

1) Do you prefer to own or lease the land you are farming?

#	Response
1.	As land prices have increased it is no longer economical to own every piece of land, nor is all land available for purchase.
2.	Don't make any return in lease or rented land after your cost of inputs, time value of money and storage. Land owners want their money at bad times (when market is flooded and lower prices)
3.	Foreign investors can buy land which they think is cheap, giving young guys a harder time to afford it, then they rent out for as much as they can get making it harder again for the next generation to expand.
4.	Would like to own all but not able to purchase due to over inflated prices of land
5.	Land equity is all we have in bad times to survive.
6.	With the price of rent these investors are demanding it doesn't make sense to rent.
7.	Buy owning land we are able to build up equity that can be refinanced during difficult times or as security on revolving credit allowing us to continue expanding our operation. Land secured loans provide lower interest rates.
8.	Prefer to purchase but as a 37 year old farmer I can't compete with these large investment companies to purchase land. My great grandfather came to Saskatchewan for this exact reason. Hope history doesn't repeat itself.
9.	Would prefer to own the majority of it and make payments towards ownership rather than "throw" it away towards lease payments and have nothing to show for it after.
10.	would like too own but all the outside investment companies have driven up land prices to where it's hard to turn a profit
11.	To many big farms to let the young guys have a shot at farming and keeping young people around is what's needed in rural areas to keep communities alive
12.	Prefer to own but it is nearly impossible to buy land as a young farmer. Corporations and investors buy outrages price making impossible for young farmers
13.	I'm a young farmer and can't compete with the high land prices and rents brought on by outside investors but would like to own land for my farm operation
14.	I prefer ownership for the fact that the value of land is mine and that I worked hard to purchase and own. As a farmer that becomes part of your farm just like your equipment. I understand it's nearly impossible to farm without renting but to me leasing or renting just seems as an accessory to your farm to make money
15.	Prefer to own if affordable and would Lease from a local retired farmer. Not an investor.
16.	Hard to buy land due to mining and foreign investors driving up demand for lad
17.	Keep Saskatchewan land in the hands of Saskatchewan farmers.

18.	We want to own but cannot manage to get any more. It is more viable to own but the foreign investors and corporate farms and Indian reserves have made that impossible.
19.	Rent payments don't build equity or growth ownership does, however, with the high cost of land I am forced to rent to offset the cost of purchasing.
20.	I have never leased land but I believe in ownership. The ability to grow my acres and eventually have a family member farm the land
21.	I like the security and continuity that I can enjoy when I own and control the land. I know I can plan on farming that land and what my associated costs are for the foreseeable future.
22.	Land is always a sound investment; you are not throwing away land rent that instead is equity to further improve your farming way of life. Owning also ensures the land you're taken care of for years does not get sold out from under you to foreign investors who all too often don't care for or ensure land is properly cared for and utilized.
23.	Owning is always better depending on the cost
24.	<p>We rent and own around 4,000 acres. There should have been a next question of 5,000 and under and 10,000 and over to show how many Factory Farms are out there! Maybe you don't want to know!</p> <p>We have tried to buy land in the area but investors have been buying up blocks of land. So instead of land near us being for sale on its own, it is being clumped into larger real estate blocks from around the area. The investor buys this land mass and either farms it, or sells off any slough/shrub filled land to anyone who will buy it for the price they overpaid. Or doesn't sell anything off.</p> <p>Other land we have farmed for decades is rented and is not for sale, (we have offered) although they tell us they have been approached by people to sell, they are loyal to us for now, but they are aging, who knows after they pass away.</p>
25.	I would prefer to own all my land as once it's owned, you can then make more of a profit and I don't have a pension plan as a farmer, owned land is my pension plan. As ownership is expensive, that means the equipment also; leasing is a way of getting by until you are in a position to purchase more. Much like city people renting until they can afford to buy.
26.	Land I own I can afford to improve and maintain as the payback time can be decades. Rented land I am only looking to pay the rent.
27.	More profitable to own. You are on control if you own.
28.	I am 20 years old and feel the government is selling out Saskatchewan's agriculture, we have been using the pfra for 3 generations and no one knows what is happening with it and now this, makes it very hard to look into the future with optimism
29.	Renting land helps us young farmers start to get ahead. 25% down through FCC is unbearable with the local inflated land prices caused by the Assiniboia land group. Nice to own land as it is guaranteed acres and gives you something to retire on.
30.	Our family is farming together...our children are eager for expansion...purchasing land/leasing land has become out of our reach...too much competition

31.	The inflated price of rent, you might as well own it if you have to pay those lease rates.
32.	I would love to buy the land I lease but with the spike in land prices it is too expensive to buy unless grain prices take a huge jump. Unfortunately I cannot make a living on the 1000 acres I own so I have to lease land to make ends meet.
33.	More security in owning my own land.
34.	I prefer to own the land. But because of the ridiculous cost that these big farmers and corporate farms are paying I cannot afford it.
35.	Being a young farmer working a full time job to try to get myself into farming full time. Sounds realistic but each day seems longer till the dream comes true! Can't afford to buy land due to foreign investors driving land price up!
36.	with rental rates where they are profit margins are tight therefore making owning more profitable
37.	Prefer to own but cannot at current price of land
38.	owned land for backing and longevity and leasing for convenience
39.	land values in our area are so outrageously high that what I pay for rent wouldn't service the interest on the loan over 20 years never mind the principle
40.	Rather own the land then rent because don't have to worry about some big farmer or investor trying to grab it from me
41.	If the land was avail. To purchase we would be interested. In our case it is not going to be for sale as it is mostly reserve land that we lease
42.	It is much more desirable to own what you till.
43.	Beginning inter-generational transfer
44.	predictability of annual land costs
45.	Land values are overvalued making purchasing land a poor financial decision due to the fact that the commodity price are low and inputs are at an all-time high. Can't compete with investors whom have deep pockets which turn and sell the land to another investor which in the meantime corporate farms go bust due to poor management that farm the land. Family farms become unsustainable.
46.	There is more security in owning the land however financially because of inflated land prices it is cheaper to lease
47.	Prefer to own because you know that you have that land to farm each year. Renting is so uncertain. We know of neighbors who have lost their rented land because of another farmer offering more rent money. Money talks when you only own land for investment purposes.
48.	It is impossible for me to buy land in my area with foreign investment and corporate investments driving up the prices
49.	You can be a better steward for the land during ownership. Land quality is always better. Owning the land also helps during financing, equity is easier built.

50.	The rent values are \$100 to \$125/acre. That level brings significant risk; it makes sense with interest rates low to make a land payment by adding the principal portion to what would be considered the rent portion, and eventually owning the land.
51.	I would like to own the land that I farm for many reasons. As a farmer you work your whole life and reinvest in the farm to secure a retirement and to make the farm in better shape than it was when you started so you can pass it on to the next generation of farmer. In many cases a family member.
52.	Owning my land allows me to make the decisions that are best for the health of my land and soil rather than chasing the highest short term profit possible.
53.	Lots of leased land needs improvement and if you don't own it your reluctant to spend a pile of money for improvement
54.	Owning at today's land prices is too much risk when the likelihood of reduced commodity prices is looming Also the average yield of crops we have been growing is much higher in recent years than can be expected in long term
55.	Ownership provides security of land base and potential for increased value
56.	Owning the land provides the cost of what would be the rent or lease to be kept in the operation of the farm so it could be used to better my financial situation. Farming is an up and down game. Good years are followed by bad years. To be successful you need to limit your expenses where you can.
57.	When you own land you gain equity plus the income from farming. When you lease land all you gain is a small profit, or in some cases loss. In order to farm this leases land expensive machinery must be purchased which depreciates each year. You never really gain much on leases land.
58.	Owning our own land makes more sense. You won't lose it if you own it
59.	Owning land increases your equity. If you lease the land you have very little equity in which to borrow money to buy land.
60.	Ownership allows you more control as to how you farm. Organic, conventional, etc. Also, there is more assurances as to if you can farm from year to year. Nothing like going back to a feudal system where land was rented from the lord of the manor!!!!
61.	I firmly believe and have witnessed in our area that owners our better stewards of the land.
62.	With the price of land it's getting almost impossible to get started farming. Which means the death of young farmers and the takeover of corporate farms. There will no longer be the friendly neighbour that will help his neighbours out now it will be just a corporation that wants you to fail so they can take your land also.
63.	Always like to buy rather than lease, more control farming your own land.
64.	We like to invest in the land so that we build up equity rather than pay the same amount of money each year and end up with nothing. The problem is that land prices are so high that it is difficult to buy land now.

65.	Land values have escalated to levels that I am unable to buy at. Taking on additional land would jeopardize my entire operation. Land that I rent has continually been bought out from under me and I don't know what the future holds.
66.	I would prefer to own land rather than rent but the prices and the amount for sale is prohibitive.
67.	Ownership gives farmer a feeling of land stewardship. A tenant is only out for 100% profit that year and will over use the land until its yield potential is diminished, then give up the lease. This is leading to reduction of shelterbelts which will cause massive farm failures during next 10 dry cycles. An owner will take care of land and not overuse, as it is their land.
68.	We have a grazing lease with the province that makes up 60% of our acreage. We would prefer to own all of our grazing land. We bought some of our lease back three years ago, but the asking price was too high for us to buy back all that was available. Someday I would like to buy more.
69.	Have farmed for 30 years, rented my land out last year. Prefer to own my land over renting. However I believe that we are in a world market and if I can sell my produce to the world, buy my inputs and machinery from the world, then I should compete with the world for my land costs.
70.	I would like to own more land but it's pretty hard to compete against multi-millionaire investors and pension investors from outside of Saskatchewan or Canada something has to change very quickly not in years. My opinion is if you don't farm the land why you should have land as an investment when farmers are trying to make an honest living. Invest in the stock markets
71.	There will be a direct relationship between lease rates and land ownership costs, as long as open market conditions exist.
72.	I recognize ownership as an asset as opposed to a lease that has little value other than the current year
73.	Owning land means I will always benefit from the copious amount of work and care I put into the land to ensure it stays high quality soil
74.	If you own, you are putting something down for your retirement-an investment. If you rent, you either have to save diligently or when you are done, you have no equity.
75.	We own most of our land and rent some land. We are in limbo about land purchases right now as we are in a PFRA pasture for majority of our cattle and do not know what is happening.
76.	The only way to get ahead is to buy land. Leasing can be used to spread machinery costs over acres but true wealth in farming comes from purchasing land, an asset which holds its value or appreciates over time. Machinery depreciates. Even cash depreciates with inflation.
77.	Owning farmland is good, pass it down through the generations
78.	The ranching/farming lifestyle involves a lot of hard work & dedication. Most often the 'investments' the landowners have are just that, the land & assets they have managed to acquire over the years. The challenge is the parents often work longer & their retirement package is when they liquidate their farm or ranch. We need to keep land at a feasible price so young people can afford to take over the operation & not compete with foreign investors and

	<p>huge corporate investing to do so. Consumer demand is headed towards production of safe food & accountability. Landowners who actually own & manage the land have a lot more than money invested; it's their blood, sweat & tears resulting in land management and production second to none.</p>
79.	<p>I already took the survey but wanted to add a comment: on just one quarter of land; say it grows canola at 55 bushels per acre and it sells for \$10 bushel for easy figuring (a nice crop at a nice price). That land generated \$88,000 in gross income. If I own it, I pay taxes on that income to the Saskatchewan gov, if a guy from Alberta owns it, he pays the income tax to Alberta, if it is owned by a corp in any other state or country, they pay their government for that income. Now, which jurisdiction pays for the roads to that land, pays for disaster relief if the land floods, dries up and blows away or hit with infestations of X, Y or Z? What restrictions are put on land that is marginal at best, with 100s of years of historical rainfall data to demonstrate that the land is easily broken and susceptible to severe destruction?</p>
80.	<p>I'd prefer to own it someday but as a young farmer getting into farming it is impossible... If you don't inherit a farm these days you can't make a go of it. Once my dad retires there's no way I would be able to take over without a handout and I'm not asking for one of those.</p>
81.	<p>I prefer to own but some land is too much to take on mortgage payments for my growing operations at this time and some landowners are not ready to sell so I've leased some to keep expanding.</p>
82.	<p>Have to own the land to build equity, I you only lease then when you die then it all goes back to the government, which is bad; have to own it to pass it to your kids.</p>
83.	<p>Trying to build a home on farmland is next to impossible. You can't use your RRSP'S and the paperwork and the 20% down payment isn't always easy to work out... it would be nice if you could use your investments for collateral. Ownership is still the most secure and stable way to farm... it provides permanency.</p>
84.	<p>I prefer to have equity in my land.</p>
85.	<p>I prefer to own my land. Leasing land makes sense short term, but owning is much better long term. No one plans to farm for only 5 years, it's a lifetime endeavor.</p>
86.	<p>Leased land helps to pay mortgage on owned land</p>
87.	<p>With ownership you have control over the land, your pricing is set (land payment), and you are building equity.</p>
88.	<p>Owning land is permanent there is no doubt about next year's plans.</p>
89.	<p>Would far rather be putting rent money towards owning the land but the retired farmers aren't selling and if they do I have to compete against other local farmers and random buyers from???</p>
90.	<p>What is a more stable owning your house or renting it? You can't pass on a rental agreement to your kids and say "here is a stable, viable, business for you to run - take pride in it!" you can transfer a rent agreement but it's just not the same. Agriculture is just coming on its own - generational farms are finally making money. Big business in agriculture is here (think Monsanto, etc.). Let's keep some form of a conscience in the agriculture industry - the family farm; after all it is our food we are growing here!! Keep investment plans and foreign</p>

	ownership out of the Saskatchewan food business.
91.	If you lease your land, you are putting your income at risk because that land could be taken away at any time. There is enough risk in farming, we don't need more. Also, farmland is a good investment as it always appreciates in the long run.
92.	When leasing land, you are giving away a major part of the profit. Owning land allows the farmer to build equity this is a farmer's retirement fund or at least part of it.
93.	I prefer to own the land because not only do I build equity, but I can monitor, maintain, enhance, and reinvest in the land without risk of losing it to another farmer/company. At some point my land can be passed on to family or put up for sale to local buyers to keep people in the community and give opportunity to another local person looking to expand.
94.	Be big wig fools made rich by oil have the opportunity to invest and own Saskatchewan land. This is a matter where the rich should not profit. If they wish to invest. Live here.
95.	Leasing puts money in the owner's pocket. I prefer to own my land.
96.	We rent a bit from a family member, rent 1 quarter from someone else whom lives in a city. Recently purchased 1 of her quarters, but due to high land prices we are renting one until we can get a bit outa debt from recently purchased.
97.	Owning land is much more secure in terms of long range planning. Also, the pride of ownership means that owned land is farmed more sustainably and long - range improvements like soil - building practices are much more likely to occur.
98.	Leasing does not have enough permanency. We farm for life - not just the good years. It is too difficult to plan very far ahead when every few years you have to negotiate a new rental contract with the landowners.
99.	If it doesn't come up for fair sale it's hard to own. And if it does we don't have the money foreign investors have.
100.	Continuing to build equity in our farm and include a new generation of our children wanting to come home to farm requires ownership to move forward. Land lease or rental agreements are subject to renewal in a very competitive land rental market making it unprofitable for you people to move forward
101.	Prefer to own but because land prices are so high, it is almost impossible for a young farmer to start anywhere nowadays
102.	Would prefer to own but land prices and investors make it difficult to purchase.
103.	some base ownership mixed with lease allows for a less capital intense operation
104.	Crown land lease and family operated/owned land. I farm but I am a food producer.
105.	I am presently retiring from farming and rented most off my land out
106.	Land is getting to expensive to buy and make it profitable, with investment companies buying up land.

107.	would like to own but it's became too expensive
108.	ffff
109.	You need to lease to build up your land base and add purchases when you have down payment saved up...I could not of farmed if I could not leased land.
110.	We have always rented land.
111.	I prefer to own if the return is there but leasing does have options when financing is tough
112.	I view land as an investment. To build for another generation or to sell to the young farmer down the road when I want to retire.
113.	We always have owned a majority of the land we farm the local joke is if we rent it we eventually own it. Ownership by farmers is way better than renting to an out of country Canadian. Both local land barons live in Vancouver and Regina for about 3 months of the year then back in China. So are they really Canadian or just have a three month holiday in Canada.
114.	Times are changing. Started in 76 and was almost impossible to rent land to get started. Had to buy so was not able to expand my operation as fast as I would have liked.
115.	Smaller businesses farmers that are just starting out may not have the financial means to purchase all the land they are needing, therefore leasing is the next option to build an income for loans etc.
116.	It's hard to rent from people who don't understand agriculture they think just plant seeds and get a big pay cheque.
117.	Cannot afford high priced land so we prefer lease the expensive stuff
118.	No need to waste money on something that isn't yours and the lease owner can dictate price per acre. Especially when the leaser can uses phoney markets to justify price
119.	We have a mixture right now that works for us.
120.	I love to own the land so that I can feel more of a sense of responsibility to take care of the land and invest into maintaining soil sustainability. I'm proud to be able to own land that my forefathers own and want to keep it that way.
121.	My wife and I own 50% of our farm and rent the other 50% from my father in law which we are in the process of purchasing.
122.	Cash has always seemed tight, as a farmer for 40 years it seems to have been a work in progress, have some extra money, need to get this or that bigger or some extra land. My retirement is my equity in my farm.
123.	There is more security in owning. It is much easier to plan your future knowing the land rent won't increase or the land won't be suddenly sold from underneath you.
124.	It is hard to get bank loans for farmland especially if there is a residence involved. I have recently purchased a half section with a yard that we now live in. The amount of hoops we had to jump through was ridiculous. Banks will lend you an infinite amount of money to buy a house in a city but very little to buy one on agricultural land!!! Also owning land is the only way that farming makes sense. It is your security and your retirement fund. Leasing land is costly and at the end of the day you own nothing. Margins are too small in farming to not have

	something secure that you can count on!
125.	The rent investment groups are demanding is not reasonable. The farmer is forced to carry a disproportionate amount of the risk in profiting from the land.
126.	I find that with land values going up so is land rent. Land rent is a sunk cost. I would rather put that money towards something I have equity in. Rent can be justified at \$50/ac or less but anything more than that it gets too risky in case of a crop failure
127.	With the rising cost of farm land I have been unable to purchase land, any that does come on the market seems to be snapped up by investment buyers, also it seems the realtors that are involved are in the pockets of the investment buyers, and it is a fairly unfair scenario.
128.	Having the ability to own land you have a long term commitment to the land and do not need to constantly compete with the constantly changing market.
129.	Leasing land does not build equity or add value to operations
130.	There is more risk in leasing unless you have firm contracts with right of first refusal in the event of death of a land owner. In some situations, a farmer may lease most of the land he farms and there is a high risk in leasing land without some rights afforded to the lessee
131.	We want to own our land as it is an investment for us and our children and their future.
132.	Economic reality tells me in the short term leasing may be lower cost, but in the long term ownership will be more cost effective.
133.	When u own the land u can farm it in your practice way and u know that the rotation of your crops and lay of the land and cost of rent is not going to be adjusted or sold on u.
134.	I would like to own it to show something for the money I am selling and I can farm it the way I want it farmed not the way the land owner wants it farmed.
135.	We are young farmers and can't afford to buy more land, renting & leasing works for us at this time to have a larger land base than our home 1/4
136.	I would prefer to own land. I am finding it increasingly difficult to compete with a couple of the largest corporate farms in our area already as they seem to have endless amounts of money to invest, no matter what the crops do. I am thinking they are already investing money through the back door from outside investors. This loophole also needs to be addressed. Outside ownership does absolutely nothing for local families or local communities.
137.	Chinese shouldn't be allowed in. They own farms around us we as young farmers will never be able to expand. No one is going to under sell their land to you ever. If Chinese want to pay top dollar anyone who wants to sell will. We are going to have to move.
138.	Owning land allows for a sense of surety in operations. Knowing that your land base won't be pulled out from under you and leased to someone else from year to year, gives stability to my operation and the local economy.
139.	Owning means you have something in the end. Something to pass down to your children, so farms can still be owned by born and raised Saskatchewan residents.
140.	I would rather work towards owning property than continually leasing.

141.	Ownership has been the most available way to access land locally but long term leasing has potential to allow us to expand without major capital outlay.
142.	I have only been involved in farming for eight years but have found it impossible to purchase more farm land to expand my farm into a more viable unit. I've made a couple of offers on land but the price at which land is changing hands ensures a loss to me. In fact, my last offer was close to the asking price and would have created a break even for me meaning than no profit would have been earned on the land but at least no loss would have occurred. My offer was not accepted. I'm concerned about the trend of retiring farmers not selling their land but holding onto it and just leasing it out to the highest bidder. The best situation for Saskatchewan is to have farmers that are land owners and that the farms are limited in size so that more farmers can come into agriculture. It would be terrible if Canadians and Saskatchewan residents become nothing but a population of "share croppers".
143.	Although leasing helps generate income long term stability comes with owning the land.
144.	Cost of leasing going up dramatically every year and sometimes the land we lease is not able to be farmed thus still costing us but no benefit to us. If all the money we have paid in rent over the 30 plus years we have leased could go towards the purchase of the land we would have paid for it already.
145.	I would like to own so I would be working towards no land payments later on
146.	Prefer to own what we can afford but lease the remainder of the land to make the farm large enough to be viable.
147.	It is nice the build equity in your farm land and have something to sell or pass on at retirement
148.	I would prefer to own, but land has become too expensive based on its productivity.
149.	Owning is an investment in my future. It is the only retirement pension plan that is realistically viable for farmers.
150.	Young Farmer Starting out and I would like to own land to borrow against as opposed to leasing and struggling to get enough capital for each season.
151.	I would like to own everything but the effect in the balance sheet would be hard to work with. I don't mind having investment outside the farm either and by not having principle payments in all of my land, renting land allows this to happen
152.	Would like to lease to own...
153.	I'm an age 30 farmer, our current land prices in the Lashburn region have been driven up by some Alberta land owners. Land used to be about 200k per quarter section in the last 4 years it's now over 300k Since we are near the border these buyers see Saskatchewan land as cheap compared to Alberta. So they are paying more for the land than the lands carrying capacity. For example for me to buy (finance 1/4 of farmland over 25 years). I have to use all the income off that one 1/4. Plus 70% of the income from another owned quarter of land for 25 years in order to pay down one purchased quarter section of land. So it takes 1.70 quarters of land to pay down a 25 year mortgage on one quarter of land. Would you pay 850k to own a 500k house? And in the market and weather unpredictability and its makes it impossible to buy land since these out of province guys raised values by 100,000 /quarter. Not a bright outlook for a young family farm starting out. How will I ever compete enough to own a sizeable land

	base to provide a stable long term farm operation and have a sizeable land base for retirement in 30-35 years?
154.	Would rather own land, and will purchase when comes available. Renting land allows farming more acres with the machinery we have. We own about 70% of our farmland.
155.	own the land leasing seems like going back to medieval times of kings owing everything and the peasants doing the work
156.	I live in northern Alberta and I have seen firsthand how these foreign investors and land banks impact the small farmer and how they also change the value of the land. Farmers cannot afford to compete with these investors and are losing out on opportunities to grow their livelihood. I think the current rules Saskatchewan are smart and I think they should eliminate the Canadian pension groups from buying farm land. You're going to affect Saskatchewan farmers if they are able to keep purchasing farmland that comes available.
157.	Owned land makes it easier to make decisions about future growth when there is no risk of losing rented land.
158.	Would rent if the option was there but in the past 5 years land we are interested in has been sold rather than rented when current owner stops farming or land is in long term lease where both parties are happy
159.	More security and reduced risk, allows for land improvement to own land
160.	With current low interest rates it makes much more sense to own land. Also you can put more into owned land because it is more secure.
161.	I find getting started farming takes a lot of capital and once you get your operation going economically - I don't want to have the lease taken away. Leasing in the short term may be the only way to make the farm unit economical.
162.	Owning land is what farming has been about forever in this province and that is what brought our forefathers here
163.	I own most of the grain land that I farm but rent most of my pasture land. The pasture is a crown lease with very reasonable rates. I would cost me significantly more to pasture my cows if I had to buy pasture land.
164.	My grandfather came to Canada from Europe to get away from being a serf....only the rich owned land there and his family just worked the land. I don't want that to happen here too for my kids and their kids.
165.	Land is an asset and I feel it is important to own it rather than lease it. I think it is important to keep the asset in the hands of the person who is farming it.
166.	When you lease land, there is always the uncertainty of whether you will be farming that land after a few years. It is hard to make long term plans.
167.	More security in ownership.
168.	Currently renting a quarter from my uncle but looking to purchase. It's hard in the southwest as we little guys can't get started and the big farmers don't care how much they have to pay for land driving all small farmers trying to start out of the picture

169.	Prefer to own and lease if had too. The land should always find its own value and not held up falsely by corporate or large entities. And not owned by people outside Saskatchewan. Hopefully we're not that greedy that we can't make Saskatchewan farmland available to those from Saskatchewan.
170.	A Saskatchewan resident should have the first right of farm land ownership. By allowing corporations or other investment ventures the wealth for Saskatchewan farmers is being taken away. Young farmers have no chance of competing.
171.	can make changes build bins etc. without permission
172.	Helps manage cash flow with a mix of each.
173.	I like owning my land instead of leasing. To me it's a sense of pride owning my land.
174.	Owning the land builds my equity whereas leasing - in the end - I don't own it and the lessor cannot decide to rent to someone else.
175.	Many of the owners we work with do not understand the business of farming very well. This can make negotiations tough and has resulted in some major issues at key times of the production season. As well, long term agronomic decisions sometimes get overlooked because of the risk of an uninformed landlord pulling land before the agronomic decision can provide its long term benefit.
176.	Although we rent about half of our land, we would rather put the rent money into a loan payment than continually pay for rent. That being said it is nice to have a small percentage of rented land because it helps bring income in and that income helps allow us to purchase more land
177.	Holding title to the land allows for better opportunity to consider the long term sustainability of the land in planning and carrying out farming operations. That said, there should be stronger regulation and monitoring of 'improvements' to farmland.
178.	To succeed I need stability of my productive base - leasing arrangements, despite long term provisions, cannot be made to be secure. I have learned this through difficult experience. My landlord was tempted to violate the terms of our agreement by non-farmer competitive pressure.
179.	Owning is security. Renting, especially from an absentee landlord, is not.
180.	how much equity can you gain by leasing Answer- 0
181.	I have farmed for 45 years did lease land in the past but just farm what I own now.
182.	As a young farmer, the current market based prices have increased to a point in recent years that they are no longer affordable to get into farming.
183.	With land values rising the rental rates also rise. In order to ensure long term viability it is vital to our success that we own the majority of our land. Another benefit of owning is that it guarantees that the land will not lose the rental contract. With the rapidly rising farmland prices due to out of province investors and limited supply it is making it harder to purchase much needed farmland.

184.	A mix fits with our financing options while reducing cost of production by spreading costs over larger land base
185.	I own slightly less than 1100 acres. Ownership is important to me because the sale of the land will give us the cash need to buy a house in town when we retire. Land values increase as housing values increase, so land ownership helps us to keep up with inflation.
186.	Have been raised on a Saskatchewan farm. Took pride in being able to own our own farmland and operate it ourselves.
187.	Although it is higher risk to own land, that is what I want. Young farmers can't buy the land at the prices already, but I still can. Letting the pension fund come in and buy land just allows young farmers to be able to farm easier and become established. It is only older farmers that benefit from keeping out non-residents of Saskatchewan.
188.	<p>I'd like to own all farmland that I will farm, who doesn't? The issue is: what kind of Saskatchewan we want it to be? Personally, I hope to see a booming agricultural community just like ON and BC. I believe we can achieve that by opening the market. We couldn't do it by restricting ownership before 2002, right? And the most important thing, I'd like to see freedom.</p> <p>For whoever support restricted ownership, if they own some farmland, they can always sell to local young farmers at a courtesy price; if they don't own farmland, they are talking about limiting others freedom. I'm not quite sure that's right thing to do.</p>
189.	I am 27 years old and have a full time job in the city but eventually want to take over the family farm. I work in the Ag industry as a lender and have found that land values are at a point where it no longer makes sense to buy land if you need to take out a mortgage (which I would need) because that land can't actually produce enough income to support the payments on the mortgage. With larger investment companies coming in with lots capital they are willing to spend more per acre as they don't need to worry about paying interest or a mortgage and therefore feel it puts me in a disadvantage to bid against them for land.
190.	Over a long period of leasing, 20 years or more, might as well been making payments.
191.	Ownership is preferable but with recent prices more difficult to purchase in area.
192.	I can't afford to buy but leasing allows me to farm more land.
193.	Ownership allows me to secure and reduce risk.
194.	I would like to expand but find it very difficult due to the huge prices that the corporations have paid, which drove the price of farmland almost out of reach.
195.	Our son has joined us on the farm and we will need to expand our land base. This is in order to justify purchasing newer machinery etc. Expanding our land base is a challenge but can be achieved only if we pay more than anyone else for the land, or pay a higher rent. In today's economic climate we must be careful not to underestimate risks and certainly not be overly optimistic. A good analysis of any purchase is very important.
196.	<p>Pioneers over 100 years ago came to Canada because of not being able to own in their original countries. The dream could be realized here.</p> <p>Today selling your land and renting out back is akin to leaving a "Dream" that our Pioneers</p>

	could not wait to get away from.
197.	Ownership allows patience to ride out any financial downturns and promotes better stewardship of the land.
198.	The reason that I prefer to own the land is because it affects the major decisions in my operation such as equipment purchases, storage, land improvement, time and money invested into the land. If I own the land I can make longer projections as to what I want to do with my farm. If I lease the land I cannot look past the term of my lease because as soon as my lease is up I may lose it to someone else. If that's the case I feel like I would be improving the land for someone else's benefit. It is extremely hard to expand my equipment and storage on leased land because everything is short term. It also seems that if I lease land for a 3-5 year term at a set price that after the lease is up the rent goes up. If I purchase land I have more control for the land payment over the loan term. As young farmers, my wife and I find it hard to compete with land investors on purchasing land. If farmers own their land they tend to put more time and effort into keeping the land clean and making land improvements. Many farmers who lease land are there to get the most money out of the land for the term of the lease. Once farmland is in the hands of land investors the land will most likely be owned by a farmer again.
199.	prefer to own but with all the investment companies buying driving the prices far beyond any young farmers affordability we found it hard enough to pay for a 35000 dollar quarter section let alone a 200000 dollar quarter you will find that we will all be poppers as they are in Europe rich land owners and poor farmers. So you will find yourself without farmers as the farming population ages no young farmer will stick around to work for the landlords and the machinery and crop inputs dealers when you can't own your own farmland which like peoples home used for retirement and as an investment.
200.	better long term planning with owned land
201.	if you own it you are in control of your farm, otherwise the landowner is
202.	Leases can be very expensive or hard to get and keep land with other farmers wanting more land in your area, so owning stops that variable.
203.	I think land is better looked after by an owner, my grandparents came here to get away from tenant farming. Although renting some land from retired farmers is a good fit to help young farmers get started.
204.	Owning is easier and less stressful. You do not have to negotiate rent and worry about pleasing landlords.
205.	Very high land prices have tended to make it very difficult to negotiate with non-farming landlords with marginal lower quality land
206.	Owning land is the best investment for future expansion and growth.
207.	Ownership gives me more buying power because even when land prices are high I gain equity in my operation
208.	I believe my farm stewardship is more sensitive with ownership

209.	I farm with my two sons and we are fourth generation in order to have a stable operation without worry of owners upping rent or selling it to a Calgary millionaire who will never even see the land and will want an unrealistic price for rent.
210.	I don't want to be a serf, men should own their land.
211.	After a short time of renting the owner seems to know more about farming than I do. I also know what kind of farmer he was
212.	Improvements can be made and retained on land that is owned, but not as easily on land that is leased; sustainable farming takes a long-range view that cannot easily be accommodated or secured on leased land; better stewardship is more likely on owned land vs rented.
213.	I prefer to own my land so I can have control over my farm. I have seen too many farmers rent land from landlords and investment companies pull rental agreements or sell the land out from under the farmer leaving the farmer in a financial shortfall
214.	If I could get longer termed leases at a fair market rate I don't need to own land. It is quite difficult to get this kind of a lease though! Many landlords react predominantly to current conditions, especially when returns are increasing, and are quite slow to react when returns drop. Too many leases are predicated on very high rates of return. These expectations result in soil mining rather than in soil preservation, at least, or development, which occurs quite rarely!
215.	When you own the land you put the effort in producing and the land in better shape for the next generation. I leased some land from the Saskatchewan Lands Branch as land lords they were only looking for more money.
216.	The stability of ownership for a long term as to keep farming in our family.
217.	Depends what is affordable.
218.	As a farmer the only way you can acquire equity is by owning the land and hoping it increases over time and that is your retirement fund, by renting you only have machinery equity which is always devaluing.
219.	test
220.	It's difficult to make long term plans when you have short term agreements for your land base. Ownership by far outweighs renting or leasing.
221.	By purchasing land, you should realize capital appreciation in the long term, where as in a lease payments go to the landlord and at the end of the day there is no asset to show for it. Also when you own the land there is more incentive to manage it properly or make improvements that would not be made on land that someone else owns.
222.	I have leased crown land for pasture that is adjacent to my land.
223.	much easier to wind up or down size or increase the size of operation
224.	I'd like to own more but due to the increase in land prices it's hard to buy more.
225.	Currently my dad and I rent 1 quarter of pasture from the province but we own the rest of the land we farm.

226.	test
227.	Leasing land allows me to free up security.
228.	Depending on the rental rates, it makes more sense to me putting an equivalent dollar amount into owning the land rather than renting it.
229.	I am a farmer and my son is starting to farm. It is hard to compete with pension plans and corporations to buy land; we do not have their deep pockets. We wish to expand our family farm and feel we cannot compete with corporations. At one time land may have been hard to sell but now prices are good to sell land and I want farm families to own land and keep our rural communities strong and vibrant. My grandfather, a peasant, came to Canada from the Ukraine to own land. His dream to own his own land was fulfilled in Saskatchewan and he helped build this great province.
230.	If you do not own your own land, you are always at the risk of leasers, not only limiting your options on how to manage your land, but affecting your net worth which hampers your borrowing ability and essentially retirement ability.
231.	I would like to own my own land because I can't possibly see making money on not owning land as I can barely make a living on our land.
232.	I am used to owning most of the land. So I feel most comfortable that way. If I had experience with larger lease base I might find it okay too.
233.	Never had to finance for many years so not sure about financing today that is why I answered not sure. Also would always prefer to own land as if you are paying for a lease might as well be paying for the land as a lease will not give you ownership.
234.	Prefer to own, however price increases make this difficult and returns don't justify paying current price.
235.	High cash rents leave no profit.
236.	Ownership is the only way you are guaranteed to stay farming. With rent/lease your landlord always has the option of taking the land away that you NEED to keep food on the table for your family.
237.	You have to keep in mind that farmers need to run their land and keep the rural communities alive! Whoever buys the land should farm the land.
238.	I am at the point in my farming career that just farming my owned land is enough.
239.	owning my land puts me in charge also equity in land could be my pension
240.	If you own the land you're sure to have it for years. If you lease investors or whoever may make a big offer to your landlord, if you want to keep this land you have to match the offer or it's gone, leaving you with more machinery than you need or can afford per acre.
241.	Trying to own most of our farm land as my son and daughter are both involved in the farm. Expansion by purchasing is becoming more difficult with influx of outside investors from Alberta and nontraditional farm businesses purchasing land.
242.	I prefer to buy and own Saskatchewan farmland, since I was born here and wish to transfer our farmland to our children and keep it in the family and secure the family farm image that we

	are proud of in this province.
243.	Owning is way better because you can landscape, plan for the future, and generally weave that parcel of land into the fabric of your farm. When you rent, you have to adopt a totally different mindset which is slightly detached from the land. It goes against the grain of one who makes a living from the land and feels very attached to it.
244.	owning the land makes it easier to pass down to a family member also for land improvements
245.	I have much more flexibility with cropping options and long term stability with ownership.
246.	Own my own land, I'm a fourth generation farmer with five children and some of them are interested in becoming GENERATION farmers also. Saskatchewan farmers should own and live in Saskatchewan. Let's not sell one of our own natural resources to outside investors and or Foreign investors just to make money! Look what we've done with potash!
247.	I find that even with contracts there is a chance land owners can pull land away. And when u use that rental land for loan payments on equipment. Just too insecure!
248.	I feel a farmer should own most of his land for financial strength and acre security
249.	I've been farming not a long time in comparison to most farmers. Just in time in fact to catch high land prices and with that, high lease prices. It is very tough. I'm not greedy. I just want to make a living.
250.	Security and equity
251.	Land is an asset, as a land mortgage is paid down equity is built and there is less risk in terms of running a family farm business as time goes on. Leased land is just a right off year after year.
252.	There is no way I should have to compete against my own tax dollars! Or against another money that cannot be traced outside of Canada! That is absolute !!!!!!!!!!!
253.	Ownership is essential to stewardship long term.... and is the only real way to build equity.
254.	If the lease land does not require improvements i.e. Rock removal or drainage etc. then leasing is fine but prefer not to improve someone else's land.
255.	With the propensity for drought in our area it makes the farm more viable and secure to have equity in your land. Also with the yearly escalation in rental rates and shortening of lease agreement terms it is risky to invest in machinery or bins in case you lose the rented land at the end of the agreement.
256.	Owning is a sense of pride. To farm land that business is fulfilling but it is hard to get.
257.	Leasing is hard to find a contract long enough to make changes in the land for the way I want to farm. Adding more nutrients and micronutrients takes time and money and by the time it is done and starting to show results my lease contracts are up and at times it has been money wasted
258.	In owning my land I fix some of my costs.
259.	cannot purchase equipment over longer periods, if buy equipment loss land to someone else auction sale time
260.	You can't make money by renting land with enormous rental rates and competing with huge

	corporations
261.	I think land ownership should be restricted not bought by corporations
262.	Owning land gives security for the future and will see a larger return on investment in the long run.
263.	Owning your land helps you to be able to make better financial decisions because your land payments are set whereas rent fluctuates
264.	We would refute to own the land but we have long time rented some land from family members and neighbours who have no interest in selling
265.	Would like to own more land but local land is being bought up by investors from out of province. This is land that is taken away from farm families like mine and my children or any other families in our area will never have the chance to own or their children to own. In return these kids are unable to have the chance to stay in our area and farm possibly even forcing them to find out of province jobs.
266.	Eventually I hope to own the land that I'm currently leasing.
267.	When you lease you farm for today. Put the least in while taking the most out. Don't improve anything. Don't care about anything. Who cares of the weeds go to seed. That's next year's problem for whoever rents it next year. Burn the stubble - that's the best plan for one year. When you own the land, you farm for your grandkids. Improve the land in every way you can. No short term decisions about today, but focus on the long term health of the land. It is really hard to farm "good" on rented land. I consider our farm land our heritage. It is the base and strength of our farming BUSINESS.
268.	We feel that there is security in owing the land we farm. We have seen rental and lease rates increase incredibly in the last few years and it can become unfeasible to pay these high prices. We have struggled with excess water and the consequences of the excess water (inability to seed certain fields, disease etc.) With a cash rental arrangement we must pay the rent even though we have no guarantee to recover the cost of sowing the crop. The risk is entirely with the producer and not the landlord. When the land is owned we feel there is more ability to reduce risk.
269.	At least at retirement time have some equity.
270.	I would prefer ownership of land if there were a chance to buy it but for a young farmer going against outside investment that have financial resources far beyond what I do is impossible. It is tough to compete with that.
271.	With lease land it is hard to make long term decisions, you never know when lease is up if land will be sold to other parties or rented to someone else
272.	When we own our own land then we have the ability to financially recoup land improvements.
273.	I would rather own my land and have value in the land instead of renting you are left with no value to your name.
274.	Land ownership gives me some stability and security. My great grandparents came to this

	country because they had the chance to own land. They left a system in Europe where only the wealthy elite owned the farmland and the peasants worked the land for minimum return.
275.	I am 35 and have a young family. The CPP and other large almost faceless investors buying land and driving the price of land up will make it impossible for me to make a living farming and raise my family in a small community that I was so fortunate to grow up in.
276.	I prefer to own land it gives me the stability in my farm
277.	Farmland ownership is preferred. It is one of the reasons people immigrated here in the early years. Where they lived in Europe, they could never own land, only be tenants.
278.	As a farmer, in a typical year there is no money in leasing land. The landlords all think a 5 percent return is fair. In my farming career (I'm 43); the average return for a farmer's investment is less than that. The five percent rule works until the investor has overpaid and the five percent calculates to a value per acre that and average yield and average commodity prices cannot support.
279.	42 year old farmer and we have a nice balance of owned and leased. When I started farming in the 90's there was tremendous opportunity to buy land as grain farming was tough, But borrowing capital was tougher. We bought what we could and then rented other land as lots of great family farms couldn't survive and moved on and rented the land out. We have rented land from great families for over 20yrs. With the sudden surge of land prices from outside investment \$ they are now thinking of selling. We would love to buy and we could has borrowing capital is now almost too easy but the price of land is beyond the productive value.
280.	Need to have the option to own
281.	Ownership of land gives you a stable land base. In farming, which is highly competitive between farmers, it is hard to ensure a strong land base when there is always someone ready to snap up any available land.
282.	long term security and succession depend on the ownership of the land
283.	Ownership is secure and long term...but not always attainable from the perspective of cost and availability. We have a son who would like to continue our farm operation but the chances for him to find affordable farmland in our area are few and far between.
284.	I am 26 years old, and trying to make living grain farming. I bought my first quarter off my grandfather; I am looking to buy another at the end of the year. The land prices in this province are so inflated it sickens me. My land is in RM 128, where the going price for a section (640 acres) of land is in excess of 1.2 million. I ask the Saskatchewan Party how am I to make a living with land payments at that price? The Saskatchewan Party is killing the small family operated farms one by one. When I approach the old couples in my area to inquire about purchasing land they all tell me the same thing why do you want to get into farming? There is no money to be made, and you can't pay top dollar like the potash companies nor the out of country buyers. Why would you take ownership away from the ones working the land? I feel you guys want to make us serfs. These companies or out of country owners don't care for the land nor do guys that lease the land, people who own and live on the land are the best for the stewardship of the land, they care for it, how can't you see this? The Saskatchewan Party needs to look to Europe and learn how their farming operations are where the little guys are supported and

	encouraged. These family operated farms in Saskatchewan that are 10000+ acres are not a family farm they are corporations. Also I am an electrician I work 21 days straight, this job alone is over six figures. I would give it up in a heartbeat to be on the land 24/7, but unfortunately I don't see this ever happening with land prices like this. I would love to hear back from the Saskatchewan Party.
285.	New farmers and young farmers would likely lease more than own as they mature and gain equity the mix of lease vs own would move towards own.
286.	Land is not available to buy so I lease to increase my acres
287.	Because you build equity. With rented land you are just working for a wage.
288.	Of course you would prefer to own the land! If you rent it you could lose it at any time, or a neighbour could sneak behind your back to your landlords to try to take away your land base. That actually happens quite a bit here.
289.	I feel it is a travesty that our boys and young farmers have to compete with large pension firms when trying to buy land. Get your heads out of the sand. Does your govt not release that even countries like China are buying our farmland out from under us using individual people? We eventually will be farm peasants farming the land for giant oil and pension firms and foreign companies. Is this what we want for the future of this province? They will this countryside taking our valuable resources back with them. Thank you.
290.	We see land ownership from a couple perspectives: 1) some has more value to us as a part of a heritage for our children and their children not just from the perspective of a capital asset for business 2) some land we prefer to own as an investment and hedge against the investment market swings i.e.: land value near a city increases in value because there is more interest in it as recreational property/small farming or for specialty farming. 3) We also see land as something to be cared for and respected.
291.	I would prefer to own the land I farm. It is very difficult to improve and do what is best for the land when it is owned by an investor or pension fund! Their primary concern is getting the highest return possible in the short term!
292.	I am 73 years of age, and will retire when I want. Some of my misguided NDP friends, who sold to the land bank some years back, can't retire because they have nothing to sell except worn out equipment that's worth peanuts. Farmers need to own the LAND - not large corporations or pension plans.
293.	Owning obviously gives the owner access to capital appreciation as land values increase. So land ownership provides potential retirement and estate security.
294.	The short term benefits of leasing are far outweighed by the benefits of long term capital appreciation gained through land ownership. Non-farming individuals or entities can make any claim they want as to the benefits of allowing them to own farmland; the reality is they want the capital gain active farmers need to finance their retirements.
295.	Lease rates are so high in my area that I would only earn about \$20/acre before taxes and insurance....seems like a lot of time and machinery/fuel cost for \$20.....If I own the land I can add back the \$80 lease payment. Work it out another way....If I was to buy land and rent it out...I get \$80/acre. I pay about \$2000-\$2200/acre.....20-25yrs to pay for it without interest or

	taxes. Not bad if it doubles in value every year like a house in the city.
296.	Usually the margins on lease land are slim, leases can be terminated leaving you without land, ownership gives the farm and family some security, paying leases usually means the bulk of profit does not stay with the operator
297.	I'm a cattle rancher and 2/3 of my operation is crown grazing
298.	More profit in owning your own land
299.	We sold our land and are renting it back. This is the last of the three year lease agreement.
300.	Owning land gives me the flexibility and security that I like having. I can grow anything I want without permission, no risk of losing the land after investing large sums into machinery. Overall it is a preferred way of operating a farm. In a drought year like this where a net income will be hard to find, I don't have to worry about making that lease payment knowing my land is mine.
301.	I feel that owning the land I farm is an important way to manage risk in such a volatile commodity based business. When starting to farm at a young age as many farmers do they are able to build equity through land payments over time, allowing them another aspect of growth in their business. This growth may accumulate and represent a large portion of my retirement income when I decide to quite farming. This equity would stay in the province as opposed this capital leaving the province or country if I leased foreign entity.
302.	I am a young farmer starting in a family farm. Please, please, please DO NOT ALLOW FOREIGN OWNERSHIP OF FARMLAND. It would also be really good if investors weren't allowed to own land. There has been investment in land near me and I don't believe I will ever have the chance at renting or ever owning that land.
303.	Long term I find that it will be beneficial
304.	More cost effective to lease. Can't pencil in the cost of 350,000.00 for a quarter section.
305.	The financing options available to young farmers are supportive. The only catch is the banks willingness to be helpful in the process. Our experience is that credit unions are more supportive. Adding more competition to the market by allowing nonresidents to buy land will only make it more difficult for Canada's youth to come back to their homes after getting post-secondary and farm; higher cost, a likely shift to a more corporate focus. I don't want to return to a caste system where I can't afford to own and instead must choose to work as a peasant for a corporate farm.
306.	Prefer to own for fear that rented land will get sold to foreign investors!
307.	Lease prices have risen to the level of land payments. If a farmer can afford the 20 or 25 % down payment it would make more sense to buy.
308.	I prefer to own the land I farm because it allows me to plan into the future knowing that I will have the land. The land that I do lease is either a 1 year or 5 year term, the 1 year term makes

<p>it difficult to manage properly. I also think that owning the land is a way to build equity and save money when times are good. I have one landlord from Manitoba that won't do more than a 1 year lease and will show up in the spring and increase the rent; this makes it difficult to budget.</p>
<p>309. Like to have total control farm operations</p>
<p>310. Owning is preferable but it is hard to compete with foreign investment, pension funds etc.</p>
<p>311. prefer to own but it is too expensive to buy</p>
<p>312. Buying land allows our farm to access more low interest financing. We also like to lease in order to be reactive to market conditions by changing our farms size.</p>
<p>313. The lease land I have is crown land. In which I pay taxes on. At one time lease was very inexpensive, but with every year passing the government is upping the lease every year. So with that I would rather own.</p>
<p>314. I own my land. Would own but now land is over priced</p>
<p>315. Owning your land is always better in the future</p>
<p>316. we have leased pasture for a number of years, which has been helpful to us when we were getting started, gives an opportunity to younger farmers to increase when they can't necessarily get more mortgages</p>
<p>317. That's a stupid question. Who wouldn't prefer to own land?</p>
<p>318. I would prefer to own more land because I know it's mine and I can plant it how I want. Whereas once a lease is up you may no longer have that land which can really throw a wrench in plans.</p>
<p>319. Large land owners are driving the price of rent/lease too high for average farmers to do little more than break even. I would be better off owning land than leasing it.</p>
<p>320. Owning land is a farmer's retirement</p>
<p>321. Banks like RBC will not help out a small farmer to try and get a land loan. We are stuck with FCC which is really helpful but their interest rates are not even comparable to the Big Banks. Both have pros and cons to them. Too bad farming is such a great risk; it would be nice to get appropriate funding to get land.</p>
<p>322. Ownership gives me better control of my farming costs. I know that my rent will not increase at the whim of the landlord, or if provincial rents increase over time I will not be impacted; therefore, I get better control of my bottom line. There is the additional issue that the landlord may decide to rent to someone else and my farm will be impacted with the loss of the land. Farm net worth tends to be tied up in assets like land. If farmers do not own the land, their net worth will be impacted and they risk not qualifying for financing, especially if their operating income is used for financing expensive equipment. There are many financial tools available to farmers wishing to purchase land that can make the land more affordable. There is no scenario in which leasing is more profitable than owning over a period of years. In summary, owning the farmland provides a more stable long-term business projection and ultimately a more profitable operation.</p>

323.	Prefer to own so there are no surprises from landlords wanting more money or selling the land on you.
324.	Preferably all should be owned. Even crown leases where possible, That may not always be possible but perhaps some programs could be initiated to help the process.
325.	Would like to grow the farm
326.	Would like to own more but availability and price is restricting.
327.	Our farmland is by far the biggest asset on our farm. Owning the land provides the ability to make long term plans and goals which cannot be achieved with leasing the land. It also provides a stable asset to acquire credit when needed.
328.	If I own I have control on how my land is in production.
329.	Ownership gives stability
330.	I am farming the family farm. Just have a primary residence outside the province
331.	No person, group or organization should be allowed to own farm land in unless they reside in Saskatchewan and intend to actively work the land. No one person group organization or family should be allowed to control more than 2000 acres. Large farms kill small communities. They cost thousands of jobs. Farm tractor horsepower needs to be limited to 200 per engine. Instead of encouraging big farms all levels of government needs to get it back in hands of families. Otherwise rural Saskatchewan will die. You need to get young people like my 24 year old son back on the land. From .
332.	Rather than make rent payments, I would rather make payments toward ownership. It is getting harder to buy land now that foreign investors are artificially inflating prices.
333.	I don't have the recourses to own it all
334.	I have been 35 years trying to own the land I farm and in that time there has never been an environment to make it possible, Now it seems to be becoming even more impossible to own my land than ever. My entire family of boys will be denied there right to farm and be farmers if people who do not farm are allowed to own Saskatchewan land. Serfdom will return. Land ownership will be as rare as it was in the countries my ancestors left in order to own land here.
335.	Farming has always been a low return investment unless you include the capital increase of the farm land
336.	Buying land is an investment for us as well. We want to keep all land within the family and continue to be family owned and operated.
337.	Looking at all opportunities to expand.
338.	It depends on the price of land. Currently land values are too high for me to own so then it pencils out to be better off to lease land. It all depends on the situation that you are in at that time and what the \$\$\$'s work out to be.
339.	Owning the land we farm has always been our first choice. Acquiring farm land is a long term process that is expensive. However, owning land makes financing other purchases for the farm possible. Cannot imagine trying to buy inputs or machinery without having a solid base of owned land to back up my financing. Also, over long periods of time, farmland values do rise,

	adding important dollars to the initial investment.
340.	Ownership is a more stable situation for long-term planning.
341.	deeded land prices are too high at the present time in relation to the animal units they will carry
342.	If I do not own the land I farm then I have no control over its future use of it. The trend is for people to purchase farmland to treat as an acreage, or to use as a playground for hunting. Our experience with the urbanites who move into our area is that they treat the area like an off-leash dog park, and the children/grandchildren of these people become a likewise unrestrained nuisance as they trespass onto and damage farmland with their ATVs and dirt bikes.
343.	Ownership provides more flexibility with borrowing needs. For the average farmer, borrowing against land is extremely restrictive (understandably so, given the uncertainty that goes along with farming). However, having to "pull teeth" to be approved for any sort of land mortgage by the bank is incredibly frustrating (especially when you aren't in an insolvency situation) and is made even more so when we watch investors of all sorts waltz in and borrow their money from our financial institutions, buy land at overpriced values and then, in so many cases, not even farm it because they can't get anyone to rent it at the value that makes them a return (because of the ridiculously inflated price they bought it at). At the end of the day, those investors have no interest in the area and can walk away just as easily as they walked in. The farmers of these areas will be the ones that are left, does it not make more sense to be supporting and encouraging more growth from that end of things?
344.	Don't sell to foreigners period
345.	I want to own some land, but leasing is a good option. I don't have to have so much money tied up in a capital asset.
346.	Prefer to been buying as much as possible then in future have something for the payments I've been making compared to land rent you have an expense
347.	We currently own approximately 50% of our land and lease 50% crown land. Not all crown land in the province is eligible for purchase. We support that as long as our lease contract remains renewable every 33 years.
348.	I prefer to own the land because of the rising price of land in my area .This is do to outside investors in potash and oil. The price of "renting" is becoming too high for a farmer to make a profit in this industry.
349.	The only way to guarantee stability in your land base is to own it yourself.
350.	We have roughly two thirds of our acres as owned and lease the balance. As a younger farmer that is looking to grow there is a lot of uncertainty with leased land when making larger capital decisions.
351.	To purchase and own the land at current values puts limits on cash flow and at time restricts good farm management practices which may have long term effects on future productivity of the land.
352.	legitimate full time farmers need to own the majority of the land they farm
353.	Would rather own the land as I have don't have to worry about losing leased acres in the future

	by the whim of the landlord.
354.	I have rented land but the landowners wanted to much rent & there was no money left for profit.
355.	Ownership produces stability and would be the likely objective when leasing is used to expand an operation.
356.	Will use leased land to help expand.
357.	LEASED LAND PMTS. HAVE RISEN SUBSTANTIALLY IN THE PAST YEARS AND ALMOST EQUAL THE PMTS. ON PURCHASING
358.	We like to do land reclamation so renting is inconvenient because doing land rec on Rented land may not be best for future farming if we lose said rented land
359.	I owned most of my land and sold it to my son. I still own land jointly with my son. We also have a government lease/
360.	I prefer to own then I have total control over the land, as what to plant, when to plant etc. But we cannot compete against foreign investors financially. They will ruin our farming!!!
361.	I can't afford the best agronomic decisions if I have to give away cash in rent or crop share and still be able to make a profit.
362.	I just prefer to own my land, rather than rent or lease.
363.	You have no equity when you lease.
364.	If we own the land at least we have something in the end to hand down to our children
365.	There is no security in leasing and payments over time will be close too same
366.	Owning is better in the long term. Don't have to worry about losing it.
367.	As a producer I believe the land is better cared for when owned by the producer. Farmers feel more confident investing money and time into the long term health of the soil and surrounding ecosystem when they feel secure that they or their children will be farming it in the future.
368.	Our leases have been problematic - landowners have been quick to demand an increase in rent with increases in commodity prices, but reluctant to reciprocate when prices decline. Landowners demand maintenance of fence and other aspect of property but lease terms are short at 1 year to 3 year making it unattractive to invest in infrastructure or other improvements to the land. Recreationists feel they have access to the land because we are not owners.
369.	It's a lot more secure when you own it because you're not at the mercy of someone else dictating what your land costs would be from year to year. You also know that land will be available for you to farm the next year so you're more likely to use better practices on that land. Owned land can also be used as security to grow your farm.
370.	Would like to own but investors have driven the price too high to purchase
371.	I would like to expand and be able to own the land outright
372.	I rent land (640 acres) owned by Non Canadians for close to 30 years with a very good

relationship.

The landlord is a farmer in Germany and already second generation owning the land in Saskatchewan and fully understanding the challenges of farming. I can only recommend the process of granting land ownership to foreigners to be flexible; I can see foreigners being allowed to own farmland in excess of 10 acres for longer periods of time as long as there is a mutual understanding. Land being acquired for speculative purposes such as the CCIP is to be rejected, the Canada Pension fund is known to have real estate property in Berlin Germany under a legal construct (created in Luxembourg) which allows it to avoid taxation in Millions of Euros and avoid nonresident ownership restrictions.

One question is the effect of the Free Trade and Investment agreements currently negotiated which may allow large investment funds, companies and foreign interests to force the provincial regulation not effective (loss of sovereignty). So the question in principle is if the provincial legislation is effective at all - why have the discussion if Ottawa allows investment freedom for global players. Farm land ownership needs to be provincially regulated, large ownership must be weighed with provincial interest and the provincial economy in mind; large entities may produce agricultural products here and ship those off shore without spin off to the provincial economy. Under current condition large scale investment in farmland looks attractive but what will happen when economic conditions change and the large investments are no longer financially attractive? Who will be interested in taking over the land if the infrastructure is not supportive for smaller operations (neglected roads, no services in rural areas).

373. Leasing may allow for greater write offs but land assets are worth more to me.

374. I will own my land and farm what I own.

375. I am still young and would like to own more land, but don't mind renting or leasing land, as it allows for some better cash flow. I would prefer to lease land from the government or from individuals who had in the past or plan to use the land, rather than individuals or groups just investing in the land. I am also interested in joining cooperative groups, mainly for pasture.

376. My family is in the farming game for the long haul, and prefers to own our land.

377. As a young farmer, it is hardly feasible to buy land at today's prices, driven up by developments (our area), corporate farms and foreign investors. Rent has been driven up as well but is still the easiest and most common way of taking on more land. The issue is that it is fairly volatile to build a farm off of rented land. There is usually only 1 - 3 years of security. Each year, more and more family farms are forced to sell or rent out their land and get jobs, due to losing rented land to large, possibly corporate farms...

378. When you own the land you can make plans for the future. When you lease land you never know how long you will have it.

379. farmland should belong to REAL farmers not pension plans or big investors of any stripe , who will expect a nice profit every year regardless of conditions down on the farm. Are you trying to turn us into communist type communes?? Please remember why our great grandfathers came west 130 Years ago.....to own their land and farm it as they saw fit....no longer as tenants but as owners. What does a pension plan board know about farming...nothing? Please make better rules with actual Saskatchewan farmers in mind. Thank you.

380.	I'd rather have control over my farming assets and not worry about losing rented land.
381.	I do not lease from foreigners as that money simply leaves the local economy for destinations unknown
382.	Ownership of land helps to ensure that your input and soil nutrients will be maintained
383.	Would like to own more but land values have gotten too high to purchase land and pay for it through a farming income.
384.	Currently land we have bought that is leased gives you zero value as an asset making it very difficult or impossible to deal with lending institutions. The land is relevant to your operation but gives you no assets for borrowing power.
385.	There's nothing like pride in ownership
386.	I prefer to own the land. All of the land I farm has been held in my family for 3 or 4 generations, there is a pride of ownership to the land we hold.
387.	Own as much as you can and lease the rest in order to have enough land to make it a viable farming operation.
388.	owning is key to my farm
389.	I believe that to preserve the farming way of life that sustains our economy the landowners need to live and pay taxes in our province.
390.	When the payment to own the land is roughly the same as renting then it is more feasible to purchase. However, when land sells for more than \$1500 an acre then it is more profitable to rent than own.
391.	The return to investment in farmland over the last several years has been substantial due to the rapid appreciation in farmland. However in many cases the rental rate for farmland has not followed the same appreciative level and therefore rental has become a more affordable form in which to acquire farmland. The major problem is security of tenure. Long term stable investors who are looking for long term stable tenant agreements are I believe a welcome thing whereby the younger generation of farmers does not need to tie up large sums of capital in low return land investment. The challenge I believe becomes what are the investors' motives for investing in Saskatchewan farmland. The large influx of uninformed investors has distorted the marketplace in some areas; however that will be sorted out in time. My question is such: Are there alternate motives driving the desire to own farmland such as immigration that creates a difficult situation for tenants to try and deal with absentee or nonexistent landlords.
392.	We have been buying small amounts of high quality farmland over the last twenty five years. It is the best way to build equity, build an operation for the next generation and owner/operator land is cared for in the most sustainable way
393.	We have lived and farmed in Saskatchewan for over 39 years. It has always been very difficult to have the opportunity to purchase land. We have been fortunate to pay taxes for that number of years so that agriculture can be achieved, communities can be fostered, schools can continue to survive, roads can be built and all our way of rural life can be supported in many ways.
394.	I believe there should be some land held in common such as garden plots in cities, the former

	<p>PFRA pasture land, forests, and rough un-arable lands, and that all Homo sapien citizens of Saskatchewan should be able to access some of the public lands to produce food or part of their living. I think the balance of arable land should be owned by Homo sapien citizens of Saskatchewan or Farm Corporations registered in Saskatchewan whose shareholders are all human residents of Saskatchewan.</p>
395.	<p>It is not feasible to rent land and try to make a living with rented land. The Payment is manageable for a period of time when buying. But once the land is paid for equipment needs to be bought. If u rent land you are always behind the financial security point.</p>
396.	<p>I like to have ownership of a "base" of my land to have the security that I know I will have it to farm, have as an investment and be able to make long term plans with it. However, as in any business, I am ok with having some of it leased, but want those leases with retired farmers who have decided to maintain ownership for whatever reason and understand the complexities of running a farming operation. Renting from non-farm groups or investors does not work for our operation as they do not understand the cash flow and risks associated with farming operations.</p>
397.	<p>Ownership provides the security I need. Land is an appreciable asset which can provide long term revenue. Selling land to buy machinery then renting leaves me with a depreciable asset and no control over my land base. Good landlords are golden, bad landlords can bring you down, and do.</p>
398.	<p>As a starting younger farmer I find I cannot get into land ownership because of the high cost of purchase, this is exacerbated by having to compete with outside absentee land owners and investment groups.</p>
399.	<p>Owning eliminates the instability that leasing has in terms of controlling the land</p>
400.	<p>Ultimately, I prefer to own, but to get there leasing is very helpful, especially if there is the possibility of purchasing it 5 or 10 years down the road.</p>
401.	<p>Leasing has been problematic as long term leases are difficult to acquire and short term leases do not allow improvements which would benefit person leasing without guarantees for future of that lease. Ownership allows for better management decisions and improvements.</p>
402.	<p>Our business is livestock including grassing yearlings in both Alberta and Saskatchewan. We are also leasing grass for pairs and yearlings along with the grass we own in west border of Saskatchewan.</p> <p>In Alberta we operate and mid-sized intensive livestock operation along with farming both irrigated and dry land. Of our cultivated land we are about 70% owned and 30% leased mostly because of cash flow and the need to expand as financially responsible as possible.</p>
403.	<p>I like to own the land, you are more independent und spend no money for leasing.</p>
404.	<p>Every farmer would like to own the land they farm. You treat your own car better than a rental don't you?</p>
405.	<p>Owning my land has given me the opportunity to build equity through personal investment and appreciation in land values. Many farmers have used this scenario to build a retirement. While I realize that with a favourable rent/lease agreement one can use any excess income to invest in retirement options this does not always come to fruition for various reasons, equipment</p>

	repair/replacement Etc. A good balance of borrowing and cash investment in your operation gives you opportunities to manage within a preplanned farm management model.
406.	Reasonably priced land allowed us to build equity to grow our operation with lower risk than renting in which rental rates could rise fast or could lose larger rental blocks vs the stability of ownership with longer financing times.
407.	Prefer to own, a sense of security when making purchase on equipment. Also when margins are tight or nonexistent that all your effort and hard work is not in vein and that at the end of a farming career there is still something there.
408.	Good investment Not working for an investor Am in the 70's and would prefer to sell to a young person or have family take over More freedom in owning
409.	I would prefer to own but land prices are too high to purchase more than a few hundred acres a year so I rely on a combination of renting and buying
410.	I would prefer to own but I'm a young farmer and can't compete with the investors buying land in our area.
411.	Prefer to own so that I can invest in long term land improvements. I am also much more likely to farm in a way that is sustainable and improves the health of the soil because I know I will be the one farming it in the future.
412.	Long term control matters
413.	Prefer to own because when you pay a lease for 20 - 30 years of your life, at the end of that term you have no equity and how do you retire? It is not fair to pay all that money for nothing at the end of the day.
414.	Leasing and renting seems good at first because of reduced capital outlay but as the lease costs and rentals go up and up owning the land is a more attractive option. Today interest rates are low so owning land makes more sense. Our operation is primarily cattle so fencing and water infrastructure investments can only be made with solid long term agreements.
415.	If I own the land it is in my control and don't have to worry about losing land do to unforeseen events.
416.	I live in an area where it is hard to expand acres, as the demand is high or the price to rent or own is too high. I cannot financially compete with Foreign Investors as they buy site unseen and drive our market higher.
417.	Obviously any one would prefer to own their own land. Just as anyone would prefer to own their own house. Sometimes however cost is prohibitive.
418.	Generally, ownership provides better predictability and security for major, long-term decision making such as machinery and labour requirements, financing arrangements and soil management practices.

419.	As a young farmer trying to expand my own farm, it is extremely hard to start from 160 owned acres, 100 ac of it farmed. It is hard to buy another quarter as since I bought the first (home quarter), land values have tripled around me in the last 7 years. Foreign investment and land ownership will further decrease my chances of catching up.
420.	I prefer to own the land as I am building equity by making my payments every year. But the price of land has gone up so much that the climate for selling land to farmers in my area has almost disappeared. Purchasing land is just not possible because of the economics of it.
421.	I prefer ownership. The cost of borrowing vs renting is too close to the same on a yearly basis, and as time passes I then have equity to grow the business. I would like to have access to RRSP funds of mine and invest in the land through a self-directed RRSP program, the same taxation benefits all the pension funds have,
422.	Province should own some land. Lease land is good for young guys trying to start out.
423.	I want the profits of my land coming back to me--now and in the future for my family. I don't want to become a serf to someone else's idea of farming.
424.	It is cheaper in the long run for me to own my own land. Short term expansion may be via lease, but will cost more over time. As I am looking at this long term (over 20 years) my preference is ownership
425.	I want to own the land so I can pass it onto my children.
426.	My two sons , their families & I would like to get closer 50--50 owner ship
427.	Then I know where I stand and I'm not so worried about what the current market price for rented land is.
428.	Can't own it all, too much debt.
429.	Land ownership is critical to the longevity of our operation through the generations. It supports good stewardship.
430.	Ownership is where most of your equity is without that you're .
431.	Over the long run land ownership is very important.
432.	Would like the competition to remain between farms to slow land value inflation.
433.	Owning your own land is an advantage to being a farmer. You're working and building not just your future the future of your next generations. We have farmed in the province for now 6 generations and since 1908. Don't give away the one thing that keeps Saskatchewan apart from the rest of the country.
434.	Need to own land to provide long-term stability to operation!
435.	Owning is always better.
436.	Definitely prefer to own for many reasons. First of all, if you purchase the land, eventually it will be paid for, as opposed to paying rent year after year forever. For a billion dollar company to purchase farmland in Saskatchewan will be the end of century family farms like ours that are smaller operations but still viable. With purchasing you know what your land base will be from year to year. Renting you are never sure.

