want to say that throughout the budget debate (and I don't know how it had any relevance), and indeed when the minister introduced the repeal of the land bank, the criticism toward this program was one which, to me, indicated a hate for a program the like of which I've never seen.

I want to say that in introducing this bill and talking about it, they indicated that the lessees were somehow inferior individuals because they participated in the land bank. They referred to them as sharecroppers, second-rate citizens who under this act will have no rights.

I want to say that the minister took us on a tour of the Iron Curtain countries in order to demonstrate that the land bank was. That's what he did.

I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, perhaps he should have taken us on a tour of some of the

countries which United States and the free enterprise governments of this world support. Why didn't he take us on a tour of Argentina, where they have free enterprise and about 80 per cent to 90 per cent of the land is owned by 10 per cent of the people? Why didn't he take us to Brazil and indicate what free enterprise has done in Brazil, where the same representation, where very few, own all of the acres? Why didn't he take us to England where democracy was founded?

I want to say, if you go through England you will find that land is privately owned. Go into Yorkshire and go down through the rich valley, all the way for the city of York to the city of Middlesbrough. Go and see what free enterprise government did and supported in respect to ownership of land. There, from York to Middlesbrough, the rich valley and the moors, guess who owns them? Lords and dukes and princes. Who farms? Tenants. A right to own? No possibilities. These are huge estates, not farmed by individuals, not a possibility of purchasing. They are tenants, not of an elected democratic government, but of a privileged few who own large, huge holdings in England.

I want to say, if you compare the land bank, a government program, with that in other countries where it's privately controlled, and the only possibility of being a farmer is in fact of renting this land, you find in England, for instance, the tenant can't even go out and hunt. Can't even go out and hunt rabbits or pheasants or anything of that nature. Foxes are absolutely kept for the lord. Each fall the lord comes out to his land and guess what? He rounds up his tenant farmers and they drive the birds into shooting galleries that are built up on the moors. No rights for the individual tenants.

So I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that one has to take a look. What is the land bank and what is the correct perception of it? My colleague has indicated the primary purpose of land bank. The land bank was designed to help a group of individuals, a particular group which otherwise would never have been able to farm. And I want to say that some will say, "Oh, we only have 2,700 picking up leases under land bank, 150 who actually purchased." They say it has been a dismal failure. But I want to say, if one looks at the report of the land dispositions, this is what we find. We find that lease competition remained high — 914 applicants in competitions for 74 pieces of land. This averages out to about 12.5 applicants for each parcel of land.

Why are we saying that land bank was not a program in which the people of Saskatchewan were willing to participate? Here are the statistics: 900, over 900 competing for 74 parcels of land. And let us just take one more statistic here, and indicate who in fact were the people who were receiving the benefits. Fifty-six per cent of the 1981 lessees were 30 years of age and under. The age group to receive the most leases included those who were 26 to 30.

I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the land bank was designed for the young farmer. It was designed for those who did not have huge assets in order to go to private institutions to borrow money. I want to say that in the past, before land bank was in and we had the farm credit corporation, many of the young farmers who wanted to go and get established with a half section would go to the farm credit corporation and attempt to get a loan. And I want to say, many of these individuals were denied a loan from the farm credit corporation.

I talked to a very established farmer with respect to this bill in land bank, and he tells me of a young farmer in my constituency. He had a half section of land and another quarter section came up and he wanted to go out and obtain a loan from the farm credit

corporation to buy the third quarter. This is a fact — a fact. And what happened is this: the farm credit corporation refused him. They said, “Sorry, we cannot provide to you loans. The reason: your unit is not large enough; it’s not viable; it will not sustain you even with the additional quarter.”

AN HON. MEMBER: — You said he had a quarter?

MR. KOSKIE: — Two quarters. No, no, two quarters and went to buy the third quarter. The farm credit corporation would not provide additional loans.

So what I want to say is, this individual then had to go to the local credit union. Had the land bank been in place, certainly this individual with the two quarters would be a prime candidate for receiving any additional land which was available.

I want to say that what is happening here in respect to the repeal of the land bank is rather a disappointment to many people throughout the province. I want to say to the Deputy Premier and the Minister of Agriculture that he is putting into place another program. Yesterday we supported that bill. I just want to say to the Minister of Agriculture that while he is repealing the land bank and the operation of the land bank, I think he is leaving a vacuum, a very serious vacuum for a number of young people who otherwise were participating in it.

I ask the members opposite, if you’re not prepared to maintain the operation of the land bank, I say to you that you have an obligation, if indeed it is your purpose to see that more young people have the opportunity to farm. I say that the program which you are introducing, as has been indicated by my colleague, will not reach out and meet that group which we were attempting to assist. I ask you to take a look at the limitations of your program and to establish an alternate program if it’s not indeed the land bank which will in fact will fill that vacuum.

I want to say that I have had an opportunity to review and to look at some of the principles within Bill 46. I want to say that I am shocked, shocked by the fact that within the principle of this bill individual citizens of this province, sons and daughters of people who homesteaded and built this province, are suddenly going to have all of their legal rights taken away.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Where does it say that?

MR. KOSKIE: — Section 4. Take a look at it. I want to say that this is a vicious piece of legislation, because it says, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, it indeed indicates that the lessees or anyone who had any rights which may have accrued under the land bank shall be . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — You just strip them out of there.

MR. KOSKIE: — . . . stripped. You put the words in my mouth. I am very surprised, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to see that the Deputy Premier and the Minister of Agriculture is so very, very happy about providing me with the word “stripped” of their rights.

I want to say that within the land bank individual contracts, there were certainly certain rights set out for the individual lessee. As a consequence of this bill any right that may have accrued pursuant to the lease agreement are not totally wiped out. I want to say that the position that this government is taking is a difficult one to explain to the people

of Saskatchewan who ask, "What crime have I committed? All I did is want to get established as a farmer. I participated in a program. Why should not the succeeding government honor the obligations?"

I want to say that to those 2,700 lessees, representing probably 10,000 people in Saskatchewan, the result of this bill can be one of the most difficult and most destructive of any legislation that has been foisted upon a particular group of individuals.

You know, the minister has consistently said that bill 46 would in fact provide certain rights to the land bank lessees. He indicated that the lease would in fact continue. He indicated the right to pass on to an heir, to a child or a wife, for those are basic principles, but then if you look and see what that really says, it doesn't say very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Because every lessee under a land bank contract had an established and determined rental rate. Within this bill, this dastardly bill, as it has been referred to, it is possible for the Minister of Agriculture to unilaterally establish the rental rate. What is the significance of that? The significance of giving to the Minister of Agriculture total power in respect to the setting of the rental rate can have disastrous effects on the lessees.

I want to explain that because what it allows the minister to do — the minister who is determined to do away with the land bank, to do away with existing leases — is to establish a rental rate which is so high that it's impossible for the individual lessee to maintain that lease.

What options, then, would be left? If the rental rate is increased to a level that becomes prohibitive and uneconomic, then exactly what happens is that the individual farmer has the following choices: he can attempt to pay the exorbitant rates, rental rates, and if they're higher than is economically viable, or what his unit will support, then he has what other alternative? Well, under this act he would be probably given the right to purchase. But what I want to say is that the individuals, many of them who are on the land bank, are not individuals who can immediately walk into a purchasing situation, because the very individuals that were established on land bank were those who did not have huge assets.

What happens here, and what will happen, is the land bank and the leases will be destroyed. Land bank lessees, many of them will be unable to take up the option to purchase it. As a consequence, the wealthy, the large landowner, the land grabber, he will have a field day. I want to say that as a consequence what will happen jointly as a result of the two bill introduced by the Minister of Agriculture is that we're going to see not more farmers in total; we're going to see larger and larger and larger farms controlled by agricultural corporations . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Oh, I can tell you of a few down in my area, and I'm going to go into that.

