

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a petition regarding the proposed 230 volt power line from Condie to Queen Elizabeth power station.

Wherefore your petitioner humbly prays that the Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to do the following:

1. Order SaskPower to facilitate the production of non-utility generated power in areas of increased demand. Several companies in this area have applied to generate power;
2. Order the Minister of the Environment to undertake a complete environmental assessment including public hearings;
3. Order SaskPower to ensure that there is a full and complete compensation package for all affected landowners;
4. Order SaskPower to table in the legislature a complete economic analysis by an independent auditor that proves the economic benefits of the proposed line exceed the economic benefits of non-utility generated power or conservation;
5. Order SaskPower to table in the legislature a review of all national and international studies on the effects of electric and magnetic fields on humans; and
6. Further, order SaskPower to cease and desist all planning, surveying, or preparation for construction of the Condie to Queen Elizabeth 230,000-volt power line on any of the proposed routes until all other points in this petition are honoured.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, these individuals are from Moose Jaw, Craik, Aylesbury, Regina, Allan, Markinch, Middle Lake, Young, Kenaston, and so forth.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING, SELECT, AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Deputy Clerk: — Mr. Martens, chair of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, presents the fifth report of the committee:

Pursuant to an order of the Assembly dated May 4, 1993, your committee reports Bill No. 41 —

An Act respecting the Financial Administration of the Government of Saskatchewan, with amendments.

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to just say a few things about the work of the committee in Public Accounts. The responsibility of the Bill 41 was given to Public Accounts Committee of which I am the chairman, and we reviewed the matter. There were a number of observations made by the Provincial Auditor, there were a number of observations made by the comptroller for the province, and also the deputy minister of Finance. And together with members of the committee we put together a Bill that will respond in some way to the financial services of the provincial government.

I want to say that I appreciated the cooperation of the committee in dealing with the items that were there. There will be a few amendments that will be brought forward, and they were voted on in the committee, Mr. Chairman, and they were approved by the committee.

And with that, I move, seconded by the member from Saskatoon Idylwyld:

That the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the Assembly that the consideration of the said Bill in Committee of the Whole be waived.

Leave granted.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, by leave, I move the Bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Leave granted.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

Standing Committee on Communication

Clerk Assistant: — Mr. Speaker, as chairperson of the Standing Committee on Communication, presents the second report of the said committee which is as follows:

Your committee has considered the recommendations of the Public Documents Committee, under The Archives Act, contained in retention and disposal schedules comprising sessional paper no. 141 including schedule 326 being the Saskatchewan administrative records system; amendment to schedule 327 of the Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly; and amendment to schedule 328 of the Tripartite Beef Administration Board, tabled this third session of the twenty-second legislature and

referred to the committee by the Assembly on May 19, 1993.

Your committee recommends to the Assembly that the recommendations of the Public Documents Committee on schedule 326 and amendment to schedules 327 and 328 be accepted.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden:

That the second report of the Standing Committee on Communication be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Knezacek: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 21 grades 6, 7, and 8 students seated in the Speaker's gallery from Countryside School in Saltcoats. The teacher that is accompanying the students is Ray Isaac; and they have three chaperons, Denver Wiebe, Charles Penner, and Bert Friesen.

Following question period we're going to meet for photos and also for drinks and discussion. And I trust that they have had a fruitful experience in Regina so far, and that it will be enhanced somewhat this afternoon after listening to question period.

I'd like to wish them a safe trip home and ask you to join me in welcoming them to the Assembly.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jess: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you and to the rest of the Assembly here 22 students from Beady's School, grades 6 and 7. They are in the west gallery, and they're accompanied today by their teacher Harry Salahub, and chaperons Ivie Cameron, Dion Smallchild, Roy Gamble and Shirley Gamble, as well as their bus driver Tom Gardypie.

I met with this very polite group of students this morning for question and answers as well as pictures. And I would like to ask you now to join with me in welcoming them to the Legislative Assembly.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also would like, to you and through you, to introduce a very special group of young people in the west gallery today. There's a large number of them; they're 60 grade 4 students from the school of St. Theresa in Dewdney constituency here in Regina.

It is always special to introduce students from St. Theresa School because that is the school in which I

taught for some time before I became a member of this Legislative Assembly. I am looking forward to spending some time with this group of young people after question period for pictures and for a discussion about their visit to the legislature. Hopefully they can get me up to date on what's happening at St. Theresa.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask members to join me in extending a warm welcome to this group of students who are here with us today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a great pleasure for me today, Mr. Speaker, to introduce to the members of this Assembly a group of 40 students from the community and town of Waldeck. Waldeck is about 10 miles away from where I live and my youngest son took his grade 7, 8, and 9 there. I know the teachers fairly well and I am very proud of those teachers and also the students.

Two teachers that are there with them today are Lorne Hustak and Marv Parschauer. Both of them have done excellent jobs in class and in the school. I also want to acknowledge the councillor for my division, Mr. Clifford Veer. He's the bus driver there today, and I want to welcome him here today too.

I also want to say that I know quite a few of them, but there's one specific one, Mr. Speaker, that I want to introduce to the Assembly, and that is my niece who lives on the ranch there with us. Her name is Loni Chickoski, and obviously not very happy about it, but I want to introduce her anyway because her mother would not consider anything less than that.

I want to have the members of the Assembly join me in welcoming these students to the Assembly and thank them for coming.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today on behalf of my colleague, the member from Prince Albert Northcote, to introduce to you and to the members of the Assembly some students, some grade 8 students from Boucher High School in Prince Albert.

They have travelled here today to visit the legislature and to see some of the proceedings as well as some other sights in Regina. I will have the pleasure of meeting with the group at 3 for photos and for a discussion.

And I also want to welcome with them their teacher who is Heather Schulte and their chaperon, Steve Kasyon. And I'd ask the members of the Assembly to give them a hearty welcome.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — And I think finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to on my behalf and on behalf of the member from Moose Jaw Palliser, introduce 12

students, adult students from the SIAST (Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology) campus in Moose Jaw. They are currently studying at the Alexandra centre.

The Alexandra centre is located in the constituency of Moose Jaw Wakamow but will serve students from both Moose Jaw constituencies, so both the member from Moose Jaw north, Moose Jaw Palliser, and myself would want to ask all members here this afternoon to greet these students.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, they are here just for a short time just to observe question period. And I'm sure they will hear some very good questions and some even better answers. I would ask members then to join me in welcoming these adult students from Moose Jaw.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Co-op Upgrader Review

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier today. Mr. Premier, in today's paper we see your government leaking out more details of its plan to break the legal contract with 240,000 co-op members and take over the upgrader.

Mr. Premier, unfortunately this is just like the 1970s all over again, the way you want to do it. You don't look for solutions, Mr. Premier. You don't try to negotiate. You just go and take it over. It's just like we did with potash, Mr. Premier. It's like we did with that \$200 million boondoggle called the land bank.

Now, Mr. Premier, now you're adding one new trick to your bag of tricks. You're taking over control of the upgrader, but you're leaving co-op members across the province holding the bag for the finances.

Mr. Premier, why should 240,000 co-op members hold the bag for you when you run the upgrader into the ground? Mr. Premier, didn't you learn anything from your experiences in the 1970s that this is the wrong way to go?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, what I learned from the 1970s, as reinforced by the actions of the 1980s, was the difference between two governments which, faced with serious economic situation, approached solutions, one from a rational, economically logically based position in the interests of the taxpayers, and the other in an economically irrational position.

The privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan for example was done at a loss to the taxpayers of about \$600 million when you, sir, and your colleagues sold it off in haste. This is documented in the Gass Commission and the like.

But the substance of the member's question is the

issue of — again he comes back to the central theme — why are we doing this. We're doing this because Justice Estey said that this project, the way it was packaged by you, has run financially aground. That's the fundamental conclusion.

And Justice Estey recommends the principles of how to save it. I presume you people would want to save it. We want to save it. Now that's his best shot as to the way out. We've endorsed that way out. We think the federal government, while not totally endorsing it, at least has got the door open to that. We ask that FCL (Federated Co-operatives Ltd.) adopt the principles of that way out, as set out by Estey. And finally we ask you, if you really have the interests of the upgrader and the people of Saskatchewan at heart, to endorse the principles of Estey. Will you? Yes or no?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Justice Estey never said in his report that 240,000 co-op members should have their contract broken by this Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Premier, in 18 short months you have broken your contract with 60,000 farm families. Your commitment to health care in this province is broken by the fact that you are going to close hospitals all over rural Saskatchewan. Matter of fact, Mr. Premier, at a meeting in Prince Albert, when a prominent member of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool asked you if you would ever move against the Co-op upgrader, you categorically denied that you ever would. You said to him, no, that is not our intention at all.

Now, Mr. Premier, the betrayal grows each day that you threaten to use this Legislative Assembly to break that legal binding contract and not negotiate. Justice Estey's whole report was based on negotiation, of arriving at a mutual settlement; 240,000 co-op members, Mr. Premier, are asking you to keep the word that you gave in Prince Albert, Saskatchewan. Will you keep it, Mr. Premier?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member refuses to accept the basic fact here. I repeat again, the clear indication of the government and the intention, again, that the way out of this is a negotiated settlement. The way out of this is a negotiated settlement based on the principles. It doesn't have to be the exact crossing of the t or dotting of the i's of Estey, but on the principles of Estey.

Estey's report is based on three months of trying to get an agreement through mediation. Estey's report is based on considering all of FCL's arguments, and still he said, this is the way out. We accept that former Supreme Court justice's recommendation as the way out. There's room to negotiate, but there must be adherence to the principles.

Now what more, sir, can any premier or government do when after 18 months we have neither gotten FCL

to move nor have we gotten them to accept even the principles of Estey nor have we even gotten them to the point of sitting down with the Premier of the province or the minister responsible for this file to negotiate. Their position simply is, they're not going to negotiate.

Now that means that this is a prescription for, as I say, a policy of prayer; hope that nothing goes wrong even though we're living with a megaproject which is on the edge — \$300 million of losses for NewGrade over four years; over \$600 million in exposure. And you, sir, by your questioning, would have us continue putting the taxpayers — all the taxpayers, including the Federated Co-op members, the Co-operators of which I'm a member — every taxpayer at risk with that kind of a megaproject.

I say, Mr. Leader of the Opposition . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Next question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Premier knows that that simply is not the case. FCL were told by your hand-picked political friend, Mr. Ching, that those issues that they agreed to by writing yesterday to put to arbitration as per the original agreement, were simply not on the table, that the bigger financing question had to be dealt with first before he would accept arbitration. Mr. Premier, yesterday your minister received a letter saying that those issues can go to arbitration as per the agreement; there is no problem there. Justice Estey recognized that arbitration is a big part of the original agreement.

Now, Mr. Premier, why don't you take the time to at least put those issues to arbitration before you would use this Legislative Assembly to irrevocably change the contract of 240,000 co-op members in the province of Saskatchewan? Why wouldn't you at least give that a try, Mr. Premier?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member either does not understand or ignores is that this issue is a large issue which involves, among other things, the arbitrated issues, the arbitration matters. There's no doubt about that, but it doesn't stop and end there.