437.	Ownership is always preferable to leasing.
438.	<p>I believe strongly in farmers owning their own land. The price of land has undoubtedly gone up because of a string of profitable years due to favourable growing conditions. It's my belief that one or a few average to below average years, like 2015 could be, will lower the price of land and bring it closer to historical prices. Lots of investors look to get 6-10% annual return on their land in addition to the increase in land value. Looking at piece of land at \$1500 an 8% return is \$120 per acre. Simply put, profit margins are not high enough during poor years to make those types of rent payments. Even during average years, sacrifices must be made in other areas such as production or infrastructure to make those payments. Having high rent payments on even half your acres will mean buildings and equipment will be neglected as those assets are left to depreciate.</p> <p>Saskatchewan farmland is in good care, both long and short term, when in the hands of Saskatchewan farmers. Year to year profits are sporadic but does create a good living. The built up value on land assets is also what makes it possible to get through the rough years. Refinancing or interest only payments are a couple of financial options that are available during lean years. These options become increasingly available as a producer accumulates capital or other assets that are paid off. With the majority of equipment being financed due to high turnover and the hi rate of depreciation on infrastructure such as bins, buildings and equipment, land is often the only source of capital for a producer to borrow against or use to secure loans. A small piece of land paid off and owned is by far the easiest way to aid in expansion as well. Having a few acres paid for will lower your average rent or mortgage payments on a per acre basis across the entire farm.</p> <p>My motto has always been 'sustainable profits via sustainable practices'. Owning land is fundamental and one of the most primitive building blocks to my business model.</p>
439.	I prefer to own to reduce production risks including, crop inputs (re: fertilizer requirements), pest control and continued availability at determined costs per acre.
440.	As young farmer with small children who might want to farm I want the security of owning land that will give them a chance to get involved. With leased land there is no gate tee they will get the chance to lease it in the future.
441.	I would like to own more land as any money paid into/for the land would be better used as equity for me.
442.	I'm concerned about leading land and the risk it poses to my business stability. For example, we rent land that is owned by an out-of-province investor. We couldn't afford to buy it so now we rely on this land base but can only guarantee it from one year to the next, which is unfortunate. As a livestock producer, I can't contract and expand my herd that quickly to adjust, therefore I feel that renting land puts our operation in a precarious position.
443.	Prefer ownership of FCC would be more able to finance they seem to prefer larger operations
444.	I farm in Manitoba. South central
445.	Ownership is stability
446.	As a farm land owner you will always make the best long term decisions for your farm.
447.	Owning our land is preferable because it is a good investment for us. When we decide to retire from farming, we have the option of selling or leasing out our land to provide us with

	retirement income. It also enables us to transition the farm to the next generation of our family.
448.	Nobody wants to rent a house their whole life. They want to own it because when the mortgage is paid off they have money to spend on other stuff not paying for life. Plus it adds security as rented land can be long term but it can also be pulled at the end of any agreement. Hard to plan if all you are counting on is 3 year rental agreements and the land owner will switch renter for an extra \$5/acre
449.	I find more stability in ownership of the land I farm. Tough to budget on rented land you may lose in the future.
450.	There is more of a long term view of the care of the land
451.	Then you have something at the end to pass down to your children to farm as well
452.	I would prefer to own if I could afford it.
453.	Owning provides a pension for retirement but leasing provides a lower cost in short term.
454.	We currently lease a percentage of our farmland from retired farmer / neighbors only
455.	If you own you control no worries
456.	Own. Can make decisions and plan for long term. More security. Inputs and care for the land will pay off in the long run (harder to justify a phosphorus application or picking rock on land that you are renting). If a piece of land is owned, a farmer will do everything possible to eliminate soil erosion.
457.	I believe owning the land gives you more control long term of the land. Renting people only care about today's profit, not long term. I see alkaline soils needing long term healing not short rent profit mind set, and yes alkaline patches are getting bigger or worse new ones popping up in places you never thought it could. Also I am a history person. For decades and many even centuries my family were peasants in Europe, my great grandfather came here and worked in the prairie for 2 years before his family could come here. Why? Because of the change, ability to control your life, working for yourself for long term investments, something impossible in Europe. He said never let landlords or companies control the land because then you lose everything, you're just a peasant. If these young farmers get their way and just keep renting they may do fine, but what about their grandchildren? Can they say the same? History does repeat itself because we never learn the lesson the first time.
458.	When it's owned and paid for one has more pride! Work hard to buy and pay for it
459.	I am a rancher operating on a large percentage of Crown Lease, I would have been preferable to own the land for the last 75 years but it was never offered for sale. Now it would cost too much to buy at market price to ever pay for it.
460.	Ownership provides our operation equity, which is our investment for the future exit strategy. Also allows security in our business plan long term to build assets and grow.
461.	It is important to not have inflated land prices to allow the farm to succeed.
462.	I am a firm believer in owning my land, that way I have security in my business, and can pass my land on to my children.

463.	I would prefer to own my land but have not been able to secure any since I began farming 4 years ago with my dad. I'm unable to compete on land prices in my area between the large corporations overpaying and overly aggressive Hutterite colony's. Land values have become so high they are unrealistic that I will be able to pay for it in my lifetime. Land to me is more than a 5-8% return on my money. I care about my land and what I do, unlike these large corporations who have come in and bulldozed old yard sites of pioneers who built this country and tore out trees rows in search of an extra acre of land while destroying animal shelter belts and increasing soil erosion. I rent because I have to, if my generation 25-40 can't enter the business, which will be left but large corporate farms that are just in a hurry to get done with unskilled foreign workers just doing a shift. Don't have to drive very far to see where these farms are because the care and attention to detail is not there like a small family run farm who actually care. Hired men are there for a pay check not necessarily caring about the end result
464.	For sure I'd like to own the land that I farm. I feel I pay a high price for the rented land that I farm but have no equity in it. If I owned the land I'd to be able to farm it plus I have equity in. At the moment I'm basically farming the leased land so I can have the opportunity to own it.
465.	More stability in owning. Higher net worth for financing.
466.	I like to have all the profit from my hard work not split with land owner.
467.	Better control of cost/acre
468.	We don't need people who are not actively farming owning land in Saskatchewan as all that will do is make big corporate farms with no communities
469.	Spreads out the cost of farming the land - renting as compared to making payments on loans
470.	Hi, I prefer to own my land that I farm because it allows me to invest in my family's future. With ownership you pay your payments with the amount that you would give away in crop share. Farming is cyclical and demanding. When in competition with investors who came in bought blocks of land then try to force land rental prices to grantee there profit. These investors take every cent that they make out of the area. The will not donate to local charity's, community projects and lastly contribute to developing the areas future. They suck it dry. I'm young with a family. We have got what we have today with hard work, help from our parents and work with other farmers to build a new community rink. Donated time to an investor would never be offered. Locally we have personally seen what big corporate firms buying land did. Broad acres drove land values, rental rates almost doubled to have them walk leaving bills, unpaid rental agreements and worst stifled the local young farmers from purchasing small blocks to add to their farms future.
471.	own and rent from retired farmers
472.	I lost my Asian born wife of thirty years, some 3 years ago. I have re-married to a woman from China. I have returned to farming, as opposed to leasing my lands to provide a proper income for the two of us. I'm sorry, but, government pensions will not support 2 people, and, I am obliged to provide an income that will reflect the true wealth of our lands. In our area there are several "Corporate Farmers" whose sole purpose seems to be buying farms, severing the house and out-buildings, and retaining the farmlands for their bloated incomes. I have told my wife to never sell the farm, or its lands, and that, in the very near future, Climate Change will make ownership of farmlands worth more than all the gold in the World. I am hoping that her son, his wife, and their first child, will immigrate to Canada and take over the farm business for a

	<p>stable, rich life.</p> <p>I love farming, the fresh air, the quiet nights. After living and struggling in Toronto for 22 of my years, I call this place Heaven...</p>
473.	I would prefer to own for future family. We currently operate 112 year family farm.
474.	Owned land is always better but may not always be possible. Innovative solutions may be found involving investors, governments etc.
475.	I prefer to own the land I farm because if I am paying the money that the investors want for rent in our area I mid as well just put that money towards the payment to own it and have something in the end
476.	When leasing land you can't plan past the end of the contract.
477.	The prairie provinces were settled by people leaving Europe because they were tired of working the land for someone else and wanted to have their own piece of land. I feel the same way.
478.	My great grandfather traveled from Scotland to Ontario for a better life for his family 1880's. My grandfather traveled to Saskatchewan to begin a farm in 1909. My father continued to develop the farm my son is buying from my wife and I, All Canadians. It should be a priority that This opportunity is always available to Canadian citizens and those that become Canadian.
479.	Leasing land is far too restrictive. Improvements such as drainage and clearing land do not make sense and most land lords (especially investors) do not care about taking care of and sustaining the land, only how to make the most money.
480.	Farming is a long term operation. There is no sense in paying someone else every year to use something that is fundamental to the operation
481.	I prefer all Saskatchewan farmland to be owned first by a Saskatchewan resident, second by a Canadian, never by a foreign investor or any investor
482.	Owning land gives me more security about changing conditions and not having to deal with renters who are nothing but greedy people trying to suck young farmers in and make big investment profits on the backs of young Saskatchewan farmers
483.	Owning the land your live off leaves no room to lose money renters are always putting rent higher and higher until you just can barely pay when you own you know where you stand all the time no increases just the taxes and the payments
484.	I have bought in '83, 07, and,'14. I plan to continue purchasing as opportunities arise. Renting allows expansion and annual income but ownership is where security and long term profit lie.
485.	I believe land owned receives priority as to pace of possibly improvement, and thus more potential benefit from improvement to the primary producer. I believe long term stability of a farming operation is enhanced relative to the percentage of owned assets, and furthermore this ownership will aid in the ability of the farm to be passed to the next generation or offered to a person with the ambition to be a young farmer at a rate that will help ensure continued stability. Farms must expand and update to compete with the advances in technology, and the inability to purchase land creates an uncertainty and risk that may not be favourable in the mind of many people interested in becoming farmers.

486.	Landlords can be troublesome.
487.	Some of the land I lease is to help out the old fellows I rent from so they make sure they get paid their rent. Since the rise in inputs, there is also a rise in unscrupulous farmers. No intention of buying it, just help them in their retirement.
488.	ownership in the land I farm gives me a fixed cost and a more stable environment leasing can be risky as the price of the lease may rise above the actual net farm income and the lease could be broken making it hard to pay for added equipment and labour used to farm the leased acres.
489.	Operating high value and input costly crops which require a blend an owned and leased farmland where with costs of inputs and costs of field equipment and costs of manpower are increasing considerably. Operational costs are increases are exceeding the National inflation rate and the need for greater farmland values is necessary to go forward.
490.	Farming is a capitally intensive business. We need to ensure the opportunities to start or grow your farm are not inhibited by only allowing traditional financing models to operate in Saskatchewan. Innovative new ideas and methods are needed to allow farmers to grow in this capital intensive business. This will mean new financing methods must be allowed to flourish.
491.	Land prices are beyond crazy (I myself started buying land in 2013)! As a young farmer who was born and raised in Saskatchewan it's very hard to expand my 4 generation operation with land prices going the way they are and almost have to be of royal birth to afford anything in my neck of the woods! Ever since I was a young boy I always dreamed of having a larger (but not overly large) successful farm where I could have a sustainable income instead of having an off farm job to keep the farm going I KNOW these foreign investors do NOT have the same attitude towards what farmland in this great province means to them. It is the great farmers of Saskatchewan who helped build this province and its communities into what it is today! There is no way that in the future that these foreign investors will leave the same legacy! That's my rant!!!
492.	We own our land and it has been in the family since 1887
493.	Ownership is ideal. Necessity requires some to be leased.
494.	I prefer to own, you then have more control over your operation and can invest in your land, buildings and equipment without fear of losing the land and having your land base eroded.
495.	Ownership gives you long term stability. You don't run the risk of being downsized at the end of a lease agreement.
496.	Prefer to own for the security of knowing what you have. It is also a long term investment for retirement and for our children
497.	Owned land I can farm it to what I feel is the most responsible and profitable for each area. My lease land has restriction on some farming practices that I have found to be very beneficial. Assiniboia Farmland has clauses in my lease that does not allow me to see any new forages on their land. I have farmed this land for more than 18 years; they took over ownership 5years ago. Before that I found that the land was responding very well in the areas that I had seeded forage.
498.	Prefer to own, to have control of land, impossible for future planning on leased land.

499.	Buying and owning ties up too much capital and reduces flexibility in financing the ever increasing costs of operations.
500.	As a Saskatchewan resident owning the land of the province means all of the proceeds and spinoff benefits stay in Saskatchewan to benefit its residents
501.	A good balance of owned and leased land is important to maximize use of capital and balance risk. Too much leased land could leave you vulnerable to loss of land, yet having some leased land gives opportunity to increase profit with less capital outlay.
502.	I prefer to own so that I can improve the land and make it more efficient to farm.
503.	As much as I can afford.
504.	Owning the land provides for future continuity and stability. Leased lands are subject to increasing rental rates due to competition for acres from large corporate farms and land investors. Leases are subject to termination and may be non-renewable due to affordability, and this restricts cropping options as well as on-going operations. Tame hay lands that are leased and require rejuvenating are especially susceptible, as longer term, affordable leases need to be secured to make the cost of breaking up and reseeding hay lands viable, however, landlords are increasingly averse to long term leases and prefer shorter terms to capitalize on higher rental rates resulting from land base competition from other producers, typically larger corporate farms. It is becoming increasingly difficult for individual producers to compete due to the capitalization of large corporate farms and land investors who have easier access to capital and financing and therefore can out-bid private individual operators.
505.	Owning land provides the security that the land it will be accessible in future years. Leases may be lost and therefore that security is not there. There is also more incentive to make improvements and maintain owned land in a more sustainable matter than one might treat leased or rented land.
506.	With ownership comes control; leasing can create uncertainty and variability.
507.	It is difficult to expand a livestock operation on leased land. The owner can change their mind and you are left stranded with a bunch of cows and no place to go.
508.	I prefer owning as a long term store of wealth. Also like to raise my own food.
509.	Would be interested in owning a little more to help out my son who wants to farm
510.	I would like to be able to lease land but now as soon as lease land is given up it goes up for sale and big corporations buy it up at prices a regular farmer can't compete with
511.	There is only so much land in this world, in this province. It should be sold and leased to those who have been here for years, generations and more and to those who can afford to buy it. Not by shareholders, not by non-Canadian citizens.
512.	If you own your own land, the landlord can't screw you by selling the land out from under you, jacking up rent prices, or renting the land to someone else without you knowing
513.	I feel it is important to own the major portion of the land you farm if it is possible.
514.	Lenders are all the same

515.	Prefer to own land because tenancy is more secure for long range planning
516.	Prefer to own most of our farmed land for security. Rent if at a reasonable rate, which is hard to find, can also help to increase our revenue while minimizing risk
517.	We ranch and own all of our pasture and hay land.
518.	As a lifelong second generation rancher on this place we need to own it to survive as a viable ranch to continue for future generations because takes 25-30 years for us to pay for it so renting prolongs expansion
519.	It takes a number of years to gain the required data from the land to properly manage and produce successful crops. Ownership implies a longer possession period for the land, giving the producer time to adjust. Most lease agreements are short term. Producers' goal in the short term is to maximize profits without consideration to the effect it may have on the soil health. In the short term of a lease, it would be too costly to choose a practice that is likely to break-even or yield a slight loss for the betterment of the land.
520.	I have had opportunity to buy land, but I can't afford it.
521.	If you own the land at least you have that one part of your operation, not, "up in the air" so to speak. There are so many other variables that we cannot control.
522.	Would prefer to own to build up equity
523.	It's better if small farmers can own their own land
524.	In order to build a farm business with long term viability it is important to have a land base that is owned. A small portion can be rented but if the rented land is lost it cannot be so large that it jeopardizes the operation.
525.	I prefer to have the money I spend on farmland going towards myself building equity in my farm.
526.	<p>Farming is very risky, and there are some years when you just don't earn a profit. The low profit years and the physically hardest fought years are often simultaneous. (I.e. we work the hardest when we make the least).</p> <p>It helps ease the stress of those years knowing that at least we are building equity in the land.</p> <p>Farmland values have skyrocketed in our area specifically due to wealthy Alberta farmers who went on buying sprees as soon as the rules changed.</p> <p>Land I bought in 2013 I paid \$1500/ac for. The adjacent land I bought around 10 years earlier I paid \$600/ac for.</p> <p>\$1500/ac is completely an unprofitable price for land, and it threatens the very survival of our farm. There is no way we could afford any more land purchased at that level.</p> <p>Farmers who own the land have a vested interest in looking after it properly, so the land and hence the environment will be better served.</p> <p>Final point. Pension funds don't fill hockey rinks.</p> <p>Thanks for governing our province very responsibly, I trust you will deal with this issue as you're track record has proven that you will go to bat FOR Saskatchewan.</p>

527.	You know where you are going to be in the future. No worries about losing land base.
528.	Need to own land to have equity for input financing.
529.	I like to have control of my land; landlords can just up and leave you hanging thus losing acres which can't be afforded to be lost due to the cost of machinery.
530.	I feel that unless you are actively farming or are starting to farm you should not be able to purchase farmland. This allowing other ownership only drives up rent and purchase prices to unprofitable levels. As farmers we are expected to produce cheap food for the world but don't make a decent profit margin. Everyone wants in when times are good .as a business we need to try keep a margin and that is fading
531.	owning land is a way to secure land for my children to farm
532.	With ownership you have more control; you are more willing to invest more in making the land environmentally sustainable and profitable in the long term. Leasing land seems to be more susceptible to larger mega farm operations driving cost of rent up by using foreign investors and out of province investors' money. But the same can be said about trying to purchase land as well.
533.	Farmers should have a right to sell their land or any product to the highest bidder. We compete in a world market and should be able to sell our land to a world market.
534.	Leasing land is a good option for young farmers. But lands lease payments should not equal land ownership payments.
535.	A significant portion of the ranching / farming opportunity is the appreciation of the land assets under our control. Canada and Saskatchewan does NOT want lose control of the food supply. It is a strategic resource just like oil potash and uranium.
536.	To get adequate farm size a farmer must lease and own, although ownership is preferred as it allows the capability for greater stewardship of the land as a resource. This also implies ownership by individuals with close ties if not a resident of Saskatchewan.
537.	Who would rather lease than own. I have leased only when purchasing land got too expensive or when I had no credit or when land was available for lease only
538.	Ownership gives you security. It is hard for long term planning of equipment, buildings, storage etc. when your land base can change drastically.
539.	When I own it I can leave it to family.
540.	Owning the land allows you to refinance in tough years and provides income at retirement
541.	Still believe land owned by the farmer is better for everyone because land that is our livelihood will be taken care of, not just an asset that has to make more money or it's gone, which leads to land abuse.
542.	Need stability of ownership
543.	The pride in ownership is much greater than renting it and is looked after better in my opinion
544.	If you don't own the land, you are vulnerable.

545.	There is no point in leasing land
546.	Owning my entire farm is the ultimate goal, but having some rented land is also good as generally as you are paying for land there isn't much profit left after all crop inputs, and land payments are made. Anything left after that is purely "bonus".
547.	I believe if you own land in Saskatchewan you need to live on the land or in a nearby community. You should support your local community and businesses.
548.	Ownership provides complete control of farming practices. You are more committed to your community. More likely to preserve the land for future users.
549.	Prefer ownership so that land improvements and expansion may be made as desired and land asset may be passed on to the next generation of family.
550.	Ownership of the land makes us better stewards of the land. It involves all family members and therefore we remain active in our community. Our children know responsibility and understand the importance of good work ethics. These traits of commitment and dedication roll over into their present day jobs, making them better employees. Owning the land gives you the increased sense of pride, gives you a heritage, makes you proud to be a Saskatchewan resident.
551.	There is a certain level of comfort that comes with knowing you own it rather than renting or leasing.
552.	With ownership I have more control to look after the land better. As an owner it allows me to make long range goals, like making sure my soil is healthy, nutrients management, noxious weeds are under control, wildlife and environmental concerns are cared about. This is better than short term economic gain, like getting every possible cent out of the land without caring about the damage you do to the land, environment, wildlife and community.
553.	I would prefer to own because it's one less thing to worry about by if somebody else comes in and offers twice as much for rent. How to make a go of it can be getting tough
554.	There is just something about owning farmland that makes one work harder and try harder. It is a feeling of pride to be farming land that has been passed down through the generations.
555.	Too many foreigners investing in land and driving up the price. Making it very difficult for young farmers to establish a land base.
556.	I want the right to do whatever I want with my land. I have farmed for 40 years and I think I should be able to sell to whoever I want to.
557.	It would be nice to be able to own the land I am farming but it's very hard for a young farmer to come up with the capital to do so. Most of the land I farm is leased from parents or close relatives. It would be nice to be able to buy other farm land to increase my acres and become more efficient. It is impossible for a young farmer to compete with foreign investors, CPP, and other investment groups. Only the people actually farming the land should be able to buy land. There are fewer and fewer young farmers starting and no one in their right mind would these days with the current economy. Even with the programs available there is very little support for farmers. We risk everything every year we put a crop in the ground and it is totally

	<p>depended of the weather. Crop insurance doesn't even cover your costs. No matter how many hours we put in and how hard we work we have no control over what we make. Most farmers would get paid pennies per hour if you figured out an average wage. With equipment costs so high and input costs always rising all suppliers know their margins. As a young farmer I can't compete with high priced farmland and inputs costs and have no guarantee of what I will get out no matter how many hours I put in.</p>
558.	I like to make improvements to the land that are only viable when I own the land
559.	I want control of my property
560.	Pride in ownership, increases our assets, able to pass land down to family members which won't be done with investors. Investors do not put money back in our small communities. Renting land has an expiry date or best before date.
561.	The only guarantee to keep farming is to own the land you're farming. Lease agreements can be terminated and all of a sudden you've got a bunch of equipment and no land to farm
562.	currently own one third would like to own two thirds
563.	It gives you security if you own it.
564.	That is the whole problem with letting in foreign investment, pretty soon born and bred Saskatchewan farmers won't be able to afford to own their own land. When we pay for and own the land we take care of it! Investors are investing to make the most money on a piece of land, that's it.
565.	With rented land we have no equity, without pride of ownership, stewardship and the health of the land goes by the wayside, land then just becomes a commodity. For young farmers, it is hard enough to compete to purchase land with their neighbours, without having to compete with outside investors. Absentee owners do not have the same passion for the land or the future of the land, and do not contribute anything to the local town's economy.
566.	I would prefer to own my land but there is no way I could afford to own my lease land.
567.	Younger farmers starting up.
568.	with ownership you know the land is yours to farm and any improvements will benefit you
569.	When you are leasing, you need to review lease agreements and deal with somewhat unreasonable owners who look at what you are making in one year to decide they want a bigger piece of the pie never mind what you lose in the next years.
570.	best way to maintain control of your operation is to own it, you are not subjecting yourself to fluctuating rental agreements as much, there is a place for rented land, ownership allows you to hopefully gain on the capital side
571.	My fore fathers came here from Europe to escape the feudal system where the rich owned all the land and the farmer was enslaved to work it for fear he would be kicked off of it. We are doing it again. A few rich people owning land and the farmer slowly being subjugated to work it carrying ALL RISK with little to no reward.
572.	More return on input costs
573.	Security in owning the land can make decisions based on the fact that the land will be available

	in 5, 10 or 20 years. As with a lease it might not be renewed with you, it could go to another person.
574.	I prefer to own my land but the landlord of my rented land would not sell it to me until after he died. Then when he died, it went into an estate and was still not for sale. Now, no farming inheritors are in charge of it.
575.	When you lease land, you can never be sure how long you will have it to farm.
576.	Prefer to own because it gives a sense of security when making other large purchases in order farm that land in a productive manor. Examples include purchasing equipment, fencing costs etc. Also it leaves a land base intact for future generations.
577.	When farmland is leased there is no guarantee that the lessor won't discontinue the lease and therefore all the hard work is for someone else
578.	I prefer if the land in Saskatchewan is owned by Saskatchewan residents this keeps the money in our province which creates more jobs in our province there for helping us thrive. If the land is owned by an outside investor generally the money leaves the province and country.
579.	I would prefer to own the land I am farming; however, we are not a big enough operation at this point to make it feasible.
580.	How can you justify investing in equipment and buildings if the land you are renting may be taken back and given to the highest bidder at any point in time? Also, people came to Canada to own the land they farmed, not to be peasants living under the rule of the landowners.
581.	In ownership you can better plan and budget for your needs and production. In leasing you have no control as to what lease or rent rates will be. Typically whenever a producer has a good year rental rates instantly go up and it never allows for a person moving forward. In owning you can budget and know where you are at.
582.	I would like to own all my land but outside owner ship has caused my ability to buy land to be severely restricted
583.	I would very much like to own farm land but as a younger farmer of 25. I cannot catch a break with not only foreign hands in the Saskatchewan farmland but even just city people who are investing to rent it out. They do not farm it's just an investment for return. No such thing as fair value when anyone can buy farmland.
584.	There is more freedom and security with ownership.
585.	When owning you don't have restrictions on what you can develop on your land. When leasing the government can take away your land without compensation.
586.	Change the rules back to if you are going to own farmland you need to farm it. Farmland should not be an investment for the wealthy to get wealthier it should be about future generations of farmers conserving the environment, producing safe healthy food for generations and having a safe secure livelihood. When land companies, pension plans etc. own the land it is all about the return to investment. When farmers own the land the benefits multiply through so many aspects of society we all benefit.
587.	I prefer to own, and in my opinion only farmers should own farm land, not speculators.

588.	Farmland should be owned by the people who work the land and CARE for it. Not by outside investors whose sole purpose is a return on investment and nothing else.
589.	prefer to own but prices are too high from all the foreign investment
590.	It is more profitable to own land because I have lower payments over time and I also expect the price of land to go up via foreign investors/more competitive pricing among farmers because of foreign investors.
591.	Prefer to own land but leasing an option until it works financially.
592.	Everybody wants to own land. However, with CPP and other corporate ownership along with Huderite colony buying groups, how can a 40 year old buy land? I continually get out bid because you can't compete.
593.	Prefer to own but unaffordable because of foreign investors.
594.	Prefer to own but just starting out the price of land is extremely high and is knocking out the little guys just to make corporations bigger
595.	I would like to own ore but it takes time to build equity and also land prices have went up rapidly
596.	I am more comfortable owning the land that I farm.
597.	Would prefer to own the land and put lease payments towards payments on the land. The sky rocket of land values has made it very unreasonable to purchase land and be able to make the payments on this land.
598.	A farmer should always own his land and if not it should be rent to buy
599.	Owning the land provides a stable environment for build equity on my farm and access to capital if I need it.
600.	Land prices are unattainable due to land conglomerates (some foreign funded) moving into the area
601.	We prefer to own. Rents will go a long way to owning land over 10 years or so and we are in the business of farming for the long haul. We try to buy the land when possible.
602.	I enjoy owning some land but like the flexibility that leasing a portion brings.
603.	Letting CPP buy land is wrong if I have to compete with government it is like communism.
604.	Have been farming since 1968. Glad we made decision to buy as now have equity and retirement capital for future. We were able to afford to buy because of gradual increase of land base and hard work of mixed farming. Now have four sons that take part in farming because we can help
605.	Renting sucks. No \$\$\$ to be made here, long term.
606.	Leasing land today is equivalent of making payments on the land. If I were forced to lease all of my land, I would not be building any equity. Equity is often the only value increasing on the farm.
607.	Leasing reduces the cost of ownership and spreads the risk, ownership provides stability.

608.	My great grandfather homesteaded this land and I would like to keep owning it for more generations
609.	Owning allows you to invest more time and money into cleaning up and taking care of the land without the risk of the renter selling it to someone else or renting it out to someone else without providing the farmer compensation.
610.	Owning provides the opportunity for capital appreciation.
611.	We have a cattle operation. I have a son who wants to do this, but land prices make it difficult.
612.	It is difficult to afford to own all the land necessary to support the size of family that participates in the farm, therefore a mix is necessary
613.	Have the land as an investment for retirement
614.	Currently own all of my land but would consider owning and leasing more.
615.	Ownership is best. Leasing is no different than being a serf in England two hundred years ago
616.	We prefer to own farm land and only lease so we have a chance to buy it.
617.	Those who farm the land need to own the land in order for proper stewardship to take place. If the farm land is rented, fertility is often overlooked and chemical, crop, and disease rotations are not necessarily respected. If the land is rented, the renter is not willing to invest in the land by making improvements like brush removal, breaking, stone removal, drainage and or tiling. If the land is owned by an un-interested non farming party, then improvements are rare and the whole economy of SK suffers because that productive value is not optimized. Fewer taxes are collected because less profit is made. Fewer people are employed because there are fewer products to sell, less inputs to buy, and less profit to spend at machinery dealers and in local communities.
618.	Investment in equipment requires assurance the land base will be there to farm. When land is rented, the producer has to compete on rent costs to farm the land whereas when land is owned, the producer does not have to compete on costs to farm the land because the cash cost is the set land payment. In this way young people wanting to farm are able to because the farm overall is more viable. Usually people who own something take pride and look after what they own, thus residents of Saskatchewan will usually take appropriate steps to ensure the land is protected. That is why a few years ago (after the great drought of thirties), farmers in Saskatchewan were considered to be the most innovative in the world because they wanted the land to be healthy for the people of Saskatchewan. Usually those that don't have an ownership stake, they won't care what affects other people in the province.
619.	It would be nice to own more land, if too much land is rented you'll be at higher risk of losing land that will screw up your overhead costs per acre and could put you in a tough position. It's hard to farm without land!
620.	Ownership is important to farmers as it provides financial stability to their operations, as their know how many acres they are farming year to year and are therefore able to right size equipment, labour, grain storage, etc. Also, over time equity can be used to help finance expansion, or to weather unexpected financial storms such as excess moisture, hail, and low commodity prices. Ownership also allows the farmer to take a long term approach to managing fertility, rotation, etc., and is better for long term soil health.

621.	Land prices have increased exponentially since land has been bought out by outside sources (i.e. investment groups last 10 years or so). We would like to own more land but its no longer feasible using borrowed money at the current cost of land. This outside ownership has also lead to rising rent prices.
622.	I believe ownership makes for better long term decisions, especially in regards crop rotation and other areas that impact soil/land health.
623.	lease some from neighbours who don't want to sell ever
624.	I would rather pay land mortgage than land rent. You have more security. If my landlord wants to more rent or not renew the contract It would be hard to make machinery payments.
625.	Ideally, owning is the most lucrative way to succeed. Landowners could sell or lease to others which make leasing risky. Giving crop share or cash rent definitely increases costs on rented land.
626.	Owning all of the land that we farm is my preference; however, I do not have the financial ability to afford this amount of land base, nor do my owners, who are relatives, wish to sell me their land.
627.	I have kids interested in farming. I want to have a stable land base that we can depend on. Leased land does not give me confidence to insure the land base will be there. It's hard to purchase required equipment also if land is leased (increases risk). My forefathers came to Canada to own their land not lease it. That's why many came to Canada. If we don't give our youth the chance to own land Canadian farming will be dire straits.
628.	Prefer to own our land. Our son wants to farm however with the large corporations owning he finds it hard to own or is in a bidding war with large corporations. Leasing is the same they want a lot of money per acre and a startup farmer cannot undertake only larger farms can take on the larger costs they can offset.
629.	Owning an asset is positive if that asset appreciates in value. We have already arrived and gone beyond where it is financially reasonable to buy land and farm it for a retiring in investment.
630.	There is security in owning land as it can't be pulled on you and you are able to do with it what you want. For example, if renting on a crop share basis, I wouldn't have the option to cut my durum for green feed as I do now. But, land prices are so high that, at my age with no one to take over my farm, I wouldn't be buying farmland now.
631.	Owning land is a good investment renting land is throwing away your money
632.	I will take what land I can get if there is the possibility of making a profit.
633.	As an organic farmer, it can be challenging to lease land, and we have a three year transition period from conventional to organic. If I lose leased land, it can be really difficult to lease organic land, or to cover the cost of transitioning leased conventional land to organic. Also, owning my own land gives me financial security.
634.	Family farm, we own some of the land we farm and lease the rest. We cannot afford to own all the land we farm.

635.	As our leased land comes available to buy, we buy it. As our family and operation grow we will be looking to buy more land to support ourselves.
636.	We are hoping to purchase the land that we lease in the future. Leasing is just a temporary way to expand our operation.
637.	Ownership gives you security
638.	Prefer to own land, would be looking to expand.
639.	Looking to build equity in my operation. Owning the land makes your operation more profitable.
640.	From a farmer's point of view land ownership is better. Once the land is paid off it is one less expense to worry about in an industry that is dominated by uncertainty, or else used as security to expand. Owned land is easier to plan other purchases (machinery, inputs) around as well as rotations because once you have it, it can be taken away to the next higher bidder. Foreign owners would care little about what is being done with the land and solely concentrate on the return on investment, making it harder for smaller operations to compete.
641.	Owning land is key to being free to farm as I see fit with the minimal of interference.
642.	I am able to invest more care and inputs into the land I own vs lease.
643.	Have more control of land rent prices can change. The rent payments leave the country.
644.	Land should be owned by Saskatchewan residents.
645.	It's tough to compete with land prices when immigrants are buying farmland with money funded from their home country
646.	Owning land excludes lease uncertainties. and provides equity as time advances
647.	As a farmer it is important to manage the soil health and work to eliminate degradation (erosion, nutrient depletion) and it's impossible to do that with a one or three year lease, when all the absent landlord cares is for the annual return. From _____, Edam, Saskatchewan
648.	Owning is always better if you can, however I am not opposed to leasing
649.	Want to buy more land and stop big companies from taking it all
650.	Saskatchewan's cultural, economic, and moral strength have always stemmed from its private family owned farms.
651.	Own some rent some, start your farm small, you don't need 5000 to start. Own 40% rent 60%
652.	I like to purchase land close to our home base when it becomes available. I prefer to continue to lease that which is further away
653.	Owning the farmland gives my farm security and stability. Having equity in my farmland helps me get through the inevitable tough farming years.
654.	Owning your land makes decision making easier
655.	We are in our 60's and have no desire to purchase land. Leasing permits us to farm. If we had

	a mortgage, I don't think we could afford to.
656.	We began farming mainly renting land from previous farmers who still owned their land. Over time we have been able to purchase some of that land as well as rent additional land. Although renting land has been a large part of the success of our farm operation, it also poses risk. Often we have improved the value of the leased land by our farm practices, making it more desirable for the owner to sell. In one instance after greatly improving a significant parcel (15% of our operation), the owner sold the land without giving us any consideration.
657.	I am actually semi-retired, with this being my last year with farm status, then will be all rented. I am frustrated by this kind of a knee jerk reaction from a pro-business government
658.	Ownership gives more security!!!
659.	More control on how to farm when you own.....you can control how much fertilizer; spray etc.... is being used.
660.	I like to own land as I can build equity by owning it. Also any improvement I make I get the full benefit from. There is security in owning land. Being a tenant isn't guaranteed to be long term or stable.
661.	I would prefer to own the land but with the foreign investors and investment companies buying land in our area it has made it impossible for me to compete with the prices they offer. As a younger farmer trying to expand my farm for myself and my son. We can't pay the prices they are offering so I rent which is becoming hard to do as well because rental prices are going up which is starting to make it not viable to farm.
662.	Can't afford to buy the government pasture land we lease
663.	When leasing the land there is never a guarantee farming it the next year.
664.	Then you are completely in charge of your decisions. And nobody in an office in Toronto is telling you how to do it.
665.	There are a couple of reasons that we prefer owning. Once our land is paid for, our farm business becomes more profitable as we will not have land payments at that point. As well, owning guarantees that we have the land base to justify the size/types of equipment we purchase and use over the years.
666.	It's increasingly difficult for Saskatchewan born farmers to purchase local area farmland as foreign investors can pay more and as such increase the value The sellers of course will benefit.
667.	The whole concept of being a farmer or business owner is to build your wealth for retirement, land is the best way to build it, and if you rent your whole life you built nothing. There is very little money in farming as it is. If you cannot build your net worth it's not worth doing.
668.	Self-ownership is the foundation for family owned and operated farms being able to pass the way of life onto the next generation
669.	By owning our land, we have full authority to manage the way the land is used. We operate our farm as a certified organic operation which makes ownership very important due to the huge commitment it takes to transition land from conventional farming practices to certified

	organic farming practices.
670.	The current system is fine the way it is. Don't change it.
671.	Owned land provides a source of equity to borrow against when times are tough. We used land equity to term out our operating loan in the early 2000s when the drought hit.
672.	If you own land you are going to invest more in the land in terms of improvements and fertility. If the land is improved it will return greater revenue for the farmer and in contribute more to the provincial economy in terms of increased sales and income tax revenue. Rented land does not get as much put into it and does not produce as much.
673.	Unable to afford today's prices to purchase so my hard earned money is given away to landlords instead.
674.	With a good balance of leased and owned I can best manage my investment. Thus allowing me to gain equity for other purchases.
675.	I prefer to own my land for multiple reasons, one big one is that by making payments my equity grows you don't get any equity from leasing. Our leased land has to be renewed every 3 years so crop planning, rotations are a challenge if I know that that land is mine I can make better agronomic decisions. With ownership I know what my cost of the land is for a long time with leasing the cost may increase with higher commodity prices. In the case of low prices farmers may walk away from leases leaving neighbours to clean up their mess of unattended land.
676.	I prefer the security of owning my own land. I also have to compete against Hutterite colonies to expand my land base which I don't feel is fair. A colony keeps their people's wages under the poverty line to be able to claim welfare. e.g. my tax dollars go to paying for their basic needs (glasses, health supplies etc.) while the colony itself is very wealthy. They also hide large amounts of income behind their church which are not taxed. Try to compete with that.
677.	We would prefer to own the land but the prices are very high right now and being as we are young farmers just entering the industry, we cannot afford to buy at this time. There also aren't a lot of options to buy right now - most people in our area are renting out their land.
678.	When you rent farmland you have no way of knowing your future. With high cost of equipment we are purchasing equipment over a 10 year period. With 3 year rental agreements you could lose your land and still have equipment payments. As a young farming couple we are finding it increasingly difficult to purchase farmland. Small profit margins make it impossible to compete with investors. Example Canada Pension plan! Farmland belongs in the hands of the Saskatchewan farmer. Allowing out of country and corporate investment is just another nail in the coffin of the young Saskatchewan farmer.
679.	I like to be in control of my assets and feel that my effort in operating returns the profits to me versus sharing with others
680.	Farmers have no company pension fund and land ownership is there retirement fund. Renting to a young upcoming farmer or selling part is the way a strong family farm is built enabling the next generation to come on board
681.	With land prices appreciating rapidly it is difficult to purchase additional land and maintain a healthy balance sheet. Farmland only yields so much contribution margin per acre and when

	land prices no longer reflect that through speculation, producers have to be even more careful/strategic about their growth plans.
682.	Lease the majority but would buy if had chance.
683.	It has become uneconomical for me to purchase land at these inflated prices. And the inflated prices are a direct result of outside investments; not farmers
684.	I would prefer to own the majority, if not all of my land but the current cost of the land, as well as competition for the land in the area make it very difficult to obtain enough land to for me to have a viable grain farm.
685.	It is far better to own your own land than lease it. If everyone was to lease land it would be better to have the government own it and we all work for the government. Owning your own land is a better way to secure ones future.
686.	Families will keep land after parents pass on. The desire to keep it is there not as an investment to make easy money but rather of pride.
687.	Prefer to own as it provides continuous operation - not tied to a landowners wishes, whims or bidding war.
688.	We find that owning the land gives us security against rising rental rates, as well as the possibility of losing the land to another renter.
689.	I m a young farmer under 30 trying to buy land and get a head and I hate when big outside investor groups by up farm land it's a death sentence for a young farmer and his family.
690.	Prefer to own, seems out of reach
691.	I need to have enough capital to farm many acres. I would like to own more but farming is a very capital intensive operation. To have all the equipment to farm all the land I am unable to own very much land. It's either one way or the other. Either scale down and own more land and lease less or scale up by owning more equipment and renting more land. I cannot do both.
692.	Instead of paying lease, you build equity which helps your bottom line. A lease agreement does not guarantee that family members will always have access to that land. Without a constant land base, your machinery requirements could have a shortfall or have too much invested.
693.	For starting up farming you have to lease land, but to have farming and financial security you have to own that land or a good portion of it over time.
694.	It would provide more stability to my operation and commitment to stay in the province.
695.	When younger preferred owning, in process of winding down so not as aggressive.
696.	I would rather be making a land payment than a lease payment and not know if my lease will be renewed.
697.	Lease arrangements make long term investments in land improvements less likely.
698.	I own my farming property and it has been paid for by making prudent choices and savings instead of financing and getting into financial difficulties requiring debt write downs. When the phone rings in the morning I know it's not a banker asking when I will be making my past due payment.

699.	There is no security of having the land in your operation if you lease. You could be outbid at any time. Also you don't gain any equity by leasing.
700.	Always uncertainty with leasing, if you own the land it is yours until you choose to sell.
701.	It has taken me a life time to own what I have.
702.	Large investment in machinery and storage need the security of ownership to warrant the investment. Many large farms also lease equipment but I see a lot of these take large risks to keep afloat.
703.	Rather pay on a loan and gain an asset than pay rent.
704.	I am a young farmer that is trying to expand and take over my parents operation as they move to retirement.
705.	Land ownership provides security.
706.	The long term I pay less than if I were to rent.
707.	Owned land you know is yours always and your management can continue year to year. However rented land has a rental lifespan and your management has to be different. This may take on more options depending upon ownership from current to younger family owners upon senior's death.
708.	Older farmer, land is paid for. Debt risk is not in my plan
709.	I would prefer to own the land I am farming, but the price of land has gone up so much it is hardly affordable to purchase more.
710.	The uncertainty of leased land makes for hard planning. Equipment purchases, Grain storage facilities, farm transfers.
711.	We have owned most of our farmland for generations or we would not be able to afford to farm at this time.
712.	I am a 27 year old Beef producer trying to grow my Business and built land base. This task is proving to be difficult due to land prices and lack of farm land up for sale in the area.
713.	By owning the land I have future security. With leased land there is no guarantee of getting the land again at the expiration of the lease
714.	I definitely prefer to own my land, because when you own your land (meaning having it paid off and not owing money on it) and farming in tough times it's one less expense you have. When you rent your rent is the same in the good years as it is the bad years.
715.	Own is always the preference but not always possible. Particularly at current pricing. Owning allows definite decision making ability. And land base security. When renting you don't know what that cost will be when the agreement is up and you can't be sure you will keep the contract when it comes up again.
716.	Prefer to own so I can build equity.
717.	Owning is more beneficial for a farmer once established and set up in farming. Once set up though owning is easier and more beneficial instead of continuous rent payments and not owning the land in the end. Most renters are not knowledgeable to the farm environment and

	challenges a farmer faces and only see the grain prices are the land rent factor.
718.	We have a mixed farm in south central Saskatchewan. We own about 3200 acres; about 2300 acres is seeded crop land and the remainder is pasture land. We also have some government leased pasture land. This farm was settled in 1905 by my grandfather and our son is wanting to farm after taking agriculture.
719.	Prefer to own land I farm-makes for better management practices-price must be reasonable and affordable.
720.	Owning is the way to go. No one can just kick you off the land whenever they feel like it.
721.	Because of high land prices it is no longer financially viable to buy large chunks of farmland when expanding your farming operation, which is why it is necessary for farmers to lease lots of land.
722.	I prefer to own the land that I farm to build equity for myself and family and the economic security. This is what my father did and his father did, and I plan to continue for my kids and their kids.
723.	When I own my land I have the security and control of my farmable acres and don't have to worry about losing rented land to a foreign or local investor who has no interest in the agriculture sector and they are just interested in a return on their investment.
724.	Own. Better chance for family to invest or take over.
725.	Have leased some land since started farming. Generally worked well as long as you have some owned land so that the risk of losing the rented land wouldn't shut down the farm.
726.	If the balance of ownership on the owner side for long term health of Saskatchewan's economy so not exposed to outside forces. Keeps the home base strong.
727.	Renting may not be long term depending on the wish of the land owner.
728.	To start as a young farmer and plan to expand the farm once I take it over from my parents it is extremely impossible to buy land which is an investment in your farm rather than lease the land at a high, high price per acre. Some land around me is leased for 110 an acre. I really Hope things change to give a little hope to us young farmers.
729.	I would prefer to own all of the land in our operation; however, the economic reality is that, for us, we must rely on a mix of owned and leased land. It is important, in my opinion to own enough land to have an economically viable base. This would ensure the survival of the business in the event of losing a land lease for some reason.
730.	We lease low quality land for cattle pasture and own the land we use for grain crops
731.	The only people involved in this survey should be Saskatchewan farmers!!! It's no one else's business what the rules are on the sale of farmland in this province. Investors have no business even giving opinions on this subject.
732.	Owning provide more control when 3rd party development occurs
733.	Don't want to be chasing after land to rent every year bidding against my neighbours.
734.	I prefer ownership of land so that I have an asset base to fall back on during difficult less

	profitable years.
735.	I would prefer to own land but with all the outside investment in our area it has driven land prices so high that it doesn't make economic sense to buy it. This has made it so that the next generation of Saskatchewan farmers won't even get a chance to start. All of the money that is made off the land is taken out of our area and out of province. It is destroying our communities.
736.	The only way to get ahead in farming is by building equity in your farm. Leasing builds no equity.
737.	Do Saskatchewan farmers want to end up like serfs?
738.	I would always prefer to own because there is a security in knowing what you will be farming. With leasing there is always uncertainty, both with availability and cost to lease. Downside to ownership is often the cost, which is sometimes inflated by nonagricultural influences.
739.	Pride in ownership land better looked after farmer has the ability to have increase in land value.
740.	I prefer to own my land so that I have some security. Input costs are too high to not have the security of ongoing acreage guarantees.
741.	Ownership provides me with control of the land.
742.	To have stability in your operation you have to work at increasing your equity. The land has to be available long-term in order to have continuity in your operation. You can easily lose your rented land over time.
743.	I find the current financial lending rules restricting because we have been trying to purchase land for two years. With the sudden and extreme increase in land values, we find ourselves unable to compete. FCC has approved us up to fair market value but land has not been selling at that price. The comparisons they use, average out to a number that is just not feasible. When you take into account a sale that is clearly undervalued and average it into fair market prices. You get a number that is unable to compete with a demanding market with little supply. That is what the lending facility is doing. We have tried for two years to buy land and just cannot come up with the 25% down for the loan AND then the \$20,000 cash on top to make the purchase at the going rate.
744.	Owning our land provides long term stability to our business, it improved our equity positions thus increasing ability to finance our farming operation. We have the ability to size our equipment the needs of our operation now and in the future.
745.	Prefer to own, but it's not possible, so leasing is an option with its obvious pitfalls of not knowing the long term opportunities of the property. Leases expire, landlords die and then you're dealing with estates (gets messy). Owning is by far the best option.
746.	I feel more stable knowing I own and financing leased is not an option with banks
747.	Owning the land that you operate gives your operation much more stability. You cannot have the land taken away from you when you have set up to farm it.
748.	Land ownership builds equity, landlords are unwilling to sell because their returns are better than they can get anywhere else.

749.	Land is a long term investment, retirement, savings account if you will. Leasing is just a valuable way to increase land base but in long run doesn't add much to equity position.
750.	IF the value will not go up farmer will lose their interest.
751.	The majority of our farm is owned and only about 1/5 is leased and that is from family.
752.	Trying to get enough land to quit job but not going to quit if can only rent land and be kicked off after lease is done which just happened to me from an investor
753.	You can only lease if land is available and you're the highest bidder.
754.	We'd love to own and have tried to purchase land on three occasions. Outbid in all three instances. Last thing a local farmer needs is more competition.
755.	I don't see any value in paying for something for the rest of my life that I will never own. There is no light at the end of the tunnel in renting farmland.
756.	When you own you make your own decisions.
757.	As an acquired asset have freedom to crop, lease out and/or sell depending on the market and needs. Have a desire to increase holdings to pass on to the next generation. No guarantee that the leased land will be available for them to farm. To be efficient, larger parcels of land are required to make it profitable.
758.	All farmed land is owned.
759.	We were in the process of selling land in the spring just as the rules were changed, and it killed our sale stone dead, left us with a real cash crisis, outside investors NEED to be allowed in to keep the market buoyant for the good of all.
760.	I come from an English background, the idea of owning and farming land there is somewhat alien, stable growth in value allows the land to be an investment asset for both the core part of the farm you own, and the investors who wish to underwrite my business by providing lease available land.
761.	<p>Most developed countries with a free market in land have large landowners who operate estates of considerable size. Many farmers in the UK for example own no land as about 35% of all land is leased for fixed terms of ten years. As farmers develop and increase their wealth they will often buy some land as a store of wealth. However Saskatchewan land ownership and debt management laws almost make owning land a liability as courts use the assessment value to appraise value which mean farmer net worth is often vastly underrated.</p> <p>This leads to the rapid formation of an aristocracy of large farmer without the moral turpitude of honesty, who go bankrupt frequently and still operate huge multi square mile enterprises often over 15000 acres</p>
762.	Can't afford to own enough land to operate, so rented land is needed.
763.	Nice to own it all but risk is greater.
764.	I would rather build, restore, and improve land for myself. Not for corporate, land investment companies.
765.	Owning is just simpler and easier to manage the land.

766.	I am trying to expand my operation but between operating costs and land costs it is unfeasible.
767.	Right now, to buy a quarter of land for us is not feasible because of the high market value.
768.	Saving up to buy land.
769.	Agriculture is a competitive industry in which producers are willing to bid land prices to the point where the cash cost of the land will capture the residual value of their expected production. The result is long run break even operating margins but growing equity in real assets. I would prefer to own because ownership equals equity in an environment where operating profits are unreliable.
770.	My ancestors didn't immigrate to this country to lease farmland!
771.	There should be no foreign land ownership allowed or even out of province not allowed period...
772.	Equity is king. I can make year to year decisions knowing my land base is the same
773.	For a young farmer starting out if you can lease some land it keeps your investment lower.
774.	Financing can be somewhat restrictive although not overly so. I find it strange that it is so easy to finance equipment yet relatively harder to finance land purchases. I know it is easier to repossess equipment.
775.	Leasing farmland gives no security. A land lord can and will take the land away as soon as someone offers a few more dollars rent. Makes it hard for smaller farms to compete.
776.	I only lease from my parents, I don't need a landlord.
777.	Ownership frees me up to do long term planning for the land, including possible planting of tree shelterbelts for example, without having to deal with a landlord.
778.	Owned land is a guarantee and it also helping with budging into the future.
779.	Owning land is a secure way to grow the farm and stays in the family for generations to come
780.	Although I have always leased a small percentage of my farms holdings, ownership provides a much more secure land base. It also provides the added benefit of any capital gains.
781.	If one leases and another party comes along with lots of money the young farmer can't compete.
782.	I would support that ownership of Saskatchewan farm land be restricted to individuals who are either residents of Saskatchewan or incorporated farming operations owned by individuals who reside in Saskatchewan.
783.	Lease land introduces a variable, with owned land you always know how much land you will have in production now or in 5 years. The possibilities of losing rented land to a higher bidder or being trapped in a long term lease during a downturn in farm economy are variables best avoided. In times of booming Ag economy these are not concerns, but with all things the boom will end.
784.	Prefer to continue to lease native pasture and own cultivated land.

785.	In operating a farm business you need to migrated risk. By leasing land you have control of the asset yet have less risk as it is also spread to the land owner.
786.	I am also a retired farm Implement dealer of 47 years.
787.	<p>I don't believe in becoming enslaved to foreigners in our own country. Who knows where this money comes from? It erodes our tax base and economy, and greatly enhances foreign ones. I don't think China would allow Canadians to own farm land and our government, isn't going to print up a bunch of phoney baloney money and send us over there to buy it. As far as older farmers wanting to retire, the ones I rent from will never sell anyway and other ones who would sell aren't going to spend it here. The ones that have sold come back to do their health care time, and then there gone.</p> <p>I also don't like the amount of land that "that unlimited duck outfit" is buying and Saskatchewan Crop Insurance isn't paying the amount, of crop losses that I'm experiencing, and now their promoting mouse and elk in an area that they have never been in. I asked the D.U. guy when I saw him out there "how many mouse per section would you guys like to see?" He didn't have an answer for me. How many elk? Three years ago, when I was swathing canola, I had 10 elk run in front of the swather for 8 miles. Shelling canola all over the field and I'm not getting paid for it. These guys, they don't have a number. How many mice? How many elk? They just look at you, like totally clueless.</p>
788.	Would like to own but the land prices are getting to high to make a living. Leasing land is a risk as the lease could be taken from you and not has any say. When you invest in assets (equipment, cattle) some can be very pricey and you want a certain guarantee that you will have the land to pay for it.
789.	I would like to own land but the price of land is too high to justify grazing cattle on it.
790.	Sask. farm land ownership should be limited to primary producers and people acquiring land through estate planning. Farmers should not be made into servants to support land lords and governments.
791.	<p>I'm not sure why people outside of Saskatchewan should be able to take this survey.</p> <p>This is our province not theirs.</p>
792.	Prefer to own, but can only buy if price is right and I can afford the additional land, I only lease if the land is not for sale, I often lease with the hope that when it comes up for sale I can buy it. Unfortunately my experience with non-farmer ownership and out of province ownership is that they only buy, they NEVER offer the land for sale.
793.	Try to own but land is expensive right now
794.	To me, owning land is an investment. Owning my land, I can grow anything I want on it and make it the healthiest soil. I do not have to have permission from the landowner.
795.	With owned land I can control the cost of land. As with rented land when commodos prices rise so does the rent which means as a farmer I see very little profit from higher prices. When prices drop it takes years sometime before rent drops depending on terms of rent. So having a pension fund or companies own land will lead to cooperate farmers that rent large blocks of land and equipment. Which they won't care how they use the land. Just get the most out of it before the lease runs out. This will lead to land which is destroyed for years after. That type of farming will lead to consumers being held hostage to paying whatever price large companies

	want to charge because of the lack of competition.
796.	Leasing land is like renting your accommodation. You don't cash in the capital gains
797.	I am interested in purchasing more land, even renting land if it was available
798.	I would like to own more, but the cost of land is so high it would either take my whole life to pay it off or financially handicap the rest of my operation to purchase (i.e. can't afford equipment), especially because foreign money seems willing to buy at any price. Even at low interest rates, it still takes too long to generate a financial return.
799.	Saskatchewan farmland should be owned or leased by real farmers for the sole purpose of producing food at a reasonable profit rather than an investment/tax strategy
800.	You are investing in your own land and putting inputs into it. You don't have to make justifications to non-farming owners about what the state of farm economy is and realities about what land can produce
801.	Prefer to own but leasing is sometimes the best or only choice
802.	We would prefer to own but the cost of buying the land has been/is prohibitive.
803.	I feel that a lot of private lease land could be better utilized if there was an option to sublease it out. Maybe it would have to stay as a unit attached to the deeded that it belongs to. Also I feel that there are not a lot of restrictions on certain religious groups that have a definite advantage over private farmers that sell to their children, each generation pays for that land and contributes to tax and economy through interest. I'm referring to Hutterite colonies, which purchase the land once and do not necessarily benefit the rest of the economy thereafter.
804.	Leasing is less secure and more vulnerable to government changes
805.	Owning land gives my farm stability that enables me to be profitable in years of poor production or unexpected weather events.
806.	Being a lifelong resident of Saskatchewan and a fourth generation farmer makes me and my family stewards of the land for generations to come. Yes farming is a business yet also a way of life that feeds everyone in the world.
807.	Ideally to own is the best way in my opinion. There is consistency and stability in ownership. The problem comes though that the capital cost of financing land, that at present would never pay for itself, become prohibitive. It requires too much of the cash flow to finance.
808.	Impossible for young farmers to start farming.
809.	I am 46 with a full time off farm job in the Ag Industry. I am trying to expand my operation for myself and that of my three children who also want to farm. My dad has his own farm and when he retires, I may be able to retire from my full time job so that I may farm full time. I need to be able to continue to expand and I can't purchase inflated land prices due to demand from NON-Ag related companies. THIS LAND IS FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION FOR FARMERS TO PRODUCE FOOD TO FEED THE WORLD, not for land speculators, pension funds, or nonresident people for purposes NOT related to feeding an increasing global population.
810.	If you own the land you will be a better steward of the land and its operation. Land has been leased and the farmer has improved the production of the land due to his

	farming practices only to have the land owner terminate the lease. Owning your own land make the farmer more productive and concerned about production stability.
811.	Prefer to own land but am willing to rent. Don't mind renting from local landlords, but absentee landlords concern me. Lack of relationships and long-term sustainability of farmland is a major concern when it comes to outside investors. They seem to be into farmland ownership for themselves, which is fine, but a lot of money is removed from the rural economy which is very important to the communities in rural Saskatchewan. At least if the landlord is a local resident, chances are they will at least put some of their rental income back into the local economy.
812.	I prefer to own the land I am farming so I can make all decisions concerning crops and land without having to pass it by someone else. I also do not like having to pay someone else to be able to grow a crop. Lease prices are high and it make it much harder to get a profit when grain prices are lower, inputs higher and the weather can go one way or the other.
813.	I would own all I could but if I can't buy any I have to rent.
814.	Prefer to own but prices have become too high because of corporate interference.
815.	I prefer to own but with price of land also need to rent some now.
816.	You are never sure of how long you can rent land.
817.	I guess I prefer to own my land to have better control of it and to know I can have it to pass on to family or neighbours without worrying about a lease or terms.
818.	Would love to own land but starting from scratch in the Ag sector is next to impossible with the down payments that the banks want.
819.	Owning the land that I farm is the best form of security that I can have. It provides the physical ground to grow the crops, and it ensures that I will have continued access to the land base. Farming is a tight margin business, and I can't be vulnerable to losing land to higher bidders and/or facing large increases in land rent on short notice.
820.	It is preferable to own but leasing can be a viable option. Many ranchers lease for next to nothing from the province and have done very well.
821.	As a 30 year old cattleman who is trying to grow it is impossible to grow my herd and save money to buy land. Even if I could I can't compete financially against foreign investors or established farmers. Being on my own and not with an established parent is tough. And with so many hoops to jump through to get capital to expand it's frustrating. It's the main reason so many guys I know just say screw it and go back to the oilfield or jobs off farm. My wife and I both work jobs and are living in town and running cows on the side.
822.	Ownership of the land provides stability to the operation.
823.	The cost of rent has become very high.
824.	Right now land ownership is very difficult for young farmers starting up. The ability to lease crown land makes it possible for young farmers like us to expand our operation.
825.	We are very small farmers and have established a farm from buying our home place, with one quarter and began to buy equipment. We are struggling to keep on with this, after 11 years for the prices of land and the investors buying are keeping the small guys, like us to strive

	to keep on farming. It is very discouraging!! I think Saskatchewan people need to continue on having ownership of the family farms and not be forced to sell because they cannot compete with prices.
826.	I FAR PREFER TO OWN THE LAND THAT I FARM
827.	Ownership provides more stability in planning, and management.
828.	Over the long term owning is the best for me but has to be somewhat affordable. It is not going to pay for itself needing money from somewhere else to be paid for. It makes it hard to buy for someone starting out.
829.	I would prefer to own, but have not been able to purchase any due to large corporations driving up the price.
830.	Land we lease seems to have so much public interest from outside groups (Ex. Conservation groups) these interests are going to pressure many restrictions to manage our operations and to concentrate on raising food
831.	Our ranch is predominantly leased. We would like to purchase the lease, but it is mostly considered wildlife corridor. We feel that as residents, we are the highest stakeholders in the ecosystem.
832.	Would rather own
833.	Ownership allows my full control.
834.	Farmers owning their own farmland adds stability to their operation.
835.	It makes good business sense for me.
836.	Farmland is the only asset we can own that will appreciate in value. All other assets depreciate (machinery) rapidly. Farmland ownership is the best way to obtain financial security as a farmer.
837.	I have completed a survey in the past, however forgot to mention the following facts: I am appalled that farmland investment companies have bought large amounts of land via limited partnership funds and then rented this land to farmers, later selling it to investment companies in huge blocks that are only affordable to institutional investors such as pension funds. The absentee landlord idea may recreate the feudal system that our forefathers had to search for. Also, between 2010 and 2014 the FLSB has only denied 4 of 130 applications from land investment companies, transferring 761,130 acres to non-resident owners. This must stop. Please follow the recommendations of the NFU. I will not complete the rest of the survey as I have already done that, however, forgot to mention these very important points.
838.	By allowing buyers of farmland who are only looking for investment puts land prices so high it is difficult for a lot local real farmers to justify and pay off the debt.
839.	It is then yours to do with and you won't be affected by the owner of the land changing his mind and saying you can't rent.
840.	With lease rates so high on a marginal year all you do is make money for the investment group that made it so you can't afford the land in the first place .bottom line owned land improves your equity.

841.	Outside investment is making rent unaffordable as well as no long term security.
842.	As per market conditions.
843.	If the opportunity arises, ownership is my preference because it gives me the control of access to land. Leasing does not guarantee that. I would prefer payments go towards ownership than to someone else.
844.	Strongly.
845.	We would like to own everything if it were affordable
846.	Greater control of your future. Renting can result in loss of the property to large farming corporations or entities, with which the mid-size farms cannot compete. Ownership results in a payback to your life's efforts as annual remuneration from the farms yearly income is not comparable to what an individual can earn in a salaried work place.
847.	We would love to own all of the land we farm. However, banks have their rules and they don't exactly fit the world of farming we live in. We have our hands tied by our financial ratios, and when you need to finance equipment, finance farmland, and finance inputs there just isn't enough equity to do everything. Mortgages will not go longer than 25 years. That makes the cost of owning all your land extremely high. So we need to rent a large portion of our acres to make our grain farm economically sustainable, and if we didn't we wouldn't be viable. We've tried to buy as much of our land as possible, but the banks have been turning us down for the last 5 years. We lease much of our equipment and when the banks see that they add that to our loans and mortgages and it disqualifies us every time. The comment is always, "We'll, if you owned all of your equipment..." But that day will likely never come since one combine is over \$400k, one tractor is over \$400k and one air drill/cart is over \$400k.
848.	Since lease land has no borrowing power I would have to say owned. But we lease grazing/pastureland and it is a good deal.
849.	Would like to have bought more than lease but with foreign buyers prices have gotten to high.
850.	Would like to own more but cannot justify the cost of ownership.
851.	I prefer to own my farmland because it offers the most secure form of tenure and secondly the future appreciation in the value of the land will accrue to me.
852.	I would prefer to own but rising prices make that prohibitive in the competitive area that I am in.
853.	Owning the land allows me to be a good steward of the land and ensures responsible use of the land.
854.	With the foreign ownership right now it is more expensive to purchase or lease land.
855.	We own half our acres and we co farm with an investor the other half. It is a very win-win situation for everyone.
856.	I have more leased instead of owned only because I can't afford to buy out right.
857.	It is easier to lease than to own and much easier to grow land base when leasing from investors. Investors are my supply of land to rent.

858.	I have rented land since 1977 and that helped me get a start in farming but I wish I had bought more and leased less as my farm grew .Leased land is not a sure thing to establish or plan a farm operation on. It is my opinion that large amounts of land being bought up by investors is keeping the next generation of farmers from having a reasonable chance to own what they farm! No different than the places our grandparents left behind, only a few generations ago .Now in just a few short years it seems we are heading right back to what they left behind! The rich own the land and get richer and the poor do all the work, take all the risks and have no hope of the security of land ownership. This will for sure be a sad time in our history. I truly hope we can do something to stop this absent ownership trend as it will surely destroy the rural Saskatchewan we have worked so hard for the last 100 or more years to have and to leave for the next generation.
859.	I prefer to own because the payments are going towards my net worth and not someone else's.
860.	I am a young farmer, would like to own more land but cannot afford it.
861.	As a new farmer would like to buy when possible.
862.	Big corporations and or out of province groups should not be allowed to purchase or own Sask. Land.
863.	As a young second generation farmer, it is extremely difficult to purchase farmland. It would be detrimental for non-farmers to purchase land before priority going to farmers in that area.

2) If you were to expand your operation would you be more likely to lease or own the additional farmland?

#	Response
1.	There is less land coming up for sale in the recent past. While some farmers have cashed in on higher land prices, many retiring farmers are holding on to their land as a form of retirement income.
2.	Don't make any return in lease or rented land after your cost of inputs, time value of money and storage. Land owners want their money at bad times (when market is flooded and lower prices).
3.	We prefer to buy land because eventually the payments will stop and you will own it where renting you might pay a little less per acre but never have anything in the end.
4.	Would prefer to own if the price is reasonable.
5.	I prefer to own land rather than lease as then you have control over how long you have the land.
6.	We would prefer to buy more land and invest in our operation for the long term. However the price increase of land in our RM has made this option out of reach. As a young farm with limited cash flow we struggle with the high prices being requested by retiring farmers.
7.	Would be very hard to buy land at such high prices in order to compete with investor based land companies or such groups like Hutterite colonies (who qualify under different borrowing rules) and still be sustainable as a young un established farmer.

8.	Probably to expand will have to rent land because buying it is not affordable.
9.	The way the rate of rent is going I'd feel much more comfortable owning. Foreign investors or large corporations can move in and offer more rent without their bank account even feeling it.
10.	A mix of owned and leased gives the best flexibility for debt and financing ratios.
11.	Funding is hard to come by for startup guys like myself. Leasing is a little easier but you're not the owner in the long run.
12.	If possible we want to own. The only land we have been able to acquire either owned or tented has been through relatives. Our grown son lives in a trailer in our yard with his young family and he has not been able to purchase even one quarter.
13.	Land values have increased to fast and become almost too costly to buy.
14.	I believe in ownership. More control over my operation then.
15.	I would like to own, but in order to expand I have to rent land as opportunities come up.
16.	Would try and buy out lease land, and build more equity to try and expand.
17.	Depends on what is available, as well as potential landlords.
18.	I think it's very important that land in SK is owned by farmers and Saskatchewan born residents. Foreign owners and investors should have to give up their land and not be allowed to buy. Farm land needs to be attainable for young farmers and the land needs to be properly worked.
19.	If good arable land was available in the area we would try to buy it so that our growing farming family would have more land base in order to bring a better return. Unfortunately there is a lot of sandy pasture, alkaline, slough land and there has been a big push on our RM to allow for people to build homes along the highway and make country estates of them. These 40 acre parcels are expected to be built on farmable land, which means there is more competition for land base, as real estate agents are trying to talk farmers into sub dividing their property.
20.	Refer to my previous answer.
21.	With the current land prices I can't afford to own it all.
22.	If we can find land we can afford.
23.	We are finding that leasing land has become a cash cow for land owners who have inherited their land and have lost the concept of "land stewardship".
24.	Feel that Ag land is good investment for the future of my kids
25.	I would own it if I could afford to buy it which I can't so most likely I will have to lease land in order to expand.
26.	I would probably have to lease if the rent was still affordable. Because these big guys are paying too much. I don't understand how the financial institutes can keep giving them that kind of money when there is no way possible to pay it back.
27.	Simply can't compete with land prices! 160,000 for 160 acres. Some zones that's feasible but in south central just starting out not possible!

