

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**December 14, 1982**

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**

**THE ASSISTANT CLERK:** — Mr. Sveinson, from the standing committee on crown corporations, presents the first report of the committee, which is as follows:

The committee has considered and agreed to the following resolution:

That the standing committee on crown corporations allow televising of its proceedings by the commercial television media.

Therefore, your committee recommends that in accordance with this resolution the televising of its proceedings be allowed by the commercial television media.

**MR. SVEINSON:** — I move, seconded by the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster:

That the first report of the standing committee on crown corporations be now concurred in.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I got into trouble once before by not listening closely enough to the proceedings in the House, but I understand this to be a motion which would permit television in crown corporations. I rise as chairman of public accounts, because we face the same issue. At least one member of the media, CKCK-TV, wanted to come into public accounts. We said they couldn't, because we felt only the committee on communications could deal with that and rule otherwise. I think, unless there is some urgency on this, I am going to beg leave to adjourn the debate, because I want to consider this in light of public accounts . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I wish I knew what members were proposing.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker. Speaking to the motion (and I have an amendment for that motion). I believe the rules committee of 1979 dealt with the question. What they did under that rules committee, which was concurred in unanimously in this Assembly with the previous legislature, was recommended that under the guidelines, as may be set by Mr. Speaker and the Legislative Assembly, the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly be recorded by remote control audio-visual cameras and the tapes made available to conventional cable television and partial etc.

What happened from that, Mr. Speaker, was that a new committee was also formed at the same time that the House voted on television. That committee, of course, is chaired by Mr. Speaker and is called the communications committee. That committee is an all-party committee of the legislature designed to deal, not only with where television goes, but also the rules. I think the recommendation of the committee (if you read back in the debate) was that it was important that the House basically set the rules as to how television would work; in particular, who could use the television. We wanted to avoid

the situation where perhaps at election campaigns television shots from the Assembly were distorted, etc. I think it tended to be a consensus at that particular point in time that once the television cameras were up and running in the Assembly, which is very close as you can see now, then certainly there would tend to be no objection, I think to the cameras then going further into the committees. But we felt it most important that the cameras be into the Chamber first. So with those few statements I would like to move an amendment to the report that all words after "That" be struck out, and the following substituted therefor:

The subject matter of the first report of the standing committee on crown corporations be referred to the standing committee on communications.

And I would so move that, seconded by my seatmate, the member for Indian Head-Wolseley.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that sitting in the Speaker's gallery today are 15 external affairs officers-in-training from Ottawa. This group is in Saskatchewan as part of its cross-country familiarization tour. To achieve this end, the group is meeting with representatives of provincial governments, industry, labor, and other groups. So far the group in Saskatchewan has met with representatives from SMDC, SED Systems, the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion or whatever it's named these days, the Departments of Tourism and Renewable Resources, Industry and Commerce and Intergovernmental Affairs. The group has toured the Cory potash mine, the POS pilot plant, the laboratories at Innovation Place at the University of Saskatchewan, Government House and a grain elevator.

The objective is that each foreign service officer, whatever his or her specific area, will be better able to represent Canada when posted abroad. I believe that I can say on behalf of all members that we hope that Saskatchewan will be a vital part of that promotion.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all members of this Assembly join me in welcoming this group here today.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### WELCOME TO STUDENTS

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce a group of 25 students from Osler High School in my constituency. They are here in the west gallery visiting the House while the roof on their school is being fixed, seeing as they can't have classes, and I will be meeting with them later.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### QUESTIONS

### Remarks by Member for Canora

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier and in his absence, the Deputy Premier, and in his absence, the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Speaker, obviously the nominating convention has overcome certain members of the government opposite since they didn't manage to get back here before now.

On Thursday, Mr. Speaker, the member for Canora made remarks in public accounts committee which grossly defamed native people and immigrants among others. On Friday, a news report indicated that he had apologized, and that the Premier proposed to remove him from committees. Now to remove the member from committees, with their telltale microphones, is obviously prudent but as we all know imposes no penalty.

In a somewhat similar situation the Hon. Robert Stanfield made clear that he did not wish the offending person, a Mr. Leonard Jones, to sit in his caucus. My question to the Minister of Finance is this: do you and your colleagues propose to ask the member for Canora to leave your caucus, or do you propose to retain him as a colleague, and thereby condone the insulting attitudes which he so colorfully, so colorfully expressed?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, I think the Premier made it very clear that he did not, in any way, condone the statements made in public accounts by the member for Canora. In fact, he clearly stated the policy of our party to be completely the opposite of that expressed by the member. I think the matter is properly not a privilege of this Assembly. I think it's a matter of discipline within a particular caucus.

The Premier took what he saw to be the appropriate discipline, I think he is not going to be guided by the actions or the successes of Robert Stanfield or anyone else. I think he took the action that he saw as appropriate. The person involved apologized. He indicated that the member would be removed from the committees of the Legislative Assembly. He read that as appropriate action. I suppose it's for the people to judge whether that action was proper, prudent and in the proper way.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I ask a new question to the Minister of Finance. During the April election, of which we have heard a good deal, in the constituency of Prince Albert, a city of which I am sure we will hear a good deal, the Conservative Party ran ads calculated to stir up anti-Indian sentiment. I will say that the ads were withdrawn during the course of the campaign but my question is this. Does the party opposite reject the sort of attitude expressed by the member for Canora and expressed in the ads of the then candidate for Prince Albert, or do you condone those sorts of attitudes as expressed, on not one now but two occasions in eight months?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate the statement of the Premier, the policy of the government, and the policy of our political party. We are not racists. We believe that the natives are a proper people within this nation. They have certain rights over and above the ordinary person; I think everybody has recognized that. By and large, we live up to the standards of the Canadian Bill of Rights, and anybody who goes against that, quite frankly, goes against our government and goes against our party.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — My question is to the Minister of Finance. I say to you that it is a

question of finally allowing your actions to meet your words. In the Pelly by-election in 1978 you ran a racist campaign. In the North West by-election, you did the same thing. You now allow a man who said racist things to continue to sit in your caucus. Isn't it a matter of political consistency? Shouldn't your words match your deeds?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I have always been amazed at the sanctimonious attitude of the NDP not only in this province but across the country, that somehow they have . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — . . . that somehow they have a monopoly on decency and fairness and everything else that goes with it. The party that we stand for, we stand forward, the people of Saskatchewan . . . You say we said all these various things. I don't think the people accept your statement of where we stand. The people of Saskatchewan duly elected this government as an open government and as a fair government. We believe we have a tradition in this party as strong as the tradition in any other political party in this country, and we're proud of that.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — A new question. I say to the Minister of Finance, nobody has ever accused you people of having a monopoly on decency on this issue, consistently. By way of preliminary, I will simply say that it is relatively cheap to reprimand the member for Canora in public. Will you take an action which will mean something and will show your commitment to equality by removing him from your caucus?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — No

**MR. ENGEL:** — I have a question to the Minister of Finance. In the public accounts committee this morning your government, using its majority, voted down an attempt to pursue a point of privilege on the racist remarks made by the member for Canora. They voted down an attempt to have this issue debated in this Assembly.

In light of what you just said that you are for open government, how can the people judge if debate is squelched?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Well, Mr. Speaker. I was not in the public accounts this morning, but let me relate to you, if you like, what I understand. A motion of privilege was brought yesterday before this Assembly. The Deputy Speaker properly rules that he could not deal with that because that was to be properly dealt with in committee. That then falls upon the chairman of the committee to deal with.

The chairman of the committee, quite frankly, did not see to raise the point on Thursday, did not see the right to raise the point on Friday until it came out in the *Leader-Post*. Then he goes out, Mr. Speaker, and spreads political statements across the air waves. How can he then sit and say that somehow he can be an independent assessor of the situation? I think any assessment and reading of parliamentary rules would indicate that the statements made by the member for Canora, while wrong, are not a privilege of this House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, if members opposite have anything to say, would they kindly stand on their feet and stop shouting from their chairs.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I would ask for order on both sides of the House, and if the member has a question. I would ask him to get to his question.

### **Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I do indeed have a question and it's to the Minister of Finance. He has advised us of the concern of the members opposite for human rights. He just did now, I want to refer him to some remarks by the member for Saskatoon Westmount, as quoted on December 4 in the *Star-Phoenix*, dealing with the matter of human rights. And the question is as follows: does the minister concur in the following remarks?

The commission (that being the human rights commission) are being manipulative, used by the NDP administration to create issues. And she went on to say the human rights commission, if unchecked, "is going to be one of the avenues to take away our human rights."

Does the minister concur in those remarks and is that a statement of the policy of your government?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Well, Mr. Speaker. I suppose without reading the context of the exact statement. I would not want to make a comment with regard to where the government stood on a particular quotation, because it would be taken out of context, could be misquoted, any type of situation. I think the member for Saskatoon Westmount makes very clear her position on several issues, one in particular being the question of abortion. That does not necessarily reflect the position of the Government of Saskatchewan. Or that doesn't mean that the Government of Saskatchewan will take the exact position as expressed by the member for Saskatoon Westmount.