It involves arbitration. It involves a convoluted governance system on NewGrade which was designed by your government in such a way as to stymie effective commercial-making decisions respecting the upgrader. It involves the issue of what happens when there is a deficiency on operations as there has been — \$76 million that your former premier and government pumped into it in order to save the project. It ignores the fact that there is a huge debt, \$360 million which you, sir . . . I am on the hook on, every taxpayer in this province is on the hook on, in addition to another 260 approximately from the

federal government. Those are the issues which have made this project run aground. It is what has led Justice Estey to conclude you need to negotiate those issues now — now.

Just because the sun is shining and you can see it through a hole in the roof is no argument for saying you shouldn't repair the roof. Wait till the day that the rain comes down and destroys all the furniture in the house, is your philosophy. Well that may be yours, but it isn't ours. We're acting to protect the taxpayers and we're doing it now, in the absence of negotiations.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, your urge to protect the taxpayer, I suspect, has more to do with your political agenda than anything else.

Mr. Premier, when you have Mr. Ching and Mr. Banda and Mr. Dombowsky, a whole raft of your hand-picked political patronage appointments over there in CIC (Crown Investments Corporation), I would think that people would be a little bit suspicious of your motives. When we see that you're going to take over the board of the upgrader, I suspect those will be the kind of gentlemen that'll be on that board carrying out your political agenda.

Mr. Premier, I don't consider that a good way to negotiate or to enter into arbitration. Why don't you be upfront with the process here so that 240,000 co-op members — who are also taxpayers, I would remind you, Mr. Premier — know that this Legislative Assembly is not going to send a message that legal, binding contracts with people don't matter any more; that if I don't get my way, I'll simply do like I did with potash and uranium and oil and farm land; I'll bring in legislation and I'll expropriate it, I'll nationalize it.

Mr. Premier, don't you think that that is the wrong message to send to Saskatchewan taxpayers?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, on page 10 of the Estey report, Mr. Justice Estey concluded, among many conclusions along this vein, the following:

Furthermore, at no stage in the foreseeable future will cash flow of (from) the Upgrader, by itself, service the interest and (the) principal charges falling due on the guaranteed debt, even when operating at full capacity . . .

That's the finding — at no stage in the foreseeable future. Now that results in the liability that I've talked about in several hundreds of millions of dollars. That is the outcome of this all.

Mr. Justice Estey has set out the terms of reference of a potential settlement to get out of this. You, sir, either refuse to accept those findings, in which case you might as well go out and tell the taxpayers that you are going to stick to the deal that you negotiated and that's

the end of it, and therefore they're going to be on the edge for upwards of \$700 million, \$700 million — you're going to stick to your deal that you and your former premier negotiated, that you may as well come clean and tell the people — or you have to follow the Estey report.

And we say the principles of the Estey report is the way out. It's the fair way out for Federated Co-op, FCL. It's the fair way out for the taxpayers of the province of Saskatchewan. It's the fair way out for the Government of Canada. Everybody who looks at it must come to that reasonable conclusion. What's your problem, sir? Why don't you endorse the Estey report?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The problem, Mr. Premier, is that you're saying to 240,000 co-op members: I'm going to take your business, but if I mismanage it down the road, you're on the hook for the financial repercussions of it. That's what you're saying.

I mean, Mr. Premier, it's like you promised them no new taxes in the last election. Do you remember that, sir? No new taxes. Well you've taxed everything that you can possibly find in this province. And now you're saying to co-op members, I've figured out a way to tax your co-op dividends. That's basically what you're saying, Mr. Premier, to the co-op members of this province who thought they had a legally binding contract.

I mean if you run the upgrader like you did the Potash Corp or the P.A. (Prince Albert) Pulp mill or all the land bank land spread around this province, the fact is that co-op members will have their dividend taxed, in no uncertain words.

Mr. Premier, is that your solution, to bring in a tax now on the dividends of co-op members in the province of Saskatchewan? Is that the solution we're looking at?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, these people, this question is so far off the mark of any of the factual basis of what the debate is about that I don't think anybody can make any intelligence out of it. This is a situation which is unrelated to any of the factual circumstances which are before us.

Look, the debate is we have an albatross and a bad deal negotiated by them facing us. That no one disputes. Everybody concludes that. Unless the former premier from Estevan still sticks to the view this is a wonderful deal that he negotiated 10 days before the election. Unless the former premier believes that \$50,000 a day in interest charges on this project is good for the taxpayers. And unless the former premier thinks this is a good way for him to get elected as a federal Member of Parliament down there in Souris-Cannington. He should say so publicly. He should say so publicly.

But this does not make sense. This deal does not make sense. Don't take my word for it; take the word of Mr. Justice Estey.

Now if you say this deal makes sense, end of the debate, you and I disagree. But if you think it does not make sense, then you've got to say to me, negotiate along what lines? We've tried every line. The best line is the Estey line. A neutral, independent, competent, integrity-filled person who says, here is the way out.

We will accept that way out. I repeat again to you, why don't you accept that way out?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, what I say to the Premier is, negotiate, not legislate. That's what Estey said — negotiate, not legislate.

What we've got here, Mr. Premier, is not an acceptance of negotiation, not an acceptance of arbitration, not an acceptance of the parameters of the Estey report. What we have here is a political problem, sir, that only you can fix.

Now we all know who the real minister of CIC is. The associate toy minister over there said to the press yesterday that the government has always been willing to negotiate on the outstanding issues. Unfortunately the message delivered to the other party in the so-called negotiation was that that wasn't on the table.

Mr. Premier, you are passing legislation through this House to give your friend Mr. Ching the ability to tear up and rewrite agreements on Bill 42. The record that he has shown on the co-op deal, Mr. Premier, says that 240,000 co-op members are having their contract broken because of your political agenda.

Mr. Premier, why don't you tell 240,000 co-op members today that your hand-picked political friends are not the ones going to do the negotiation, that that negotiation was done by somebody with some credibility in the province.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, that is a very revealing question. Prior to 1991, FCL came to the former government of the day and said on three separate occasions, which will be documented by the documentation which we'll be tabling shortly in this House and publicly, on three different occasions and said, this man has got to be out. We have no credibility or confidence in him. And they moved him. The premier capitulated.

Then the second person came. He said, this man has got to be out. And the premier, former premier, capitulated. The former premier got a letter from an adviser, a personal friend and adviser of his, which will be tabled, pleading to the former premier not to sign that agreement. They said, that adviser, who's an expert in oil matters, he's got to be out. They moved

him out.

Now the Leader of the Opposition says to this government that we have got to say, our negotiators are out. I don't say to FCL who they negotiate with, and by golly, FCL is not going to tell me who we're going to negotiate with. We stand up for the taxpayers of Saskatchewan — unlike you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would say, Mr. Speaker, by that answer that the Premier is saying that his political agenda and his political friends are more important than the contracts that he signs in the province of Saskatchewan, the dealings that he has with the people.

Mr. Premier, 240,000 co-op members don't want their dividends taxed because you are breaking a legal contract; 240,000 co-op members, Mr. Premier, don't want your political agenda in the road; 240,000 co-op members want negotiations, not legislation.

Mr. Premier, don't use this Legislative Assembly to repeat the mistakes that you made in the 1970s by bringing in that legislation. Negotiate in good faith, Mr. Premier. Send the right message outside of the province of Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I have said inside this House during question period, and outside this House before the matter arose. I repeat again. I say so, as of this date, the government of the province of Saskatchewan is prepared to negotiate. The Government of Saskatchewan wants to negotiate. The Government of Saskatchewan does not want to introduce legislation. The Government of Saskatchewan is prepared to meet Mr. Leland and his team as he chooses it, any time, anywhere, to negotiate on the principles of Estey.

Our condition is, and our only condition is, that the principles of Estey be negotiated. Our line also is that we want a memorandum of understanding which can be taken elsewhere for further consultation. We're prepared to meet any time, anywhere.

I told that to the president; I'm saying this to this House; and I have been rebuffed — yes. Those negotiations have not been accepted. That is not my choice. None the less, I repeat the offer now.

If FCL wants to call at this stage in the game and say they are prepared to negotiate on the principles of Estey, let's do it. We'll go. In the meantime, the legislation can go too, and there's nothing that prevents a negotiated settlement and to avoid all of this.

But if they continue to take the position which you do which says this deal is the best thing since sliced bread, notwithstanding that the credit rating agencies . . . notwithstanding that the taxpayers are facing all kinds of pressures in health care, in education, and social services, if you take that position and they take

that position, I say to you, sir, that's a policy of prayer and nine and a half years of you praying for a turnaround in the economic circumstances has only sunk us in a deeper hole.

It's not our policy. Where do you stand on Estey? Join us.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. Mr. Premier, you say you want to negotiate but then you use a threat of nationalization as the hammer over Federated Co-op. That's what you've done, sir. That's some negotiating strategy.

Have you given any thought at all, Mr. Premier, to the signal that it is sending to the business community in this province. The message is clear, Mr. Premier — don't do business in this province with this government because they may change their minds and rip up a contract that they have with you. That's the message, Mr. Premier.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Premier, that new companies don't want to relocate to Saskatchewan. Is it any wonder that there's been negative job growth since you've taken power. Is it any wonder that there is negative economic growth since you have taken power.

Mr. Premier, when are you going to stop . . . or start working with businesses in this province instead of against them, Mr. Premier? And when are you going to stop your tax and take-over mentality that is driving jobs, growth, and hope from this province?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Minister of Economic Development, will take subsequent questions along this line, but I do want to . . . I want to make one response because I thought it was in the context of the FCL upgrader. I want to say that today we received a rating report by Standard and Poor's of New York, which I'm very pleased to report, Mr. Speaker, has indicated that our BBB plus rating has been confirmed. The rating remains stable.

But I also want to say this, in response to the hon. member when he talks about the business community. This is what the business community reads. This report also says that we have done this. The government's . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The former premier, you know, something about him and truth which makes him very allergic, because he just continues to chirp from his seat. And I wish he would scratch that allergy and get up and ask a question on this matter. He'd feel better for it and so would I.

But here's what S and P (Standard and Poor's) says about us. It says: the ratings reflect the government's strong, demonstrated commitment to deficit reduction and a more rigorous management of its off-budget loans — off-budget loans — and

investments. Now what we're talking about here, what we're talking about here is an off-budget loan, an investment on FCL.

And they say we've got to do more of this. The business community knows that when you deal with government, it's got to have the proper smell. The deal's got to have the proper smell. They all know that. And they know that this deal's a bad deal. I tell you, Federated Co-operatives knows it's a bad deal. I tell you ordinary cooperators knows it's a bad deal.

Now what we're trying to do is square the circle and get a properly negotiated settlement. If your line of questioning was the right way, namely: we acknowledge it's a bad deal; we don't think this is the solution; here's what we think is the solution, we'd entertain that. But you stick your heads in the sand and you continue to say that this is a good deal come heck or high water, and it doesn't matter, we can't do anything except have a policy of prayer. And I repeat again, I reject that, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, by any yardstick available, your economic record has been a disaster. Your first quarter labour report released today shows unemployment in Saskatoon has climbed in the past year by almost 2 per cent to 12.4 per cent. There are 11,000 less jobs in Saskatchewan today than there were at the same time in 1991. There are 12,000 more people on social assistance, the highest number in the history of this province. And you are the Premier who said that you would end poverty in this province. Our economy has shrunk by 3.5 per cent since last year; that's \$700 million gone from our province for ever.