28.	The price of land in our area is now out of reach for the average or young farmer. Big companies have started buying in our area (Peace River area in Alberta).
29.	Too many out of province buyers. Driving land prices up and making it for young Saskatchewan farmer to start up. Like myself.
30.	See previous response. I'd love to own land but find it over priced to the point it will take outside funds to make a quarter pay. You cannot produce enough on a quarter of land to make the payments on it.
31.	Same as last question.
32.	We like to have control of and we farm.
33.	We would only expand if we could own the land. However, there is very little for sale in this area and what is, is now high priced.
34.	Too much debt trying to buy good farmland.
35.	Land prices are beyond the ability to pay for itself through production.
36.	CAN'T PAY OFF THE HIGH PRICED LAND WITH ONLY RANCHING COWS AND HORSES.
37.	To grow my farm, I need assets. But at the price of land, land rent is much cheaper which lowers my risk of a failure.
38.	Can't afford to buy right now so lease would be best option to increase land base.
39.	If there was land to purchase I would buy. But land price has been pushed so high you are limited to the amount you can borrow to buy the land.
40.	Would rather own for the security. But lease land is cheaper. But, you don't ever own lease land. Biggest scam going around. Open up all the lease land to the current landowners to buy of they want. And if they don't, they can still keep the lease. Their choice. No other party can buy the land from under them!
41.	Land is too expensive, too many corporate farms and Chinese investors paying big bucks making it hard for young farmers like me to buy and make a living off of
42.	Owning is the least risky to expand.
43.	I don't rent any land, as much of the land that is available for rent has (in my opinion) been poorly farmed and to get it into the condition I require, costs a significant amount of money (fertilizer and herbicide) and you are only improving it for a landlord if you are renting whereas, if you improve it for yourself if you are the owner. I have rented land in the past, did the improvements and the neighbors saw the land was producing good crops and went and offered the land owner higher rent and I lost it along with all of my inputs. Learned a lesson and didn't do it again.
44.	I would like to keep my acres the same as now and expand my owned acres by purchasing my leased land. The problem being Chinese investors in our area are buying up anything that is for sale for prices I cannot compete with. After they buy it the lease back rate is set so high only large corporate farms can take on that risk.
45.	All of our land is owned, and it all will continue to be. Returns are naturally better if you don't need to divide up your profit between multiple parties. And a business model that tells on land

	sales to raise capital isn't living within its means.
46.	Would buy more for sure but the price is so over inflated from out of province buyers it's hard to justify.
47.	Leasing is a good option as long as you have a base of owned land to work with.
48.	The current value of farmland has shot up here in recent years to where it is not viable to make payments on the land with profit generated off it. Leasing is somewhat more affordable right now which is a strange scenario. Farmland values in the area have nearly doubled beyond what the agricultural capacity of the land can bear. Long term this will be troublesome as young farmers are in a very high leased land situation and will have no opportunity to purchase if their sole income is from agriculture. They have no guarantee that the land will be available to them to lease as little as two or three years into the future.
49.	We don't have enough capital to buy up to the size we want to be.
50.	It depends on the type of land, current grain and cattle prices and current land prices.
51.	With the rising cost of farmland we'd prefer to own but would cost too much at first to expand. Long term I'd look at buying.
52.	Leasing can be a lot of headaches.
53.	Try to buy as much as I can but that's getting harder every year.
54.	If I was able to buy land at near a sustainable level that is what I would do.
55.	I would add as much as I could own as well as some leased.
56.	I would rather own and make the land viable as I see fit as oppose to bidding on land. Young farmers cannot get loans/leases on equipment (as realtor think they can) without proving steady cash flow, which you cannot have on year to year leases.
57.	I would prefer to buy. We haven't made much money farming the land; most of our gain in equity has been in land value appreciation. Without that farming would not be profitable for us
58.	See opinion above.
59.	Depending on location, and opportunities that become available. I think the price is high right now for what land can produce and make a living off of, so might wait for the correction to buy
60.	Prefer to buy more land to expand our farm ourselves, rather than lease or rent. Hard to make long term decisions with short term rental/lease agreements.
61.	The land values have gone up so much that with our land soil types it is very iffy to make a living off the land.
62.	I will purchase if the land is close to home or the price is right. I will lease if that is all the current owner wants to do. I prefer to purchase at my stage.
63.	I'm young so ownership is the better fit.
64.	I believe the hard work, dedication & sacrifice of our farmers/ranchers for generations all had one thing in common...they wanted their kids to have something. Something real which instills priceless values in ones soul from such a young age. This is not obtainable through leasing land from corporate companies who have one motive of financial gain in mind. What a crime it

	would be to strip Saskatchewan youth of the ability to continue to contribute so positively to the world in this way.
65.	Can't afford to own.
66.	I couldn't afford to buy with these crazy prices.
67.	Same as above.
68.	Depends on what comes up for sale/lease.
69.	Can't afford to compete with the investor's purchasing land. Also there should be a cap on how much land one farmer can own. Say 15,000 acres. Big is not better...and if hired labour is used the care in how things are done and dealt with is removed.... the farmer who farms his own land has the most interest in how things are done but.... nowadays farmers are retiring and holding on to farm land because it pays better interest then the bank.
70.	There is no way I can afford to buy when I have to compete with non-farm related investors.
71.	Land prices continue to be pushed up by institutional investors and if this allowed to continue or expanded then the average farmer will no longer be able to afford to purchase land. This will leave you at the mercy of your landlord as far as rental costs.
72.	Owning is preferred. Leasing could be used as an intermediate step to generate income in order to buy.
73.	I can't afford to buy anymore right now.
74.	Again, rather buy but not much available/ affordable.
75.	As I stated earlier "If you lease your land, you are putting your income at risk because that land could be taken away at any time. There is enough risk in farming, we don't need more. Also, farmland is a good investment as it always appreciates in the long run."
76.	What's there to say? We would buy what we could afford and lease if we couldn't buy.
77.	Land values have been driven to such high values with investment companies and foreigners/out of province buyers that buying land has become an uneconomical venture for my farm. I can't compete so in turn I am forced to rent to expand acres.
78.	I feel I could be making a land payment and owning the property for the amount I have to pay to rent any land. I also like the freedom of deciding what and how to best treat the land.
79.	It's not easy to lease, as larger farmers whom already farm 20 plus quarters out bid everyone else. Seems impossible to get anywhere.
80.	I would only lease if I thought it would increase my chances of eventually owning the property.
81.	Simply cannot afford expanding at these prices so no other option for expanding than leasing.
82.	Response above applies.
83.	Realistically, it would have to be a combination of both given the current situation with land prices.
84.	Want to buy but can't compete with outside investment, in a strong financial position but cost per acre is more than the cost of return on production.

85.	Do not want to tie up capital or mortgage.
86.	Depends on the land available, if for sale, would consider purchase. If not for sale but lease then would consider leasing. If family wants more land, probably look at purchasing. Purchase prices right now cannot be justified based on production of the land. Potash mine land purchases has distorted prices in the area.
87.	No plans to expand.
88.	More likely to lease but would prefer to buy but the cost is too high.
89.	So expensive to buy because of outside investors.
90.	Would like to own it but the land prices are too high to be able to afford it.
91.	ooooo
92.	Hard to come up with large down payment to buy 1000 + acres...so need to lease some.
93.	It has always been the way we expanded the farm.
94.	Lease due to the high price of farmland now.
95.	Do to the current price of farm land and the amount competition to purchase land it becomes very hard for a young farmer to buy land. Currently some land is only for sale for less than 24 hours.
96.	It's yours and your families.
97.	Less risk .do not want to lose the land I own.
98.	Presently we would need 50/50 because of the skyrocket land prices.
99.	If we can afford it, we would like to own it.
100.	If I could find something worth renting/leasing sure but that's difficult. I'd rather own the land then can improve the land (fence/bush/) without having to contact the leaser. Unless it's a long term agreement ie:10-15 years, that way you can plan crops and what not without worrying if your lease or rental agreement will be renewed.
101.	As above.
102.	We are ready to retire, our farm is for sale, do not consider expanding, unless something next door comes up, and would make our sale more attractive.
103.	Price of buying land is very high so as much as we would like to own all our land it is cost prohibitive.
104.	Again we are not interesting in leasing large amounts of land. We want the same opportunities as the generations before us to own our own farm! This is how Saskatchewan was built and it has worked well.
105.	I would prefer to own but the prices investment groups are paying is not reasonable for land.
106.	We currently rent just over half or land. Luckily our farm is in a cash strong position and we were able to purchase some of the land we rented and relied on over the last 3 years. This land went up for sale and had we not bought it, it would have been a big hit to our production as it was a sizeable portion of our land We would have needed to downsize our equipment or find

	some other land to farm.
107.	My first choice is to own but with investment buyers around with bottomless pockets the price just keeps going up until they own it.
108.	We are currently in a position on our farm where we would love to expand. Due to the high land prices and competition with investors or 3rd party entities it is not possible to expand exponentially. We would financially be in a position to grow only by a quarter or two if the opportunity to purchase land came available. Growing by renting would be a less financially straining way to expand but again the competition is very high.
109.	Payments on land getting higher than can be supported by farming activities.
110.	We could not afford to purchase the acres that we would want to expand at today's prices, having to give 25% cash down or additional land in lieu of cash down. So the most realistic option, financially, would be to purchase some and lease the balance. Of course, this also depends on the area of the province and the cost of leasing land. A cost analysis would have to be completed to determine the most economical for the farmer.
111.	We can't afford to buy any more land at the current prices.
112.	Would like to buy more but can't afford, and can't compete with "investors".
113.	Purchase more... but the price is presently ridiculously lousy. As a young farmer, I find it quite challenging when trying to compete with investors...
114.	At present I have no thought of expanding, so question is hard to answer.
115.	The number of owners from British Columbia that are or have bought land and drive prices too high or just need a tax right off have driven prices so high the people that actually do the work can't own it.
116.	It makes more sense to buy it if it's not \$160,000 a quarter. If you are renting you still have nothing but expensive machinery farming someone else's land and if they take it away from you how does a person make the payments on it?
117.	Would prefer to own but I may not be able to afford to but
118.	Financially we can't get a loan for land, it's easier to buy a new tractor than land when you go to the bank for a loan and that's wrong in my opinion.
119.	Either is acceptable to our farm. My sons would like to acquire land but none is available and when some comes available we have to compete vigorously with outside of our country buyers plus back door corporations within our area to acquire more land.
120.	I distrust lease, we have been screwed by leases.
121.	There is plenty of land available for lease, its finding land for sale that is the issue. Allowing institutional ownership will only add to this problem.
122.	It is hard to build a cattle herd, not knowing if you will have pasture and hay for them next week, next month, or next year. Leases and rental contracts are only as good as the paper they are written on.
123.	It depends on the number of acres and proximity. More likely to purchase a smaller parcel

	adjacent to existing owned land but would definitely look at leasing a large block.
124.	I prefer to own my own land as this would provide for my retirement many years from now. Leasing does not do that. However, since there is virtually no land for purchase at a reasonable price I may be forced into renting or leasing at very high prices.
125.	Land has become very expensive so purchasing large amounts of land is very difficult. Leasing along with buying helps expand my land base to generate cash flow to make future land purchases more feasible.
126.	With prices going up so high, I feel there will be a fall of prices before long. All we need is a couple crop years of failure and prices will fall, partly due to farmers not able to or want to pay the rental the pension plans want.
127.	With the price of Saskatchewan land rising so fast I do not think we could afford to pay the purchase price up front. We would probably have to lease more land to expand.
128.	Land gone past its productive value.
129.	Don't want any more land.
130.	Owning the land would be strongly preferred but with land prices so high it's hard to make payments.
131.	Would buy land for the right price or right location. Would also be willing to lease more. Expansion recently has been due to buying land.
132.	It's hard to expand and own all your land it ties up to much cash. It's nice to partner with a land owner be it a neighbour or a pension fund.
133.	Can't afford to buy land in our area.
134.	See above response.
135.	Well I'd prefer to own it all...but that's not really realistic so I will have to lease and buy.
136.	Cash flow is a key player. Bad year is best to own land and only have to worry about p taxes.
137.	I can't afford to buy at these inflated prices that are above the carrying capacity of the land.
138.	If the right land came for sale, I would purchase. Right land means close to some we have already and must be productive.
139.	It depends on land prices; it's hard to expand when land prices are so high.
140.	in the long run lease payments do nothing to increase the assets we borrow against
141.	Would prefer to own but would take lease if it became an option
142.	A lot of times you're able to lease the land at the beginning and then have the option to purchase it at fair market value after. However with the land banks coming in they affect that fair market value price and outbid the farmer who is trying to better their livelihood.
143.	It would be too expensive to simply expand through purchasing so I would have to lease more land
144.	Presently don't have enough cash to buy the land, so likely have to lease if the land is near

	enough.
145.	Can't afford to buy all the land for an expansion.
146.	Land is currently very expensive and leasing it or a rent to own arrangement would suit my cash flow
147.	Land is so expensive right now; it does not make economic sense to purchase it. Also because of the high price it is very risky. On the other hand. Rents have been pushed up so high, that in some cases they are not an economical option either
148.	Ownership offset with leased land allows risk splitting.
149.	I would like to own but as described earlier it is extremely difficult to start out as a young small farmer that wasn't born into a large operation. Would like to buy but for now the only thing that makes sense is to rent if we can but even the price of rent is driven up by large farmers that have so much land they can't even farm it all. Renters don't care because it is cash rent but it's hard to watch when all a small guy wants is to just be sustainable and not have to sell any family land that will be passed down to me
150.	Would prefer to own and lease only if it's close to home until I was able to purchase it.
151.	Pick up what you can, where, and when it becomes available to you!
152.	My gain stays in Saskatchewan which is not the case with corporations.
153.	depending on price and land availability
154.	See above comment.
155.	There are 6 or so large corporate farms all within a 20 mile radius of me as well as Hutterites and pretty well any land for rent or sale is offered to them and no one else - except to use our bid to make sure they (the large corp. farms/Hutterites) pay more.
156.	We will expand in any way that we can, including leasing land, however we prefer to expand by owning to provide some security to our operation.
157.	Whatever comes available, but ideally a mix as the cost of purchasing large chunks of land is extremely high. (Note: Rental prices have increased recently with the increase of land purchase prices)
158.	We can't afford to own the land because big corporations are driving the prices higher.
159.	Same reason as the comment above.
160.	Current cost of land is simply not justified by its productive capacity. Buying land at this price would be a dumb business move - there would be little chance of a positive return. I hate to lease, but that would be my only real choice.
161.	Land prices have risen so drastically ownership is becoming more difficult. I would buy if possible but may not be able to afford to.
162.	As an organic grower, leased land is rarely an option for me.
163.	Decision to purchase is based on location and cost. Again a combination works well for us at this particular time.

164.	At 60 years of age I am not interested in expanding, but if I were, I would purchase.
165.	Would want to own but as a small operation it would be difficult to purchase because of inflated land prices.
166.	I am established and will afford it. My boys see leasing land is their best option because payments are more reasonable and no land tax bill. Well landowners will accept less than a 5% return on land, young farmers can't. Having the pension fund own land should allow a young farmer a fairly secure rental to build his/her farming operation.
167.	I believe nothing help local municipal community more than medium size farm. Current restriction is helping MEGA farm instead. If farmland price could be decided by free market, I think there will be more young farmers to operate. Look at average farm size in ON or BC, or even US.
168.	With Farmland values being on the rise it is not feasible to buy all of the land that you are planning on farming unless you can purchase with cash or use the additional acres that you own to help pay for the mortgage. With renting some land along with buying it would allow me to slowly increase my owned acres by paying lower rents than what I would on a mortgage payment but again if land is purchase by large investment corps who need to make certain returns the rents increase to a point where you still can't build enough cash flow for the down payment required to purchase additional acres.
169.	I'm an older farmer with equity.
170.	Currently there is available lease land so will continue for now.
171.	Expand or die!
172.	reduce risk
173.	A mix of owned and rented for us is approx. 65 percent owned and the balance rented. For us building equity thru land ownership is important.
174.	Once you own, you never again need to negotiate constantly changing requirements or demands. Owning provides the security for long term planning.
175.	Ownership allows control.
176.	I would purchase the land because I can make long term decisions and projections on how I can better my farm operation.
177.	The reason is because at these prices its bankruptcy waiting to happen.
178.	When you own land it is yours to make complete decisions about as renting or leasing you had to negotiate with the owner.
179.	Leasing some land will help spread out your risks.
180.	Leasing just adds another unknown variable on the expense side of the operation.
181.	Some of the land coming up will not be up for sale. Owners want to hold onto it but not farm any longer. Obviously coming up with enough money to buy large amounts of land is not always feasible.
182.	Owning your land base is always preferable, but competing with foreign governments or

	investors is just not an option for young farmers trying to get started. And renting can be very unpredictable.
183.	Cost of land has gone up so much that for size of my farm it is virtually impossible to expand.
184.	Land is always a good investment.
185.	If more land was readily available where I am located I would consider buying more land.
186.	We would pick up small parcels but are not able to compete with big money on large parcels.
187.	My ancestors left Europe not to be a serf.
188.	There has become some concern about the cost of farming ...lower grain prices-- high cost of land -- weather concerns.
189.	When you buy it at least your payments are going towards it. At the end you have something.
190.	Same as above! Main reason for expanding land owned would be to have better control over stewardship of lands surrounding my own, e.g. limit / reduce to zero the application of chemicals to the land, better manage water and nutrient cycles, erosion, etc.
191.	Once again I like to know I can count on a certain amount of land to provide financial stability to my operation.
192.	Financing is very challenging to get until one doesn't need financing - - - then financing is proffered from many sources!
193.	On leased land you are working for someone else you are surfs for someone else.
194.	There are very few for sale signs out there.
195.	depends what is affordable
196.	Since 2009 it has been difficult to buy land as these investment firms have come in and doubled and tripled the price of land.
197.	test
198.	My ancestors came to Canada many generations ago to escape a system of landlords owning the farms and the peasants doing the work for a small portion of the profits. They wanted to own their farms and so do I.
199.	For the same reasons as stated above.
200.	Lease rates are so high that it maybe be more feasible to purchase.
201.	Investor land purchases over the last number of years have contributed to soaring land prices which makes it very difficult for a young farmer to compete. Only option right now would be to lease however high land values also translates to higher rent which is another barrier for young farmers.
202.	I am not interested in expanding due to my age and will probably be selling in the near future.
203.	As above.
204.	It's sometimes easier to acquire more land by buying due to increasing lease prices.

205.	In my opinion owning land gives you a more stable long term outlook for how much you can expand you operation.
206.	test
207.	Purchasing is such a huge commitment if something in my life changes leasing allows me to exit some land.
208.	I would do both, but prefer to own the farmland, then I can choose to pasture, farm, hay, etc. without risk of putting money into improvements on the land and losing those improvements.
209.	I would like to expand the farm, but every year with poor commodity prices and skyrocketing input costs, I can't see how that can happen unless the price of commodity's go up and input costs drop. I also have to compete with other farmers who have deep pockets and who want to buy all the land in the area. If you were to let people from other countries buy land there would be no way I could ever afford land. I would have to move and gets a job somewhere else doing something different.
210.	I am a bit old to be purchasing. Leasing is easier. More land available.
211.	Answered above.
212.	Can't afford nor does it make economic sense to purchase at inflated prices.
213.	We would prefer to own, but if the only way to expand is to lease, then that is the option we would have to take.
214.	Let us keep the rural communities alive.
215.	There is land in the area for lease if I decided to.
216.	Hard to make enough off land to make payment with higher land values.
217.	Farm land is a good investment and farmers need to have this land available to rent or sell when they retire. They will be able to pass it down to the next generation or sell to a potential farmer.
218.	It all depends on what's available, what price, where, how many acres are in a parcel.
219.	Have to try and lease some land to offset the higher purchasing price. Son and daughter both want to continue with the family farm. I am 3rd generation and would like to see it remain a viable family farm operation for generations to come. My grandfather came here in 1905 from an Ontario farm because of being able to farm in this province. Higher cost back in Ontario meant some of his families were unable to farm. So opportunity gave him a chance here.
220.	I plan on buying a bit more land, but I am average age of farmers in this province at 54.
221.	Land may be easier to acquire by renting. If you patiently rent for a few years, you will probably have first crack at it when the owner eventually wants to sell. Plus, despite the advantages of owning, it's so expensive! With recent equipment upgrades, our farm can't afford more land right now.
222.	Building up the family farm.
223.	50/50 they both have positive advantage for expansion. Probably more of advantage to lease for young farmer undercapitalized.

224.	As my Father would say they aren't making any more land. Selling land to non-Saskatchewan farmers will surely allow the profits to leave our province, when there gone they don't come back. We need the money to stay where it's needed!
225.	I feel a farmer should own most of his land for financial strength and acre security.
226.	I'd like to own more but realistically can't afford it.
227.	Land is getting more expensive to buy, therefore need to rent to expand.
228.	Own as much as possible, lease whatever is available.
229.	Hard to turn down any opportunity as a young farmer starting out.
230.	Would like to own! Have two children that would like to ranch with me but with current land prices I can't see any profit in buying more right now! The last two years have been the first time that myself and brother were able to take a wage out of ranch! It was off farm income that kept us going! And our bank tells us we are in top 10 percent for profit compared to Canadian average. Now I have to compete against my own tax dollar and foreign money that no one knows where it came from????? So much for a future farmer or rancher! I said it before and I will say it again !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
231.	Interest rates are low and profitability is good currently.
232.	I'd like to own more but current land prices are being pushed so high it's almost impossible at this point.
233.	If I purchase the land I do not have to worry about losing the land at the end of a lease agreement to a competitor that has outside investment money and no knowledge of the true production value of the land. Speculators are either ignorant of or ignore the variability of the Saskatchewan climate and also the cyclic nature of commodity prices.
234.	Would like to own but with the prices where they are at that would be impossible for me.
235.	The security of knowing what I have for more than a few years is crucial for me to plan for machinery and help. Farming is an expensive profession!!!!
236.	As a relatively young farmer (32), we have a long time ahead of us to grow our operation, and unfortunately with leasing, there is a certain amount of uncertainty related to the scenario. As our neighbours retire, and/or pass on, their land is being transitioned to non-farming family members. This creates a huge amount of uncertainty for the business - I have a business arrangement that could significantly impact my operation with an individual that I didn't actually choose to do business with - my contract was with Grandma.
237.	If you own it you have set your destiny.
238.	See above.
239.	Prefer to own if price is kept consistent with a reasonable rate of return on investment. If price is too high it must be passed onto the end product consumer which is simply inflationary!
240.	It is more ideal to own, but it is very rare for land to come up for sale in our area as much of it is owned by children or grandchildren of former farmers living in the city, so current farmers do not have much of a choice between owning or renting the land.

241.	It would depend on the price I would like to buy but might not be financially sound so might have to rent
242.	If you own you can plan equipment purchases etc. for the long term
243.	Chance of buying more land is very slim with current rules because price land is selling for to investors will not pay to own it and make money farming.
244.	Capital constraints.
245.	See comments above.
246.	If we were to expand we would much prefer to do it with purchased rather than rented land. However, the price of land in our area has become unaffordable because of the interest of various investors. We have two children that would like to farm but we are not sure if they will ever be able to accomplish their goals because the rental and purchase price of land has skyrocketed. Investor interest in farmland is great if a person is ready to quit and sell out but it makes it extremely difficult for those of us who wish to continue in our agricultural careers.
247.	I would sure like to purchase more than I lease but for the financial end of things I would have to lease to have the cash flow to pay for the loans of the purchased land.
248.	I would lease land providing it was from another farmer and not a corporation or a land trust fund type group.
249.	Would like to own all my land that I farm.
250.	I would want to own as much of the land that I farm as possible. Leasing is ok for short term growth but ultimately ownership would be the longer term goal.
251.	Leasing farm land rather than owning is compare able to renting a house your whole life or buying one. If you lease you nothing to show for 30 years of payments at the end of your career.
252.	I've had bad experiences leasing land. Poor farming practices by the previous farmer had destroyed the vitality and created a massive weed problem. Spent five years losing money on investing in the problem only to have the land sold off to vale and the land rent raised 40 percent.
253.	We live too close to a city for farmland to be affordable.
254.	See above, long term agriculture in Saskatchewan is not a Gravy Train; it makes the most sense to own and put that rental rate in our pocket. After all, less than 5 percent is our long term return on investment.
255.	It is hard to buy land when the wealthy, well set up farms are able to snap it up. Throw in a group which buys land in huge blocks, and rental may be the only option in these cases.
256.	Even though we would prefer to own the additional farmland, the cost in our area has risen so dramatically over the last few years that ownership is unlikely. The cost has been driven up by non-farming investors.
257.	I am 26 years old, and trying to make living grain farming. I bought my first quarter off my grandfather; I am looking to buy another at the end of the year. The land prices in this province are so inflated it sickens me. My land is in RM 128, where the going price for a section (640

<p>acres) of land is in excess of 1.2 million. I ask the Saskatchewan Party how am I to make a living with land payments at that price? The Saskatchewan Party is killing the small family operated farms one by one. When I approach the old couples in my area to inquire about purchasing land they all tell me the same thing why do you want to get into farm? There is no money to be made, and you can't pay top dollar like the potash companies nor the out of country buyers. why would you take ownership away from the ones working the land I feel you guys want to make us serfs. these companies or out of country owners don't care for the land nor do guys that lease the land, people who own and live on the land are the best for the stewardship of the land, they care for it, how can't you see this? The Saskatchewan Party needs to look to Europe and learn how there farming operations are where the little guys are supported and encouraged. These family operated farms in Saskatchewan that are 10000+ acres are not a family farm they are corporations. Also I am an electrician I work 21days straight, this job alone is over six figures. I would give it up in a heartbeat to be on the land 24/7, but unfortunately I don't see this ever happening with land prices like this. I would love to hear back from a Saskatchewan Party representative.</p>
<p>258. Own use my equity to expand.</p>
<p>259. Would like to buy if we could get funding. Prices have skyrocketed beyond the small farmers' range which is what Wall wants I guess lots of capital to throw around and mega farms which as no refused for others around them it's the almighty dollar. Absolutely no assistance for smaller farmers to increase in size we can't compete</p>
<p>260. To own is better for me but it have been getting more expense to buy land.</p>
<p>261. Cash flow.</p>
<p>262. Naturally you would prefer to own, but you can't always find land to buy. Also with the rise of the land investment company's which some neighbours get in league with, the prices are getting ridiculous.</p>
<p>263. See response to the question above.</p>
<p>264. I would prefer to own all the land I but since the cost of land, equipment, and inputs is so high it would be impossible to have a viable operation unless one inherited it you simply can't get enough of a return on your operation to survive if you have to make payments on every aspect of it.</p>
<p>265. My great grandfather came from Europe to get away from rich land lords who owned all the land. Are we going to let it happen here? NO THANKS</p>
<p>266. I'm too close to retirement now to tie up significant capital in non-liquid investments.</p>
<p>267. In poor or no - profit years it has been the equity in farmland that has enabled me to keep farming. Being unable to rely on farmland equity will make it extremely difficult for farmers to power through the tough times.</p>
<p>268. I would only own land. Would only purchase if I had the money in full. Won't expand land base unless price is right.</p>
<p>269. I believe in ownership. A smaller operation with ownership is better off than a larger one with less ownership</p>

270.	If another ranching operation came up for sale with deeded and lease land I would not mind it all comes down to if I can financially make it work.
271.	We are retiring after this year.
272.	Land prices are being driven so high by land investors that it makes it nearly impossible for young farmers to buy land.
273.	Not much to purchase around my area, and would not turn down lease land for the right price.
274.	I see neighbors who lease land, buy machinery, then sometimes lose the land for various reasons. They then have to continue to make payments on machinery on a smaller land base. Sometimes to prevent this from happening they pay way more rent than what it is worth to maintain a land base, which equally puts their operation at risk as we are seeing in this drought year.
275.	I always prefer to buy but the reality is many landowners simply do not want to sell as they see their land as a valuable investment.
276.	I cannot afford to buy land at current values
277.	Will be more dependent on price of both scenarios
278.	Land prices are too high, virtually impossible to make the payment.
279.	We'd consider any opportunity if it was the appropriate decision for our business. However having the title in your name is always perceived as safer... if government won't pull it out from under me.
280.	Same as above
281.	At this time we can't afford the 25% down payment so high lease rates will be our only opportunity to expand.
282.	Land prices too high so will lease for now
283.	It is difficult to buy land that connects to mine because I have to wait for the right pieces to come up for sale. There is lots of land in this area that is owned by people more than 50km away and by _____, so land comes up for lease quite often. I would rather lease a piece that connects to mine than own a piece that is 10 miles away.
284.	The expense off leasing has risen so high in our area buy investor's buying land and leasing it back that u may as well own it. The problem that occurs is they have cheaper lending rates and we can't compete. This is great for investors but very poor for our future farms
285.	Can't afford the down payment.
286.	Owning is preferable as any money invested in improvements to the land remains with the owner.
287.	Land is too expensive to buy.
288.	As I would like to preferably own, but with the hardships of financing especially to a young farmer like myself it is easier to find a lease then potentially buy it once funds can be established.

289.	Depend on situation and opportunities.
290.	Would prefer to own the land
291.	Buy from some retiring neighbors and rent from others
292.	When you own land you benefit when prices rise
293.	Would depend on where the land was located if it was directly connected to land we already own. We raise cattle and if the land is all in a block it makes it easier for pasturing especially in fall.
294.	Own whenever possible.
295.	More likely to lease because it's very expensive to buy land and make a profit. Need more rent land to cover the higher cost of making payments on newly purchased land.
296.	I would prefer to own before lease but would take both if I didn't put myself in a high risk situation financially.
297.	Leasing and farming the land has less risk than today's spiraling land prices
298.	More likely to lease because I'm a young farmer and capital is a major issue when starting out
299.	I can use farmland that I own currently to back new farmland mortgages. The interest and principal that I pay on the farmland could potentially be the same or lower than the rent I would be charged by the landowner. For instance, a quarter-section purchased/mortgaged for \$120,000 (160 acres) at 6.25%/annum would have an annual payment of \$8,952.34. Rent on 160 acres at \$40/acre=\$6,400, \$50/acre=\$8,000, \$60/acre=\$9,600.
300.	I would try to buy if possible. That may not always be possible.
301.	Security.
302.	There are only so many opportunities to purchase and lease land. If that opportunity arises and we think it will benefit the long term goals of the farm we will try to purchase or lease. In many instances we will try to purchase farmland we have been leasing for a long time.
303.	Don't like to work for some big land owner - that is the reason my grandfather came to Saskatchewan.
304.	At the current rate of rental you would rather own it.
305.	If I could get cash down payment.
306.	Buying land is a means of investing for retirement, leasing is often cheaper than buying land these days therefore a better short term solution for expansion.
307.	Would prefer to buy but financing options are difficult especially FCC. As a young farmer it is hard to get started.
308.	Thinking of retirement so not looking to expand.
309.	With foreign and out of province money competing for the same land I can't afford to expand
310.	When we own our land we have more options
311.	Would like to buy but probably can't afford to compete with investors.

312.	I advise all young farmers to buy their land because the worst thing I ever did was to work land and put my blood sweat and tears into it so that someone else could walk away with the profit and appreciation. Young farmers today who rent land for \$60 dollars an acre and more are simply wasting their lives and making someone else richer and at the end of they will have nothing of their own.
313.	Buy as much as we can afford.
314.	As prices increase it's not always easy to buy land. In order to expand, we may have to rent more land to increase revenue then gradually look into buying land.
315.	Leasing gets you in the door and maybe the opportunity to buy.
316.	Again it all depends how the \$ pencils out.
317.	Would be interested in buying land but the competition for it is very strong where I farm.
318.	At this stage of my farming career and my age I think leasing would be more responsible
319.	A livestock operation needs to be sustainable both now and the future. Too tight a margin even in good times will result in overgrazing to the detriment of the land
320.	I do not wish to lease land and put improvements on it, then lose the lease, and I do not wish to leave land close to my farm open to development.
321.	Depends on where the available land is.... We are only interested In land near our home
322.	Being from the area in which we farm, we know best what particular quarter or piece of land is more or less productive and what could be a reasonable expectation for rate of return off that land. As such, we are not going to overpay to own land that won't be turning us a profit. This doesn't seem to be the case for these investors and the values that they keep on driving land prices to are completely out of reach for most average farmers. Thus, many of us are being forced to lease rather than own newly acquired land.
323.	I am 55, not really interested in buying more land, but would lease some.
324.	The leased land will hopefully help pay for the owned land.
325.	It's easier to find land to lease than buy.
326.	No intention of expanding.
327.	You can't buy it all at once.
328.	I would prefer to own the land I take care of and farm.
329.	As stated above the preference would be to purchase if at all possible to create as secure base which to work off. Reality is that there will always be some leased land but would prefer to limit the exposure if possible. However, since growth is necessary will have to do both.
330.	To purchase and own the land at current values puts limits on cash flow and at time restricts good farm management practices which may have long term effects on future productivity of the land.
331.	Definitely own the acres, I need stable expansion for the health of my farm, equity in owned land that is eventually paid off will help me through tough times.

332.	Expanding through leasing allows expansion where a capital base not yet developed.
333.	Will purchase if available or lease if the option is there.
334.	WITH INCREASE IN LAND VALUE MORE LANDLORDS ARE LOOKING AT SELLING TO HIGHEST BIDDER AND CASHING IN.
335.	I don't plan to expand.
336.	Ownership gives me a second value aside from income, that being a secure retirement package.
337.	It is an appreciating asset. I will take buying over renting any time. You might as well put your rent payments towards land payments instead. But we cannot compete against huge foreign investors and the days of our kids taking over the family farm are over.
338.	We are in the process of downsizing our farm, so expanding our operation out of the question.
339.	Land is too high priced for me to own.
340.	We would prefer to buy the land when we expand but currently it is more likely that we will have to settle on a lease
341.	If you rent and outside competition is buying are you secure
342.	I want to make sure my land will be there for future farming and for my children to inherit and carry on farming.
343.	Unless the land is close to the ranch we would be more likely to lease.
344.	Own would be the preferred response but at current prices it is very difficult to expand with purchased land.
345.	We are frustrated with dealing with landowners and would be willing to pay more to own our own land. We would be willing to make improvements to save money and time in the long run and would also build equity. Livestock are unattractive to lenders as collateral and farm equipment depreciates. Land would help improve/ stabilize our financial future in agriculture.
346.	With farm land values inflating it is tough to come up with the money to purchase land which would be the most ideal.
347.	At the price of land right now we cannot afford to buy land all the time and we will take the opportunity to rent when available.
348.	Same as above.
349.	if land was not available at a price I could afford I would be open to leasing
350.	Shared responsibilities, shared financial risk, long term relationships, contribution to local economy.
351.	I may buy more land when it is available.
352.	Would like to purchase, but financial restraints sometimes necessitate leasing land.
353.	I would like to own, but it is already evident, with increasing rent and land values, lease is basically the only option. Land owners who rent their land are not thinking about selling, when

	they can make good revenue off of high rent prices driven up by outsiders.
354.	Owning is more secure.
355.	It's better to have ownership and control
356.	Would more likely to own but foreign investment groups have already driven the price of land up. This deters and prevents the next generation(s) from becoming farmers and careers forcing them to move elsewhere in the country.
357.	Would like to add owned land, but the current competitive environment makes it difficult to purchase land.
358.	Because we cannot afford to purchase.
359.	Lease land now costs the same as deeded, easy decision. In certain cases lease is cheaper than deeded but financing can be impossible.
360.	I've got lots of money to buy land it's just that all the land is already being farmed; investors have no incentive to sell to me. The land here needs lots of improvements that are not being done by current tenants.
361.	I prefer to own and would rather invest money into owning a physical asset as opposed to saving money on lease payments/taxes.
362.	Leases can change up or down drastically much more so than interest rates tend to.
363.	Lease crown land until capital allows purchase.
364.	At my current situation, I want to expand but I don't want to take on any more dept. Renting land would be the best option because I don't need any more equipment.
365.	Very situational dependent.
366.	Buy whenever can afford it and land is available.
367.	As indicated above ownership is preferred. It has become increasingly difficult to purchase land as the price continues to rise. As a result it is often necessary to rent or lease land in order to expand. There are several investors that have purchased land in the area. Some have paid what is generally viewed as an exorbitant price for marginal land. There are also some that do not reside in Canada. One such owner appears to live in the UK as that is where one must call in order to get in contact with him.
368.	Owning land by Saskatchewan residents helps us drive our Province and better looks after many generations of farmers and their families. Roots in farming families run deep. It does not prosper unless that want and desire is bred in each generation and that want to be a Saskatchewan Farmer living each day in Saskatchewan
369.	I think humans should own the land the farm so they are more likely to look after it.
370.	Renting land and trying to make a living is like playing the lottery. When you own the land at least you have financial security from your assets.
371.	Depending on the size of the expansion, I would like to purchase as much as I could, but it is really going to depend on what is available in our trading area, is it for sale or for rent.

372.	Some balance between lease and ownership with a real lean towards ownership. I'm not willing to put up all the capital, take all the risk and have limited reward.
373.	Trying to buy everything is too expensive. Land prices have risen too much for new land to pay for itself without being subsidized by other land.
374.	I would like to purchase land, but cost is out of my reach.
375.	Since out of province investors can run up the price higher than a person who actually lives here and contributes to the province and its communities.
376.	Depends on the price.
377.	Prefer to purchase, but retired landowners are not willing to sell, so leasing continues.
378.	We are saying this looking at the price of land and the risk management that is needed in the face of fluctuating commodity prices. Also in our area in Alberta many older farmers are finding it is to their advantage to lease the land. It is our experience that most of the land, when it does trade, the people that are currently leasing have the right of first refusal.
379.	The return from farming is low; you cannot afford buy more land.
380.	Live to close to Saskatoon. Unless major economic catastrophe, land is priced too high to farm
381.	For many of the same reasons as above I would still rather purchase. I don't believe that the size of my operation would or should affect my opinions so the line of questioning respecting that element is invalid as all farm operators have a stake in this survey and the outcome of same.
382.	With the high price of land, ownership is unattainable after the purchase of a couple of quarters. We run out of collateral very quickly.
383.	Farm land values have falsely climbed beyond their production value. The only way to buy a piece of land is to subsidize it with existing land. Makes it difficult for young farmers who are not already established. It is why many of our ancestors escaped and came to Canada. We are repeating history, where we'll have wealthy land owners and peasants that work the land.
384.	Cannot afford to purchase.
385.	I plan to buy more land every year, but only maybe a quarter or two, while it is much easier to commit to farming additional thousands of acres when it is rented.
386.	Leasing is the more affordable option. Leasing makes for an uncertain future because when your term ends you may not get the land back. Owning land would be ideal but it's difficult to compete with investors.
387.	Prefer to own so that I can invest in long term land improvements. I am also much more likely to farm in a way that is sustainable and improves the health of the soil because I know I will be the one farming it in the future.
388.	For same reason as above. Long term stability.
389.	Prefer to buy it to own it, for future generations and retirement. We take pride in the land that we own, raise cattle and grow crops to feed the world.

390.	Even government leases with the unpredictable nature of lease prices and ever increasing fees makes leasing land a less attractive option.
391.	I prefer to own as I know what my loan payment is until paid off. As for renting or leasing, most people want a 3 year contract regardless of grain prices. If you negotiate rent at a higher rate then you are stuck with it if the grain prices drop.
392.	When you own the land there is more probability of making improvements on it.
393.	Due to my age, I am unlikely to acquire long term debt for the purchase of land.
394.	Not sure. It depends on how this drought year is for us; either a major setback year or a "made it!" year. If we end up with enough cash flow this year to lease land, and if land comes available to lease we will as it seems to be one of the crucial steps to expanding.
395.	As mentioned above at the prices of land now I would be losing money on the land I bought and financing it with my other land. So even though I would like to own more it just doesn't make my farm better off financially.
396.	It's about control and security. My father rented land from his father's estate from the mid-seventies until about 2006. This very much hindered the growth of our farm as we had to be prepared to buy our "family land" which we always farmed when his mother passed waged (she lived to the age of 96). This also hampered my succeeding or taking the farm over from my parents as with 7 siblings it would get sold to the highest bidder. We wanted to continue to farm the land.
397.	If there were more leases I would be able to expand a bit more. I might buy more if I could afford it.
398.	Same reasons as above. The only exception would be leasing from neighbours who have the same mindset as me.
399.	Just this spring I rented more land. I am looking at the possibility of more land purchases but there is limited land for sale. So a guy can only get what is available. Usually there is more available for rent than to purchase.
400.	I would be interested in owning if the land was available.
401.	Add a mix of leased and owned also applies.
402.	Right now can't afford to debt service the purchase of new land. Only way to expand is by leasing land.
403.	Is cheaper to lease land to grow land base short term. But long term is cheaper to own land.
404.	I buy land as able and expand cautiously but strategically.
405.	Why should I be competing against a pension plan or investment company give me a break.
406.	You're not giving away profit to a land owner; ur hard work is going to owning something vs pay a mortgage for some land holder in Calgary; Toronto or overseas. Let the farmers be farmers!
407.	Our children and their children should have the opportunity to own their land .The land their ancestors broke and helped built Saskatchewan for future generations and not have to compete against big companies and foreign money. It`s a way of life and keeping our towns

	and communities alive.
408.	I would more than likely lease because you cannot afford these ridiculous land prices. How is anyone just starting out going to make a go farming at these prices? Leasing is just about as bad cause who can honestly afford \$70/acre cash rent or more.
409.	Hard to buy land in my local area as not much for sale within 15 mile radius of our farm. Will likely need to lease some land as well as purchase. Purchased land will be part of a farm succession plan, leasing will be land we currently do not farm
410.	Owning is always better.
411.	We want to build up our land base as we are a small farm and purchasing would guarantee us to have that land in the future when our children return to the farm. We do not want to see a big multibillion dollar company purchasing all the land in our area to rent it back. That is not what any rural area needs.
412.	Investors are coming in and buying land for around 20 percent higher then what land should be going for. Then shortly afterwards selling the land and making lots of money off of it. None of this is right and fair for the farmers trying to expand their business and make money.
413.	Due to the increased competition for farmland, it is restrictive to come up with the capital to purchase for a young farmer who has not yet had time to flip the liability/asset equation that the banks look for
414.	The value of the farmland I would like to own is valued too high to justify any crop that I could grow on it and it makes more sense to lease it at this time.
415.	I guess I would prefer to own but unfortunately, it's cost-prohibitive so I can't rule out leasing. But it is a tough market to buy into.
416.	Smaller operations are being out bid for leased land and FCC seems to have money to find larger operations but has turned down 3 loans for equipment and land.
417.	Land prices are very high, turning into a multi-generational investment.
418.	With ownership comes control.
419.	More interested in maximizing return per acre than more acres.
420.	Most land that we have leased we end up owning long term.
421.	Land prices in our area have risen significantly in the past 3 or 4 years. Purchasing land at the current price is almost becoming non-profitable when you factor in input costs, equipment costs, grain prices, etc. It is hard to justify buying the land if you are not able to show a profit farming it. The same applies with leasing as rental prices have risen as well.
422.	For long-term financial it is always better to own as a farmer. If all you do is rent land and you go to retire all you have is machinery and building equity left. Farmers are typically (except last couple of years) cash poor asset rich. If all you do is be cash poor and asset poor at the end of the day, with no retirement after you are done your working days.
423.	Once again ownership gives me stability to budget with. I'm in for the long haul.
424.	We want to build our farm to pass on to our children.

425.	I'm more likely to rent because it's unaffordable to own with investors paying huge prices.
426.	Same as previous response.
427.	Then you have something at the end to pass down to your children to farm as well.
428.	I would consider the possibility of leasing from retired farmers only. I am not interested in leasing farmland from absent investors or institutions.
429.	Have to lease because it's too expensive to own.
430.	Have rented in past. Hate having landlords.
431.	I do rent some and would continue to do so and maybe a little more but prefer to own. Maybe as I get older renting may make more sense. But due to age, my long term capital investments are doing fine.
432.	You only get one chance to usually purchase land in life....buying and owning it is the way to succeed.
433.	Adds to primary growth and stability plan.
434.	It will not be possible to make a living if the price of new land gets any higher. Essentially killing our livelihood.
435.	With reasonable and affordable land prices it makes sense to own the land, and continue to run a business which is sustainable. Now that ownership has been opened up to all Canadians I am seeing none farm types wanting to own land and they do not share the stewardship that real farmers have. This has doubled land prices here in a matter of two years, resulting in an influx of people just wanting to profit from increasing prices. These people have no interest in good farming practices resulting in some terrible poor farming practices, leaving us long term farmers having to put up with being neighbours to these practices.
436.	Would like to own but not under the current parameters and overvalued land. In my area land is up over 300% in the last 5 years, last time I checked our income is not up 300%, if anything inputs and equipment went up that much.
437.	I would want to own the land but with prices so ridiculously high I'm not sure if I can buy any.
438.	Prefer to purchase for stability in growth of operation. Unpredictability in leases unless there is a long-term lease agreement. Need to rely on a set acreage to operate.
439.	Would like to be owner of majority now but find that land in the area is not for sale. Land is being held on to by no farmers because it's a source of rental income and investment. That is true and I would do the same if I was not a farmer but as a farmer I would prefer to be able to own.
440.	Cannot make money on land I don't farm.
441.	I personally prefer to own my assets. When you rent you are forced to give a guaranteed share of the lands potential. Ownership means stability. As you read my answer think of it as most home owners due. You slowly pay for your home monthly as an investment in your future. Land is no different except it isn't being created. It's limited so by opening it up to the world. I

	mean this because it's happening now since the policy change years ago. Companies have sought investment and have avoided the laws and cheated others along the way. Our Premier stood up for potash why not out most important resource the farmland of Saskatchewan. It has allowed our province to be seen as the world's breads kettle at first. Now with our diverse crop rotation it is providing a vast variety of products helping people eat better as well as provide commodities that will secure our place in the world.
442.	Would rent more land but large corp. Pay too high a rent for an average farmer to make a profit renting the land that is so called owned by Canadians.
443.	With farmland equities approaching the limits of a bubble about to burst, financing Land Ownership through loans would be devastating if the interest rates rose, loans were called in, or, crops failed. It is too much of a gamble for a small farmer to expand by ownership.
444.	If land was more affordable I would expand but the competition from bigger and corporate farms make it next to impossible.
445.	Personally I would rather own land and lease equipment. Financing equipment is very easy. Land purchases are more difficult to finance.
446.	Due to the price of land being driven up I would be more inclined to buy as much as I can but if I can only buy half I would be leading the rest.
447.	I would be forced to lease/rent additional farmland because I cannot afford to purchase. Most of the land being sold in our area is being bought by established farms (local corporations) but they have to outbid large land groups (RRSPs, golden opportunities, etc.)
448.	Expansion opportunities vary with economic cycles and opportunities within the community you operate. You cannot change those as an individual farm. You work with the opportunities that make sense to your business.
449.	I'm nearing retirement but would like to see young Saskatchewan farmers competing on a level playing field for farm startup or expansion
450.	I want security of ownership
451.	Again this is about opportunity. Leasing options are more abundant then purchasing in my area
452.	With the increase in land prices many land owners who aren't working with the younger generation have held on to their land speculating that it will continue to rise and continuing to pull income from rental and oil leases. There are not a lot of parcels of land available. I would like to buy land to have the assurance of its availability to my operation long term, however the unavailability of land for sale and the relatively smaller investment into leasing land verses buying land (even at low interest rates) would push me to rent land.
453.	Affordable land is a scarce commodity, oftentimes leasing is only option.
454.	I'm 48 and I would only expand slightly. I have enough time in my body to pay for a little more land as long as the inputs and machinery don't become more . If they continue upward, then I will retire earlier than planned.
455.	Ownership in land helps keep farmers on the land and the communities we live in alive.

456.	Prefer to buy but will lease if have the chance.
457.	We prefer owning to leasing. Leasing is however less onerous on the balance sheet. Innovation is required to allow new financing methods with less equity so you can buy instead of renting and eternally renegotiating with the landlord.
458.	I would say I would rather own land. For the reason to have control and give opportunities for future farmers after me whether it was a neighbor or a child that I could have someday I would love to help give them the dream that I've always had and I'm very sure many more Saskatchewan farmers have had ever since childhood (it's in our blood).
459.	Might be near retirement.
460.	Because of rapidly inflated land values only land that provides a strategic location would be considered. Other land would be leased.
461.	We do lease a significant portion of our farm, but we are careful who we lease from. We find the investor/ institutional investor is somewhat unrealistic on their rental terms. When you lease land from someone who has no farming background they do not understand the realities of farming.
462.	I would be more likely to lease because foreign investment has driven land prices up beyond its ability to repay the loan needed for purchasing farmland.
463.	At this point in our farming career, it is unlikely we would expand as we have a viable land base now. If both our children decided to actively participate in the farming operation, then we would consider expanding again. It would then likely be a mix of leased or owned depending on availability and price.
464.	No outside interference into what I feel are the best farming practices for each piece of land.
465.	Only lease if it makes financial sense.
466.	One of the big problems for are farm is competing for farmland with large investors who are only looking for a return on investment. They have no interest in local community or support for rural Saskatchewan.
467.	I would love to purchase land but in my area land rarely comes for sale and if it does competition is strong.
468.	It's very hard to purchase land now. I simply can't compete with investors.
469.	As much as I can afford.
470.	My preference would be to own the lands I operate, however, leasing is a good option in some situations, as well. Land prices locally, due to my farm being located in close proximity to a larger urban centre, are at a level where one cannot grow enough grains/oilseeds/etc. to justify the purchase price, which is overinflated due to urban encroachment and speculation on future development potential.
471.	The ability to purchase land is not as easy as it once was. The competition is high and smaller farmers have to compete with larger operations, which is a reality. By owning land, you have the security that you will be able to farm this land and make long term plans. Lease agreements may be made yearly or every couple years, but they do not necessarily guarantee long term

	control. Unless you are a large operator with economies of scale, it is difficult to bid and compete when prices are high.
472.	Leasing does not provide enough stability to support growth (livestock operation, not grain).
473.	Would like to own but all depends on the ability to finance.
474.	Owing and leasing is the only option around me.
475.	If the price was workable I would like to own but if not work a lease.
476.	Just too hard to find anyone that actually gives up lease land they normally just hold onto it and not utilize it.
477.	While I might rent some land, I'd like to own that land in a couple years in order to ensure security on our farm.
478.	It's permanent and I feel more secure about my and my family's futures. All inputs and outputs come to me versus owing to someone else. The price of renting land has skyrocketed to ridiculously high amounts with so much competition between the huge mega farms that end up wasting so much product.
479.	Owning land is the only way to be secure in maintaining your operation in the long run, leasing land can be insecure if landlord suddenly decides to increase rent to a high rent not being realistic compared to potential income.
480.	Paying high leases kills any chance of retained equity on a bad year.
481.	Lease because farm land is too high priced relative to the risk involved.
482.	Already rent enough of more land came available would like to buy some before renting anymore. Although prices are getting high enough now that finding reasonable rent is easier than finding reasonable priced land to buy. Both of which seem to be in short supply last few years.
483.	Our son is interested in taking over our ranch in future years so if we increase our livestock would have to look at leasing or buying. We would prefer to lease from smaller farmers. the government has to realize that the larger these farm corps get, the more destruction to the land....with shelterbelts being plowed over and no windbreaks to stop snow and ground drift, less trees to capture carbon, etc. need to make smaller farms more viable... bigger is not better.
484.	Because of high prices hard to afford land now we work too hard to compete against money men in suits. Their version of expendable income and ours can't compete. So if we can rent some and try to borrow to buy that would be the plan. As of right now we have rented to expand.
485.	Can't afford to buy.
486.	Because at today's prices how can a young farmer expand his land base by buying.
487.	The government should ensure Saskatchewan farmers the right to own their own land.
488.	Currently can't afford to purchase more land.
489.	Would love to own more, but it's too expensive. Will have no choice but to rent land.

490.	Farm land has gotten way more expensive here than its productive value but still doesn't stay on market for long.
491.	Would like to own land but with investors pushing land price way above productive value it is becoming impossible.
492.	Too expensive to purchase land in the province right now, though that is the preference.
493.	It is difficult to compete with investors who are purchasing land because I am a young farmer with not a lot of money backing me, so it is hard to own land, so that is why we have to rent some and not own it all.
494.	Lease is money thrown away. You are c left with nothing to show for your efforts.
495.	Don't know if I can afford the prices to buy or to lease.
496.	As a farmer that is just getting started it makes sense to expand both ways as buying land seems to require more and more capital outlay as prices continue to climb.
497.	The market value of the land in my area has tripled or higher in the last 5 years where the cost to rent land from retiring farmers has not increased as significant as the land value.
498.	Can't afford to buy at current prices.
499.	Land cash rent prices are getting too high that the margins for profit are getting smaller. You need to have owned land to help cover costs of a bad crop year.
500.	Lease payments are not going down. So for equal payments I may as well pay to own. That way I can lock in my payments and I know what they will be. It is more within my control.
501.	I want control our destiny by owning the land we improve and farm. See previous comments.
502.	If farming you do what makes the best economic sense.
503.	We would all rather own than lease be it a house or land.
504.	We prefer to own so would definitely look at purchasing over leasing however we can only pay for land based on what it can produce. This may not be competitive with large investment companies and out of province speculators looking for short term gain by flipping properties. These investors can drive the price of land up to unrealistic levels that are not tied to productive capacity.
505.	Want to keep in the family.
506.	Companies and other farmers, investors are paying big money just to have land leaving the young farmer or farmer that wants to make a living off the farm and still have wildlife and land that can produce, can't afford it.
507.	Foreign ownership has drastically increased land prices
508.	I would prefer to purchase if land was available but would lease if no other option
509.	I would rather be able to build equity in owning the land rather than gaining equity for the landlords that have wealth beyond all means already
510.	I am 57 years old and am not really interested in expanding our ranching operation but would prefer the reduced risk of leasing if I were to expand.

511.	renting anything is just throwing money away
512.	It really depends on the situation, Depends on what the owner wants to do. If land that suits our operation comes available then we would be interested in it regardless of whether it was to rent or to own.
513.	I like owning land; you have an equity base for anything you may plan to do.
514.	Difficult to give a definite response .Prefer to own but would work with what was available and affordable. Also would depend on what length lease was possible.
515.	Asset may be passed on to the next generation.
516.	Rental rates are very high in our area at present. With low interest rates you are wiser to buy as the interest alone is less than the rental rates. You have money left over to put towards the principle. With land prices ever increasing, it is a personal investment for your operation.
517.	We have enough lease land. It would be nice to own it to retain control later on if I ever decide to quit farming.
518.	My response is the same as the response to the previous question. I would add that I would lease land from a neighbor or retired farmer because they understand the pride of ownership and good land stewardship.
519.	Would prefer to own but prices are getting so high. The payments will be high. So I will have to rent some more because of that reason.
520.	In order for agriculture to continue to grow in our province the economic benefits gained from agriculture should be reinvested in agriculture.
521.	I am a young rancher, ranching alongside my dad. I would love to own land, but prices are just too crazy for the amount of risk there is in ranching. So, I would probably end up leasing if anything, but if that's the case I probably just won't even bother and get an off the ranch job until dad is ready to retire and who's to say I'll come back. One 50 year old farmer said farming is a rich man's game and he is right.
522.	I'd prefer to purchase if any land comes for sale at an affordable price. The oilfield and foreign buyers have the land ridiculously inflated.
523.	I want to be in control of my land.
524.	But what I can but have to lease most.
525.	I prefer to buy but will rent land that is close and is priced right.
526.	If I were to expand it would be more likely that I would lease the land because there isn't very much land out there that is available just at the snap of a finger. There is a substantial amount of completion and prices are quite high making it hard to expand at a quick rate.
527.	Same as above!
528.	Not necessarily expand but would like to own a higher percentage.
529.	Would not be opposed to leasing, just prefer to own.

530.	I am a young self-employed male. If I wanted to work for someone else, I would. Leasing is just that, working for someone else. The land is never yours when leasing. You are always at the mercy of the land owner.
531.	Would like to own but cost may be prohibitive.
532.	I would prefer to own but it is getting unaffordable from a ranchers income.
533.	I couldn't afford to own what I need to make the land pay for itself. Without the capital funds to be readily available at the start it is hard to get your money back out of the land in a 25 year period.
534.	I would love to buy all land that I want to increase my operation but financing is not always available to buy large parcels of land.
535.	Would prefer to own the land, but financially impossible. Would have to lease as inflated market values have made purchasing land unattainable.
536.	To secure your land base it better to own land.
537.	There isn't always farmland for sale in the area and it doesn't always sell for what I'm willing to pay.
538.	We rent enough already.
539.	I don't want to work for someone else all my life.
540.	Farmland prices way too high to buy large amounts
541.	Would prefer to purchase, but would depend on location and prices. If land is not in an ideal location would lease.
542.	Cannot afford to buy land for the return off of it.
543.	Some land that we currently rent will be coming up for sale in the near future; we hope to buy it if the prices aren't out of this world!
544.	When "investors" drive up the price of land far above what the revenue of the land could pay, it is best to rent land and hope they go broke.
545.	For the same reason as above. However if leasing was the only option, it would have to lease
546.	It makes strong financial sense to own land at a fair price. When renting or leasing, that cash value simply disappears from the farmer every year. When purchasing he is not only helping the local economy thru the loans, he is also investing in himself and future generations. As well it gives security in making equipment improvements; the land is most likely not being taken away. You can support your local dealerships by purchasing the proper equipment to farm the land.
547.	We would like to have land as an asset ahead of a liability only.
548.	Currently I believe we are lucky to farm were we do our land values are reaching the point where it is difficult to turn a profit but I am optimistic in the future of agriculture.
549.	Again, I would prefer to own the land I am farming; however, with the increase in land prices

	over the past decade, it makes it harder to break even with the purchase option.
550.	Same answer as above.
551.	Ownership lets you be more flexible in controlling your own spending and budgeting.
552.	Prefer to purchase but will lease if purchasing is not an option.
553.	Don't have much of a choice have to lease as I cannot purchase any land at all in this area.
554.	I would like to expand and lease land from retired farmers as they need income for retirement. In hopes to eventually purchase that land without ridiculous price increases from non-farmers.
555.	It is preferential to own your own land.
556.	I m a young farmer and it will never pay to own farm land when you have to compete with investors that inflate farm land prices
557.	I would prefer to own but financially it would be in the best interest to have some of each.
558.	We are not interested in adding to land companies and pension plans bottom line.
559.	The price of land has made it not feasible to expand.
560.	I would be more likely to want to own.
561.	To expand we need the opportunity to purchase. We try and purchase what we can but sometimes purchasing is not an option or the competition of buyers is too much. Buyers are not just farmers anymore they are investors, hard to compete against investors that are cash buyers and will pay above market to buy an asset.
562.	When I farm land I invest in that land to improve it. Why should I improve the land for someone else to own or farm next year?
563.	Same reason as last question.
564.	The price of land right now is too cheap to not own. Farmers are paying 5 and 6 times more for the same type of soil and similar yields in Alberta.
565.	Purchase land as is financially viable.
566.	Simply can't afford to get into bidding wars with Hutterite colonies and corporate investors. They can move into an area and simply buy based on having more money. If you can talk a neighbour into renting, they rent to bigger money bids.
567.	Will rent if I have to but would like to own in the very near future
568.	Don't have the cash and paid land to buy all
569.	I would prefer to own the land but it is becoming increasingly difficult to do so.
570.	It's less risk for me to have a mix
571.	Own if the opportunity presented itself but would also consider renting if the land owners chose not to sell at this time.
572.	If I could ever afford it.
573.	I would prefer to own but the increasing price of land is prohibitive.

	Outside investment and non-farming companies and investment groups artificially drive up the price of land do nothing benefit the local and provincial economies as they usually do not live in the province.
574.	Depending on the location of the land. If it fits in well with what I currently own, I would be more willing to purchase. If it is poorer land or further away from my owned land I would lease.
575.	I am an individual and I feel it is totally wrong to have to bid for land against land investment corporations.
576.	In financial position to be able to.
577.	Ownership is number 1.
578.	Provided this makes some sort of sense.
579.	A lease payment is about equal to a Mortgage payment. If the cost is the same, why choose to build no equity?
580.	I farm for the long haul. It's simply a lifestyle
581.	I am not interested in mega farming therefore prefer a slower approach to expanding via ownership
582.	Absentee owners and speculators drive the price up. Our youth need a chance.
583.	Don't plan on buying any more land.
584.	Prefer to own
585.	What to own more of the land we farm. However land price is out grown the ability to pay for itself. This makes my farm financially unstable. My neighbour is renting from an investor today the land is for sale by the investor for \$2700 per acre. The land was purchased for approx. \$650 per acre about ten years ago. The investor is unreasonable with his price and the rent which he believes should reflect his land value. Local market for land here is approx. \$1200 to \$1400 per acre traded this spring. My neighbour land base is now unstable and so is his farm financial picture. (now over equipped for a larger land base).this is not a heathy environment for farmers.
586.	Not planning to expand. Planning to sell some.
587.	Our preference is to buy land if it is available.
588.	I prefer to own land so that I can invest in the future profitability and farmability of that land through better fertility management and Ag drainage. It is more fulfilling to improve land and grow ever better crops on owned land. It's better for my community, province, and country if I own the land.
589.	Would try to own. significant high values for producing land makes it very difficult to purchase land if it is available
590.	If more land could be purchased at a reasonable price it would be what I would prefer. Adding rented land would be alright but I'm looking for more long term landlords that understand how farming work these days so it is easier to set a price on land.
591.	We would prefer to own the land we farm, we're currently trying to expand but land prices are

	restricting our growth so often we are forced to lease instead.
592.	Current cost of purchase compared to ROI from commodities makes purchase impossible.
593.	Own if the financing is able.
594.	High land prices right now make buying very difficult.
595.	I expect to inherit additional land, but this may occur after I have retired from active farming.
596.	I prefer to try and own land.
597.	Would lease if we could find a reasonable price per acre and would definitely own more if we weren't in a bidding war with large corporations.
598.	There is no point in buying more land at this point in my life.
599.	It is better to own then you can do what you want with the land but is getting hard to afford it with all the foreign investors.
600.	Same as above.
601.	See above.
602.	We would add a mix of owned and lease. We would own more if it could be financed appropriately. The payments on owned land are usually too high so we lease some land from other land owners.
603.	Ownership is better for the long term as I am only 29. Over the next number of years I can have my land paid off and have something to show for it. In the long run it will yield a better return for me. Owned land as a farmer can be a great retirement plan.
604.	Rent to own would be a great option.
605.	Leasing can leave you stuck with payments for machinery that you cannot pay.
606.	From a banking background and understand that owning land reduces risk. If expanding would need to consider a combination of ownership and lease.
607.	More likely to lease as large 20000 acre operations and potash excitement have driven land prices up above the ability to make the payments on the crops grown.
608.	Landowners are getting higher lease rates from land so are slower to sell because of the return they are getting annually. Land prices are soaring to new levels making ownership harder to pencil out. If land comes along at a reasonable price it would be nice to buy.
609.	Our ancestors left brutal situations behind where the best one could hope for was little more than indentured servitude. If the rules are broadened to allow more non farmers to hold land in Saskatchewan then I predict that history shall repeat itself.
610.	I'd rather invest in long term ownership of land to ensure my farm base is secure and I can further invest in long term goals of improving the land through fertility and farm stewardship practices. Too much land is being neglected in our area due to absentee land owners.
611.	Lease payments go on forever payments eventually end. No one knows how much investment companies are going to lease land for.

612.	I would buy all I could afford then lease the rest
613.	I think land at the current market price is still a good investment, considering prices elsewhere
614.	Have no choice but to lease with current prices and buy a little at a time.
615.	I would only buy a quarter or 2 so buying would make more sense
616.	When you own something you don't have to worry about it Being taking away from you
617.	Saskatchewan's greatest resource that is the farm land and the hands on people and families who have for generations operated and protected that resource for everyone's benefit is now in jeopardy by off shore investors, home grown and foreign farmland Investment Companies, and Institutional Investors. PROTECT OUR RURAL HERITAGE AND SASKATCHEWAN RESOURCES SLAM THE DOOR SHUT NOW ON THESE OPERTUNIST WHO ARE DRIVEN BY GREED AND MONEY AND WITHOUT SOCIETAL INTEREST. Protect us from reverting to a feudal system.
618.	I would much sooner rent more land than own more. There was a time when there was no land to rent for many years, it is really nice to see investors coming to buy land so those who want to sell get a proper price for land and then the young guys can have land to rent.
619.	Both owning and renting have become very expensive to do. Many ask prices knowing full well the local community (farmers) cannot afford them or justify paying it as it makes no sense when you do the number crunching.
620.	Our operation is at the point where we have borrowed as much money as we can so we have to look at leasing land instead.
621.	I would like to buy the land if I could, in my area around Lloydminster, non-farming interests drive the prices up very high. Oil companies in the area are buying farmland for large projects and many small oil companies (i.e. trucking companies) want property in the oil patch to establish shops and homes. There is a lot of wealth in this area and farmland seems to be a popular investment these days.
622.	Depends on financial position at the time and what is being offered for land.
623.	It would depend on the land that was available. Farmers in our area that are retiring generally are leasing their land rather than selling. Land in our area is also at an all-time high I believe so I would have to consider the proximity to our farm to justify the costs of ownership.
624.	Same as above.
625.	Although we were able to buy about half of our currently owned land base from the family farm, we have had to gradually build our owned land base as our financial situation allowed and sales opportunities arose. We currently have a son interested in farming the land in the future. Owning a larger portion of our farm land would provide security and ensure the survival of the family farm.
626.	I would like to buy more land but with land prices in the area I just can't afford it. Allowing other province and countries to come in and buy land would drive the price up even further.
627.	Won't be expanding, but after busting my and getting by on dam little for a good number of years it should be my right to sell to whoever I please, with the exception of CPP. The city folks will have plenty to say about this, but I didn't see any price controls on housing in the boom

628.	Ownership is for the long haul; so you plan for the future.
629.	Next generation would like to farm.
630.	It is getting more difficult to buy land. Prices are making it somewhat prohibitive to make it easy to acquire land. That being said I need to become more profitable to make that happen.
631.	Same as above.
632.	I'd like the land to stay in the hand of a Saskatchewan resident and out of the hands of the multi nationals.
633.	We would purchase and lease from retiring neighbors.
634.	Oftentimes, retired farmers will rent/lease land until they are ready to sell. That works well for us new farmers, as it allows some time to set aside money to use as a down payment for eventual purchase of the land. As a renter, many retired farmers allow you first rights to purchase.
635.	The big corporations are the only ones paying the huge prices in my area; I don't want to build their wealth. I would rather buy the land.
636.	Because there is not an abundance of land available for sale around me now or even in the foreseeable future leasing may be the only alternative to expand.
637.	The price per acre in my area is \$50000 to \$6000. Can't farm your way out of that debt!
638.	We desire to expand our land base as certified organic commodities are very lucrative and we see an increased demand for our product. We have also worked extremely hard to build our farming operation, having had none of our land base passed to us and therefore being completely responsible to purchase every single acre of land we own. As we hope to pass what we have worked so hard for on to our children and future generations, ownership is paramount.
639.	I'm not interested in leasing land. I want to have control over the land and not have to answer to anyone.
640.	Investors have driven the price of land near us from \$800/ac to \$2500/ac in just 6 years. The land payments on those values exceed the productive capacity of the soil meaning farmers can't cover depreciation, inputs and land costs and still get a ROI.
641.	The realty is although we would like to own all of our farm land some people would rather rent their land out as a source of income for their retirement.
642.	I take what I can get being a young farmer but between subsidized Hutterite colonies and corporations over paying for any land that comes up my options are limited.
643.	Again a split in ownership/lease allows more financial flexibility.
644.	It depends on what is available and location I prefer to buy if I can make money at the price it is but can't afford to make payments that are higher than what the land will produce. If foreign buyers do pay more then I will be forced to lease.
645.	I feel leasing is too risky for my farm. I have leased land before, expanded my equipment at a large cost and then had my lease take back the land to try to farm by myself again.