But isn't it fundamental to our system, Mr. Speaker, that a member when elected here does have the right to express some of those views? Are you going to stop them at every step of the way to say. "We don't agree with her particular position on this, or her particular position on that"?

I might remind the hon. member across the floor of the suggestion made by the Hon. Attorney General. A member of this House, a member of your government, on the cabinet benches, made references about the Jewish people. And there's one person in our party that's Jewish. That matter was brought to privilege. The ruling of the House was it's not a privilege against the House or against a member. And I suggest that you did virtually nothing about that particular question, and I suggest you are equally doing exactly what you now, in a sanctimonious way, sort of suggested somebody else should do.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I will return to my question. I will return to my question, Mr. Minister, because you didn't answer it.

The member for Canora in effect attacked the human rights commission, and asked

what it was doing to defend his rights. The member for Saskatoon Westmount attacks the human rights commission and says they are going to be an avenue for taking away our human rights. When two members in one month attack the human rights commission it's fair that we ask you where your government stands on a human rights commission and whether or not you will back up that commission in defending human rights in Saskatchewan.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — As I indicated earlier, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the quotation, the total statement, made by the member for Saskatoon Westmount. But I also go back then to another particular statement made when you were the premier of the province and you made an attack on the Supreme Court of Canada. "I question the validity of the Supreme Court of Canada. I question whether or not they were distorted and biased under western Canada." Now what is the difference, quite frankly, between an attack on the human rights commission and an attack by the premier on the bias of the Supreme Court of Canada?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question. If the member for Kindersley doesn't know the difference between questioning the supreme court and questioning the human rights commission, it's unlikely that there is anything I can say that is going to assist him.

The Supreme Court of Canada is well able to look after itself . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask this question notwithstanding all of the interruptions by members opposite who don't want to . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please. The hon. member is rising on a supplementary question, and a supplementary question does not allow a long lead to the question. I would ask you to get directly to the question.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I think that if you'll check the record you'll find that I prefaced that by saying it was a new question.

I asked the member for Kindersley a question. While it is clear that the supreme court or any other court has full powers to protect itself and it can cite me for contempt if I said anything wrong, the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission depends for its success on the support of the treasury benches. And what I am asking is: does the human rights commission have the support of the treasury benches in its effort to enforce human rights in Saskatchewan?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Yes they do, Mr. Speaker, and I notice that they are still operating in the same way they operated before under the previous government.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister in charge of the human rights commission. Are there now any plans to remove the chairman of the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission from his present post, and are there any plans to change the geographic location of the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — No.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, supplementary. No to both questions, or no to one?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — You know the rules. You asked two questions. I gave you an answer.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I will ask them one by one, if the minister wishes to take the time. Are there any proposals to change the personnel of the human rights commission or the chairman of the human rights commission?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — No.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Are there any proposals to change the geographic location of the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission from a head office at Saskatoon to a head office at some other place?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — No.

### Uranium City

**MR. THOMPSON:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. In a brief to yourself on November 23 from the community of Uranium City, enclosed in that brief, and I want to quote. Mr. Speaker.

This brief is a last effort to pierce the devious pretense that Uranium City is a healthy and continuing municipality when, in fact, its bankruptcy is certain.

My question to the minister is: would the minister agree with the council of Uranium City that bankruptcy is certain by 1983, and that it will likely have a deficit of more than \$275,000 by mid-summer? Would you agree with that statement?

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't agree with the figures that the hon. member cites here. Certainly, as that hon. member knows very well, and as other members of the House will probably know, the issue of the municipal corporation depends to a great extent on the regional study.

What is left in Uranium City after the winding down of the mine, and so on, on June 30 of next year will depend to a great extent on the regional services study that is now under way, cost shared by the federal government and the provincial government. The thing that they'll be studying, one of the items certainly will be the particular debt load and one of the great concerns that we have as a provincial government. Certainly, we know that once Eldorado is gone — and they have every intention to be gone and that's unfortunate as the hon. member will also know — as a provincial government we will have a great responsibility to accept there in terms of the winding down of the community, if that's what the study says.

**MR. THOMPSON:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister has indicated that another study is under way and I most certainly was aware of that, as this is all we have had in northern Saskatchewan since this government has taken power, one study after another. Would the minister indicate to this House, and to the citizens of Uranium City, whether he will ensure that a viable local government will be available to the citizens of Uranium City as long as it remains an inhabited community?

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult at this stage, this very transitional stage of that community, to say what type of municipal corporation or what type of local

government will be in that particular location when we don't know, and no one knows including the residents of Uranium City — two of whom I met with this morning — when no one knows the number of people that live there. It should be very clear to anyone that the provision of local government, provision of municipal government depends to a great extent at any location on the number of people living there.

**MR. THOMPSON:** — Final supplementary, Mr. speaker. Is it fair to say, Mr. Minister, that you will not be making any decision as to financing for the community of Uranium City until your study is completed?

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — No. I didn't say that either and I will be in consultation with the municipal corporation of Uranium city, as we have been on an ongoing basis and will continue to be. And I'll just give you this undertaking through Mr. Speaker that we'll continue that consultation and we're very aware of the problem that you say.

**MR. THOMPSON:** — New question, Mr. Speaker. You indicated to the House that you met with two officials of the corporation of Uranium City. Could you indicate to this House what type of a meeting that was and was any decision made at the meeting this morning concerning funding to the community?

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — No, there was very little discussion on the issue that you have raised here in the House today regarding the future of the structure of the municipal corporation. And I can't say that any decisions did come out of it, but I met with two representatives of the community of Uranium City.

**MR. THOMPSON:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, final supplementary. At that meeting with officials of the corporation of Uranium City, could you indicate to this House if you have discussed compensation for the private home-owners and the private business people of Uranium City at that meeting this morning?

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — I didn't say that they were officials of the municipal corporation. One was a councillor and one I don't believe is a councillor. I don't think it's any secret it was Mr. Classen, who is a councillor, and Mr. Dana Spence. And there was discussion of their request for compensation, their ongoing request. And our answer to them was the same as had been given in the House several times, that we agree with paying relocation but we don't agree with paying compensation as a provincial government.

**MR. THOMPSON:** — A new question, Mr. Speaker. You have just indicated that you met with the president of the chamber of commerce in Uranium City and a member of the council of Uranium City, and that you discussed compensation regarding the private business community and the private home-owners of Uranium city. Did you or did you not indicate to them that you are not going to provide any compensation to the business community and the private home-owners?

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — That's what I indicated. Our position has not changed and I indicated that to them this morning.

#### **Absence of Premier**

**MR. YEW:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll address my question to the Deputy Premier. I see that the Premier, for the fifth day out of the past seven days . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .



**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! Does the member have a question? You're not here to make observations but rather to ask questions. I would ask the member to stay on the subject.

**MR. YEW:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At the present there is nothing in the Premier's itinerary issued by the information services for his schedule for the rest of the day. Where is the Premier and why is he not in the Assembly to answer the question on behalf of his government? Why is the Premier ducking the House and attempting to avoid opposition questions? Does the Premier feel no obligation to the people of this province to be in the Assembly to defend his government's actions and inactions?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I take notice of the question, Mr. Speaker.

### **Funding for SCIC**

**MR. ENGEL:** — I have a question for the Attorney General. Some time ago he assured us in this House that he would provide me with a list of 75 per cent of SCIC's funding project, and why he was withholding the money, and he still hasn't come across with that list. In light of the fact that the director of SCIC, who was on CBC radio this morning, said they've cut their staff down to a barebones staff of two and one-half members (the rest of the work is carried on by volunteers and all the overseas projects are on hold), what are your plans or are you just using an excuse to withhold the funds? What is the government's present plan as far as funding SCIC.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — We're very close to resolving the question as to which projects will in fact be approved, plus developing what we believe are criteria for future assistance. We will discuss that criteria with SCIC as soon as the criteria are finalized.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The budget was for over \$2 million. Overseas projects were approved and all these projects are on hold. Are you following in the same track as the Lyon government did in Manitoba, where they phased right out of funding overseas projects? We started at the same place and they went back to about \$300,000 or \$400,000 a year. Are your plans on the same scale as that? Should we be notifying member agencies that that's basically what your intention is: to phase out overseas development projects?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well, if you had discussed the matter with SCIC instead of simply listening to the radio, you would have known that in fact we had indicated to SCIC and certain of the representatives that we were able to arrange meetings with, and the invitation did go out, that in fact we will be continuing to fund. The level of funding has not yet been determined. We indicated that there may be some slight reduction but it would not be anything Draconian. We indicated what the review process consisted of (and I've indicated it in this Assembly), and finally, we are firmly committed to maintain our moral obligation to those countries less fortunate than ourselves.

### **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill No. 53 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act (No. 2)**

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act (No. 2).

Motion agreed to and the bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

**Bill No. 54 — An Act to amend The Northern Saskatchewan Economic Development Act.**

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I move first reading of a bill to amend The Northern Saskatchewan Economic Development Act.