Mr. Premier, you say everything is fine and run around scaring businesses out of this province by doing government take-overs. Mr. Premier, why don't you simply admit you have no economic strategy for this province, diverge some of your attention away from your tax and take-over agenda, and get to work on a solution to the problems facing Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I hear the member's gloom and doom. Again the member from Kindersley obviously having a very, very difficult time finding things to ask questions about. He continually goes back to the gloom-and-doom scenario when nothing else works.

Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to the member in May 25's *Leader-Post*, on the market page:

Oil and gas stocks hot.

Saskatchewan's oil patch in for a mini-boom.

This is just one example, one example of where the private sector is creating employment, and in fact activity in the oil patch is up by 187 per cent this year

alone. Housing starts are up 80 per cent. In the area of trade, non-traditional exports are up 15 per cent.

So you can continue your gloom-and-doom and hope-for-disaster scenario, but I can tell you after 10 years of your management the people of this province are sick and tired of it and they are very pleased they have the government they have, the Premier they have, creating economic development in the province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Before orders of the day and by leave of the Assembly, I have already indicated to the Government House Leader that I, by leave, would move that certain following items be dropped from the order paper.

The Speaker: — Does the member have leave?

Leave granted.

RESOLUTION AND RETURNS WITHDRAWN

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you to the Government House Leader. Mr. Speaker, under private members' motions, item 11, resolution 17 be dropped.

Under motions for returns (debatable), return items no. 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 26, 27, 30, 31, 33, 36, 44, 46, 49, 55, 63, 65, 67, 70, 72, and 186, Mr. Speaker, be dropped from the order paper.

The Speaker: — Order. I'm not certain that this has ever happened in this legislature before, but I will ask, is leave granted? Order, order. Is leave granted for each of those items that the member has requested to be dropped?

Leave granted.

The Speaker: — Those items are dropped. Order.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 77

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Mitchell that **Bill No. 77 — An Act respecting the Implementation of Certain Treaty Land Entitlement Settlement Agreements** be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

(1445)

Bill No. 78

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Mitchell that **Bill No. 78 — An Act to confirm an Agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Saskatchewan varying the Saskatchewan Natural Resources Transfer Agreement** be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 74 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Farm Security Act

The Chair: — I will ask the Minister of Agriculture and Food to introduce his officials to the members of the committee.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. With me today I have Darcy McGovern, Rick Burton, Dan Patterson, and Bev Cleveland.

Clause 1

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I have a few questions I'd like to ask you and it's on the land ownership part of the Bill. Would you, in your words, Mr. Minister, just enlighten us. And we've read the Bill of course and we think we understand it, but just in your own words tell this legislature the purpose of this Bill, the overall picture of bringing this Bill to this House.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — There are several sections to the Bill, the land ownership question that you addressed. The purpose of this Bill is really to clarify and somewhat tighten up the regulatory control of the farm land ownership Act. It doesn't put any provisions in that were not in the Bill previously.

The restrictions as to foreign ownership are the same as they have been for the past number of years. But the Bill gives the board more investigative powers and some powers to investigate sales before they happen, rather than after the fact which, as the current legislation stands, if there's a land sale and the farm land tenure board has no power to intervene until a sale has been made, then they can order a divestiture of the land which creates, I think, some problems for all those involved. So in this case it will, with the amendments, it will allow them to be out front a little better and to make some rulings before actual sale takes place.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Minister, in Saskatchewan in the last year, year and a half, there were several large portions of land that were about to be sold and the public thought they were sold, and all of a sudden it fell through. I think you know where I'm talking about. There was some over in the Kindersley area or Eston area; like you say, some large, large areas of lands from several different farmers that thought they had

their land sold to outside investors.

Is the actions or whatever happened there . . . it fell through, but has that got anything to do with the purpose of this Bill, is what was happening there?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Well certainly that was one of the things that alerted us to the inadequacies in the Act that were there. We don't know whether those deals were outside ownership. They were being piloted by Saskatchewan people, whether it was . . . whether there were actually options taken on land which were not exercised.

We don't know why the deals didn't come to pass, but it did point out to us that we had no . . . the board itself had no power to investigate to see if this huge sale was going to be legal or not. All they could do was wait for the sale to take place and then rule afterwards. And if they ruled that indeed the sale was not legal, then they would have to resell the land. And that seemed to us to be a bit of an anomaly in the Act. It hadn't been updated for a good number of years, and so that's one of the reasons that I think prompted us to look at the Act and make some of the amendments that we made.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, what you're saying then that you could see problems with those types of sales. What were your problems that you seen with it? If there were outsiders coming in or outside money coming in, maybe dealing through somebody from here, what was your own personal view what was wrong with what may have been happening. I understand we don't know exactly, but what is it about those types of agreements or sales we heard about that bothered you?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Well I guess perhaps the member opposite could answer that question himself. Those were the same restrictions that were in place all during the time the members opposite were in power. I guess it's always been a Saskatchewan desire to own and control our own farm land within the province, and that was . . . you know, certainly we have grave concerns about outside interest buying up large tracts of Saskatchewan farm land and having the rent or profit from that land continually flow out of the province over a large number of years.

And again we didn't change the regulations or the restrictions on foreign ownership. They remain the same, 320 acres for residents of Canada and 10 acres for foreign investors, and we didn't change that restriction. All we changed was sort of the timing and the power of the board to enforce those regulations a little more practically we believe.

Mr. Muirhead: — Now, Mr. Minister, you can say that yes, those regulations were in place when we were in government, but as time is going on through our nine years, close to 10 years in government, we could see the need to maybe loosen up on some of these regulations. And I'm sure that a lot of your officials will know that the feeling of . . . especially in the debt situation and people out of money and banks not wanting to finance land, there was a tendency for

loosening up.

Now what you've done here is you've tightened up. I know that it didn't happen in the regulations, and no Bill to that effect, but, Mr. Minister, there was a strong feeling among our government, and I'm sure if we had had one government again in 1991 that we would have been going the other direction, loosening up.

I wonder what you have against other countries or other people that are non-Saskatchewan residents or non-Canadian residents. What have you personally got against them coming in here with some money and buying land? Just want your feeling on it, not that I'm saying that. I just want your feeling on it.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess the feelings of the government are that we would like to certainly restrict that in some way. We do not, would not, like to see a large percentage of Saskatchewan farm land owned by foreign investors for the reasons that I have articulated earlier, the lack of control that we have, the effect it has on traditional family farms, and on the economic benefit and the well-being of the province having the rent or profits from that land continually flow out of the province.

And I think that those are the reasons behind why the Act was enacted way back in 1970 and probably the reasons why it was not changed by the previous administration.

And again, we haven't tightened up those restrictions or changed them in any way. All we've done is give the independent board . . . that it enforces them, a little more leeway and power to do its job.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Minister, that's the difference between your thinking and my thinking. I'm not speaking on behalf of all of our caucus because I'm not sure where they stand on it, but I think majority-wise they support what I'm going to say.

You see, we've had a tragedy happen in Saskatchewan here. And as you know it, in rural Saskatchewan there's another 1939 approaching — or the 1930s, I should say, '30 to '39 — where it's a disaster in rural Saskatchewan. We need some cash inflow. We don't need it all going out. And you just finished saying it there, Mr. Minister, that we don't need to have non-residents owning land and people out of country owning land because the rent and what not would be going out.

Well what do you think is happening now? What do you think is the situation if you borrow money from Farm Credit or the Royal Bank or whatever? Where do you think that money goes? Do you think it stays in Saskatchewan? Did you think it even stays in Canada? If you borrow money from Farm Credit, who's making the only money? It's the people lending the money to Farm Credit who comes from New York, for goodness' sakes.

It's the same kind of thinking you people had back in the days you sold the potash mines. I can remember

the debate in here, oh, we got to own those potash mines so let's make a Bill in this House and kick those Americans out and make sure that we own and Saskatchewan owns that soil — and they'll always own the soil — they'll own the potash mines, they'll own the businesses.

So what did you do? It cost multimillions of dollars to kick the Americans out, go to New York, borrow the money to pay them off; and we're still in debt to New York. Where do you think the profit's going? For goodness' sakes — and I'm not hard over on this because I might be wrong — I'm just suggesting that, Mr. Minister, that maybe we need . . . maybe the point is that we need some outside money coming in.

When this country was broke up in the first place, there was no money out here when the first people came west at the turn of the century and prior. They come out here with very little money, but what they did have came from European countries. They're all migrated from Europe to the East, and then West. It was brand-new money in the West.

Don't you think it's time now that it's . . . I would just as soon somebody from Italy or Hong Kong or Africa, India — I don't care where. If they come and bought some of my neighbour's land — that they're going to lose it to the big corporation, to the bank, or to the provincial government through ACS (Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan) or whatever, I'd rather have rented from them than have to have it to the Royal Bank or the Bank of Montreal or whatever. I mean what's wrong with some new money coming in? If you had a few hundreds of millions of dollars worth of money come into Saskatchewan to pay for this land . . . that they cannot take the land away. The soil will always be here.

So I know it's been a situation that we didn't deal with too much in the prior years of the '80s. But the latter part of the '80s, we were sure starting to change our mind and getting a lot of requests from farmers. For goodness' sakes, I'm losing my land. I've got a chance to sell it to an outsider. I've got a chance to sell it to somebody from Switzerland, Germany, whatever, and I can't because of your restrictions.

Now I know your officials know that we were starting to loosen up on our thinking. Instead we get this Bill in here, and it won't be the direction from the officials; it'll be the direction from the government. Let's tighten up and let's control.

Now what's wrong with some new money in, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Well certainly we have no problem with new money coming in, and we certainly welcome people from anywhere coming here and buying farm land and farming the land and moving to our province. That's how our province was built, and we certainly have no problem with people coming in.

But I think what would be a catastrophe, as we go through a very tough period in agriculture, is to have

billions of dollars from offshore or elsewhere come in and buy up the farm land, have the price of grain turn around, and have all the benefits of that flowing outside the province.

And we as a province always, because we are a province that's rich in natural resources and our scattered population and very expensive to service, we have always tried to get our fair share of the natural resource income to stay within the province and to be used within the province. And I think the farm land is no different than other natural resources. In fact, there's a very strong feeling among Saskatchewan farmers that they would like to own their land, and I guess that's the explanation.

(1500)

Mr. Muirhead: — Yes, Mr. Minister, I agree that farmers would like to own their own land. But there's very, very small percentage of land in Saskatchewan owned by the farmer. He might have a bill of sale on it, but if he has a loan from any lender other than a credit union — the credit union would be the only Saskatchewan-owned lender that would be money 100 per cent Saskatchewan — but if you have any major bank or Farm Credit, the money is owned out of province, and in most cases out of country — right out of country.

Now you know right well if they come in and bought land here right now, it'd be an influx of cash into this country, and it would give security for the farm that's in that position. He's losing his land; it's going. Just like an auction sale, it's going, going, and maybe gone. So here's a chance for them to . . . they're lots of people who will come in and buy. There's a lot of investors that'll come in and buy. I'm sure it's the laws of Saskatchewan that stops the big sales of land that was going on out in the Eston area.

Now I'm not blaming your government before that because those laws were in place by us. I understand that, Mr. Minister. But it's those kind of restrictions that will stop anybody from coming in. And I guess what I'm saying here, Mr. Minister, that maybe we should have had a Bill in this here House opening it up to anyone that would like to buy land. They can't take the land away. They're going to . . . not likely going to come in and farm it; they're going to have our own people from here farming it.