I want to say that what is going to happen is that we're going to have corporate farmers — corporate farmers. That direction is not a direction that we were striving to achieve. We were attempting to maintain the family farm to establish young people who otherwise would not be able to get on the farm. I want to say that we have a trend that is developing in Saskatchewan, a trend which we looked at and we're very concerned.

I know, in my area, of a farmer with over 50 quarters, over 50 quarters of land; another one with over 60 quarters of land. I want to say that what happens is that changes the whole outlook and the development of our small communities throughout

Saskatchewan. Some many support, and obviously the members of the government side support, large corporate farming. I suppose if that's the direction they're going, they will succeed, because they have the mighty and the powerful and the land grabbers on their side. I want to say that that is not good for Saskatchewan, and let me just demonstrate. We were trying to get away from that with land bank; maintain a reasonable family unit size, a viable family farm.

Corporate farming is not efficient farming. Let me relate. The fellow with close to 100 quarters of land — close to 100 quarters of land — what happens? It's a laughing matter throughout the community where he farms, and he farms in about three. He has so much land that he sows some of the land fairly early (when he should), some soon thereafter, and the third is so late that he has no prospect of possibly getting a decent crop. So what he does is insure that acreage which he has put in too late under the insurance of crop insurance. He picks up crop insurance. No crop, no production, but coverage, because it's either frozen or doesn't ripen.

But take it a step further and I'll you what happens. Do you realize that this farmer has, on occasion, forgotten that he even had a quarter sown? Let it out. Neighbors could have gone to him and said, You forgot a quarter." Never even knew how much he had; didn't get around to farming it all.

I'll say the direction that the Tory government is taking agriculture is in a wrong direction. I want to say, another trend is developing that should be controlled, not encouraged. Implement dealers are going out right across the country and renting huge, huge lots of land. What I say is that we want for the citizens of Saskatchewan, for their young people who want to farm, the opportunity to farm.

So I say that is what is happening, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is we're going certainly in the wrong direction. The 2,700 lessees that we had established under land bank, the 10,000 people it represents, I say again, have committed no crime by merely participating in land bank. And I ask again the ministers, the Minister of Agriculture, the members who talk from their seats, I ask them . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . You had lots of opportunity and you know very well . . . Sure, you'll stand up and then sit down because you'd have nothing to say.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order, order! I think the member should be allowed to make his point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I was wanting to say that those 2,700 lessees, approximately 10,000 people had committed no crime by merely participating in the land bank program. As I was saying when I was so rudely interrupted by the member for Kelvington-Wadena, I submit to the Minister of Agriculture, to the members on the government side, that if they are going in fact to do away with land bank, then I ask them to take a look and to deal with these citizens, these lessees under our program in a decent and fair manner. And I submit that if one takes a look at this land, this repeal of the land bank, there is no guarantee. Indeed, it would appear of course, their rights will be stripped . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Indeed? I know that. You're all wrong.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, this member last night rudely interrupted the member for

Assiniboia-Gravelbourg. Now they have sent him over here because we're getting to the truth. It's starting to hurt. The real estate boy wants to get out and be able to sell this land bank and make the 7 per cent on the backs of the young farmers who are trying to get established.

I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this is not merely a question here of what is happening destroying legal rights. But if those legal rights are destroyed, the implications are of destroying the very livelihood of 2,700 people.

And I stand up here and I ask for those to stand up in order to explain that to us. We have asked for the regulations. All we get, in so far as what is going to happen, is the spokesman for the Tory party, Deputy Premier, Minister of Agriculture, making statements.

But you know, why are we to believe a statement made at a press conference when indeed, if we look at their promises in the election versus what they are prepared to implement, there is a variation. So why can't there be a variation in their facts, as there will end up being when the minister speaks at a press conference? During the election he indicated, with respect to the loan program, 8 per cent for five years, 12 per cent thereafter. The thereafter has disappeared. Gone. So there is no way of the lessees being able to know or intelligently able to address their concerns.

Now granted, many of the members opposite have said there are no concerns. Don't worry. Trust me. And I think one of them carries a lighter around and he needs to, because he has to keep pleading with people to trust him. Because people are starting to less and less trust the members opposite.

Well, all I'm saying is certainly these lessees should have an opportunity to know whether or not their rights are going to be dismantled. Now if they aren't, I agree. That is good. But how can we, as an opposition, or how can the lessees who are concerned and vitally concerned even make a representation without knowing exactly what is going to happen? Because with all the powers again in this act, the very nuts and bolts of this program are within the regulations.

I'm saying that this government has a great mandate, a large mandate. But I think that really in fact the mandate was an expectation that this government would, as they had said, listen to the people, allow the people to make representations. And what has happened? We have had two major pieces of legislation, and let us compare, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we did in introduction of the land bank versus their repeal of it, or the introduction of their program to assist with the \$355,000 loan. I want to say that we walked, we went across the province, and we outlined to the people of this province, the young farmers: Here is proposal; look at it; give us your best advice. And I want to say that here what is happening is once again, as I indicated with the previous bill, arrogance. The government is blinded by their own power. The people no longer count. Representation from individuals will not be acceptable. They know best. Their mandate gave them the right, they seem to say, to do anything that they feel like. And that is the direction they're going.

I want to say, and I caution the backbenchers, I've asked them to go, if they ever have a caucus meeting, to make representation that this cabinet should go to the people. There are, I want to say, a large number of lessees who are prepared to discuss this matter with the government. They're prepared to put forward their views to the

opposition. And I think one of the challenges in a democracy (and for people who represent it) is that that type of intelligent discussion go on — discussion with the groups being affected, then a major intelligent discussion here in the legislature. And I want to say what really disappoints me, what really disappoints me is the lack of participation, the lack of participation.

I want to say in conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the principles of this bill in summary are rather devastating to the individual land bank lessees. In summary, I want to say that these are the major effects that the land bank repeal bill will have. First of all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, farmers who are damaged by the repeal of the land bank have no recourse and no possibility of compensation for damages. That's the principle that's set out in the bill. Those who are damaged by the repeal of the land bank have no recourse and no possibility of compensation for damages. That's the first principle.

The second is: the only rights of the lessee to be continued are the lease itself and the right to pass the lease on to the family. Those two are there. But the third principle that is set out is that the rental charges in existing leases can be changed under the power of this bill. And so, as I say, rights are being emasculated. The fourth consequence or principle: there is no continuation of the right to prior possession for the lessee and his rights to chattels and improvements are not guaranteed (like a house). These assets could be seized under the power granted in the bill. Fifth: the only thing that can be appealed is a decision respecting passing on of the lease after retirement or death. That's the only appeal. Six: lessees are not given time to remedy a breach. And seven: the regulations — making power enables the government to do practically anything again. And eight; there is no consideration of people with a partially completed transaction when the government changed. I want to comment on a couple of these. And the ninth principle: the stage is set to force lessees to buy the land whether they want to or not. And I want to say that one of the principles that we had in the land bank, which has been so grossly misrepresented, is the fact that the land bank program was a voluntary program. No one was forced to go into the land bank. Everyone knew the terms of it. Everyone knew that if you leased it it was for five years and then you could purchase. That was set out right in the legislation — set out in the legislation. And I want to say it was voluntary, and we had more people than we could accommodate who wanted to use the land bank.

I want to say in wrapping up, in concluding my remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have not had a lot of land bank transactions in my constituency. But, I want to just relate for the record, and for the backbenchers who have not read the land bank legislation and have not read the repeal of the land bank, I want to indicate a couple of examples of how land bank can save a couple of farmers: financed substantially with the bank — very substantially — outstanding farmers they were, in their community respected (a father and two sons), and what happened is that they went into a heavy cattle operation. And you know what has happened to the cattle operation. As a result they were unable to make enough to sustain the heavy payments under the financial arrangements they had made to finance their operation. So as a result they had no option if land bank had not been there. No option. They would have lost the land; it was gone. And, I can tell you, there were a lot of real estate people, and a lot of land grabbers who were rubbing their hands saying, "That land is going to be coming up, and we're going to grab it. We're going to grab it."