Motion agreed to and the bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

**Bill No. 55 — An Act to amend The Highways Act.**

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I move first reading of a bill to amend The Highways Act.

Motion agreed to and the bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

**Bill No. 56 — An Act to amend The Department of Revenue, Supply and Services Act (No. 2)**

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I move first reading of a bill to amend The Department of Revenue, Supply and Services Act (No. 2).

**Bill No. 57 — An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act (No. 2)**

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I move first reading of a bill to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions

Motion agreed to and the bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

**Bill No. 58 — An Act representing the Consequential Amendments resulting from the realignment of the administration of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan**

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I move first reading of a bill representing the Consequential Amendments resulting from the re-alignment of the administration of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

Motion agreed to and the bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

**Bill No. 59 — An Act to amend the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources Act.**

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — I move first reading of a bill to amend The Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources Act.

Motion agreed to and the bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

**An Act respecting Prairie and Forest Fires**

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill respecting Prairie and Forest Fires

Motion agreed to and bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

## **RULING BY SPEAKER**

### **Point of Privilege**

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Yesterday, in my absence, a question of privilege was raised by the Attorney General. I have reviewed the record this morning, and I found there was not a prima facie case of privilege in this matter.

## **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

### **MOTIONS FOR RETURNS**

#### **Return No. 17**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — moved, seconded by Mr. Lingenfelter, than an order of the Assembly do issue for return No. 17 showing:

(1) The total dollar amount paid by the Department of Executive Council during the period May 8, 1982 to November 26, 1982 to commercial air lines for air fares; (2) The name of each individual for whom air fare has been paid and the amount for each individual.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Mr. Speaker, there are a few things that we'd like to look at on this. We would like to have some time to get the appropriate answers for the member.

I want to adjourn debate on this one.

Debate adjourned.

## **GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

### **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

#### **Bill No. 45 — An Act to establish a Program to Facilitate Financing the Purchase of Farm Land**

##### **Clause 3 (continued)**

**MR. ENGEL:** — I think the Minister of Finance acting on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture is fair. We get a different approach to it, because I'm sure he'd want to stand up and tell this House why they can't include this amendment. Just a nice, short concise answer to why you don't want to define what your election promise was in simple terms like this. I don't think this deviates at all from the proposed plan of the bill. I think it would just clarify the position of the people that are going to get involved in your bill ad your loan program.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't really add a great deal more than what the Minister of Agriculture responded to this particular question last night. He did want the particular items into regulation to afford him the flexibility with regard to farm credit to be able to adjust to the climate that happens in the field of mortgage lending with regard to farm credit corporation. I think that's really the rationale for it. It wouldn't

then require, particularly, a returning to the Assembly to effect some perhaps minor housekeeping type changes that we're able to do. And, I think, perhaps the dispute that we had a long-standing dispute as to the amount of weight one should delegate to regulations from bills. It's not something that just fits this particular bill, I think; it's been universally debate probably across Canada in every jurisdiction.

I suggest that perhaps the remedy is to make the regulations committee a more active committee when we now have many of our elected MLAs basically becoming full-time members. The regulations committee, of course, is controlled by the opposition, at the call of the opposition. Then, I think, clearly if there becomes what you are suggesting, some kind of an abuse of power in those regulations to twist the rules or twist this, then I think that clearly would be brought to the attention of that regulations committee, which allows the flexibility to debate that particular issue and refer the question back.

Clearly, I suppose, it's the mechanism which has been chosen to deal with that particular question, given the changing things that are probably happening (or there is some suggestion) with more modernization of farm credit corporation. I think that is really the rationale as to why we didn't put that in. I don't think anyone in this province who has followed the question at all is unaware of the commitment with regard to the level of lending, the rate of lending, and this type of thing, but the flexibility just be there by which to adjust it. That's the reason, and whether you accept that reason or not it's certainly the reason that we have moved in that direction.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Mr. Chairman, there's no flexibility. There's no flexibility in your program at all, and consequently are you saying that the flexibility will be in the 8 per cent? You're talking about wanting room to manoeuvre. Do you want to manoeuvre in that 8 per cent bracket? The minister assured me last night that when farmer A signs a loan on January 10, he's going to be locked into that loan at 8 per cent for five years, at 12 per cent for five years, period. No flexibility on that person's loan. So, if you're saying that, and that guarantee is going to be there, why not set it in the legislation? Then when farm credit corporation comes along and decides to change their interest rates drastically, you need that flexibility.

The member sitting beside you in this legislature told me that if the interest rates go up to 35 per cent it will break the province. And, that's the flexibility you're looking for. So, if you're looking to raise the interest rates up down the road, debate it legitimately in the House and let us know why you're changing, what the conditions are, and who should absorb the risk, the farmer or the province. And all I'm saying is that this is the commitment you made; why not stand behind your commitment and accept this amendment?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I think the hon. member is aware of the erratic nature by which the economy has reacted over the last six months with regard to interest rates, with regard to inflation rates. As a farmer you can recognize over the last several years what the price of land, not only in this province but across North America, has in fact done. It has escalated extremely to the point where, let's say, you see quicker ups and downs with regard to values. You might have to be able to adjust that situation to take into consideration the times that we in fact are in.

I simply take you back to the time when the land bank was brought, 10 years ago. If I was to tell you at that time, had I been in the House, that the price of land we would see in Saskatchewan would be \$1,000 within six or seven years of that time, you would think that I had something to drink before I got up to debate. But that's in fact what happened,

and hopefully we can come back to a more stable economic situation. I think, as you know as well, that that particular issue isn't completely in the hands of the provincial government as well. It's federal; it's international; it's a lot of things. So I think the reason for it, quite frankly, is the flexibility with which we can deal with that particular situation, and that's the reason for it. I think it makes some sense, and I think there is protection in the regulations committee by which we can cover that off.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Mr. Chairman, every time the Minister of Finance gets up and answers a question he is underlining the reasons why this is such an important amendment. If we are in that vulnerable state like you are (and) I agree with the minister that things could change drastically; I'm not a prophet and I'm not going to make a prediction now that the price of land is going to go down or up), but during the debate we talked about going from \$53 all the way up to 400-and-some dollars an acre. And I know that happened over 10 years. But because the land bank program was enshrined in legislation the farmer was protected by that because he wasn't under pressure for drastic increases in the price of his rent. And your staff knows well that the people that were locked in were locked into a rental scheme, that the changing fluctuations didn't put them out of business. And all I'm saying is that if you are going to lock in a young farmer on a loan program, stipulate it in legislation, and let him know that he's got a guarantee that, regardless of what the interest rates are going to do, he's locked in. the minister assured me he was. If that is the case, why not put it the legislation? And that's my final argument with you.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — The argument, I think goes as follows. The particular person, when he takes out the mortgage with farm credit, is in fact locked in for the term, the double term of 8/12. And there is nothing precisely you can do about that because that's basically being locked into a commitment. Okay? Where the flexibility comes is, let's say three years from now, when the value of land has escalated significantly to the point where the maximums are not realistic anymore and, at that point in time, that is when you would make your adjustment. So we are not talking . . . Don't be confused that we are talking about people that will qualify and obtain the money. It's the people . . . Any change that would have to be made would affect people qualifying or coming into the system after any particular change was made. I am not suggesting that changes will not be made, or that they will be made. It's just that you have that flexibility of not having to return to the House to get that particular housekeeping change, or legislated change, to make it go away. You can do it by cabinet. It's no different than a weight restriction on a highway, or the speed limit, or anything else.

I think you are aware as a legislator of the significant amount of regulations that we have brought in as governments over the last several whiles. We have made a commitment as a government to, quite frankly, review the whole process of regulations to try to, where possible, bring those down. That's a challenge that's being addressed, I think, in many jurisdictions, not necessarily to bring it back into legislation, but to streamline the regulator process. And I think by streamlining the regulation process, you basically will also be looking at setting mechanisms in place by which regulations can be dealt with, basically as a delegation of legislation to be dealt with on a similar footing. I think that may be the concern you have now, as to the point where you can refer it back to the legislature.

Look for example at the situation in Great Britain now, an interesting case study with regard to the parliamentary process. An area that we tried to change back in the previous legislature, and of course, without much success, and I think you know as well as I, as members of that special committee on rules, we dealt with that question, and

could not come to resolve on it. But I think that . . . I would suggest that not to look at the question of protection, if you go back to the young farmer who bought some land or didn't buy some land and the land bank bought it for him, I question who is going to have the most protection, the young fellow who buys some land and gets an 8 per cent mortgage from this government, or the young fellow who had land bank buy some land, perhaps at \$100 an acre, only to find now it's worth \$800 an acre and the proceeds or the capital gain from that did not go to him, but went to the previous government?

I ask under which system does a farmer have the most protection? It's perhaps a moot point, but I think it's weighted pretty significantly on this side of the House.

**MR. ENGEL:** — That capital gains that the minister is talking about (and we're getting off the bill. Mr. Chairman). If you had left the land bank in place, was definitely with the legislation and with the program that he was locked into, was definitely to his advantage because his rental scheme was calculated on a basis of productivity. And this business of getting burdened with interest for the rest of his life and for the generations to follow . . . By the time he's old and has his bills paid for, he's going to turn it over to his son who is then again going to heap on some more interest rates.