The most people that farm the land in Saskatchewan now didn't . . . their ancestors didn't come from Saskatchewan; they come from Europe. If the money wants to come in and buy . . . if people want to come in and bring cash in to buy some more land, I can't understand what you'd have against that, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Well again, Mr. Chairman, we have no problem with people coming in and buying land if they intend to be Saskatchewan residents. And we certainly . . . and the board has powers to make exception for border areas and so on. But I guess there's a basic disagreement on whether

we just do not believe that we would like to see huge tracts of our farm land owned by foreign owners. And I guess maybe we're in basic disagreement on that item.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, you bet we got a basic disagreement on that because that's what this government wants to do. They want to put a wall right around Saskatchewan and just retain it and hold it and nobody else come in — no investors, no nothing. They just want to sit here till we all just have less money and less money, and we eventually go broke. That's what you want.

That's why your socialists are all against free trade. They didn't want to deal with anybody. They want to put a wall around. That's what causes wars, when you put a wall around. That's what happened in Germany. They put a wall around Germany, and they said . . . in both wars, we won't trade with anybody; we're going to take it. Well they found out it doesn't work that way. You've got to trade with people. There's nothing wrong. It's just you socialists that are want to protect . . . you think you're protecting a few labourers, and maybe you're right but maybe not. Maybe in the long run you're not protecting them either. Maybe you're not protecting anybody in Saskatchewan.

Maybe you got to open up, get new money in. You're against trading with Mexico; you're against trading with United States. If it wasn't for United States here we couldn't even exist, and you people don't want to even admit that.

But I see you're getting much quieter about this here trading and what not, because you got a socialist across the border potentially trying to make a mess of that country down there. He's gone downhill so bad that we should have sent somebody down to New York to the Democratic convention. We sent the Economic minister down, the member from Elphinstone. The member from Elphinstone went to the States when Clinton was elected as their leader. We should have sent somebody else and give a better direction because they're going the same direction you are. The socialists are just going to try and put a wall right around the United States the same as you people are here. And that's what's going to happen. The more socialists take over this country, the bigger wall we're going to have around.

For goodness' sake, open up, loosen up, and let some new money come in. I'm very disappointed in this Bill, and as I said, Mr. Minister, I want to be fair. These rules and regulations were there when we were there and we didn't change them. But boy, I'm sorry we didn't, sorry we hadn't loosened up. But it wouldn't make any difference because you people are going to return back the best as you can, to take over. You're going to try to control.

Somehow or other you'll never be able to bring the word land bank back in here because you lost the election in '82 on the land bank issue, buying Saskatchewan. But you're going to get a form of it somehow or other, and it's going to happen because

as farmers lose their land, they'll do anything they have to. There's something going to happen. You people are not right-wing enough sitting in that front row and the second row and maybe the whole of the four rows. The only way you think is control and how do we take over, but we got to do it smarter than we did in the '70s.

When this Bill gets public to the people out in Saskatchewan, you think that the farmers are saying to you, we want to own our own land. You bet they do. But when they're starting to lose it, they would rather have somebody . . . If I was losing my farm — and goodness' sakes my family has had enough trouble — instead of dealing with a big lender, I would have loved it if some stranger from Hong Kong had've drove in one day with a cheque and says we're ready to buy out your lender and lease you this land for 25 years. Well it's a way of staying on that farm; it's a way of life.

The member over here seems to know a lot about farming. Maybe he can get up and talk about this. Well if we'd gained . . . even if that happened, if somebody wanted to come in and farm it, it's better than what's happening in our country. We're losing . . . When I was elected in 1978, there was 76,000 farmers with quota books and now there's 60,000.

We're going down. And I'm not blaming your government for that; I'm blaming all the conditions in North America. We're going down and down and down and down. Maybe we got to have some new people in here with money to farm or we're not going to . . . We can't have all just one big co-op farm. When you people get through, that's what we're going to have — is one big co-op farm in Saskatchewan.

The government will have to own it all because the farmers aren't going to be able to. The only farmers that can exist out there, Mr. Minister — and you should know this; you're a farmer — the only farmer that can make it out there, he's got to have some prior bucks before this '80s came along. He couldn't survive.

If somebody just up and started farming in 1980, '82, and started right on their own with their bare hands and went out to work, they could not become a farmer. They'd have to have help from their parents or family or somebody would have to help them get started to farm. And you know that.

And so we needed this here influx of money coming in here. But the biggest thing I don't like about this . . . we know we can't outvote you; we know you're going to get this and it's . . . But the biggest thing I don't like about it, you're putting all the power into your cabinet.

Since when should a few people sitting in your cabinet room decide who's going to come in and do this or whether this is kosher or whether that's kosher or not. Why did you give the power to your cabinet?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Chair, I thought I

understood this Bill quite well. I didn't realize that it was about to start wars and create this stop to trading. But I think the member opposite goes a little far in his judgement of the impact of this particular Bill.

As to cabinet powers that he made reference to, the Bill gives power to the independent Lands Appeal Board. All the power that was given to cabinet was the right to request the board to investigate a particular land sale that's brought to our attention. I think again that's in reaction to a sale like the Eston land deal which we were made aware of, was going on.

The Department of Justice thought that it could well be interference and illegal for us to even ask the board to investigate it. The board certainly did not have the power on its own to investigate the sale. All we could do was wait for the sale to happen, and then if it was not legal, to order that land to be resold.

And I think nobody wanted to have that scenario develop, and therefore the regulations doesn't give any power to the cabinet. The power still rests with the Appeal Board. It's an independent board, but it gives the cabinet the authority to ask them to investigate a particular land sale. And that's all that's in the Bill that gives power to cabinet.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Minister, I don't think you or any government's got a right to investigate a potential land sale. No right whatsoever. I don't care whether it's a quarter section or 200 quarters, they know the law. Anybody coming in out of province, it's up to them to find out whether they're within the laws of Saskatchewan. And if they make a mistake they would have to suffer and it would have to be resold or whatever. I agree with you that it would have to be sold. But it should come to that point before we have an overpowering cabinet looking into it and looking into potential sales and scaring them off.

For goodness' sakes, it might have been a very legitimate sale. It might have been . . . because I understand there was people from Regina involved in it and it was never proved whether it was out of province or not. If somebody out of province wants to lend money to somebody in Saskatchewan to go and buy land with it, that should be legit. And I think it is.

So I don't think your government or your cabinet has any right if they hear about a land sale, read it in the *Leader-Post*, has any right whatsoever to go out and start investigating it. Why would you investigate it? Why wouldn't you just stay out of it until after it's done and then you investigate it and see if it was done right or not? Because you don't know. You can't be investigating every sale of land that happens.

What's your comments on that, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Well I think that somebody who was buying land and then doesn't know whether it falls within our . . . legally falls within our law would like to know before they make the deal that it's illegal and not after they make the deal. So I guess that's our approach.

We did not do any investigation of the Eston land deal because all we know is what we heard from hearsay. We had no right to investigate and therefore we didn't investigate it. The deal fell through on its own. So that's the reason for that.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister. Mr. Minister, you mentioned earlier in response to a question from the member from Arm River that your concern about money coming into Saskatchewan and buying up farm land, that there would be billions of dollars potentially moving into Saskatchewan buying up farm land and then the price of grain perhaps would turn around and all of the money that's made by the farmers would essentially go out of the province.

And I'm wondering if you could let us in on where this billions of dollars of potential investment is coming from. Or have you done any kind of study or any kind of . . . is there any kind of information available to support that kind of contention?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Well certainly there were the land deals that were begun, and as we say, fell through for whatever reason. Rather a huge tract at Eston, several others around the province — Nipawin area, and a couple of others which were very, very sizeable chunks of land.

We don't know; I don't think we make laws based on what we know to be happening today or tomorrow. We make laws based on principles that we like to see over the long run.

We do know that there are huge pools of international capital that are becoming available in the world and huge pools of money that could well one day, if some investor sees the turn-around in the grain market and believes that Saskatchewan farm land is underpriced, it's certainly within the realm of possibility that there would be billions of dollars in a fund that would move into Saskatchewan to buy up the land and wait to reap the capital gain.

So we don't know that it would happen, and certainly I guess if there's no great turn-around happening in grain prices that we can see, and this probably would not happen at the present time. But because of the deals that were going on, we wanted to look at the Act. And it hadn't been rewritten since some time in the 70s, and we just wanted to update it a bit.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you. So, Mr. Minister, you have nothing to base it on — your reasons for wanting to move on this legislation — nothing to base it on other than the thought that maybe at some point down the road Saskatchewan land will be viewed by outside investors as underpriced and therefore willing to invest into Saskatchewan. Nothing to base it on other than just you feel that maybe that might happen.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Well certainly the law is based on the fact that we want to retain ownership of farm land and by and large within the province of

Saskatchewan, against whatever contingencies should occur.

I guess, as the member pointed out earlier, the members opposite were in power for 10 years and had those regulations in effect. I don't know if you foresaw at that time that there was going to be huge investors coming and therefore didn't repeal the Act. I think it's been in place since some time in the early '70s and we just believe that it should continue to remain in place.

Mr. Boyd: — Mr. Minister, you mentioned that the large tract that was being assembled in the Eston area was the primary reason why your government felt that this legislation may have to be updated, as you call it, or changed. And I'm wondering if you could provide us with any information to support that claim.

Was there a large number of calls to your office or to the farm land ownership board with respect to that? Were there a lot of people calling, saying that they didn't believe that that transaction should be able to go ahead?

(1515)

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Well I don't have documentation. Certainly I received 10 to 20 calls in my office. I think a number of MLAs (Member of the Legislative Assembly) approached me saying that they'd received phone calls — not all opposed — many curious about what's happening, some concern. And, you know, I don't have documentation on it other than certainly was . . . it was in the newspaper. It was a prominent issue about for a time. And I think when those sorts of issues arise, you immediately look at what your options are.

If this was not a legal sale, obviously we would be involved and you want to know that. We found that the legislation that we had really hamstrung us in saying we have to sit back and wait for this sale to take place and check its legality. And if it was illegal, you know, I thought that would be . . . or we thought, as government, that would be very disruptive to have people invest their money and then have to resell the land, and it would certainly be devastating for the community involved.

And so I thought that was one of the reasons that prompted . . . I guess all legislation gets reviewed from time to time. We, I think, have something like a hundred different Bills in the House. Many of them are amendments of legislation. They need to be updated from time to time. So I don't think it's terribly unusual to look at a Bill that hasn't been revised for 10 or 15 years and update it as needed.

Mr. Boyd: — Well, Mr. Minister, while you may have felt there was a need to update this legislation, I think there's a lot of people in Saskatchewan believes that the problem we're faced with in Saskatchewan right now in agriculture is a lack of capital. And that's based primarily on the fact that we have low grain prices and a whole host of other international factors that we're dealing with.

But I think a lot of people in Saskatchewan feel that if there was outside investment available to Saskatchewan farmers, outside money to be able to bring in investment into Saskatchewan, I think that they would perhaps welcome that.

I know in the Eston area — which I incidentally farm in the Eston area — I know there was a great deal of concern, but there was also a great number of people that felt that it was the best thing that could ever happen to them. They were looking at the opportunity to be able to sell out at a very, very attractive price potentially, and therefore they were more than happy to look at the opportunity that was presented in front of them.