But, I'll tell you what happened to this individual family. They made an application to land bank. Through their solicitor they made an application to land bank. The land bank was appraised, evaluated, and references were received with respect to the qualifications

of the individual, whether they would likely be successful, what happened to their operation because they ran into financial trouble. The land bank received high recommendations that these people were competent individuals, that they got caught in the cattle industry at the wrong time. I want to say that what happened is they were able to sell their land to the land bank and lease it back. It was a voluntary operation. I want to say that on that farm today you have two or three families still operating it. I want to say that if we did not have land bank those farmers would have been excluded. They would have been wiped out. And who would have got it? The land grabbers — the land grabbers were there.

I want to say also that not only was the land bank beneficial in this particular type of example, but there are other examples — the father-son transfer. During the last campaign, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I remember talking to a farmer, not a supporter, and he indicate to me that he had examined, and he hadn't understood before, how he was going to get his son established in farming. The son was working at the potash mine. The father was ready to retire. But he needed some cash to retire. So what he said was, "I can see of no other way of doing it which will give me cash to retire and will allow my son to operate my farm without debts which he will not be able to pay." What he did was to make an application to land bank. I want to say that this is an individual who after he understood the land bank said he fully supported it. He said, "No matter what government comes in I hope that the land bank concept is sustained alongside of any other program." This is what I wanted to say.

In concluding my remarks I want to say in summary that you are putting in a program — a program which you basically outlined during the campaign. I commend you for that. But I plead with the Minister of Health, who I have a high regard for in so far as basic understanding of decency . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — It's not all of them I would say that about. I ask him to take my concern to the caucus, and take it to the caucus when the other two former Liberals are not there, so that the backbenchers will have an opportunity to talk. I ask you to do this. I ask you to take back our proposition. This is our proposition: bring in your program, but also allow for a period of time at least for the land bank to operate in conjunction with it. Now, alternatively, if you're totally opposed to land bank, then I say, at least address that group of people which land bank was in fact helping. I want to say that I put this very seriously to you and to the members opposite. Certainly there is a need for a program similar to what we had in order to at least address that group of people.

In respect to that I want to say that I am again, in conclusion, very concerned about the overriding powers of this bill. I guess we will have to get used to this form of procedure by the government opposite.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I think a new has dawned, Murray.

MR. KOSKIE: — Then I think that day will end rapidly with a crash. It's going to end. Do you know what is going to happen? People are going to start to mobilize, and they are going to take on the arrogance of the government opposite.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I ask again the members to take a look at meeting that which they will destroy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I may say, Mr. Speaker . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . I'll yield to the member for Kelvington-Wadena if I don't lose my right to speak in the debate. Is that agreed? I guess I'm recognized am I?

Well, I would never accuse the member for Kelvington-Wadena of intentionally being 20 seconds too late in rising to his feet. I would never suggest that. I would never suggest that only because it might be unparliamentary. It might impute unworthy motives to members opposite, and we now know that that's a serious offence in this House.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I listened with interest to my colleagues. I am disappointed they have left me with such a short period of time in which to address this bill. I suppose, however, we'll always have Monday. I may try to wrap up my remarks on Monday.

I want to talk about . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . I'll try to get finished by Christmas Eve. I'll try to see that the member for Weyburn gets home by Christmas Eve.

I said yesterday on a different bill (and I want to repeat what I said about the land bank) that the land bank was, I think, a successful program. It should not be judged by some sort of artificial standard of what might have been expected of it or what it might have done. It should be judged by — well, let's try judging it by what it accomplished and what it was rather than what it might have become . . . [inaudible interjection] . . .

Well, I suggest to the members opposite it might be a fairer test to look at what the land bank was, what it was intended to do, and what it did, rather than what it might have done. Members opposite have held forth the giant shadow of the hammer and sickle falling across the province with this wave of unbridled, undemocratic socialism. I see half the members opposite sagely nodding their heads, yes, that's exactly what they saw. I suggest to members opposite that's a little overwrought, that's a little overwrought. I am having some difficulty in understanding why members opposite would want to repeal such a sterling piece, such a useful piece of legislation.

To try and educate myself I turn to none other than the present Minister of Agriculture to see if I can understand why they would want to repeal a bill which has been so successful. And I want to repeat for members opposite, since it's been so long; it's been so long ago that members opposite are using a battering ram to try and get this through. It's only four days but members opposite seem to have problems remembering things.

I want to repeat some of the more striking comments that I found. Mr. Berntson said, in telling us why he was repealing the land bank:

So the land bank, one of the great failures of the previous administration, must go.

If that's one of our great failures then we have a pretty proud record to refer to. He went on, and I'm going to get back to this because I think this is exactly what the Saskatchewan public cannot do. He said:

When the Saskatchewan voters elected this government to office on April 25, they put their trust in us and we are not about to betray that trust.

Well, I say the voters of Saskatchewan certainly have to put their trust in this government, because there is nothing in that bill to give them any protection . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . The member for Cut Knife-Wadena reminds me of an old dog I used to have, whose name was Tippy. Tippy had been a good cattle dog in his day and every now and then Tippy used to wake up barking. There was no apparent purpose but he'd just wake up barking his head off. Some of the members opposite remind me of Tippy. They just seem to wake up barking their heads off. I used to wonder why Tippy did that. I finally came to the conclusion that it was just a means of drawing attention to himself.

I may be testing the patience of Mr. Deputy Speaker in relating the story of that dog, and I will not dwell on it. Mr. Berntson went on and said:

The land bank legislation was bad legislation. It was bad for the taxpayer. It was bad for the farmer. It was part of litany of failures of the previous administration.

And those were some of the saner comments. Those were some of the saner comments. He went on to explain further what evil he thought would befall the land if the land bank continued. And he said . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Well, at least Tippy used to quit barking after a while. And he said:

You can look at Russia in the '20s and '30s and see what that legendary socialist Josef Stalin did to the Russian farmer. Collectivized the farms. Sent Nikita Krushchev to massacre millions of farmers. That's right, shot and killed those farmers

. . . [inaudible interjection] . . . No, this is apparently the new Saskatchewan.

The result of the Soviet socialist agricultural policies was a massive failure in which millions died.

Years ago — and that apparently is the reason for repealing the land bank legislation — we had here a leader of one of the old-line parties, Tucker. His motto was Tucker or Tyranny. And Tucker got eventually laughed out of the land as a politician.

One of my earliest memories was of politician Davey Steuart, who used to raise a spectre of communism and enslavement. They got to calling him, "Steuart or Slavery." I don't think it's going to be very long before they'll be calling him, "Devine or Destruction." "Devine or Destruction," because that's what he seems to promise: either vote for me or you will be destroyed.

However, it isn't just apparently the Soviet Union that he looks to for help in determining what's going to happen to Saskatchewan if the land bank remains. He went on to say:

Now we have strange socialist agricultural (policies) . . . forced on the population of Tanzania, and we see pictures of (millions) of innocent but starving children. The lesson is obvious. Let the people own their land and work it how they want (or they will go the way of Tanzania).

I may say that the land bank is being judged, I think against a standard which it could never have met. It was never intended that it would instantly solve all the problems of agriculture. It was intended to deal with the problem which was critical in 1971. Given the policies of this administration, I think it may well be critical again. In 1971 the average age of the farmer was 57 and getting older. The farming industry was an industry in trouble. It was necessary to get new people into the industry, and the land bank was designed as a means of doing that, and it was successful, Mr. Speaker. It was a successful program in doing that.