646.	If we can't purchase the land there is no possible way our children will be able to start farming in the future.
647.	Would like to buy so that the farm has the stability for long term goals.
648.	Of course leasing is and has been beneficial, but it has been farmer to farmer, not from foreign or investment corporations.
649.	Without a sufficient land base, farms will not have sufficient working capital to weather the inevitable downturns in farming - prices, drought, whatever. Without a proper base of assets to backstop your operation you are incredibly vulnerable; especially if there is a back-to-back failure on the farm.
650.	Will do either. Prefer to own but have some very good long term leases. Prefer to build wealth through ownership.
651.	Cannot afford to purchase at these prices.
652.	Land too expensive to buy.
653.	I will always strive to purchase additional farmland but the most likely scenario of expansion involves more leased then owned land.
654.	I want to own land the land. I would lease land if there was no other option but owning is a far better alternative to the success of our farming operation.
655.	I would like the security of owning it myself, leasing means that the lessor can change his mind about letting me lease the land just as he sees fit.
656.	See above.
657.	The recent increase in farmland values has resulted in increased equity and therefore borrowing capacity for us to expand. As competition for land becomes more heated, opportunities to buy land we can afford may be fewer.
658.	Buying more land will depend on land prices and financing rates.
659.	I always like to try and buy if I can buy farmland is usually a once in a life time chance.
660.	Land doesn't come up for sale often in our area due to oil and gas.
661.	Being a young farmer I find the recent rise in land values putting the options to own out of reach. Many people are borrowing against land previously purchased at lower costs; foreign ownership would compound the problem.
662.	I've already grown into a 12000 acre farm mostly from renting from investment firms.
663.	By owning the land I have complete say over what happens with the land. Once it is paid for it can be passed to family members.
664.	I would like to add purely owned land, however, land in my area is owned by many retired farmers who are making good money leasing their land to larger farmers therefore not much land is changing hands at this time.
665.	In our situation leased land for the cattle operation is a good fit as it is adjacent to our home farm yard which required no hauling of cattle. The leased land in this case is Crown Land or Ducks Unlimited Land and we do not have the option to buy. Having this leased land also

	allows us to free up our owned land for grain production or hay production.
666.	Unless you have been born with a silver spoon in your mouth you cannot afford or have the financial ability to even start up farming, and in my case having 3 children wanting to farm, even starting them out with more than 160 acres is almost impossible, if they are all to farm my father has to drop dead and leave his farm only to them.
667.	Same as above comment.
668.	Closer to retiring than starting so liked ownership more when I was younger.
669.	Land, input costs and equipment costs are high. It's easier to expand while renting land but would sooner buy and own the land I farm.
670.	Land prices have gone up so much in our area due to large companies coming in and buying up the land around us.
671.	It is very expensive to buy all the land.
672.	There is pride in ownership as well as security. A landlord can decide to cancel or change the terms of the lease when it expires. It makes future stability uncertain if I was basing future land use on having that additional land base in my operation.
673.	Owning is all about long term security of your operation. It is very hard for smaller or younger farmers to buy smaller parcels as land ownership by investors grow. If land comes for sale it is usually buy it all or you get nothing. Bigger land owners won't split off parcels that younger farmers can afford to acquire.
674.	Can't build equity with leased land.
675.	I would like to own if I expanded; however I am close to retirement.
676.	Same as above.
677.	Land does not come up for sale often in my area.
678.	Owning land is important to me and my operation to ensure long term sustainability of my operation.
679.	leasing land just makes money for the land owner and they have no risk
680.	Would prefer to own but large investors outcompete small farmers in price wars.
681.	Would like to buy more farm land and have a son who would like to expand but can't bid against the government for land (Canada pension plan) prices have been driven out of reach.
682.	To use it as collateral for a loan.
683.	Ownership has fewer variables associated with long term decisions of operation.
684.	It comes down to the cost of the land expense as to which is more favourable.
685.	Again, the price of land is so high and there is really no land around here to buy. More likely to be able to rent some.
686.	There is no land to purchase at this time, so we would have to lease at this time.
687.	I currently lease 90% of land base.

688.	Sometimes the land owner wants to retain ownership and only wants to lease and isn't interested in selling.
689.	Would lease if I can lease at a reasonable rate.
690.	Cheap interest rates make for more compelling purchase options. More competition from private corporations that are interested in corporate profits instead of farming betterment has increased land prices making it harder to acquire.
691.	Ownership provides security for the future of your operation. If you own long term planning can be done.
692.	Leasing land is a way to build our farm in the meantime until we can afford to slowly buy land to own.
693.	Likely right now any expansion could only be done as rented land. In my area most recent land purchases has been made by non-farming investors and numbered companies financed by off shore interests that have over inflated the land prices past the ability of the land paying for itself. Especially if the purchase requires financing.
694.	With today's land values I would likely try to lease rather than go further into debt.
695.	Own additional for family expansion.
696.	The cost of adding to our land base through ownership is high and the net income from cow/calf is historically low thus limiting our ability to purchase land, and thus leasing is the next best option.
697.	We have a fair amount of government lease land in our operation and neighbouring us. It is mostly this land we would acquire but we would be more comfortable buying this land instead of leasing it. Also foreign investment agencies drive up the land price of all land making it very difficult for us to expand.
698.	We would only be buying 2 or 3 quarters at a time. Generally land rent is too high in the area.
699.	Unreasonable to expect if someone else has stake in your operation, that you won't be paying a higher price in the long term.
700.	I would like to own to keep my family farm going to the next generation and keep the farming practices up to date for the good of Mother Nature.
701.	Would love to own land but as a young farmer the purchase price of good grain land is getting prohibitive and the cash flow is crippling. That leaves renting as the only option.
702.	I am in it for the long term. I would prefer to pay for my own farm than make money for a foreign investor.
703.	I would strongly prefer to own the farmland as I expand the farm but the prices from foreign investors are impossible to compete with so leasing is the only option
704.	Current land values seem to be well above the "productive value" of the land. Perhaps not so important if you are adding a small piece to an existing operation, but very important if you are expanding by a large percentage.
705.	Prefer to own land as it negates the possibility of purchasing machinery at high cost then losing some land that is rented to a higher bidder which could make it impossible to make the

	machinery payments.
706.	Owning is always better, it takes away so many risks that come with renting land; how long will the rental agreement last, what will be the cost of rented land in the future, huge machinery purchases are a result of taking on rented land and you have to be confident you will retain that land, if the price of that rent goes up too much you may not be able to. If you own the land you don't have those concerns. We're farmers, not tenants, I don't want to rent land from absentee landlords - anyone with half a brain should be able to figure that out!!!
707.	Capital to own is limiting.
708.	Land ownership is almost impossible with my size operation as investment has driven price beyond my means.
709.	It has become more difficult to purchase land due to the number of investors purchasing land in the area where we farm.
710.	This is dependent on land prices and whether we even know it is for sale. These out of province buyers go door to door and buy up land for big offers before anyone knows it is for sale.
711.	Renting leaves farmers with no retirement fund.
712.	The cost of complete ownership is just too expensive. A fair lease agreement allows for more cost spreading of ownership over more acres.
713.	Freedom to make decisions comfort of ownership.
714.	Land is very difficult to come by in this competitive industry. One must try to secure land however one can, but I do not wish to become a serf to an entity that has no feeling or knowledge of what is required to be a successful farmer.
715.	We would like to own more, but literally everything near us has been purchased by Max crop () at way above fair market value.
716.	Even though buying land to own is costly at present, in the long term it is a good investment that in the end will have appreciated.
717.	Land is a valuable asset, and one is more likely to look after it if you own, rather than lease.
718.	I would like to own more land but foreign investors are forcing the price to levels that can't be sustained from farming income.
719.	Land is very expensive, prohibiting large acreage purchases. Rented land may help short term. Sometimes land becomes available to purchase after renting.
720.	The only security we feel we have is in the ability to own our primary asset, our farm land. Even long term lease will come to an end with a new round of negotiations.
721.	Probably the leased would be the most available, farmland values (at least what people think) have made purchasing not an option. You get stories of land selling to an aggregate company and suddenly everybody's land value is based off of that transaction, not even in the same league. I'm raising grain, not selling gravel.
722.	Can't afford to buy land and pay for it when young farmer as investors have driven the price

	past production income.
723.	As a young farmer entering the business, land prices have become prohibitively high. It is very hard to grow at the rate needed to have a viable operation and purchase all the land that you farm. As time goes on I will continue to purchase land as it is possible to give my operation more stability, and reduce dependence on rented land that could be lost in the future.
724.	Not going to expand.
725.	With the run up in land values and allowing pension plans, etc. in to buy land very hard to pencil out buying.
726.	At this point in time we will do which ever we can to expand our farm.
727.	Lease is risky because the equipment needed to farm is so expensive and find investors want short leases so can get more from you or someone else after you have improved the land for them
728.	Not wealthy enough to outbid farmers with oil income or large corporations.
729.	We lease our entire farm and want some security in owning enough to keep us farming in the future. Landlords have us over a barrel just to keep them happy so they don't look elsewhere for renters.
730.	Foreign investors are buying marginal land and are expecting \$50-\$80/acre rent when there is less than 100 acres on a quarter sections. There is no profit involved in this and again at the end of all of it you are not building equity into your farm.
731.	I'd rather work my own land and not be a share cropper.
732.	Price of land in our area has been driven up due to corporate investment, making it almost impossible to afford for smaller land owners in the area.
733.	No plan for expansion.
734.	The cost of purchasing land is more than the cost of leasing, irrespective of the value, leased land is just as efficient. I can lease for 4% on money, any day, and some days less than that. I can't 100% finance land for less than 4% then I have to pay taxes on that, and find a way to pay down the value too, buying land costs about 11-15% to my business, and the restrictive land laws means the banks aren't prepared to value that land asset as equity anyway. So the additional 6-10% direct cash cost to my business gains me nothing.
735.	<p>Due to the attitude of the main lender and smaller competitors to the Saskatchewan ownership rules, it is hardly possible for new entrants to enter farming.</p> <p>As the amount mortgage able bears little resemblance to the real value of land. Without background assets for two large of farm salaries is difficult to borrow at all to enter farming but hey this is a challenge everywhere.</p> <p>The last thing we need is a land ownership system allowing the forming of an Aristocracy at the rate it did during the Sons of Saskatchewan period.</p> <p>They value by assessment allow a risk factor and lend approx. 140% of average assessment in a RM. In Abernathy for example, values are around three and a half times assessment, meaning that a guy has to put down 60% to even get a mortgage.</p>

	<p>Outside investors from BC for example, are easier for the lender to pursue for repayment as they put up property outside of Saskatchewan as security.</p> <p>I believe that Canada pensions are a better choice for ownership than some from Vancouver or some rich oil guy from Alberta.</p>
736.	We would like to expand our cow herd and those types of plans are difficult to do without knowing you'll have the land long term. It is difficult to find long term leases and therefore we prefer to own our land.
737.	We are experiencing significant competition for ownership of farmland from non-farmers, both out of province and out of country. The purchase price of farmland has not been reflective of its agricultural value. This has led to an increase in rents as well, as landlords are demanding a percentage return on investment. This will be a significant problem when commodity prices drop.
738.	Would like to own more land but investment has drove the price out of reach
739.	I would like to own, but cannot afford falsely inflated land prices at this time, perhaps ever. Soon may not be able to afford the high rent being asked by land owners or shareholders.
740.	Cost of ownership is beyond operational cash flow in my area. Growth for me is more feasible through rental or lease arrangements. Ownership is hampered by the economics available for my type of operation which is cow/calf/stocker
741.	To buy enough land to sustain an operation. But would like to lease land with option to purchase in the later future if permissible
742.	Land is too expensive to buy a significant amount so you have to lease to keep costs down.
743.	Would buy if not too expensive, and could make a decent down payment.
744.	I am at an age that I will not expand.
745.	Purchasing outright is not an option - but would prefer it to be that way.
746.	Although I prefer to own the land I farm leasing affords me the opportunity to improve my cash flows. In the current farm land market, as a young farmer, I cannot afford to exclusively own my land base.
747.	My ancestors didn't immigrate to this country to lease farmland!
748.	At the price of land you can probably do better leasing than owning.
749.	I'm a young farmer trying to grow my operation but cannot compete with larger farmers or investors buying land.
750.	Would like to own more, but as there isn't a great turnover of land in our area, it's not likely.
751.	Would prefer to own if I could afford it.
752.	Whatever would fit it the operation.
753.	Do to restrictions on loans/grants I feel a lease/own mix is my only viable option to 100% ownership (prefer owning).
754.	With outside investment it is hard to compete to buy farmland. Ridiculous prices are being paid

	to own farmland.
755.	See above answer.
756.	I would rather own because this way I can pass it to my children instead of selling it to someone else.
757.	If we can afford to.
758.	As above, better to own than rent. Rent is good during boom times as it will increase net profit, during bust times the additional rent can break a farm. The land owner will also see their asset devalued in a downturn, possibly so much so that if many investor owners attempt to exit the market the crash in land value will ruin the net worth of all owners. The fewer investor types of owners during a downturn will provide more stable land values as the farmer owner will be much less likely to attempt to sell their asset.
759.	For the sake of continuity, would prefer to own. Never know when the owner may decide to sell.
760.	It is necessary to maintain a mix of assets in your business. Therefore as opportunities present themselves you may expand your farm by purchasing land or by leasing it depending on the capacity of your equipment and your financial position.
761.	Most of the land we lease is family owned and we will probably buy it in the future.
762.	If I were younger and farmed only then would I also consider leasing (renting).
763.	Most likely forced to lease, due to high land prices.
764.	As mentioned above.
765.	More likely to lease do to land prices.
766.	Farmers should not have to compete with non-producers and outside investors.
767.	Hard to own when you're trying to compete with large non Ag businesses. Agriculture is a low income business. Hard for a low income business to compete with other business
768.	Same as above.
769.	Find it hard to buy with the recent price increase.
770.	Same as above.
771.	Would prefer to own, but costs are too high.
772.	ownership has pride attached with it and people are more considerate of what they do with it in regards to environment etc.
773.	Leasing from retired farmers is good as they understand their land and follow trends in farming still. One can't always be purchasing as a young farmer.
774.	Owning or leasing is not often a choice that I can make as the owners or investors dictate.
775.	Again, due to cost a mix of each would most likely be the most feasible.
776.	Equity is good, but leasing is sometimes the best for cash flow.

777.	To build a land base for future family generations.
778.	Land values have gone crazy so you almost have to lease.
779.	I would like to think this, but as prices continue to increase the only option is likely going to be leasing. Farmland is increasingly being bought up by investors looking for a return on the land with little to no care for how the land is used, only how high they can charge for rent.
780.	Owning is always preference but investors and competition is not making this easy especially for the young ones starting out.
781.	To me owning and operating land you own, you have a more sense of self-worth and will take all measures to insure that the land is kept in good condition for generations to come. Too many people that rent land do not take care of the land and are there only to make a buck.
782.	Buying right at this point requires too much capital. The banks would require my first and second born as collateral.
783.	I have rented 400 acres of land for over 15 years - I have paid for it many times over. I will not make that mistake again.
784.	Why would you go to the cost of increasing production and taking care of the land when it is not your own or may never be your own.
785.	I would be more likely to own the additional land I add to expand my operation because I want 100% control.
786.	Need a mix of both so that it spreads out the risk if land values increase or decrease and helps from a tax perspective of cost of ownership.
787.	See above.
788.	For us ranching to have some gov't lease land would be nice but it is a grandfathered deal and seeing many people with lease land renting it out is frustrating.
789.	The intent would be to buy farm land, but with increased land values, acquiring more land becomes a more difficult endeavor. Ideally, any business asset should pay for itself. Sadly, farmland values are at a level where they may not financially pay for themselves over time, which in turn can put my business at risk.
790.	More likely to lease right now because of answer above.
791.	I would prefer to own my land rather than be at exposed to the whims of landlords.
792.	Would love to buy and produce crops off our own land. It would be nice, if some small family farms, could have some help from our governments and provide programs more for the small farmers that are less than 2000 acres as opposed to corporate farms, who benefit more.
793.	Try to buy if we can.
794.	Leasing is fine, but is more challenging to plan through.
795.	Price of land too high to buy.
796.	Not interested in farming more unless it's our own. Don't need more unless for investment or it fits into our farm.

797.	However I can get it.
798.	Would love to buy but it's hard for a small guy to compete.
799.	In our area to be economical at present land values it isn't feasible to purchase the lands on the production off the land.
800.	Just like Alberta, it's too expensive now to buy land.
801.	I would rather own all the land I farm because it would make my operation more stable by knowing my farms acres every year instead of having to compete with increasing rental rates.
802.	Landlords may not renew a lease and affect my long-term plans and income; rates can be too much based on crop returns. A fixed rate long-term predictable payment on owned land can reduce one more layer of stress in this business.
803.	At this point with farmland values as high as they are it does not seem affordable to acquire more owned land with current prices - the land will not pay for itself. Either prices of commodities need to improve, input costs need to decrease and farmland values needs to be more reflective of productive values.
804.	When you buy the land it's yours and the improvements you do to it will be yours also.
805.	Lease rates are too high because of inflated investment money.
806.	Can't afford to buy.
807.	We will be buying from now on. Outside investors have no loyalty to a farmer who has always paid his rent and looked after the land properly.
808.	Even though ownership is my preference, land prices are so ridiculously high that I could not afford ownership. Even leasing has gone sky high in our area.
809.	All depends on what is available.
810.	Currently in my area there is steady growth in the oilfield sector so the farmers that are retiring are renting out their land so they can continue to collect their oilfield lease cheques and rent out their land as well.
811.	There is very little land for sale around us and if there is land for sale we would have to compete against two nearby Hutterite colonies and other big corporate farmers around us. that means we would probably have little chance to own or lease
812.	As long as it is affordable.
813.	Ownership is becoming more difficult with the high input costs and reduced commodity prices. We are selling into a market driven but true competition, and buy inputs from monopolistic and oligopolistic entities that do not provide for low input prices that free competition achieves.
814.	We will purchase more land as we are able to but until then will have to lease to expand.
815.	If programs are in place to buy over longer time period.
816.	Since cattle is the direction we are leaning towards leasing will probably have to be a major consideration.

817.	Leasing farmland has never been a very secure form of tenure in this area except from family members and crown lands.
818.	Too expensive to buy.
819.	Leasing land adds additional risk.
820.	I am just starting out as a young farmer.
821.	Same as above.
822.	Again can't compete in the ownership market place due to investment companies.
823.	Not prepared to buy more land at my current age.
824.	We need a plan for financing that will put young farmers in a competitive position to purchase the land they farm. The young farmer loan from FCC is the right idea but 500 thousand \$ is about one tenth of what is needed!
825.	Depends what land comes up if it's a lease or own I would bid on either. With a preference to owning.
826.	As a new young farmer the only way I can grow is to lease some land but also need to buy when possible.
827.	Due to current land costs and competition for land, lease/rent is most probable option.
828.	If there was land available nearby I would like to purchase it to farm more acres.

3) Do you expect to purchase farmland in the next five years?

#	Response
1.	Hopefully be buying family farm
2.	Our family is looking for land...whether or not it is 1)affordable 2)worth purchasing for arable acres 3) and is not lumped into land tracts that make it economical unfeasible to try and purchase 4)inflationary costs of product, equipment, seed and transportation do not create havoc with our finances, etc.
3.	I would like to buy Premier Wall a coffee.
4.	Perhaps consider investing in farmland
5.	We have a son and son in law that farms with us and they would like to purchase more land but the cost of a quarter is too high.
6.	Currently own 1/4 section of land inherited from my parents
7.	It is a dream of mine to farm someday but the reality of accomplishing that in next 5 yrs are unlikely.
8.	Young rancher/farmer
9.	Depending on land prices versus commodity prices

10.	Not sure as rule changes and uncertainty usually brings instability. Why invest in a product if it's future marketability is in question?
11.	If comes available
12.	only if investors and corporate farms quit driving up the price of land
13.	I farmed for 20 years and had to sell out to work in the oilfield when mad cow disease took a huge toll on us. I plan to resume farming the family land one day that is now rented out
14.	I am close to retiring now.
15.	Trying to buy land but it's being bought up by outsiders cannot compete
16.	provided I am able to compete with outside investors
17.	As a young farmer trying to start out I am not sure about purchasing any more land as it is hard to compete with these investors and pay what they are for land.
18.	Considering purchase of another qtr nearby.
19.	I am hoping to purchase land adjacent pasture land to my home quarter when my neighbour retires. That is assuming that the value of the land is still manageable.
20.	My family is young, we would eventually like to own a place
21.	I am a beneficiary of my family farm.
22.	Hoping to purchase more . Have younger generation who want to farm. But with all the investors trying to buy land is going to make it impossible for young farms to even hope of farming. Realtors are also helping to push prices out of reach as they are the ones bring in outside investors.
23.	If available.
24.	Want to buy farmland for investment to retire on.
25.	I would like to but price is a factor
26.	However, as a lawyer I expect to act for those that will.
27.	increases in asking prices are way out of line with what the productivity of the land actually is
28.	real estate agent
29.	I am a young farmer and would like to grow so no off farm job is required.
30.	I have bought or attempted to buy land constantly since I started farming.
31.	The people that I lease from are getting older and will want to sell some land.
32.	Our operation will be buying a half section of pasture and a section of tame hay land in the coming years.
33.	When we retire we may purchase a small farm.
34.	Will add to land I own and rent to my farming son.
35.	Close to retirement

36.	It is the cheapest farmland in the democratic world
37.	The current value of farmland in this area is far beyond what the capacity of the land is to make payments. I hope to purchase but will need to save more so as to put a higher down payment so the payments are manageable with the income I receive from farming.
38.	I believe there will be a lot of land for sale in the next 5 years.
39.	I'm 34 years old. I'd like to be able to expand and not have to compete with investors
40.	If land becomes available in our area. I have 3 sons who are farming with me and we want to expand
41.	Because it meets our cattle grazing needs
42.	We are happy with our size and can make a good living with less land if you own it. We began buying land in 1983 when prices were high and interest rates were high but we made it work and are now reaping the benefits.
43.	My husband and I purchased 3.5 sections of hay, pasture, and broke land five years ago and we won't expand anytime soon as our payments are high enough already.
44.	If it's affordable I will defiantly be trying to get my hands on as much as I can.
45.	With the price of land right now I'm not sure I can afford to purchase more land.
46.	At retirement age.
47.	It all comes down to price. When poor land sells for more than a hundred thousand a quarter, it is not worth buying. Good land is more, of course, which is even harder to rationalize, given the price of what we sell.
48.	We own land, but don't farm it, we conserve it.
49.	Not at these land values.
50.	Am looking to expand if price not too prohibitive. If I have to compete against pension plans I don't see how I can afford it.
51.	Live on acreage surrounded by farmland
52.	I prefer not to answer this question as my response (i.e. yes or no) has the potential to create the perception of a bias in my responses.
53.	Like many Saskatchewan residents, I have relatives who farm and I expect that I will assist in some fashion through ownership of some land.
54.	I do not have a reason to increase my land base as I am retired and land is a very expensive investment, one that would not give a return any time soon.
55.	I am the son of a farmer.
56.	Current lifestyle doesn't work outside of the city
57.	I'd like to own land, but I don't think I'll be able to afford it.
58.	Interested in increasing farm size.

59.	We would like to help our children buy land and start out on their own.
60.	I am retired from the credit union system.
61.	Depends on cost of purchasing.
62.	I owned farmland until January 2015, when I sold it to my nephew. He is interested in farming, and although still enjoy working on the farm, I cannot see how I could make a living on one quarter of land.
63.	If I could buy land next to what I own I would buy it as an investment for my family. At some point my kids may decide to return to the farm and they could farm it. Or grandkids 20 years down the road.
64.	If the right strategic opportunity for acquiring land comes up near existing land would like to purchase more.
65.	I would like to, however the price of farmland is a limiting factor.
66.	Want to own a land but do not have enough money.
67.	See previous response.
68.	We have a small farm however our son would like to purchase more land and with the prices now with foreigner's investments this is almost impossible.
69.	Yes, but only if land in the immediate area comes up.
70.	Prices of farmland make it scary, but if we were to purchase it would only be a quarter or two
71.	As soon as I can get the money together
72.	Trying to get into cattle to follow the family tradition
73.	I have my land rented.
74.	Don't expect to purchase farmland but know farmers and am related to farmers.
75.	My dad owns a ranch and we would like to be buying into it in the future. Also my husband has a business doing custom farming in our area and is renting some land of his own to farm as well. We would like to purchase our own land in the future to farm/ranch.
76.	Waiting on a correction or for us to get accustomed to the new price. If some came for sale on my doorstep we would recalculate and possibly sell further away stuff to another farmer- not investor , and buy closer
77.	Would like to purchase land and start farming with existing family farm.
78.	If new land nearby becomes available or if current leased land (leased by me) comes up I will attempt to purchase.
79.	If land comes up in my area I will buy.
80.	I am the child of a farmer/rancher. There are several sons, so I will need to purchase land in order to make my inheritance viable (ie. we will have to split it up and it won't be big enough to be self-sustaining unless I add property).
81.	I have no interest in owning more farmland. The only exception would be farmland owned by

	my father, should he decide to sell, I would consider buying it.
82.	Real estate is always a good investment. I have extended family members involved in farming and may decide to invest in agricultural land that would allow them to farm it for me.
83.	My dad always told us, if land comes up in your area, you do what you can to grab it, because you will never get another shot at it. There are many farmers retiring in our area with no kids to take over the farm as it is today. This problem will only be amplified by allowing foreign investment & huge corporation investing.
84.	I MAY BUY IF SOME ADJACENT LAND COMES UP FOR SALE, BUT AM 64 YEARS OLD SO NOT LIKELY TO BUY.
85.	I may be interested in buying land in the future and have my son start farming
86.	I do not need any more land, our farm is the right size for us.
87.	Currently I'm not expanding my operations I am slowly closing my operations as I am retiring from farming and I like to sell my land.
88.	I haven't contemplated it seriously, but I certainly a long term goal.
89.	I am a life-long Saskatchewan resident who cares deeply about food security, speculators, foreign ownership of land and the predatory nature of capitalism. I hope to buy land in the future and don't want to find that most land is prohibitively expensive, foreign owned or misused. I'm also VERY concerned about impact of sales on native prairie, ecological sustainability and the well-being of the population.
90.	Can't afford it.
91.	Depends if farming crashes for a couple years and prices come down to reality.
92.	We are a young growing family and our farm needs to grow with us to be sustainable.
93.	I have family members that are approaching retirement age and want to step back from farming and would like to be able to buy their land at a fair but reasonable price
94.	Well, we're looking at some farmland right now but the guys not sure if he wants to sell or not right now.
95.	If it is available and priced right... according to what it actually produces not what some investor with deep pockets can afford to pay.
96.	Can't afford to purchase
97.	I rent land that the landlord said they are interested in selling.
98.	I will be inheriting the family farm I grew up on and still work on in 10-15 years' time
99.	I'd like to purchase farmland and enter into a crop-sharing arrangement with young farmers where I would contribute the land, grain storage and half the variable costs, and the young farmer would contribute their time, machinery and half the variable costs. I am also prepared to invest in value-added processing.

100.	Depending on land prices I would like to purchase more land. Currently, land is overpriced. Margins are too tight. A quarter-section is selling for \$220-250k locally. If you make a gross profit on that quarter of \$20-30k on a good year, it is still not feasible considering the risks involved. Even at low interest rates it will take 15+ years to pay it off depending on the down payment.
101.	Until there is market rule stability I will be on the fence.
102.	Depends on the pricing and what the Quill Lakes are doing. They are currently reducing my land base to water covered parcels with no value.
103.	Still paying off my current land.
104.	Retired.
105.	Looking at expanding
106.	If some good land close comes up for sale I'll try to buy it.
107.	I'm planning to buy a quarter section from my parents this year on the farm where I grew up, in order to keep some of the land in the family for the fourth generation.
108.	If land were available at a fair price.
109.	Too old
110.	My father is a farmer and still farms over 4500 acres and has downsized from over 7000 acres over the years due to retirement. I moved out and I own 15 acres of farmland I use for livestock and if I could afford more on my own I would have bought more.
111.	I intend to purchase the majority of our leased land in the next 5 years
112.	An acreage is about as big as I plan. Do not consider that farmland.
113.	I have relatives who own and farm land. It is something I have thought about as a long term investment even though I am not a farmer myself.
114.	Some of the land we currently lease is up for sale. Whether or not we buy it will depend on the purchase price. It has to make economic sense.
115.	We have one individual in this area that is worth around 30 million. He worked in Alberta most of his life. Now retired and wants to buy 50 quarters of land. How are the younger generation of farmers supposed to compete with this?
116.	The purchasing of land will need to pencil out for my operation before I can purchase it. I would like for that to be the case.
117.	Looking
118.	The farmland I own was passed down to me by my parents, who farmed and lived here all their lives.
119.	I am a 30 year old Saskatchewan resident who grew up in a family farming. My family still farms. I want to purchase land but the prices in my Rural Municipality have more than doubled in the past four years. Recently, investment companies have been paying prices that Saskatchewan residents like me cannot compete against. Our small town is dying because new families are not moving in. Rent is high because the investment companies overpay for

	their land and the farmer is the one who suffers.
120.	<p>We are currently looking for farmland and pasture to buy instead of always leasing and renting the extra that we need.</p> <p>It would be a travesty if foreigners or out of province investors were able to get control of Saskatchewan's farmland. One only has to look at the real estate mess happening in Vancouver to see what would happen here. And this time it's not housing, it's FOOD to feed our country.</p>
121.	I am looking into purchasing some land near my Uncle to look at a retirement idea.
122.	More land to be rented out
123.	If we do, it should be the other quarter we haven't purchased yet. Land is out of reach for us, and especially our son. Our neighbours don't rent local, they let people come in from miles away.
124.	I would like to ensure any children/grandchildren have accessible land should they wish to farm.
125.	Would like to but several retiring neighbours have just sold to 'investment companies' at ridiculously high prices. Will this land come up for sale again in our lifetime? For sure not at a lower price...
126.	Looking to purchase land where my family farms and may start a small farm.
127.	I will if I can actually afford it.
128.	Because I have had long term lease on certain parcels and are family friends.
129.	We have had the opportunity to purchase land recently. The land did not sell yet because of the owner expecting a larger value when and if pension or trust funds could purchase
130.	We currently own 50 acres of pasture and could buy more.
131.	We have recently purchased a 12 acre farmyard and plan to run cattle. But we are unsure if we will purchase or rent land in the near future.
132.	I would like to return to farming, but prices and entry/start up costs are prohibitive to having a decent new operation.
133.	If price is good/right and some adjacent land becomes available, then will consider purchasing.
134.	May consider depending on price
135.	I will purchase if the opportunity presents itself
136.	Investment property
137.	Trying to buy family farmland in a very competitive market
138.	Depends what happens to the prices
139.	I have other diversified investments that do not include farmland. But, I would hope that Canadians could participate in farmland investments through public and private pension plan

	holdings.
140.	It's just part of business to expand
141.	The land I have will be made available to my son, if and when he wants to farm. I'm at the age and farm size that I'm happy with.
142.	I do hope to expand but if land prices remain high I may just sell
143.	I rent land from older farmers that will want to sell at some point
144.	Do not want the added risk.
145.	If I can find land that is affordable I'd like to expand, but with the current rule of land buying I have very stiff competition against the pension plans, investor groups and the CHINESE. Their pockets are deep, mine are not so much.
146.	Im 67 years old and probably will be selling my land in the next 15-20 years
147.	There are 2 quarters close to us that will likely be sold in the next 2 years. Having this land works into our operation.
148.	Plan to try to take over the family ranch that has been going since 1883! Yes 5 generations.
149.	From my father in law. Our farm size will basically stay the same as we are currently renting this land.
150.	We are not planning to farm.
151.	Hopefully retired.
152.	I would only purchase if the right opportunity came along. Right location, quality and location to enhance our existing cattle enterprise.
153.	I'm a retired farmer for 12 years, from Ontario and would have hoped there was more competition to bidding on my farmland when sold, tough economic times didn't warrant higher prices. Remember that this is a retirement nest egg instead of mutual funds. I'm a Dutch immigrant from 1955, from The Netherlands. My parents and 9 siblings made our lives on the farm in Canada, in South Western Ontario a large portion of farmers are from Dutch decent. These farmers all contributed to a better rural society and improved the value of the land. So what does that say about foreign ownership, several of these farmers struggled to get started on owning a farm, many died in there early 60's. I have 60 nieces and nephews and only 3 are farming, does that not speak for itself on how hard it is to remain farming. Farming is more than a one person business, capital is very hard to find to farm for a young person, life has changed dramatically.
154.	My grandparents farmed in Saskatchewan and Manitoba. I sometimes dream about having farmland, there is farmland for sale near my property.
155.	We have the next generation joining us on the farm and would like to expand.
156.	I'm 20 years old and I'm still in university. I'll be looking to purchase farmland in the next 5 years but record high land prices make it extremely difficult for young producers to enter the industry.

157.	We represent the small demographic of farmers that are under the age of 35. We want opportunity to expand our farm!
158.	I no longer farm but still have all my land and rent it out on a cash basis.
159.	At current prices and average crop yields we are looking at 25+ year payback periods. That is a very risky proposition. That way of thinking led to many farm failures in the 80's.
160.	If the right land comes for sale and we can afford to buy we will.
161.	I am an active investor and business owner in Saskatchewan
162.	I would like to purchase but again it is very difficult with investment buyers around
163.	If there was an opportunity (availability) to purchase farm land and our farm was financially capable, my answer would be yes.
164.	I expect to purchase family farmland in Saskatchewan in the near future.
165.	We are currently renting some land that could come up for sale in the next 5 years, depending on the land owner. Most farmers retiring in our area are not selling, but renting out the land for continued income stream. It would be most beneficial to have a rental agreement with a right of first refusal clause in it.
166.	My name is . There are many farmers now in Saskatchewan who followed my example and bought significant parcels of land. Now as we reach retirement age and wish to sell, the number of Canadians who can afford that kind of investment are few and far between. (As I have found out. I have lowered the price of my ranch by \$10,000,000 and still cannot sell in Canada. I could have sold my ranch for my asking price to an American 3 years ago.)
167.	It is no longer practical for me to purchase farmland. I am currently renting out my property at rates which do not measure up to the financing required to buy land.
168.	We can't afford to buy at current rates
169.	Eventually I'd like to purchase farmland, but it may not happen in the next five years.
170.	If land prices become reasonable again, and we don't have to compete with investors
171.	Buy closer to yard, sell further away land.
172.	I've considered purchasing farmland before; but decided against it for personal reasons. Might reconsider in the future.
173.	I would like a small piece of land , if foreign investors are allowed to buy land , it will make land costs too high
174.	I am a real estate agent and a farmer's daughter.
175.	If available I would buy if it was affordable
176.	Prices are out of line right now
177.	Would like to expand owned acres and eventually decrease rented acres. Depends on location of the land available.
178.	Closing in on retirement. If I win the lottery I would buy land.

179.	There is land for rent but people are hanging onto it until for tax purposes. Rent is high. Driving land prices too high that the cost of farming has gone crazy above the income received. People don't look at the whole picture. Cost of machinery, seed, fertilizer, chemicals, labor workers and rent has left farmers with no money.
180.	I'm hoping to buy more farm land to expand my operation
181.	Hope to, but if outside investors come with their money from out of country we can't compete in that market.
182.	I would like to start a small micro farm less than 10 quarters.
183.	We will purchase if some comes available near our operation.
184.	Not where we are we can't afford too
185.	Help grow my family farm in the Sceptre area.
186.	Would love to, but currently can't afford any of the asking prices around here.
187.	Depends on the opportunity. If the right parcel is available we would definitely look at the potential to purchase.
188.	I hope to purchase land in the next five years but the current price will probably make this impossible.
189.	It would be a consideration if the opportunity presents itself
190.	I have three sons that wish to farm so we will be looking to purchase land over the next number of years "hopefully" to get them established in the business.
191.	I Have Cattle and my family farms plus I sell farm Machinery for a Living
192.	Would like to purchase our now leased land but with the cost rising and all the hoops needed to jump I am not sure we will purchase.
193.	I am retired. Grew up on a family farm as did my spouse. We own a small amount of land purchased from parents. Land is rented.
194.	I am recently retired but would not rule out purchase of additional land.
195.	If land is available due to a neighbour retiring I would like the opportunity to compete to buy it.
196.	If I win the lottery or have enough money I would purchase more farmland.
197.	The current price of land is making it difficult to justify buying more.
198.	If cash flow permits it would be nice to own more land
199.	I am moving toward retirement.
200.	Want to expand, will buy land if/when possible.
201.	Farm is In expansion phase. Demand for the land we are renting is increasing.
202.	Need to expand surface crop area.

203.	Yes but only a small amount and only if the prices come down. 30%. Based on farm income over 2500 acres the margins aren't there to buy at these inflated prices.
204.	Would have purchased be for but at the time rules had just changed and drove the prices out of reach. Could no longer afford to pursue as it was not feasible to invest as return on investment would have taken decades instead of years.
205.	Some land in our area will be for sale soon due to farmers quitting.
206.	not at 250,000 dollars + \$5.00 wheat and \$10.00 canola doesn't pencil that out
207.	I hope to save and find some that is affordable.
208.	I think, that farmland is a good investment. Besides that fact - and now I am talking as a farm business advisors - it is my belief, that farming will be even more capital intensive in the future. Access to capital outside of debt structures will be paramount for the farms to stay competitive on an international level. Investments in farmland in Jurisdictions outside of Canada are large and help the farmers to free up capital to improve their operations. Besides this fact only a very small part of the farm land goes to outside ag investors. Most of the farm land changes hand intergenerationally. All the farmers I am talking to, really liked the fact, that their farm land values were going up over the last few years. Investments in farm land and agriculture is nothing bad, it gives the sector the needed liquidity. What about investments in real operational farms, that own farm land. Maybe something to consider on top of straight forward investments in farm land.
209.	My parents might have the opportunity to purchase land we are currently renting. I want to help them buy that land so we are able to improve our livelihood and create a more stable source of income.
210.	We are not planning on buying in the next 5 years unless one of about 5 parcels that border our land come up for sale
211.	Expanding operation to allow next generation to become farmers.
212.	I wish to move my operation to Saskatchewan from Ontario. Land is too expensive in Ontario and not enough available
213.	As other land is paid off I will buy more in future.
214.	I am counting on having the livestock prices stay where they are (relatively high) and then I can likely make payments.
215.	I like country living
216.	Inherited some of the family farm that was homesteaded by family. Also purchased additional land when farming. Do not intend to purchase any more land but the family will be liquidating land holdings over the next couple of decades.
217.	Expansion of existing holdings
218.	I have some land that is 20 miles from home. If some land came up for sale close to home I may consider buying it and selling the farther away stuff.
219.	Currently own 320 acres may purchase more if the opportunity arises.

220.	Do other type of work and could not combine both
221.	May or may not be expanding operations over the next 5 years. May retire instead
222.	Retired farmer.
223.	I'm hoping to make a living farming, but with foreign investment it has made it very tough to buy farmland and have enough to make it economically viable given our fixed costs.
224.	Land prices have been pushed up to uneconomical levels. Some of this has been driven by outside investors, who don't know the "local" economic value of a parcel of land. they compare it to land that is valued close to large city areas or high productive areas and bid accordingly.
225.	It would have to be the right location and desirability along with price.
226.	I am a retired farmer still owning my farm land.
227.	Again, would like to but as the price goes up small guys can't compete if the land isn't even producing enough to cover payments. Large farmers have enough land paid for that it evens out but trying to buy your first quarter or 2 after renting a half section is difficult
228.	In my area it doesn't make sense to buy right now
229.	I will buy farmland when given a chance and finances allow for it.
230.	My son would like to farm, a Saskatchewan way of life, community involvement.
231.	depending on prices and proximity to my existing property
232.	if the land I want comes up for sale
233.	Retired and rent my land out.
234.	Looking to expand.
235.	I have seen land prices rise and fall so often, it makes me nervous on where the prices may end up. I manage a financial institution and we have to have confidence on these prices and if these rules change to limit who can buy then the audience will be smaller and the prices may be more volatile.
236.	If some good affordable land became available in our area I would consider a purchase.
237.	I will inherit farmland
238.	If land is to be sold nearby our existing land then yes we are interested.
239.	not likely - none available as mention above - 90-100% of farmland within 20 miles radius is offered exclusively to the 1/2 dozen large corp. farms/Hutterite colony.
240.	May purchase an acreage or small holding for retirement home or investment
241.	Cannot afford to purchase
242.	I plan to move to an acreage
243.	When my parents retire I hope to buy part of the family farm
244.	As a young farmer, we are looking to build our farm earlier in our career rather than later to

	have more time to pay off the investment
245.	Farmland is too expensive to make it viable to live off of
246.	<p>I would like to expand on my current land base to become a more full-time cattle rancher.</p> <p>Currently land is at a price where it is completely unrealistic to purchase enough pasture land to feed enough cattle to make a living at ranching.</p> <p>With land being restricted to being owned by only Saskatchewan farmers, I will then only be competing with them to expand my land base. I don't have anywhere near the pockets deep enough to be competing with major corporations, the CPP or overseas investors.</p> <p>Farmland should be owned and worked only by Saskatchewan Farmers.</p>
247.	Family currently deciding on transgenerational transition. No further purchases until we know our future. Also cost is currently prohibitive to purchase.
248.	Depends on family members wishing to farm in future.
249.	if it is close and fits in I would purchase
250.	As a progressive farm family focused on long term viability we see it as vital to continue buying anything that makes sense for our operation along with any tracts that come up for rent. We try to expand 300-500 acres per year.
251.	I expect to inherit it.
252.	I'm 26 and grew up on a farm. Live in Moose Jaw. Would like to own my farm. Land price increases are making it harder for young farmers to get started.
253.	If land in my area becomes available it is certainly an option to purchase
254.	See last comment.
255.	I am over 60 years old, I rent my land. I had farmed for 35 years and would like to see young Sask residents to farm the land not corps or investment firms.
256.	Depends on debt load and whether commodity prices remain strong.
257.	Grew up on a farm and would like to own farmland. I'd build a house and rent the land along with raise animals.
258.	I will continue to purchase more land no matter the price and if land continues to be cheap because the sellers are held hostage in regards to who they can sell to, good for me.
259.	That depends on my income and farmland price.
260.	I would like to purchase about 1000 acres over the next five years
261.	5 years may turn into 10 as it would be an investment when I have the expendable cash.
262.	If I was to purchase farmland it would be with the intention of organic farming. The "corporate" farmers are killing this planet, especially through our drinking water due to fertilizers, chemicals etc.
263.	It depends what land comes up for sale or lease. I do not want to travel over 20 km to farm land

264.	slowly purchase small amounts
265.	I am always talking to neighbors hoping to entice them to consider keeping the land locally owned rather than sell to a corporation. This will keep the money local, rather than it all leaving the Province or country
266.	Depends on price
267.	I am a Saskatchewan resident that has purchased farmland for investment. Less often now that the price has increased
268.	I'm semi-retired with a background in agriculture in SK. Farmland is an attractive investment option for me.
269.	For us owning our land base is important .
270.	All my landlords are now ready to cash in on nose bleed prices. Land can also be a commodity, and like any commodity will fluctuate back down from these prices
271.	Purchase can only be assessed when land becomes available for sale.
272.	Providing land in the area comes for sale we will be looking to purchase land so we can get away from leasing land. Another problem with land investors, is that in our area alone there have been thousands of acres sold to them without any of us local farmers having a chance to purchase the land or even know that it was up for sale.
273.	to pricey
274.	I am a professional Agrologist, so I am keenly interested in agriculture, but am not planning on becoming an actual farmer. I work with all kinds of farmers, from small specialized units to large corporate entities.
275.	I inherited a section of Saskatchewan farmland and may buy my brothers section if he wishes to sell.
276.	Close to retirement
277.	Things are very tight financially.
278.	Our children are in the process of taking over the farm, so would buy some land to help them.
279.	I would like to purchase farmland in the next five years; I'm concerned about the availability of farmland in my area and, of course the more constraining variable, the, seemingly, increased cost of land. The cost of land, similar to start up capital for any business venture, inhibits new entrants to the industry; thereby creating a unfair advantage to large farms who can absorb those costs.
280.	We have two sons who want to farm so yes we will want to increase our land base.
281.	Leased crown land want to purchase
282.	Im looking to retire.
283.	I would not want to compete against a huge pension plan or offshore buyers.
284.	my nephew presently farms and I would like to purchase some farmland and join him.

285.	It's preferable to have a stable land base from year to year
286.	I do not intend to farm in the immediate future, but I may yet join my father on his farm.
287.	With the cost of land I do not have enough land bass to offset the price of the new land.i don't plan on farming for another 25 years already farmed 30
288.	Buying more farmland as my son wants to get invlved with the family farm operation.
289.	I am a professional agrologist, graduated from U of S, College of Agriculture, Plant Science and Economics. I have worked in for agriculture industry my whole life. I came from a farm in Alberta. Currently I want to retire to a small farm and live my days out contributing to a the rural community.
290.	If the price ever comes down to a decent level
291.	I don't plan on expanding
292.	I'm very interested in the proposed changes to the Farm Ownership Act because, as a signatory in the Treaty Land Entitlement Act of Saskatchewan, the Provincial Gov't of Saskatchewan is obligated to make land available for purchase until the TLE agreement is fulfilled. First Nations are one of the major land buyers in the last 20 years under the agreement. Many First Nations still have the means to purchase many hectares of land.
293.	Parents are farmers
294.	I used to farm and operate a medium sized cow-calf operation. I am going to try and sell my cattle land and pasture (poor land) and buy higher assed land. I am the largest land owner in our RM 307 with 21 quarters.
295.	It depends if we have cash on hand and the land is affordable
296.	I'm interested in farming
297.	Renting right now with the hope of purchasing in the future
298.	I quit farming 10 years ago
299.	Hoping to be able to acquire the few acres in the valley and above that surround my current 10 acres.
300.	land prices are rapidly rising in my area due to investors buying land, i would like to add onto my farm but not sure i can afford these land prices
301.	I need more ground to do what I would like to do.
302.	I AM CLOSE TO RETERMENT
303.	We operate a family farm and if land becomes for sale close to our farm we would be interested providing the large corporations around us make that impossible as they will pay almost any amount which our farm cannot do.
304.	We are actively looking for a farmland. We would like to be farmers as soon as possible. As the young generation (Under age 30), we hope the price of the farmland can keep at a stable level. The farmland's core value should be on the crop producing, not on the investment. No one should change the core value of farmland, otherwise it will bring lots of negative effects. For example, young generation can no longer afford to purchase the farmland so that they

	won't become farmers. Eventually, there will not be enough good farmers left in Saskatchewan.
305.	I sold a few acres thinking I could replace them but land has not come up for sale.
306.	If I have the chance and the money I will buy farmland.
307.	depends what is affordable
308.	I am trying to set my family up, I have four children, one has decided to quit as he says it is just too expensive and risky today.
309.	I wish to purchase land in an area more suitable to my liking, and with dual-usage (crop and raising animals) to retire on , however , prices have jumped dramatically over the past few years because of foreign ownership. Landowners are padding their prices and refusing to negotiate w potential Canadian / local buyers because they know they can get their price from foreigners. Crap land is being sold at values as if it was all prime cultivated acres.
310.	test
311.	test
312.	I have two sons who want to farm but we need more land to make the operation viable.
313.	I will purchase more if any becomes available that fits my operation and budget.
314.	Retired, no sons
315.	High prices will not allow me to purchase farmland in the next five years.
316.	If it becomes available and I can compete with hutterites
317.	With farmland values having risen so much, I'm not sure that I can cash flow a land investment given current commodity prices and input costs.
318.	I am retired from farming and I am currently renting my land to our son. He has purchased most of it our farmland.
319.	I/m 64 yrs old with no successors and I made the mistake of using lane realty to sell a half section and cattle but the buyer it was a cheap business deal and I was used as cheap labor after the sale and the buyer had no interest in the pasture cattle business
320.	land prices have been driven up so high that a piece of land can no longer generate enough net income to pay principal and interest
321.	I intend on buying the family farm land
322.	With prices of farmland as high as they are it is hard for a smaller operation to come up with capital to compete with larger operations both locally and from outside the province.
323.	If I had the option, I might become in investor in farmland.
324.	test
325.	As members of our family age, we are interested in purchasing land from them.
326.	We would like to buy more land to expand but worry that the prices for land have been driven up by corporations with deep pockets and will not be able to compete with them.

327.	I am retired but made my living in the agricultural sector over a 40 year period. I was actively involved in helping to change the land ownership rules in the early 2000's
328.	If land becomes available. I understand that 20% of Sask farmland was purchased by investors, doesn't seem huge on a Sask. wide basis, unless you're the guy next to land bought by billionaire through some means of his daughter having dual citizenship and begins the Chinook Bison Company, which ships the bison back to the US to be slaughtered and sold. (What is the revenue benefit for the provincial government of all those acres being removed from people living in Saskatchewan?)
329.	I would like to buy land but I cannot compete with big farms and corporations, like pension plans and other corporations. It costs more and more to farm every year and now we need a good crop just to pay our expenses. At the price that farmland is at now there is no way I could ever afford it.
330.	I am too old.
331.	I see it as a good investment but prices are increasing rapidly.
332.	I am not actively involved in farming at this time but I was raised on a family farm and my parents continue to operate the farm.
333.	Retirement age.
334.	Born and raised in the wonderful province of Saskatchewan (now living in Vancouver Island), I hope to one day purchase some land around where I grew up. All depends on what and how the government handles it from here on in.
335.	If someone in a reasonable price range comes up I would purchase.
336.	Only interested in small additional acreage, because of high land values.
337.	It would depend if any were to come available in our area that isn't spectacularly priced. We have "foreign" investors in our area that put the price of land sky high so us younger farmers who are trying to expand cannot afford to do so.
338.	I own a 1/4 sec now.
339.	We have just purchased 3 quarters at a ridiculous price, which a young person could never afford , as it just doesn't pay for itself (caused by multi - national or big companies)
340.	Not at the current land prices.
341.	Nearing retirement
342.	I am the last member of my family interested in farming.
343.	land values have more to do with speculation than production
344.	I will add to my holdings.
345.	Farmland is increasing at a significant rate and farmland in Saskatchewan is very undervalued. The world will need more food in the future and in order to accomplish this we are going to need to be farming more acres with more efficient equipment and technologies. Foreign

	investors are not interested in this goal.
346.	Prices have been driven so high it is hard to buy land
347.	Can't compete with the investment groups at the prices they offer.
348.	Having to expand to keep up to higher cost of equipment purchases and new family members starting to farm.
349.	I plan on a purchase of a half section which I am renting presently. It is adjacent to our farmyard.
350.	more land that we are renting now
351.	if land comes available before I retire
352.	Very likely to purchase a little every few years.
353.	depends on land availability, land values, markets, availability of credit, interest rates, etc.
354.	If I can afford it
355.	Purchase land to actively farm
356.	I'm in the process of expanding.
357.	hope to access some the PFRA Lands
358.	Getting very hard to find because retiring farmers or even the first right of refusal is a joke. Sooner do business with Chinese descendants that even entertain the thought of w local farmer getting it. Then watch them buy the land. Rent the good land and let the rest grow weeds for going on 4 years now!!
359.	I hope to have the opportunity to buy out or partially buy out my father in law and possibly other land in immediate area.
360.	would like to expand and buy land close to me
361.	I'M NOT SURE!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
362.	Depends on price. Would like to acquire more farmland to rent out.
363.	It is impossible to compete with prices being paid for land by investors.
364.	1/4 section enough for us
365.	Young Saskatchewan resident who would like to get into the farming industry.
366.	Certain lease contracts are expiring. Hoping to purchase
367.	Hope to expect.
368.	Prices of land must be in line with production and they are not right now !
369.	Like to keep expanding as I am under 50
370.	I'd like to but probably won't be able to afford it.

371.	As the neighbours that I have been leasing land from for the last 20 years pass away or decide to sell their land I will need to try to purchase the land in order to keep my farm viable. I count on this land to keep my farm within a certain geographic size since it is nearby also. I have no problem with having to bid on it against my neighbours that live nearby who have lived through the same challenges on their farm that I have and know the actual productive value. They are more likely to be here long term and not go bankrupt because they drove prices up to unsustainable prices. With outside speculators that only have interest in a quick capital appreciation the price would be driven up until the point that eventually there will be a large number of farm defaults. At that point I hope that the government is not going to step in to bail the industry out.
372.	Rising prices. May not be attainable
373.	We are a SK cattle company that are expanding our operations
374.	I would like to buy some more farm land but with the price being driven up without side investment it is hard to afford.
375.	I may be interested in buying farmland.
376.	we will purchase more land in the future with our children to help them start out in agriculture
377.	Some of our neighbours are retiring, and as land is a finite resource, if we don't purchase, we may not get enough to make our farm viable. The size of equipment and costs increases, so we need to have economies of scale in order to be a profitable business. As well, as rental rates continue to climb and interest rates are extremely low, buying affords us similar cash (after the down payment) flow while building equity.
378.	Want to increase the amount of farmland that I lease
379.	will compete against any land investor have two son farming with me under 30
380.	WE INTEND TO RUN CATTLE OR SHEEP ON OUR PASTURE LAND AND AS WE EXPAND, WE MAY LOOK FOR MORE LAND
381.	I am starting out farming, and as a farm, you must always be adding land to the business to keep up and remain profitable.
382.	My current land is almost paid for and would like to invest in more and also my father is retiring and my landlord is also thinking of selling
383.	If land adjoining land became available at a reasonable price we would buy
384.	I farmed at one time, now I'm retired and don't plan on buying more land unless opportunity comes up
385.	We are transferring our farming business to our family
386.	I would purchase land if the right parcel comes available.
387.	As the age of famers gets to retirement I hope to purchase farmland from neighbors without the farmland values skyrocketing due to investors.

388.	If we would have an opportunity to purchase land at a reasonable price we certainly would take advantage of that opportunity. We are hoping to purchase some land we currently rent from the owner in the near future.
389.	Depends on if prices come down to a more reasonable point.
390.	Right now too expensive to buy
391.	I've been trying for the last 4 yrs. land is hard to come by in my area. Most of the land that has changed hands in the last couple years has been done quietly to investors without anyone knowing it was available. Then the investors want more rent than what is reasonable.
392.	Because of my age
393.	I fully intend to bring myself and my family closer to the base of the hierarchy of needs, food. The more society "progresses" the further every person becomes from what is truly the most important thing in everyone's life. An appreciation for the land, the creature in and in it, and the entire ecosystem is my motivating factor.
394.	If land comes up for sale and I can afford it I will buy it. It will allow me to secure more land for my kids to keep farming with. If land goes to a corporation group my kids will be doomed not to farm. No farmers equals no food.
395.	At present the ownership of land is through a pioneer family estate farm. No intention is made to purchase further ownership, only to keep the land in the family descendants.
396.	Have farmland which will go to our daughter when we have passed on.
397.	May but not to farm myself.
398.	getting ready to retire
399.	We are trying to expand so our children can be a part of the operation.
400.	I doubt it because the current market values have been pushed beyond what the land can support.
401.	If the opportunity does come up and personal financial situation changed, I would for sure move forward to purchase more land, especially if land became available close proximity to the land I currently own.
402.	Hope is more like it. But with rising land prices it will be very hard to pay current prices and make it pay in a lifetime.
403.	My son is farming with me I would like for him to own his own land
404.	If the right situation arises
405.	We have made a purchase last year and are trying desperately to pay the loan off before the Ag economy turns down too fast.
406.	Some of the land I currently rent, may or may not come up for sale. It is also highly dependent on what kind of farming years follow. Strong returns= a higher chance to buy.
407.	Would maybe involve pasture land as well

408.	In the process of passing on to son.
409.	Prices are too high in our r.m. we also have two young adult sons who also want to farm they began with a rented quarter each.
410.	It would be nice! We have a neighbor who has indicated they may be selling within the next 5 years...but land prices have risen in our area to the point that it would not pay for itself through farming.
411.	I am 26 years old, and trying to make a living grain farming. I bought my first quarter off my grandfather, I am looking to buy another at the end of the year. The land prices in this province are so inflated it sickens me. My land is in , where the going price for a section (640 acres) of land is in excess of 1.2 million. I ask the sask party how am I to make a living with land payments at that price? The sask party is killing the small family operated farms one by one. When I approach the old couples in my area to inquire about purchasing land they all tell me the same thing why do you want to get into farm? There is no money to be made, and you cant pay top dollar like the potash companies nor the out of country buyers. why would you take ownership away from the ones working the land I feel you guys want to make us serfs. these companies or out of country owners don't care for the land nor do guys that lease the land, people who own and live on the land are the best for the stewardship of the land, they care for it, how cant you see this? The sask party needs to look to Europe and learn how there farming operations are where the little guys are supported and encouraged. These family operated farms in sask that are 10000+ acres are not a family farm they are corporations. Also I am an electrician I work 21days straight, this job alone is over six figures. I would give it up in a heart beat to be on the land 24/7, but unfortunately I don't see this ever happening with land prices like this. I would love to hear back from a sask party.
412.	Have some land. Would maybe buy more if land close to mine would become available
413.	If the government reverts to old laws of land ownership land will likely get very reasonable
414.	Comes down to dollars and cash available to buy and cost of land and can I pay for it with the cost of commodities what they are without the CWB can I sell it like large farmers and companies do
415.	I might be exiting the industry because it is impossible for me to expand at the high prices of land and I cannot reach the economy of scale to be an efficient farm and support a family.
416.	If the price of land goes down we will buy.
417.	not if there is restrictions on farmland sales
418.	We need a larger land base and we have an opportunity to buy close to home
419.	If land comes up in my area of operation & the financing is there I will definitely buy land. However opening up land ownership to outside parties will likely spell the end of the Saskatchewan young farmer!
420.	Depends on price. I am willing to pay a fair price but can't compete with pension plans or

	other countries treasuries
421.	I would be interested in purchasing more farmland providing it was close to owned land.
422.	I am quite happy farming what I have.
423.	reasons stated above
424.	Always open to opportunities
425.	Would like to purchase more land but am competing with out-of-province entities for adjacent parcels (including, but not limited to, CPPIB). When these groups decide to sell I am sure they will want to sell their holdings in large blocks to a single seller (as Assiniboia Farmland trust did to CPPIB) not hive off small chunks to individuals such as myself.
426.	depends on location depends on price
427.	I am staring at retirement
428.	I live in Regina and currently own 160 acres which I plan to develop as a hobby farm in semi-retirement. I plan to expand my land base to make this venture economically viable.
429.	Originally from Saskatchewan and my family still farms there.
430.	I am a 31 year old farmer, who is looking toward the future. The way economies grow, machinery technology efficiency increases, the cost of production, and normal life cycles of industries I calculate that I need to try to maintain an average of 5% land growth per year. A well run farm should be able to maintain this pace. When the price of land in our area has gone from \$50,000 per quarter to \$256,000 per quarter in 10 years, it takes a much sharper pencil to make this work. Some might say, "well just lease then". If I change my farm growth strategy to leasing, I feel I would expose myself to more risk. This is because the leased land can be leased to someone else, or sold to someone else. I would also need to increase my machinery investment to cover the land that I am not sure if I will still be farming a few years from now. I do rent some land and are familiar with the extra management skills needed to maintain relationships. In a drought year like this, many farmers will actually have a negative net income. Land owners enjoy a return on investment and are not willing to share in the negative prosperity. This puts further strain on the farmer. If the Government of Saskatchewan's goal is to maintain the family farms, then relaxing the land ownership rules will result in more financial risk to farms and have a net negative result. A quick lesson of European history is all that the Ministry should have to review to see what happens to farmers who don't own their land. One final point, I believe a farmer does a superior job with respect to farming techniques (weed control, soil erosion prevention, less overgrazing) if they own the land. In the era of environmental concerns, this should be a consideration.
431.	As I grow and expand my farm I definitely plan to purchase more farmland and I find it as one of the most important parts of my business plan.
432.	Only in very small amounts unless farmland drops in value
433.	Possibly depending on price.
434.	We hope to grow our farming business such that it can be our primary source of income allowing our young family to return to the multi generation family farm.

435.	May help my children purchase but not myself
436.	Would buy land if any became available nearby
437.	Hopefully.
438.	I have a couple of neighbors that farm with small pieces of land connected to mine, they are still in their 80's and still farming. I am hoping that I will get the chance to buy some of that.
439.	There is always land for sale and our operation has three generations that want to continue to farm.
440.	may purchase a quarter or two if the right land became available
441.	I want to buy one more section
442.	The lease that I have I would like to buy it if I can get an accurate value.
443.	Potential to move back to the family farm and farm in some capacity.
444.	I would like to, but costs and availability make it very difficult
445.	I want expand. My farm operation can support a family
446.	Interested in owning an acreage and a small amount of hay land
447.	older neighbors nearing retirement
448.	At current prices, farmland is already difficult for me to afford.
449.	Depends when grandpa plans to retire
450.	Just purchased a quarter of land from a neighbor. Depends if son decides wants to farm whether we would increase or not.
451.	I'm a young farmer trying to begin my career and take over the family farm. Have to start somewhere.
452.	I am reaching retirement
453.	I currently don't have enough land in hay for cattle feed and I have to purchase bales. I would like to purchase a couple of quarters to reduce my reliance on being able to purchase hay from nearby neighbors. I want the land to be very close to or, preferably, adjoining my current farm. I am a one-man operation and my equipment is small. I do not have the ability to haul equipment long distances to reach other land that I own. My purchase ability will depend on whether any of my neighbors is willing to sell land to me.
454.	Would like to acquire more hay land
455.	I mean I would like to, but Saskatchewan's rules brought in an Alberta investor that bought up 20,000+ acres over 5 years ago and now owns everything around me. Plus he sold a good chunk to BHP for 4X the FMV, making someone from another province, extremely rich.
456.	I am nearing retirement but if the right opportunity came up or a family member wanted to come into the business , we would do so
457.	Hope to purchase land if prices balance out

458.	If the opportunity arises
459.	We have many agreements in place with current renters whom we will purchase the land from in the next 5 years. Also if land comes for sale and it is a fit for our farm we will try and purchase it
460.	Have to get bigger to survive
461.	Would love to if I could afford it.
462.	If right price and close to current farm
463.	costs are too high
464.	Am retired, but believe that the former Land Bank was an ideal solution to land purchase problems
465.	I would like my grandchildren to be able to purchase land without having to have government agencies bidding against them. After all they farm land and care for the rural communities
466.	Too costly
467.	Land right beside me will be available but it will depend on how much outside competition
468.	We run a family farm. Heavily invested in land and rentals already.
469.	I would like to but I do not see how given the present trends
470.	I plan to expand (and hopefully purchase) in the near future while I am still young.
471.	Getting to old and land to expensive
472.	depending on price and availability
473.	There is no hope of purchasing more land right now primarily because the value is so high. Also for the reasons that have always existed. Banks want to have way more collateral than is justified for the purchase and the sales and markets fluctuate too greatly to providing the stability needed to purchase at today's prices. The introduction of speculative investors only aggravates the situation.
474.	If it is available next to our farm
475.	My father and uncle currently own our family's 8 quarters of land. I will be inheriting these 8 quarters within the next 10-15 years as my father and uncle age, but this land transfer will be an inheritance rather than a land purchase. I may look at expanding my land base at this point in the future when I become the land owner.
476.	I would prefer to buy land now before it gets too outrageous. In parts of southeastern Saskatchewan, land is ridiculously priced. The northern part of SE Sask is still reasonable.
477.	As land becomes available
478.	Young couple, would like to own farmland, but dependent on opportunities and finances.
479.	Farmland is currently overvalued in comparison to the return it can generate. Any purchases in next 5 years likely to be small as rest of the farms returns would have to cover payments.
480.	I hope to retire in the next five years

481.	Plan to own an acreage and hobby farm at some point
482.	not sure how my response will be used and don't want my answer used to support change i disagree with
483.	I am in search of a place I can leave for my children and their children that is clean and safe. I would show them how to become great farmers as were my grandparents. I would show them how to respect the land.
484.	need to expand crop land base
485.	We will need to buy out the rest of the land in the family farm.
486.	We are nearing retirement. We are more likely to sell than to buy
487.	If the price was fair, we could be in a position to make more land purchases but as stated before will not get caught overpaying.
488.	I'm a senior citizen - Canadian by choice for over 50 years, life-long educator and grandparent of two children born into Saskatchewan farming family. Their parents are actively farming and see a future for at least one of their children in agriculture.
489.	Depends on markets, land prices and land availability.
490.	Through an Ag lease
491.	Transitioning the retirement process by continuing livestock and renting out annual production acres.
492.	I would like to own an acreage, not sure how much land if it will be farmed or leased out to farmers nearby.
493.	This would depend on location and value.
494.	I am a senior citizen
495.	Yes, I plan to buy more land. I plan to buy it in more Rural areas away from urban centres.
496.	Changes in current legislation would price me out.
497.	We are interested in buying farm land
498.	AS LONG AS RULES REMAIN TYHE SAME.
499.	Have enough land
500.	I am not an operator. As a resident I consider myself a proxy owner in the interests of food security.
501.	I would like to purchase a section for long term homestead and farming.
502.	Since the passing of bill c68 I'm not sure I wish to continue farming. My government has once again taken the side of "big business" further dooming rural Canada
503.	Have recently begun succession planning with my father and leaving my career to take a more dedicated role on farm. As such as opportunities present themselves I will have to evaluate the cost and hopefully continue the expansion.