So I think if you're trying to save him some money, avoid all this business. This is why, at the outset, when I saw you sitting here today and handling this legislation. I was particularly happy because I know the arguments you have been making and I know the kind of ideas you have as far as avoiding all this bureaucratic nightmare of regulations that you'll be changing and working with, and also taking away some persons' rights. That's the point I'm trying to make.

I think if you can guarantee a program . . . I'm not sure what kind of an agreement you have; you haven't tabled those. I'm not sure what kind of an agreement it is, because on reviewing what was said last night, the minister came from one aspect of saying where the young person qualifies at 8 per cent until we find the actual effective interest rate he is paying is 13.5 per cent. So I'm not sure that he doesn't need some protection in legislation.

So I'm anxious to see you reconsider your option. I was hoping that the minister would have a chance to sleep on it. He slept on it. He was free to come here and vote against it, so he's not even with us today. But I think you, on his behalf, can accept this as a good amendment. It's the basis as to whether we can accept this bill or not. The next couple of amendments to us are the key basis of what's in this bill and who is the bill designed for and who is it going to help.

That's the crux of section 3. The amendments that are in this basically are going to underline where we stand as far as this entire piece of legislation is concerned.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I think the first point that you raise probably is closer to the crux of the debate. And that is the land bank proposal by which the previous government (of which you were a member) believed that the proper way to go was for the government to buy the land and to rent it out to the person on a long-term lease. The government would gain the capital gain in inflationary times. That would accrue to the government, not to the farmer.

I think the fundamental difference between the programs, if you really went to come down to shaking the chaff off and getting her down to the wheat here (I'm beginning to

talk like a farmer), is that the farmer should in fact own the land and the capital gains should accrue to the farmer. The ownership of land, I suppose, is one of the fundamental areas where our party and our government differ from your party and your government. You don't see the right of ownership in the way that we see in the right of ownership, and I think that is the debate.

Clearly we can go on for a long time with regard to that debate. It has been debated in the past many times. I don't think it comes as a surprise to anybody that there is a significant philosophical difference between the two sides of the House with regard to that fundamental question. I think that was basically one of the key arguments during the campaign the past April. And I think, by and large, the farming community said, "We prefer the ownership of land versus the system of the government owning the land and rents it to the people." And that's fair, I suppose that you could say that in 1978 they voted for you, therefore they endorsed the situation of government owning land and renting it out, as opposed to the right of ownership. So I think that's basically the philosophical differences where we sit.

If you recall the arguments that I had previously with regard to regulations, it wasn't the question of should you have regulations as much as should you have a mechanism in place by which you could review those regulations in a more appropriate way, and I stand by that.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I'd just like a clarification from the minister. He indicated that today, under the program, the government is offering 8 per cent for five years and 12 per cent for a subsequent five years. Now I understand that basic proposition . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The back side of you is more pleasant than the front and . . . (inaudible) . . .

So the program, Mr. Minister, sets out 8 per cent for five years. 12 per cent for the subsequent five years. What I am asking is: if indeed next year the interest rates went up to 20 per cent — let's take that as an example — then are you saying that you have the flexibility, so indeed for next year the 8 per cent guarantee or the 12 per cent guarantee would not be applicable and you have the right or the flexibility of changing it relative to an increased amount or rate of interest?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Three comments with regard to that comment. Number one is that most economic signals indicate that interest rates are back to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm going to answer this thing in three ways. Number one, that the interest rates trajectory is going to go down always. I think that we as a government, and prior to that when we were in opposition, recognized the fact that in high interest rate times governments had to provide extra interest assistance, and we did that through the mortgage plan; we did that through the farm purchase plan and that's why we're here. That's one of the fundamental reasons why we are here.

I will guarantee you today that if the interest rates go up to 20 per cent next year, this program will be in place at 8 per cent and at 12 per cent, because that's a commitment we've made.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Then why are you using the lame excuse of needing flexibility to address new economic conditions if, indeed, you're saying this year, next year, next year you're guaranteeing the 8 and 12? Why not accept the amendment?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I indicated that anybody who has a mortgage will be protected for 10 years. Their rates are fixed for 10 years. Anybody that's into the program.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — When?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — When it starts. It runs for 10 years. I've indicated that there is no intention of making any move on that, but there is a recognition of the fact that the economy over the past year has been very volatile. Hopefully that will settle down, but it could remain very volatile and get even more volatile. And if that happens, you have to have the flexibility to react one way or the other way.

Particularly, what we are concerned with is the value of the land. If inflation takes off again, it could be invalid with regard to those rules. What happens if interest rates go, instead of 20 per cent like you're saying, down to 8 or 7 per cent? Then it becomes a question of: should we give some assistance to deliver to the younger farmers some assistance over the larger farmer? And that's what you're trying to look at.

So you cut that thing both ways. We want the flexibility to that. I think we can stack our record up against the record of the previous government. I suggest that the people of Saskatchewan are going to accept our word that those programs are going to deliver at 8 per cent and 12 per cent far more than the scares that you folks are trying to put into their heads.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I would just like to ask the minister why the people of Saskatchewan should in fact have that type of faith toward your party because during the last campaign, clearly and unequivocally it states that:

A Progressive Conservative government will assist in the transfer of farmland through a once in a lifetime loan of \$350,000 at 8 per cent for five years and 12 per cent thereafter.

Now you have already broken faith with the very promise that you gave to the people of Saskatchewan. Now you are saying you have reduced it down to five years for the 12 per cent. That's not what you said in your campaign. You said "thereafter." Why have you retracted on your promise?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Well I suppose what we are doing is recognizing the fact that most of the mortgage money now in the mortgage market into about a 10 per cent situation, as opposed to the longer term mortgages: a 10-year term as opposed to the 20-year term. It's very difficult, as you know, to borrow 20-year money on the markets anyplace today. It's basically down to 10-year money. As well, farm credit corporation now, as you know, are not going to the consolidated fund of the federal government but are going to the bond markets of the world to borrow that money. That money tends to be borrowed in amounts of 10-year periods. I think you are aware of that.

Hopefully as that interest rate goes down we could certainly look at making some adjustments on that to twist it out a little bit longer. If we can lock in long-term money at 10 per cent or 7 per cent, then clearly we are going to make some adjustments. I will tell you, so that they can run it not past 10 years but into a lot longer. So that's the type of flexibility we simply ask for in this regulation. I think it's common sense.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — It may be Tory common sense, but I think the people of Saskatchewan will be disappointed at what they see in the bill. I just want to ask a further question.



Why, and you have given an answer partly to my colleague on this, but you indicate that you don't want to put any substance in your bill because somehow that's less convenient for you. That's basically what you are saying. I'm saying that putting the nuts and bolts of a program in a statute is better protection, regardless of what you say, for the people who are depending on a program, because you have to come to the legislature and fully dispose and debate your changes, and with regulations you don't have to do it. What I'm saying here is that you are putting nothing into the bill in order that you can manipulate the program to suit the Tory party.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Well, I suppose, Mr. Chairman, what we have here is . . . Perhaps I should give the members opposite a small lesson in politics which they seem to have forgotten in the last seven or eight months. The previous government had a land bank program. That land bank program was reasonably controversial over its entire 10-year period. The people voted to get rid of the that program. If the people of Saskatchewan don't like the 8 per cent money program that we are providing. I suppose the farmers of this province will vote against us in the next election. Quite frankly, if I'm in touch with the farmers. I don't think that they are against this program. Quite frankly, I think there is very, very, very much widespread support for it.

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

#### Yeas —8

Blakeney  
Thompson  
Engel

Lingenfelter  
Koskie  
Lusney

Shillington  
Yew

#### Nays —35

Birkbeck  
Taylor  
Andrew  
Lane  
Pickering  
Sandberg  
McLeod  
Klein  
Katzman  
Currie  
Duncan  
Schoenhals

Hampton  
Weiman  
Bacon  
Hodgins  
Sutor  
Sveinson  
Meagher  
Schmidt  
Parker  
Smith (Moose Jaw South)  
Martens  
Rybchuk

Young  
Gerich  
Domotor  
Embury  
Dirks  
Hepworth  
Folk  
Myers  
Zazelenchuk  
Johnson  
Baker

**MR. ENGEL:** — I suppose that voting on a motion that sets out that we are going to have a bill with \$350,000, and sets out that the interest rate will be 8 per cent for five years and 12 per cent for five years, then voting against that is really a matter to celebrate for the members opposite. I am glad I did them that favor, Mr. Chairman. I am happy I did them the favor of saying that we don't want anybody to know what the numbers are in this bill. I am glad you voted for that. I am glad you put it on record so that everybody in Saskatchewan knows you don't want the people to know what the numbers are.

Now we have another amendment. I've got one more little amendment for you. Let's see who those numbers are for. Let's see who you want to give the money to. First they said their program doesn't apply at 8 per cent and 12 per cent for \$350,000. They are against that. It is no good. Now, let's see who it's for.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order, order! Does the member have a question?