It was successful in getting about 1,200 people established on a viable unit. I am told that 21 per cent of those 1,200 people were people who were new to the farming industry. They were not sons or sons-in-law, or daughters or daughters-in-law of existing farmers. But, it has been misrepresented. It has been suggested by members opposite that this is the beginning of the collectivization of all of Saskatchewan farmland — all of Saskatchewan farmland.

The members opposite are fond of forgetting that the land bank was in effect for 10 years and only accumulated 2.7 per cent of the arable land in Saskatchewan. The late Wacky Bennett, premier of B.C., was fond of warning people about creeping socialism. Well, boy, that's creeping socialism — 2.7 per cent in 10 years. It would take a modest 220 years to collectivize this province.

I've accused members opposite of being short of foresight. Well, I'm not this time. If you're concerned about what's going to happen to this province in 210 years, then I congratulate you. I wish you would show more concern about what's going to happen in the next decade, because I think the next decade in the farming industry, with the kind of policies that you people are implementing, is not going to be a very happy one.

So, I'm sorry to see this program go and I'm going to return to that. I'm sorry to see this program go, because I think it was a successful program. It got new people involved in the farming industry and it. . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . [inaudible] . . . You've only got an hour to go yet.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — That isn't going to be enough to start. I say I am really upset that what I had to say should be condensed into such an impossibly short period of time. There's something unfair about the democratic system. But being a good old boy, I'm just going to do my best to try and say what I've got to say in this brief, fleeting flash of time that I've got left for me.

I am sorry to see the program go. I think it was needed. Leased land (and I'm going to get to this in a moment) plays a part in many provinces. This is not something that is unique to Saskatchewan. It is something other provinces have. But every time I suggest that there's some alternative to the capitalist system, I hear someone across the way talking about Moscow, or communism. I haven't heard such silly nonsense in this House for many years. You people may be thankful that there's nobody in the press gallery quoting some of the comments you are making . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . I assume, Mr. Speaker, I'll now have a little more order in this House, and that members will not want to be quoted.

Part of my concern is a sorrow at the passing of the land bank, and it's obviously passing. And it will obviously be squeezed out just as fast as the Minister of Agriculture

can arrange it. And he's not going to be, I think, particularly delicate in dealing with those lessees. The province is filled with people who have felt the boot of the government opposite because they were not part of the new Conservative regime. I will not dwell on them at length, but there are the public servants who were dismissed, some of whom were thought to be New Democrats, some of whom you couldn't possibly have thought of that. There was Mr. Van Mulligen who made the mistake of opening his mouth at the wrong time. Now there's the lessees who are not part of the new Conservative regime. So they go. It matters not that these people had rights guaranteed to them. They had signed contracts. I have a copy of the contract here.

The big fellow, my colleague, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg has been calling him, has been asking that the terms of the contract are. Well, he's in luck because I've got the contract here and I'm going to tell him what rights were guaranteed under that lease, and contrast that with what they've got in this bill, which is nothing. Absolutely nothing, except the tender mercies of the Minister of Agriculture.

What have the lessees got once this bill is passed? Nothing, unless they have faith in this government.

AN HON. MEMBER: — They do.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, there's a surprising number of them that don't. And I think you're going to be surprised at the number Monday who don't have faith in the Minister of Agriculture. They have no other protection, no other protection at all, but any faith they may have in the tender mercies of the Minister of Agriculture. And if you . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . I'm going to get to it. I say to members opposite, you are in luck. Before I rose to speak all was darkness. By the time I'm finished all will be light. You are in luck . . . [inaudible interjection] . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order please! I don't mind a little communication, but sometimes it gets a little overdone and I would ask the members to give the man on his feet the opportunity to speak.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I don't mind him not being in his seat. They have to rely on the tender mercies of the Minister of Agriculture. It was the same Minister of Agriculture who thought that the land bank was going to bring up on this province (and I want to quote):

Collectivization of the farms, massacring farmers who own their land, millions of children starving. The lesson is obvious. That's what happens when you don't own your land.

That is the enlightened view of the Minister of Agriculture, about the role played by those who lease their land. I suggest that those land bank lessees are worried. They have every reason to, having heard that from a minister of the crown. I think members opposite should be ashamed if we heard their sort of comments from a backbencher, but when you hear them from a member of the crown, I suggest those sorts of comments are utterly irresponsible utterly irresponsible. There is . . . [inaudible] . . . Pardon me? . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . No, I'm just . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . I haven't got started. I have not got started.

There is, in addition to the question of the continuation of the land bank . . . I suppose members opposite may argue that they have the right to end the land bank; they did get

elected. I'm waiting to see, I am waiting to see the first piece of campaign literature in which you people told anyone that you were going to bring the land bank to an end. I heard an endless number of comments about the need for 8 per cent mortgage money; but I never heard any responsible person in the Conservative party, and that excludes a goodly number of the candidates, but I never heard any responsible member of the Conservative Party say the land bank is coming to an end.

So if you people are suggesting that you won a mandate to bring the land bank to an end, I say you didn't. I say the people on April 26 did put their faith in you. The Minister of Agriculture is right to that extent. But they're aghast now — aghast at how little faith they should have had. But you did win a mandate. You were philosophically opposed to the land bank and perhaps if you were honest enough to tell the people what you were going to do, perhaps they should have understood from the very nature of the beast — the very nature of the beast — that you found land bank so abhorrent that you wouldn't be able to live with it whether it was a good program or bad program. Perhaps the public should have understood that.

Now that's asking for a very high degree of political literacy on the part of the electorate, that perhaps they should have understood that. Perhaps they should have understood that, although I may say I am amazed at the number of land bank lessees who say to us, "We voted Conservative. Boy! Did we make a mistake." I'm amazed at the number who didn't and who should have. Maybe they should have understood that you found it philosophically abhorrent and you would bring it to an end, with nothing about the tradition or the past or the history of the Conservative Party, to suggest that you will trample contractual property rights.

That's not been part of the history of the Conservative Party. It is now a part of the history of the province. The day this bill is passed, that will be part of the history of the Conservative Party and I say to you, it will not be your happiest chapter, it will not be your happiest chapter, it will not be your happiest chapter.

When most people in this province think of the Conservative Party. It is now a part of the history of the province. The day this bill is passed, that will be part of the history of the Conservative Party and I say to you, it will not be your happiest chapter, it will not be your happiest chapter, it will not be your happiest chapter.

When most people in this province think of the Conservative Party, they think of John Diefenbaker and the bill of rights, ineffectual as it was. I don't think that was John Diefenbaker's fault that that bill was ineffectual, but the bill did turn out to be toothless tiger. They think of defence of individual liberty, individual rights. Would any one, any one of our forefathers who would have followed John Diefenbaker down the barrel of a gun (and many of our forefathers would have), would any of them have believed that a party bearing the same name would pass a bill in which the contractual rights given to the lessees are swept away with nothing in their place? Would anyone have expected that from the party of John Diefenbaker? Nobody. I know people — rock-ribbed New Democrats, CCFers in those days — who voted for John Diefenbaker because they thought they could trust him. There's a lot of people who will vote for anybody they think they can trust. That's going to be a problem for you people in four years time, but that may be getting a little off the topic. But John Diefenbaker is not, because John Diefenbaker's personality and his history was part of the reason why people were not listening to what you were saying, but were expecting you to follow your traditions.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order please. I think the hon. member realizes himself that there is a long way from the topic and has stated that. I've had patience with you, but I'm going to ask you now to come to the subject that's before the House and to try and stay on that subject.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I may have gotten a little off topic, I must admit.

The subject of the contractual rights of these lessees is not off the topic. They have no contractual rights. They have none at all. And I ask: why would you do that? Why would you pass the bill? I can understand why you would pass a bill doing away with the land bank; you find it philosophically abhorrent.