504.	To purchase and own the land at current values puts limits on cash flow and at times restricts good farm management practices which may have long term effects on future productivity of the land.
505.	Have been interested in ownership but have not decided if it's appropriate for our portfolio.
506.	I am 60 this fall and am considering a succession to a son he is the one buying land now
507.	I have 2 young boys and if they decided to farm I don't want them to have to run the farm on a bunch of rented land that could be here one year and gone the next. Or have to deal with escalating rent prices continually because someone else is in charge of the land they make a living off of.
508.	Retired
509.	While I have retired from active farming in the short term, I plan to acquire land and return to active farming within 5 years. I am 40 years old right now, so I have many years of farming left to do.
510.	Hoping to expand my farm, my two sons are trying to get into the family farm operation, they cannot buy land themselves competing against out of province investors with deep pockets and are definitely not interested in leasing farmland. Farmland is largely overpriced due to out of province investors.
511.	I currently own farmland and would like the opportunity to purchase more land for the next generation of farming in our family. I do not like the idea of foreign investment driving the prices of farm land out of reach for young farmers in our province.
512.	Prices have gone out of reach for a farmer to pay for the land without off farm investment.
513.	I do not intend to buy more farmland.
514.	Planning retirement
515.	I am interested in possible purchasing farm land but in 8 to 10 years.
516.	Wanting to continue running the family farm but the high land prices are making it very difficult to stay on the farm with a small family.
517.	WITH THE RAPID INCREASE IN LAND VALUES AND THE INCREASES IN EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT THE AVERAGE FARMER CANNOT AFFORD THE AVERAGE 20% TO25%DOWN PMT.ON LAND PURCHASES.
518.	I live in the country, on an acreage, but would buy more land if it came up in my area. However, between the market meddling by this act, as well as zoning restrictions and development freezes put in place by the RM and the city (Saskatoon), and potential expropriations by various levels of government, I am not sure it is a good investment at any price, if it, or its value, can be stolen by government for a growing list of excuses.
519.	Don't know if I will be able to afford the land
520.	I have been trying to purchase for the last 25 years.
521.	Less risky then the stock market and historically good returns year over year.
522.	I'm old enough to retire.

523.	I'm hoping that I can afford to compete with my neighbours for land that will be coming up for sale. I CAN NOT compete with out of province/country investors. I'm already having trouble competing against large corporate farms and out of province investors.
524.	We will be downsizing our farm over the next 2-3 years.
525.	Neighbour's lady has been hinting she wants to sell.
526.	I have owned farmland ever since I was 18 years of age. I have seen reasonable commodity prices and terrible commodity prices. I have witnessed extremely high interest rates and of course recent rates. My reason for purchasing would be to leave a legacy to my children and grandchildren. Depending on how my investments turn out over the next five or ten years I may consider again to purchase farmland.
527.	My son would like to farm and buy some land but it's too expensive. He can't get a loan.
528.	Our family plans to slowly take over my dad's farm and possibly some of my husband's parents land.
529.	Prices are such that purchasing more land is already prohibitive for agricultural only use.
530.	Me and my wife are 31 years old with no plans of slowing down the growth of our farm
531.	I have close relations to farmers, so perhaps one day purchasing farmland would be an option.
532.	Larger farms are making almost impossible to get land Driving the price up of both leased and purchased land Most of these large farms are financed in debt millions of dollars They own no equip (leased) They are the ones that will qualify for ag stability Our farm can't qualify because we are honest mixed farm were the cattle inventory doesn't change These large farm will also get the governments ear and because they look good will get the debt right downs They destroy communities ruin neighbour relations and are of no value too the local economy bludgeoned
533.	Hope to buy more land but the cost of land is horrible and only foreigners can afford it and when they buy it they don't even farm it and let the land rot.
534.	Our 10 year plan includes adding farmland to our operation if our children decide to stay and farm. At current land prices we are unsure if it is a profitable move for our current operation if our children are not planning on farming.
535.	have considered purchasing a small parcel for investment and to cash rent
536.	We are actively shopping for pasture and crop land in our area and have been approved for financing through our lender.

537.	I am semi-retired due to health problems.
538.	Interested in farming and purchasing land, once prices come back to the fundamental value that our production can afford to pay.
539.	My dad will be slowing down in the next few years and selling my brother and I a portion of his land
540.	depends on my health and the market value of farmland
541.	I'm from Philippines. We have farmland in our country. We have livestock and crops. Our Main crop is Pineapple and Dragon Fruit. If given a chance, I would like to move in Canada and establish a farmland too.
542.	I want to buy more farmland because I want to settle down in Saskatchewan.
543.	At age 63 land purchase is questionable.
544.	Grain land or small farm to retire
545.	Planning on buying more land in Saskatchewan
546.	I currently help on my parents farm and am looking to take over the family operation and also purchase more farm land in the future.
547.	Would like to expand our operation for our children.
548.	We hope to expand as the land owner we purchased from is looking at retirement.
549.	I would like to buy another half section in the same area as my land.
550.	I would like to re-enter farming.
551.	As a young farmer, I would like to purchase additional land to expand my operation.
552.	Will probably purchase more land as the older generation retires.
553.	I expect to fully buy my father out of the farming operation. As for other, market value land, it will all hinge on my finances and most of all the financing I can get. (Interest can really be discouraging)
554.	In our area there are large farms owned by big \$\$\$. They out bid regular farmers to lease and/or own any land that becomes available. They will pay more than a normal farm budget can reasonably afford...or earn a reasonable income from. This does not make us very hopeful or happy.
555.	I currently feel we can take on more land and more and more are approaching retirement all the time.
556.	We can't afford to.
557.	I would seriously consider taking up the farming of plants for herbal medicinal markets and try to use my fluency in Chinese language to find markets there. But I would NEVER want Sask farmland owned by foreigners.
558.	Increasing a land base is not in the strategic plan.
559.	If a good neighbor can resist the ridiculous money being offered from corporate

	organizations, colonies, and other investment companies my children may have hope to be a farmer/rancher someday.
560.	Investors have no incentive to sell
561.	I hope to purchase an additional 1 or 2 sections.
562.	I would consider buying farmland as an investment. The cost is prohibitive at this time.
563.	We have some crown lease land we are going to purchase.
564.	Depends on the price and what is available.
565.	High quality land rarely comes for sale in our area. Would definitely consider buying if opportunity arises
566.	I would like to purchase farm land in the next five years. Whether there will be any land offered for sale or if I can make a competitive offer to purchase and how much competition there is from outside interests will be the deciding factors.
567.	retired
568.	We will buy land in our area if we have the opportunity. As it is now, foreign ownership restricts us and many more generations of could or would be farmers! Everything we talk about in agriculture, at each level, is about encouraging youth in Agriculture. How can youth be encouraged when the government allows a foreign investor to decide the direction of our Agriculture farm land?
569.	I live in Saskatoon and would prefer to invest in assets close by.
570.	I am old.
571.	Slow and steady purchases has proved to be a business model that has worked for generations. It will continue to work into the future.
572.	growth is imperative
573.	Trying to move up from our hobby farm to a viable farm but the land costs seem to continue to climb making it too difficult to get started
574.	Depending on market values in that time frame and any changes to property rights.
575.	hard to come by
576.	I turn 65 this year. Purchasing more land is not in my plan.
577.	My brother owns farmland, and therefore I would like to show my support small farmers in Sask.
578.	I am getting close to retirement and will not be expanding into the ag market
579.	Buying land from family who are selling their farmland.
580.	Only if the relative cost of land falls in my region.
581.	As a farmer I have always been interested in purchasing more farmland. I'm cautious about the current price levels / optimism.

582.	Currently trying to purchase land.
583.	It has been our business model to grow on a continual a planned basis. We bought our first land 25 years ago and have grown continually every year to where we have increased our land base more than ten fold. We are also a multi family organisation including two generations and because of the numbers of families and their expertise we are committed to grow.
584.	Our family farm with ca. 2500 acres works for 2 people (father and son) and for one line of equipment (seeder, combine, swather).
585.	I hope so
586.	Would if we could afford
587.	Hopefully will try but the investors are driving up the price of land beyond its ability to pay
588.	I currently own a small farm (2 quarters) and am interested in purchasing more farmland if the circumstances suit me.
589.	I want to purchase land to secure my future as a farmer. It's difficult to expand your operation when lease terms are only 2 or 3 years.
590.	Likely will not be able to afford to buy more land if prices keep going up at the rate they are.
591.	Sure hope to buy it, but with the Chinese investors that we allow in this country, it is pretty hard to pay that costly price. It is hard to justify and be profitable when you have overpriced land. I would hope that these Chinese investors are thoroughly investigated for money laundering, clearly they are trying to hide money from their country and take away from ours.
592.	We are looking to expand where it makes sense with land adjacent to our existing land base. We might sell some land on the periphery.
593.	You tell me who can make a living these days with two quarters of land.
594.	I am hoping that our older neighbors will give us the opportunity to purchase their land.
595.	if something came available nearby perhaps.
596.	Nearing retirement.
597.	Again it depends. Like i said we have almost the minimum land base to start out farming. I keep saying if only we would have bought one more quarter 7 years ago, it would take less time to catch up and build cash flow and equipment with twice the income.
598.	I have some land that I rent from family that expect to purchase.
599.	As aging farmers retire we would like to buy their land. It is vital for our local family and community and their families. The risk isn't just foreign but domestic "religious" as well. I have heard from swift current to the Rockies south of the number one highway over 50% of the land is owned by Hutterite Colonies.
600.	If affordable

601.	I would like to if I can save enough money and get financing in order.
602.	Locally there is limited available for sale, but if some comes available close by I am definitely interested. Financing is the limiting factor often though.
603.	We expect to sell our 4000 acre farm and buy 160 acres for a retirement acreage.
604.	looking to expand my operation as older area farmers sell out
605.	to old
606.	not a farmer
607.	I will be expanding my farm if the opportunity arises.
608.	It is uncertain that land will come up for purchase during that time.
609.	Depends. Have bought a fair bit of land the past 5-10 years, not sure it is in my best interest to buy more land in the next 5 years without taking too much debt risk
610.	Farmland in Sask is a good investment. I've explored leasing out land and would consider investing in farmland.
611.	Father farms, may inherit farmland
612.	I work at an Ag Chem Fert Retail and am interested in farm ownership but do not intend to buy myself
613.	If the right parcel of land comes up for sale , could be interested in purchasing more land. Son may come to farm as well.
614.	With less and less farms around more land does come available.
615.	As land in our region comes available we try to purchase if we can afford it.
616.	I farmed almost all my adult life and in 2007 my brother and I sold our family 100+ year old farm. I was the selling process that really upset me as to how non- Canadians got around regulations not to purchase farmland but to get into Canada under the citizen nominee program. I would love to relate my experience in that process.
617.	Depends on price. Maybe one more quarter
618.	I am nearing retirement but I expect my sons will be purchasing land
619.	Would like to buy more but it is overpriced and a very competitive market
620.	Hope to buy at least 4 more quarters in next few years.
621.	Bought a half section last year hope to buy another half section this year. It's very hard for young farmers to purchase land.
622.	at my age I would to help my grand children
623.	Mostly part of a succession plan, but am trying to get operation to at least 75% owned and 25% lease.
624.	Yes I plan on purchasing more land in the next 5 years.

625.	Our children are of the age where they are ready to farm. Competing with CPP and multibillion dollar companies makes it impossible for them as they don't have pockets that are that deep. It will drive prices up and force young farmers out of the province. Previous rules that were changed in the last number of years are also making it difficult for young farmers by allowing investment firms to purchase farmland.
626.	We have farmland currently, but do not farm it. Only make hay
627.	Trying to expand the farm
628.	Won't if government lets foreign corporate interests distort the market to make land unaffordable
629.	I am a retired land owner and rent my land to my son.
630.	I am not a farmer, but my parents were. They currently rent out their land. One day, I will likely inherit their land.
631.	I recently (2013) bought a quarter section of crown land as a hobby farm, lease the hay land for now till I am ready to take it off myself. I love it and it is my retirement dream. I will consider buying more if land becomes available nearby, but am mainly interested in healthy land prices so my asset base is stronger so I am able to develop the land I have (drill a well, build a cabin, run power in) and finance (if need be) modest hay farm equipment, maybe have a few cattle.
632.	I grew up on a farm in Saskatchewan, where my parents still live.
633.	I am not a farmer.
634.	Would like to purchase more but the big always buy.
635.	I would like to purchase some land if it comes available in my area to reduce my leased acres percentage
636.	My husband is a farmer and we expect to purchase land in the next 5 years.
637.	I would like to expand but it needs to make economic sense.
638.	I am a lawyer and would not be interested in investing in farmland.
639.	We are a small farm and not likely to buy land soon, but may do so over our working years (another 25 or so).
640.	As long as I can afford to, I plan on purchasing land.
641.	I am working toward retirement.
642.	If I can get financing
643.	Young farmer with big goals
644.	No plans to expand
645.	I grew up on a farm and work full time in Alberta
646.	We are always in the market for good land that fits into our operation
647.	We are in expansion mode as we have two adult children who are interested in taking over

	the farm within the next 5 - 10 years. My husband and I will slowly transition into retirement in that same time period but we need enough land to sustain two families eventually.
648.	I am 40yrs old with a large enough land base I don't need to. If my nephew was to comeback to farm, then I could see some expansion but that isn't for another 5 years
649.	Would like to expand just a bit. Certain land close by. Would not travel far to farm additional land.
650.	price to high
651.	The current review has put the investment prospects and long term liquidity of Sask farmland at risk. I understand a desire to maintain farmland as CDN owned but beyond that I don't understand the logic.
652.	At my age I do not have the desire to farm, especially with this year's drought as an example.
653.	Hope to buy a couple more quarters that we currently lease.
654.	Depending on availability.
655.	if the opportunity was there for some close farmland perhaps
656.	No plans to
657.	If I can save up enough for the down payment
658.	I am a young man trying get into cattle on my family farm
659.	Small portion of adjoining pasture land owned by U.S.A. party might become available.
660.	There is a possibility that my parents land may be for sale and then I might consider buying a quarter
661.	son may want to farm
662.	My land is currently co-owned and bequeathed to FARMLAND LEGACIES, a registered non-profit charity, which holds agricultural land in trust and works to promote and communicate sustainable values.
663.	If I can afford too
664.	Could be good investment.
665.	I've been involved with farming at various times and currently own land that is either rented to or crop shared with small family farm operations.
666.	Would like to, depends on availability and market price.
667.	Yes, when opportunities come around to purchase good quality farmland.
668.	I do own land in Saskatchewan at this time. The revenue it creates will most likely stay in Saskatchewan and potentially used to purchase more land.
669.	Hope to expand by a few hundred acres
670.	Not really looking to expand but if land comes up for sale that fit into existing operation it would be considered.

671.	there is always opportunity to purchase and grow
672.	We have a current offer from one of our farmland tenants in the Viscount area would like to sell us an additional 20 quarter sections and rent it back from us on a long term lease to free up cash and transition farming to his sons. We are waiting on positive results of this farmland review before we can make a decision to invest in more Sask farmland.
673.	Can't afford it.
674.	Would like purchase 2 quarters and rent it out.
675.	I would like to buy more land, but when the price has been artificially inflated to a point that the revenue generated by the land cannot pay its way, something is wrong. It's a sad day when long term Sask. farmers cannot afford to buy land because Europeans who can sell their land for 10 times our prices come and purchase the land and have no intention to stay for the long haul, but sell at the right time and profit, then return home.
676.	I'd like to purchase land before I'm forty so that I can have it paid off before I'm too old to farm. The way land is overvalued right now, it don't seem like an option
677.	I'd like to purchase farmland in the next five years. But I'm not sure if any opportunities will be there because of high competition.
678.	If neighboring land becomes available we would definitely be interested in purchasing but may not if it is a distance away.
679.	Not sure if it will come available for purchase. If the next generation is willing to sell we will buy otherwise we will continue to lease
680.	Try to, hard to compete against land investors
681.	I am a youth leaving high school, and I want to be able to expand the farm that my Great Grandfather started even more than my father and grandfather already have.
682.	Land is becoming scarce in my area and any deals made are never known until after the fact
683.	I would love to but with the increase pressure for this resource it looks like not.if As it stands it has made the area as a opportunity for the rich who then try to dictate every else.
684.	older, but son would if could find land in area
685.	Expansion is uncertain.
686.	Under the right circumstances yes I am nearing retirement but the land could generate a good income and benefit new producers.
687.	As a young farmer I am always looking to expand.
688.	I hope to be able to afford farmland in the next 5 yrs.
689.	My son plans expansion to maintain a sustainable economically viable unit. Technology and

	<p>production opportunities continually change. To survive you have to take advantage of these changes and trends.</p> <p>I will do my best to help him develop a productive farm into the future.</p>
690.	Am in the wind-down stage of farming
691.	Nearing retirement
692.	depends on what happens in the future
693.	I can identify some properties that will likely come for sale in this time frame and will aggressively try to buy. Long term land is more secure than cash in the bank.
694.	If land close to me, or land that I am renting now comes up for sale I will be compelled to buy it.
695.	Depends on children's future plans.
696.	Parents land.
697.	I hope to purchase more farmland if it becomes available in the next 5 years. That will depend on a variety of things including if other farmers are selling, as well as if the land will actually be affordable.
698.	I hope to purchase land in the next 5 years to help get my children farm careers started.
699.	Hope to purchase what we lease
700.	It will depend on how actively our successor steps into our operation. Secondly, on the financing tools available. We are not that interested in placing significant amounts of debt free land up for security.
701.	I hope to purchase family farm
702.	I want to expand my operation.
703.	The cost of farmland and money required to purchase equipment, buildings and pay for seed, chemicals and help is a big cost which many people do not understand.
704.	Only IF the already large farms allow us to buy any at all.
705.	A corporation I own, made entirely of Canadian citizens, will be investing into irrigated/irrigable farmland in Saskatchewan.
706.	My family still farms in Saskatchewan, where I was born and spent most of my life up until a couple of years ago. I care about what happens with farmland in Saskatchewan, even though I may not directly be an owner anymore.
707.	We will be retiring soon
708.	Some critical lease will likely expire and I have first option to purchase.
709.	There is good investment potential in land in Saskatchewan.
710.	We are looking to replace some leased land with owned land. With interest rates low and rents being so high we can own and make mortgage payments for about the same as rent, then we build equity.

711.	It all depends on how much money non-farming absentee investors are willing to pay for land
712.	It would depend upon the proximity and price and on whether our children would want to farm
713.	At current prices it makes it very difficult to mortgage the land and still make a profit. Outside investment has driven prices to a point that if you cannot pay for it with cash, you cannot pay the mortgage and earn a living.
714.	just waiting for an opportunity
715.	I am nearing retirement and have the cash flow to keep the operation intact for my successor as currently rented land comes up for sale.
716.	Are farm has been growing and investing in the future growth of farm. We are currently trying to buy land we currently rent.
717.	I expect to purchase some of my rented land. If additional land was for sale I would be interested.
718.	My wife and I have just retired from farming
719.	Should the opportunity arise and the price be affordable, yes I would definitely consider purchasing additional lands. I have a son (aged 35) who is actively farming and intends to continue to farm, and to ensure his future, I would actively pursue increasing owned land base for his benefit.
720.	We are planning to pay off some current owned (financed) land, and then will hope to acquire additional land and grow our operation.
721.	Land values have made it difficult for livestock producers to purchase land - any that becomes available is quickly purchased by larger grain farmers. Would like to expand land base, but there are very limited options to do so.
722.	Not aggressively seeking but if local land was available would consider it.
723.	no comment
724.	Depends on availability
725.	We do not plan to buy land but make our living from the farm.
726.	Purchasing the family farm from my father.
727.	Depending on how our family decides to deal with farm attrition we may purchase more land.
728.	Renting some land with option to rent more next year, it's close to our land so would like to buy it
729.	Already own homestead farm land.
730.	It will depend on prices and how the weather holds out.
731.	In our area we have a very hard time competing against the Hutterite Colonies in our area. We are surrounded by colonies now, making it hard for young people to take up farming and maintain residence in area which helps maintain our school system in the rural areas.

732.	I am a retired farmer and the Land was sold to people who live and work in the province of Saskatchewan.
733.	Depends
734.	Will buy land that I currently lease unless the price of that land goes sky high, following the trend that has taken place lately
735.	Depends if certain local farmers retire and sell in that period. Only wanting to buy land within a small radius of our current operations.
736.	I am hoping to purchase 2 quarters off of my parents.
737.	I currently rent a half section. I have previously bid on 5 quarters, but was unsuccessful.
738.	Our son might....but we are not increasing ourselves.
739.	Always need to expand to survive on these markets normally last year cattle prices are not the norm.
740.	I plan to buy farm land to help continue the family farm that we run right now and make it my full time career in the near future with a cattle/grain farm. I think the people that are going to buy farm land should only be those that have a career plan to actually start farming. People that are just going to buy farm land to try and make money off it and make things more expensive and harder for farmers themselves to get should not be allowed to buy it at all.
741.	If land is available to purchase in our immediate area our company would bid to purchase. Land is a declining commodity. It would be wise to purchase as opportunities arise.
742.	Can't afford it.
743.	Looking to purchase farm / hay /pasture land in our area. Large corporations purchase and rent out land , this drives the prices up . If u buy land, farm it!!'
744.	Current relationship may make farm ownership /purchase possibility.
745.	I'm born and raised in Saskatchewan, and while currently we live out of province in the north, we are debating returning to Saskatchewan and are considering this as an option.
746.	You cannot know for sure because one does not know what may be for sale.
747.	Taking over my Father's land
748.	We have about 30 acres we would like to purchase as pasture land.
749.	Farming is a very involved lifestyle. In order to give yourself the greatest chance of success, you should be born to the land, or have studied the best practices of farming. I have not, but strongly support those Saskatchewan residents who have.
750.	Pending any comes available in the area
751.	I have two boys expressing interest a taking over it appears the trend is to larger farms so getting a bit larger appears necessary however we have two Hutterite colonies on our door step Canada pension plan land butts on to our farm plus another land company within the RM purchasing land or even leasing is becoming difficult

752.	Current land prices, and the trend towards selling land to out of province investors, make it nearly impossible for me to afford to purchase more land.
753.	unless the price drops, certainly will not be able to buy more even though I am a 47 yr old well established lifetime sk farmer
754.	Looking to increase land base
755.	Trying to purchase some from my parents.
756.	Setting up son in business
757.	I am retired & own an old farmyard acreage. We spend about 90 days a year at this location. I can afford and enjoy the rural experience. I contribute to the local business', schools and culture. I pay more in taxes than the farmer who owns the adjoining quarter. If cooperation owned the land the yard would be leveled and put into agriculture use, losing the history of the early settlers.
758.	land prices to high
759.	Ideally I would like to, but currently it is not financially possible for me to do so.
760.	I am trying to build a base that may allow my young family the same opportunities in farming that I have had.
761.	My dad and uncle are the only other people in my operation and they plan on getting out or passing down the ownership.
762.	I am interested in expanding my livestock operation
763.	soon to retire
764.	Close to retirement
765.	I would like to own more land and let go my rented land.
766.	I grew up in North East Sask, and I could potentially purchase land in my future.
767.	I would like to be in a position to purchase land in the next 5 years, but investors and big corporations are making prices unattainable for young farmers.
768.	I am a farm realtor with 35 plus years' experience with FCC and Farm Real Estate. I am nearing retirement and not planning on any land purchases.
769.	Retired from farming in 1999-
770.	Too old to start farming now but still help out sometimes, have relatives that still farm
771.	I have two sons that need to expand
772.	Depends on family dynamics
773.	I will be retiring in 5 to 6 years and may use land as investment to rent.
774.	I'm getting older and will be downsizing by reducing leased land. I will always be interested in buying even after retirement
775.	There is land that we would be interested in purchasing but the land price is becoming out of

	reach for the average family farmer.
776.	Have sons who want to farm.
777.	The rising cost of land ownership makes it increasingly harder to ever pay for the land with the land itself. The only way I think it can pencil out is if you think of it as a retirement investment with the land increasing in value. New land will cost me \$120 per acre for 30 years.
778.	I was raised on our family farm in Saskatchewan and moved to Ontario to work. I intend to purchase the family farm from my parents.
779.	because of the false bigger is better theory I have to get bigger
780.	No longer farming but still hold a couple of quarters of land
781.	Hopefully
782.	wish to control land i now lease
783.	thinking retirement
784.	I would like to be able to if the economics are right.
785.	age 80
786.	We are always open to new investment opportunities whether it benefits us or our children. Land is always a good solid investment. If an opportunity comes along, we will take advantage of it.
787.	We currently rent out our farmland that we used to farm.
788.	Always looking to buy more farmland.
789.	If the right opportunity arose I would concede purchasing more land as investment.
790.	Hope to expand family farm operation to include children and family members
791.	Some land we rent may come up for sale. The price may make it unaffordable and we will end up scaling back our operation.
792.	Currently have an interest in Saskatchewan farmland through a corporation and if the opportunity arises would look at purchasing addition lands.
793.	I would like to buy land, but my revenue has to come from grain production, not some hedge fund.
794.	We are currently renting land from older "retired" farmers and eventually they will want to sell it.
795.	We own our Farmland in Saskatchewan for many decades now and if there would be land for sale Close to our farm we might buy some land
796.	We are as large as we want to be.

797.	If some within reasonable distance becomes available and I'm not competing with large investment groups
798.	Still planning to expand the farming operation.
799.	We wish to increase our farmland to a profitable amount to sustain the farming operation year round so that working off the farm is not necessary for survival.
800.	We have tried to purchase land in proximity to the section of land we own presently, but have not due to shortage of cultivated land.
801.	If I could afford it I'd like to buy a small parcel and possibly rent out part of it for farming
802.	Concerned that values are higher than lease rates justify over the long term.
803.	I'm young and looking to expand my farm until I get brought in more with my parents
804.	I would like to grow my land base so that I have room for my children to make a living farming when they are of proper age.
805.	Not sure because family members are starting to get close to retirement age and could possibly start transition
806.	I'm 61
807.	I grew up on a farm and my parents are currently in the process of selling their farm, which is why I am interested in this survey.
808.	Depending on what prices do
809.	I'm going to try to buy land close to home if any comes up for sale at a price that pencils out. The cows need to be able to make the payments.
810.	I live abroad but recently inherited farmland in Saskatchewan from a deceased relative.
811.	I would hope to find some land to buy at a reasonable price.
812.	Have all I want
813.	normally buy some land on a regular basis
814.	to expand to create a more efficient unit
815.	Provided the cost of land is not beyond productivity meaning not three generation to pay for the land once!
816.	I should be able to expand or better my farm operation within the next five years.
817.	if land available is close to our farm and reasonably priced
818.	Grew up on a family farm. May purchase land for retirement.
819.	I expect to be able to purchase farmland in order to enlarge my current farming base. I don't want to pay more for land because Chinese investors are trying to buy land in the area.
820.	We would possibly sell some land that is further away from our home base and purchase land closer to home if some came available that interested us.

821.	My wife and I have a 2 year old boy and are expecting another child. We want to keep living this great life, but land is becoming increasingly hard to acquire. Prices keep rising, mainly due to out of province investment. If we want to continue we must expand, and soon. If more outside investment is opened up, the land will surely become unattainable for regular hard working couples like us.
822.	I am limited because of deep pockets from out of province
823.	Would like to purchase but I cannot compete with the large industrialized farmers.
824.	Would like to own more instead of leasing.
825.	May purchase more when we have paid off what we have
826.	I am hoping to purchase a small farm soon
827.	I have purchased several quarters in the last 3 years and would like to buy more if small parcels became available, in my financial budget.
828.	Due to drought related conditions, viability of our operation depends on acquiring more land to make a feasible operation. It is unreasonable to keep trying to rent land. Landlord's terms and rental rates are fluctuating. There are already too many variable costs in agriculture; one has to take on land purchases to ensure stability of payments and availability to survive. There is so much risk in agriculture availability of income producing land is a necessity.
829.	Have to. Currently renting land to graze over half of livestock because of continued drought conditions. A smaller herd would not be viable to make a living. Currently we pay more in land rentals than what we as operators spend on personal items. (we live on \$12,000 a year, but pay \$25,000 in land rental costs)
830.	I would like to purchase the rest of the family farm.
831.	Possible as an average with the land(1/4)
832.	I was raised on a farm BUT now I am a self-employed contractor who owns 1section of land and farms the land myself
833.	We'll have to see what happens. What competition is to buy land etc.
834.	will retire in next 5 to 10 years
835.	I'm the son of a farmer, currently in school to become a chemical engineer. I hope to get a job at one of the mines near home and take up farming with my father.
836.	Depends on price location economy a time of sale
837.	Want to remain as we are
838.	Depending on when people want to retire and if they are willing to sell the land or just rent out.
839.	I have a small cattle farm of 200 head and enough cultivated acres and hay land to grow my own feed and enough pasture owned to graze my own cattle but my primary source of income is my profession off the farm. I am a Chartered Accountant and a partner in a large national accounting firm. I may expand my farming operation as cash flow and economic

	feasibility permits.
840.	Grew up on the family farm & farmed until 1995. Still involved in the cattle industry. Want to return to farming.
841.	If land is available, I hope to buy it to replace rented land.
842.	We are seniors so it would depend where the land is located from our farm
843.	As a young farmer, I find it logical to buy farmland at a fair market value. (Not an inflated/unrealistic value). Not only to stay relevant when marketing commodities, but in order to justify more efficient, but also more expensive equipment. Example: precision farming equipment (GPS, sectional control, etc.)
844.	We would like to purchase farmland but the current land values are keeping us from doing so.
845.	There is no farmland for sale in our area and prices have sky rocketed making ownership more difficult for the everyday farmer
846.	Am retired.
847.	I am a young farmer who is looking to expand my farming operation significantly.
848.	If the opportunity arose and it was feasible, yes that would definitely be an option.
849.	I want to, but the current prices are too high to justify purchasing the land, as in our areas, the returns from the crop would cover only the land payment for the next 25 years, leaving nothing for living on.
850.	Will never be able to afford land in Saskatchewan
851.	would like to start part time farming
852.	I am a farm wife and we will be retiring within the next few years
853.	If the opportunity arose to add to our land base that would hook up to our present land possibly to purchase just anywhere no.
854.	If land is available and affordable, we would like to purchase
855.	I own 17 acres of farm land but do not farm.
856.	I have turned down offerings 5 times the assessment. This is at a ratio that is barely viable to breakeven but in ag you need land to expand
857.	Hoping to buy into the family farm.
858.	If I finish school and find a job in a rural community, I would consider purchasing farmland.
859.	Currently leasing inherited farmland, not seeking expansion.
860.	As I am currently renting land and have been for the last few years I would like to have something of my own. Hard to purchase equipment on rented land when you can't trust people to honor their word!
861.	Hopefully...but land prices are high and currently there is no land available.
862.	Prices for less than marginal land are way over priced because investors think all land is equal.... it's not....it was cheap for a reason.....no body bought it for a reason..... people

	selling it for a reason
863.	I am a real estate agent plus may invest personally in farm land.
864.	I want to leave the city and move to an acreage.
865.	Depending on market conditions and opportunities near our current locations.
866.	If the potential for expansion in my area becomes available in the next 5 years I will be purchasing more land.
867.	will be purchasing more as opportunity arises farm land needs to be owned by the farmer and farmed by the owner
868.	My parents currently own land, am interested in becoming part of the business.
869.	Would love to, but unfortunately there is none around us available due to the big farmers buying it at outrageous prices and foreigners buying to rent/lease it out! The little guys can't get any!!!
870.	Our plan is to buy an acreage, possibly farmland within 5 years. Of course this all depends on support from the bank at this point. We hope to raise livestock.
871.	Price of farmland around Saskatoon (where our farm is located) has gotten too high to expand our farm because of developers buying up good farm land and turning them into acreages.
872.	Currently own 1 quarter, family owns 5 quarters & leases 1 quarter of crown Renting half quarter of pasture for cattle
873.	Do not want to buy more land which leads me to the question as why the government is disposing of community pastures. In my opinion these lands should be left in the public hands.
874.	We hope to.
875.	Depends on the land and how close it is to me.
876.	would like to if I could afford it
877.	WOULD BUY CERTAIN PARCELS IF AVAILABLE AT REASONABLE PRICE. WOULD PURCHASE TO EXPAND CATTLE OPERATION.
878.	Do not have the cash to purchase.
879.	I am trying to relocate our land in to a better 'chunk' for more efficient farming.
880.	I am a x farmer
881.	Purchase land if available, depending on cost.
882.	I currently farm with my father who still resides in Saskatchewan. I have one quarter section and will probably buy more land to increase our holdings.
883.	Buying would be great. Even with interest rates at an all time low really, land prices are rising every year and just about impossible to finance millions of dollars.
884.	Former Saskatchewan resident

	Family farms still
885.	I would love to buy my grandfather's homestead that is now owned by investors.
886.	I hope something reasonable comes available that is close
887.	Hope to buy land that I am already leasing as long as I can get enough cash together
888.	Price of farmland as of now has decoupled with possible farmland cash crop return. Farmers are middle aged, and to buy land and pay for it with some time to reap a profit is very narrow. Allowing the land to increase in price will have a negative impact on existing producers who are largely older looking at return on investment. Young starting out farmers, have no chance to make a start-up possible already. I would like a couple of quarters, since I lost a lot to flooding, with no chance of return to that soil in my lifetime.
889.	It is very hard to compete with foreign backed capital and corporate farm organizations.
890.	I would like to expand, if land was for sale in my area I would buy
891.	There should be no need to think you are going to buy land if it comes up and the numbers work then you go for it but with the over inflated prices it is very irresponsible to hang your head over the barrel.
892.	Yes I would hope so, land comes up very rarely around outlook sk and if it does come up for sale then its already sold to some big or foreign investor
893.	Potentially. With father and two brothers farming full-time, if the right situation arose, I would consider purchasing land in my own right.
894.	If no purchase is made in Saskatchewan it will be made elsewhere (not necessarily in Canada) where ownership rules are not unduly restrictive
895.	Hope to
896.	We have a new generation of farmers joining the farm business in next 5 years and will expand to accommodate them. This includes expanding the whole farm(livestock, etc.).
897.	there are a few quarters I am leasing that I want to purchase when the owner is ready to sell
898.	Currently starting out ranching and would like to purchase pasture land in Saskatchewan
899.	I would like to take over the family farm someday however land prices are already getting too high to expand the operation.
900.	ready to help next generation instead
901.	Going to retire in 5 yrs..
902.	I would not be able to afford land due to the increase in price caused by investor groups driving the price.
903.	Perhaps, I have owned Sask farmland and enjoyed the responsibilities, rewards and failures that come with it.
904.	My father farms and I have often thought about following in his footsteps.
905.	There is some land owned by relations that is available that I would like to add to my base to

	make my farm more viable.
906.	Let the younger farmers do it or big farm company's buy it
907.	Land has become not affordable anything that comes up gets picked up by hutterites, or cpp Chinese investors come along they drive prices up to uneconomical levels
908.	As land becomes available, I will purchase. In fact, I am renting land today in hopes that I will be afforded the opportunity to purchase it.
909.	We are surrounded by large corp. farmers and I probably can't afford to compete if land becomes available
910.	Not sure whether we will expand our farming operation by purchasing more land or not
911.	Potentially as an investor
912.	I am close to retirement. I have been employed for over the past 45 years in which my employment was very dependent on the well-being of the agricultural industry.
913.	Depends on the available land being sold, and prices. I'm not willing to put my current farm in financial risk if the situation is poor.
914.	As I was raised on a farm in Saskatchewan, I feel it is important to reserve the purchase of Saskatchewan land for Saskatchewan farmers and their nearest and dearest. I am interested in starting a small farm with my family in the near future, and I want there to be the potential to grow my business without worrying that land prices will prevent me from investing in and enjoying my desired "farm" lifestyle. Keep in mind that economies of scale cannot be reached on small "family" farms, so it will inevitably be necessary for me to acquire more and more land in order to produce greater volumes of product and support my family. Thus, affordable land prices are crucial to the success of Saskatchewan farmers.
915.	I would help my son , but the prise has to be in line with income from livestock, not lottery winnings.
916.	semi-retired
917.	May be land coming for sale in the area soon
918.	To old
919.	Price has to be in line with farm profitability
920.	59 years old. Planning to reduce workload. Planning to rent and or sell land.
921.	if we can find some for a good enough price in the area
922.	We would like to purchase land if we can find some that is available. These investor groups and very large farms are driving up the price of land.
923.	I expect to purchase farm land from retiring farmers who do not have family interested in farming.
924.	Price is a determining factor

925.	Just finished college and debt free, would like to make the purchase in a few years to invest in land which is not getting cheaper these days due to inflation of all prices
926.	We will purchase land if we can acquire land at a cost that is feasible.
927.	At current land prices versus commodity prices the land cannot produce enough to pay for itself. And a return of at least minimum wage for my efforts would be nice.
928.	Do want to see all the land owned by a few people the can control and set rent and land values
929.	I am 58 and considering retirement. Not sure if family members will be continuing to farm.
930.	We will likely inherit some land.
931.	Would like to if given the opportunity to purchase
932.	Depends if outside investors jack up the price or not
933.	Going to purchase more of the family farm
934.	Transfer within family - between generations
935.	I was born and raised on a Saskatchewan farm, I now live in Alberta. I own some farm land in SK. My family who are residents own the remaining family farm land. I remain involved in agriculture, my company owns farm land in Alberta and my business relies on farm land production and relationships with primary producers.
936.	All due to my age.
937.	I want to buy land to farm but the price is ridiculous.
938.	The organic sector is the fastest growing agricultural sector in the country. I need to expand to keep up with demand.
939.	If some land becomes available for sale we will certainly try to purchase it.
940.	Once owned a quarter section and would like to buy it back if and when the opportunity presents itself.
941.	Speculating leased land coming up for sale soon.
942.	My family is expanding and would love to buy enough land to get my children involved and take over my family farm.
943.	my son in law is presently operating my farm
944.	As land comes available for sale I will explore options regarding ownership.
945.	Neighbors are old and their children are afraid to farm
946.	Landlords looking to retire
947.	If land values go up any higher expansion will be out of the question

948.	Getting closer to retirement, no farming children.
949.	retired
950.	Unsure as to how feasible it is with outsider competition
951.	Probably not, unless a good opportunity arises
952.	All depends
953.	Young farmer working on expanding
954.	May purchase more land for sons to farm if it makes sense economically.
955.	The returns in cash crops and livestock are not high enough to justify the risk of annual inputs if we are not working toward ownership.
956.	I am retired from farming but still own farmland and are still involved. Would invest in farmland if situation was right.
957.	Would like to but due to non resident ownership there is no land available for sale near my home town
958.	Was raised on the family farm and still owned and run by a brother and his son. This family farm has been in the family for over 100 years. I still help on this farm harvest time and cattle. I am interested in purchasing a quarter in conjunction with my brother but find that it's getting too difficult to compete with some investors in the "oil business" in the area we want land....ie. It's getting just too damn expensive!
959.	Want to buy some land we are renting today
960.	I operate 'intensive small agricultural' operation. Only specific land is suitable.
961.	Unfair completion from home grown and foreign investment companies and institution limits and even prevents our traditional farm units from expanding.
962.	I am a recently retired farmer and a current owner of Saskatchewan farmland. As a Saskatchewan resident, I am also very interested in any potential changes to farmland ownership rules
963.	See my last response
964.	I am retired and no longer interested in purchasing more land.
965.	I am interested in sheep and goat production but don't have the finances to purchase enough animals to be viable, and to buy the necessary equipment and infrastructure
966.	Farmland is currently overpriced
967.	I'd like to buy the farm from Mom (who is retired, land rented out), but right now I can't afford to pay her what it's worth, and she can't afford to give it to me. We will see what happens in the next 5 years.
968.	I will always consider buying farmland in my area if the price is right. I have many neighbors who may wish to retire soon and may want to sell their land.
969.	let Saskatchewan residents have 1st shot at buying any large tracts of land before we allow foreigners, outside investors or large corporations to purchase it because when it's gone from

	our control; it is gone and they don't make new farmland every day. if you force the price of farmland up too high the only ones who could afford to buy it is large conglomerates. good if you are selling bad if you are buying
970.	Intend to help my son acquire more farmland
971.	Currently do not own any land but know many who do. Would consider possible purchase if right opportunity came up.
972.	Considering purchasing a quarter section for residence.
973.	As owners of leased land age, it is apparent that in the near future some of the land we already farm will become available for purchase. There are limited opportunities to purchase land affordably in our area, but occasionally we may have the chance to bid competitively.
974.	I will be buying land from my father at market value
975.	I am retiring, and farmland values effect my retirement
976.	Perhaps another section of land.
977.	We have the next generation already farming with us
978.	No comment
979.	I need to work on relationships with individuals that may sell land in the future. If land comes for sale I need to be in a position to pull the trigger and make the purchase.
980.	If the price goes down to where it is affordable for a single farmer.
981.	too costly
982.	Depends on if I have to compete with investment companies.
983.	We are currently renting a large portion of our land base that we are hoping to purchase in the next few years.
984.	A owner operator has a hard time competing with corporations we don't have the money that they do.
985.	purchase family land and other land nearby if possible
986.	Retired early, after cancer treatment, in 2007 after 40 years of mixed farming at Lucky Lake. Home quarter was 100 years in the family in 2007.
987.	depending on availability
988.	I'm a young farmer owning 160 acres in a highly competitive farming area near Melfort.
989.	My parents and grandparents were farmers and for 5 years I owned farm land. I do not think that people who are not residents should own farm land.
990.	As farmers in our mid-40's, we see the need for continued agriculture and we love the life that agriculture offers us and our family. Purchasing farmland will help us to expand what we have already built and assist us in improving what we have established since beginning our farming operation in 2000.
991.	Purchase farmland in Alberta and Saskatchewan and lease to farmers on a crop share

	agreement.
992.	Yes, 50% of land I farm is rented. As owners get older I expect they will want to sell off what is rented.
993.	I am part of a family farm corporation and the farm needs to grow to support me and my farming son's family/ We would like to purchase but already due to professional sports people investing in land in our area and European dairy farmers moving in, the prices for land in our area have sky rocketed and put it out of reach of grain farmers. In our area, which is a very productive area, the going farmland price already doesn't make sense for grain farmers, if the costs of production stay as high as they are. The cost of leasing land due to the demand is out of line. A poor crop would bankrupt many leases.
994.	If a piece of land in the area comes up for sale at a reasonable price we may consider the investment.
995.	Only if the price doesn't go up. Increasing prices of farmland is not a good thing.
996.	I HOPE to purchase land to allow my son to be able to join the farm. But I won't at current land prices because financing and only being able to service interest costs doesn't build equity.
997.	We are actively searching for opportunities to buy farmland and are willing to pay as much as any investor has paid in our area.
998.	I'd like to pick yes but if prices and the market stay where they are now owning land will never be profitable
999.	Just starting out. In process of buying our first quarter. To be farmed with the help of my dad (and his equipment) as it is nearly impossible to buy land and equipment and inputs when just starting out. We are so lucky to have him it would have been an impossible dream if we didn't have an "in" already
1000.	As a young farmer it is important to be continually investing in land. (A somewhat non depreciable asset)
1001.	If land comes available that is good for an affordable price I will buy it.
1002.	My family farm is owned and operated in Saskatchewan. I currently reside in Manitoba.
1003.	My son is interested in coming home to farm in which we would have to increase our land base to support the 2 families.
1004.	We would definitely like to purchase land but it will depend on availability, price and how well we do in these next few years of farming.
1005.	Profit margins are increasingly narrowing. We must expand our farm to continue operating. My parents are at retirement age. If land values keep rising I won't be able buy the land that my father and grandfather farmed.
1006.	Likely looking at retiring
1007.	Am 57 years old and am trying to help my son get into the business
1008.	Yes we hope to purchase, but unfair competition from outside entities is making it almost

	impossible for legitimate farmers to expand.
1009.	I AM CLOSE TO RETIRING.
1010.	My farm is expanding. We will purchase.
1011.	Local estate will be for sale. Have to plan to make purchase as currently lease some of that land.
1012.	I hope to be able to see a readjustment in all things surrounding agriculture ie; financing possibilities as well as a correction in land prices.
1013.	Advisor to companies interested in acquiring farmland in Canada.
1014.	pricing too high at current production margins
1015.	I would like to but with prices where they are at it seems impossible to afford land or compete with older farms. Hard to get ahead as a new farmer with no owned land
1016.	I will continue to try and purchase additional land if it fits within my operation.
1017.	Land turned over to children.
1018.	Of course we would buy more land. The problem is that people from foreign countries are coming over and buying land. Many of these people do not pay the same taxes that we do and have not contributed to the economy of Saskatchewan or Canada. The regular farmer is having more difficulty competing with this outside competition. There is no way that a young farmer can get started when facing this competition. As a result our young Saskatchewan farmers are not able to purchase land and make farming their career choice.
1019.	The value of farmland will only increase as we see the rising importance of food and a decline in the economic importance of the energy sector; it needs to be primarily in the hands of SK farmers/investors and a firm limit placed on outside investments, be they from CPP Pension funds or China. The age of cheap food is over.
1020.	I am the wife of a farmer. Some of the land we farm is owned by both my husband and myself. Our son is also involved in the farming operation. I am also a retired school teacher and am very involved in our local community. I am answering these questions as a person who has a stake in our farming operation but also as a concerned Saskatchewan resident and member of a farming community.
1021.	there are a lot of neighbors, who are older farmers considering selling land in the next few years, so I would try to buy from them directly before it gets bought up by outside investors.
1022.	At the present time farmland is completely unaffordable for the average person. I would like to buy some but at the present prices I would never be able to pay for it
1023.	RETIRED
1024.	As it becomes available locally
1025.	We would like to expand our land base and would hopefully purchase land to do so.
1026.	Depends on opportunities.

1027.	I would like to buy more land to rent out or farm.
1028.	Would like to, but most land goes to tender and to compete with large scale farmers is very difficult
1029.	I am retired and don't have the financial resources to buy land.
1030.	Depends if any is for sale in my immediate area and what the price is.
1031.	Investment funds available consistent with security of tenure
1032.	Retired, passed land on to children
1033.	We are in a partnership with our son- although I am near retirement our son is a young farmer and would like to expand our land base, primarily for grain farming.
1034.	With the current inflated prices of farmland, which has been the result of either non-resident, both out of country and urban investment, and combined with the present day trend to sell land in large parcels to only one buyer, it is impossible to make a purchase.
1035.	We are hoping to be able to purchase the family farm from parents within the next 5 years.
1036.	Have just started acquiring farmland.
1037.	But am likely to move to a small community based on agriculture - coming from Regina
1038.	I would like to remain in Saskatchewan as a farmer.
1039.	I am a retired Saskatchewan resident (and Canadian citizen by birth) and gain an important part of my income from my farm.
1040.	Would love too but not financially possible for the price they want.
1041.	I am happy at the size that I have. I am also over 60 so I am not looking to expand.
1042.	Depends on the availability of land for sale in our area and also what the price is. It makes it extremely difficult to compete with huge companies that have access to funding that is not available to me.
1043.	I may purchase some lease land that I hold
1044.	I would like to expand with my son and daughter wanting to be involved but it is very hard to find someone to sell smaller parcels that we can compete on.
1045.	Have been a farmer in Alberta many years ago, but have now retired. I have a daughter actively engaged in farming/ranching in Saskatchewan.
1046.	Increase farm size to include young adult children wishing to join the 135 yr old family farm
1047.	I like the idea of owning land that can produce food for myself and fellow Canadians. Food security for Canada should be a national priority.
1048.	I would like to purchase farmland in the next 5 years, however with current land prices in our area it is unlikely I will be able to.
1049.	Depends on good land sale value or good return on renting out the land.
1050.	Land is very pricey based on return on investment. Nervous about interest rate increase.

1051.	As an active farmer supporting the next generation of farmers to take over I am in support of affordable land prices that can be sustained through production, not inflation.
1052.	Only purchase land if close and for good price
1053.	If opportunity arises in the right area.
1054.	I grew up in a farming community and would be very interested in purchasing land for the use of agriculture or any other means.
1055.	Retired farmer, still own farm.
1056.	Trying to but corporations and government agencies buying it up in huge blocks
1057.	Land price is being set by investors and it is hard to compete
1058.	Because I am a young farmer
1059.	I don't intend on purchasing more land.
1060.	Land around my operation is currently under large super farm rental and any land coming open would be GRABBED by the greedy oversized neighbors.
1061.	No plans today, but what we grow today may change in the future
1062.	If land close to my existing farmland became available I would certainly consider making a purchase.
1063.	If some came available close by at a decent price, maybe.
1064.	depends on the price land prices have jumped dramatically making it difficult for small farmers to expand
1065.	We do not make enough money on our farm to purchase farm land at the current rates.
1066.	I own an acreage, would like to purchase some farmland.
1067.	if any becomes available for purchase
1068.	I have an opportunity to get into farming through some relatives who are retiring soon.
1069.	Not sure about future availability of land for sale
1070.	I would like to purchase more farmland in the next 5 years, but with demand being at a high, prices are also at a high. Only greedy people and investors would buy at the current prices.
1071.	If the opportunity arose at a price we found profitable we would most definitely purchase land
1072.	I already own sufficient farm land.
1073.	I'd like to expand, but the prices don't work out on paper and don't wish to still paying land loans when I'm 60.
1074.	prices are so high it is not a viable option to buy any

1075.	If land becomes available it would be smarter and make more sense to buy instead of rent economically.
1076.	Medical student. Currently heir to family land that's been in the family since circa 1940. I plan on purchasing farmland for myself as a form of investment in the future however the nature and length of my education make it hard to predict when that may be.
1077.	My hope is to move out of the city and onto farm land eventually, within the next 5 to 10 years.
1078.	This past winter we had the opportunity to purchase 1000 acres neighboring our farm. We were told we would have first opportunity to purchase this land. Shortly after, we were informed that C.P.P. had purchased this land (and at a ridiculous price). Farmers cannot compete with the federal government or foreign ownership when buying land.
1079.	Land prices in this area of Sask. have sky-rocketed in the last few years due in part to investor speculating that the price of land will continue to increase. This has put extreme pressure on local young farmers from expanding their operation.
1080.	My family already owns rural land - no need for more
1081.	Can't afford it.
1082.	My family has owned land for 3 generations
1083.	Will be finishing school in 3 years. Hope to have the chance to purchase land that is truly my own. Not just owned by some big corporation or rich person who only cares about \$\$.
1084.	I own 3 quarters of farmland which I plan to pass on to my children to either continue to own or to sell. I think that owning farmland is a good investment personally from an estate point of view. I also feel very strongly that Saskatchewan residents should retain ownership of this valuable resource
1085.	I want to give my children the same lifestyle I had growing up.
1086.	Retired - farm income is a small part of my professional pension income.
1087.	I'm hoping to purchase farmland after I finish my M.Sc in agriculture
1088.	The present expected land values even with reasonably good commodity prices, may not be financially viable for a smaller and younger farmer like myself.
1089.	Currently a student, may consider buying a small acreage.
1090.	Cost is too high
1091.	If land in my area is available we will consider it
1092.	Would like to but too many other more advanced competitors
1093.	We are relatively young farmers and are looking to expand our operation to make it viable (right now - in order to provide for our family, we have to look for income off-farm). We also have teenaged sons and daughters how are interested in agriculture.
1094.	We hope to expand our farming operation but it is quite difficult to compete with foreign

	investment agencies.
1095.	I grew up on a farm and would like to make farming a part of my semi- retirement plan. I would like to see land made available to be put in to a RRSP or TFSA, as these are instruments that self-employed people use for their retirement.
1096.	My husband and I are retired, and the farmland we own has been in our family since 1910 or thereabouts.
1097.	First year farming. Renting everything. Goal is to buy land.
1098.	Depending on the financials I may.
1099.	Too near retiring.
1100.	Am at the age where I am satisfied with what I have.
1101.	Want to be more involved in my farm. My soul belongs on the land.
1102.	When land becomes available which strengthens my existing holdings cumulative value with diversification, access improvements and/or productivity gains I would be aggressively trying to acquire those holdings
1103.	If economic situations allow and overall profitable, I plan on purchasing more land.
1104.	Proper stewardship of the land, for me, means owning the land because I have a direct stake in how it is treated. At this point in time I couldn't take on more land and farming it with respect and sustainably
1105.	am nearing retirement
1106.	My mother has 13 quarters and we are exploring estate issues.
1107.	I own 10 quarters of land and find that to be sufficient.
1108.	Not sure if any family members will take over.
1109.	Purchase if my renters want to sell. May have to buyout my dad.
1110.	I sincerely hope I have to opportunity to purchase farmland in the next 5 years
1111.	Although our farm is of a moderate size, we feel pressure to expand to meet the future needs of the generation which may follow us in this business.
1112.	I will be phasing out of farming and my son is taking over, we will be looking at expanding our grain land base if quality land close to home becomes available at a price that we can afford. If foreign money and pension plans can get in to bid on the land prices will probably rise past the point that we can afford as we have to pay for it from future profits which will vary with many things, weather being a major one.
1113.	This will depend solely on the cost of that land. Farmers can't compete with investment groups, whether private or public pension funds, etc. They're working with interest free money. I don't want to become an employee of an absentee landlord, what does that say about life in this province? What is wrong with Saskatchewan as it is? I've always thought it was a good place to have a life.
1114.	I grew up on a farm and my father farms. I currently work off the farm but would like to try

	and go back
1115.	Depends opportunity and cash flow
1116.	I'm a senior now not able to handle more land without help and unwilling to hire help
1117.	I would like to
1118.	Ownership of land should be by the person doing the work.
1119.	Getting a little older and land values where I am are artificially inflated.
1120.	I grew up on a farm and would like to buy farmland within the next 5 years or so.
1121.	Would buy if land was available and price was right.
1122.	in process of transferring to next generation
1123.	Want to, but probably won't be able to
1124.	Looking to increase the farm size so the 5th generation can continue to farm but it is very hard to compete against large corporations.
1125.	it is very hard to purchase farmland of any kind here, because I cannot compete with rich syndicates, most of whom are out of province
1126.	If land becomes available close, we would try to buy.
1127.	Unless prices reflect realistic value not speculation by investors
1128.	We have two or more children who would like to be involved in farming in the long term. They are making huge personal sacrifices to help keep the farm viable.
1129.	Hopefully
1130.	As land becomes available, we investigate as to whether it is a long term fit our operation. We only buy land that compliments the long term vision of our farm operation.
1131.	We'd like to, but with current land values I really think it's not going to happen.
1132.	cost too much to run cows
1133.	We would like keep our children farming so need to purchase land at a price where it will pay for itself and support a family.
1134.	I've been interested in getting into small scale farming, and have been researching the possibilities.
1135.	too much rented land, I need to own more for my own retirement
1136.	will be buying retiring family members acres
1137.	We are currently in the process of moving to a rural area where we would like to eventually purchase more land to farm.
1138.	I simply want to see SK progress, not regress, economically
1139.	We are hoping to increase our acres in order for our son to join the farming operation. Without more acres this may not be feasible.

1140.	Trying to but investors keep pushing prices to the level that FCC won't lend me money to purchase
1141.	Can only purchase if land is available
1142.	While I do not personally expect to purchase farmland in the next 5 years, I recognize my rural town, school, and community agencies depend upon the economic success of the family farm.
1143.	Once university is complete I want to buy more land for cattle
1144.	We want to but having a hard time competing already without outside pressure.
1145.	Am thinking about it, but not yet decided
1146.	We are a young farm family (under 30) and we would like to keep expanding until we feel comfortable with the size of our farming operation.
1147.	I like land
1148.	Depends on whether the land prices continue to increase or not
1149.	Yes I want to purchase more land to be able to grow food locally and get away from commercially farmed land that does not respect water flow, environment, soil quality or wildlife(big farms are in it for \$\$\$ and don't care about environmental concerns)
1150.	current farm size is sufficient
1151.	if the ownership rules are changed to Saskatchewan residents and money only it'll be the most destructive thing possible to the current small young farmers in Saskatchewan. our asset base will be destroyed, commercial financiers will run for the hills abandoning the 80's style collapse in land value. ill be trapped under massive debt with no hope of every repaying, I'll join the list of people declaring bankruptcy, so no buying land anyway.
1152.	I am 65 and need to store wealth somewhere safe, Sask farmland was safe until Lyle pulled this political stunt. Now market response, to his economically shockingly incompetent decision, is doubt and stagnation a major downside shock bankrupting thousands is possible
1153.	I am 60 yrs old at the end of my farming days
1154.	I have been trying to expand the family farm as an investment in my future as well as my children
1155.	If the foreign investors piss off and quit driving the price up where normal farmers can't afford to buy.
1156.	We are a growing ranch. With two teen boys interested on joining the operation. We will need to buy more land in order to grow.
1157.	Some leased land may come available
1158.	In order to expand our cow herd we will have to.
1159.	If I can come up with the down payment etc. and the right land I'd be buying.
1160.	Purchasing from a family member

1161.	We would like to convert some of our leased land to owned land, but given the competition from investors whose interest is not whether the land can produce sufficiently to justify the payments, not sure we will be successful.
1162.	Retired farmer - renting out land
1163.	I will purchase land if my uncle chooses to retire in the next few years
1164.	Farmland left to us in estate
1165.	Again, I would love to purchase. It may not make economic sense to purchase or rent, if it costs more to work the land, than you would ever see in return.
1166.	I hope to. My teens are interested in being a part of the operation so we need to grow
1167.	I am semi-retired farmer and would like to expand.
1168.	Currently own farmland in central Sask.
1169.	Grew up on a farm but had to leave the farm to earn enough to start my own farm
1170.	I could buy the land surrounding my property if it came up for sale
1171.	When we pay off our mortgage, we will look to more investments, including adding more land to what we currently have for farming.
1172.	our land is currently leased
1173.	Want to become a full time cattle operation
1174.	Would like to, current financial situation prevents this.
1175.	I want to buy a small amount of land to produce food for locals, in a sustainable way. I would like to experiment with what can be grown here. I would like to be able to provide enough produce to also help out the local shelter and to also have school groups come out so children can learn about where their food comes from and how to live sustainably.
1176.	Farmland is very expensive here and does not often come up for sale.
1177.	I currently own land, if the opportunity came up to purchase neighbouring land, I may consider purchasing.
1178.	If the opportunity arose, may be an option.
1179.	If the price would go down and we would get more money for our grain, then perhaps we would buy.
1180.	We own 50 acres of land right now and would be interested in purchasing more.
1181.	I intend to purchase a small plot of land to rent out for farming and to hunt on in the future.
1182.	Land in our area is hard to acquire because of bigger operations with bigger wallets
1183.	I am a retired teacher in his late eighties who was born and grew up Saskatchewan and lived in this province all his life.
1184.	Yes. If I can compete with pension plans and the Chinese investors. And get a price that is fair and generate a profit for my family. Not going to pay outrageous prices just to say I own land

1185.	I am retired and do not intend to expand the land holding.
1186.	I have no plans to purchase farmland in the next 5 years.
1187.	Will expand our acres as funds permit
1188.	potential purchase of home quarter from parents
1189.	I won't, but would like to see my son be able to purchase land to expand his farming.
1190.	Under the right conditions yes. Farmland is still a good investment Let's keep it that way
1191.	I am get close to retirement
1192.	My father is in his 60s and has farmed for most of his life. My grandfather is a retired farmer. I am a woman in my 30s that is interested in taking the farm over and hope to purchase land of my own as well as lease some from my family.
1193.	If land close to our current farm land becomes available then would certainly be interested.
1194.	I am not a farmer and I am not involved in agriculture industry.
1195.	We are very seriously looking for farmland, we're just not sure how quickly we will find the right parcel.
1196.	Depending on where farming is in five years and availability
1197.	At my point in my career probably not but things change such as one of the kids deciding to farm.
1198.	I have a brother in law that's going to retire and we want to keep it in the family for the next generation to farm.
1199.	Would to but large investors are pushing prices out of reach of family farms.
1200.	Land seems to be artificially inflated in value due to good growing conditions and commodity prices plus investor type of buyers attracted by these two factors. Over a 25 year period the economic reality of revenue derived from farmland does not support current value trends.
1201.	Due to age
1202.	Price of land is too high.
1203.	Again as opportunities present themselves land purchases will be made, probably from our current land owners that we have lease agreements with.
1204.	would consider purchasing if some came for sale close to my farm at reasonable price
1205.	If a parcel becomes available at a price that can provide sufficient return on investment I would attempt to buy. Currently that is not happening asking prices are overinflated.
1206.	I am a Farm Labourer
1207.	I have family members who would like to purchase farmland if they can find something suitable. I would lend them some money to help finance the purchase.
1208.	I'm the 5 generation son of that would like to come back to the farm and build up my own operation. However due to the last land ownerships changes it has made it impossible for

	younger generations to even think about buying land.
1209.	I am starting out with cattle and would like to buy.
1210.	I had planned to expand for last quite a few years till the government lifted the ban on Hutterites owning land within 60 miles of each other they started driving the price of the land up then and now huge corporations have put land prices out of reach and have killed off the rural communities. The greed out there now is terrible not many small farms left and our way of life is gone.
1211.	Hoping some of the neighbors retire and sell
1212.	competing with outside investors makes it difficult to make a profit
1213.	Hard to compete with outside money
1214.	I am currently purchasing my father's land from him to start my own future in the agriculture sector because I love this career.
1215.	Hoping to buy more with sons wanting to farm
1216.	I want to purchase more farmland to make my farm worth more
1217.	I hope too if not out bid by corporate land buyers/pension funds.
1218.	Can't afford to buy too much foreign investment
1219.	Farmed for a number of years. Now retired and our land is farmed by a neighbour.
1220.	I'm a senior
1221.	I'm a young farmer looking to farm full time. this can only happen by buying more land that is near our farm for reasonable dollars, which has jumped substantially in recent years because of the deep pockets of foreigners
1222.	I am the daughter of a hard working farmer and will be inheriting farmland one day.
1223.	If land near where I already farm came available I would try to buy it.
1224.	Like to see more help financial to young farmers/ranchers! Keeping family farms
1225.	yes definitely if farmland comes up for sale close to me and if it fits my farming operation
1226.	n/a
1227.	I own 12 acres, roughly the old yard site of a previous owner, and I expect to add 5 more adjacent acres which is currently in grass. I plan to raise pigs, chickens and sheep. From my research of I would be able to gross about \$90,000 per year on this land, with net profits of approximately \$70,000/year. As I become more experienced, I would be able to purchase other small acre parcels and achieve similar results.
1228.	We are in our early 30s with children. We have done one major purchase and plan to do more purchasing to get to a larger size in next 10 years. We also hope to expand by renting some. We are a multigenerational operation too although land is separate
1229.	Can't afford it
1230.	the aggressiveness of non ag related investors takes a lot of the land that is changing hands

	out of our profit range
1231.	I want to expand my farming operations
1232.	If expenses allow yes
1233.	Not in a position to buy land, not a farmer
1234.	I am purchasing land through a succession plan that we developed through the YFBDI (which was an excellent program and I would not be farming without that program to help us put together a plan). I think it is unlikely I will purchase land privately, as I believe I am much better off keeping my off farm income rather than expanding my farm.
1235.	Our children would like to buy. Investors that don't even know anything about farming are trying to buy up at ridiculous prices then rent to others at high prices. Takes the fun out of family farming
1236.	With all the foreign investors that have been purchasing farmer land in our area, they have driven the price that a person cannot afford to purchase. With this being said, the youth of this province are in no financial position to afford to start farming.
1237.	Asking prices are too high to make a profit
1238.	There is an economy of scale that is ever increasing and in order to remain profitable, I need to keep pace in order to afford the equipment I need to effectively manage this acreage.
1239.	We would like to but don't know if we can afford it.
1240.	I am at the age where it would not be economical for me to purchase additional land.
1241.	I am a farmer and would like to be able to expand my operation
1242.	There is local land I would like to purchase, but it all depends on the prices of crop, the weather, and above all, the price of the land itself.
1243.	I am 35 year old 5th generation and am trying to expand
1244.	land prices have become unacceptable and unaffordable for the small farmer
1245.	We would like to expand our farming operation, so our sons may have a chance of farming. CPP owning land is not a good thing, how can we as farmers compete with them, when they are using investors money. How would you like to have some outside workers come in and take over your job or your house then you could lease it back from them. Never owning it again.
1246.	Will expand at about 10-15% per year or as market permits
1247.	I have a son entering the farm operation and will likely let him buy/lease any future expansions.
1248.	Being in the area that we are in it's not the big corps of large farmers I'm worried about it's the Hutterite colony's that we can't compete with and they are not afraid of pay 4 to 5 times what it's worth cause they have 400 years in their minds to pay for it
1249.	I currently rent some land where the owners have expressed intentions to sell the land. In order to maintain by farm size and efficiencies I have created, I hope to purchase the land if

	economically feasible.
1250.	Probably will not but farmland is still a good investment
1251.	Currently getting things in place to go to FCC to buy land. Banks severely limit our lending abilities
1252.	retired
1253.	I came from a farming background but unfortunately years ago took a different path. I may or may not buy land. If foreign ownership is opened up, I will purchase in an attempt to save a bit of Saskatchewan.
1254.	Purchase of additional land will be dependent on a number of factors: opportunity; price; productive capacity; economic return
1255.	depends on what is available
1256.	We are young farmers staring out and hope you continue expanding our operation through purchase and lease.
1257.	I HOPE SO IF I AM NOT COMPETING AGAINST AN COMPANY OR PENSION PLAN THAT MAKES IT IMPOSSIBLE
1258.	Son showing interest in farming. Will need more land
1259.	We plan to expand, and ownership provides better control and planning ahead.
1260.	I am looking to buy a section along the fringe
1261.	Family members retiring and want to sell
1262.	Not much farmland sells here or if it does its quick to move.
1263.	In the next 5 years I would like to own a yard site on 160 acres of farm land
1264.	I grew up on a mixed farm, have always been involved with it for most of my life and pursued a degree in Agricultural Economics to better enable me to farm. It is all I have ever wanted to do. Due to bad marriage and subsequent divorce and fighting in courts (\$\$\$) for equal parenting of my kids, I did not have the financial resources to take over the family farm when my mother was no longer able to continue running it. Unfortunately I live 2.5hrs from the family farm so I had to decide to either choose my kids or to take the farm over somehow and not see my kids. I chose my kids. Now that my last kid is in grade 12, I am trying to figure out how to get started farming. The family farm was sold 7 yrs ago, and there isn't a day that goes by that I don't think about the farm.
1265.	Very concerned about farmland being sold to none farmers. For example pension funds, investment companies, foreign investment especially! Farmland should be owned by farm operators not ivory towers with serfs and slaves! And profits being raped out of Saskatchewan to some offshore account and not pay any income tax!!
1266.	Hopefully to help our next generation set up in Agriculture.
1267.	Our children are taking over and many of these decisions are theirs. However, purchasing is preferred to leasing, as boards of director's change, priorities of that board change, and ranching requires stability of the land base. Who on the Canada pension board was

	considering sask farmland 5 years before the decision to buy? Fluctuations in real estate will affect board decisions greatly.
1268.	Depends on affordability
1269.	Banks and Credit Unions and FCC continue to be over secured in their lending practices and prohibit more aggressive land acquisition that would create a better market value than an influx of cash from outside interests and investors.
1270.	I do care about who owns the land, for someone who has a love and respect as a resident of this land, will care for it for future generations.
1271.	This depends on the prices of commodities and the availability of land.
1272.	The prices are too high in the area in which we own land; seemingly driven up by absentee owners with money from other parts of Canada/the world.
1273.	Forced to buy but increasingly difficult with increase in prices. It's a highly competitive market with prices already beyond reason. Some farmers leaving farming are selling as packages, increasing pressure on small farms.
1274.	If location and price is affordable that I don't put my paid off land at risk of loss to a lending institution.
1275.	Yes I plan to purchase more farmland in the next 5 years. I work off farm and am planning on taking over the family farm in the next 5 -7 years. I would like to expand the farms acres over the next 5 years while I still have an off farm income.
1276.	Young farmer interested in purchasing the family farm in about 5 -10 years.
1277.	if land is available
1278.	Live in the city
1279.	Yes I have 2 sons fresh from Ag school. We will buy verses renting.
1280.	age consideration
1281.	Land I am leasing is up for sale.
1282.	My goal is not to purchase farm land. However, the ever increasing demand for food makes land ownership more appealing and a point of potential interest to pursue in the future.
1283.	My husband and I have a farm corporation, but we are both over 65.
1284.	We are about to retire so we won't be purchasing any land.
1285.	Hoping, expecting, preferring to retain land inherited from family and not seeking to expand. It's a matter of heritage and long range relationship to the land. And for some, this is traced to pioneer times. This ownership is different than that of speculators and investors and there needs to be this important distinction.
1286.	My brother now owns the family farm homesteaded by my grandfather in 1902.
1287.	We do plan to expand, but not sure what land values will do and how affordable it will be

1288.	My son may be entering farming, in which case I may to help him
1289.	Land values are too high for me to contemplate expending my land holdings right now.
1290.	Age 71
1291.	Land that we rent from aging landlords.
1292.	I presently own a quarter but would like to purchase/lease more land in the near future
1293.	If we are able to we would like to purchase more land to secure our land base and lock in our land costs for the long term.
1294.	Depends on my financial situation. If it improves I may purchase.
1295.	It would be more for my sons than me.
1296.	I lived the 1st 15 years of my life on a small family farm and the majority of my contemporaries were farmers. Some of those families still farm the home place. I am first generation off the farm.
1297.	Our sons are interested in joining the family operation so expansion is definitely a positive direction for us. Especially pasture/marginal land
1298.	We buy Saskatchewan agricultural produce and may consider buying farmland in the future.
1299.	my son looking to expand the farm
1300.	I am young and have only been farming for five years. Would like to purchase more land and farm full time. Right now I also have a full time job
1301.	although we are retired we still own land which we farmed for 60+ years
1302.	I am approaching retirement age so I personally don't see an expansion of my land base, however my son farms with me and as a farm units are looking to expand.
1303.	I would like to expand my farmland base so my children are able to farm. They appreciate the agricultural way of life.
1304.	Too expensive to buy at my age
1305.	I am a young farmer looking to expand and become self-sustaining from an agricultural income.
1306.	Our corporation which includes our son's family as well as us needs to expand to remain viable.
1307.	Only in close proximity to Existing...some of my land is 4th generation family owned.
1308.	I am born and raised from a mixed farm. I am a young, recent Agriculture grad student that wants to invest in some land around our own family farm. However, I would have to invest alongside my brother.
1309.	Maybe even within the next year
1310.	I would like to buy or have an investor buy the land

1311.	I have finished my degree in Agriculture at the University of Saskatchewan and want to invest in the family farm.
1312.	I would like to purchase pasture land in Saskatchewan within the next 5 years
1313.	Currently involved in ag industry and might want to become a farmer in the future
1314.	I might rent (lease) but not likely to purchase land
1315.	Family owns farmland
1316.	I am a young farmer starting out and would like to purchase more land as it is an appreciating asset currently.
1317.	Land is hard to find so it would depend if there is land available close to the area
1318.	May retire back to Sask. and purchase small parcel of land for place of residence and garden to sustain self.
1319.	I am planning to purchase some of the land I currently lease.
1320.	If land is available in our general area and is affordable we may purchase some.
1321.	Somewhat uncertain of retirement plans at present.
1322.	Interested in purchasing ranch land as a means to producing food, providing habitat for wildlife and protecting biodiversity, and to provide ecosystem services to our society. My ability to purchase ranch land will depend on the availability and price of the land
1323.	We have considered purchasing farmland, in particular pastureland with wildlife conservation value.
1324.	Land prices and values are for to expense for many young people to purchase or get started in Saskatchewan agriculture right now
1325.	Would like to.