And I'm wondering, Mr. Minister — you mentioned that there was a few calls, a few MLAs, that sort of thing — was there any kind of concerted outcry from the people in the Eston area about this land transaction, potential land transaction?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Well, Mr. Chairman, again I'd like to point out that although the Eston land transaction was one of the things that triggered us looking at our Bill, we did not in any way interfere with that transaction. We have no indication that it was foreign money that was doing the deal . . . or were being done by people from Regina. So we assume the deal fell through for some reason, and unlikely that it was our foreign ownership law.

Because presumably anybody doing that large a tract of land and offering that much money would certainly have investigated the foreign ownership laws before beginning to make that sort of deal. So to say that somehow this Bill has crushed that deal, I think is unlikely and pure speculation at best.

All I'm saying is that certainly those sorts of deals with foreign money certainly would be possible if it weren't for the law, and we just felt that the law needs to be there and we wanted to give the independent board that administers it a little better power to administer the law that was there.

Mr. Boyd: — Mr. Minister, did your officer of the farm land ownership board conduct any kind of an investigation or make any kind of inquiries with respect to the proposed land deal at Eston?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Essentially there was no investigation. There was a bit of monitoring that went on. There was certainly information was, I know, phoned into . . . people volunteered information to the board as they did to my office. I had people phone my office telling me that, you know, they had an offer and who it was from. But there was no formal investigation of the land deal.

Mr. Boyd: — Well, Mr. Minister, just to conclude here; I won't take up too much more time on this. I certainly recognize that your government is intent on changing this. I just want to I guess go on the record as saying that I think in the province of Saskatchewan

that people should have . . . And if the prior legislation restricted that, I guess that's another matter. But the prior legislation, in my view, wasn't correct either and it should have been changed, and I'm disappointed that it wasn't changed. I wasn't a part of that administration, but unfortunately it wasn't changed. And I think in hindsight of the government, the previous administration may have looked at that.

But nevertheless, I think I want to go on the record as saying that I think the people of Saskatchewan should be able to sell out if they want to sell out to people with outside interests. In a business community it happens all the time. I'm not restricted if I have a business in Saskatchewan, from seeking outside capital to buy out my business. And I think that farmers want that opportunity as well.

I know in the Eston area it was an interesting time, to say the least, and when that transaction was perhaps coming together, there was a lot of people that viewed it as their opportunity to retire. And that's basically the way it was looked on. And because it was such a . . . the price was an attractive price, there was a lot of people made some pretty serious decisions based on the fact that that attractive price was being offered.

With the ageing population that we have in agriculture right now and continues to get . . . the average age of a Saskatchewan farmer continues to increase, I think we'll see in this province where more and more and more land becomes to the stage where people want to divest. They want to sell down their holdings and retire or move on to other pursuits, whatever.

And I think this is going to be a continual problem. I think your legislation's going to make it even worse. For example, in the area that I am from, I think there is . . . the youngest farmer, probably the youngest farmer is over 30 years of age. There is no new ones starting up. It just isn't happening. And I suspect that's the case pretty much all over Saskatchewan. There isn't, in large numbers anyway, any big migration back to the farm. It just isn't happening.

And the member over here says they need land bank. Well I think that's probably the last thing that's needed in this province. That's probably the last thing that's needed in this province and I suspect even the Minister of Agriculture recognizes that. If he wants any political future in this province, I expect he recognizes that anyway.

But, Mr. Minister, I think that I would like some kind of response from you with respect to that concern. There are farmers in this province that are at the age where they want to retire. They want out of agriculture. They have worked their entire lifelong in agriculture. Their family perhaps isn't interested in it. They want an opportunity to be able to sell out to whoever happens to have the money.

And, Mr. Minister, I wonder what your thoughts are on that. Should the people of this province have the opportunity to sell out, or do you think that the

government should be putting forward legislation that restricts them on their ability to retire?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Well certainly the government believes that farmers should have the chance to retire and retire with dignity and with some financial security.

I guess there's two sides to the coin: higher land prices for retiring farmers means a tougher start for the young farmers. And I think if it means that we sell out the future of the province by having huge tracts of lands become owned by foreign owners and forever become serfs on our own land, I guess that's where — as I mentioned to the member opposite — we agree to disagree. We believe that these foreign ownership restrictions are important, that our land is a natural resource and should benefit Saskatchewan people, and that's our position. I guess the member opposite disagrees with that, but I think that's basically the difference.

Mr. Boyd: — And yet, Mr. Minister, there's absolutely no evidence whatsoever to suggest that that is going to happen. I asked you earlier if there was any evidence to suggest that there's large tracts of land . . . large amounts of money going to be flowing into Saskatchewan. You have no evidence whatsoever to support your contention that that's going to happen. The only thing we have to go on is the feeling that this government has that it might happen somewhere down the road if grain prices happen to turn around or somebody recognizes perhaps there's an opportunity.

An Hon. Member: — There won't be an opportunity.

Mr. Boyd: — Incidentally, that's probably true too. You won't be in office for that eventuality to happen, I would suggest, Mr. Minister, especially in light of the kinds of things you're . . . in light of the things you're trying to do in this province.

There's no evidence, no evidence that you can give us today to support your claim that there is huge pools of capital just waiting with bated breath to move in here and scoop up Saskatchewan farm land. And yet you have to bring in legislation to deny . . . or to try and stop that perceived problem that you see.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Well, Mr. Chairman, in the first place we're not bringing in legislation; it's been here for 10 to 14 years. I guess we know that it won't happen as long as the legislation is in place.

I guess . . . I don't know what the member's line . . . where he's going with his line of questioning. He's saying if there's no money coming in, then nobody's ready to invest in Saskatchewan farm land, then I guess repealing the Act and allowing it wouldn't make it happen anyway. And if it is going to happen, as long as the law's in place we know that it won't happen. And I guess if it's something that we don't view as desirable, we just keep the law in place through good times and bad times. And we know it won't happen as long as the law is in place.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, in the Act you limit non-agricultural corporations to 10 acres. Then if they hold . . . in those corporations if the shares are held in the majority by Saskatchewan residents, they're allowed to have 320 acres. What effect will this have on Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation, Ducks Unlimited lands, etc., the wildlife lands?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — If the member opposite understands the procedure, the Farm Ownership Board has the power to make exemptions. In the past, the wildlife federations have gone to the board for exemptions. They've been routinely granted. There's nothing in this legislation which changes that process.

Mr. D'Autremont: — What about any other wildlife-oriented group that may come forward with the purchase of land? Will they be given a blanket consideration that's similar to Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation? And how do they know that this will be guaranteed to carry on?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — There are no guarantees. The process now and has been in the past is that they come forward to the independent board and ask for an exemption. They have been routinely granted. There's no reason why the board will change; however there's no change in the legislation which affects that at this time.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well you say that there's no reason for concern about this, but contracts have normally been fairly sacrosanct in Saskatchewan, but that no longer is the case. And what is to keep these contracts sacred when others are being broken all across the place? I think that there needs to be something different in this Bill giving wildlife lands some special consideration under the legislation that you as a minister or any of your colleagues can't, on a whim, change that.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Well I think there are no contracts, and as I said there are no guarantees. It's the independent board which makes the decision, and at some point maybe if wildlife were to own 90 per cent of Saskatchewan they might decide to start defining them. And I certainly understand the member's concern, because there are no guarantees that the board will grant exemptions, but that's the process that's been in place in the past and has worked well, and we think it will probably work well in the future.

(1530)

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On section 5 you deal with the homestead and talk about it in some substantial kind of way. Would you provide me the explanation for section 5 so that I know what you're trying to say there.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — This amendment has to do with apportionment of debt against the home quarter, so if there's land involved that's not a home quarter or land that is, when the court's going through . . . when there's a foreclosure, the court will apportion the debt

to those quarters equally.

There's a court ruling which denied that apportionment, put it all against the land that was not a homestead, which could be foreclosed on, and that was not the intent of the legislation when it was passed. Therefore this legislation clarifies that the debt should be apportioned to all land equally, including the homestead.

Mr. Martens: — So if you had, Mr. Minister, if you had \$100,000 worth of debt that was going to be written off and you had five quarters of land and the fifth quarter was the homestead quarter, you'd have \$20,000 allocated to that quarter, and the rest would be done away with. Is that the explanation?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Yes, that's essentially true. The home quarter might be worth more money, but in essence that's the effect.

Mr. Martens: — Well doesn't this in fact take away the waiver function that normally applies to the homestead? Isn't that a requirement? Shouldn't that be continued as it is? In what way do the courts say that they could or could not do it in the way it was happening previous to this?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — This doesn't affect the waiver on the homestead. It still would be protected against foreclosure. But it does just technically apportion the debt to it so that there's not . . . it's not apportioned to the other quarters and another claim necessary to start over again.

It just says that that portion of the debt is apportioned to the homestead. It's still protected under the homestead rights, but the debt is apportioned there.

Mr. Martens: — Well, Mr. Minister, so that . . . just running another scenario by you and that is that if \$100,000 on these five quarters has been assigned . . . four quarters of those five and the fifth one, the homestead, has not been assigned, will the action that takes place then have an opportunity to have it assigned against that quarter because of the individual's responsibility to the whole debt? Will that happen if this is put into place?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — The situation is, if you take your example, if you had the \$100,000 debt, 20,000 is homestead, but there's one mortgage that covers all, say five quarters, homestead included. If there's a foreclosure action, only 80,000 of that debt will be applied to the other land and the 20,000 would be applied to the homestead and would be protected under the homestead rights.

Mr. Martens: — So then if the bank or the credit union or any lender would want to go after the extra \$20,000, they still have the right to go after the \$20,000 under the basis on the homestead. Or they would have the right in court to attach it to that homestead whether he wanted it there or not. Is that accurate?

Which is in whose best interest? Is it in the banks' and the credit unions' and Farm Credit Corporation, or is it in the best interests of the farmers?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — All that would happen is that the mortgage, the 20,000 that was under homestead, would then be protected and the bank wouldn't have access to the full \$100,000 loan because only 80,000 of it is proportionate to the land that's available to be claimed on and the other 20 would remain owing but be protected under the homestead.

This is the way the Act has operated since 1988, and that was the original intention of the Act, we assume. The Act has been administered that way for a number of years and they got a court ruling that said that's not what it says, or the court overruled the way it was run. So this just brings it back to the way it's been run since 1988.

Mr. Martens: — Under section 7, the individuals who are assigned the farmer's rights, is this the leaseback function in the leasing program that the government has in place? Is that the assigning functions are being adjusted, and would you explain that to me.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Yes, that's essentially correct. This deals with the leaseback; it's to correct a gap. Somebody who is eligible for the leaseback after the Act is enforced has the right to assign that to a child, but people who were not eligible for the leaseback or who were on lease when the Act was in place are eligible for the leaseback but not the assignment, and therefore it is to correct that deficiency.

Mr. Martens: — Would the minister explain to me . . . I had a gentleman from my constituency ask me about why bachelors were not allowed to transfer their lease rights to other individuals. Would you give me an explanation as to why you think that it shouldn't be included as an amendment to allow single individuals the opportunity to transfer to nieces and nephews because they obviously don't have children, and give that opportunity to them to do that.

This individual raised the point and I want to raise it too. And I think it could just as easily be included as an amendment in this section of the Act and then allow the opportunity for people who are in agriculture, whether they are male or female, who are single, who own land, and have an opportunity for a leaseback . . . have it stymied by the fact that they can't transfer that lease to whoever they wish — a niece or a nephew. And that, I would suggest to you, could cause a serious concern in a lot of places. And I even raise it from the point of view of whether in fact your Human Rights Code would be able to withstand the scrutiny of that item if it was ever presented in court.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Well the member makes a good point, and it's certainly something that was discussed when the Act was drawn up.