You have a slavish commitment to the economics, to the classic liberalism of the 19th century. I think that is probably why you're doing away with it, blind to the fact that this program has done a lot of good, and I'm going to get to some of the good it has done. You're blinded by your slavish commitment to the classic liberalism of the past century. I say that the economic doctrine and economic thought did not stop with Adam Smith; it has gone on since his works. But nobody over there, apparently, has read any of it. I suggest that that's part of the reason why you're doing away with it.

Part of the reason why you're doing away with it is because you need the money. And, as has been suggested by one and all, you need the money to try and finance your program, and you sure didn't tell the people that you were going to finance the program with the land bank money. So don't tell me you had a mandate to pull off that shell game, because you didn't.

I think no one should be misled. No one should be misled by the suggestion . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Yes a lot of them were. No one should be misled by the suggestion that land bank lessees will be able to buy the land. No one should be misled by that. Because that, in fact, will simply not be possible, and many land bank lessees know that.

I have done some work for the farm credit corporation. I know what their security requirements are. Their security requirements are high. To that extent, I think, they have failed their purpose. Their interest rates are good, but their security requirements are high. How does a land bank lessee . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — When we have a committee, bring him in.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — You know, that's not a bad idea. The member for Weyburn wants to have the farm credit corporation talk about it; that may not be bad idea. Is the member for Weyburn suggesting we refer this matter to a special committee, so that we may call such witnesses. How about that idea? It may work. I may think about that. As I say, I may think about that idea.

It is unlikely, I think that land bank lessees will be able to purchase their land. That was, first of all, not what they wanted to do. They had the opportunity; the vast majority of them did not. I have some stats, which we will get to in a moment. But the vast majority of them did not want to buy the land. They preferred to go on leasing it. What they wanted to do was to buy additional land to increase the size of their holding. They would have a quarter or two. They'd have a quarter or two. They'd have a quarter or two. They'd have a quarter so they'd buy a couple more . . . [inaudible interjection] . . .

I'm gong to get to the Matador. I think the example of the Matador Co-op was exactly what was right with the land bank. And I'm going to get to that in a moment, so if the big fellow will just be patient and let me continue I will explain all. I will explain the Matador Co-op because I think that's exactly what was right with the land bank, and that's exactly why we should be keeping the land bank.

But they don't have the collateral. They had a quarter section, and got a couple more though leasing. How does that man now buy anything from farm credit corporation? It may be possible; I don't suggest that my experience in farming is the be-all and the end-all of the subject of agriculture. But I sure haven't got a lot of enlightenment from members opposite who have talked about all the evils of socialism in Tanzania and Russia. I'm amazed that we didn't hear about what's wrong with Britain. I'm amazed that members opposite didn't tell us how socialism has brought Britain to its knees. But that's what we hear from members opposite.

The members opposite have not bothered to tell me how the average land bank lessee is going to be able to use this program. Just for openers, he has to buy the land he is already leasing first. I suggest that few of them, I suggest that few of them will have the security to do that. And they will be trapped because they were new people who got into farming. These were not wealthy. Many of those in farming are asset-wealthy but perhaps not income-wealthy. But they were not asset-rich enough to purchase a farm. They don't have a section and a half clear. They don't have a section . . . [inaudible interjection] . . .

I'm gong to get to Manitoba. They've got a program there too and it's fairly successful, so if members opposite will be patients with me I will explain all.

I know all is darkness but I will make it light if you'll be patient with me. I suspect as well, without any protection in this bill, and there is no protection in this bill, that pressures will be brought on them to buy the land. There is nothing in this bill at all that gives them any protection. Nothing at all. Nothing at all. It says they will continue. It doesn't say anything about rent. Nothing but some press releases. I've read those, and they aren't exactly airtight. There's nothing but press releases upon which to go.

The member wants to know if he can read this. I tell you that there are, I suspect, more than one in the Legislative Library. If the members were curious I suspect the staff could find you another one. It may surprise some members to know that I'm not a land bank lessee, so I can talk to this I suppose with some degree of impartiality. I didn't get this.. I wasn't given this, wasn't given this.

There is no protection at all for these people in the bill. I can't believe, I can't believe that. I can't believe that of the party that was once led by John Diefenbaker, and this party once was led by John Diefenbaker . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Yes, he must be rolling over in his grave when he sees what you people are doing to the rights of the Saskatchewan people.

Let's look at the objectives of the land bank. The objectives of the land bank are relative to determining whether or not this program is worth continuing. I want to look at the objectives, and then I want to look at how well the land bank may have met those objectives. And I think from that we may be able to determine whether or not we want to keep this program. I know that members opposite, including the member for Moosomin, are listening with an open mind so I'll continue.

One of their objectives was to establish viable farming units and they did. That was one of the problems and still is. This program is still needed because one of the problems was that some units were too small and some were too poorly managed to be economical. This program sought to address both of those programs. The land bank

sought to address both of those problems and was in part successful. I am going to suggest with some statistics, and not with a lot of blather as we have heard from members opposite but some statistics, that the land bank did meet these objectives. I am sure when I am finished you people will be repenting your sins in trying to repeal this legislation.

A second objective was to encourage the perpetuation of viable units and the practical ability to begin farming independent of substantial family assistance. This refers to the fact that a small farmer would hardly afford to give the land to his child. There is nothing to live on. Larger farmers may well have had a substantial nest egg. That wasn't true of a smaller farmer. A smaller farmer may have had assets the size of a couple of hundred thousand dollars. He was asset-rich, but he was income-poor. Many of them saved very little. I know this from my experience as a lawyer. I have handled more estates than I care to recall. I know that . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Well, don't.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I don't. The member may rest assured I will not. The small farmer often does not die with a lot of money in the bank. He doesn't retire with a lot of money in the bank. He has to get the money out of that half section or three-quarters if he is going to live decently when he retires.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Is this a post-mortem on the small farmer?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, it may well be a post-mortem on the small farmer. It may well be. You may well be putting it rather aptly. I'm sorry that the member for Regina North is not getting into this debate from his feet because he is making an interesting contribution from somebody else's seat . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Yes, I know you will. You will be up 20 seconds after the next person gets on his feet.

What this program sought to do was to allow small farmers to get their money out of their land and yet pass it on to children who could begin to farm. So in a sense you could kill two birds with one stone . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Oh, there is lots of time for the Leader of the Opposition to speak. There is lots of time for him to speak. . . [inaudible interjection] . . . I don't quite know how we get water-drinking in the *Hansard*. Yes, I just accomplished that.

To enable those individuals . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . I have 16 people yelling, "Ned, Ned, Ned" at once. A third objective was to enable those individuals . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . I don't know. It seems to me there are more letters in "Tory voter" than eight. I am not sure though. It doesn't seem to be a proper guess.

A third objective was to enable those individuals with the desire and practical ability to begin farming independent of the substantial family assets, and it did that. It was also to allocate land on a fair and unbiased selection between applicants. And it did that. I am going to go on later to show members how that in fact was done. The system of allocation of land was not perfect. I think if you scratch hard enough you might find members of this caucus who have some problems with the allocation system.

I will tell you what the primary problem was. The primary problem was (and I am going to get to these facts later on) that there were 10 people chasing every quarter. So a member wound up with one happy voter and 12 unhappy ones. No one can survive this very long. You people seem to be intent on trying but not many political parties can last

that long with that sort of public relations program. That was one of the problems, but at least it had no element of political patronage in it . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . I wait for the guffaws. I know that members opposite believe that Jack Messer personally did a blood test on everybody . . . [inaudible interjection] . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — It's so noisy in here.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, it is noisy.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Just blew the whole weekend, Ned.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Well, my gosh. That's a dreadful crime. In Saskatoon none the less. Oh dear.

The program did provide the allocation of land on a point system. The point system did not have any element of political patronage. I know that members will allege that. They'll say: tell a lie often enough, if you tell a big enough one people are going to believe it.