4) Do you expect to sell farmland in the next five years?

#	Response
1.	If we can't buy more land the land we have would not support our 3 families
2.	Economics force sale
3.	None to sell
4.	If you change the rules to take out current approved players and thus put an anti-competitive environment in place I may have to do what my Grandfather did and wait until the rules change yet again.
5.	Want my kids to have a chance
6.	If farming does not improve in the next 1-2 years, we plan to downsize. Unsure if we would sell land or lease it to others at this time

7.	To son
8.	Have succession plan in place to son
9.	I AM A THIRD GENERATION RANCHER I AM HOPING TO GROW IT FOR THE NEXT GENERATION
10.	Not selling. Period.
11.	I am 33 years old, and am at the point where I am trying to expand my land base in the hopes of being able to one day sustain a living without an additional, off-farm full time job.
12.	I would like to own more and rent less. Money pending
13.	However, as a lawyer I expect to act for those that will.
14.	as a real estate agent, yes
15.	Still many years left to farm.
16.	The land is a legacy for future generations
17.	I am a 32 year old farmer on a family farm with a young family myself and I would like to keep it in the family and pass on what I build up to my children
18.	Perhaps lease out to a responsible operator we know. But not sell.
19.	We do not own farmland.
20.	My son is an active farmer
21.	Have sold some in recent years will keep the rest as it has been in family for generations
22.	Land is 30% cheaper than either Alberta or Manitoba.
23.	I am in the process of expanding my farm.
24.	It depends on what happens with prices
25.	I am a young farmer.
26.	My sons want to farm so we won't be selling any farmland.
27.	I have 2 young farmers wanting to farm.
28.	Will farm what we have until we retire and enjoy being debt free for a few years
29.	Don't ever want to sell I want to keep the land in the family
30.	Might sell if price is right
31.	I am selling some land and replacing it with land closer to home.
32.	I'm farming to pass on to the next generation.
33.	I prefer not to answer this question as my response (i.e. yes or no) has the potential to create the perception of a bias in my responses.
34.	I am relatively young for a farmer as I am in my 30s.

35.	Our children will likely want to maintain ownership as investment
36.	Don't have any
37.	I currently do not own land.
38.	none to sell
39.	Have two sons that are taking over farm
40.	I don't have farmland anymore
41.	I am 53 years old - I would like to keep my land till I die - I view it as a good investment with solid growth (capital) and good return 3%-5% which is very conservative.
42.	Long term investment.
43.	I do not own a land
44.	Family farms built Saskatchewan why sell to investors when most of them hardly know how agricultural even works
45.	We want to expand not sell
46.	I have some land that doesn't fit into the existing operation that I would consider selling
47.	My land is rented, & I am very pleased with the renter I have.
48.	Look at previous response.
49.	I actually do not expect to sell, just rent to local guys when I retire. We own quite a bit of land and can make a difference to quite a few young farmers in the area that want to rent. And how many farmers go to a financial planner upon selling and get the suggestion, "farmland is a good investment"
50.	I'm 32.
51.	I own my both of my grandparent's homesteads. These are part of my family history and I will never sell them.
52.	Active rancher
53.	I don't own any land right now
54.	We intend to continue farming for many years.
55.	I am currently trying to sell some of my wine and I even gave a reasonable offer to my neighbors to purchase a very honest like most farmers in this province they want something for nothing
56.	I don't presently own any farmland
57.	I am a city dweller who wants to live on the land one day.
58.	Getting older... may sell to kids...have two sons who really want to farm... but trying to find the finances to start a second year....and still afford to live off the land...is challenging.
59.	I will most likely rent out to neighbours

60.	I'm not ready to retire or in financial trouble
61.	I will most likely lease to neighbours as they probably won't be able to afford to purchase
62.	I won't buy Saskatchewan farmland until after the eligibility issue is cleared up. If I buy it I would want to hold it as a long-term investment.
63.	I don't plan to ever sell my land.
64.	Farmland has been in the family for about one hundred years and has been rented out for about thirty years. There are fewer farmers and the farms are getting much larger.
65.	Until there is market rule stability I will be on the fence.
66.	Retired
67.	We are just starting out trying to grow.
68.	My goal is to hold onto the quarter section for the next 30 years and then pass it on to my son.
69.	Depending on the availability and financing available may sell some land to buy a block closer to other land that is already owned.
70.	Too old.
71.	Own 3200 acres and is part of retirement plan. All land is currently leased out.
72.	Depending on what's available due to people buying land just to move in houses and kick farmers and acreages out and forced to move which is bull
73.	We own a half section quite a distance away. We are currently renting it out to someone else. We are considering selling it and buying some closer to home.
74.	Depends on the prices, my financial standing, and how much I have to chase my renter to pay his rent.
75.	We have a few more years of farming left before we will hope to make changes.
76.	Don't own any at this time.
77.	I would like to rationalize the farm, selling some more distant land and purchasing replacement land closer to the home farmyard.
78.	It is too difficult to replace at this point.
79.	We are over sixty five and find that driving on rural roads, difficulty obtaining good internet access, and increasing need to access to services such as health care, dictates that we would like to live in an urban setting at this stage of our life. We have children, but they have no interest in farming as they have witnessed the stagnation of farming income over the years and they have excellent jobs in larger centres.
80.	I'm a young farmer trying to keep a 3 generation farm running.
81.	We are a 2nd generation family farm working on including the third generation
82.	We are in the process of taking over the family farm and are in our late 20s. We would not be

	downsizing our farm any time soon.
83.	would sell to free up capital \lease back
84.	As we wish to begin farming we will not likely sell any of the land we currently own.
85.	Family will be taking over the farm food production.
86.	I expanding our farming operation
87.	We have sons that want to farm
88.	Would like to keep the land in the family
89.	see above
90.	I need land to farm
91.	it will depend on my son's plans
92.	Would like to keep farming now what does this have to do with your changing the ownership laws?
93.	Looking at different options on the years before retiring
94.	Why? I'm still farming
95.	We are active farmers and don't anticipate retiring for at least 10 years.
96.	We have no intentions of selling the land.
97.	We don't have farm land to sell.
98.	I intend to maintain my Cow/calf ranch for the long term, and pass it on to my family.
99.	No, as I said I sold at a low value. I'm a farm consultant and with today's transfer of farmland, I see very few options available for young farmers. I see contract farming as a way of the future, leaseholds reduce the cost.
100.	They don't make land anymore so I intend to hold onto mine.
101.	I'm 27 years old with a young family taking over my father's farm. I like my job and want to stay in it.
102.	I farm with my dad and younger brother on our farm which has been in the family for 110 years and we would like to be able to sustain and grow our operation.
103.	We plan on expanding acres as our son has recently started farming with us. We have formed a legal partnership and require expanded acres in order to support 2 families.
104.	I am trying to sell my ranch and farmland but because I cannot sell to anyone outside Canada I have been forced to lower the price significantly. I was born and raised in Saskatchewan and I would personally rather sell my land to American farmers than have a buyer from Asia come in and buy my land. The day of the small farmer is over. The small farmer cannot afford the price of equipment at today's prices.
105.	The escalation in farmland values must meet or exceed the inflation in other sectors of the economy before I would be enticed to sell but it is moving in that direction.

106.	We don't plan to ever sell our land. We plan to pass it to our children and family.
107.	Both our boys are joining in on our family farm
108.	Buy closer to yard, sell further away land.
109.	For my job.
110.	Even though my children will not take over the farm, they would prefer to own land over cash for an inheritance or gift.
111.	I am fairly young and intend on farming for many years
112.	It is staying in our family. If it is sold it will stay in our family.
113.	We have to sell here to move on to buy bigger.
114.	You'll never get it back, land sales are rare and at a very high value. Rent it out if anything.
115.	Our farm has been in our family for several generations and the next generation is joining the farm with their wives, so hopefully another generation will be able to farm too.
116.	I'm a young farmer. We are looking expand our operation. Not competing again investment funds would be advantages.
117.	Our sale horizon is likely 20-25 years away.
118.	I will not sell my land until I retire. At that point in time I will try to sell my land to a smaller farmer or someone I know so it helps them in having a better future in farming.
119.	If you sell land, you will likely never have the opportunity to get it back
120.	Approaching retirement
121.	My Job is Farm Related
122.	Family continuance.
123.	We have 4 sons and would like to succession plan with them in mind to take over.
124.	Intend to pass land on to our children.
125.	I believe ownership of Saskatchewan farmland is an excellent investment, In future, I would allow my children to inherit my current farmland.
126.	As a 30 year old farmer looking to take over the family farm I am looking to expand, not sell land.
127.	I should be able to sell to whoever I want to. Some of these farmers that are complaining about the price of land have some of the newest equipment sitting in there yards.
128.	I hope one of my kids take interest in farming, I enjoyed the lifestyle growing up. As an adult I appreciate the values learned from my dad and now the bond of ownership of land.
129.	See what economic environment is like
130.	Still plan to be farming in the next 5 years.

131.	It depends on retirement options that may open up.
132.	no way
133.	Currently don't have any to sell.
134.	I will not sell land unless to swap a purchase
135.	never sell been in our family over hundred years now
136.	Long term hold.
137.	My brothers are going to take over the family farm. We want to expand not downsize.
138.	I am a young farmer and wish to expand my farm to offer my children a chance to farm
139.	I plan on farming for another 20 years.
140.	THE LAND I HAVE IS BEING CONFINED BY URBAN LIVING AND SO THE UNIT HAS TO DEVELOP ECONOMICALLY TO SURVIVE THE urban INTERFACE (NON FARMER ATTITUDES). THERE HAS TO BE SOME WAY TO ACCOMODATE THE URBAN ATTITUDE THAT FARMS SMELL AND ANIMALS HAVE SEX IN THE OPEN WITHOUT CONSIDERATION FOR CITY FOLKS. "Drive-by" city folks often phone the Humane Society and complain that the animals only have grass to eat and look skinny. They often look at farm livestock as pets. There needs to be a way to interface with non-rural people to help them understand agriculture.
141.	don't own any land
142.	Land will be sold sometime but no specific planned schedule.
143.	I have land that is 20 miles from home. As I near retirement I will sell this land.
144.	If the market sends strong sell signals through appreciation may sell current assets.
145.	Do not own land.
146.	Even if I retire within the next 5 years I will not sell the land but rather will rent it out.
147.	I hope I don't have too, but if they allow foreign investment, it may squeeze us smaller farmers out, and me and my young family may have to leave the province looking for other work.
148.	We are a family owned and operated farm. We hope to pass it on to the next generation.
149.	I have scratched through a farming career, many sacrifices few holidays, unlike the young farmers of today I fear. I didn't expect to have my land paid for in a short time. A quarter of land was the same value as a house over the years as was a combine for that same quarter. It is time land values caught up to the rest of the world. A half million doesn't seem unreasonable. Land prices are low because of restrictive policy.
150.	Going to pass it on.
151.	As a young farmer looking to expand the family farm I have no intention of letting land go.
152.	son would like to farm
153.	I have a son who is developing an apiary business and he is using some of this land for his base.
154.	No. I have great producing land no need to sell.

155.	Our land has been purchased for long term investment
156.	Not unless ill health would force us to.
157.	Do not currently own farmland
158.	I am aging
159.	as my parents retire and want to sell the family farm
160.	We are in the business to grow our land base and our farm, not for a short-term investment
161.	We want to continue the family farm to give the opportunity for our children to farm
162.	I would like to expand my land base and farm full-time.
163.	Not done with it myself.
164.	If discontinue farming I would rent it out.
165.	some of it for retirement
166.	Not for a long time
167.	Our farmland will never be sold but passed on to future generations ... Some of this land has been in the family for almost 100 years!!
168.	Because of BSE I will have to farm until I am at least 70, if I hope to have any pension beyond CPP and OAP. For 24 years I worked of the farm at various jobs just to pay off the farm land mortgage. I only have 80 cows, but as long as I stay healthy I plan on farming for many years to come.
169.	I will sell in the next 5 years likely to someone in the local neighbourhood.
170.	Proud to own land.
171.	Do not have any in possession.
172.	I plan on using my land for retirement, renting it out. Other farmers that sold out 10 years ago were treated unfairly because of the ownership rules previously and nobody here to farm it, which has all changed now, so now farmers can retire with some money.
173.	Most likely not, but that depends on my income and land price as well.
174.	I want to increase my acres to a point where I don't need to work in the city and instead just farm full time but with the price of equipment and land it makes it very hard for someone to get started without having a parent retire and transfer the farm to you. Which in my case I would probably need to wait until I am 40 to farm full time.
175.	No a land owner
176.	Yes....selling some pasture land since cowherd was dispersed
177.	I am already leveraged and if prices fall I may be forced into a sale??
178.	I still get a good return
179.	Depends on price.

180.	I have a long term hold thought about farmland.
181.	I don't currently own any farmland to sell
182.	As I stated before we have a family member who wants to continue our family's involvement in agriculture in this province, therefore my wife and I are doing what we can facilitate his taking over the farm.
183.	I am a 3rd Gen farmer with long term goals
184.	Ownership of land is the key to the farming operation.
185.	I am a young farmer looking to grow my operation and raise a family on my farm.
186.	I own no farmland to sell.
187.	Our son is farming with us and he will take over our acre.
188.	I want my children to have the farm and keep farming for generations.
189.	I do not own farmland.
190.	We intend to increase our farm base.
191.	Leased land back to the government.
192.	I need the rental money in order to retire.
193.	It will be left in trust to my family.
194.	I do not own farm land.
195.	Still involved in farming and my land will be passed on to my children to be kept in the family.
196.	I do not own farmland
197.	If prices of land stay up I might sell some
198.	Will possibly be selling and replace sold land with higher assessed land.
199.	As I age it is always a consideration.
200.	I may try to sell some to my sons but the fair market value clause in the income tax act makes it hard
201.	It will be sold to someone with local ties, and not to something like MaxCrop.
202.	Have a son interested in farming
203.	Might sell or pass it on to next generation
204.	I'm trying to get my farm to a size where it is profitable without off farm income
205.	I am 61 years old and no one to take over
206.	We are not old enough to stop.
207.	If I have my way land will never be sold outside of the family.
208.	still hope to be farming

209.	I hope my children will take the farm over.
210.	Already did, as executor of an estate, with no siblings interested in living or farming that area, it was decided it would be best to sell. A Chinese land-buying corporation (Max-Crop) paid more than the land was worth and did so very quickly. This was beneficial to finalizing the estate, but in subsequent meetings with the CEO to finalize the sale, it became apparent they were buying everything, and being backed by investors from China.
211.	test
212.	test
213.	I have a daughter with an interest in farming and she will inherit my land.
214.	I am looking to expand even though I am 60 so the next generation will have enough land bases to make a living.
215.	Might sell, daughters not interested in farming
216.	If
217.	Due to my age I will probably selling or leasing my land.
218.	My daughter will inherit my remaining farmland
219.	do not own
220.	I would like to expand my operation
221.	My grandfather and father have lived and farmed this land. It is important to me to keep that tradition of the family farm alive.
222.	test
223.	at my age I would maybe sell some land to provide for my retirement if the price was favorable
224.	We plan to own our farmland for our entire lives.
225.	I'm turning 30 years old this spring, I want to expand, not contract.
226.	I will never sell land. My grandfather came over here to own land and get away from the rich owing the land and the poor working it. I will never sell land we worked so hard to get it and now it is a struggle working hard just to keep it.
227.	I prefer to have the land remain in the family. If I sell it no one in the family would ever be able to afford farm land again.
228.	Because it is a good investment I expect to keep what I have.
229.	Will sell to family if they are interested.
230.	None to sell at this time.
231.	Not interested in selling.
232.	We have 9 kids, (6 of which are boys) and we hope to keep it in the family. You don't grow farmers in the city.
233.	Too young to retire. Proud of farm ownership to pass on to children.

234.	I have sold some farmland but have some gravel/pasture land that I hope to sell within five years
235.	I will be selling my farm within 5 years.
236.	would like to keep farm in family
237.	We have retired but retained a small amount of land which we will be selling.
238.	I have sons who would like to stay on the farm if they can make a living at it.
239.	Farm will still be in family when I retire or die which ever comes first.
240.	I do not plan to sell any farmland, as my wife and I wish to transfer it to our children with in 10 years. We will not sell to any face less corporations, Canadian or not. I prefer to keep Saskatchewan, Saskatchewan owned.
241.	Sell?!No way! We're just picking up speed!
242.	still farming
243.	may retire or sell a small portion of land furthest from base
244.	Just purchases first quarter section last year.
245.	With the high/long term rents the investors demand, I might go broke and have to sell. Move out of here.
246.	Read above!!!
247.	Currently live on Lakefront property
248.	Will never sell farmland.
249.	New farmer
250.	I'M NOT SURE!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
251.	Currently renting land to farmer as part of income.
252.	time to move on and get on with life
253.	I plan on leaving it to future generations of rancher or farmers in my family
254.	retirement is an option
255.	I have a young family and strong ties to my community. I will be supporting my oldest child as he goes through Medical school by having him work on the farm to earn his tuition.
256.	I am a young farmer trying to make a go off the land
257.	We are in expansion mode
258.	ranch is still growing
259.	Want to increase my farm size

260.	Our son is farming and our land would stay in the family
261.	The land I have will pass on to the children
262.	We are selling our land to our family at what we paid for it 40 years ago
263.	Our land is family land that has been in our family since the early 1900's. The heritage value is very high.
264.	We would like to maintain ownership of our land. We hope that our children (currently 23 and 28 years of age) will have the opportunity to take over.
265.	The land will be deeded to children.
266.	I don't plan on selling. I would like my sons and nephews to have an opportunity to farm if they wish when they get older
267.	Can't be a farmer if you don't have any land
268.	I currently own two 1/4s of land. This is in consideration of 7 other estate 1/4s of land from an original family homestead farm dating back to 1908. At present the 7 1/4s I intend to have listed under my 2 daughters and my name as a trust farm. The 2 1/4s in my name will be added to the trust on my passing. The entire 9 1/4s were once part of the family farm. Since this is heritage farm land, I would like to see the third generation maintain this heritage and have it rented out to responsible local tenants. All involved are Canadian born citizens.
269.	Not planning on retiring or leaving SK.
270.	This was given to me by my dad, I feel very fortunate to have this property,
271.	I want to be able to raise my family on the farm.
272.	We did sell a portion of the land we bought as it didn't fit in our long term plans and as a result it looked like the best thing to do was to bail out on it before we were struggling to pay for it. And before land prices softened.
273.	I hope to farm for a fair while yet as a young farmer.
274.	We are a 5th generation ranch and hope to ranch in the future
275.	I'm hoping to sell to my son
276.	5years is too far ahead we are under 55 would like to farm for many more years to come
277.	Hope to expand to accommodate our son's desire to continue the farm, so selling at this time is not in the plans.
278.	Will never sell my children can deal with it
279.	Actively farming son will acquire ownership of the home quarter I still have in my name.
280.	We are a young couple under 35 years old trying to build our farm.
281.	We are just getting set up after 25 years of no profit we may do some trading but not selling

282.	I am not yet thirty years old, and am trying to build something sustainable for my future. I will not be selling what little land I own!
283.	we have some land near a major city and may subdivide 10 - 20 acres
284.	My sons will eventually take over the farm.
285.	If I sell, it won't be to some large corp.
286.	I have a son who may take on the operation.
287.	Currently do not own any
288.	My family has been farming in Assiniboia Territory since 1872.
289.	I am keeping everything I have.
290.	Our land will be transferred to our family who are already actively farming
291.	I plan to keep growing so this farm can support my family.
292.	I'm a young farmer
293.	The farmland I own has been in my family for over 105 years I will not sell heritage and my Will states my children will not sell
294.	Only to children if they were interested
295.	I am looking to grow my operation and get it set up for my children to take over, not looking to sell any land.
296.	Expansion is only if affordable.
297.	might sell some if the right offer came up
298.	no intent to sell
299.	I have just started farming and I need to obtain more until I'm where I want to be.
300.	My land won't be sold. It will stay in family
301.	I've worked hard for many years to increase the value of my property. I certainly don't want the provincial government interfering by taking steps that would effectively put a limit on what I could sell it for.
302.	It is important to me that farmland stay in the hands of farmers and farm families. I would consider selling farmland if I knew someone who was interested in starting a farm, but I would not sell to an investor.
303.	Young farmer not retiring anytime soon.
304.	My son farms and it will remain in the family
305.	I do not expect to quit farming in the next five years and feel very strongly that ownership is superior to rental. There are few, if any, investments better than Saskatchewan farmland.
306.	Depends on family situation
307.	Again under right conditions I would sell and or rent land

308.	Not planned
309.	Our owned land is the backbone of our farm and selling it would hurt the long term health of the operation
310.	how does a young farmer buy in with farmland so expensive
311.	Retired
312.	It will stay in the family
313.	Whatever I have when I die belongs to my son James
314.	I am only 32.
315.	will keep farming
316.	We will keep trying to farm and own farmland in spite of government interference in the market as I have witnessed in my years with FCC holding values high in the 1980's , when markets were poor and I should have been able to purchase land and banks would not loan the money. And now when the government allows corporations and investors to directly compete with farmers who have had to live off the slim profits of farming and now must compete with oil companies.
317.	My son will take over
318.	Our farmland has been in our family since 1913 and I will not be selling any land unless I am financially unable to pay the taxes.
319.	We want to keep all owned land within the family and continue to operate under the family name.
320.	Do not own any farmland.
321.	I am only 46 and have 3 sons interested in farming, so not likely to sell.
322.	That will depend on the availability of buyers and my personal situation.
323.	not sure how my response will be used and don't want my answer used to support change I disagree with
324.	The land is rented to a local farmer/neighbor and will be sold to him within five years.
325.	whether I sell will depend on whether (moisture) cattle prices and lastly government policy- whether they seem to want me and my kids to stay in Saskatchewan
326.	There is no advantage to selling our land, and if we have land we aren't using then we can lease it to another farmer.
327.	Approaching retirement.... May decrease workload or sell in entirety
328.	No plans as of yet, but everything has its price tag. If it gets to be more and more of a fight to be able to borrow against what is owned or expand to own more than I could see a lot of farmers just throwing up their hands and calling it quits. This would be a last resort though.
329.	My child and partner are buying more land as they can afford it to grow their farm so they can leave their off-farm work and commit themselves to full-time farming.

330.	Family would like to show interest in maintaining a farmland base.
331.	My son has recently moved back home and has invested in our ranching operation.
332.	I do not own any farmland
333.	My dad owns farmland and has no plans of passing it along until his passing. It is productively rented out to a neighbouring farmer.
334.	If we found land more suited to our operation we would sell current land in order to buy more if needed
335.	Will bequeath land
336.	I will never sell my land. It's been in my family for over 100 years.
337.	In growth mode
338.	Not getting any younger and next generation has taken employment in urban centers. Farming has to be in your blood and you have to be prepared for the unexpected. Just got severely hail on two days ago. Income suddenly cut in half!!!!
339.	Farm presently 'for sale' and is being leased annually. We have had a number of offers; however, most of them have not come close to the present value of the land. The local farmers are not willing to offer the seller the market value.
340.	When I farmed, I was renting family and neighbor's land. I will inherit family land through an estate in the future. The only opportunity to "sell" that I would ever consider is to sell my share of that family land to a farming family member. I would never be a liquidator of farmland.
341.	Hope not to as I hope family may come back as our farm is 110 years old.
342.	Retiring
343.	I HAVE TWO SONS & DAUGHTER WHO ARE TRYING TO MAKE A LIVING FARMING AND WOULD LIKE TO INCREASE THERE LAND BASE
344.	I would be a buyer, not a seller.
345.	Still trying to buy.
346.	If the land goes up will sell for a profit unless looks like my investments will do better other places.
347.	The land is owned jointly with my son. He gets it when I die.
348.	Not at that stage in life.
349.	We are downsizing our operation over the next 2-3 years and plan to sell the farm.
350.	My health well be the deciding factor if I can or cannot remain involved in farming
351.	I won't ever sell it. It will be passed on to my children.
352.	We are young family putting down long term roots in our community.
353.	Depends on health help and happiness

354.	I expect to inherit farmland, but hopefully not within the next 5 years.
355.	See above.
356.	My son and family are slowly buying me out.
357.	Survival is simplistic, own land, own food. Selling our land to Foreign Countries would allow them to ship all of our commodities away from our own folks at home, potentially increasing prices or having a lack of food in the future.
358.	I expect my children to keep the land base we have
359.	If I will be given a chance to move in Canada. We will sell our land in Philippines to use the budget for Canada
360.	As I expect that farmland value is increased gradually, I don't want to sell farmland.
361.	Sell poorer farm land and buy better farm land
362.	I have no intention of selling any farm land as our family has a deep rooted history in farming.
363.	Unless we can sell and increase our land base somewhere else.
364.	I will rent my land if not able to farm it myself
365.	I would possibly sell the land I currently own to buy land elsewhere, preferably in Saskatchewan, if it created better opportunity to grow my farm.
366.	I see farmland as a buy and hold investment
367.	I don't plan on selling any farm land I attain. I operate a small family farm and am only looking to grow larger with the equipment that can suffice a father son operation.
368.	We're looking to expand
369.	If we can't expand our operation we will be forced into early retirement.
370.	Consolidating land in one area
371.	Sale of the Farmland in order to change the lifestyle.
372.	I am concerned about the stewardship of the land and animals/ecosystem in Saskatchewan. Foreign or out of province owners who live far away from the land do not have the same connection to caring for the biodiversity of species on the land.
373.	We are quite content nurturing our land and being stewards so have no interest in selling. The opposite can be said about the numerous corporate farms in our area that have had every homestead, head land, water runs bulldozed and broke up. Wildlife has been eradicated, water runs washed out and 200 lbs fertilizer/acre running thru the waterways.
374.	I'm too young to retire, and I only own one quarter
375.	I don't ever plan to sell any farmland.
376.	We are older farmers and want to be able to sell our land to any Canadian resident we want to. No other property owner (that I am aware of) is restricted on who they can sell the property to as long as the buyer is a Canadian resident. I don't have heirs and young farmers expect to be coddled to make it easier for them to buy farmland - but all at the expense of people who want

	to sell the land. Why should I (who have worked hard and taken all the risks) have others tell me what Canadian resident should and should not be able to buy my land. Why do we all want to coddle young farmers???
377.	The land that we own will hopefully never be sold, it is a valuable asset that will only appreciate in value and it will be passed on to my children.
378.	No land is for sale, ever. It will all be passed along to my son and daughter.
379.	Even if I were to sell some land I would like to see it go to someone who resides in Saskatchewan or Canada and preferably to someone who is active in a farming operation. At this time I feel like I would be willing to take less money to see that this happened. I don't want to see farmers reduced to share croppers or peasants again. We value the land and our communities and have a desire to see a strong and vibrant Saskatchewan. While I value capitalism I don't believe that it serves then best interests of our province or our food supply in this situation.
380.	retired
381.	We will farm for as many years as we have our health and ability to farm. We look forward to encouraging and working with the next generations of our farming family.
382.	I inherited land; I consider it to be a good long-term asset and I have no plans to sell it.
383.	The next generation will farm the land, I hope.
384.	There's no point in selling what so ever. investment returns are so low.
385.	No, I would never sell farmland once acquired.
386.	This property has been family owned for over 60 years. I hope to die here.
387.	I have none to sell.
388.	I'm still looking at growing the farm.
389.	We are in expansion stage.
390.	It is not part of our business plan. Although we are largely an Alberta business it has been necessary because of the need for pasture land to expand or buy land in Saskatchewan Because of our proximity to Saskatchewan we have done business for decades in Saskatchewan and as a Canadian we believe that the rules as they are now allow business to trade as it should in a fee competitive market.
391.	If I go out of farming, our son maybe has to reduce, because it is hard to find good farm worker.
392.	May transfer some to our children. It became very hard for a new farm family to buy much farmland At 250,000 per quarter and needing maybe 5000 acre to profitability farm the rapid increase in farm land made it extremely difficult for young farmers to own land. By limiting ownership of land to only farmers you reduce the demand for it and the value of it stays near its productive value. This sets up a system of farm families owning their own land and along with this pride of ownership, and best agricultural practices for the land. Renting all land brings us back to a serfdom system of which we left Europe a century and a half ago to get away from it.

393.	Family will take over
394.	If I am unable to buy more land under the right terms and location I might sell my small farm.
395.	I am 31 years old and plan to keep farming for many years.
396.	Don't plan to sell unless we are forced to because of these big corporations bullying out the small guys like ourselves.
397.	Depends on what options are available and what makes sense for our operation. We might purchase some land from within our family depending on retirement considerations.
398.	I will keep my land and help my children out. The younger generation cannot afford to farm as machinery, land and land rent is too high. Overhead expenses go up with increase in land values and grain prices but they do not come down when values drop.
399.	Not thinking about retiring yet.
400.	Consultation with family would take place before any sale. At present there is no interest in selling.
401.	No as the only farmland we own is our home quarter. We would rent out the land but not the farm, if things go really bad for us.
402.	I will never sell. As far as I am concerned it's not mine to sell, it's my kids.
403.	Hope I don't have to. It depends on health and personal circumstances. Nothing is %100 sure.
404.	We are retiring from farming and are farm is listed for sale at this time.
405.	to family
406.	Don't have any
407.	Might sell some cow quarters.
408.	Our farm is very stable right now.
409.	No. Still young and plan to farm for another 20 years
410.	I currently don't own farmland.
411.	do not own land
412.	Our farm is built for longevity. It is our grandchildren's right to farm.
413.	As mentioned in the previous question we sold our land in 2007
414.	Only own one quarter. Fourth generation. Would like to get one or two more quarters.
415.	More likely we will divide up the land for the kids.
416.	Farm has been farming for over 100 years in province; haven't sold And not looking to sell anytime soon.
417.	it would be passed onto my family
418.	I'm under the age of 40 and just starting to manage the operation

419.	No.
420.	We need to hang onto the land we have and purchase more if we are to remain viable. Only farmers should be able to own the farmland.
421.	<p>I view selling farm like getting rid of the goose that laid the golden egg. It's the foundation to being profitable as a primary producer in agriculture. If it is profitable for an investor to own land and rent it out at 5-10% then it is equally or more profitable for a farmer to own the land and make the payments on it themselves.</p> <p>Securing a Saskatchewan-owned land base is key for the long term success of the ag sector in Saskatchewan. Owning land in good years makes it possible to fully capitalize on high prices or any increase in production. During lean years, owned land acts a security blanket to creditors.</p>
422.	I intend to leave my land to my children.
423.	The family is starting to discuss selling the family farm, as my parents decide to retire.
424.	I have land that is not real close to the rest of my land that I would sell to assist in purchasing land that is closer to my base
425.	Over my dead body, ha ha. Unless.... We sold a parcel to buy a more productive or larger land base elsewhere.
426.	I want to be able to control what I have to ensure it is used for food production.
427.	May sell because of viability issues it is very difficult to operate with smaller acres and limited operating money because of FCC refusals
428.	Too young to sell.
429.	Never plan to sell land
430.	No I will rent it to my brother
431.	We have been selling poor or distant land acquired in the past and trying to consolidate our operation at these higher prices.
432.	We will not be selling any land until our children are ready to purchase from us. They will buy other land for now in order to expand the operation. We can lease the land to our kids until they are financially ready to buy it.
433.	Not quitting farming or downsizing. Would never sell my land. They don't make new land. It stays in the family.
434.	retirement age but have a son that farms
435.	No ownership position today.
436.	Do not need to sell
437.	not yet, hoping within ten years to be selling to our son
438.	If health failed would have to reconsider.
439.	Don't own any.

440.	I hope to purchase more land not sell
441.	I do not plan on selling our land but instead to leave it to next generation if possible.
442.	See above
443.	Use land as investment.
444.	If I chose to leave Saskatchewan, I may sell part of my farmland. But hope to bequeath a portion to my child.
445.	Don't own any currently.
446.	The investment of land in Saskatchewan is a long term investment.
447.	Hope that our son will take it over...been in the family for years
448.	More like 10 years, we might sell some property
449.	We plan to hold farmland indefinitely.
450.	Own one quarter and would sell it with the intention of replacing it.
451.	My interest is in ensuring that Saskatchewan farmland is used to produce products that provide food for Canadians first, and then export after needs have been met. Should be owned by people who reside in Saskatchewan. IE. I don't want to see farmland bought through loopholes by Chinese, as I hear is already happening, then the food directly shipped to China.
452.	My farm is still in the expanding mode.
453.	Want to get in
454.	We will be maintaining or growing our operation as the next generation becomes involved.
455.	We will not sell but have children who will continue to farm the land so it will be passed to them
456.	Trying to increase size of farm
457.	I want to farm, and I want to expand the land base my family owns to be larger than it currently is.
458.	I don't foresee selling as I'm young and love living here with my family
459.	Son will take over.
460.	I may need to sell at least a portion to fund retirement.
461.	I'm buying not selling
462.	If any is sold it will be to Canadian family members.
463.	See the above response
464.	depends what happens
465.	Some poor farmland or pasture may be sold as I have sold my cattle and would look to upgrade to better quality farmland. It is my belief that good quality land will appreciate at a faster rate per year than lower quality land.

466.	I am one of few young farmers in my area and believe that the opportunities and importance of agriculture are more evident now than any time in history. I am in this business long term for many reasons including my heritage, friends in the business, rural lifestyle, and the fact that I have never and never wish to do anything different through my working years.
467.	Like I responded earlier, if inputs and machinery continue to rise, my retirement might be moved up.
468.	I do not expect to sell as I have children how want to farm and be a part of and help build and live in the local community
469.	Depends on interests and farmland value being competitive with Alberta, Manitoba, Montana and North Dakota.
470.	We have been here for 105 years and plan to keep the farm in the family.
471.	You're either farming or you're not. The only time to consider selling is if you're not farming.
472.	Land will continue to be passed on the family involved in agriculture.
473.	If the son decides NOT to farm
474.	Our timeline for liquidation is within the next 4 years, but will be buying more land during that period.
475.	We refuse to sell our land and will pass it to our children as we are very upset about all the land sales to the Chinese and our countries. Our children agree with us on Sask losing ownership of the land to non-farmers.
476.	We would only sell to a farming member of our family. We have another generation of farmers coming up in our operation, which would be the fourth and fifth.
477.	We intend to still be actively farming in the next five years
478.	I plan on farming for another 15-20 years.
479.	I'm 36 years old, hoping to farm for another 30 years, wouldn't make sense to sell.
480.	We are now renting but hope to see in a couple of years
481.	I am actively farming and intend to do so for some years ahead, and my land will ultimately be transferred to my sons, who are actively farming as well.
482.	We are younger producers and are not at the age to sell just yet.
483.	I would not sell farmland, even if I chose to quite farming.
484.	Trying to get land in a closer parcel.
485.	Life is ever changing one must keep eyes open.
486.	Again, depending on how the farm attrition plans go with our family farm we may sell.
487.	Once we own it, we don't want to sell
488.	Been in the family sine the homestead days.
489.	Never sell land; it is a secure way to earn income.

490.	Your questionnaire is poorly structured, basically asking me the same question twice. I speak from experience because I have 3 degrees, one a masters and two advanced certificates. Whether as an individual I decide to neither buy or sell land in the next 5 years is irrelevant to the question about the importance of keeping control of our resources so that they only belong to people who can be identified as living in Saskatchewan. Check around the world and you will see that even in many underdeveloped countries they have realized that maintaining control of their land resources is crucial to their survival.
491.	Plan to keep farming
492.	This is a third generation farm that will hopefully be passed on to the fourth. My husband's great grandfathered settled this land...and it has special meaning to our family. Through holistic management we are trying to return the land to more of its previous structure....which was ruined with decades of farming to remove all the nutrients and replace little leaving very unhealthy soil. We need to make it vibrant again and family cares more than big outside corporations.
493.	We have two sons that we hope will want a hard lifestyle with small paychecks.
494.	Looking to expand
495.	I still am in good health. That can change.
496.	I'd prefer not to currently sell my farmland, at this point in my life. But, my farm is currently not large enough to remain financially viable, and at current prices for purchasing or renting farmland, I am unlikely to be able to increase the size of my farm. So selling the land I currently own, and finding a new career, may be the only viable option.
497.	Will never sell. hope to set up some of our 6 children
498.	Will pass on to farming son.
499.	Wanting to expand
500.	Young Farmer
501.	Building farm size
502.	I don't have farmland to sell.
503.	keeping what I have for my children
504.	I do not yet own any land to sell.
505.	I am just getting started at 32years old.
506.	depends on the price
507.	Need money for retirement
508.	I am trying to expand my farm as land comes available at prices I can afford.
509.	Might sell to our son who is actively farming here.
510.	My grandfather homesteaded our farm in 1904.... Want to keep it in the family
511.?..

512.	If I need money for my retirement I may have to.
513.	May sell some pasture land
514.	I like what I got and if retiring will rent and pass on to children to rent.
515.	I am 58 with no one interested in immediate family to take over. May sell some land further away to buy closer. May have to sell for other reasons health problems, paying taxes to take advantage of capital gains exemption
516.	sons want to farm
517.	not sure if I can afford it
518.	Looking to retire and may have to sell land to live and for comfortable living
519.	This is part of my retirement plan, I want top dollar when I sell my land.
520.	lack of better or secure investments
521.	Will either pass down to our children or sell the land depending on the value.
522.	I don't own any
523.	I am 57 years old with retirement looming. We are counting on sale of farmland to provide retirement cash flow but have no definite timeline.
524.	son will take it over
525.	We will be maintaining our land base till retirement, and then considers either parcelling it out or selling it complete.
526.	Do not intend to sell our land unless we need income for retirement.
527.	we want to Keep our farm in our Family and Transfer it to our 3rd generation
528.	We plan on keeping our land. If we decide to rent our land it will be to a younger farmer with a small amount of farmland.
529.	Plan on keeping farming
530.	Planning to be farming for the next 5 to 10 years and then passing the land to the next generation of family
531.	Our son will be the fourth generation of farmers on this land and no we will not be selling as we are very traditional and want the land to continue on in the family.
532.	There is no more land being produced; our children know the family land (and more if available) is NEVER to be sold!
533.	I don't own any farmland
534.	If I sell it would mean I couldn't continue farming and had to sell the whole thing.
535.	I ranch with my dad, my name isn't on any of the titles.
536.	I'm young I have no intention of selling anytime soon.
537.	I plan to liquidate my inherited property when the current lease expires.

538.	Young farmer hoping to expand not downsize but one bad year will ruin me and this could be it.
539.	I, as a native of this great province, have a vested interest in Saskatchewan remaining in the trusted hands of those who live here. A farmer living on his land has a far greater desire to manage and protect his land than a foreign owner. Investors, landlords, and other outsiders have self-interest and profit in mind, whereas those who live here are vastly more likely to care for and preserve what we have for future generations.
540.	Like owning what I have
541.	still expanding
542.	Land will be handed down.
543.	If the right opportunity, presented itself I would consider selling some land to buy other land.
544.	I am a young farmer wishing to make a living from farming. But due to rising expenses like fuel, machinery and parts, land, etc. It is discouraging to continue. Owning land has become a big under taking and is very difficult to be competing with investors. Recently our neighbour had sold six quarters to investors and myself and other farmers cannot compete with these land prices. This is not right! Saskatchewan land should be staying in the hands of the care takers that will have the best interests in mind for it. Also the revenue would also stay in the province if it was locally owned instead of leaving the province like so many resources already.
545.	Would like to re-acquire the home quarter.
546.	Answer above.
547.	It's time to look up at that flag and remember what it stands for and say this country's not for sale Our sons were hoping to get a chance to come back to ranch.
548.	I am a third generation farm and have 3 boys to pass the farm onto. I will not be selling my land.
549.	That would be like a city person selling their vehicle or wardrobe they need to go to work in.
550.	In Mid 40's, still have hopes of making agriculture our means of a living.
551.	I'm not ready to retire yet.
552.	I will be selling some land, just not sure if it will be sooner than five years from now
553.	Our family has owned this land for 100+ years. We have a generation that would like to be able to farm it.
554.	I would like to purchase more land in the next 5years
555.	the land will remain in the family
556.	We may possibly give up leased land but will likely keep our own land.
557.	Plan on renting land out for retirement income stream but may sell poorest land if price is higher than productive value.
558.	Wish to sell land to the highest bidder. I do not care if Sask resident or not. Retiring farmers should not be penalized in their retirement, being forced to sell land at a reduced cost. We had

	to have off farm jobs, high interest rates, and we still managed to buy and pay for land, with a lot of poor grain prices. The next generations should have to work as hard as we did, not get breaks off the backs of retiring farmers. Our pensions and retirement income is funded off of the sale of our land investments. The higher price we are paid for our land, the more money we have to spend to get us to our end of days. If we sell land way below what someone else is going to pay, it will make it tough for us to survive.
559.	I hope to expand the family farm by buying the land of neighbours who do not have children to take over the farm instead of selling our own land.
560.	multi-generational farm
561.	Getting older probably would like to sell to our neighbor
562.	Not planning on selling. Have someone in the family that would like to eventually take over the operation.
563.	I plan to expand the operation not retract.
564.	Do not currently own any.
565.	It is a real asset that will usually give a return.
566.	As a young farmer I have no interest in selling farmland.
567.	We currently have 20 acres which includes our home, yard and pasture. We have no plans to sell.
568.	We are still a young active farm family
569.	I will not be selling any day soon I hope that my kids can farm the land one day and expand on to it.
570.	At this point, we are looking to increase the size rather than decrease the size of our operation.
571.	Have none
572.	do not own farm land
573.	may retire in next five years
574.	I do not own farm land.
575.	We will be retiring in the next few years
576.	It depends on circumstances of health and market issues.
577.	I hope not...
578.	If I were id try to sell to another farm as I don't believe that farmland should be allowed to be owned by non-farmers to the point that it should restricted that land that is willed to family should have a 5 year restriction that you have to farm it or sell it
579.	I intend on raising my kids on the farm and if interested guide them to be stewards of the land and manage it in a productive and environmentally friendly manner.
580.	We want to expand not downsize

581.	Trying to keep up with what I have and make the best of what I have...selling is not an option at this stage maybe in twenty or so years
582.	Real estate agent that may represent sellers.
583.	The farmland I own has been in the family for generations and is still being leased by my brother.
584.	I am looking to expand not decrease my property.
585.	Our farm which has been in the family since bought will go on to the next generations.
586.	Retirement
587.	Don't have any to sell!
588.	Not selling. Looking for more pasture.
589.	Hoping my son takes over the farm
590.	We are young farmers looking to grow so we are in the buying mode.
591.	I am happy with the land I operate.
592.	WOULD BE PLEASED TO HAVE THE LAND WE OWN CONTINUE TO BE FARMED/OWNED BY MY CHILDREN.
593.	I will not try to lessen the acres I seed. Just trying to sell and buy to relocate land around me.
594.	I'm a retired and no farmland left to sell
595.	I am only 25 so should not have to sell my land yet.
596.	I love to farm and enjoy it. If I can't expand my land base to warrant the machinery I have, then I'll have to quit. But I won't sell.
597.	I have no interest in selling land. It is my family base and heritage. I and my family value and cherish the land we own. It is not a commodity like wheat or oil. It is the foundation of this province and its people. After all why are investors after land? Some as an investment and many just to own something tangible and of value.
598.	Do not own anything yet. Just rent.
599.	May give up, with the economics of farming and price gouging with inputs companies, why should I bother anymore. It makes more sense to buy a Tim Horton's then pay for land that makes almost zero return.
600.	I do not expect to sell my farmland. I would prefer to leave it to my children should they desire to continue farming in the future.
601.	I will never sell my land
602.	It depends on the movement in market prices and rentals
603.	I am probably 10 - 15 years away from selling land
604.	If I am not able to take over we may be selling land

605.	Might rent or sell in 6 yrs.
606.	No, if I buy I will hold on to it for a long term investment.
607.	I do not currently own farmland.
608.	I have no plans to sell land for quite some time
609.	It's nice to rent out to have some income
610.	no I would like to see my farmland get passed on for generations even if my kids are unable to farm
611.	I am still in a growth phase (being 40yr old)
612.	We are nearing retirement age - but may choose to rent out our land vs sell.
613.	See comment above
614.	The farm will stay in the family.
615.	My land is not for sale. My son is fifth generation in this area. if we don't have the right to keep On, then nobody does.
616.	may have health problems
617.	Lots of years left
618.	Will leave it to my kids
619.	Expect market value for land. Do not want land values kept low by government rules which will restrict the number of buyers.
620.	We are in a growth phase.
621.	we are near retirement and have incorporated the farm as part of a succession strategy to pass on to family members who will be Canadian shareholders leasing out the land
622.	Our family farm has been willed to stay in the family with a share program. We have the water well rights and will keep the land as is due to the upcoming water resource crisis set to exist In the next 1-200 years
623.	Not unless prices get so high from investors that it doesn't pay to keep it.
624.	I love farming
625.	We plan on retiring in the next 5 years and renting to farmers in the community. In time we hope to leave some or all of the owned land to our children.
626.	We are making retirement plans, and ideally, this would include keeping our current land, inheriting additional land and renting all of the land out with the eventual plan of succession to the next generation.
627.	Plan on passing onto the family.
628.	Never!
629.	The land I have will provide me with income for the rest of my life, whether I farm it myself, or

	rent it out.
630.	We do not expect to sell any farmland in the next 5 years as we are a family farm with young family members farming and hoping to expand our operation.
631.	N/A
632.	I plan on farming for another 25 to 30 years and then hopefully hand it down to my kids.
633.	give it to my daughter
634.	I am a young farmer trying to establish my farm.
635.	Land ownership is fundamental to my sense of freedom.
636.	May be interested in selling some land to secure land closer to home farm location.
637.	My farm will be willed to the next person that farms it (family)
638.	Depends when we retire from farm, which of course depends on health, etc.
639.	non left
640.	Probably, if I decide to quit farming
641.	All depends
642.	Plan to keep existing land for sons to rent.
643.	I am 37 and my family feels it's important to look after the land, and want to keep it in the family, where there opinion still matters.
644.	Farmland is a good investment It is an asset that will always have good value and provide a stable return.
645.	Still looking at purchasing land....price is too high now.
646.	Don't need to sell farmland as we want to grow our operation bigger
647.	Local operations are only of the pillage and style of agri-business. None deserve quality in their quantity driven operations.
648.	I may have family members who may choose to return to farming in the future, so if an opportunity to purchase land in our area became available I would certainly consider a purchase.
649.	I have five adult children who will have input on this.
650.	farm land is a good investment
651.	I have no interest in moving from my home on farmland, the land is currently on a long-term rental agreement, being very well managed.
652.	I want to leave my farm as an inheritance for my grandchildren
653.	I may be persuaded to sell a parcel of land soon for a large oil project. I have been negotiating with Husky Energy for 2 years now about a quarter for a steam flood operation. I don't want to sell since it is close to my home. However, if I don't sell they claim that they will buy land right next to my home that I don't own, and I will have to live next to the operation anyway. They

	are using big money, and extortion tactics to try and acquire my land.
654.	Don't own any
655.	As our farm operation is relatively young, we are still in a building phase.
656.	I may sell some depending on personal issues, both wants and needs as we age
657.	<p>I see farmland as investment, same as mining.</p> <p>It is just emotional thinking who owns your land or house or car.</p> <p>Lots of people rent, lease or borrow from bank to purchase something?</p> <p>We all own something for a little while and give it away or sell it.</p> <p>I would say bring investors in, if they see gold that my neighbour does not see, fine.</p> <p>If our commodity can't afford those prices, nothing wrong to sell to outside investor. It is still the farmer who decides if this investment is going to fly.</p> <p>Without a farmer that pays back the revenue (rent or lease) of this investment there will be no interest.</p> <p>Conclusion: with no farmer who wants to rent there is no discussion.</p> <p>But the fact is farmers want to rent more land, that's why I have no problem with outside investors.</p>
658.	Saskatchewan farmland is a great investment which produces an acceptable annual return that I can't find in the stock market, the banks or other forms of real estate without considerably more risk.
659.	We have a growing farm family corporation and feel that opening up ownership to the world will cause land speculation and drive up land prices. The ownership of land should stay with producers or Canadian citizens
660.	I'm 37 years old and am in an expansion mode and therefore wouldn't want to sell land unless it would mean consolidating my operation or improving it.
661.	If land prices and rent keep going up I won't be able to afford to farm.
662.	I plan on continuing to farm.
663.	We are working towards continuing our families' legacy of farming in Sask. We homesteaded more than a century ago, and are the fourth generation on the farm. We hope to get our land base to a size that will ensure an easier transition to our children in the future if they wish to pursue farming.
664.	I'm not ready to retire yet
665.	would sell distant land if nearby land came up for sale
666.	We sold everything in 2007 so missed the land price spike.
667.	plan to pass my land down to children
668.	Sold it quite a few years ago

669.	Plan to keep this farmland long term for agricultural production.
670.	Our land is staying in the family, as long as we are alive. We have gifted some to our non-farming kids to make things equitable. This will make our retirement more austere.
671.	Depend on market and health
672.	I want to expand the farm to allow our 5th generation to join.
673.	As we buy land that fits geographically better to our operation we will continue selling parcels that no longer have a fit.
674.	Still in an expansion mode
675.	We are a growing farm expanding slowly.
676.	I will never sell my farmland. It will be dispersed to my kids.
677.	If we sell off our wonderful province to corporations and foreign investors I plan to sell the farm and take Mr. Walls job.
678.	Not sure if I will sell or lease it out
679.	Our proper intergeneration transfer of land is making it possible for succeeding generations to continue to farm.
680.	Again... we are in expansion mode.
681.	I'm a young farmer trying to expand.
682.	I would never sell farmland
683.	Children making those decisions.
684.	Not unless we go broke and are unable to make profit farming.
685.	It depends on how our farming situation looks in the next five years....if our son is able to continue to farm and buy land to secure his situation. If my husband is able to continue to work on the farm. And if we continue to be able to maintain an adequate living from the farm.
686.	I have recently settled here, so I am not planning on downsizing or leaving the area
687.	SOLD MY LAND IN 1997
688.	We plan on condensing our land into a tighter group by selling off outlying quarters and purchasing land closer.
689.	Selling farmland is a bad idea, the prices will remain strong.
690.	need what I have for my operation
691.	That depends on circumstances at the time, Health, value of land, options available etc.
692.	see above
693.	We have an exit plan in place so that we would not be selling land but would be transferring ownership to our son.
694.	At present I cannot have any smaller farm to justify starting up my children.

695.	but am a strongly rooted "rural person" and grew up on a wonderful farm in NE Sask.
696.	I hope to farm for a long time.
697.	I'll keep what I have, thank-you! I worked long hard hours and "did without" to pay for it with no help from government intervention.
698.	We view land as a long term asset that will keep our farm sustainable. Part of the problem is that investors and large farmers now view land as a commodity to bought and sold whenever for profit with no regard for environmental stewardship.
699.	Have none to sell.
700.	I would have to own some first.
701.	I may rent it out.
702.	Nest generation interested in farming.
703.	I buy land for its productive value.
704.	my farm in good swing and my health is good
705.	Will sell land in one area to purchase in another.
706.	See farmland as good investment.
707.	Because I am a young farmer
708.	I farm mainly long term family owned land and have exactly ZERO intention of selling too those oversized greedy operators. We have had some influx of foreign land barons who drove the land prices out of our reach, one of which lasted a few years and then for financial reasons sold out. Long term family operations are more stable then fly in, disrupt everything, and sell out short term later. These are not stable for your local economy or community.
709.	I what my kids to keep the land for eternal revenue
710.	may buy some and sell some to get land in a block to make more desirable to rent out when I retire
711.	Once farmland is in the family, I believe it should stay in the family.
712.	my land is not for sale
713.	Am renting to family
714.	I currently do not own farmland but my parents do
715.	I want my farmland to stay in my family.
716.	With low commodity prices and shortage of labor I may be forced to downsize, would like to expand our operation but it doesn't pencil out!
717.	Would hope not to but if land prices become unattainable and farming does not make sense, selling out to a corporation may be the only option.
718.	Currently in negotiations with a buyer of the family plot

719.	I don't own any farm land to sell.
720.	Will be selling to sons involved in farming.
721.	We have no intention of giving up our family's land
722.	I don't have farm land.
723.	I intend to help the land my family owns in my family's name.
724.	As above. If one of the families can continue to own it that would be my choice. I have a custom operator who has farmed it for many years and I feel loyalty to sell to him if that should materialize
725.	I have no land to sell
726.	I am a farmer in my late forties and hope and pray to continue farming.
727.	We have a young family who loves the farm and we will want to pass our land on to the next generation
728.	We farm organically. Would like to have our future generation that r seriously interested have opportunities to farm
729.	We are trying to expand our farm.
730.	At this time a nephew is farming our land, but he may retire in the next 10 years at which time the land might be sold. We hope that is not the case, but there are no young men/women in our family who want to take over the farm.
731.	I own in a city
732.	Our land was purchased at a reasonable amount, therefore we can rent to neighbours at a reasonable rent and still make a good return on investment
733.	Will eventually have family take it over.
734.	If value can be captured, with a sale, which would provide me today with after tax dollars that are more than I could reasonably expect to earn from the land during the balance of my farming career, I would take the cash.
735.	The land will remain in place the family for future generations to enjoy
736.	Sold my farmland several years ago and I don't currently own any farmland
737.	It is a heritage farm (fourth generation).
738.	We are not in the business of selling land. We are not speculators. We are farmers and stewards of the land!
739.	We cannot afford a smaller land base.
740.	You never have to sell land. There are always farmers in your area looking for land to rent. The days of worrying about having a renter are long gone.
741.	none to sell
742.	Only 39

743.	not as long as I'm able to farm
744.	Not ready to retire.
745.	Not ready to retire, and I may have son or daughter want to farm.
746.	No plans to sell
747.	Believe farm ownership is the basis of society
748.	Own farmland with husband, brother in law and my sons. May be selling land as part of scaling back for retirement, succession planning to family.
749.	I have two or maybe three children who would love to farm, ages 17 - 25. They are very passionate about trying to secure land before the prices are driven up by investors, corporations or the Canada Pension Plan
750.	We will hang on to any land we have for future generations. We've been on this land over a century
751.	Owned farmland has always been the farmer's pension plan or "ace in the hole". Commodity prices can drop or become nonexistent, but the land is always there. It is a sure investment which is why everyone wants to own some.
752.	I have no desire at this point to sell farm land
753.	Plan to keep the farm in the family and pass it on like my father did.
754.	We are young inter-generational farmers. Looking to purchase land so we can be secure in our farming future. We currently are making a living leasing land but that could change at any time.
755.	We are still in the growth stage of our operation.
756.	Our acreage has been in my family since my birth, and we intend to keep it within our family. We have no need for more and would be heartbroken to lose what we have.
757.	may not have a choice if cattle prices drop or the border closes again
758.	If we can expand our farm through reasonable rents and purchase prices we would like to stay in the Ag business.
759.	My husband and I are near retirement age.
760.	as above
761.	If can't buy anymore will sell out sick and tired of getting screwed around
762.	I will leave it to my family
763.	We plan on keeping what we have for future generations to farm.
764.	If my land gets flooded out then it won't be worth much.
765.	no succession plan
766.	Maybe
767.	We will be retiring in the next 5 years, the land is our investment, it needs to be allowed to grow in value

768.	Flip side is if things go well, we may choose to sell our operation here and move to a larger farm.
769.	While retirement looms I just hope the damage can be repaired in time.
770.	It will be handed to my kids
771.	never for sale
772.	If the price is right
773.	Our operation and land has been in our family since 1883. We hope it will continue for many more years to come.
774.	Sold some marginal already because it was time to lock in a return on Investment. Not expecting to sell more
775.	Not ready to retire yet!!
776.	Renting out land at this time
777.	Once it's gone, it's gone. I will let my children decide.
778.	I am a semi-retired individual who would like to expand his land base and farm as long as I am able.
779.	Have interested buyers that are waiting for this confusion to be sorted and maybe get back to regular market. (Make a deal and farm the land)
780.	We have farmland close to Saskatoon, and will hold on as long as possible.
781.	Waiting for clear guidelines so that buyers can make decisions
782.	Looking to expand not down size
783.	Sold my Sask farm land in 2006
784.	Once I buy land I expect to keep it for future generations.
785.	I do own land, I currently cash rent my land...I am not certain.
786.	I currently do not own any land.
787.	Would like to keep the farm for future generations.
788.	I will be 60 this year so depending on health I have no intention to sell. I may never sell.
789.	We do not anticipate selling our property at all in the next 20 years but are considering buying more
790.	I have to buy land first
791.	I'm trying to expand
792.	I want my children to inherit my farmland without restriction regardless of where they live.
793.	Don't own any
794.	We plan on homesteading for foreseeable future

795.	Want to keep land in the family.
796.	Again right circumstances yes
797.	Depends on one's health
798.	We are an established multi-generational family farm that hopes to maintain it in the family in the future. We have used certified organic management on our whole farm for the past 30 years and have established numerous market contacts for our heritage grains.
799.	I own none.
800.	We are a young farming operation with deep roots. We have no intention of selling.
801.	My sisters and I will inherit our parents' home quarter eventually. There are no plans to sell.
802.	Continue farming
803.	Leaving it to our children
804.	Unless something catastrophic was to happen to my wife and me, we would be using rent from the land base for retirement income.
805.	Why would I want to sell my land when I can pass it to my children? The last thing I want is someone coming from another country with big bucks and taking it over. We should get our young generation interested in farming instead of someone coming from Africa or China
806.	Renting to neighbour to generate additional retirement income.
807.	Need land to run the business.
808.	Have family that farms & land will likely rollover through a succession plan
809.	N/A
810.	We are in a long term business model with inter-generational transfers taking place.
811.	Retiring
812.	Would like to keep what I have in case my children want to farm or part time farm. consider it a good retirement investment
813.	Don't own land
814.	61 years old, my sons would like to farm, but we are priced out of the market.
815.	Due to economic times I don't have much left to sell
816.	Young
817.	I would only sell poorer land if better land became available; I intend to keep this farm in our family for the long term.
818.	I am in the process of growing my farm
819.	Trying to expand farm for my kids.
820.	Children will (and already are) carrying on the responsibilities. They grew up on the land and

	do not wish to sell it.
821.	Land will pass to next of kin
822.	My dad has requested that we keep the land and rent it out.
823.	As a young farmer I'm buying, not selling
824.	I well Will my land to our kids as they want to farm, and are now part time farming with me. that is the only way that they are going to be able to take over the family farm as there's absolutely no way that they can compete against foreign capital or corporate/pension investment funds. no one should have to compete against that calibre of "loose" money
825.	n/a
826.	I, as do many other residents, and investors, now realize the value of farmland, and would I would only want to add to my property, not sell it.
827.	We r in expansion phase. If we were old farmers we would still rent out land instead of sell
828.	Don't have any get afford to buy any
829.	have young children that may want to farm
830.	I plan on retiring in the next 5-6 years
831.	To our sons
832.	Not a farmer with land
833.	We retired, we are selling some of this land to our children and will eventually sell to our renter
834.	I think that if I were to purchase land to expand my farm, I may end up in a situation where I would need to sell. A common mistake of over-leveraging the farm coinciding with a year or two of poor yields or soft markets puts many farmers in this situation.
835.	The land that we own will be transferred to our children so that they can continue farming, for if they had to buy us out they would never be able to afford it.
836.	I am in a growth phase to keep up with the economies of scale, and to provide a suitable land base for my children to farm and to do so at a profit in order to feed our global population. We have celebrated the Century Farm award in 2002, we wish for this tradition to continue.
837.	Our daughter is interested in agriculture. She is studying in university now and so we want to hold onto the land for her use.
838.	To me it is a valuable asset and to sell it would perhaps impact the upward potential of that asset.
839.	I am a third generation Farmer and hope to expand our operation for the next generation of the family farm.
840.	I am a young farmer with an expanding operation, so I have no aspirations to sell my land.
841.	I am looking to add to our farm, not make it smaller.