**MR. ENGEL:** — I want to amend section 3, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to amend section 3 by adding the following section to section 3. Another section (2) on the bottom of the page (the first page you're on):

A bona fide farmer who meets that requirements set out in clauses 1(a) and (b) and who is currently making payments on money borrowed by him to purchase farmland prior to the coming into force of this act is eligible for an interest rebate in accordance with subsection (2), payable on and from the day this act comes into force, in respect of the principal and interest component of his current payments.

I so move, seconded by the member for Shaunavon.

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 8**

Blakeney	Lingenfelter	Shillington
Thompson	Koskie	Yew
Engel	Lusney	

**Nays — 34**

Birkbeck	Hampton	Rybchuk
Taylor	Weiman	Young
Andrew	Bacon	Gerich
Lane	Hodgins	Domotor
Pickering	Sutor	Dirks
Sandberg	Sveinson	Hepworth
Hardy	Meagher	Folk
McLeod	Schmidt	Myers
Klein	Parker	Zazelenchuk
Katzman	Smith (Moose Jaw South)	Johnson
Currie	Martens	Baker
Schoenhals		

**MR. ENGEL:** — I agree that the Minister of Finance is ready, but his troops are sure in disarray. I'm quite impressed. I'm quite impressed today. We had two basic reservations with this piece of legislation. First, we were worried and definitely had major items of concern. We raised it over and over and over in this House. And the concern to just

. . . (inaudible interjection) . . . those that skulls are more than an inch and one-half thick and meet in the centre, I suppose.

Why would my friend, my neighboring MLA, vote against this money going to farmers? All we're saying in this amendment is that here is an assurance and a guarantee that my lawyer friend or my doctor friend or dentist or eye doctor or even a veterinarian doesn't take advantage of this loan and through regulation be considered a bona fide farmer. That's all that regulation did — say that the money would be payable only to farmers. That was a simple clarification: just a simple degree of what the minister said on the steps yesterday. "Trust us."

We can't trust him because he won't put it into legislation. They're afraid to guarantee that the amount is going to stay at \$350,000. They are afraid to guarantee that it's going to be 8 per cent for five years. They won't guarantee it's going to be 12 years. The minister says we've got to deal with a few flexibilities. In fact, I like the Minister of Agriculture's word better. And he said, "the fuzzy area." The blue fuzz I suppose would be a nice new term for your kind of legislation. This, as far as I'm concerned, is a piece of blue fuzz. It doesn't contain any substance. You're afraid to put a line in here saying that the money goes to a farmer, and you're asking me to support it.

I guaranteed to the people of Saskatchewan when I saw this bill, within 15 minutes after seeing this bill tabled. I guaranteed that I'd support it. I did — but after we came up with one or two clarifications, just little details.

The Minister of Finance sits in his chair and it's ironic, it's ironic that he has to handle it today because of the way the lot falls down the line. It's too bad it fell on you, because the Minister of Finance is honest, and he told us today, "We need some flexibility." And we believe that he wants some flexibility. So he voted against our second amendment. He voted against the second amendment. Now, when we say we want this money to go to farmers period, he voted against it. We were here 100 per cent. All of us were here to support this. We think this is serious. You were here just a little better than 50 per cent. Well I'm going to show you that your 50 per cent support is going to hinge on how you deal with the people of Saskatchewan.

So we have a few more amendments to make and we'll just go clause by clause until we get them. I haven't got any more amendments until section 5.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Chairman, I think we need a short lesson in politics for the boys opposite. Somehow you get the view that you can go along for 11 years, not come up with any new ideas, think you can go along with the election campaign that says, "Tried and trusted; somehow we are here forever." Then along comes a party that basically captures the imagination of the people with ideas, with going out and talking to people, with bringing in concepts that were in tune with the people and with the young farmers of the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, in come these wizards without any ideas, without any new imagination, bankrupt of ideas, and think somehow you can play some little tiddlywinks with the bill here, and make a little change there and have a lawyer draft you some things. And somehow you're going to take this away from us politically. You're losing on it. You're losing on it out there.

The people out there are looking at two things: (1) do we want to own our land, or do we want the government to own our land, and (2) is there a government that will stand up

and give us some help with our interest rates? That's what the people see out there.

Quite frankly, if I can give you a little bit of political advice, whether you accept it or not . . . Perhaps we don't have the political expertise that you have over there. That, I suppose, is a subject of judgment. But the political advice I could give you is: it is not so much the crossing the t's and dotting the i's that count out there; it's the ideas and the concepts and the beliefs. That's the stuff that counts out there. That's the thing that makes governments change and programs work or not work.

And quite frankly, I think the people of Saskatchewan are fully cognizant of the issues before the House in these two bills. And they're clear. They're clean, and I think the farmers of Saskatchewan voted very clearly on April 26. They voted clearly, number one, that they didn't want the government buying and owning more land. They wanted to own it themselves. That's the number one thing that's clear. The number two thing that's clear is that they wanted more mortgage help. They wanted not the 20 per cent or the 18 or 19 per cent that was current at that time: they wanted somebody that was prepared to quite frankly roll up their sleeves and look the issue square in the eye and do something about it.

And that's precisely what we've done with this legislation. And I can tell you, if I can give you any advice politically, that quite frankly out there, my friend, the people like this program. And they don't like the matter sitting here: harangue, harangue, harangue, about fine little legal points. They want to get on with the program. They want to go to the farm credit office. They want to be able to get this money. And they want to be able to buy some land where they can grind the dirt in their own hands and say, "That's my ground." That's what it's all about, my friend. And that's what the political debate on these two bills is all about in this Assembly.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ENGEL:** — Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance again comes across as a very honest and truthful person. He said that they captured the voters. I assure you and I can see that see that you captured the votes. But you captured them with a slick campaign, Mr. Minister. You had a slick, polished campaign that talked about ideas. You talked about concepts and you talked about beliefs. The farmers believed in the idea. They believed the concept, and they believe, they have a belief that they're going to own their farm. But when you say they don't worry about dotting an i, when it comes to putting the i down there, is the i going to be the farmer, or his city cousin, when they want to know where you stand? And you stand with the city cousins. You're afraid to put it in . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

I would like to ask the Minister of Finance a reasonable question. Can he remember in his lifetime, not in his political career, but in your lifetime, when so many people of one segment of our society, and that is farmers, picketed on the steps of this building against two pieces of legislation, ever in our history? I've never seen that many farmers aroused over an issue, ever, ever.

These people believe in a concept. They believe in a belief and they believe in the idea. And you know what that idea is, Mr. Minister? They want a farm - - f a r m, farm.

That farm to a land bank tenant is his just as much as if he had been buying it, and he'd be paying hordes of interest. That farmer would be buying that land just as much, and more so, and he's into the farming because of an idea and a belief and a concept.

Maybe you think it's a total failure. Maybe you think it's a total failure. All we are trying to do is give the farmer some assurance that this bill belongs to them, and it's for them, and you reject the idea. I don't know if your big money lenders told you not to add this piece, or if your slick ad campaign told you that. You had a slick strategy. You had a slick piece of thing that would sell on single issues, but when it gets down to a basic idea, the young people want to farm, and that's what it's all about.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Let's address what the member has said. First of all, he says the people got taken in by a slick campaign, and that, my friend, is where you differ from me, because I happen to have a fair amount of faith in the people of the province of Saskatchewan. They can see, my friend, whether something is a proper program or not a proper program. You can't seem to get over the view that you lost the election. And the reason you lost the election was not because of a slick campaign. The reason you lost the election is you were out of touch with the people. You forgot who they were. All of a sudden you believed that you, as government, could tell them everything: that you somehow could bring all the wisdom down from on high from your little group. That's why you lost the election, my friend, not a slick campaign.

You want to talk about campaigns? I campaigned through my riding on this particular issue, and it was well received. And, you know where I ran into the problems? Do you know where I ran into the problems? The odd land bank tenant. Do you know what his concern was to me? "The NDP member says that if the Tories are elected April 27, mark May 1. What's going to happen? They will come in there the next day, they'll take their land, they'll put it onto the market, they'll sell it to your great farmers. That's what will happen." Three days after the election that's what's going to happen. That's what we're talking about — campaigning. And they got tired of that.

Do you know why they got tired of that? Because you go back to the previous campaign, 1978. You want to talk about campaigning right in the gutter. It was my first campaign, and that's where I saw it, and that's why I suppose I had the most contempt for your party organization, because I wanted into the house of a man, 85, 89 years old, and he's trembling. He's trembling, and he's saying, "Get out of my house." Well, jut a minute, sir. What's the problem?" "Well, I don't want to talk to you guys. You guys will take away my medicare the day after you are elected. I can't stand for that. You will take the hospitals away. You will make us pay \$500 every time we go to a doctor." That's the type of campaign you people run.

Well, I'll tell you. I'll tell you the latest budget that came down from this government did not put a \$500 deterrent fee on health care. It increased the amount of money we put into health care. That's when we say that you can trust us, quite frankly we have delivered our commitment. We have delivered our commitment more than ever by any government in this province.