The truth is — the truth is — while the truth is still tying his shoes, the lie is halfway around the world. It spread a lot faster.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You know what they need is more Quinlans to sell their programs; they don't have enough Sean Quinlans.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, you don't have enough Sean Quinlans. That's right. . . [inaudible interjection] . . . That may be tad off the point, so I won't . . . [inaudible interjection] . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. It's getting very difficult for the members to compete with all the talk across the floor from both sides, and I would ask the members to give him an opportunity to speak.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — In spite of the deafening encouragement to get into the subject of Sean Quinlan, I will avoid that. It was also, and this was a point I touched earlier . . . one of the functions of the land bank was to encourage and to provide counselling services to those lessees who indicated a desire for assistance in either farm management or financial management. I think we would all admit that some of the farming units which aren't viable are not viable because of management.

The vast majority of farmers I'm sure are good managers. They live on far too tight a financial shoestring to be anything else, but there are unquestionably those who are not good managers. One of the objectives of the program (and I will show later on that objective was reached) was to provide counselling services to those lessees who indicated a desire for assistance. It was intended to provide a continuous sales opportunity to those people who own farmland in Saskatchewan.

I would suggest that members should not judge the land bank by what it was not and what it never was intended to be. I know that that's a favorite pastime of members opposite, but I suggest that you should not judge the land bank by what it was not, and what it was not intended to be. Well it . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Well, it was not intended nor was it likely, I say to the Minister of Agriculture, finally back in the Chamber — I've been addressing remarks to you for the last hour . . . (inaudible)

interjections) . . . That's right, that's right. By popular demand. I've tried to sit down several times and the members won't let me.

You should not be judging land bank by what it is not. It is not something that purchases land above the market value. Now I know . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Oh, ho ho ho, ho ho ho! You can hear the guffaws coming. The land bank did not buy land above the market value. That was one of its strong features in terms of the service it provided to the public of Saskatchewan and it was one of its weaknesses in political terms. Because as the value of land rose rapidly, and I am going to show you in a moment how the value of land did rise, the land bank felt that the land was being bought at prices above its productive value and they began to buy less of it. Thus it became to be more of a political problem. But they did not . . . They bought land at its market value.

The sales policy. I want to outline for the members opposite what the policy was, because I think you misunderstand it. I think you must misunderstand it when you are repealing the bill. As an example (and I think 1981 is the last annual report), I'll quote a short paragraph:

With the arrival of 1981, an additional 242 lessees became eligible to purchase their land. This brings the total number of lessees eligible to purchase in 1981 to 1,151.

How many of those 1,151 did buy the land? How many? Just a very small handful. What does that tell you about the leasing program? Does that suggest to members opposite even with your distorted logic that the program was a failure, and wasn't meeting the needs of lessees? Does that suggest to you that there was something terrible about leasing land? Does that suggest to you . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Do you want me to ask you, Ned?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, I would. I would like you to get up at a proper time to speak in this debate. Does that suggest to you that from the point of view of the lessees the program was a failure, and was not meeting their needs? How's everything in Kinistino? Does that suggest to you that it was meeting their needs? I suggest the opposite. I suggest that what this suggests about the program was, from the point of view of the lessees, that it was an outstanding success in meeting those objectives that I read a moment ago.

Given the painfully short memory of the members opposite I may have to review those objectives again. But for the moment, I will forego that. I suggest that it was successful in meeting the objective of allowing people who didn't have viable units to accumulate enough land to have a viable unit. I suggest that it was successful in doing that. The average size of the holding for someone in land bank would certainly have been under one section. I don't know what those stats are, but I am certain a person who got land bank land would have started out with less than a section. So the land bank allowed him, without any additional outlay of capital, to set up a viable unit.

AN HON. MEMBER: — To go broke slowly.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Most of them aren't going broke slowly. There isn't a shred of evidence to suggest that. In fact, they are doing very well. The thought someone might get into farming who isn't either extremely wealthy or who doesn't have relatives farming is just not believable without the land bank.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, what it costs to get into farming. I was caught without . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Yes, there's maybe something to learn from the farmer from Regina Centre. I must say, I haven't forked a lot of hay. I may have had some experience with manure in recent times, but I haven't forked a lot of hay recently, and I haven't been jumping much stubble recently.

I did have some time to spend in the Canadian Tire store (I got caught there); I spent about 20 minutes there. One of the people who walked past me was an assistant manager (I kind of knew him actually; I didn't know he was managing the store). I started talking to him and asked him what he was doing. He said managing the store. He told me that you need about \$500,000 in equity to set yourself up from scratch in a Canadian Tire store. That's what it takes. That's all it takes. That is about what it takes to start from scratch, and get into farming on a small scale. You'll be darn small scale, that's right. I don't know how many quarters you'd have but you wouldn't have very many, and you wouldn't be farming with new John Deere equipment either. But with half a million dollars you can make up your mind — do you want to set up a Canadian Tire store, or do you want to go farming?

I ask you to compare the incomes of the two. Let's suppose I inherited half a million dollars from the lottery and so did the member for Moosomin. He goes farming and I set up a Canadian Tire store. I want to ask you, I want to ask you who enjoys the greatest income over a lifetime? There is no question about it. My income will be 10 times someone who spends the same amount of money to go into farming.

The capital costs of getting into farming are extremely high when one considers the income one gets. For the same amount of money he can set up a Canadian Tire store such as exists on north Albert. I was in the north Albert store at the time, and that was the store I was asking about. With the same amount of money are you going to get into that or get into farming? There isn't any comparison in the amount of income. My income will be 10 times the income of the member for Moosomin who goes into farming with the same amount of money.

So I suggest without some program like the land bank it is extremely difficult to raise the capital costs of getting into farming. And so the farmland accumulates. There are larger holdings, and in the hands of fewer people. And I want to get on in a moment . . . I'm going to run short of, really going to run short of time here. I really am . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Well I suppose I might be able to use Monday afternoon as well, but I'm really running out of time here and I'm not even started.

You need something like land bank to assist new people with the capital costs of getting into farming. The only new people that are going to get into farming are someone who is extremely wealthy, who is not terribly concerned about what kind of returns you get on half a million dollars. You are going to get the Gordies, if I may say so. He may be a legitimate farmer, I don't know. Someone like Gordie Howe with a lot of money — he farms out in the Moosomin constituency — to whom return on capital is not a serious problem . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Yes, he . . . When I left the Moosomin constituency . . . I may say, I'm probably off point and I guess I'd better get . . . When I left the Moosomin constituency he was involved in a cattle farm at Whitewood.

One may judge the program as well . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Well, I'd be prepared to admit, prepared to admit . . . Wayne Gretzky? I'd be prepared to admit the member for Moosomin has a sharper knowledge of who is farming in Whitewood than I do. It's some time since I've been there. When they also judge, I think, the success of the

program . . . Yes, it may have been Bobby Hull.

The logic was impeccable. It's just the name I had wrong. The logic I think was impeccable.

One may judge . . . Thank you! Thank you! Thank you!

One may judge the success of a program by its public relations, by what other people think about it. That's a common way of judging our success or failures — what other people are saying about us. And what were other people saying about the land bank? Well, I am told that in 1981 the two full-time commissioners received delegations from other parts of Canada. Yes, other parts of Canada. From other parts of North America; indeed other parts of North America came to look at the land bank. But that wasn't all. They came from other continents, the Netherlands. Mr. Speaker, it wasn't just from other provinces; it wasn't just from other parts of Canada; it was just from other continents; they came from another hemisphere, came all the way from Australia to look at the land bank. It was a world leader, and it is a tragedy that this leadership has been brought to an end by the short-sightedness of this government. It is a shame, and I urge members opposite to reconsider in bringing this valuable program to a conclusion.

But there were yet other benefits; other benefits of the land bank. A drink of that water just makes you want to go on forever. One program I'm going to refer to is the . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . There's obviously some of our out of town visitors whom it doesn't strike in quite the same way.

