

Farm Debt Review Act

least be a move in the right direction. I think the banks should take this as a notice that if they fool around with this legislation and do not co-operate with the will of Parliament as reflected in this legislation, they had better be prepared for some stronger legislation with some teeth. I see the Minister nodding and I know he is committed to that. In a sense we are serving notice to the banks of Canada that this is their opportunity to prove that they have the best interests of the agricultural community at heart.

I hope the Minister will go on record saying that if the banks do not co-operate, a review process will be put in place to make it clear to the people of Canada and the Parliamentarians who represent them that something else must be done.

• (1620)

We are very disappointed with Bill C-117, but nevertheless hope there will be an opportunity to improve it. Certainly a review process is necessary, and I hope the Minister will sit down with the banks and tell them just how strongly we feel. Unless they come through on this legislation, they can expect something in the form of a farm credit arrangements Act to be introduced shortly.

Mr. Hovdebo: Mr. Chairman, I have a considerable number of things I would like to put on the record, but I am concerned about the procedure here. We have less than an hour to go today and obviously we cannot pass the Bill because we do not have the amendments which have been suggested and which the Minister has agreed to. I wonder if we could have established some kind of procedure to allow us to go through this very quickly and find out which amendments will be accepted and then give the Minister and his staff time to draft them in an acceptable form. Rather than take the time to make a number of statements at this point I would rather proceed with it, if that has the agreement of the House.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: May I point out to Hon. Members that the amendments presented to the Table appear to be in order technically. Certain Members have brought up points concerning amendments to Clause 2. Therefore, I presume they will not get into extensive arguments when the specific clause to which the amendment is addressed comes up. The only way of dealing with the matter as far as the Table is concerned is to go through clause-by-clause and deal with each amendment as it comes up, taking into account the fact that as far as the Table is concerned the amendments presented are technically in order.

Clause agreed to.

On Clause 3—*Binding on Her Majesty*

Mr. Foster: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the Minister can respond to this right now, but Clause 3 says that this Act is binding on Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province. I am just wondering why it binds on a province as well. It is a technical point that the briefing officer did not

clarify for me and I wonder if the Minister is familiar with that clause?

Mr. Wise: Mr. Chairman, I believe that what is meant there is that once an arrangement is made, it is accepted by the review panel. The review panel has the authority to make that arrangement legal and binding. It is really nothing more and nothing less than a contract. So far as contractual law is concerned, that is clearly a provincial jurisdiction and that is what is meant in this particular clause.

Mr. Foster: That is fine, Mr. Chairman.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 4 agreed to.

On Clause 5—*Remuneration*

Mr. Foster: Mr. Chairman, Clause 5 provides that the Governor in Council may provide remuneration for board members. Could the Minister indicate what the board members will be paid, the per diem?

Mr. Wise: No, Mr. Chairman, I cannot indicate at this point what the rate of remuneration will be. Obviously we will use federal guidelines which reflect an acceptable remuneration now being paid to people performing similar functions.

Mr. Althouse: I wonder if the Minister has thought through the type of remuneration he is talking about here. Will these board members all be paid on a per diem basis or will some be paid monthly or annual salaries?

Mr. Wise: As I understand it, there will be a chairman and more than likely that will be a full-time, salaried position. However, I am not ruling out the possibility, if we agree that a certain individual is a suitable person to serve in that capacity, that it would be done on the basis of a contract. I would think members of the board would be on a per diem basis, but again it might well be on a contract.

Mr. Althouse: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Minister for that response. Can he go further? Clause 9 deals with the Public Service Employment Act which would set the guidelines for employees of the board. Does the Minister have any comparable guidelines that he would be using to set the remuneration for these board members? What types of boards would he use as a guide? Would it be, say, the National Energy Board, the FCC or what? Can we have some sort of idea of the remuneration he is talking about?

Mr. Wise: Mr. Chairman, my first reaction, not having had an opportunity to consult the appropriate officials but using some common sense, is that the advisory board of the Farm Credit Corporation might well serve as a guide for the level of remuneration on a per diem rate.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 6 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

On Clause 11—*List of Persons*