842.	we are close to retirement and will sell to family
843.	I may if need to relocate or block up large parcels of land closer to my main centres
844.	Likely will stay in the family for a while.
845.	Here to stay
846.	I am in a growth phase of my business, and do not intend to sell land.
847.	plan to leave land to children
848.	The land base is the foundation of the farm operation. It was both inherited and purchased through many tough economic times & will continue to be operated by the next generation of farmers in the family
849.	If we are farming and not making any money then we will be forced like everyone else that is pushed out of farming by the corporate farms.
850.	NO WHEN I RETIRE THE LAND WILL GO TO MY FAMILY
851.	Ownership provides stability.
852.	Currently do not own farmland
853.	Don't own any farmland.
854.	I want my farm to go to a farmer not an investor!
855.	Not ready to retire yet!!!!
856.	We are more likely to expand than contract.
857.	Our family and extended family has worked to maintain ownership for 99 years and continue to grow.
858.	Farmland should only be sold to other full time residents. Absentee owners care only about cash crops/herds and destroy the soil; use millions of tons of chemicals...drinking water is endangered.
859.	No, at this point I am still actively farming
860.	We would like to keep it in the family. We might sell it a bit after that to a nephew who will likely be getting established by then.
861.	I have many friends who are farmers. I have a common interest in proper stewardship of our land as a consumer and as one who walks on this land.
862.	We are a young farm family trying to expand as our son joins farm. Trying not to break him in process, we need to keep land we have and expand.
863.	I wish to grow our family farm size not decrease acres.
864.	We are looking to get into the family farm, and my parents will be looking to sell out to us.
865.	Don't have own any farmland

866.	If land price keeps going up won't be able to afford to stay in farming
867.	The land we own will remain in our possession.
868.	I am over 65. I am not sure what could happen.
869.	Hoping, expecting, preferring to retain land inherited from family and not seeking to sell. It's a matter of heritage and long range relationship to the land. And for some, this is traced to pioneer times. This ownership is different than that of speculators and investors and there needs to be this important distinction.
870.	We are in our early 30s and setting up to take over the family farm
871.	I'm in early retirement and value the lease income I derive now.
872.	Family involved that are early in their careers.
873.	We will only be selling land if we are forced to by the banks because of a black swan event.
874.	My sons will take over the farm when I retire.
875.	Not applicable
876.	Our children want to see our land stay in the family
877.	My farmland will be turned over to my children.
878.	Only if I have too
879.	We need the land base and our machinery can accommodate about another 1500 acres.
880.	Expand family holdings only.
881.	Might be willing to sell if other opportunities arise
882.	I would like to invest in the family farm and pass the land to future generations.
883.	Don't see that happening regardless of the market.
884.	Dad will be selling to my brother
885.	Not planning to sell land.
886.	I do not currently own any farmland.
887.	Do not currently own farmland.
888.	Son and Daughter will inherit it

5) Rate the relative importance of the following (AND) state your level of agreement or disagreement...

#	Response
---	----------

1. Farmland ownership should stay in the hands of Saskatchewan farmers. It's only been 3-4 generations since Europeans moved to this province in droves seeking the opportunity to own the land they lived and worked on. And now we're willing to throw that away all to bring in foreign money that will have absolutely no benefit to agriculture or the people of this province.
2. Saskatchewan is a resource rich province, agriculture being one of our most important sectors with farmland being the natural resource needed to be successful. Farmland ownership by farmers and local land owners (in province residents) ensures that communities are created where the farmers live, work and OWN land. Allowing outside companies to buy farm land drives up prices making it difficult for farmers to own land and have a vested interest in the communities in which they farm. Farmland ownership by farmers versus leasing from large companies also ensures environmental stewardship of the land. When a farmer leases the land they try to get every last inch of profit out of it, which includes aggressive crop rotations or in fact no crop rotations at all with attempts to consecutively grow the most profitable crops year after year. This poor land management creates weeds and disease that needs additional chemicals to combat against. With all the question of chemical use in today's agrifood sector, additional chemical is not desirable if you talk to the average person. When farmers own the land over the long term, they are more likely to take a better management approach to ensure they do not infect their land with disease through continuous cropping.
3. Farmers are no longer "the traditional farmer" they are large corporate farmers that may not have the need to own land therefore I don't think it is necessary to restrict all pension funds etc from purchasing land. You may want to set quotas but don't agree with a full restriction. We have to think about the retiring farmer too and the fact that these large purchases also help them get the best price possible for their land.
4. Land around cities is already inflated in prices due to speculation of residential development leading to less land in the rest of the province.
5. With the cost of inputs, machinery and land it is very difficult to become a farmer these days and acquire land. If foreign ownership is allowed it will come to a point where a farmer will be unable to purchase any land because they cannot compete with investors. The majority of land will be owned by foreign investors and that land will never come up for sale again.
6. If it is simply the ownership of farmland, my responses would differ. However presumably these investors are investing in farms operating on these farmlands as well; farms which qualify for subsidies and special regulations which protect them. If these special conditions are removed, not only would the land probably become less attractive but any remaining privately owned farms would suffer. If they remain, it means large investors benefitting from tax-payer funded advantages. Moreover, large corporations are primarily interested in profitability and have little to no hesitation about using genetic modification to increase production at the expense of safety in the medium term - it is not that I think small farmers care more but that they are less able to invest in R&D. Moreover, farming is cyclical and though large investors are more likely to be able to afford the down times more than the small farmer, they are less likely to stick around. It will be unfair to Saskatchewan when times go hard (due to any climate issues for example) and investors abandon us in droves. Or do like foreign investments in residential real estate are doing to home owners. Finally, while I don't know enough about farming to have studied the debates, what I have heard about similar in issues in Europe suggests to me that there are solid if not always the most profitable reasons

	more than just because it's tradition, to keep farms from becoming solely large commercial enterprises.
7.	The government needs to
8.	Investment funds in the 21st century control truly vast sums of money. There is zero chance for any 'farmer', which includes the more sizeable corporate farms of today, to compete with such funds in purchasing land. Land ownership is, as it has always been, a key component of both estate/retirement planning, and sound equity management. Unrestricted access to land purchases by such funds makes farmers nothing more than an employee, albeit one with significant debt burdens (especially on equipment), and less capital as a cushion for the future.
9.	Government's role should be to regulate not restrict. I deal with Saskatchewan investors and rent land from them, and I feel that there is a difference in this type land ownership and foreign ownership.
10.	I believe strongly that Canadian institutional investors like Canadian pension funds and endowment funds are long-term investors and Saskatchewan farmers would benefit by partnering with these long-term investors to productively and efficiently manage Saskatchewan farmland over the long term. New business models need to be developed to better assist young Saskatchewan farmers to better manage their farmland over the long term. Partnering with patient long-term Canadian pension funds will ensure that farmers have access to capital and can share in the risks and rewards of Saskatchewan farmland.
11.	A lot of out of province land owners are just in it to flip or make some cash and get out. Which does nothing for the rural economy of Saskatchewan. And only show up when commodity prices are high. One or two years of hard times and they disappear. A lot of family farms have been here over 100 years and understand the ups and downs of farming in Saskatchewan.
12.	You are pushing the young farmers out.
13.	<p>I am a Saskatchewan resident and wanting to become a "farmer" if you want to call it that. I have looked into what it costs and what I need to do. It is no easy job, it is hard and back breaking. It is also so rewarding. I cultivate in several places right now all on the city limits. The pricing and the development of land to so called "acreages" that are only two acres and fit an oversized house on have severely hampered my ability to afford my goal. These look great now but wait til the boom softens. And they will be unaffordable.</p> <p>The influx of outside investors is another problem. Many just buy like a rental building to get the return and nothing else. The care of the land and the stewardship is going by the wayside to improper drainage of wetlands and habitat changes just for the buck.</p> <p>I am not against making money, the more the better, just responsibly.</p> <p>We need to go forward but have to keep the core goals we have always valued.</p>
14.	Farmland ownership over 1 quarter should be restricted to Saskatchewan residents.
15.	The agriculture industry is not the only industry to consider these regulatory changes. Natural resource exploration - potash, wind, coal - requires investment in Saskatchewan farmland. To bring a corporation to Saskatchewan to invest in other industry, particularly in operations that would require a decades long project and community presence, would be difficult without

	allowing them to own farmland. If we expect a commitment from them, we have to give them the resources they need to bring such projects to fruition.
16.	Allowing large investment based land buying makes it very difficult for younger un-established farmers to purchase or increase leased land base due to the high driven prices from deep pocket investors
17.	Big companies, pension plans and foreign owners should not be allowed to purchase farm land in Saskatchewan. It harms small farms and would see the consolidation of land for big companies and foreign owners and would harm the ability of Saskatchewan farm families to expand their operations. If land purchases by foreign companies or pension plans is allowed to be continued I fear I will not be able to start my own farm because there will be no land for sale or it will be much too expensive. The government of Saskatchewan should be sticking up for Saskatchewan farm families as they have always claimed to do and should not be helping these companies when it harms us.
18.	The survival of rural communities depends on a strong local farm economy. If farmers are reduced to tenants, how will that enhance rural communities? We need more farmers, not less. When pension funds like CPPIB purchase farm land they are competing against producers with the producers own money. This land will not be on the market again for 70-100 years. If potash was a strategic resource worth protecting so should be farmland.
19.	I think outside investors in farmland will kill off rural Saskatchewan and push out young farmers from the ag industry
20.	Pertaining to the last question my response would be that it seems like ownership doesn't mean anything but it's hard to tell because nobody can afford land as investors and foreigners are blowing prices up
21.	Farmers of the province should own the land. If new farmers from other countries are buying and farming the land GREAT. If they own it they farm it
22.	More small run farming operations with the breaks corporations get are needed! Look at Look at big sky farms.... One earth..... All big and flipped from poor management. Keep Sask land in the hands of farmers in Sask.
23.	Farmland should remain affordable and available for current and future farmers of Saskatchewan only.
24.	Why do we want to sell off Saskatchewan to foreign investors instead of trying to help what we have now. I seriously think there are too many newcomers coming here and changing and bending our beliefs and culture to fit their own culture.
25.	I am a resident of Saskatchewan and have lived in the City of Saskatoon my whole life (approximately 20 years) and am just realizing the importance of the traditional rural community structure and resettling the Canadian Prairies. I hope that I can afford to acquire some farmland in the near future and begin to establish a family farm - against the already overwhelming odds and critics of such a life choice. I have worked very hard to put myself in a position to succeed as a sustainable producer of the future with a sound education and means of acquiring the necessary funds. I would be exceptionally disappointed if this dream was not possible as I love this province and the land. Farming is much more than just a business and needs to be preserved.

26.	I don't want to see huge foreign owned corporate farms
27.	I don't want to live in a place where I don't even know who owns the land around me. I grew up on a farm, I live on a farm, and I hope to be able to afford to buy farm land but I can't compete with out of province or international investors and giant corporations. I think there should also be a limit on First Nations land ownership UNLESS they are willing to pay tax on it.
28.	We should be able to sell our land to who ever provides us the best price no matter where they are from.
29.	Foreign and corporate owners do not care for land as local owners who live here. We contribute to local economy. We need stability of knowing we have land to farm year after year. Leasing land means you might have it this year but can be taken away anytime. Uncertainty regarding investment on machinery etc.
30.	The agriculture industry provides a vital service to the citizens of Saskatchewan, and the citizens of Canada. Protection of food resources is vitally important to the longevity of our country. Foreign ownership of farmland should not be permitted in Canada and Saskatchewan
31.	Agriculture economics 101. IF you have a bad year, you need to be able to draw on equity to finance next year. You can't do that without owning the land. Renters may farm for a while, but one bad year will wipe them out causing the further destruction of the rural economy.
32.	Farming isn't just business it's a way of life and tradition for many it's not like building a Starbucks based on company shares although many farms are incorporated I believe the farmers themselves to be majority shareholders unlike the majority of business in and around Saskatchewan for this reason it should be sold differently from commercial real estate
33.	Pension plans, and Government and foreign investors driving the price up hurts young under 35 aged farmers like me trying to increase our personal land base. When you want to own your own land, you can't compete with them for purchasing power.
34.	What on earth is "the tradition of Farmland Ownership" vague,vague, vague.
35.	Once the govt turns over land to foreign investment and nameless corporations, the province ceases to be a province and relinquishes control to corporations, especially in regards to agriculture, farmers disappear and farm labour becomes the norm with reduced wages. If your a hunter or one who enjoys the outdoors. Foreign corporations will buy up the best hunting areas for the benefit of the wealthy
36.	Pension funds and foreign investment take no consideration into the true value of the farmland which is to produce the worlds food supply. Locally owned farmland ensures the land is used responsibly and will continue to be productive for generations. Foreign investments can potentially devalue land if economic landscape changes and investors are forced to or choose to abandon their holdings. Currently over-valued land cripples new farmers or local expanding farmers to compete with investment funds and corporations or large scale corporate entities. Large holdings by a single entity will lead to further exodus of rural populations and the ability to maintain the land.

37.	Invest in our products, not our raw land resources. Investment in our products also contributes to local jobs and economy.
38.	The reason more farmers are being forced to rent/lease land is because the price has been driven up by non farmers buying land. The land is best taken care of when owned by farmers.
39.	Saskatchewan land for Saskatchewan people. Either purchased or Leased. Need to be a true resident for a period of years not I moved here a month ago type of deal.
40.	<p>I don't understand the question "Maximize the farm value....."</p> <p>Nothing is said here about controlling the size of farms. East of the S. Sask. River there are Factory farms covering massive tracts of land, one of which is _____ who is buying up farmland in massive tracts, bulldozing tree lines, pumping out sloughs (which I understand has been stopped), and taking over farmsteads. At what point will the Sask. Gov't stop massive tracts of land being owned by one conglomerate/owner? If they go under they could bankrupt an R.M., the people who have moved off their land aren't replaced and local businesses suffer.</p> <p>Should large land owners be scrutinized as to where the money is coming from before more land can be purchased? This is in no way saying that land is being purchased with illegally gotten money. It is simply a question, if one person is buying land in such a massive amount, who or where is the money coming from? Can you be a Canadian citizen and buy land in your name but have a shell company that supports out of country conglomerate investors? Again not saying this is what is happening, just asking a question?</p> <p>A woman whose husband died said she was phoned by a foreign land conglomerate and was told they just read her husbands obituary and wanted to buy her land. She was grieving and was baffled how the person knew to phone her. Not coffee row discussion, the widow shared this. How did they expect to buy her land?</p> <p>In B.C. Vancouver is being bought up by outside investors (Albertans, Americans, Europeans and Chinese etc.). They own whole buildings with no one living in them, they own massive tracts of properties along lakes which no one uses, all in the name of investment. The local people cannot buy a family home or condo for cabin property because investors have created a false inflated market. Family dwellings going for 2 million dollars that should be closer to 250,000.00. This is what is going to happen to Saskatchewan. Our land will be controlled by outside investors. Canada and Saskatchewan doesn't need to be conquered by invaders, they just will buy it up, our farm land, our lake fronts, our homes, our resources, our businesses. Saskatchewan experienced farm labourers will be serfs to investors, with no sense of pride in their accomplishments as they will be told what and where to seed and what to destroy if it is in the way of the land owners interests. Stewardship will be a lost way of life.</p> <p>It is easier for large Multi National companies to contract seed, chemical and pesticide purchases with larger corporate farms, then with the smaller family farm(4,000-7,000 acres)With the control of what is being seeded and used on crops comes control in the market.</p> <p>Market control can create gouging, can create food storages or overages as it would affect large corporations bottom lines. That isn't farming! That is Factory Farming, the same as any massive Feed Lot system.</p> <p>The Saskatchewan Government should not only control the amount of land owned by a</p>

Corporation but also set limits of ownership so that farm assessments are subject to a separate category. Eg: After 10,000 or 15,000 acres, assessments should be based not on agricultural land but ag-commercial ventures. This would help R.M.'s with their tax base and help with road building. This would also put a different tax bracket on the massive land holders who seem intent on buying every neighbour out and controlling all resources around them. Ag-Commercial ventures/corporations would be scrutinized more closely as to their investments and to how they are making neighbours feel pressured to sell. (Local Ag Equip. dealers buying back multiple equipment lots from Factory Farms or having multiple leased machinery turned in every year and smaller farmers equipment isn't wanted on trade. Second hand equipment that is coming from these large corp. holdings although one to two years old have been ill used by untrained or uncaring hired workers- so is poor investment for smaller local farmer.)

Local grain elevators are catering more to the larger farmer, and smaller farmers are left waiting to get their grain in. Etc., etc., creating frustration and eventually the smaller farmer caves, they still have to pay their bills and the money has to come from somewhere!

41. The way the questions are framed are misleading and purposefully obfuscating. Pat on the back to the lawyer and/or public relations person who framed the language. It's too bad that most people will likely be manipulated into giving answers that suggest policy you want, but that they won't favour. People won't want you to sell off Saskatchewan to foreign interests; although I imagine you're going to do it anyway.
42. As a farmer, with a son who wants to take over the family farm as the fifth generation, I want that to be possible without having to compete with not only investors but possible foreign governments. If the cost of staying in business continues to climb, I do not know who will afford the stay in business. Many farmers, big and small are one bad year, investment or decision from bankruptcy. I have had to sign personal guarantees on every loan or operating line of credit, etc. , at the age of 47, I do not wish to start over as the world of big business and foreign investment has driven me out of business as I can't compete with bottomless pockets or investors money. Outside investment also takes people out of small communities that are also struggling to survive. I may be old fashioned, but I want to know my neighbours and have them remain here
43. The biggest problem with foreign and pension funds etc.... Buying farm land is that they are buying them on tax free dollars, where as I am paying tax on my jabs payments.
44. First we had Alan Blakeney taking property rights out of the constitution and telling Canadians, who lived outside SK where they had been driven to find jobs, that they could not inherit the land their great grandfathers had homesteaded. Now we have a pandering bunch or rural politicians looking to save their jobs and take property away from land owners.
45. Like I said before don't sell Saskatchewan's history of family farming for money it will never be the same if opened up for investors
46. Farmland ownership should be restricted based on residency.
47. I feel that opportunities have opened up since losing Cwb. That agricultural exports have been increasing their for putting more cash in farmers hands
48. However it's loose because we know of many investors that have no connection to farming that are buying land and many people believe those investors are getting their money from

	non Canadians.
49.	Selling to outsiders increases the competition pool for farmland and drives the price up for farmland making it less likely for the young farmer to be able to afford farm land.
50.	For a young farmer it is impossible to get started. At the price and rent of land these days and cost of machinery you can't make a go of it. These big farmers are taking all this land and killing rural Saskatchewan and it's small towns. There will be a day when these big farmers are going to start going down one by one then what? There will be no smaller farmers to pick up that land because they will not exist anymore. There should be government programs to help the small farmer to keep that land in the family and make the small farms survive and more profitable. These small farmers take pride in what they do and pay their bills. These big farmers are in it to see who can be bigger, hid money in their pockets, pay only the interest on money owed and then what happens when they quit. A whole lot of unpaid loans and banks are going to count on their good customers (small farmers) to bail them out.
51.	Saskatchewan's farming community should be owned by strictly people from Saskatchewan! I grew up on this land I put hard work into my land! I want my future kids to be able to freely roam these areas knowing their neighbour owns that field or pasture, not China! I personally want to be able to farm without having prices being raised by investor groups purchasing the land! I rent land from an investor group I lost half my land because someone offered more money per acre than I did! Which is fair and business but I never even got a chance to match the current bid! This group is also supposed to be an investor for young farmers in 23! 21 at the time they gave it to a farmer who was 37! Keep our land in local hands!
52.	I feel that farmland ownership should remain local. Investors manage from far away and contribute very little to the local community. As well, they just see the land as a possession that helps them get a good return on their money. I also believe that most of them have little knowledge and understanding of agriculture and farming in this province and especially lack understanding of the quality of farmland that they are purchasing. In my opinion, farmland will cycle like it has done many times before and then no more decent return on investment for investors and they will run for the hills and sell at a loss. I truly believe that history will repeat itself and even if the rules on farmland ownership do or do not change, time and the economy will straighten it out, it may take 10 years, but it will straighten out.
53.	The current restrictions provide adequate safeguards for the "tradition of farm ownership". Canadians and Canadian Pension Plans to which I contribute should be able to invest in farmland. This benefits Saskatchewan and Canada as a whole by enabling farmers to enjoy the benefits of a strong market for farmland and also enabling new farmers to enter through lease arrangements or purchase, while offering a stable investment vehicle for Canadians. That pension plans and others will come in and buy all the Saskatchewan farmland is a myth and fear mongering. Further restrictions will simply keep the market value of farmland flat, reduce the benefit to our economy of strong farmland values and the investment of funds into our economy, and limit the ability of retiring farmers to obtain a good price for their land. The proposed policy is short sighted and certainly appears to be an example of the government bowing to the lobbying of a very small but vocal minority. The proposed restrictions just aren't the right thing to do.
54.	I don't know about other farmers but I feel when land is owned locally it is looked after and there is a pride of ownership that large companies don't have.

55.	Value isn't always measured by dollars, Saskatchewan is a place to be proud of because we earn what we get and our humble about it. Selling out would be a shame to the fiber of who we are
56.	Farmland ownership should in my opinion be allowed only by Sask residents and corporations should have restrictions in place to the number of acres farmed
57.	If it keeps way it's going and investors buy it all parents just gonna tell their kids not to worry about farming in the future and we will have a bunch of idiots running big investor farms that go broke in 3 years like recent scenarios
58.	Preserving tradition is a vague and fluid idea, and needs a time frame to be stated. Investment from inside or outside the province? How do you define that? Pension fund of Saskatchewan Employees, CPP? If the investment contributes to the economy does the 'benefit' only occur if the funds have a specific source? There are many different business models that farmers of varied backgrounds and financial means have used successfully, either owning or leasing. Are you suggesting a farmer can only farm a specific ratio of owned/leased land? "Ensure predictability and stability inland value?" Is this an anti-market price legislation discussion?
59.	The people of Saskatchewan deserve the right to farm the land that their families have farmed for generations and should be able to continue to farm that land for generations to come and make a decent living while doing what we love to do. If a person has the talent and knowledge to provide food for the world, he'll struggle to make ends meet his entire life. If a person possesses the knowledge to destroy the world with a push of a button, he'll make billions. Support your farmers, thank your farmers. A farmer feeds you three times a day. Remember him at your next meal.
60.	To much land is being sold to foreigners just for profit how is that farming? Sold to people who does not care, environment, future, safety so why are you letting this happen.
61.	Land values will remain high, lots of demand, just too hard to compete with pension and investment funds.
62.	What happened in Europe at the turn of the century should be all that you need to know when you see what happened when they went to the landlord and surf system. The pride of ownership drove my ancestors here to Canada, I want my children to enjoy that right also.
63.	I THINK ONLY PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN SASKATCHEWAN SHOULD OWN THE LAND ,IN MY OWN COMMUNITY OF THERE IS A LARGE MIXED FARM THAT IS OWNED BY A GROUP OF ALBERTA INVESTERS WHO DON'T SEEM TO NEED TO MAKE A PROFIT AND HAVE DROVE UP THE PRICE OF LAND RENT TO WHERE OTHER RANCHERS CAN'T COMPETE BECAUSE THEY HAVE TO MAKE THERE OWN MONEY AND NOT GO BROKE
64.	Farming is a capital intensive business facing demographic challenges. Canadian capital of all kinds is required to provide young farmers and the industry in general with options that will maximize choices that can help them thrive and succeed without being beholden to too much debt and banks.
65.	The government should stay out of the marketplace.
66.	Private locally held land ownership is key to the future food security of our country. Allowing foreign ownership is selling out the key asset of the Saskatchewan people.

67.	<p>It is in our interest to ensure that our land is owned by the people of our province. Why on earth would we sell off our land to people/organizations who are solely wanting to profit from it, and take those profits outside.</p> <p>There is no shortage of local buyers for farmland, and the local farmers/ranchers/residents are certainly going to be better stewards of that land than a foreign owner.</p> <p>How can a local farmer compete with the capital \$ of foreign investors/organizations? It is simply pricing local residents out of the market.</p> <p>Land is our investment. We don't need a one-time \$ payment on something that will continue to be our home for generations to come. If we need investment money, take a look at investment in processing the produce that comes from that land, don't look at selling the land itself! If we sell it off, it's not ours anymore.</p>
68.	<p>We already have countless farm families booted off the farm by this government. My God government!!! you have already screwed up what was once a family farming province so instead of making it worse why not bring in a program to help whats left of Sask farm families survive????? Must tee sell everything off to other countries????</p>
69.	<p>We need to stop foreign investors and investors from purchasing farmland. Our communities are suffering because of lack of people living in rural sask. Land is being sold to investors who aren't living in the community. Who don't take part in rural life . Towns are suffering from lack of people . An investor will rent his land to the highest bidder and to a well to do farmer. That leaves a young farmer as a high risk renter so they aren't even considered.</p>
70.	<p>Makes it difficult for young farmers to purchase land in their area.</p>
71.	<p>Canada's most valuable resource is its land and water! Canadian soil should be for Canadians only. It's to sell farmland to other countries. That's a resource that belongs to Canadians. Are we not still an independent country? Let the farmers who work the soil, own the soil.</p>
72.	<p>In many of the questions posed in this part, I think free market forces are better than government to establish the underlying value of farmland.</p>
73.	<p>dont change anything, all is good</p>
74.	<p>Simply farmland should be for farmers, we need to encourage new and young family farms in saskatchewan.</p>
75.	<p>It seems everyone wants a chunk of Sask. farmland right now. In the past, the demand ran hot and cold, and it will probably do that in the future, meaning, when times are good on the farm, farmers were looking to expand and when times were not so good, farmers were not as interested in expansion. The investors may become less interested in land if they are unable to demand very high returns from rent (presently).</p>
76.	<p>When foreign money comes in from outside the province it increases land values so that the local farmer cannot expand or own his current land base and drive risk up and profit down. This will hurt the province as the local farmers profits are spent in their communities and the foreign investors profits are taken out of the province and spent elsewhere.</p>
77.	<p>If we sell off the farmland what is next and what do we have left? The land has been bought already by the residents with the subsidies given to farmers in the past, and belongs to the</p>

	farmers and the taxpayers. We helped them through tough times to benefit and invest in the farm for the whole province not for some other people from another province or country.
78.	Do we want Walmart, or China or the Government owning major portions of Sask farm land?
79.	The problem with a farmer leasing large amounts of land instead of owning is how do you build a multi million dollar business and invest millions in equipment when your land base could be here today and gone next year. All it takes is the stroke of a pen and leased land can be gone. Unfortunately contracts are made to be broken, as soon as somebody comes along with a few more dollars.
80.	Farmland ownership should remain in the hands of Saskatchewan people. Our ancestors came to this country to be independent farmers not tenants
81.	make it simple , if you are a non Sask resident or a fund buying farmland then the entity must farm the land not just rent it out or have it custom farmed.
82.	<p>Purchasing land is one of the biggest costs to a producer but the ownership of that land makes the operation long term viable. Operations need to be able to withstand the ups and downs of agriculture? The unpredictability and fluctuation of leased land does not provide this? Investment in land by foreign interests, hedge funds and speculators increases the value and thereby increases the cost.</p> <p>Sask needs investment in agriculture but it is needed where it will create value. An increased land price adds no value to the crop grown on that land. It only adds to the cost of the purchaser and in a lease situation divides and possibly sends the profits out of the province. It is a loss situation for sask.</p>
83.	I would way rather have pension funds buy the land so at least a guy has a chance to rent it then continue to let Hutterites get everything. Pension fund are the same as the large private investors I really don't think they should be treated differently
84.	If land is owned by pension funds and large corporations with deep pockets the price of land is and will continue to become out of reach for new and young farmers. You will be forced to rent land from these corporations, essentially turning yourself into a peasant that takes on huge risk for not much reward other than a small profit. The quality of life gets less and less as farms get bigger. Communities fizzle and die as farms get bigger and bigger. It takes lots of little wheels to keep the big wheel turning.
85.	If we allow foreign ownership of farmland a lot of young local farmers will never be able to buy any considerable amount of land. There is not enough profit margin in farming for them to compete with investor groups.
86.	<p>-Rental rate expectations from investors is not a reality for the long term viability of the industry.</p> <p>-Why was a group from China allowed to buy up 60000 acres around under the pretense of potash exploration. China wants to farm the land and send the produce straight to China....as has been happening in the area. This government needs to think long and hard about what they are trying to accomplish. By the way...I am not a NDP supporter.</p>
87.	Our communities are dying. Land owned by investors is often farmed by huge farmers that do little for our communities. The young farmers cannot compete with pension funds but at least

	they shop and live here.
88.	If I wanted to sell my land I can understand wanting to make as much money as I could which might come from foreign investors. However it artificially inflates the prices when those investors buy up all the land and then rent it back to local farmers making impossible for young famers to expand their farms. I believe that would drive up the prices in everything from input costs to buying a loaf of bread at the grocery store. For these reasons as well as others I believe you should be a Saskatchewan resident or at least a Canadian resident who plans on farming the land themselves before they are allowed to buy land in this province. And I believe these off shore corporations who are buying up land using a fake buyer from another province should be stopped before they own more Canadian land than Canadians!!!
89.	Tradition is killing the environment. Time to move away from pushing down forests to spray chemicals, kill habitats, grow toxic crops, and feed livestock that pollute our water systems. Environment before economics.
90.	Quite often one farmer renting from another is something to watch, the renter mines the land and doesn't put back in what's taken out of the land. So I can imagine what some people would do renting from somebody thousands of miles away, who never see or care what happens to the land as long as the bottom line is okay.
91.	<p>Comment: When asking the public to rate the "relative importance" of an item in the future, it may be more beneficial to use a numerical rating system (or even important, unimportant as opposed to agree/disagree). In this case, please accept the "Strongly Agree" response as "Very Important", "Agree" as "Important" and "Neutral" as "Neither Important nor Unimportant".</p> <p>While owning farmland is not necessarily essential to the operation of a farm due to option to rent, having good "landlords" and good "tenants" would be essential and may require new legislation to protect both parties (basically turning the Farmland Security Board into a Rentalsman Office for farmland). Farmland is also a different ballgame than a typical renting scenario due to the year-to-year activities that are required to allow a farmer to be efficient and to ensure the quality of the farmland itself and the crops growing on it (for example, rotation of crops such as canola to prevent an increase in diseases like clubroot).</p> <p>By preserving the current traditions, there is a greater potential for ensuring appropriate stewardship of the Province's farmland.</p>
92.	There are manufacturing and post harvest production possibilities that are not fully exploited that will benefit from a thriving base of owner operator farmers. They need to be owner operators because that gives them the interest in success. But the owner operators need to achieve a certain scale, so corporate ownership is needed too.
93.	I find is odd the older farmers who are pushing for the change are the same ones who did not want a change 50 years ago when they were the ones purchasing.
94.	It is almost or at least almost impossible to recoup the price of farmland today. In other words land prices are high enough.
95.	I think it's important to support family farms, keeping prices reasonable so they can keep their small/medium operations and not be forced out. I also think it's important to keep land in the owners of people who live here so they want to stay. We should also support people who understand our land and want to use the best practices, not just turn a profit, potentially

	destroying our land.
96.	My Dad owns farmland, but is retiring. I'd like to purchase his land and take over the farm. He can get many times more for the land, than I am able to pay him. So, I guess, I wont be farming in my future.
97.	In the past 20 years most of our gain in equity has been from land value appreciation. If we had not owned the land and gained that equity we likely would no longer be farming. We have stopped renting private land because we weren't getting ahead with it. We only have our crown grazing lease left becaue we hope to someday purchase that land.
98.	Outside investment creates an unnecessary rise in farmland values. The large corporations can afford to buy high prices and then rent the land out. But, their profits usually do not stay in the province.
99.	We are in a world market. On one hand some farmers want the price of farm land to be artificially kept low but on the other hand they want world prices for products. If we took out all investors and reduced the value of land by half, the same producers could not afford the land because their net worth would then be cut in half and the banks would not lend them the money. I agree that when buying we should work to the best value we can achieve, however when we are spending \$1,300,000 for a tractor and airseeder why should I give my land away for next to nothing? If I sell and want to move to Regina, Calgary, Vancouver I have to compete with world money for housing - therefore I should be able to sell my land to whomever I want (Please note I actually have no intention of selling - I'd be more likely to buy and I don't mind the competition)
100.	<p>-Owners of farmland should have the complete freedom to sell their land to who they want too in a free market, they can sell their grain all over the world so should not limit investments that can create a more vibrant and healthy Saskatchewan economy.</p> <p>-Pension funds do not overpay for land, they have strict models and people who understand the real values of land and are only willing to pay for what makes sense long term. They never make hasty decisions and are very strategic in land purchases.</p> <p>-More and more farmland is being rented by farmers, if a small farmer in an area wants to buy land they likely are going to have a hard time outbidding their neighbors who are larger already. If pension funds and long term investors own pockets of land this increases the amount of land that is available for rent and allows farmers of all sizes to bid and get parcels of land for rent. If a large "Saskatchewan" farmer owned this land they are going to farm it themselves and will NOT rent it back to smaller farmers. The end result of limiting outside investors will DIRECTLY hurt the smaller farmers who will not be able to compete with his larger neighbor and will reduce land available for rent for them to expand. Choosing a winner with legislation will actually harm the people that limiting land ownership is intended for.</p> <p>-Other provinces and U.S. states that have open land ownership have shown great relationships between land owners and farmer renters. Large investors understand land markets and grain markets and provide flexibility in land rent options.</p> <p>-Large institutional investors provide liquidity in bear land markets. They plan to hold land for 30 years and are well positioned to ensure in down and up cycles to remain solvent and provide consistent rent availability for farmers.</p> <p>-Investment in any markets have shown to be beneficial, opening Saskatchewan for</p>

	investment in oil and gas has driven Saskatchewan to be a world leader creating jobs and helping small communities grow. If (no guarantee long term after it stabilizes) it results in increased money flowing into farmers who are selling their land who have more to invest back into local areas starting more businesses and helping to sustain the local business already there (as well as being able to retire and be rewarded fairly for farming for many years).
101.	We should consider to Get more Investment that can Contribute in More Money for Saskatchewan and will create more opportunity for Saskatchewan residents
102.	See previous answers
103.	<p>Investment money (from anywhere) is good for the industry.</p> <p>Open market environment (with its risks and rewards) is consistent with neighbouring provinces and is fair for buyers and sellers (no uncertainty with govt intervention).</p> <p>The trend of fewer and larger farms will continue with or without government restriction (ie: it won't make it easier for young people to enter or expand.....large farmers will still bid the land up).</p> <p>Outside ownership still requires someone to farm the land!maybe easier in some ways for entry or expansion into the industry.</p>
104.	I need to know who pays Saskatchewan income taxes on the income generated from that land. If the income from that land is paid to a non Saskatchewan resident, I believe that only the land taxes are collected by the Saskatchewan government while the income is gone and its taxes are collected elsewhere. In that case Saskatchewan is loosing a lot!
105.	Our forbears came to Western Canada because they were needed to settle the West. They came from countries where they were just tenants, & could not ever prosper. If we allow out of province entities to buy farmland, our young farmers will be in precisely the same situation that our forbears were in the countries from which they emigrated: poor tenants with a slim chance of prospering. Is this what our forbears worked so hard for? Is this what we want for our young farmers?
106.	No point in leasing unless you already have a home quarter.
107.	Keep everything local.
108.	We are a young couple in our 20's. I will be the fifth generation to ranch on our place if we take over. My husband grew up farming and would like to continue to do that and add land to the ranch in order to do so. We are passionate about what we do as are many young people. However, it is hard enough to get into agriculture as it is. If outside investors, especially non-Canadian residents are allowed to come in and boost the price of land this will make it near impossible for my generation to buy into farm/ranch land.
109.	If someone from "timbucktoo," wants to come in and put their butt in a tractor seat and actually farm, all the power to them. Go for it. We can all compete with an actual farmer. But renting from investors is not stable. You never know if the contract is going to be renewed and you buy equipment for those acres and you are virtually held hostage when the contract is up cause you need the land, you have machinery payment commitments etc. so you pay more rent just to have the acres to justify the equipment. vicious cycle

110.	Keep Saskatchewan farm land in the hands of Saskatchewan farmers, not in the hands of non-resident land managers.
111.	All that the hedge funds are doing is looking to make an investment. The price they pay for land is not tied to the production and profitability that the land can produce. The dichotomy between what it is "worth" ie. fair market value (what someone will pay) and what a farmer can make off of it is the issue. With canola below \$10, farmland purchased for \$2000 per acre in which an investor wants 4 to 6% return on investment requires \$80 to \$100 in rent. With typical input (seed, fertilizer, spray, fuel) costs in the order of \$200 plus to grow canola a farmer needs \$280 to \$300 to cover his or her input costs. That's 28 to 30 bushels at \$10 canola. Today's new crop price is \$9.63. This doesn't include machinery costs like depreciation and the farmer hasn't taken a wage or paid himself or his employees yet. Wheat pencils out significantly worse than canola.
112.	Let's keep land ownership with the hardworking farmer, the land get cared for better and farmed better if the farmer is the owner!
113.	This means more competition in buying land and smaller farms can't compete
114.	I see no problem with Canadian-owned pension funds or investment trusts owning farmland. Their interest is in long-term stable income derived mainly from leasing the land to farmers. What we must avoid is allowing investment primarily for capital gains based on rising land prices. We should continue to restrict foreign ownership of land. The decisions on what to grow and where to sell it should remain in the hands of Saskatchewan farmers.
115.	Very unfair having endless government money competing with local farmers for the same land
116.	The fundamental character of Saskatchewan comes from its history as a farming province and from the viability of small communities. Changing the rules would change our identities over time and threaten small towns across the province. This would ultimately mean that the province would have a smaller rural tax base while legacy infrastructure costs on small communities would increase.
117.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Absentee owners are only interested in profit, not the care and proper management of the land, which is truly the role of the farmer. Certainly, farmers leasing land will take care of it, as it is part of their livelihood, however, nothing promotes attention to proper management of farmland than ownership. 2. We should recognize that most farmers are no longer subsistence farming, but rather larger corporations. To that end, they make their money along the way, the payout at the end is a bonus. This is different than subsistence farmers who only survived along the way and the payout at the end was required to fund retirement. 3. Given the current price of farmland, anyone who is just starting out would have an almost insurmountable obstacle in terms of cost in order to get into farming in any meaningful way (ie 10 quarters or more). 4. The price of farmland is only one of the capital costs (equipment being the other). Another factor is the yearly operating costs (seed, fuel, spray, fertilizer, etc.) all of which exacerbate any new farmer just starting out. If there is consideration for 'regulating farmland' and ultimately cost of farmland (ie capital costs), is there also a need to regulate the operating

	costs?
118.	I have no opposition to land ownership by the CPP but would be completely opposed to foreign ownership of SK farmland. I think the current rules and regulations should be maintained.
119.	It is very important for farmers to own land and/or rent from people who have a personal relationship with the land (such as retired farmers and family members). When land becomes just another means to make money for investors it makes land less affordable, increases rents, makes farms less profitable, results in rural depopulation and a loss of our social fabric, culture and traditions. Land should not be owned by non-residents or investment companies (regardless of the ownership of the investment company).
120.	With today's options it is better to rent the land from a group like a pension plan than going through the worries of paying off your debt of purchase the land.
121.	Farmland should be regulated in the same manner as other commercial property. We need to move into this millennium.
122.	<p>Have we learned nothing from early Canadian history? Foreign speculating land owners bought up the land leaving locals with nothing! More recently, look to Vancouver where homeless abound, yet condos and apartments sit vacant, owned by speculating foreign investors!</p> <p>Look to any major city. Houses that are owned are cared for and maintained while the city fights with slum landlords over the state of their property. Having lived in Regina's North Central Neighbourhood for 6 years, I have had plenty of experience fighting with landlords who care only for the bottom line. Now imagine that the landlord lives in another country and doesn't speak your language, doesn't have any impetus to follow the local rules (chemical dumping, drainage issues, wetland destruction). What would happen then? Does the government have rules in place to chase down and prosecute offenders BEFORE land sales begin?</p> <p>Foreign owners don't have the same Canadian values or responsibilities to the land. What about undiscovered archaeology or unbroken native prairie that still exists on some farm and ranch land? I doubt that it means much to greedy corporate fat cats that only see value in money. They have no connection to Canada - they are only here to take what they can and leave the land used up and broken.</p>
123.	<p>I think easing the restrictions on farm land ownership will benefit existing farmers. Farm land by and large is only good for farming, no matter how it is owned someone will be working this land either as owner or leasee or employee. It is hypocritical of government of any stripe to play politics with something this important. Let the market determine the value of farm land and how it worked.</p> <p>The economics of farming already plays a role in this. What is next will government create crown corporations to invent and manufacture farm implements, fertilizers and chemicals to control disease etc.!</p>
124.	Saskatchewan farmland should be owned by Saskatchewan people.
125.	I still believe that the best farmers are the ones who have a personal vested interest in the land. People who lease land do not care for it the same way those who own land do. Some of

	<p>the water issues are results of drainage to get every ounce of production off land... often land not own... ownership of land I believe leads to better stewardship of the land.</p>
126.	<p>The days for cheap farmland prices in Saskatchewan ended the legislation was changed back in 2003.</p> <p>I don't have a problem with a pension plan or investment trust owning land but I don't care for the concept of having non-farming domestic entities owning farmland in perpetuity.</p> <p>Most land is selling for rates that are far beyond its productive capacity and so there would have to be a compelling reason for a farmer park their equity in land. There was a time when land ownership was required to raise operating capital however there are other alternatives today.</p> <p>It would take 70% less cash to rent land that it would to own it and I believe this benefits younger farmers and smaller farmers. A 20 year mortgage on a \$320,000 quarter at 4% interest would require debt servicing of \$23,000 while the rent would be the cash rent value would be ~\$80 per acre or \$12,800 per year.</p>
127.	<p>Outside investment creates a false value of farmland. The value of farmland is limited to the production capabilities of that land using current commodity values of a specific time.</p>
128.	<p>Although I believe that the markets will correct themselves. Opening the floodgates by allowing foreign investors will cause a lot of problems. The average age of farmers is nearing 60. With no young people willing to take on millions of dollars of debt, farming will die off. Quite frankly, I don't blame them. Who wants to invest that amount of money when you can go bankrupt because of the weather? There are many other industries that don't require as much capital to make the same or more money.</p>
129.	<p>most younger farmers need to rent land rather than purchase. this allows them to fund equipment capital more easily. the return on investment is much higher for farmers who rent. farmland owners still receive a low return on the land's worth, even given Saskatchewan's lower farmland values.</p>
130.	<p>-Is the tradition owning 4 quarters and subsistence farming?</p> <p>-Maintaining an unnamed and undefined Tradition is pointless.</p> <p>-The Province should not be into price fixing just as local farmers should not collude to keep them low.</p> <p>- Government should pass enforceable rules and put cost of meeting the rules on the buyers</p> <p>-Maximize the market value of farmland for current and Future farmland owners</p> <p>-Governments supporting the rule of law, land titles, and not interfering in commerce and not changing market rules is a key economic consideration.</p>
131.	<p>The agricultural industry and Saskatchewan society as a whole would benefit from having more families living on farms and limiting the amount of land one person or entity can control. Having more farmers would increase Saskatchewan's population, decrease centralized control of the industry and increase competition between farm input providers.</p>
132.	<p>Institutional investors can distort the value of land. Value becomes tied to the investment potential of the land vs the productive value of the land.</p>

	<p>Institutional investors have very deep pockets which farmers cannot compete with. When the value of the land becomes greater than the productive value of the land farmers cannot justify investing in the land. Institutional investors are not concerned with the productive value of the land. They are speculating on an increase in the value of the land over time.</p> <p>Also, if this is allowed to continue then foreign entities such as the Chinese government may one day control huge tracts of Saskatchewan land. This will give them the ability to influence political decisions made in this province. This has already become apparent when the sale of Viterra to Glencore was put on hold pending the outcome of the Chinese government's acquisition of Nexen Inc. The Chinese government has a controlling share in Glencore.</p>
133.	Local farmers should be able to live and work on the farm without fear of some big business making it impossible to continue. Business or conglomerates should be limited as to how much land they can own as well.
134.	The Family Farm is an integral part of Saskatchewan. If we want small town Saskatchewan to survive, we need to have farmland for them to purchase. No farmer has the billions of dollars pension funds and other large investors have if land became a bidding war. Plus, if the pension funds pay too much and drives the price, there is a strong possibility they will be forced to sell during a price correction and will lose money when they sell it, thus harming the pension plan.
135.	Through my current work with international companies, I understand the value and benefits of bringing outside investment and capital into Saskatchewan. At the same time, I grew up on family farm with a proud history of owning our marginal land, and understand the pride and importance that farm ownership has played in shaping our province. Growing up on a small mixed farm and now working as a humble wage-earner, however, I generally do not support any potential policies or regulations which effectively subsidize or disproportionately benefit large, wealthy farmers, who wish to see lower land prices simply to further expand their operations and make greater profits.
136.	We must not allow foreign investors to make decisions about how land is used in Saskatchewan, or anywhere in Canada. Huge conglomerates do not care what sort of desecration they leave behind, that has been shown many times over in other countries as well as here. \$\$\$ are not the only things to be considered and even there if long-term sustainability was given the economic value it should have many land uses now allowed would never have occurred. Oil drilling, oil transport, nuclear meltdowns, chemicals too numerous to mention, and FRACKING are just a partial list of reasons why land, water use must be closely monitored BY ENVIRONMENTALISTS, BOTANISTS etc. and not by politicians who have been bought and have silenced the scientists.
137.	Our land is ours until we say otherwise. We can't't make more.
138.	No farmers can afford land!
139.	It took over 100 years to build what we have and to have it given up would be hard to keep moving forward
140.	by allowing outside investment it allows for the outflow of funds from the province which is revenue lost to the province. This is both socially and economically irresponsible. There are definitely loop holes to the current structure as i know of outside the country investors who own Saskatchewan companies buying land. I believe that it should be limited to Saskatchewan

	companies with only Canadian citizens as shareholders. Anything past this allows the loss of revenue to the province.
141.	I feel that Saskatchewan land should primarily be owned by Saskatchewan residents. But that does not translate into ensuring 'affordability' - everyone has a different definition as to what affordable land or rent equates to based on numerous personal factors (eg. personal finances, land quality/productivity, etc.). People may think land is over or under valued but a selling price still has to be agreed upon by the buyer and seller before a transaction takes place and demand still should drive that price.
142.	Farming is a business, and I do think a business shouldn't have too much interference on what it does with its property. On the other hand I would hate to see a province in the future where people from outside the province own all the land and rent it to residents. In the long term I believe it is better for the province if the owners are from here, and not absentee landlords. Prince Edward Island didn't join Confederation at first primarily because of this problem. I don't want it to be a problem here.
143.	This province was founded on agriculture. Keeping the land owned by farm families is very important to me. I would rather see lower land prices if it means foreigners and investors will be kept out, even though this has a large impact on my net worth.
144.	Saskatchewan farmers don't need big money from elsewhere, even from elsewhere in Canada being invested in land. That just recreates the feudal system. Our ancestors came to this country to escape that system. Why would we want to reinstate it by allowing our farmland to be bought up by nonfarmers? That kind of investment does nothing to help the actual farmer.
145.	As much as I support free enterprise and capitalism, I have a protectionist attitude toward farmland ownership. I believe that opening the market up to anyone or any investor in the world will profit the generation that would sell land in this era. However, I firmly believe that we will be doing a great disservice to future generations of would be SK farmers because land availability would be even more scarce than it is becoming today. Selling land to a country such as China today (who is trying to buy food security) will circumvent our opportunity to sell to them tomorrow. Selling to an investment entity or pension fund with almost infinite financial resources also makes it impossible for a young farmer like myself to compete. CPP is worst of all since I'm required to contribute every year to an entity I'm competing with for farmland purchases.
146.	Please leave farmland in the hands of Saskatchewan residents.
147.	I am thankful for the restrictions that are already in place to protect Saskatchewan's farmland. We must never let go of control of our precious food supply to foreign investors that do not have our people's interest at heart. Keeping food prices low and affordable is something that we can never afford to take for granted.
148.	I've experienced the results of foreign ownership when I worked in Banff. The hotel was owned by a Japanese investment bank that brought in their own workers and had Canadian employees train them, and then replace them. I've also seen that the profits do not stay in Canada. Yes taxes etc are paid but the real profit goes out of the country.

	<p>We also run the risk of huge companies turning prime farm land much needed for food crops, in to something more "profitable " like tobacco. Farmers could also become hourly employees on what used to be "family" farm land.</p> <p>ALL foreign ownership should be limited, not just farm land.</p> <p>As for investment port folios, what would happen when they suddenly decide it's time to sell?</p>
149.	<p>If large corporations and funds are going to buy our land, then people like me will never get the opportunity to purchase any land here in this great Province. Thanks for letting me say this.</p>
150.	<p>We have a doctor whom can afford to buy all the land he wants. FROM ALBERTA. Lets another guy farm it for him. No one has a chance. He's just an investor. How are any kids able to compete with that? They haven't a chance in . Investors come in, know them, your in. It's a jungle out there. Look after yourself, big farmers don't care about the so called little ones.</p>
151.	<p>I don't know how to interpret the last question . It appears you have decided that the "tradition" of farmland ownership in Saskatchewan is diametrically opposed to "economic considerations". Regardless of who owns the land, it will likely be farmed and wealth will be generated. If the people farming the land are the owners and residents it is much more likely the land will be appreciated and sustainably looked after, and more of the wealth generated will stay in the province/country than if foreign interests own the land.</p>
152.	<p>We are killing our agriculture industry by allowing big corporations and/or non-Saskatchewan residents come in and buy up huge quantities of farmland - do they care about the health of Saskatchewan's farmland, the rural communities around these parcels of land? Not a chance. Soon we will have only 'servants' farming the land with the land owner too far removed from the actual act of farming to care about what is actually going on in the field.</p>
153.	<p>Commodity prices have not kept pace with input costs. Look at the price of a bushel of wheat over the last 100 years. Compare this to the average salary of other industries - both union and self-employed. Review the increase of the minimum wage in Sask. Oct 1968 - \$1.05, July 1974 - \$2.25, and Oct 2014 - \$10.20.</p> <p>Farming has not kept pace with other industries and why should the existing farmers continue to support the industry if they wish to retire. Agriculture is a huge business and the small farm cannot exist on its own. To think that retiring farmers should continue to be penalized and legislated as to who can buy this property is nothing more than serfdom. The retirees still have to pay for huge increases in housing cost or assisted living costs, etc.</p>
154.	<p>It is hard as a young farmer starting out to compete with foreign money !!!</p>
155.	<p>In today's investment environment it is impossible for an individual farmer to compete with a pension or trust or investment fund when it comes to land purchases. The deeper pockets they possess due to pooled money allow them to purchase land at a price just out of the reach of individual family farms. Being out bid by a neighbour farmer is one thing. Being out bid by outside investors is on a whole new level of financial competitiveness</p>
156.	<p>I answered the last question about "the agricultural industry benefits as a result of having restrictions in place" with a not sure because clearly there are loop holes. So much land around now is owned by people who are NOT Canadian. So there are obviously loop holes for</p>

	them to own so much!!!
157.	canadians and canadian funds should not be restricted. provincial borders\moats are counter productive
158.	Immediate economic benefits aren't the only concern. Quality and reputation for our agricultural products are tantamount to the success of our industry. These values are best preserved by local individuals who reside on their operations and interact with their nearby communities. Foreign corporations will only care about short term profit margins. We shouldn't have to learn again what short term and short sighted practice's can do to the infrastructure of fertile farmland we are so lucky to have in this province.
159.	Do not want the future food producers in Saskatchewan to be tenant farmers. Many of our ancestors came here to get away from landlord ownership of the farm land. Ownership of land by those outside the province and/or country is an annual drain on the farm operations to Saskatchewan's economy, when rent is paid, cash or crop share, those are annual dollars leaving the province. It will also be dollars leaving the province if the land is resold to Saskatchewan ownership. Long term and short term economic factors must be considered. Those that pay a high price for land are expecting a short and a long term return on their investment.
160.	Markets can go both ways and probably will. Restricting ownership may only provide opportunity for wealthy residence to purchase and profit. In the past depressed land prices have forced older producers to stay in the game longer than they desired and did not provide more opportunity to younger producers. Also ownership even at today's prices could cause financial disaster for less established producers. This should be a free market.
161.	There should be no foreign investment in sask land. We should never be letting people or other countries own our canadian soil. We need to keep control of sask land
162.	Nobody that isn't a farmer or a past farmer shouldn't be able to own more than one quarter of farmland.
163.	
164.	Agriculture has changed, requiring a larger scale of investment. Capital markets and broader sources of funds are needed in support modern farming. Saskatchewan and all progressive economies need MORE open markets.
165.	we live in a free market world...not Communist country..why would you not control houses.factories etc..does not sound sensible..let free market dictate price. we finally got rid of wheat board...that stole many Thousands of \$ from my farm each year,,, I hate control...why if the world would you control a certain segment of hard working risk taking farmers.? Crazy thoughts
166.	Can't say whether Sask would benefit or not from increased foreign investment but it should be an option available to Sask farmers to sell their land to whoever they want. We didn't let farmers sell their own wheat to Americans -but that has now changed - so how is land any different?
167.	we just got rid of the restrictive CWB...why would we want to go backwards? the only people who should be making the choice of who can buy farmland should be the present

	owner(seller)
168.	Farmers get into some bad crop cycles and they will be so glad they own their land vs renting it. At least if you own you can mortgage that and continue as gov programs don't actually work if a disaster does it. All lease operators are real easy to shut down. Your broke.
169.	As a farmer for many years it has always seemed over the years our worst enemy is protectionism. just as we are fighting the USA COOL right now. these rules are just another form of protectionism. let markets work themselves out on their own. investment money coming in will stay in saskatchewan banks and is being spent in sask. Is Saskatchewan truly open for business or not? I have never seen such optimistic young kids in our community about agriculture now that large amount of land is available to lease.
170.	Farming is now a business based on margins per acre which is why we see the large acreage. It's time to forget the "mom and pop" family farm theory and treat this like a business. The input side of farming is a business and treated as so. There is no government intervention to keep it artificially low so why are the people who invested and worked to pay for the land not allowed to realize it's full value?
171.	No Chinese, banks, pension funds, investors, ect. If they are not going pick up a rock or at least look at it with boots on the ground what's the point. I've seen big farms owned by large corporations(Australia) , they do nothing for the local economy, schools, recreation. Farmers only!!
172.	We are seeing more and more purchase of local farm land by landed Canadians who are financed by foreign investors. These groups will eventually control the production of food. Human nature being what it is, there will come a time when our families will go without so that these investors can feed their people first. We are also seeing that some of these investors are farming the land themselves and making a mess of it. Good productive land is being wasted because these investors don't know what they are doing. They have the financing and are able to out bid the local younger farmers. There needs to be a process where those Canadians who are actually interested in farming get first chance to purchase. Government is the only entity that can provide a mechanism for this to happen.
173.	Ownership is everything I want and it allows for my future family to take over without the risk of losing the land from lease agreements.
174.	I think the people of Saskatchewan should own Saskatchewan land. It is hard to have a farming or ranching community with outside dollars. When you do not know who your neighbor really is or who should fix the fence anymore it is just not fair to all of us that are following in our fathers foot steps to take over. Make it affordable for your own Saskatchewan people!
175.	My children are the 5th generation on our farm and I would like to see that tradition continue. They have both shown a strong interest in coming back to take over one day. My concern is that our farm size is not big enough to support two families so we will have to look into expanding the size of the farm. When that time comes I would like to see farm land prices to generate a fair retirement for the seller, but also be affordable to the buyer.
176.	I think owner ship by investments such as cpp are not that bad, they lease the land to farmers, what would be an idea with some merit if gov't is to be involved, give beginning

	farmers first chance at that land to lease. Already in our area farmers own upwards of 100 quarters of land and like huge vacuums suck up what ever comes available ,guys trying to start have a terrible time. An open and free market would in my opinion make it fairer for every one,and I really don't think the gov't should be involved in picking winners and losers which would result with restrictions.
177.	I believe in the "market" and allowing the market to function with minimal government intervention. Land does not always go up and foreign investors and pension funds should have the opportunity to hold land for the long term an no return or a loss, just like farmers and ranchers.
178.	I see that Saskatchewan will have problems if they try to stop progress with the transfer of farmland. Even with ownership of land by these investor, whether foreign or out of province etc. it will only reap what the market offers or bears. If there is a shortage of food by 2050, based on the United Nations reports, then it will be a little late to change it then. Everyone must look at the trend that is occurring, there are very few young people taking over the farmland then old farmers are retiring, there is no balance. Statistics prove the ratio does not add up to who will be cultivating Canada's farmland or raising the livestock.
179.	I want to make sure the Chinese quit buying all the farm land trying to get a monopoly. Letting our land be owned by foreign interests is a mistake. It should be Canadian owned.
180.	The family farm of yesteryear is quickly fading away, more and more land is being owned by large corporations.
181.	When there are groups of non- Canadians and large corporations purchasing farmland it makes it really hard for local Saskatchewan farmers to make a go of it. It really should not be allowed. Local farmers should get a chance before any out of province or out of country investor groups get together and bully the small farmers out of the opportunities around home. A small farmer cannot compete with large corporations and groups purchasing at outrageous prices for land. We are going to lose the local family farms altogether and that's a scary thought.
182.	Land will be available to be leased by farmers whether it is owned by a pension fund or by local retired farmers themselves. It is ridiculous to say that we need large corporations, pension plans, or investors to own the land so we can rent it.
183.	Existing farming operations that want to expand their land base are at a disadvantage when it comes to competing with the deep pockets of investment trusts, etc. It artificially inflates the land prices in the area and farmers will have to increase their net farm income to purchase land and repay the associated debt. It means they will have to take on larger amounts of debt due to these inflated prices. Rural Saskatchewan loses as investment trusts don't live in the area where the land is purchased, affecting everything from school enrolment to supporting the local businesses. Many farmers have incorporated and increased their land base to manage large farming operations. They may be family run operations and also have employees that contribute to the local economy. They also have to compete with investment trusts when it comes to purchasing land and they are at the same disadvantage as those that are classified as smaller farmers.
184.	Ownership of farmland provides a stable base for a farm to work from. Lease land is fine but it has no permanency past the end of the contract. It is hard to make long term plans when the

	operation can be in a state of flux with land changing hands.
185.	I don't necessarily disagree with foreign investment in land as long as they move here, actively farm that land and pay here. This investment has a far greater overall benefit. It brings their business to our communities. I do not agree with land being bought purely on spec. Why happens then is they rent it back out at obscene cash rent amounts and as I said before, it is not feasible unless we have 60 bu/ac canola at \$15! But they do this because they need to collect enough money to cover their cost of buying the land until they can sell it at a profit. This is killing our farms by driving both land values and cash rents through the roof. Many Farms are financed to ridiculous levels right now just because they have to to maintain the size of their operation.
186.	Farm land should only be owned by farmers!!!!!!!
187.	There was a good fact in the information provided that Saskatchewan residents and farmers spend the majority of their farming income locally and in Saskatchewan. This is a major contributor to the success of the agriculture industry in Saskatchewan.
188.	The land will be farmed, inputs will still be purchased the agricultural economy will still function with Saskatchewan owners. Allowing control of the land to foreign owners takes control of its use, what is produced away from Canadian/Saskatchewan people. Say you allow the Chinese government for example come in and begin purchasing land and farming it. Can they take what is produced back home rather than being sold. In my eyes this would hurt economy. We should produce and sell products/produce not give it away for a short term benefit.
189.	Questions regarding market values and market ability for land are somewhat misleading. Farming is a business. A big business. And should be treated as such. Falsely manipulating land values by way of restrictions may seem like a way to increase farm productivity, but in fact it is a way to stagnate growth. The best way to stabilize a market is to let the market dictate, simple supply and demand economics. If prices and rents go above the level of profitability for farmers, they will no longer purchase or rent land, forcing the market (sale or rental) to lower to the point of facilitating a transaction. It is farmland and is going to be used for farming, not anything else. If values get to the point it is uneconomical to farm, that is not efficient for investors or farmers.
190.	The bottom line is food security. Not a problem right now, but if we let multinationals free run on buying up land, farmers become the serfs and the products/profits end up leaving the province/country. We do not need to build Saskatchewan into a serfdom. Leave it alone.
191.	It seems to me that investors purchasing land require a certain amount of return for their shareholders which is passed on to the farmers renting the land. It may be difficult to maintain high rent to investors given the weakening grain prices and the downside of the grain cycle.
192.	With \$400,000 combines and sprayers that are used 2 weeks a year, the feasibility of the small farmer is gone. The other problem that I found is that there is no control over the middle-man when it comes to the cost of fertilizer, seed, or selling cattle. The price of cattle in western Canada is controlled by 2-3 companies. At one time I owned 6,700 head of cattle.

193.	It is important not to limit market competition by burdensome legislation. I want to lease out my property or sell it at a fair market value. Manipulating market conditions that create less competition for my farmland leaves me in a vulnerable position. I do not want my neighbours dictating land
194.	I feel that letting big companies, investors , and foreign companies own land in Saskatchewan will inflate land prices to the point that current farmers and young farmers can't afford to keep farming or expand their operations. We are going back to ancient times where only a few owned the land and the rest could not afford it. Somebody has to farm the land! If farmers sell off their land to investors who is going to farm it? Agricultural land is worthless if it does not produce food! Also urban sprawl is a problem and if investors buy up land there is no control what they will do with it. Look to California, solar panels are gobbling up valuable farm land by the thousands of acres. We need to eat! Farmers need to be protected"
195.	The agricultural industry should benefit by having restriction in place around ownership by non-canadians except- it seems they are getting around it anyways
196.	Price discovery is much better left to the marketplace without government interference. Eliminating buyers lowers the price. My farmland is my pension. I am not a Canadian Senator, Indian Chief or fully indexed Civil Servant. The more buyers the better my pension. Institutional buyers need someone to lease the land. Is the government going to set the rate?
197.	Saskatchewan land should be for Saskatchewan people, foreign investors and corporate ownership will make farmland prices out of reach for most SK people. having people spending their entire lives farming on land that they will never own , otherwise known as sharecropping, will benefit no one, but the large corporate owners
198.	We cannot sell our country to people who are not Canadians or/and plan on farming. We are seeing too many numbered companies owned by someone in Vancouver who has no interest in farming or even renting out the land.
199.	Increased costs incurred by artificial inflated land costs are not good for active farmers.
200.	Saskatchewan farm land should be owned by Sask residents only. My father was shot and wounded in the Second World War so we could have the freedoms we enjoy. If we sell out to big business eventually we will have nothing
201.	If anything, there should be further restrictions. There is a limited amount of land on this planet. Let's keep sask land for sask farmers.
202.	When non farmers purchase land it inflates the market value. And then the owners look at renting the land and dont understand the prices of the land in the area, which can also push up rental prices. This is not a help to the actual farmer that works the land. More farm land is not being produced so we should be diligent in protecting our existing farmland.
203.	First group of statements:

	<p>1) bringing new investment dollars- I wonder how many of these wonderful investors file a Sask. tax return for return on their investment here. My guess they are tax payers of other jurisdictions.</p> <p>2) Owning farmland is less important than it used to be- Is very true, alas most farmers today have forgotten why their forefathers came here in the first place. " To own land"</p>
204.	We should not allow people to own land from outside of the province. There are groups formed and one person is a resident and they buy the land and rent it out. Or buy it farm big for 5 years and try to sell back to the farmers neglected. Save the land that our grandparents worked so hard for!!!!
205.	I believe any land for sale in the province should be available to Saskatchewan residents first. Then Saskatchewan owned corps then Canadian.
206.	If you don't own it you have nothing. Try making a living driving truck and you are renting the truck and trailer and someone else comes in and offers the owner more money for it but you can't afford to match it. Your way of money is gone and you need to go look for something else to do just like that. That's not right.
207.	<p>Keep the land available only for the producers who farm it and live in the local areas.</p> <p>We are the best stewards of the land that you can get.</p> <p>This is one area where I believe it should only belong to those that get their fingers dirty working it.</p> <p>We farmers know what the land is worth and what we will pay to own it.</p> <p>I don't need to be competing with someone with pockets full of cash, only to go broke after trying to match or beat their bids.</p> <p>If you want the best farmers to survive out here, and guarantee our own food supply, you better keep us on the land for our country's best interests.</p>
208.	Farmland ownership by large entities benefits no one who farms. Period. Most of it benefits retirees who distribute spend it in Vegas. The "idea" that it brings investment dollars to SK is . Most of that money will end up spent in the U.S. At a winter resort and as for the rental profits, they are exported to the large foreign entity who will spend \$0 back in our province.
209.	The history of farmland ownership by foreign interests should inform us as to the direction Saskatchewan should take on this issue. The shedding of foreign farmland ownership was a deciding factor of Prince Edward Island joining confederation. And in other jurisdictions this issue has caused much unrest to local the population, Ireland and Palestine to name two.
210.	Keep it local, not foreign investments. It'll squeeze out the smaller farmers. Don't need it to become like Vancouver's real estate situation.
211.	Out of province interests should not be allowed to buy up Sask farmland
212.	Regulation around farmland ownership SHOULD be a benefit, but they aren't restrictive enough because people are getting around it. The majority of land sold in our area recently have been to the Chinese, investors from out of province, and most recent interest has been from Mexican Mennonites.