And you go back to the days about people levelling with people. You people came into power in 1971. Did I hear anything in the campaign in 1971 that we are going to move in here and start buying up farmland, a million and one-half acres of farmland? Did you hear a word of that? Not a chance, not a chance. Prior to 1975 did you hear any word." Hey, we're going to take over the potash industry"? That's the way you people work. We level with the people, my friend. We tell them where it's at. And finally, the people saw the way. Finally the people saw the way, Mr. Chairman. And that's why they voted, and

they voted in a massive change on April 26. And the people, my friend, the people, my friend, can be fooled some of the time but they don't be fooled all of the time. And that's what the lesson of April 26 was clearer than anything else.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order! Let the member speak.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I just want to say to the Minister of Finance, that I resent him standing up here and lecturing us as to what our duties are. He can refer to our amendments as being trifling amendments, dotting the i's. But I want to say that we are making very serious amendments to give substance to this bill; and I'll tell you you are not going to deter it. And let us face the facts. I want you people, who are sick with arrogance, to remember . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right. You've become sick with the arrogance of your own success at the last election. But I want you to remember that no victory is permanent, as with defeat. Remember that. I want you to look at a little bit of history of your party. This is the first time you have been here for 50 years, so don't start saying that you have a great respect . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order. Let's stick to Bill 45. Order. Clause 3. Bill 45.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I'm replying to the Minister of Finance, who made a very wide sweeping political statement. And I think if he hasn't been called to order, then I shouldn't be called to order.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KOSKIE:** — And that's what I'm replying to. And I want to go into old records. In 1958 John Diefenbaker led the largest plurality the country has ever known. And in 1962 he was out of office with a minority situation. I say, don't start preaching because you've had one victory in 50 years. We still have a responsibility here and we intend to carry it out. And I want to say that these amendments are serious amendments, and I hope the members opposite would treat them accordingly and not try to push them off as did the Minister of Finance. We couldn't even have the Minister of Agriculture here to introduce this major piece of legislation. He's gone. We can't even have the Premier attend the session either to speak on the budget or to speak on this major piece of legislation. And now you want us to even stop talking to you. Well, I say, we don't intend to, nor will we be deterred.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I don't think that at any point in time did I indicate to you that I wanted you to stop talking about it . . . (inaudible) . . . I was simply giving the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg a short lesson in politics because . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . For the past three and half days.

Clause 3 agreed to.

#### **Clause 4**

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Just in respect to the application, Mr. Minister.

“An applicant shall apply for an interest rebate on the form provided by the minister, and shall provide any information required by the minister.” That's fair enough. Can you just indicate the procedure after he has that particular form? Will that form be directed

in the first instance to the minister's office or his staff or his administrative group that will be looking at the new blue fuzz area?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — The process that will be followed will be that the forms will be in the farm credit corporation office. The farm credit corporation officers would then assist the farmer or the client in filling out the forms, as they do with the existing farm credit program, then it would simply proceed from there. I think you can recognize the legal wording there with regard to the minister. The intention of it would be that the forms will be handled through farm credit because the farm credit is the vehicle by which all forms are accepted and go that way. They would not go to the minister's officer, and I'm quite sure the minister would not want them to go to his office.

Clause 4 agreed to.

### Clause 5

**MR. ENGEL:** — I have an amendment for clause 5. That section 5(1) of the printed bill be amended by striking out "at any time" and substituting the following"

On his financial condition except returns filed pursuant to the Income Tax Act (Canada) as amended from time to time or The Income Tax Act at any reasonable time.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — As a point of clarification, I haven't completely followed the amendment. If it would assist you. The farm credit corporation now on each of the farmers has, as I understand, three years, the three previous years' income tax returns that are required for the application. So that's, in fact, already being done. The purpose of this particular section of the act is not to unduly ask farmers to keep special records, but only in the case where there is a fraud involved so that you have a mechanism in place by which to do it. So the income tax part of it is already in place under farm credit corporation and that information has to be provided, as I understand it, to farm credit if that can assist you in any way.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — No need for duplication.

**MR. ENGEL:** — It's not that we're looking for the duplication. We know that's the case. What we're saying is that the only case when you could do a search on his records is when you require those.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — You know, you run into the problem, perhaps justly, perhaps unjustly, when you start mentioning that particularly in legislation, and I recall this summer where the allegations with regard to the mortgage program ran into some static because we were supposedly requesting income tax files. And while it wasn't valid because the government already had received many income tax files, there is a sense out there that the government should not have, and not be privy to that type of information. I would say that we would want to resist wherever possibly any suggestion that we, as a provincial government, would like to have somebody's income tax, with regards to that.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Mr. Minister, I understand that you have a need for a particular provision in order to make a check. I think our concern here was the width and the breadth of any records. It's so all inclusive and doesn't refine itself down to relating to the matter and information. In other words, it leaves it so broad. It says, "To persons

authorized by him any records or extracts or records at any time and place,” so we were concerned with respect to the extent of the demand that can be made with respect to records. What we were attempting to do is simply to refine it down with respect to his farming operation, hoping that that would narrow down, and satisfy the particular concern that you have.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I suppose the assurance that I can give you, if you can trust my assurances, is that we would ask the farmer for no more than what farm credit asks the farmer for. In other words we would not ask for information over and above that. We quite frankly don’t have any great request for that. I think basically it becomes a sort of lawyers’ type clause to cover those situations where you could have a defrauding type situation, and so you get into the whole question of evidence, and what information you should have, and could you destroy — they type of thing. I think it’s a lawyer type clause, if that can give any assistance, but I can give you assurance that we’re not looking from the farmer for any more information than farm credit already requests. We think that is ample, and quite frankly, we don’t even want to be privy to that information. It would be best to be left to farm credit corporation and that’s the intention we intend to pursue.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I fully understand that and I’m prepared to accept that. I just want to ask you one question. Since you are seeking only the information that farm credit corporation would, in fact, seek with respect to that of any transaction with the farm credit corporation have you had an opportunity to look at the similar legislation as to the requirements under the farm credit corporation? Do they have a broad clause similar to this or is it more restrictive as to what they can demand? Do you follow me on that? And, I was just wondering whether you have, in fact, checked that with the farm credit corporation legislation, and whether or not an amendment similar to that legislation might be suitable, although I don’t myself know what it says.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Well, I don’t know and the officials present do not know. Anything that would be there of course is public information but I can’t help you. I can try to have someone dig that up for you and get it to you at a later time if that’s acceptable.

Amendments negated on division.

Clause 5 agreed to.

Clauses 6 and 7 agreed to.

### Clause 8

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — There is a proposed House amendment to section 8 of the printed bill. Subsection 8(3) of the printed bill is amended (a) by striking out “and the land” and substituting “the land”; and (b) by striking out “act” and substituting “act in any debts, liabilities and obligations assumed by Her Majesty in right of Saskatchewan pursuant to The Land Bank Repeal and Temporary Provisions Act.”

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I will read the explanation on the amendment.

The House amendment clarifies that any debts, liabilities or obligations of the land bank commission and the land bank fund assumed by the crown under The Land Bank Repeal and Temporary Provisions Act are to be



assumed in the farm purchase program fund and may be retired through the new fund.

This is a proposal requested by the comptroller's branch of the Department of Finance.

Amendment agreed to.

**MR. ENGEL:** — On section 8 there appears there is some problem with section (6) of the printed bill where . . . (inaudible) . . .

Notwithstanding The Heritage Fund, (Saskatchewan) Act, the minister may transfer any amounts that he considers appropriate from the fund to the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund.

I think basically what's happening here (and I'll be moving an amendment a little late on) is, simply put: you've got the privilege here of raiding the cookie jar in the dark. I think this bill can be cleaned up considerably on that aspect of it. I move that section 8(6) of the printed bill be amended by striking out of the last two lines and substituting the following:

No money shall be transferred from the fund of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund except by appropriation by the legislature.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — As the minister will be aware, in respect to the heritage fund it had been established that it was governed by the heritage act and that there would be no transfers out without the consent of the legislature. It seems to me that in subsection (b), this provision, which was a protection of the heritage fund, and the approval of the legislature is being removed. Apparently, at the whim of the minister, any amounts can be transferred from the heritage fund. So accordingly what we are indicating here in the amendment is that no money shall be transferred from the heritage fund except by appropriation of the legislature. Our interpretation of (b) is that you are giving the minister the right, under subsection (b), to transfer any amounts from the heritage fund without appropriation of the legislature.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Just give me a minute here. What you're talking about is that you don't want us to use the heritage fund money to pay for this thing without appropriation?

**MR. KOSKIE:** — We're saying that here in subsection (b) it says:

Notwithstanding The Heritage Fund (Saskatchewan) Act, the minister may transfer any amounts that he considers appropriate from the fund to the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund.