The definition of family in the Act is spouse and

children. It's not only bachelors but other people who . . . we've had occasions where people wanted to assign to nieces and nephews and the Act doesn't allow it. I guess it's a question of how far you want to go.

And certainly it's a program of government funding to try to keep family farms on the land. And to have assignments outside of family was, I guess, we viewed as stretching it a little far. Although certainly the member makes a good point, and we could have included nieces and nephews or we could have made it quite a bit broader. But the decision was made to restrict it to families.

Mr. Martens: — I don't think that that's necessarily fair. This case, and there are many cases like that in the community that I live where individuals, have only as a part of their family, their nieces and nephews. And that can apply to women as well as men, because there's women that function as farmers as well and they own this property and have transferred it back to a lending agency and now are restricted in that opportunity. And I would say to you that that is no less reasonable than for a father and a mother to transfer it to their son, than for having a single person transfer that to an individual who is a niece or a nephew.

Today in the way the separation in farm families and the separation of land, if those families that separate do not have any children, they run the same risk as a single individual. And that, sir, is I think a little out of order because it should be allowed to happen not as it relates to individuals, as it relates to farm land. That's where the function should be.

And I think that it would be far more beneficial to individuals to have that across the board as it relates to land rather than to the individuals, and deal with it in that light.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Well certainly that was an option. We could have broadened it out. We could have included brothers, sisters, we could have included strangers in the Act and tied it to the farm land as the member suggests. Certainly that increases the cost of the program and therefore probably the scope of it in some other way. But the decision I guess we made was, it was for preservation of family farm and therefore it was restricted to families.

Mr. Martens: — On section 77 we start talking about the farm ownership portion of the Bill: land holdings by non-residents restricted to \$15,000, including an . . . excluding any assessment for buildings and similar improvements.

Would you give me an explanation of that and why you put in March 31, 1974 and why you put in September 15, 1977 and why you put in September 15 . . . no, May 6, 1980 and May 5, 1980 and March 31, 1974 and September 15, 1977? I'd like to have an explanation of each of those dates in relation to what you're doing and why they're in there so that the public can understand what you're doing.

(1545)

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Chairman, to begin with, this is not a change to the Act; this is what was in the Act, was passed from 1974. It's basically a phase-in period when the Act began. We were allowed a 15,000 assessment to a certain date and then a lesser amount. It was basically a phase-in at start-up of the program and this has just been left in there. It is not changed with these amendments that we've made. It just remains as part of the Act, as it was when it started up in 1974.

Mr. Martens: — So what's the last date that you can own land as a non-resident Saskatchewan individual in Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — If you're talking about foreign ownership or someone who doesn't reside in Canada, first restrictions begin in, I think, March 31 of '74, you could own 15,000 of municipal assessment; September 15 of '77, 160 acres; May 6 of 1980, down to 10 acres. And changes were made again in July of '88 which still remained at 10 acres for a foreign resident, a foreign person.

Mr. Martens: — Well in section 85 it says, "shall dispose of the excess land holding by January 1, 1994." You said a non-Canadian resident, I believe you said. You need to tell me about a non-Saskatchewan resident because a non-Canadian is almost the same as a non-Saskatchewan, and give me an explanation of that.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — A Canadian resident which is a non-Saskatchewan person residing in Canada for 183 days. Prior to 1974 there was none. March 31 of '74, 15,000 municipal assessment; September 15, 160 acres; May 6 of 1980, down to 10 acres; and July 1 of '88, back to 320 acres.

Mr. Martens: — By January 1, 1994, which is coming up very shortly, any person "shall dispose of the excess land holding by January 1, 1994." Who is that, and how much is going to be left to be delivered? And then what I want to find out is how many acres are still owned by individuals who have an exemption as of that date who are in excess of the requirements of January 1, 1994.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — There are 185 non-farm corporations who are still in excess of their limit which will have to be dealt with by the '94 date. They are in the process of either divesting or applying for exemptions at this present time.

Mr. Martens: — Do they include all of the major lenders, credit unions, and agencies, trust companies, Credit Foncier, all of those? Would you be able to provide a list of the names? You don't have to tell me who . . . how much each one of them has. But if you gave me the aggregate total of acres — you gave me the total of . . . the numbers of individuals or corporations — would you be able to give me the list and the aggregate total of acres?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Under section 88 you'll find that there's exemptions made for lending institutions for . . . exemptions made in the Act for lending institutions who acquire land by foreclosure or quitclaim and so on. So they are not included in that list of 185.

We have a list, I believe, of the amount of land that the lending institutions hold. The non-agricultural is 185 non-agricultural corporations. We have neither a list of those or the acreages. But we can get those and deliver them to you.

Mr. Martens: — Okay. I wouldn't mind having that.

It says here: "Where an agricultural corporation becomes a non-agricultural corporation, the corporation has: (a) one year from the date of becoming . . . to move its land off and its ability to function as a land-holding entity.

How many of these have received exemption as of today?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — There aren't a large number of those. Again we don't have the exact number. The officials tell me it's under 10 of those companies that are in that position.

Mr. Martens: — Would you be able to tell me if the individuals who have lived here and moved away in the last . . . well from 1930 till now we've had a significant amount of land change hands, and for various kinds of reasons people came . . . I have relatives of mine who moved to British Columbia, who become typically non-resident. Can they in fact come back and buy this land? Can they come back and have . . . if they still own it, do they have to divest themselves of it? Do they have an opportunity to transfer it to their children if they live outside of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Section 83 lays out the exemptions for relatives. If you are a resident of Saskatchewan and own land and move out, you do not have to divest that land; you can continue to own it and you can transfer it — the rules are in 83 — but you can transfer it to spouses, children, and so on.

Mr. Martens: — Even if they are non-resident?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Yes, you can transfer that land to your children even if they are not residents of Canada. It's the second transfer, then I think there's five-years rule kicks in that they have to divest in five years.

Mr. Martens: — They have to then divest themselves of it in five years after the transfer?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Not on the initial transfer. If I move out of the province and transfer it to my children, they can maintain ownership. If they pass it on to their children, then they would have to divest.

Mr. Martens: — Okay, if the individual passes it on to

his grandchildren and then they have that right to transfer it for five years, is that the way I read it?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Yes, that would be correct.

Mr. Martens: — Section 96 says:

Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, the minister may direct the board to investigate any matter regarding farm ownership, and on the completion of its investigation the board shall submit a written report to the minister.

That, Mr. Minister, I think is repulsive. I think that the Lieutenant Governor in Council, executive branch of this government is . . . through this has the capacity to become involved in every land deal in the province of Saskatchewan, whether I like it or not. And that, Mr. Minister, is not correct.

I will point out this to you too, sir. If you did this with business in the province of Saskatchewan — let's take Imperial Oil, for example — and you said to them, you cannot own any more than three service stations in the province of Saskatchewan, and if you have any dealings in any of the framework of ownership in the province of Saskatchewan, you then have . . . we will investigate you and all of the corporation and tell you to get out.

And that, Mr. Minister, is typical of what you're going to be doing on Friday as a part of an overall strategy to heave out Federated Co-op. And then, Mr. Minister, the head office out of Saskatoon to Edmonton. What are you going to do next to keep money and individuals and people out of the province of Saskatchewan? And then are you going to put a border guard on so that nobody can get out?

(1600)

That, Mr. Minister, is what we're coming down to. If you can't control it, you haven't the confidence in people to deliver any kind of a positive opportunity because you think you can run it better than anybody else. I think it's disgusting. And I'd have a lot stronger words for this kind of stuff if I was outside of this House, Mr. Minister.

Will you give me an explanation of why you put that in there?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the member again I think is getting some . . . (inaudible) . . . I think I explained to the previous questioners: this was put in so that we could investigate before sales were made. It's not intended to investigate every sale in the province; it's to prevent the rather serious problems that we foresaw with the Act as it is, as having only . . . the board having only the power and the government having only the power to order divestiture after a sale is made, which I think is not good for business.

I don't think people who are buying farm land, is

doing any other business, want to come in and proceed with a business transaction and find out afterwards that it's in contravention of the law. I think they'd much sooner find out beforehand.

I think . . . You know, the member opposite makes reference to businesses. Anybody who wants to sell shares has to do a prospectus and have public information. So I think certainly the intention of this is to make life easier for people who are doing land sales and not have them caught unwittingly by the laws that, as I point out, were in . . . the same laws that were in effect during the . . . when the members opposite were in government.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Minister, I'm going to ask you this question. Does this apply to only new land purchases or any of the land owned in the province of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — What this clause does is gives the Farm Ownership the power to advise cabinet on land ownership matters. It is not intended to track every sale in the province or to be Big Brother looking in on anybody.

All it does is that if there's a land sale going on, as for example the Eston sale, and there's a huge transaction taking place and there appears to be foreign money, that the minister can ask the board to investigate and advise as to what's happening there, so that some action can possibly be taken at appropriate time and not after the fact when it would cause great difficulty for businesses involved.

Mr. Martens: — Well, Mr. Minister, it says here the minister may direct the board to investigate. The minister — that's you, sir, or the minister responsible for this, who is the Minister of Justice, can say to him, you can say to the board that you will investigate company ABC, individual so-and-so. You can say that, and then they will have to do it.

And, Mr. Minister, do you think that that is fair to any other jurisdiction? You would never do that to any . . . you wouldn't do that to any holding downtown here in Regina. You wouldn't do that in Canora to any business in that community. And that, Mr. Minister, is the reason why we have a problem with this. You don't say that this is to investigate land purchases assumed to be happening in the future. You're saying this: you can designate anyone under the order of the executive branch of government to investigate any land holding in the province of Saskatchewan. You can come in and investigate mine, and then the board will have the responsibility to submit a report to you, and I say that that's wrong, Mr. Minister. It's wrong in every function.

Does that mean the next step is you're going to take Federated Co-op and tell them to have every one of the people that they pay a dividend to report to this Assembly in the same fashion you're doing here? Is that the kind of thing that you want to do? And, Mr. Minister, I'll even go so far as to say this: they're doing away with that in Russia today. The KGB (Komitet

Gosudarstvennoy Bezopasnosti) is gone. Why are you putting it back into Saskatchewan where you, as an executive member of Executive Council, have that right? I don't believe you have that right. And I believe that you should move that and strike it from the record. It should be gone. That, Mr. Minister, is what you're doing. And you can investigate every land holding.

In fact I've been reading a book about how they took over in Stalin's time in Russia, and it deals . . . similar functions were occurring to the people that were representing my family in Moscow, is exactly what they were doing there. Do you know why? So they could gain control of the agenda on the land. That, Mr. Minister, is what you're doing. You say you're not. Well then take it out of there. Why are you put it in there? And that's the question we're going to be asking every person in the province of Saskatchewan as we travel around with this Bill, saying do you know that the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Justice can look at your land holdings and ask you to submit every land holding and every share value that you have in land, in agricultural land in the province of Saskatchewan?

And they can order that and then turn around, if you don't submit to that, Mr. Minister . . . And of course you can make an exemption to your friends — which is something they also do over there — you make an exemption to your friends, and the ones you don't exempt, they go to jail. And those that don't go to jail, they pay a hundred thousand dollar fine, Mr. Minister. You think that's fair?