One of the benefits was the Clemenceau productivity project, a very worth-while leadership and a very worth-while research program . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . I can see the member for Yorkton waiting with bated breath to find out what the Clemenceau productivity project was. Well, I'm about to tell you . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . All right, I'll tell you. The member for Swift Current, I think was the interjector. The member for Swift Current is waiting with bated breath. I can tell you the member for Weyburn is waiting with bated breath to hear what the Clemenceau productivity project was . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Now the member for Saskatoon can hardly contain his curiosity . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . well, I'm going to get to that too. I'm going to get to that too, but let me first deal with the Clemenceau productivity project.

The object of the study was to determine whether normal farming practices of that area could be altered to improve yields and returns, and thus to increase . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I think the member is drawing a pretty long bow when he tries to relate that to the bill that is before us. I would ask you to get back to the subject at hand.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, it was financed by the land bank, and I thought it a good project but I won't dwell overly long on the Clemenceau productivity project.

Another project which I won't spend a long time on, but I want to mention, because it provides an interesting statistic, one which I think will surprise many people, is the Fairlight forage project. What that project determined was that from these acres, those people who worked the acreage got the same dollar per acre from cattle and forage, as they could have got from grain. The land was not fit for growing grain. They realized

\$29 per acre . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . The member for Weyburn, I think, with the interjection wants to know if land bank was a research project. It was not, of course, primarily research.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What was it them? Tell us what it was.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Oh, the water, the water! Part of its objectives were . . . The members are having such difficulty remembering the objectives. Its objectives were to enable those individuals who had a unit which was not viable to obtain a larger unit. I think what the Fairlight forage project was showing was that even off land which is supposedly marginal, you can make as much money, if it is properly farmed, as you can from growing grain. Therefore it did assist the smaller farmers, and research was an essential and very useful part of the land bank program, and that is going to be lost.

That is going to be lost. The experimental stations in this province are not set up to conduct this kind of project. The land holdings are simply not large enough at the experimental stations.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . [inaudible] . . . going to adjourn on B.C. time.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I said that one of the problems with the land bank was that it wasn't able to purchase land because of the rapidly escalating value . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Well, it was pushing the price up — that's what I say about the members opposite. You would accuse land bank of beating your wives if you thought anyone would believe it. You've accused it of every other conceivable sin in society.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I believe that was Dwain's sin.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — One of the things . . . No, I think he accused them of being child-abusers. I mentioned to members opposite, I tried to make the argument through the thick fog that seems to invisibly permeate the benches opposite. I tried to explain that they only owned 2.7 per cent of the arable land in the province. That kind of purchasing simply is not enough to have a material effect on the price. The member for Yorkton is an expert on pricing and marketing. He is very good at it. It's what he became known for . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . An expert in a lot of things, I agree.

I'd be interested in hearing the member for Yorkton tell me how, by purchasing 2 per cent of a commodity, you can drive the price up rapidly. To hear members opposite talk you'd think the price was just going whoosh like a volcano. And it was. The member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg explained the increase in price. But surely, surely not even members opposite would believe . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — What's that noise?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The water.

But surely members opposite could not believe that buying 2.7 per cent of the arable land can have any effect on the price of the land. Now if I'm wrong, I bow to the superior experience of the member for Yorkton. If I'm wrong, I wait for you to get up in this debate and just tell me how purchases of that magnitude can affect the price of a commodity. I could be wrong. I'm not an expert in commodities, pricing or marketing. I don't understand that. I admit my experience is limited and I would appreciate hearing from the member for Yorkton. But I just simply do not believe purchases of such a small

magnitude could materially affect the price of land. But perhaps the member for Yorkton will be able to elucidate.

Let us look at the number the land bank bought. Since it was such a small quantity. I'll quote again, very briefly:

99 bought in 1980; 294 purchases, 1981.

You know what proportion of the total purchases that was? Do you know? Was it 50 per cent? Would buying 50 per cent of the arable land affect the price? I suspect it would. But it wasn't 50 per cent. Was that 40 per cent? The member for Yorkton would probably think that buying 40 per cent of commodity could affect its price. That wasn't 40 per cent of the land bought and sold in that year. Was it 30 per cent? It's getting kind of marginal now, but probably by buying 30 per cent we could affect the price of a commodity. But it wasn't; it wasn't 30 per cent. 20 per cent? Getting even more marginal, but we might affect the price of a commodity by buying 20 per cent. But it wasn't. It wasn't 10 per cent, it wasn't 5 per cent. It was 4 per cent of the land bought that year. And that is somehow, in the view of members opposite, supposed to be driving the price of land wildly forward, wildly forward. The price of land was escalating but it was not being driven forward by any purchases by the land bank.

One of the objectives of the land bank, indeed I think the primary objective of the land bank when it was in the 1971 campaign of which I was a candidate (unsuccessful) in Moosomin . . . I was a candidate in that election and I recall the hopes that we held for the land bank. The hopes that we held for the land bank were that it would dramatically lower the age of the farmer. The average age of the farmer was dramatically lowered. I would not claim that the land bank was the sole instrument in that happening. Other things happened as well.

Farming went through some rather prosperous years and it attracted new people, but the land bank played a part. I want to quote a short statistic from the annual report which again establishes that this commission and this program met its objectives and therefore is worthy of keeping:

56 per cent of all 1981 lessees were 30 years of age and under. The five-year age group to receive the most leases included those from age 26 to 30.

That is a statistic which just has no parallel. I suspect no other program . . . There are a lot of them. I'm going to compare in a moment, Mr. Speaker, our program, the land bank program, to that of other provinces. Most provinces have a program. I don't think any are as inane as what you people are doing, but I'm going to get to that in a moment. I don't think there are any as inane. But I would defy members opposite to find any program which is as successful as that in getting young people into the industry.

I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, that you can judge the success of the program best by asking those who were actually participants in it. You want to know how it works? Don't ask members who had no contact with the program except their own biases, and I suppose we all have those. Ask those who actually participated. As those that participated. I will read a paragraph, a very short one:

Lease competition remained high. Nine hundred and fourteen applicants were in competition for 74 parcels of land.

That's 12 applicants for each parcel. Surely that suggests something about the popularity of the program. Surely that suggests, members opposite, that maybe the only problem with the program was that it was underfunded. Perhaps we should have had 12 times the amount of money.

One of the reasons why you people are able to walk over these lessees' objectives is because there aren't enough of them. There aren't enough of them. If there were more . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . There may be. Our society is not particularly tolerant of any government which disregards the rights of minorities. Our society is not tolerant of that. You people will learn, and learn the hard way. Perhaps if there had been more of them, we would not be at this sorry day.

On the sale of land to lessees, I want to just briefly refresh the memory of members opposite. In 1973 the program actually became operative. You remember the lessees could buy the land after five years. It was not therefore until 1978 that the first lessees could buy the land after five years. It was not therefore until 1978 that the first lessees were eligible to buy land.

So let's look at what happened in 1978. Was the province overrun with disgusted lessees who had presumably given some thought to the question of their own security, presumably had given some thought to the spectre of the starvation in Tanzania or the programs of Russia being visited upon this fair land? Presumably they had given some thought to that. Did they rush to get out from underneath the spectre of this terrible visitation? Well, not in very great numbers.

In 1978, there were 291 lessees eligible to buy the land. Did 292 buy? No. Did 100 buy? No. Did 50 buy? No. Did even 40 out of 292 bother to buy their land? No. The number was a scant 31. So presumably they felt they had some protection. They obviously did not envision the election of April 26, '82, and if they did, they did not envision the callous treatment that would emanate from this government. And so on throughout the years. The propensity of lessees to buy their land did not increase. Only 42 bought in '79; only 34 in '80. Twenty-five out of 1,100 bought in 1981. I suggest it is clear that from the vantage point of the lessees, who are the best judges of the program, this program was an outstanding success.