Notwithstanding. Now within the heritage fund it requires an appropriation to be made by the legislature, eh? What we're saying is that you're changing that procedure, and we're concerned about that. We feel that it's a responsible way of having any appropriations come before the legislature, rather than just a minister transferring from the fund. We are not opposed to the use of the heritage fund. We are opposed to the change in the appropriation from the heritage fund.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Yes, except that if you go back to the section you're trying to amend, it says:

Notwithstanding The Heritage Fund (Saskatchewan) Act, the minister may transfer any amounts that he considers appropriate from the fund (which is back to the other definition,) to the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund.

It's money being transferred into the fund that you're concerned about?

**MR. KOSKIE:** — To the heritage fund.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — So the transfer goes into the fund: the purpose of it is to clear the situation where the money could not now go into the heritage fund from any capital gain. It can only come from resource revenues. This would allow it to in fact go into the fund as opposed to going out of the fund. Going out of the fund is the same as it always has been before. It has to be covered by the proper appropriation.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Minister, what you're saying — just on a point of clarification because I can tell you that section 6 does not give that very clear indication that you refer to — is that moneys can flow into the fund, but you cannot take money out of the heritage fund without it coming to the legislature. Our concern is that we're about to set up a system similar to Alberta where the heritage fund is controlled by a committee of cabinet. It does not come to the legislature for moneys to come out of the heritage fund. We're very concerned about the precedent being set by section 6, by clause (6) of section 8 in this bill. You are assuring us that that is not the case.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — If you go to the definition section which is 2(d):

“fund” means the farm purchase program fund established pursuant to section 8.

It then simply says:

Notwithstanding The Heritage Fund (Saskatchewan) Act, the minister may transfer any amounts that he considers appropriate from the fund (that's the farm purchase program fund) to the . . . heritage fund.

So what we will be doing under that section is transferring it into the fund as opposed to transferring it out of the fund. Therefore, I don't think there is any concern there, because that particular section would not come into play at all.

**MR. LUSNEY:** — I have a question there, Mr. Minister. You are saying now that you can . . . If you sell land bank land, you will have a certain amount of funds within the program, the farm purchase fund. You are saying that if you have \$100 million in the fund which isn't required to cover the interest rebate that you can transfer it into the heritage fund. When you do that, there is no accounting to say how much you have transferred into it from the farm purchase fund, and you have money available within the heritage fund then to use for other programs. I would like to see this section dropped. If there is money within the fund, transfer that money from the fund through this legislature into the heritage fund where the people of Saskatchewan will know how much income was derived from the sale of land, and how much went into the heritage fund from that land.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Well, of course, what you have to do is that . . . This particular section would allow money to be paid out of the heritage fund for the farm program, if

we so decided to do that down the road. That's the reason for that, to transfer out. I suppose, looking at it from the farmer's point of view, it's basically a direction that the farmers who are members wanted to see, in fact, happen. They were concerned that if it was just any proceeds went into the consolidated fund if a person bought the land that he owned, that the consolidated fund boys would grab it up with some of the other people. They wanted to put a rule in there by which they could get that protected in the heritage fund. That's the purpose, quite frankly, for that particular section.

Amendment negated on the following recorded division.

### Yeas — 6

Thompson  
Engel

Lingenfelter  
Koskie

Lusney  
Yew

### Nays — 30

Birkbeck  
Taylor  
Andrew  
Sandberg  
Hardy  
McLeod  
McLaren  
Klein  
Katzman  
Currie

Schoenhals  
Hampton  
Weiman  
Bacon  
Hodgins  
Sutor  
Sveinson  
Meagher  
Smith (Moose Jaw South)  
Hopfner

Martens  
Young  
Gerich  
Domotor  
Maxwell  
Dirks  
Hepworth  
Folk  
Myers  
Zazelenchuk

**MR. ENGEL:** — Mr. Chairman, today I've mentioned before that I'm particularly happy that the Minister of Finance is handling this aspect of the bill. If he can't support this amendment, I could take three weeks to read back into the Camber and onto the record statements he's made about the role of the provincial auditor, and what a provincial auditor's role is. Here we see a bill that: the provincial auditor, or any other auditor that may be designated by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, shall annually audit the records and account for the funds. This fund account, if it were set up as a crown corporation or whatever, would have their own auditor, and the provincial auditor would still audit the records to give the people of Saskatchewan the advantage that they haven't got some little hanky-panky going on, or according to the words of the minister some blue fuzz, some blue fuzz.

This amendment that we're purporting is simply in keeping with all other legislation in this Chamber: that we have one auditor and we believe in that auditor, and we pass the kind of legislation that allows that auditor to do the books, not one of our choice. So, consequently, I think that this is one that I would just like to see you vote against, Mr. Minister, and tell us that you've had a complete change of heart, you've thrown away your complete self-respect or anything you've ever said in the past. Vote against section 8(9): that the subsection 8(9) of the printed bill be amended by striking out "or any other auditor that may be designated by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council." I so move, seconded by the member for Quill Lakes.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Well, I think what you're going to see, Mr. Chairman, and we have made a commitment (I think the public accounts dealt with it, and I believe that you are a member of the public accounts committee) that we intend to, in fact, strengthen the office of the provincial auditor. We will be bringing in separate legislation this spring dealing with the powers of the provincial auditor. We will strengthen that office. I can assure the member opposite that there will be no move away from the provincial auditor with regard to this particular section of government. I think the record shows very clearly where we stand with regard to that particular question, and I'll simply stand on the record.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — In respect to the moneys that can be used, Mr. Minister, in this program, I take it that there are three sources of funds: that which can be accumulated from the land bank and the repeal of the land bank; I take it there is money that can come from the consolidated fund; and presumably also the heritage fund — those three methods. And I just want to say that any moneys that were appropriated from the consolidated fund have always been audited by the provincial auditor. What you are establishing here is a departure from a well-accepted procedure, that any consolidate funds, even in the event that it's not being used (but the potential is there) that it should be . . . That practice should be followed, that the provincial auditor should be involved. I know there have been departures in respect to crown corporations, but in respect to the consolidated fund . . . that's the source of your fund, and therefore, we urge that this be only audited by the provincial auditor.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I can give you the assurance, and we are coming back with some legal reasons for me, if you like. Lawyers draft this type of sections in an act, as you are completely aware, and if you can just bite your tongue for a minute until they get back, we can maybe get you an answer as to why it is that way. Now, I can give you the assurance, unequivocal assurance, that you will never see a situation where the provincial auditor does not audit the consolidated fund of the Government of Saskatchewan . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I simply said, could you wait a minute until the fellow gets back, the legal people get back, as to why it's in here. I assume that probably the reason for it is not a departure. It's probably a standardized type of clause that is in most legislation.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Could I get permission from the minister to come back to this section?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Certainly, we have no hang-up with regard to that type of amendment. If it's a great departure from the standard, we would be perfectly prepared to accept your amendment.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Mr. Chairman, I recommend that we stand this section and move on and come back to it when his officials get here.

Clause 8 stood.

Clause 9 agreed to.

**Clause 10.**

**MR. ENGEL:** — We have a little problem with clause 10, and I would like to move,

seconded by the member of Cumberland, that section 10 of the printed bill be deleted . . . I am glad the member for Moosomin at least goes along with it. I said, "that section 10 of the printed bill be deleted," and he was cheering me on . . . and the following be substituted.

Notwithstanding section 8, all expenses incurred in carrying out this act are to be paid out of the moneys appropriated by the legislature for that purpose.

So moved.

#### **Clause 8 (continued)**

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Could we revert back to section 8(9) at this point in time? And in keeping with the Yuletide season, and showing that we are open to reasoned amendments, I would be prepared to indicate to this Assembly that the amendment to section 8(9) relating to striking out "or any other auditor that may be designated by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council." I think we are prepared to accept that amendment and are prepared to vote on that amendment, just to show you that we are reasonable people and open to legitimate points brought forward. I hope in the future you could maybe get another one of these.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 8 as amended agreed to.

#### **Clause 10 (continued)**

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Do I understand that there is an amendment to 10?

What he says with regard to 10 is as follows. "It's okay if we put money from the farm program into the heritage fund to be used for farmers, but boys, don't take it out. Use it for something else."

I suppose they want us to use it to buy up another crown corporation or something like that. We would simply want that money to put it in the one plan, take it out and use it for the farmers on the other hand. And that's what we intend to do with this particular legislation.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is that the source of the money is from the heritage fund (as he indicated), or from the proceeds of the repeal of the land bank, or from consolidated funds. I think the proper place for us to have any moneys appropriated is through the legislature. Otherwise it is very difficult for the public or for the opposition to keep track of what moneys you are using for the program.

And certainly with respect to the land bank and the possible sales that you will be implementing with respect to the land bank. I think it is important that any money that is being appropriated . . . that this legislature knows what money is going into the fund for this program . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right. And so what we are saying is that any funds for the program should be appropriated in the legislature.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Except that really what you do under the existing heritage fund situation . . . We have indicated, I think, in the budget, that we will be looking at changes to the heritage fund and the overall way the heritage fund is going to work. And

that's legit.