Are you going to put the corporation called the Royal Bank in jail for this? No, you wouldn't do that because they have a special exemption status. But you will do that to individuals who contravene this Act. You'll put them in jail, fine them \$10,000. If it's a non-agricultural corporation, you get a \$100,000 fine. And it's based on your investigation, and we think that's wrong. It's been wrong for ever.

As a matter of fact, the people in the province of Saskatchewan came from that, and they don't want it back.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — I think the member opposite is somewhat carried away. I don't see anything relating to the KGB in this particular Bill. And I think if the opposition is of a mind to travel the province with this particular clause as their issue, I think that bespeaks rather poorly of their talents and their performance of their job, because I think there should be more serious issues available to them to criticize than to try to make a KGB issue out of a rather innocuous clause.

I think all this is intended is to use the expertise of the independent board, to give them the power to enforce the Act that's there — that was there, as I point out again, under the previous administration. I think the provisions before were rather sloppy that we would say: go ahead, you know, we're not going to stop you from buying this land; except after you get it sold,

we're going to order you to sell it again.

I think that's very disruptive for any community and for any business that's in the province. I think this is very simply a matter of trying to give the board the proper administrative ability to enforce the law that's been on the books for 15 years.

Mr. Martens: — Well, Mr. Minister, people are beginning to believe that that law shouldn't be there any more. People are beginning to believe that there should be an opportunity to sell the land to whoever you want.

Mr. Minister, you have two classes of people — your Health bureaucrats said it right — there's going to be two classes in the province of Saskatchewan, rural and urban. And what you're doing is making a different class of people with rural people.

And in my paper, the one that you handed to me, it says:

“... the minister may direct the board to investigate any matter regarding farm ownership ...

It doesn't say any purchase possibilities. It doesn't say any future considerations by individuals to purchase land. It doesn't say anything like that at all. It says “any matter concerning farm ownership” in the province of Saskatchewan. You can do that, sir, and we don't think that that's right. We don't think that that is at all right.

As a matter of fact, have you taken and told SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) what you're doing with this? Have they told you that's a great idea? I'll bet you you haven't even talked to them about it. And you wouldn't even dare talk to them about it because they don't believe that's the right thing to do either.

And, Mr. Minister, it says here, the board will be required upon the minister's request “to investigate any matter regarding farm ownership” and then submit that report back to you, Mr. Minister.

And then what does the board have to do? It can make:

... an order declaring null and void any instrument or document by which a land holding is or may be acquired in contravention of this Part;”

So you can order the board to order a divestiture of any land. You can say that to any individual who owns land in the province of Saskatchewan. And that, Mr. Minister, I believe is wrong. It's never right.

And what you have done, sir, you've stood in your place in this Assembly and said that every contract with the crop insurance people in the province of Saskatchewan, the farmers, is null and void. You said that. And how should we expect to respect any

decision you make that isn't going to do exactly the same thing with the people in the province of Saskatchewan who own the land. And that, Mr. Minister, is wrong.

And I think you need to qualify your powers in this base because I think it contravenes the Human Rights Code. And the Human Rights Code has pre-eminence over every other law. And that, Mr. Minister, is wrong in Saskatchewan; it's wrong in Canada. And I also believe, Mr. Minister, that you're out of order on the Canadian Bill of Rights as excluding Canadians from owning land in Saskatchewan.

And I want to tell you this too, Mr. Minister: under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, freedom was given for individuals to move from province to province without restriction in any job opportunity. And yet in farm land, you decide that you have the right to investigate anyone who comes into this province, anyone who is here. And that, Mr. Minister, is wrong. It's wrong as wrong can be. And that, Mr. Minister ... You may make light of it, but the people in the province of Saskatchewan, when the justices come to this section of the Bill, they will have nothing left to do but respond to it and you, sir, can do anything you want.

My question to you is this: will you unilaterally be able to transfer land bank land or lease land under lands branch at your discretion any time you want knowing that you have this authority to do this?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Section 96 is in no way connected to the powers of the board under the Act. The member opposite makes great to-do about the Canadian Bill of Rights and so on, and that's a rather interesting phenomena for ... It was okay for 10 years while they were in power for these two Acts to coexist, but now it's a great wrong and needs to be corrected. That, I think, the voters of the province will certainly see through that.

I think the issue here is not any great change in an Act that's been in place for 15 years, and it's strictly administratively better to administer. And I think this will make the Act better for people who are wanting to sell their land and better for people who are wanting to buy land and clears everybody involved.

I think it was just simply improvement of an Act that's been in place, and I think the member makes wide-ranging accusations which I think are totally groundless.

(1615)

Mr. Martens: — Well that's your interpretation of it. But you're not going to do the interpreting when it comes down to the fact that the court is going to make a decision about an individual going to dispose of his land. The board will make a decision on the basis that the minister who appoints the board will determine what they have to live with.

And that, Mr. Minister, is what we're talking about.

You're going to make the decision for the board to investigate. The board will turn around and give back its findings and then you, sir, are going to make the decision. You're going to make the decision whether this individual has to pay a fine or whether he goes to jail.

And that, Mr. Minister, is what we think is in contravention of every right that an individual in the province of Saskatchewan has. And that, Mr. Minister, is why we don't like this Bill.

Would you be able to tell me — you didn't answer the question — would you be able to tell me whether you have the right to transfer on a sale arrangement with an individual on leased land? Would you be able to transfer that to a new individual without that individual knowing it, based on the fact that the board has made a recommendation to you that the individual no longer qualifies to own land in the province of Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — No, that is absolutely not the case.

Mr. Martens: — How do you handle a person who lives in Alberta and owns land in Saskatchewan? How will he be dealt with under the framework of this Act?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — If a person living in Alberta . . . again, if he's moved from Saskatchewan, has the right to maintain the land. If he does not, if he's an Alberta resident, then the board, which is independent, has the power to order the person to divest the land. If the person fails to do that, then the board is obliged to apply to a court to have the order carried out, and at no point does the minister or the cabinet come into that equation.

Mr. Martens: — Oh yes they do, Mr. Minister. They come into the equation when you order the board to do an investigation. And that, Mr. Minister, is where the problem is.

And I would say to you: who appointed the board? The board was appointed by you and Executive Council. And you have the authority over the board. You have the responsibility for the board. You can tell the board what to do and what to say and where to draw the line. And you, Mr. Minister, have a problem. And I think the people of Saskatchewan have even a bigger problem. And if I'd had my druthers, I'd of druther have this thing thrown out completely and allow the people in Canada to be able to buy land in Saskatchewan.

Are we Canadian or what? Do you want to build a wall around Saskatchewan? Well yes, sir, you have. Do you want to have Canadians be able to come in and buy land? I don't have a problem with that at all. This is just as exclusive as Bill 101 or 105 in Quebec dealing with French language.

An Hon. Member: — 101.

Mr. Martens: — 101, thank you. And I don't think that

this is any different than that, Mr. Minister. You have exclusive rights for only the people in the province of Saskatchewan, and I think that's wrong. If you're a Canadian, you're a Canadian and you ought to be treated that way.

And that, Mr. Minister is where this Bill should be going — not more restrictive than it was before, not with you having the powers to investigate, and not with you having the authority to determine whether an individual is out of line or not, and then beginning to change the rules as you go along, like you do with every other contract that you have in place. That, Mr. Minister, is the reason why we're complaining about this.

Would you provide for me an estimate of . . . or an evaluation or an explanation of how the court or you or the board will rule to have contravention of this Act, have the individual qualify for an exemption, or be put in jail or get a fine? Can you give me the distinction of those three possibilities and what will happen to each of them?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Section 96 again has no connection to the enforcement. The enforcement hasn't changed. It's interesting to me that all the members opposite stand up and say that this is a bad Bill and should be done away with. Ten years of government they didn't do it. I think that bespeaks of . . .

An Hon. Member: — Don't get political now or you'll be in here a long time.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Well I know they don't like me to bring this to their attention. But for 10 years they were there. They had a Bill they didn't like but they kept it there and they enforced it. That I think bespeaks a bit of their government.

All we've done is continued with the Bill. We disagree with their views on foreign ownership. We believe we should have controls on foreign ownership and we've cleared those up a bit.

As to the questions, it's the board has the power to order divestiture, as it always had. That hasn't changed. If somebody fails to obey the order, then the board goes to court and the court has the power to enforce the rulings of the board.

And I think this is no more or no less than what was there before. All we're saying is that yes, we believe there should be restrictions on foreign ownership and we want a system that allows us to enforce that in a logical manner.

And I think that's as complicated as it gets. There's no KGB in here; there's no Stalin; there's no great plot. It's simply just the same foreign ownership laws that they put up with for 10 years, only they certainly disagreed with them, but in power they didn't change. And that's all it does. It just makes it a little easier to enforce those laws that were on the books for the last 20 years.

Mr. Martens: — Section 96, Mr. Minister, does far more than anything that we ever did. Section 96 says that you can order it. You can tell the board what to do. The minister through Executive Council has the authority now to order at any time he wants. And that's where it's wrong. And that's where we're saying it's wrong, Mr. Minister. And that makes a whole thing just absolutely totally different than anything that we ever did. As a matter of fact, that should be kicked right out of there, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Swenson: — I want to get this absolutely straight about what the minister is saying. My family is in the situation where I have cousins in Alberta right now who are on the second exemption. Their parents moved there prior to the Second World War, owned the land. They've now transferred it to their children.

Under section 96 of the Act, are you saying that my cousin's children can be ordered to divest that land on the personal order of the minister, that the minister has the power to tell my cousin in Alberta that they have to divest that land or order an investigation of them by your hand-picked board? Is that true?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — No that's absolutely not true. The minister cannot order any divestiture. That has not changed. The board has the power to order that divestiture and still have . . . all section 96 does is gives a minister power to do an investigation and have a written report. And that's all section 96 does. It was put there to use the expertise of the board to investigate large land sales that are occurring and has no connection to the enforcement section.

Your cousin has the same right of appeal, as the board has the same power to order divestiture as it had before this Act, and nothing has changed in that regard.

Mr. Swenson: — Well the reason I don't find that reassuring, Mr. Minister, is that you bring laws into this legislature and courts interpret them. That's where the nub hits it all the time.

The arrangement that my cousin has with someone else, vis-a-vis farming arrangements or a potential sale that they've worked out amongst themselves, that type of thing, if that goes awry, as I understand this legislation, you have the ability to personally order the board to intervene in that. If that tenant or that person who has an agreement for sale with my cousin, whatever, lays a complaint with you, in the past it had to go to the board. The complaint would have gone to the board if there was something there. But the board would have then had to fight it out in the court.

As I understand it now, you have the ability to order the board to interfere in that situation. And I say any time a minister has that ability, that you can play politics with your friends, that you can play politics with the lives of people. You can say, Mr. Minister, that we didn't change that. I regret that every day that I'm in this Legislative Assembly that Canadians are excluded. I think you exclude all kinds of opportunities because you do that.

But I don't see where you and executive powers of government can order anyone to do anything in regard to ownership of land in this province. I think that's abusive. And I don't know that you can assure me today that the courts won't interpret this thing down the road exactly like my colleague from Morse has been saying. Otherwise you should have left it alone. If you weren't afraid of how the board might deal with these things and you weren't afraid of the court system, you would have simply left it. It would have stayed on the books as it was since 1974.