We do not suggest that it is necessarily the only program. We voted in favor of Bill 46 because there may be an alternative needed. I think if you're prepared to be fair and look at the results of April 26, one may be prepared to admit that perhaps an alternative is needed for the land bank. Perhaps that's what the public was saying, that we need an alternative. We need an alternative . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . I can keep it up as long as you can. And we voted and are prepared to admit that there may be a need for an alternative. And we voted for Bill 46. But the two bills are in no sense . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . We voted for Bill 45. I'm sorry. We voted for Bill 45.

But the two programs are by no means inconsistent, no means inconsistent. There is room for both. I grew up on a farm but I have trouble claiming to be a farm boy. I've been away from the farm for a few years. I have not, apart from keeping close ties with a close-knit family, had a lot of contact with the farm that I grew up on. I've lived in the city. You know, it's a funny thing. Some of my friends . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Well you haven't been in politics long enough. Wait till you're in politics a little longer. You may find yourself having the same fate. Some of my friends own their houses. Some of my friends . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — All you have to do is read the *Leader-Post* today.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Some of my friends . . . Yes, you people are making no end of friends, I'll tell you. They're just, they're screaming at you . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Why don't you transfer Ted Cholod to P.A. and see how many more friends you can make?

MR. SPEAKER: — The hon. member is taking quite a few liberties and I have had quite a bit of patience, but anybody's patience will wear thin, so I would ask you to stay on the subject.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I quite agree. I was skating close to the edge.

I want to compare the kind of rights. I'm going to run out of time. It's infuriating. I guess I'll have more time Monday. The Minister of Finance reminds me I'll have all day Monday.

I want to compare because so many members have asked what rights do you get under the lease. Is the lessee any worse with the lease than he would have been with the bill? So I want to . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . I should try though. I should try to get through it because members will go home and they will have the weekend to consider these things.

What is the term of the lease? Does it do the same as the bill, leave it at the whim of the minister? Is that what the bill does? Is that what the lease does? Not a chance. Not a chance. It gives contractual rights, gives the lessee a term until he is 65, allows him to pass it on to other named spouse or descendants. So it gives him and his family security of tenure. What is the rent? . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Will you stop that? Very gracious of you. What rent do they pay? Is the discretion of the minister in the bill? And that is what lessees are really afraid of. I think more than anything else they are afraid of the rent. I think when they hear the Minister of Agriculture suggesting that the land bank is going to visit on Saskatchewan the horrible evils that have been visited upon Soviet Russia and Tanzania. I think they may wonder whether or not he may want to continue this program and whether or not he may exert some subtle influence to bring the land bank to an end. They are, I think, particularly given the comments of the Minister of Agriculture, entitled to some protection. They have none in that bill at all.

What rent were they asked to pay here? Well, in simple terms it was 5 to 6 per cent of the market value of the land. What right did they have to pass it on? Let's compare the two. Let's compare the bill and the contract, because they are different as night and day. I might have said Arctic night and Arctic day but perhaps even that comparison would have been inadequate At the very bottom of the lease (I'll read it, it's very brief):

Transfer of lease on death of lessee. (It's a very simple statement.) In the event of my death I request that a lease of the land be granted to (short blank, fill in the name).

Why couldn't that right have been put in the bill? Why couldn't those people have been given those simple rights? Not given those simple rights, I'm in error, Mr. Speaker. I'm in error in saying that. Why couldn't the legislation have continued those rights which they got in the contract? If you people think that the land bank is the beginning of all evil, the source of all evil, for four long terrible years, you're going to have the right to think that I ask you whether or not you have the right . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Well,

you'll be in such sad shape in four years, you probably will extend it to five. You have the right to design what programs you want, but you don't have the right to take away rights which they were given and upon which they have expended a good deal of money.

There are other terms in the contract which stand in stark contrast with what you people are doing. They are given on the back, and it's fine print, simple language that people can understand. They are given the right to buy existing improvements, and they are given the right to take the improvements with them when the land is sold. That's in the contract. I have come to learn from this experience that a contract can give you far better security than any legislation ever can. I have come to learn that. I didn't used to think that. I have come to learn how short . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . It is a serious problem I say to the member for Saskatoon . . . [inaudible] . . . I'm running out of time, and I'm only getting started. I can see the concern on the faces of the members opposite.

That's an additional right which they have in this contract which you don't have in your bill. Surely, the bill should guarantee them something. It isn't as if they entered it knowing that you people were going to abolish it. They were told when the program was set up that the program would last until they were 65, and on to their children and grandchildren, and that family farms could be continued. Surely they should have the right to continue.

If you don't want to allow any new people to lease additional land under land bank, I guess you have that right, because you got elected, but do you really have the right to take away all the rights which they were given and upon which they expended a good deal of money? I say to the member for Saskatoon Riversdale, these people expended a lot of money on these leases. They built granaries. I may say that I sat in this House for seven years and I didn't hear your forerunners in this House say you were going to do away with land bank and strip the lessees of their rights. It may have been said, but I would be delighted if someone could find the *Hansard* where the member for Rosthern or Souris-Cannington or any of the other six or seven left from the crop of '75 said that. Because I don't think they said that. I don't think you ever told them that; I don't think they did.

It talks about termination — a very significant item, because that's another thing that's wrong with that bill. This specifies in detail the rights to terminate. I won't read it because it's kind of long. There are six clauses on one section and four on another, and I won't read them all, unless you insist. Unless you insist, I won't read them all. But it specifies in considerable detail the right to terminate and do you know what that does? It gives him security, because he knows under what circumstances his lease will disappear and under what circumstances he will be able to keep it.

I ask you to contrast that with this miserable rag of a bill, Bill 46. He has no such rights at all. The bill sets up an appeal, but it says nothing about how the appeal is to operate, nothing about who is to staff it, nothing about whether there's any further right of appeal. Such questions arising out of this contract were decided in the Court of Queen's Bench. We may have our quarrels with the judiciary at times, but we respect their independence. Nothing, nothing is said about the independence of the appeal commission. Indeed, if you have any idea of what the appeal system is going to be, you're way ahead of me.

I read the minister's press releases (that seems to be the only source of information around here), read his press releases, read the bill. I got nothing more . . . [inaudible]

interjection] . . . I know, it's a tragedy. I'll have to complete it Monday. I got nothing more than simply what the bill said, that the cabinet may establish an appeal mechanism, and then only deal with the rights of transfer, on death, to a descendant.

AN HON. MEMBER: — And they may not.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — And they may not. A section of The Interpretation Act (I won't bother quoting it for you) says that "may" means may. It means you don't have to. Thus may not establish an appeal mechanism and there may be no protections at all.

I want you to contrast that with the bill. The bill provides that farmers who are damaged by the repeal of the land bank have no recourse, no compensation for damages. They'd be wiped out. It is very easy to envision a farmer being wiped out.

Surely an democratic government would provide that if you feel, for reasons of public policy, that you have to wipe these poor rascals out, at least you provide them with compensation. If the public is somehow or other, in a fashion which has escaped me, going to benefit from the repeal of the land bank, then surely there should be some compensation from the public which is benefitting from it. There is none. The bill doesn't provide that.

The bill provides no rights to the lessees, except to continue the least itself, if they can meet all the other conditions, and the right to pass it on to one's family. That's it; that's all there is in the bill. How on earth can you expect us to vote in favor of a bill with so little substance?

I'm not going to dwell on it very long, but we have asked the treasury benches opposite to file regulations, and I say there's a precedent for that. The member for Rosthern and the member for Souris-Cannington were in the House in the period of 1975-78 when The Income Tax Act and the potash tax act bills were passed. They were bills that left a great deal to regulation by the very nature . . .

The Assembly adjourned at 1 p.m.