But if there are going to be expenditures out of the heritage fund, those will be reflected in the budget estimate documents as advanced, and you will have a perfect opportunity in the budget debate and in the committee of finance to deal with those particular questions. You can hold us here forever and a day if you want to argue that particular question in the committee of finance.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — What you are saying here, though, in section 10, is that notwithstanding The Heritage Fund (Saskatchewan) Act, sums required for the purpose of paying interest rebates may be paid, subject to any prescribed terms and conditions, out of the heritage fund. What you're doing . . .

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Don't confuse the heritage fund with the spending estimates which must be reflected in the spending estimates. That's all I'm saying. You still have that right and probably your most powerful and proper right would be to debate in the committee of finance where you have unlimited questioning power. So you still have that. It has to reflect in the numbers; it has to reflect in the spending estimates. All heritage fund moneys have to reflect into that, and you can't put a notwithstanding clause to avoid that type of a situation, but simply to adjust to the particular details of the fund with regard to legal requirements, not with regard to the right that you would . . .

I think what you're trying to raise is that we're doing the same thing that Alberta would do and that you have no accounting mechanism. That's not in fact true. You in fact have that mechanism through the committee of finance in this legislature, and that is not changing.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I don't quite follow you. You see, under the existing heritage fund any funds have to be approved here by the legislature. Right? Are you not saying that notwithstanding what's in that act, sums required for the purposes of paying interest rebates may be paid, subject to any terms and conditions, out of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund? In other words, what you are doing is circumventing the major piece of legislation, which you said you're going to be looking at in the future to change it from what we have.

It seems to me that what you're doing here is circumventing what is in the heritage act at the present time.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — The purpose of the section is to give authority. There's no authority now. Paying out the rebate, if you like, would be classed as a grant under the legal interpretation, and there's no authority in the heritage fund, at this point in time, to make a grant. So we need this in order that we can then take those moneys and pay them out to individuals by the way of the grant. Otherwise we wouldn't be able to use that money from the heritage fund if we looked to pay that money out to individuals.

It still has to be accounted for and made available in spending estimates. That's all I'm saying. There's no authority under The Heritage Fund (Saskatchewan) Act at this point in time to pay grants to individuals under this program, and that's why we need this notwithstanding clause. It's not to say that that stuff would not be made public in the spending estimates of the government, and clearly it will be . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm not changing my tune at all. That's actually what I said.

Amendment negated on division.

Clause 10 agreed to.

Clause 11 agreed to.

## Clause 12

**MR. ENGEL:** — When you come through a piece of legislation like that I almost feel guilty moving this last amendment because you have accepted so few of ours that you need the provision in this bill. You need the provision to be able to sit down and under (a) for example. “For the purpose of carrying out this act according to its intent,” say “We can do with this piece of legislation what we really promised the people we would do. If we would have bought the NDPers’ amendments we wouldn’t need this one.” But, seeing they didn’t buy our amendments, they have to have a line in there that says they can define, enlarge or restrict the meaning of any word or any expression used in the act by an order in council.

Why pass a piece of legislation? As I said in my first reading or second reading speech, all you would have needed to do is pass an act to establish a program to facilitate financing the purchase of land by the Minister of Agriculture, period, because that’s exactly what you have left.

To bring back some semblance of authority of this Chamber and to hold at least a degree of respect for it . . . Maybe the Minister of Industry and Commerce, coming back from a nice jaunt to Europe, thinks this sounds funny, but it isn’t . I have been terribly perturbed about the way you’re handling this piece of legislation so we have to move this amendments here. That clause 12(1)(a) of the printed bill be deleted and the following be substituted.

(a) defining any word or expression used in this act but not defined in this act.

So that we can limit it a little.

I so move, seconded by my colleague and neighbor from Shaunavon.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Well, I think I would simply refer the hon. member to The Beef Stabilization Act brought in by the government that you sat in, and your House Leader was a member of the treasury branches. The Beef Stabilization Act is virtually verbatim to this particular section of this act. Virtually verbatim — if you look at it and read it, almost word for word it’s exactly the same type of thing. You can say that that was a raw use of power by us if you like. By saying that, I suppose you’re saying it was a raw use of power when you were the government. I don’t think the beef stabilization plan, whether it’s good or not, whether it’s good or not the beef stabilization plan I don’t think is going to rise or fall on section 25 of the beef stabilization program, just as much as this particular legislation is not going to rise or fall on section 12. The wording in those regulations is verbatim. Verbatim. Now it seems to me that’s what’s good for the goose is good . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You’re talking about 12(1)(a). It’s verbatim 12(1)(a), (b), (c), down to (g): (a), (b), (c), (d), (g), down to (h) in the beef stabilization program. It’s the same thing all the way through. So we can sit and argue and talk all we want. We’re going to adopt the same program that you adopted, the same regulations that you adopted. Now we can talk all we want about it, but that’s exactly what we’re going to do.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that defining any word or expression used in this act, but not defining this act, is taken out of The Beef Stabilization Act on the top line. Read (a) on beef stabilization to me. Our amendment just brings us up to that one category. And Mr. Chairman, the point is this; this, in my understanding, is a copy of that, so we amended it to bring it in line with those kind or powers.

The other point is this: we didn't stake an election plan on the beef stabilization. And the beef stabilization wasn't cut and dried and simple, like this is. You're just piggybacking onto a federal program. If we could have piggybacked the beef stabilization onto a federal stabilization plan, that would have been a very successful program. I'm sure you'd agree with it. So I'd suggest all hon. members would accept this definition, that you'd define any word or expression used in this act but not defined in this act, rather than giving you power to enlarge or restrict.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to follow up on that line of questioning that the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg was making and also in response to a point that the minister raised dealing with the comparison between beef stabilization and the farm purchase program. I think the main difference is the fact that during the April election there was a commitment made by the party in the campaign that they would have an interest program of 8 per cent for \$350,000 for the first five years and \$350,000 at 12 per cent for the next five years. And all we're saying is why do you want the power to change that?

All we're doing is attempting to assist you in getting those very things put into the bill, and allowed to be in there, so that you don't have that flexibility. So that the election promises can be carried out. It's all part and parcel of all the amendments that we've been moving here today. We just feel that, rather than in press releases, those kinds of things should be contained in the bill, because they were a major platform of the Conservative party during the election, very much unlike beef stabilization, which was a new program and needed flexibility. This program was an election promise and must have been well thought out, and the 8 per cent, the 12 per cent, and the 350,000, must have been firm in everyone's mind. Beef stabilization was quite different.

Amendment negated on division.

Clause 12 agreed to.

Clause 13

**MR. ENGEL:** — Mr. Chairman, we were anxious when this bill came into committee that certain provisions of this legislation would be considered. When the home mortgage plan was introduced, the government of the day considered some of the amendments and seriously looked at the changes that would reflect to provide a broader approach of the bill. We seriously considered that this bill would be broadened to include farmers who made application to loans and we insisted that this legislation be retroactive.

In 1982 only 280 farmers took out less than \$100,000 each — 280 is all that we ask to be included, just 280 more. But, no, the government said, "These people would be guilty of speculation." That's what the minister's words were. "Those 280 for \$23 million (and the source is FCC here in Regina), this \$23 million worth of loans would be



a speculation, and these people were speculating on this bill and we can't have it."

We could have gone back another year and it would have included another \$50 million, but we didn't insist on that. We really felt that if this bill could have been broader, if you would have put some definitions in there so we would have known that you are zeroing in to help the farmers, I think we could have supported this bill, I really think we could have.

I want to move one more amendment before we deal with section 13. My amendment would number the section, the existing section 13, as section 14 and the following would be added as a new section 13. This basically appeals to the fact that here the young farmers are caught without any form of appeal. If they don't like the avenue the minister has placed, where they have to crawl to for some political help; if they can't get it there there is no appeal in place. All we are saying is that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may appoint an appeal board. It doesn't say he has to. He may . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . it's necessary. I'm, sure as the bill goes along and as it's introduced that there will be reason for appeals.

- (1) They will appoint an independent appeal board consisting of at least five members;
- (2) Two members of the appeal board constitute a quorum;
- (3) A person aggrieved by a decision of the minister under this act may appeal that decision to the appeal board by written notice, in accordance with the regulations, within 14 days from the date he is notified of the decision;
- (4) Within 30 days of the receipt of a notice of appeal, the appeal board shall give at least 10 days written notice to the person bringing the appeal as to the time and place set for a hearing;
- (5) The appeal board shall act in a manner prescribed by regulations.

This is a standard type of appeal procedure when you are affecting the lives of so many people. I think it's a good thing for the government to consider.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — The only comment I make on this is that we've been around the bush before on this, and I'm sure we're going to be around the bush on this one again as it relates to the legal question. I think the views have been stated by the Minister of Agriculture, and I don't see it would serve any great purpose for me to go over those particular things again. I think your point you feel strongly about. The point is resisted from over on this side. I think the point has been made. It's a debating point, and I think the debate has been had on it.

Amendment negatived on division.

Clause 13 agreed to on division.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

**THIRD READINGS**

**Bill No. 45 — An Act to establish a Program to Facilitate Financing the Purchase of Farm Land**

**HON MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I move that the amendments be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, by leave. I would move third reading of this bill, as amended.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.