But you have seen that you have to inject yourself and your cabinet colleagues and your political process into land tenure in this province where it didn't need to be before. Otherwise you simply would have let the courts deal with it; you would have let the board deal with it; you would have let the independent bodies that were in existence deal with it.

Tell me what power you were afraid of. Tell me what power you were afraid of that makes you as the minister have this extraordinary power in the province of Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Again I point out section 96 is only a report and has nothing to do with the enforcement powers. That continues as it has been. I think the members opposite, if you make the argument that we shouldn't have foreign ownership controls, that's a fine argument to make. I mean . . .

An Hon. Member: — Foreign is a whole lot different than Canadian.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Well, or Canadian. If you don't agree with the context of the Bill, that's fine. We agree to disagree. We believe we should have ownership controls on farm land. Obviously you disagree. I think, you know, you can make that argument and there certainly are arguments on both sides. But to stretch the bow to then go into some great thick plot that somehow, you know, that the Act that's been there for 10 years is a devious communist plot, I think is stretching the bow a bit far.

And I think if this Act continues and if it was a horrible thing that you lived with for 10 years but you managed to live with it, and now to say that because we put in section 96 which simply allows us as government to use the expertise of the board to investigate ownership problems is somehow a major change to the direction, is just not true.

Mr. Swenson: — Well my final point, Mr. Minister. The first time that someone in the province finds political meddling by a minister using this Act, are you willing to put your seat on the line and resign because of it? That's what I'm going to ask you to answer today.

Are you going to stand in your place in saying that I am absolutely confident that the political process won't be used in any way and that if it is found, that you're willing to vacate this Legislative Assembly and move out?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Well I think the members opposite know all about political meddling. As a minister, I do not indulge in it, and I have no intention of indulging in any political meddling with the farm land ownership board. And I don't think that this Act even gives the authority to do that sort of meddling.

And I think that . . . I suppose if a government, as you probably know, any government that's bent on doing political meddling will find a way regardless of the Acts that are in place. And this government is not into that sort of thing. So clearly I think the changes to this Act do not create opportunities for political meddling.

(1630)

Clause 1 agreed to on division.

Clauses 2 to 17 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 18 agreed to on division.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Chair, I'd just like to thank my officials for coming, and the opposition members for questions. Thank you.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I'd like to thank the officials for coming in and assisting the discussion here today.

Bill No. 73 — An Act to amend the Crop Insurance Act

The Chair: — I would ask the Minister of Agriculture to please introduce his official.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, with me I have Mr. Dale Sigurdson who is the ADM (assistant deputy minister) of Department of Agriculture.

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my official for coming in and doing such a wonderful job of handling the questions, and the members opposite for expediting the Bill.

Bill No. 20 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Superannuation Act

The Chair: — I would ask the minister responsible for SaskTel to please introduce the officials who have joined us.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Sitting on my immediate right is the vice-president of corporate affairs and counsel. On his immediate right is Tom Norris, senior planner, human resources.

Clause 1

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, in this Bill you're giving the power to administer the superannuation, the monies there, to the government, basically to the Lieutenant Governor in Council which is the cabinet. Why is the cabinet taking the power to administer these funds rather than allowing that power to rest with the employees and management of SaskTel?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — I'm informed by corporate counsel that there is in fact no change. The power to appoint them has always rested with Executive Council. The make-up is being changed, but the method of appointment remains the same.

Mr. D'Autremont: — How is that make-up being changed? Is there going to be more appointees from the Lieutenant Governor or the cabinet, or is there going to be . . . or how is that change going to affect the employees?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — We're increasing the number from three to five. The substantial change is that we're appointing a superannuate to the board. Legislation makes provision for that, so that's really the substantial change. The increase from three to five is consequential to that.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 5

The Chair: — I understand there is an amendment. If there is, then I would ask the minister to move it at this time.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — I move the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: — Has the amendment been distributed? Can we take the amendment as read or as circulated? Is the amendment agreed?

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, would you mind explaining the rationale for this amendment?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — The amendment is designed to provide the government with an additional degree of flexibility. We are caught between a need to downsize this Crown corporation as it moves from being a monopoly in telecommunications to being a competitor in telecommunications. That's one of the things we're trying to meet. We're trying not to get too far out of sync with other Crown corporations since employees inevitably make comparisons.

We also have ongoing a study on pensions, the pension review, and thus want to retain the flexibility to comply with any conclusions that may arise out of that study.

For all of those reasons, we want the additional

flexibility which is given to the Executive Council to bring this to an end. This is not something that's being done because it's an inherent right that employees ought to have. We are providing this benefit in order that the company can downsize, but when that goal is met, we wouldn't necessarily want to have it continued for ever.

There are the additional complexities I've mentioned of comparisons with other Crown corporations which we want to be able to meet, and the whole matter of pension review.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Basically this amendment would allow you to give one-time consideration to a certain number of employees to use as a downsizing method within the corporation. But I find when you talk about . . . because of the downsizing, you've turned around and increased the number of board members within this group.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — It wasn't as the member said — I think in a jocular fashion — to provide additional jobs for our friends. One is to permit superannuants to be represented; they've long demanded this and it's felt fair that their voice be heard. The additional position . . . that accounts for one of the two additional positions.

The second additional position was the desire to appoint someone with financial expertise and a financial background. And so we're doing that as well. So that suggests the . . . that accounts for the extra two members.

The Chair: — I'm informed that the time-saving device to take the amendment as circulated simply won't do to get it on the record, so I would ask the minister at this point to read the amendment and move it formally.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Could I ask the page to bring from the Table a copy of what you have. I'm not 1,000 per cent certain the copy which I have is the last draft. Thank you very much.

I move, seconded by the member from Moose Jaw Palliser:

That section 6 of the printed Bill be amended by striking out clause (b) and substituting the following . . .

The Chair: — I need the amendment at this point for section 5 of the printed Bill.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Okay. All right. I assume the member . . .

The Chair: — And we won't . . . in committee we won't require a seconder.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Well, you know, it takes a while before a person gets the rules here — that is very complex — gets them down pat.

I move this Assembly:

Amend clause 11.1(2)(a) of the Act, as being enacted by section 5 of the printed Bill, by striking out "as provided for in" and substituting "in accordance with".

I so move.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 5 as amended agreed to.

Clause 6

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — I move that this Assembly:

Amend section 6 of the printed Bill by striking out clause (b) and substituting the following:

"(b) by adding the following subsections after subsection (2):

'(3) Subject to subsection (4), where an employee retires before becoming entitled to a superannuation allowance pursuant to this Act, resigns or is dismissed from the service of the corporation or where the employee's office is abolished and the employee is no longer employed, at the employee's option all contributions to the superannuation fund that have been deducted from an employee's salary and standing to the employee's credit in the superannuation fund, together with accrued interest and an amount equal to the amount deducted from the employee's salary together with accrued interest, shall be transferred to an account in the employee's name in the Public Employees (Government Contributory) Superannuation Plan established pursuant to section 38 of *The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act* and administered in accordance with that Act if:

(a) the employee has not elected pursuant to subsection (1) to receive a refund of contributions and interest; or

(b) the employee has not elected pursuant to section 15 to receive a deferred allowance.

'(4) The Lieutenant Governor-in-Council may prescribe the date after which the option mentioned in subsection (3) may no longer be exercised by an employee, and after that date the option mentioned in subsection (3) ceases to exist'".

I so move.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 6 as amended agreed to.

Clause 7 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill as amended.

(1645)

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the opposition for their questions, the officials for their assistance, which was not inconsiderable, but for their wait, which was considerable this afternoon. So I'd like to thank all concerned.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We'd like to thank the minister and his officials for coming in today to answer our questions. And if the minister had been briefer with his answers, his people wouldn't have had to sit there so long.

Bill No. 80 — An Act to amend The Tobacco Tax Act and to make certain Consequential Amendments resulting from the enactment of this Act

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On my right is the associate deputy minister of Finance, Craig Dotson; behind him is Len Rog, the assistant deputy minister. Next to Len is Kirk McGregor, the executive director, taxation and intergovernmental affairs. We also have Doug Lambert, the director, revenue programs and legislation; and Murray Schafer, director, education and health tax.

Clause 1

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, these particular pieces of taxation legislation, I would have preferred — and I think the taxpayer would have preferred — coming much earlier in the session after the budget, given that you've been collecting this stuff all of this time, and they really haven't had the blessing of the Legislative Assembly.

And I would hope in the future that you would be more expeditious in moving this stuff forward to the Assembly after it is a budget item. I think it's only fair. I do remember distinctly those arguments being made by the former opposition whenever tax Bills were late in coming to this Assembly. I'll let you respond to that as to why they weren't brought ahead quicker.

But I also would say to you today that the opposition is prepared to move all three of these Bills through this Assembly very quickly if I can have your assurance that during your estimates . . . if I can have your assurance, Madam Minister, during your estimates that these issues can be dealt with and you simply won't stand up in here and say, well you had ample opportunity during discussion of the Bills to talk about them, I don't really feel like it any more.

So I guess if you would give me some response as to why you didn't bring these Bills ahead a lot quicker, and also your assurance that we can deal with all of these areas and anything that may be remotely related

to them on your estimates, then I'm prepared to move these taxation Bills through this House at this time.

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Chairman, yes. Thank you very much for those questions. I just checked with the officials. The tax Bills were introduced into the House May 5, the budget was March 18, so the time lag was not great.

But I will say this. I agree with your essential point that because the parliamentary tradition is based on the fact that no taxation without the approval of the legislature, when the taxes are being collected the day of the budget, which has to occur to prevent difficulties, I agree with the point that the tax Bills should then be brought to the legislature as quickly as possible.

With respect to your other point, I certainly have no problem making the commitment that anything relating to these Bills can be raised in estimates. And we will give you as thorough an answer in estimates as we would here today. And this may very well be a better way to use the House's time, to do it in a consolidated fashion. But I have no difficulty at all making the firm commitment that we will be willing to discuss these Bills in estimates in a thorough way.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 12 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill on division.

Bill No. 63 — An Act to amend The Fuel Tax Act, 1987

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill on division.

Bill No. 64 — An Act to amend The Education and Health Tax Act

Clauses 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

The division bells rang from 5:54 p.m. until 5:58 p.m.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 32

Wiens	Johnson
Tchorzewski	Draper
Shillington	Whitmore
Kowalsky	Sonntag
Mitchell	Roy
MacKinnon	Cline
Penner	Scott
Cunningham	Kujawa
Hagel	Crofford
Bradley	Stanger
Koenker	Knezacek
Lyons	Harper
Pringle	Kluz

Calvert
Murray
Hamilton

Carlson
Langford
Jess

under its title.

Bill No. 64 — An Act to amend The Education and Health Tax Act

Nays — 6

Swenson
Neudorf
Martens

Boyd
Britton
D'Autremont

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be now read the third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 74 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Farm Security Act

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Speaker, I move this Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to on division, the Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

Bill No. 73 — An Act to amend The Crop Insurance Act

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

Bill No. 20 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Superannuation Act

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — I move the amendments be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — With leave, I move the Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

Bill No. 80 — An Act to amend The Tobacco Tax Act and to make certain Consequential Amendments resulting from the enactment of this Act

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be now read the third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

Bill No. 63 — An Act to amend The Fuel Tax Act, 1987

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be now read the third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a third time and passed