213.	If the government is interested in young farmers growing the agricultural industry in the province they need to regulate who their competition for land purchases are.
214.	It is important for Sask/Canada to maintain control of the agricultural land as a provincial/national asset. Opening the sales to foreign investment without restriction would put one of our global advantages at risk of exploration for other nations benefit without consideration for local issues.
215.	While a farmer selling out in retirement always wants to get the higher price for his/her land, and you can't blame them, one needs to look at the bigger picture. Once we allow foreigners and perhaps even foreign governments (Chinese) to buy our farmland it will never come back onto the market for Saskatchewan farmers to buy. Those with farming skills will simply become employees of big foreign corporate interests and this is a very bad scenario for us here in Saskatchewan. Just as in owning your own home is important so too is owning some of the land you farm is important. Equity is built up and can be withdrawn at retirement thus ensuring that someone does not become a ward of the state in retirement. The same, obviously, can not be said for employees. The government should encourage private ownership of land by Saskatchewan residents instead of foreigners. Private business is important and farmers are private business men. However, if it came to a choice of having foreign owners of our land versus the CPP board I would choose the CPP as at least the money in that fund is Canadian money that has come from Canadian citizens contributing to it from earnings they have made working in Canada.
216.	<p>Farmland is the source for growing food. Food is becoming a very important resource for our world. Why would we want to sell the land in this province to outside investors that are only interested in securing a food source for there over populated countries?</p> <p>Not to mention the fact that investors in my area have never had a child in our school, donated to our community, supported our businesses, or even been here to look at what they own. It's only about money and profits!</p> <p>Maybe the province should put a special tax or duty on outside investment in farmland? Along with a tax or duty on money generated from the resale or lease of land owned by out of province investors? Since they are not spending any of there returns in this province.</p>
217.	the pension funds and the rules around owning land has made it less affordable for young farmers from buying the land
218.	Ownership creates a more efficient operation. Pride of ownership is unbeatable
219.	It is very important to keep farmland in a range where farmers big and small have a chance to compete. We cannot compete with out of country dollars.
220.	Long term price of land purchase or lease will depend on expected returns to those farming it. Farming is no longer dominated by small family farmers. It should be regulated and restricted to Canadian ownership which includes Canadian Pension Funds that benefit Canadians. Reality is land is fixed in place and regardless of who owns it can't be relocated. It's real value over time is determined by productivity.
221.	Why would we consider giving "outsiders" access to this most precious commodity.... farmland. Once we lose control of this asset, negative results will likely follow. Maintain the current government position even though it may need some finessing to meet current

	changing situations. Let's keep ownership in Canada!
222.	Without having the ability to own at least a portion of the land I farm I don't have enough control to know what kind of equipment I need to farm the land. A portion of the land will always be leased since we will never be able to afford to own all 11,000 acres we farm. Changing ownership rules to allow more foreign ownership just encourages more poorly run corporate farms that fail in the end like Broadacres.
223.	why should I have to sell my land for less than it is worth ,just so that my neighbour can make more money off of my land.
224.	Ownership by corporations, trust funds or foreign investors is not in the best interest of Saskatchewan people.
225.	Land is a finite resource, selling chunks off to people from other countries, and business entities, rips it out of the hands of the people of Saskatchewan. I want to be able to buy land and expand in this province in the future. I want to buy that land from my neighbours and compete with my neighbours for the right to buy it, not with someone in front of a spread sheet in Toronto, or with someone who has their pocket book supported by a foreign government. This is my province and our land and it should stay that way.
226.	Sask land should be owned by sask farmers. If we let companies and non agricultural persons own the land soon is farmers will own very little of the land and be forced to pay too much in leases and such. These are reasons why our ancestors left Europe because thier landlords kept taking and taking and they couldn't afford to own the lands. So they came here!
227.	I think if some one from outside Canada wants to purchase farmland, then they should live in Saskatchewan. Can't make them farm the land because there is lots of farmland owned by Canadians that just lease it out. Price of land will only change if farmers are buying. More farmers are causing higher bids on land than foreign buyers. If our ancestors weren't allowed to move to Canada and buy land, Native Canadians would be the only farmers.
228.	No foreign investors should be able to purchase farm land in sask. Let sask farmers own sask land.
229.	ownership of farm land should be the same as all large business by not allowing farms to become a monopoly in an area when it well hurt the community
230.	Farmers ready to retire can benefit from selling land at an inflated rate to investors with no history or ties with Saskatchewan. As for the future of agriculture in Saskatchewan, it is the young farmer/rancher trying to buy a place or make a living at it that we need to protect and assist.
231.	Why would anybody regulate farm land if other sectors are free markets?
232.	As I have previously stated Alberta doesn't do that. They let the foreign investors and pension plans buy land in Alberta. They have affected young farmers and the future of farming in Alberta. What Saskatchewan is doing is smart. Help the current and future farmer. Don't sell out to the land banks and affect the future economy of agriculture. Many people don't realize how much this can impact the future of agriculture. We should be supporting local farmers. Not driving them out of a job and having them work for corporate giants. Farmers are

	independent loyal individuals and by corporatizing the farms into factory farms, the knowledge of the land and treatment of the animals would diminish as it would become about the bottom line where current farmers understand it's a combination of both bottom line and love and care to the animals and the land.
233.	The competitive nature of more players in the purchasing of land causes excessive increases in land values. Beginning farmers will struggle to achieve success at farming. Owning the land is the only sure way of knowing you can farm it. We have had leased land that was taken away from us and excessive leased land rent increases. The land owner is making a guaranteed return greater than the return the farmer makes with a lot more risk. Our forefathers came to this country for freedom. Investor land owners reverts us back to slavery.
234.	If I decide to retire, my farm land is my pension, why should I be restricted to who can buy it, I have made improvement over the years I should have the right to sell it to the highest bidder, to anyone in the world.
235.	Investors from foreign countries will only be here when times are good but will be quick to remove their money when times are tough and they can't get their returns anymore. This would create a huge void and a lot of vacant farm land
236.	If farmland is owned by outside investors lease money is taken out of province, lease and purchase price is driven up, then farmers are squeezed harder and less productive.
237.	Foreign ownership restrictions are a benefit to all Canadians. Foreign investment is often beneficial, however, when food production changes to having a majority of foods produced synthetically, land (farm Land) as a component of production will be less important. The social implications will likely become more of an issue.
238.	For every potential "buyer" of farmland there is a "seller" of farmland. Most often, the seller is someone who has farmed and planned to withdraw (and maximize) the accumulated wealth in the land holdings. Often the farm is the only annuity that a retiring farmer and their family has. Restricting farm buyers in some way almost certainly affects the final and full value which a farm family had often held and farmed for multi-generations. Impeding normal arms-length sale and purchase is in effect a transfer of wealth from the retiring/selling individual to the buying family (which often already has substantially above average wealth and net worth). Just because farmland may, on occasion, be purchased by a non-farmer, it cannot physically be removed from Sask. and becomes available to a farmer to rent and farm. Rental would be at fair market value as determined by the market for all asset classes.
239.	Resident farmers should have the power to decide what crops are sown on the land and how the farm is operated, chemicals used or not used, equipment purchased, etc
240.	The means of production should always remain in the hands of Saskatchewan farmers. We always need to be able to support our own population and this can't be guaranteed if the majority of land ownership is in the hands of people who live out-of-province or out-of-country.
241.	Responsible investment will allow both farms and investors to benefit from less restrictive ownership laws. Farm land should be preserved as farm land (i.e. not used for other commercial purposes) but farm land ownership should be liberalized. Investors do not want to farm, they are happy to pay a premium to farms for the land and continue to pay them

	fairly to farm the land. Farms get capital and a steady income.
242.	I am unclear as to what a traditional farm is. Outside investment is fine if the investor takes an active roll in the operational/ownership. Retired farmers and expats should have no restrictions on their ownership.
243.	Farmers today are renting more land than ever before. As long as the land is available to the Saskatchewan farmer to rent it doesn't really matter who owns it.
244.	There no better feeling like owning your own land and whats produced on it is yours.
245.	As a young farmer I find it extremely important to own land. It's a sound investment for a farm to make and ensures stability much better than rented land with leases constantly expiring. If I own my land my land base is secure, and I don't have to worry about losing large pieces of my farming operation which could create very tough situations with machinery and other capital.
246.	For Saskatchewan way of life to continue, farmland must be kept affordable for young farmers.
247.	I am totally opposed to selling our farmland and our natural resource bearing properties to anyone outside our provincial borders.
248.	I'm fine with other farmers or even other real Canadians out bidding me but not pension funds and foreign buyers hiding behind corporate names or being silent investors
249.	As a young farmer it can real tough to purchase land when competing with large investment companies.
250.	We as farmers live here. We should not have people from other parts of Canada and the world (i.e. investment trust pension investing and foreign investment) manipulating land prices for their benefit/profit. When farmers here have a tough enough time trying to make a go of it.
251.	Outside investors have made purchasing farmland difficult as they generally have the ability to drive the price beyond reasonable market value. They then expect large rent sums that don't allow the renter to profitably farm the land. We have also run into several instances where outside investors reneged on a lease deal or purchase option with little to no consideration for us as the current renters.
252.	We've all heard stories of people, that don't even live in the country buying up large parcels of land. (No matter what they say the regulations are, there is always some way to get around the loose restrictions) These non-Canadians don't even see the land they are buying and they don't bring families here to build the communities, go to school or buy local. It ruins small town life for the people trying to raise a family in Sask.
253.	I would like to see government support for small-scale and organic farming. I do not want to see banks refusing loans for people who want to farm, urban sprawl taking out food production capacity (food security?) or increased large-scale, chemical-intensive food production.
254.	Owning farmland allows the farmer to have an asset to borrow against which is a major factor in a business where the investment for machinery, crop inputs and other costs such as insurance and fuel are extremely high, and the income can be targeted but is completely

	<p>unknown until the crop is off and sold. There are so many risk factors that affect annual income, such as crop prices, input prices, and weather events that having a hard asset like land to fall back on in tough years is invaluable. I also believe that owned land is treated better than rented land. When the land is owned by the person farming it, it will have much more investment put into it because you know that it will be yours to farm as long as you want, it wont change hands after you've done so much work and put so much investment into it. By encouraging farmers to own the land that they farm, land is farmed better and there is more income off of it, leading to more taxes paid and more money into the economy.</p>
255.	<p>Owning the land you farm helps to preserve the land and environment as there is pride of ownership and if you work the land you have a better idea of what it takes to run a farm. Corporations are just throwing money around and are out of touch with what farming really is.</p>
256.	<p>The third statement, 'Support expansion of operations for local farmers' is problematic. Does it mean support existing farmers to expand operations or does it mean expand the number local farmers?</p>
257.	<p>I farmed until 2006. I currently rent my land to my brother. I give him a cut rate compared to what land rent is going for. My rent is 6500 dollars a quarter when land rent is going for 17000 a quarter. This sounds great but it crushing the local farmer. Honestly, since I am not a farmer, writing this would hurt me financially but I can not in good conscience not say something.</p> <p>Further spikes in land values will force the age of the average farmer higher as more exit. This is because younger farmers can not afford the land. Once there is not enough farmers to farm the rented land the prices will fall out. This is very concerning.</p>
258.	<p>The cost of renting land is an added expense to the farm operation.</p>
259.	<p>Saskatchewan Farmland should be owned and farmed by Saskatchewan farmers and ranchers.</p>
260.	<p>We built an agriculture industry here, over the last 120 years, on the basis that a farmer needs to have a meaningful right to self-determination, and he needs to own his own land to do this. Our homesteaders came here to escape feudalism - the current trend is returning us to this most unfair and unfortunate structure.</p>
261.	<p>The world is poised to buy up large portions of our relatively low-priced land if we open up ownership. Allowing that to happen would eventually turn us into lessors from absentee landlords, possibly using large corporate profits to make an investment they may not really have a vesting interest or history in, compared to "local" owners.</p>
262.	<p>If you want to buy farmland in Saskatchewan there should be no restrictions</p>
263.	<p>Farmland is much different than other types of real estate. Whereas a house is simply where someone resides, farmland provides the very backbone for farm families to make a living.</p>
264.	<p>Land ownership gives farmers collateral for other investments /asset purchases , and a stable retirement plan. If everyone had to rent there would be more retirement age people relying on the government and other pension plans /social assistance.</p>
265.	<p>Young farmers can't compete to buy land against large corporations. If large out of province</p>

	or out of country corporations are allowed to buy up the land then the reality of young farmers might be that they will only ever own/rent. Owning land partly defines us as farmers. It's part of our identity.
266.	It is important for farm land that is offered for sale, to be offered first locally. The land in our region that has been purchased by non residents had never been offered for sale locally so local farmers never had the opportunity to bid on the land. It is frightening to think that this land, now owned by a Chinese company, may never again be owned by a SK resident. It would have been purchased locally had it been offered !!
267.	I would probably benefit by having a totally open market for selling my farm because I will be selling the farm in 10 to 20 years. But I would rather sell my farm for less because I want to see our rural communities survive, and I want to see young people buying farmland and raising their children in SK. How can young people compete with a rich landed immigrant from Hong Kong or a large corporation. If you want to own farm land in SK you should have to reside in SK. Many of our ancestors came here to escape serfdom. Lets not take a backward step in that direction.
268.	Keep the farm land in the hands of Saskatchewan farmers. If investors want to make money send them to Wall St. NY not to Saskatchewan.
269.	Saskatchewan is the breadbasket for the world. This gives us strength in markets. If we continue to allow foreign investors to own Saskatchewan farm land, we will lose control and see foreign investors buy more and more land in order to feed their families overseas where there is little land or too costly land.
270.	Land prices are so high now that someone cannot reasonably expect to purchase land and start farming.
271.	big corp farmers have tried to farm here and many have failed. many people have moved here to farm , many have succeeded and many have failed. Many farmers born here have succeeded and some have failed. If anybody refuses to change, they are setting themselves up for failure. Be careful with too many regulations, because the more the government is involved and controlling, the bigger risk of failure is apparent.
272.	Even with farms shifting more towards a corporate model they still use their farmland as a retirement vehicle when the time comes to cease operation. Along with that comment once the land is owned the farm becomes more profitable which allows them to spend those additional dollars on upgrading equipment as opposed to rent payments. I also see some farms who rent all of their land and if they ever had a wreck they don't have the capital or equity to get them through more than one of those tough years that do seem to come around every once in a while.
273.	None of these questions reflect the impact on Residents outside the agricultural industry. Restricting the investment in our Province in general restrict the economic spin offs that higher land values create. Here is a timeline of events: Restrict number of buyers > lower land prices > less equity in land for famers > farmers can no longer borrow against their equity to buy cars, toys, and other items that impact our economy.
274.	Bring the family farm back and get rid of corporate farming practices, it is the governments responsibility to ensure safe practices, otherwise our ministers are in breach of office.

275.	Unlike the early 2000's land has increased significantly in value, we need to insure our young farmers are able to purchase land at a fair price that benefits buyer and seller. Once land moves to foreign ownership it is gone forever, you can't produce more land, unlike commercial real estate.....all our resources need to be kept for future generations. Evidence of foreign ownership exists in other jurisdictions and has not been a positive move for citizens.
276.	The farm ownership versus leasing has changed over the years and will continue to change. Reducing the number of buyers will keep land artificially lower, but at some point when I do sell (as I only have girls and they show no interest in farming) having the other buyers available will help me to retire with some money in my pocket. After the second world war the Dutch moved into Lethbridge and he was accustomed to irrigation. These new immigrants will bring different/new ideas with them. Can we afford to keep them out as the ag industry is very competitive. We need new ideas and innovation and some of the new ideas will not work out but perhaps some will. Can we afford to keep them out? Perhaps a japaneese or chinese investor will develop the next new computer that will allow the equipment to run autonomously and operate 24hrs/day 7 days a week? I would say the price increase for commodities allows producers to borrow more to buy land and the banks willingness to lend also forces up the price of land. At this stage I am not sure I can afford to pay more for land so renting land is my best option until I build more equity.
277.	Local farmers owning local land keeps people, money and spin off employment here.
278.	Quit being a bunch of socialists and let the farmers sell to the highest bidder for petes sake. We just got rid of the ndp. now the sask party is acting like the ndp on this and many other issues.
279.	The only relevant consideration regarding the ownership of any long term asset is stability of the market and the market participants. The worst situation for an asset is if the buyer faces different markets when buying compared to when he is selling. The chartered banks have been guilty of blowing hot and cold on prairie farmland over the years - FCC has brought stability to ag lending. Whatever the rules are around ownership they need to be long term and investors need to know that they are long term.
280.	Farmland ownership by residents of this province is of utmost importance . Why ? If we as residents of this province give up ownership of our farmland.....what happens to ag policy ? If the land ownership % shifts from now on to more foreign ownership is there a danger of sorts where the \$ generated from the sale the crops grown on those acre never to returned to Sask. to help promote and enhance our rural communities. If those crops, or a large enough volume were to be grown on lands owned and operated by foreign entities, is it possible that at some point our land could be viewed as some other entity or country's land base to grow food for their own population and as I stated above the financial benefits of any ag activity would never accrue to the benefit our own province.
281.	Protecting agriculture policy is just as important as the Potash decision about 5 years ago. Do you let outside money, power and interests dictate your moves and abilities, or do you keep and reinvest your own assets? We live here and we always put our money back into our own economy.
282.	It is the farmland owner who can decide who will be the operator and who will receive the animals or crops produced.

283.	<p>What I think would happen if the Farm Security Act (s.1988) was changed to open up the land market here is that prices would rise briefly and would then settle down to what the land can support. The local buyers of land are very competitive already. I like the idea of protecting our farm land base for local producers, but most of our inflow of producers is already from outside, as our local upcoming generation isn't as interested as others appear to be.</p> <p>Institutional buyers are not going to farm the land so it is still available for lease to local entities.</p>
284.	<p>High farmland values are good for my personal situation. I believe that Canadian owned trusts or funds should be allowed to purchase farmland in Saskatchewan. Most countries or provinces would allow that. We are a very protectionist province, probably from our political history. Farmers today have townships of land and need or want more, smaller farmers cannot compete with them. Limiting who can buy farmland will mostly help the big guys who already have enough land. Its a shame what has happened to the family farm in this province, but limiting who can buy farmland to help the big farmers get bigger is not my idea of progress.</p>
285.	<p>No one restricts who buys a house in the city. People from everywhere flipped houses for huge profits with no restrictions. Now we will have to sell the whole farm to retire in a house in the city and not have the income from that land rental to live on. There are next to no services left in rural Sask. We sell off non renewable resources like potash and oil to international companies and we sold off the wheat board but you want to limit the selling of farm land to residents. Where is the equity in that? Only difference is the government getting the money versus the farmer. They are nearly all big corporate farms now so what difference does it make who owns them. We worked hard all these years with small expectations and no pension plan. Our land is our pension plan and we should be able to get the best price wherever we can get it.</p>
286.	<p>I believe what has been in line for purchasers of farmland is good but I believe some of the rules have not been followed or dealt with even though there is legislative rules. I am concerned about the rule where you have to finance through a Canadian bank or financial institution with 100% Canadian ownership. If that is in place and watched closely how can people get financing from Europe or ? And then if they default does the overseas institution get to own the land? Those ideas need to be clear and made to follow.</p>
287.	<p>I do NOT like the foreign investors buying up our SK farmland!!!</p>
288.	<p>I believe that farmland should be owned by Saskatchewan residents, these are the people who make our communities strong. People who do not live here do not contribute to our local businesses or organizations. Non Canadians should not own more than 10 acres and non Saskatchewan residents should not own more than 320 acres.</p>
289.	<p>Pension funds have an unfair advantage because they use someone else's cash to buy land. There are no interest costs associated which gives them an unfair advantage. The fund managers get their wage whether the land was overinflated or not. The pension funded companies did the exact same thing in the oil and gas industry, buying out private companies, over paying to keep out the small private operators who couldn't compete against cash. Farmers who have to finance land CANNOT compete against a pension fund.</p>
290.	<p>I know of many young people who would like to farm but land prices have gone so crazy that it is impossible for them to acquire land to rent or buy. When land prices are so high</p>

	landowners expect very high rent.
291.	If the government is going to restrict ownership (foreign) that is interfering with the free market place. does the government restrict the price of inputs, no. I'm a land owner and lease my land out. if it wasnt for the 36% of leased land (investment land) the farmer would not be able to farm by just owning. if the farmer retires they should have the best opportunity to maximize the return on investment.
292.	I believe in the free enterprise system, but strongly oppose of offshore buyers or Canadian Pension Plans.
293.	The problem with outsiders buying-up all the land is what we've witnessed in Vancouver. There are people, born and raised there, that cannot afford to stay.
294.	Here's a horror story: We open the door to foreign investment in farmland and that in turn opens the door to Monsanto being able to buy farmland directly or indirectly and furthering attempts to control our food supply.
295.	Reliable access to safe food and water is more fundamentally important to our country than some other types of investments may be in times of crisis
296.	Once the land is sold to foreign investor Saskatchewan people will never own it again.
297.	Farmland should only be able to be purchased by a Saskatchewan farmer involved in the operation. No foreign ownership should be allowed to anyone. If you don't live in Saskatchewan than you cant own land. Simple as that.
298.	Take a look at history. Who came to Canada, to the Prairies? Why did they come to Canada? Land Ownership! If we do not acknowledge history and understand why people came to Canada to farm, we will enact the same situation in Canada as existed in the countries they came from. Landlord and renter (peasant) is not a long term model to aspire too. "Economics" is a misused word. Bringing in foreign investment in farmland is not overall good economics. A basis in economics many people miss is the time parameters of an economic analysis. If you use 10-20 years as a timeline for analysis, you will achieve a different result than a 100 year analysis. Ownership among many who reside and live on the farm and who are vested in the best interest of the community, Province, and Canada, are the best or long term benefits to Canada.
299.	If you drive the young people out who are trying to make it there will be no one left to rent the investors land. Saskatchewan should take care of IT'S young people
300.	I believe the owner of the land should be able to sell it to who ever they want to it is there land and no one should tell the owner who they can sell to.
301.	The old family farm is no longer. The new company is owned by the family. These companies are very dependent on stability and predictable future. When the son can't afford to buy the land from his dad to take over, the farming industry suffers and will die off.
302.	We do not need a transient population farming our province
303.	I am very concerned that we protect our young farmers from competing with non farming individuals and corporations.

	We need to have PEOPLE WHO UNDERSTAND THE LAND OWN THE LAND
304.	I think there should be a closer watch kept on large corporate farms, and who their 'silent' partner/members are. There is a lot of foreign/overseas influence already...
305.	Do not want big corporations buying up our farmland.
306.	Have a big problem with ownership of sask. Land by foreigners when they don't live here for the winter & their children do not school here. It is happening.
307.	Tenure and stewardship of the land is better when you own it versus renting. The experts say you should not own anything-lease land and equipment. But the lease payments make the landowners wealthy while you have nothing! Young people can't compete against deep pockets of pension funds or investors.
308.	having restrictions on farmland ownership will help the future younger generations be able to aquire farmland for their own operations. young farmer such as myself will never have the capital to purchase land if we are competing against investors and pension plans
309.	We, as a family farm, feel it is very important to make it possible for our next generations to operate as family farms and keep our province rich in rural community living.
310.	We sell land to foreign companies who have unlimited financial resources (ie Chinese), commodities produced off the land will be shipped directly to China and any secondary economic benefit for that commodity is lost. Also in my opinion, once that land is sold you can forget about any Saskatchewan resident owning that land again. The most efficient farms that have the most economic spinoff are run by family farms owned by Saskatchewan residents
311.	it is a very important resource that should be owned by Canadians and preferably those farming the land.
312.	People moved to Saskatchewan in the early 1900's to get away from being surfs of state owned land and to have the land to look after themselves with. No farmer treats rented land as good as land they own. More small farms would be better for the economy than large farms.
313.	megafarm or canadian investors will destroy the smaller family farms just like outside investors
314.	It will be good for the sask economy to keep sask land sask owned.
315.	None of the large investment firms have been successful in our area farming, some have been successful at buying cheap and selling at a high price and leaving the country with there money. These investment firms bring nothing for community involment or helping small town saskatchewan. They are only interested in there own profit and off they are, no thought of the community.
316.	Todays small and large scale farmers (Canadian /Sask based) are trending more to leasing their neighbors lands. Owners wanting to retire want to keep living in their homes on the home quarter, while retaining ownership ,but rent the rest out as a source of retirement income. Large scale farmers put out massive expenditures on large equipment, trucks, seed-cleaning plants , etc.. and have enough payments without having to buy the land yet. Small farmers may want an extra quarter of land or two, but don't have the money to buy. Foreign

	owners/investors are skirting the regulations to buy up all avail crop lands as an investment, based on land prices always going up, then shipping crops and hay , directly back to China.
317.	test
318.	test
319.	Opening up Saskatchewan farmland to outside investors will drive up farmland values so young farmers will be unable to afford to start farming, established farmers won't be able to expand if they choose to, and you'll create a system where a farm can't pay for itself. It will be essentially what England and central Europe had 100 years ago when farmers left and immigrated to Canada so they would be able to own their own land.
320.	Large investment funds and other non-Sask. investors usually have huge amounts of capital to purchase land that local farmers can't compete against.
321.	I believe land ownership should go back to the way it used to be. To own land in Saskatchewan you have to be a Saskatchewan resident. THIS SHOULD NOT HAVE CHANGED! Why and how as a young farmer should I compete with over inflated land prices.
322.	Why? Give one reason why a farm business should be treated differently?
323.	Our ancestors come here to acquire land and be able to farm. A pension fund, investment fund, cannot be viewed significantly different by a farmer than having the monarchy own all the land and leasing it to farmers which is the case in much of the UK. Having pension funds or investments funds acquire land strictly for investment is not beneficial for our province in the long term. Having a pension fund owning the land provides no security for an individual farmer and only increases the price the farmer must pay to acquire or purchase land.
324.	This section is largely based on the situation of the respondent. If I am someone who is near retirement, then I am obviously going to benefit from investors/pension plans purchasing land because I will receive top dollar. I am a young farmer who is trying to start out so I am definitely not benefiting from investor land purchases. I can not afford to pay what they are willing to pay, farmers need to be valuing land based on production and based on commodity prices today, land is priced far higher than what it produces.
325.	I feel that farmland should be purchased by farmers from any Canadian or foreigner that will reside and operate the land.
326.	In the next two decades we will have the largest inter-generational transfer of land in Saskatchewan history. I don't think rural communities and young farmers are better served by having investment firms and pension plans owning the land, and becoming merely renters or employees of these companies.
327.	I believe local farm ownership/or ability to lease from retired farmers, is best to secure the industry in our province. Giving away our resources to investors, especially out of Canada or using our pension money to buy land out of farmers control is detrimental to our industry and our provincial economy and our national food security. Two recent examples of large corporate farms going bankrupt had broad repercussions as many suppliers did not get paid properly.
328.	Leasing or renting costs can end a business if large investors decide to rebalance their investment portfolio without regard to local business's capability to pay the new rate. It isn't

	about farming or food stability for them, only return on investment.
329.	and his party have destroyed Saskatchewan. only farmers should be able to buy farmland, anybody else should be limited to 2 quarters. the future of young farmers being able to farm is doomed by the actions of .
330.	I'd like to see farmland owned by farmers themselves or someone who is related to the previous farmer who owned the land
331.	Saskatchewan farmland needs to be owned by Saskatchewan residents. People that own and work the farmland will keep rural Saskatchewan alive. If farmland is owned by pension plans and large investment funds rent paid for that farmland is taken out of the province and not put back into the Saskatchewan economy. This province was built on the family farm and that should not be forgotten.
332.	What is killing rural Saskatchewan is what I would call remote ownership, where an owner takes the benefit of the land while not contributing to the rural community.
333.	test
334.	Foreign ownership would provide billions of dollars to the sask. economy. Decades ago before the govt changed the rules my family leased land from American owners. This group were the best landlord we ever had, it was a sad day when the ndp kicked them out of the province and we were forced to buy our land. They simply went to another province and still own land there and have leased to the same families for generations now. I have a young son who is just entering the business and these young farmers are not interested in owning land and being saddled with huge payments for the rest of there lives. Look at the current farm debt level we cannot afford to go thru another problem like the 80s. I will not allow my son to buy land and be handcuffed to payments for the rest of his life, but if he can get a good lease at least if things go bad he can renegotiate his lease or walk away.
335.	Investment money of foreign owners purchasing land is likely mostly not kept or placed in SK, profits from a rental arrangement will go back to the foreign owners. Large corporate (or pension fund) purchases are not conducive to renting to several 'average' sized farm operations, but instead, are more likely to rent as much as possible to as few operators as possible. This is harmful to our rural communities, as more yards become vacant and are bulldozed. The strength in our small communities relies upon the people that live here, not operators that move in with ATCO trailers for their employees, swarm over sections of land, and then move along. I also believe there is potential danger in 'absentee landlord' scenarios developing. Foreign owners or pension funds are not concerned with careless operators that affect neighbouring farmers or the local environment. I would also like to offer an anecdote from conversations with my accountant; the most efficient operation is the 'one tractor, one/two combine' operation, where the owner is often in the driver's seat. Multiple thousand (or tens of thousand) acre operations may appear to be the most efficient at the rate they can seed & harvest a parcel of land, but efficiencies are lost or overlooked (I believe) in attempting to complete the momentous task they are faced with. Good agronomy is sacrificed to simplify rotations and is not sustainable. Inexperienced operators are hired to fill a seat where only an experienced operator should be. The most efficient owner/operator operations are best for the ag industry in SK, our local & Provincial economy, and our local communities.

336.	I believe farmers who own their land are the best stewards, and care about their land almost as it is part of their family. We need strong rural communities in this province, we can't all move into the cities to live. Corporation care about the bottom line, profit. Is this the kind of province we want? Corporate farms? Farmers who sell their land are getting a good price for their land from other farmers. Times have changed from when you had a hard time selling your land for a good price.
337.	I like the current rules about Canadians owning land first. The real issue for me is the need for government to manage the existing rules. Its not a secret that foreign investors are getting around those rules in order to place their capital in a safe jurisdiction. I do not support this however I have no issue with CPP making investments as those contributors are all Canadians. Finally the land will always be farmed therefore the ownership is secondary. our stats on total framers (36k) is misleading as I would argue 20% of that total likely represents 80% of the farming capacity
338.	Saskatchewan farmland is a resource no different than potash, it is a Saskatchewan resource meant for Saskatchewan people. If they want to move here, pay taxes here, contribute to our economy and to our society, they are welcome, but we don't need land lords. You will not only cripple the rural communities, but hurt the entire agriculture industry, its almost impossible to enter it even with family support from an established ranch or farm because of unrealistic farm prices.
339.	<p>Outside investors, are investing for only one reason - return, and do not fully understand agriculture. This additional investment often drives up prices in good times, but creates the opportunity for larger drops in bad times because the investors can find better returns elsewhere resulting in more volatility in land prices and rents. Also having farmers own a larger share of the land allows the farmer to weather the poor years much better than leasing it all. Farming is very cyclical and it is tough to weather poor years if all land is leased because, that type of farming typically results in the farmers leasing equipment as well and there is very little equity tied to the operation and one or two poor years can result in ceasing operations which again adds volatility to the entire sector.</p> <p>There is no benefit for farmers becoming tenants for the majority of the land over the long term. Throughout history the owners of the land have been the ones to benefit, not the peasants that work the land. It is also more difficult to deal with a landlord that has invested in land, but does not fully understand the unique nature of agriculture. There are few industries in the world where weather can create such large swings in revenue than in agriculture.</p>
340.	Let's talk about the real issue, farmland , ag equipment , inputs have all gone up . While commodities are manipulated thru one sided contracts & commodity markets, therefore holding prices down. If margins were better lands prices wouldn't be a issue.
341.	Control or concentration of wealth by few is always detrimental to the few and overall economy. The more evenly wealth (including real estate) is distributed the better it is for society as a whole.
342.	Canadian pension plan ownership of Saskatchewan farmland would be acceptable but foreign ownership should continue to be severely restricted. Ceding ownership of a country's food production capacity to foreign interests is a very, very bad idea.

343.	I would like to see farmland stay in farmers hands, the family farm is what has built this province and Canada. The food produced here has contributed to the feeding of Canadians as well as the rest of the world. I believe that the family farm should be protected by legislation as it has contributed much to the country in strong citizens. I think some of the problems that happen in cities would not happen if more people where on the land contributing and feeling better about themselves in a positive manner.(sorry for my ranting)
344.	Our Saskatchewan farmland needs to remain just that. SASKATCHEWAN farmland... not foreign owned. Last time I looked Saskatchewan is a proud part of Canada, so I agree with other Canadians being able to purchase and or lease farmland.
345.	Farm land is likely the largest natural resource in Saskatchewan and is the backbone of what made the Province. Allowing increased ownership outside of farmers who don't have an invested interest in the province or industry it not wise. At some point these investors will find better returns elsewhere and land prices will fall drastically. Resulting in eroding balance sheets and a potential financial mess for SK agriculture.
346.	no consideration appears to be given to new immigrants, ie new farmers, whether from other Canadian provinces or other countries.
347.	I am 100% against anyone owning land if they do not reside in Saskatchewan! It is not fair to young farmers or smaller farmers (both of which I am) who are trying to expand.
348.	I believe a fair and open market is more important than restricting land ownership to a select group of people.
349.	Keep the farmland for farmers and to keep our rural communities well and thriving.
350.	A few years back when grain prices were low, I thought that I might rent out some land. Young farmers who have no trouble justifying paying \$70 an acre for fertilizer, \$50 an acre for canola seed, and operating a million dollars of machinery, we're offering \$10 an acre for high assessed farm land with me paying municipal taxes of \$5 an acre. I like to see farms prosper but not at the retiring farmers expense. I too have son's that though they aren't interested in farming, they do want to remain in Saskatchewan. We are considering developing a business with some of the proceeds of my farm sale. I have absolutely no interest in having restrictions in place that will subsidize some farmer at the expense of my family.
351.	We can talk all we want about this but wealthy non resident individuals and corps have and always will be able to buy land, we have one in our area.
352.	It is important that young farmers be able to become land owners.
353.	This is not a good role for govt. Further it is challenged to enforce these rules. Do not attempt to make rules that can be easily circumvented by a proxy owner.
354.	Farmland in Saskatchewan should only be owned by Canadian citizens as this will become in the next 50 years the most important asset that Saskatchewan and Canada has. If we start selling land to foriegn investors our country could soon be owned by non canadian residents and they would have control of one of the most important resources in the world...Food!!
355.	I graduated from high school in 1980, We looked at buying land a number of times and leased until 1994. The biggest thing that bothered me was all the young guys bought there parents out for big money, and never paid for it. But yet they were able to buy it back for 40 to 50

	cents on the dollar. You tell me where that is fair. Now in our area these guys are some of the bigger farmers around.
356.	How is the next generation supposed to compete with the millions of dollars of the investor groups? Do you think the investors really care for the land? What will happen to the smaller communities, the smaller retailers?
357.	Lets keep Saskatchewan farmland ownership in Saskatchewan farmers hands.
358.	The agricultural industry does NOT benefit from outside land owners because they don't farm the land as well as we locals do! They hire idiots who don't care and do a crappy job and are sloppy and harm the environment, the ecosystem, and give farmers a bad reputation. I've seen proof of all this first hand.
359.	even though i am nearing retirement and i do believe opening up the restrictions on ownership of land would likely raise values i do not believe this would bring greater health to the industry
360.	I think individual, Saskatchewan ownership is most important. Even large farmers have the same effect on smaller, competing local farmers as investment funds. More so even.
361.	<p>Wealth is only created through harvesting or mining of resources. Having non-resident control of the resource base isn't wise.</p> <p>Sustainable and responsible wealth creation will only happen when local residents manage and participate in their local communities with a goal of succession to future generations.</p> <p>Ownership should be limited to individual persons or partnerships and not corporate (or other) structures. This way, owners are fully responsible for their property and not protected under limited liability legalities.</p>
362.	Farm land should be owned by active farmer
363.	Out of province pension funds and investment funds funnel money's out of the province and spend profits elsewhere. How does that benefit Saskatchewan residents? Over seas owners of Saskatchewan farmland send profits back home to boost there economy while they leave Saskatchewan land owners to make up the difference! Hardly a good scenario!
364.	Canadian investments only or newly qualified immigrants who become Saskatchewan residents is a recent enough change to the rules. Sit on these changes for the foreseeable future and ag growth will be strong enough going forward to assess the wisdom (or not) of these policies.
365.	I farm land which is right beside land which has been sold to . Which they have lived in Vancouver long enough to be Canadian citizen. They are all about the \$ not about the environment nor the thought of how the land got there nor the community!! NOR SASKATCHEWAN!!! Anyone who thinks growing weeds for four years is a good steward of Saskatchewan farmland should be robbed of that land and be it rewarded to local farmers who will look after it!! They purchased it from and he owed my money which he was t paying on land which he agreed to purchase from him then He turns and sells it like it was his!! I Did some work for them and it took me three months of hounding to get paid. Every time answer was your cheque is in the mail!! Very bad on our sask govt to let these type of careless people in.

366.	Foreign investment in farmland may increase the risk of losing more land to development
367.	the "true or actual" value of farmland is being artificially suppressed, to benefit current large SK farm property owners - this should be considered while collar crime
368.	The SFLOB is an archaic and paternalistic carryover of a socialist government from a time when farmers needed protection from themselves and opportunistic parasites. That protection is no longer needed and farmers should be seen as being able to look after their own economic and business interests. The government should step back and let the free market regulate itself. Yes - prices for farmland will rise, but that will provide an exit strategy for those that wish to retire. There is no long term benefit in keeping prices artificially low through market entry restrictions - especially when those restrictions aren't being policed by the SFLOB and the SFLOB appears to be powerless to stop outside entities from coming into Saskatchewan and buying up farmland anyway.
369.	Outside investment is making farming impossible for young farmers wishing to start. As of now - it's moving to a large corporate model approach and that it's good.
370.	Disappointed that the current government has made it too expensive for Saskatchewan residents to afford to buy land due to competition from property & land investors.
371.	As a young farmer allowing investors to buy land is going to make it so there is no chance to buy land and to expand. I farm because it's in my blood my Grandfather started this farm after the war and wanted to see it continue and I want to see it continue to my boys but people buying land just for the fact to make money off of it is going to take every chance for me or my family to continue to farm. This needs to stop and stop now!!!!
372.	I don't want to be a serf ! Like my great great grandfather ! And I don't want Future generation to be serfs
373.	If it is too open we will end up with share croppers/cash renters only.....less stability in the agri economy. Owner operators are essential to a vibrant and sustainable economy.....
374.	There is no "vacuum" of ownership interest currently that a pension could potentially fill. Real estate agents might say different but their interest lies differently than a farmer. If there was land available locally there are 4 or 5 of us that would be interested
375.	Land prices have been driven up by realtors and speculators during the recent combination of high crop prices and favourable weather. They are constantly in the media saying how Saskatchewan farmland is undervalued compared to other jurisdictions . They do not take into account the true productive value of the land by comparing land in the Palliser Triangle to Corn / soybean land in lower Ontario. There has always been the money available to pay what the true productive value of the land is. To keep the industry strong and stable and prevent the need for huge government bailouts land prices need to reflect the true productive value. That should include the occasional 2 or 3 year drought or 3 year downturn of prices. In the past Saskatchewan farmers have included that in their price bids and kept the prices at a more true productive value.
376.	The investors go in and buy land for right offs. They purchase large amounts for large dollars and make it unattainable for small farmers like me. They don't want to parcel out a quarter or two they want one guy to take 5-10 thousand acres to make things quick and easy. The smaller core like me get left in the dust because economically we can't take on that much land

377.	The 3 prairie provinces need to be on a level playing field on this issue
378.	Farmland has always been a safe bet. The markets may fluctuate but as a farmer in it for the long term it is always the best benefit. We don't need people coming in trying to make a fast dollar off our way of making a living. There are already too many fingers in the farming chain. We do not need another!!!
379.	I feel that out side investment in farm land will destroy rural Saskatchewan.
380.	Ideally I would like to see every farmer own all of their own land but that will never happen. We will always have farms broken up with estates or local investors wanting to play in the Agriculture realm. If we sell off all of our natural resources we will be sitting in a situation where we could produce enough food to support ourselves but are now in a situation where we are buying it all.
381.	investors do nothing to local economys,
382.	I DO NOT FEEL WE SHOULD BE SELLING FARMLAND TO OUTSIDE PEOPLE OR OPERATIONS. LONG TERM THIS MAY BE VERY BAD.
383.	Saskatchewan farmland ought to be safeguarded by our provincial government for Saskatchewan people and their families who have built the industry. This is also an issue of Canadian Sovereignty.
384.	I think it would take opportunities away from younger farmers if restrictions weren't in place
385.	We think farmers should not have to compete with pension plans and. outside money to expand their operations
386.	Farmers should have the opportunity to buy farmland without competing against corporations with investment money. These investors are only interested in growing their money and couldn't give a about farming, or growing our communities.
387.	There have been many self serving articles written about the advantages of leasing land. Often a land buyer/investor was in the background of these articles. Ownership is still everything. It provides long term assurance for investments in other farming infrastructure like bins, shop, equipment.
388.	We would prefer to see the Province of Saskatchewan maintain some level of control over investors purchasing land. Saskatchewan and it's producers should be able to enjoy food security and reap the benefits of a strong and stable agricultural industry.
389.	Need affordable for our young farmers or soon there will be none.
390.	Farm land prices have doubled in the last couple of years. allowing foreign investment would only price the land higher making it unaffordable for young Sask farmers.
391.	I take pride in what I do on my land. I've seen cases of land ownership where the people who own the land sometimes don't know where it is. Don't care who rents it or what shape the land is left in or what burden it has on surrounding farmers.
392.	Our province has deep roots in agriculture and should pride ourselves on being the breadbasket of the world. How could we, as residents of this land, ensure the utmost stewardship and care for the land when the decisions of the care are placed On a boardroom table in a foreign country who's own country's concern for the environment lies near the

	<p>bottom of the value chain. Granted there are individuals who exhibit the same behaviours, but this province needs to maintain the ownership of our resources, and these resources would be best cared for by those who live(d) here for generations. The economics must be ignored when we think about the health of our land, people, and health.</p>
393.	<p>Farming is the most important thing to Saskatchewan and there is no shortage of farmers but if you sell out land to other countries or out of province people who have no intentions of farming the land or living here it will destroy every farmer in the province and will kill the dream of any future generations continuing the legacy that their fathers and grandfathers have worked so hard for.</p>
394.	<p>Whoever buys land has to do so sustainably otherwise they won't stay in business for very long. Some farmers wish to keep the land and potential gains all to themselves in the face of a free market system. It's not government's role to meddle in who owns land other than to ensure that Canadians come first.</p>
395.	<p>Do you want farmers on the land or do you want corporations that will destroy all the small towns</p> <p>destroy the rural fabric?</p> <p>I am beginning to think this is what all socialist government's want.</p> <p>no hospitals to worry about</p> <p>no roads to build</p> <p>no schools to build</p> <p>all the money goes to the cities</p>
396.	<p>If we wish to keep our young people in agriculture in this province then the regulations have to be supportive of young families starting out.</p>
397.	<p>Farmers owning the land that they farm is crucial if we want stable farms that responsibly steward the land. If we allow outside investors to own land it becomes just a commodity to them to be exploited for the maximum short term profit.</p>
398.	<p>I think that long term we are better off to leave the CPP and other large investors out of the picture when it comes to Saskatchewan land ownership.</p>
399.	<p>I disagree with the comment that ownership is less important than it used to be. That statement comes from the mindset that farm economics will never fall from the rates that we have seen the last five years. I'd like to believe that will be the case, but that is naive short sightedness and inexperience that makes those fantasy claims.</p> <p>The government doesn't need to regulate the price of land. The Saskatchewan farm economy will do that. I do strongly believe, as a middle aged farmer, that outside investment by investment funds should be discouraged. As they make it more difficult for us to expand our farm. They also extract a premium from the farm economy. And as a middle aged farmer I am also aware that this may make the value we will receive when we sell may be less, (depending on the farm economy at that time), but that's ok with me. I really don't like foreign money owning our farmland. I feel it's not in Saskatchewan's best interest.</p>
400.	<p>Farmers should be in control of the land, not some foreign owner.</p>

401.	farm land should have been considered a commodity.
402.	When outside ownership happens it is the death knell of small town Saskatchewan because large corporate farms contribute nothing to rural Sask.
403.	sask. farmers first
404.	<p>I am 26 years old, and trying to make a living grain farming. I bought my first quarter off my grandfather, I am looking to buy another at the end of the year. the land prices in this province are so inflated it sickens me. my land is in RM , where the going price for a section (640 acres) of land is in excess of 1.2 million. I ask the sask party how am I to make a living with land payments at that price? the sask party is killing the small family operated farms one by one. When I approach the old couples in my area to inquire about purchasing land they all tell me the same thing why do you want to get into farm? there is no money to be made, and you cant pay top dollar like the potash companies nor the out of country buyers. why would you take ownership away from the ones working the land I feel you guys want to make us serfs. these companies or out of country owners don't care for the land nor do guys that lease the land, people who own and live on the land are the best for the stewardship of the land, they care for it, how cant you see this? the sask party needs to look to Europe and learn how there farming operations are where the little guys are supported and encouraged. These family operated farms in sask that are 10000+ acres are not a family farm they are corporations. also I am an electrician I work 21 days straight, this job alone is over six figures. I would give it up in a heart beat to be on the land 24/7, but unfortunately I don't see this ever happening with land prices like this. I would love to hear back from a sask party,</p> <p>@live.ca</p>
405.	<p>I am third generation farmer, farmers have always been poor and never had market opportunities as they do now</p> <p>any govt regulation will distort land values</p> <p>bring them down to the historically low prices they have been at for the last 100 years</p> <p>please stop bringing cheap food to the tables of Canadians on the back of the farmers</p> <p>there is better ways to help Canadians have cheap food</p>
406.	<p>I strongly believe that the price of farmland should only reflect what the land can produce to pay for itself in a reasonable length of time, when farmed efficiently.</p> <p>I fully understand that world prices for commodities are unpredictable as are the variables of climate, which make farming always a type of gamble.</p> <p>I believe that to investors from other areas where farmland it very highly priced, land prices in Saskatchewan may look like a give away.</p> <p>I know that greed for more among some farmers is already pushing land prices to levels that remind us of the perils of the markets and weather that resulted in massive foreclosures not that many years ago.</p> <p>I also firmly believe that the joy of being a farmer closely relates to ownership and that as more and more of farm work is done by tenants or hired labour we are moving more and more toward the unrestricted no conscience type of American capitalism that closes factories in America and gets semi-slave labour to produce products in third world countries.</p>

407.	The govt is more or less killing off all small and mid size farms so it's next to impossible to get any bigger. Under wall and Harper it seems big is better. And sell off our land to whoever wants it the bigger the better.
408.	Right now for me land values near my farm are \$2,500 per acre. With the price of grain it does not make it feasible for me to purchase land at this price and expand my operation. So as a young farmer I must exit the industry and go to another business that allows growth that is affordable. A farm that owns 10,000 acres from another community will buy land near my farm or some outside business from another province. What will happen is eventually our family will leave our small community and go to Saskatoon and find opportunity elsewhere. It is not here in rural Saskatchewan.
409.	It is possible for Saskatchewan to benefit economically while still preserving traditional farmland ownership.
410.	"Bring new investment dollars into the province" Is not a whole question . Who is bringing the money in. We do not want to sell out our province So our own residence cannot make a living themselves Land Value It is not the governments job to control land value It is the market that should control land value Preserving traditional farm land ownership Is as important as economic considerations Short term economic growth does not always benefit in the long term The farmland will always be here and needs to be maintained for future generations
411.	As far as I am concerned, the farmland market is going out of control as is with the already existing level of outside investment, as well as some local farmers who are receiving outside silent investment, and as such they do not properly value their money, since it isn't their own to begin with. If you allow more outside investment it will make the market values go right out of control, and the ordinary younger farmer might as well give up, because they can't compete dollar for dollar with big investment funds. I realize that older farmers with no family to take over support a restriction free market as it will make them more money when they sell, but I really feel that the government should give precedence to the younger generation who will be contributing to the provincial economy for many years to come.
412.	tough questions to answer. We think that there needs to be a balance in managing the ownership of Sask land. On one hand we are not looking for the Sask Government to control every aspect of land ownership and on the other hand we are not looking for the Sask Government to have a wide open "any Canadian interest can own Sask land". Ultimately, Sask farm land should be owned by Sask people that have a bonifide interest in using the land sustainably to benefit Saskatchewan, Canada and the world ...in that order. If someone has a serious interest in owning Saskatchewan land they are very welcome to move to here and then buy land. We have lots of room :)
413.	I don't want foreign gov'ts owning sask farmland.
414.	some of your questions are ambiguous (to the one before it) which so many surveys are . So they can arrive at the responses they want to start with.

415.	I believe Sask farm land should be owned and operated by Sask farmers
416.	Leases must be viable for the operator of the land, or the arrangement will not work. Auctioning off leases can produce trouble for the winning bidder if economic conditions (or weather) change unpredictably.
417.	Keeping Saskatchewan farm land Canadian is important from a national perspective. Keeping other Canadians out of owning Saskatchewan farm land curtails investment dollars from entering the province, which would be a detriment to the provincial economy. Preventing all but Saskatchewan residents to own farm land plays right into the hands of those who would like to take advantage of the retiring farmers or estate executors.
418.	The idea that you are helping the actual farmer by enabling them to lease land is an absolute fallacy. If you truly believe that bring back the Land Bank. Owning equipment to farm someone else's land is owning the wrong assets. If you did a study of long term farm renters you would quickly see that things usually did not turn out well.
419.	bringing investment dollars into the province to buy up farmland just makes the next generation of young farmers pay way too much to get started. farmers reinvest pretty much everything back into the farm.....there is your investment dollars. put back the pre 2002 rules, investigate guys like my neighbour who has enough money to look like a farmer in the accounting world, but really just rents land.
420.	Communities are stronger when local people own and operate the land
421.	I think if there is a sale of land it should be purchased by the person who is going to farm it The only non farmer/ farm corporation land sale should be between family to keep the land in the family
422.	The land values are becoming way to high for young and pioneer farmers to expand or even start. The high values only benefit investors and retiring farmers.
423.	I believe that land ownership laws in Saskatchewan should be structured to minimize the perverse effects of uninformed investors and market manipulation by realtors on land prices in the province. Land in Saskatchewan is increasingly becoming a commodity that is traded for profit (rather than as an economic resource) and land values are becoming decoupled from the agricultural production capability and/or real property values that would normally dictate price. This has artificially inflated land values in my opinion and has created a "bubble" not unlike the one that drove the US housing crash. This is dangerous for Saskatchewan's economy and our farmers and landowners. We need informed, rational buyers and sellers of land, and policies that dampen land price volatility driven by speculative investment and commodity spikes.
424.	the farmland is better taken care of by the family farm, not corporate farms.
425.	As a younger farmer, it is almost impossible to compete with outside investors and investment trusts. It is great if you are looking to sell, however it makes my family farm impossible to grow with the next generation wanting in. It is time to CLAMP DOWN on foreign investment in farm land!!!!
426.	For the question of whether owning land is less important then it used to be, I feel it is even

	<p>more important. I feel this way because as time goes on, environmental risks are increasing, and input costs increase while net income stays the same. Why force more exposure to risk for a farm by encouraging more people to bid up land? You are in control of where the rural economy goes. Many towns face depopulation problems. The problems that go hand in hand with this are as follows. When there is a wild fire out of control (which happens every year), who do I see coming from mile around with water trucks and shovels? It certainly isn't investors. Who has families that maintain rural schools so my kids won't have to spend an hour plus on a bus every morning and night? It certainly isn't the investors. When it comes to donating time, money, food, in respect to first-aid responders, volunteer fire fighters, play ground upgrades, local social events, who are the ones there? Its the local farmers, and local land owners.</p> <p>There is only so much profit to be had in any one industry. Investors like profit, I know because I invest in my own farm. If you relax the rules, you force the farmers to have a higher land cost. This will force more out of the industry. Simple as that.</p>
427.	<p>It is very important to restrict access of non-Saskatchewan entities to ownership of our land. One of the tenants of our society is that people of our province should be able to own land in the place we live. Given that our land is so productive I think it very important we have the ownership of the land to preserve its value, reap its rewards for the present and for our future generations. As a farmer, owning land is more important than ever as we seen margins narrowing and more volatility in the market and weather.</p>
428.	<p>Farming is our livelihood and foreign ownership will definetly negatively impact that as well as possibly threaten the existence of it altogether</p>
429.	<p>I don't feel it is appropriate for pension funds or foreign ownership should be accepted in Saskatchewan. It is hard to prove where some of the money is coming from but it should be proved that they have had money in Saskatchewan for a length of time.</p>
430.	<p>Leased land is not secure.</p>
431.	<p>Stewardship of the land is critical to the health of the world, our country, and the agriculture industry. Respectful and beneficial stewardship comes through ownership, feeling a personal connection and commitment to the land that goes beyond economic profit....this is much more likely in maintaining the current structure and restrictions.</p>
432.	<p>Young farmers/ ranchers need assistance in being able to afford to be the new landowners/ landkeepers of the future. This is an expensive venture .If we allow out of province and foreign investment we will see family farms disappear and the pride that keeps Saskatchewan strong disappear My father once told me "If you treat the land well it will be good to you" and firmly believe this- as do my 3 sons who will one day own the land.</p>
433.	<p>Keep the big guys out to help young farmers start out and grow.</p>
434.	<p>I would extend the restriction on land ownership to non residents of Saskatchewan, including Canadians. We have seen the purchase and lease of land in our area by an Alberta company which out bid locals. Then in two years they went bankrupt but that increase in prices survived their demise.</p>
435.	<p>There is no benefit to the Ag industry by having outside investment... Ag production would be the same because the farmable land base would be the same. More Ag income would leave</p>

	the province. Farmers would find themselves involved in complex and costly lease arrangements, with less potential for profitability.
436.	Farmers can do a better job of managing land that they know they will be farming for a long time. In my area, I haven't heard of any private lease agreements that are longer than 5 years. I think it is difficult to manage land as well when you could lose it next year or in 3 or 5 years. The price of farmland is already well above what can be paid and make a decent return on investment, land value appreciation is calculated into the price people are paying for land now. From what I have seen, most farmers don't save much money, they have their land as their retirement fund. If farmers don't own their land, I think they will be put in a tough position at retirement. The biggest problem with outside investment is that for outside investors, it is a place to invest money, like the stock market , bonds or GIC's. When the investor can see a better return somewhere else, they will sell their land investment and buy stocks, bonds, ect. This will cause large swings in land value which will get farmers in trouble where they have high priced land mortgaged at the bank to finance their operation and the value drops. The farmer will be forced to come up with cash to keep his equity at the level that the bank wants it at, forcing the sale of assets at a time when the market is weak. The price of land will likely be under pressure when farming is not very profitable, this is the worst time for a farmer to lose equity because of a drop in the value of his/her land.
437.	Big corporate farms don't support community and schools. This baffles me, I farm eight quarters and some guys farm 20, 000 acres but don't buy local. Worse for environment. Greedy. Can't compete with big farmers.
438.	There is a limited amount. Do we want to become surfs, empty our rural towns
439.	much more land rented than there used to be
440.	Grain Farming is becoming a industry where the economies of scale are so large that they are becoming a barrier to entry for anyone who is not already a 2-3 generation owner. For those who farm, margins are being shrunk by every input and output buyer and seller looking to maximize their own companies financials. I agree that those companies have the right to do so as I am a proponent of the free market. However one of the few costs of production that react quickly and realistically to the Heath of the agriculture sector is the cost of farmland. Having outside ownership of farmland by those with target yields for portfolios, rather than those who see it as the realistic up and down investment that mimics the prosperity of agriculture will have negative consequences for those who wish to farm, those who rely on the agriculture industry and those Saskatchewan residents who wish to someday own land in Saskatchewan.
441.	should have outside sask(Canadian) investment in farmland to developpe specallty crops,irragation, vegatable, etc.
442.	The government needs to focus on long term sustainability and innovation in the agriculture market not short term over heating of land sale transactions. If the market is encouraged to sell off to large multinationals and investment firms there is only short term profitability and the long term economic benefits will be reaped by others.
443.	once the land is sold to out of country and out of prov corporations you will never get it back for the people who live here...do you want to see the return of the NDP land bank so we can

	control land for the farms here? If you let all the land go the gov will be the only ones who can buy it back...
444.	We dont need outside investors. Weve got enough hutterite that are driving the price up. We need young farmers and ranchers. Young people. Its going to be a huge issue in the very near future.
445.	There is no longer such a thing as a "tradition of farmland ownership." The days of the traditional family farm are gone. Today's large farming operators pride themselves on being fierce supporters of a free and open market. They oppose any restrictions on their operations. Why should there be restrictions on the sale of farmland? You can't have it both ways.
446.	In the long term I feel that the sask government will receive more tax revenue from the tradition family farm than a corporate structure (or foreign ownership)who main objective is to pay as little tax as possible and who really isn't participating in the province of Saskatchewan.
447.	Young farmers should be encouraged to own there land , not leased from pension fund owners
448.	Ownership gives power. Policies are set by those with power. Saskatchewan farmers should not end up as serfs under non-farming landlords.
449.	Land speculation and food crises have resulted in an increase in land prices that make me worried about the future of farming in Saskatchewan. As farmers are becoming older, there is a need for new entrants and with land costs as high as they are, it's difficult to imagine a young family being able to buy farmland. Renting from investors also seems dubious as lease terms would likely be shorter and the farmers themselves become at the mercy of land prices as investors may sell when prices improve, making it less likely that farmers will invest in capital infrastructure or long-term environmental plans on their farm. The ability of non-residents to own farmland in Saskatchewan puts our food system at risk of becoming too short-sighted and vulnerable.
450.	I was involved in trying to prevent changes to farmland security Act in 2002 We had an individual who lived outside of the province and was buying huge amounts of land. He never lived here hired people to run the operation for him. Have seen several different managers attempt to operate place for him, always going through hired help. No respect for the enviroment, neighbors or welfare of animals. He has now gone into receivership but continues to operate business and is not farming the land, weeds growing on alot of the land and is presently pasturing cattle for big private corp. Does nothing to benefit community or the province
451.	Very important to own farmland and keep it owned by the people who farm and care for it. Leased land is often not cared for as well as owned land because you never know if you will have it post lease. Unless you are able to sign a long term lease (>10 years) which would be very rare.
452.	When the farmers that farm the land, own the land, they have a higher potential to be more successful. Local farmers are more likely to reinvest their earnings in their communities and the province than out of province or foreign investors are.
453.	Outside investors only look out for the best return on the investment .

454. Large investment firms are drastically increasing the value of farmland in Saskatchewan which is a double edged sword. Its great for retiring farmers getting out of the business, but creates a problem for the next generation to take over. Too much uncertainty with leasing from a large investment company who is looking to maximize profits. Farming is a highly capital intensive business and if someone is unsure if they will have the land to farm in 5 years it is very difficult to make a long term business plan.

455. Investment and land purchases from outside the country would greatly increase the value of farmland - possibly 300% in a very short period of time. The land values already greatly exceed the productivity of the land.

Summarily:

- 1) commodity prices fluctuate from year to year,
- 2) production (tonnes/acre produced) has slowly increased but not enough to compensate for the fluctuations in commodity prices,
- 3) input and machinery costs have risen substantially in the past 20 years and have eroded farming profits, (there are occasional profits but they come and go with the weather and price of grain, and they are no common 'across-the-board' to all farmers at the same time)
- 4) and farm labour is a scarce commodity (expansion of farms usually demands finding qualified labour) i.e. the sophistication of modern machinery has reduced the volume of qualified farm labourers and the erosion of farm profits limits the wages that farmers can pay their hired help.

Increasing the purchase price of farmland by 300% would only magnify the problems the agricultural industry faces.

The increase in price would make land purchases unattainable for individual producers and small incorporated farms who would then be competing against much wealthier and nameless entities instead of against someone from 'down the road'.

Any future government considerations/surveys would consult these large non-farming entities and would be asking for their input on agriculture. Their opinions would certainly be skewed in any manner that brings them more money and their voice could potentially be louder and stronger than that of the actual producer.

Small and medium sized farms would disappear and the cost of new entrants into the industry would be prohibitive.

These wealthy entities have no ties/connections to the land and no stewardship responsibilities. The producers they rent to would have no compulsion to steward the land either since they are not concerned about the future fertility/viability of the land.

If land prices rise, rents would also have to increase in order for the landlord to maintain a reasonable return on their investment.

The Canada Pension Plan has complained for years that it is running out of money for the baby boomers entering retirement, yet it has enough money to purchase a big chunk of Saskatchewan and Alberta. The value of the land might increase over time, but the Pension Plan needs regular rental payments from the producers working the land in order to pay the pensioners. If the number of pensioners is increasing, the CPP would have to increase the

	<p>rent charged to farmers or sell some land.</p> <p>All of the stuff discussed in this paragraph points to a negative impact on the agricultural industry in Saskatchewan.</p> <p>Farmland ownership is nothing like owning commercial property in a town or city. The farmland is the producing organism, the lifeblood of the farm. It is a limited quantity - one cannot simply construct new farmland. Whereas a building for a commercial property is simply a house to hold the other equipment that the business uses to earn a profit.</p>
456.	<p>This sounds like the government is looking as which is the most lucrative for them and their coffers? This is NOT about the government and the best financial move for them. This is about the LOCAL PEOPLE, and what is best for them. Supporting local people and not outside investors is what will continue to drive this province. This province shouldn't be for sale.</p>
457.	<p>The more investment we have the better , driving out investors and pension funds will only make land less expensive for large farmers and Hutterite brethren which is not to say either of these are poor farmers or disrespect the land. Young farmers can come into the business with innovative methods for example expanding farm credit Canada's young farmer loans or using loan guarantees of some sort ,perhaps no capital gains tax for seller if sold to Saskatchewan resident</p>
458.	<p>Believe in fair priced land for the opportunity for the young farmers</p>
459.	<p>Farmland is the most important asset for farmers now and every future generation. Farmer Investment and ownership is integral to health in the Saskatchewan agricultures future. Future generations will only be successful if the own some of the land they farm.</p> <p>You can not achieve long term success when a pension fund or large investment firm owns the land. At some point in time they are going to sell it and that does not have to be to the farmer that is farming it. Many firms say they are not going to sell and that the lease agreement will be perpetual. In actual fact, most leases are 3 to 5 years long, after that they can sell if they so choose. This is short term ideology and will not be sustainable for future generations.</p> <p>Also rural community success is still largely based on the success of agriculture. Rural communities are not sustainable when other parties own the land farmers are living off. The land will eventually be sold to some out of the community displacing those who make the communities successful.</p>
460.	<p>You have already forced land prices up with letting non sask people by huge parcels of land and huge farm corperations. What you did is give away our rural area to the wealthy. Small to medium size farmers don't have a hope of owning or buying land or renting. Your current policies now are wrong next election in rural sask will let you know what we think of your policies</p>
461.	<p>agriculture remains a driving and constant force of our economy. it must be imperarive that farmland remain with farmers. No one returns more money into local economies than farmers. Entire communities are dependant on farmers for subsistance. If young farmers do not remain or if we cannot attract farmers, our entire rural area will collapse, and with that, economic repercussions, population loss,</p>
462.	<p>Does 'Agriculture Industry' refer to the bonafide farmer or the corporate industry that fleeces</p>

	them?
463.	Once that land is purchased by out of country investors it is out of production for a Sask based farmer. The likelihood of it being put back on the market ever, is rare.
464.	Farmland should be owned and operated by local farmers. Not by businesses or people from living in other countries.
465.	Keep foreign investors away from farm land and get back in the hands of sask farm families
466.	Some people try and tell farmers that expansion and profit are easier when leasing land, however farming and the land that goes with it require personal care to be successful. Ownership of land is one of the main motivations to produce high quality safe food. Farmers also need to have something at the end of their career to retire on, renting leaves you with nothing.
467.	Farmers are tasked with the responsibility of feeding people for a reasonable price. This cannot be done if board room profits and investor returns come into the equation. It cannot be done if the small family farm has an unfair competition level with large farm operations, as is the case today. The direction we are headed today will give you short term infusions of cash, but in the long term it may destroy this industry and drive people who make a life of it to leave it forever.
468.	Farming has always been a low return investment unless you include the capital increase in farm land
469.	<p>It is common knowledge that the trend in modern agriculture is toward consolidation- fewer farmers farming more land seeking improved efficiency and economies of size. However, there is also a strong tendency toward protection of the family farm, the rural lifestyle it supports, and the holistic values it promotes. There are many economic studies linking the health of the "family farm" to rural social and economic development. If we want to maintain healthy rural communities in SK the economic viability of the family farm is of utmost importance. Please note I use the term "family farm" to mean a farming operation, no matter how big or small, that is owned, operated, and managed by a principle owner who lives on the farm or in one of the surrounding communities. Not all employees of the farm must be family members, but the farm assets and decisions are controlled by the farmer himself rather than by investors or corporate boards (in which case the farmer may manage the assets of the farm but does not own them).</p> <p>The fundamental basis of the family farm (i.e. ownership and control over all farm assets and decisions) is what is at stake by allowing investment by non-Saskatchewan residents, pension funds, and large investment trusts. Undermining the basis of ownership of the family farm may quite conceivably expedite the process of farm consolidation in SK as smaller local farmers will be unable to compete with investment trusts, pension funds, and wealthy urban Canadians to purchase land and expand their operations.</p> <p>Of course, renting land from these pension funds and wealthy investors is always an option, but this option ENSURES that not all profits reaped from farming SK lands stay in the SK economy. More importantly, 100% of these profits do not stay with the farmer.</p> <p>Rental agreements also undercut incentives for environmentally sustainable farm management. Farmers who own their land have a very strong incentive to farm the land sustainably because their future livelihood and the future value of their land is absolutely</p>

dependent on the condition and productivity of that land. It is highly unlikely that an investor in Toronto will be as concerned with environmental stewardship as the local farmer whose future economic well-being is dependent on the health of his/her land.

To summarize, I support the restriction of farmland ownership in SK to SK residents, the continued prohibition of farmland ownership by pension funds, and a restriction of farmland ownership to no more than 10 acres for all non-Canadian citizens and investment corporations AND Canadian citizens and investment corporations permanently based outside of SK. I support these restrictions on farmland ownership in SK to promote the health of rural communities and local farm families, to prevent unfair competition for land between local farmers and extremely wealthy pension plans, investment trusts, or individually wealthy non-Canadian or Canadian citizens, and to ensure SK farmland continues to be managed in a way that is environmentally sustainable.

470. I have mixed opinions about the issue.

I work as an agronomist and consult on farms that are owned by investors (still saskatchewan-based investment dollars) and are farmed by local farmers. The situations that I have experience with, this is a beneficial arrangement for both the investor and the local farmers. As a young person that would like to be directly involved in the industry, this is a type of arrangement that has the potential to directly impact me.

I have also seen negative instances of this. Foreign money invested, and placed in-experienced operators on the land with minimal knowledge of area practices. In one case, SPCA involvement was required for the animal welfare of several hundreds of animals.

One downfall I see, is that people that were born and raised in the industry have a different level of investment in the long-term management of the farm land. They are cognizant of the lessons learned from generations prior (as related to soil conservation, no-till, rangeland management...etc.). This is one concern of mine.

On the other hand, it is also in my best interest that my father and father-in-law are able to get as much money as possible for their land, if they chose to retire and we are not able to take over the farm. I also understand that some of the proposed changes, may directly impact current large, family owned farming operations (i.e. family farm corporations and hutterite colonies). My feelings are mixed, but ultimately I think that some of the proposed changes are not in-line with the foundations of free enterprise that our country was built on. This issue strikes a lot of emotions and a great deal of mis-information surrounding the subject is clouding the issue. A better job of educating and debating this issue is required.

471. Investors outside of Saskatchewan/Canada are not farmers. They have no interest in the care of the land or community or families. Inflated land prices may be good in the short term for those who sell, but considering high inputs costs to farm and high lease rates from outside investors back to the farmers who rent cannot be sustained. Markets fluctuate and weather is unpredictable, so no guarantees. Family operation and young members should be a high consideration for farming operations and ownership.

472. It is hard to answer these questions because for one on the retiring end of things having large investment trusts and pension funds is a good thing for them. But for one trying to make ends meet to get on their feet as a young person it is next to impossible as they can not compete especially if your family does not previously farm it is even more difficult unless you were able to save up monies before getting involved. Also some of these questions simply are

	not realistic. Ensure predictability and stability of the market value of farmland is not possible if you want a job with a salary then you get one to have that stability you don't get into farming to be ensured everything will be predicted and stable. Life just is not predictable itself and no one can control that.
473.	Strongly disagree with CPP land purchases. Do not believe the current government has seriously traced or investigated some large land purchases, that is who is really behind them.
474.	Don't sell out my sask to outside or foreign entities
475.	Once we sell it to outsiders it is gone for good. Selling it to locals is extremely important. We can't be foolish enough to sell out of province!!
476.	owning and long term leases are vital to a cattle operation
477.	Relative to the rest of the world, the value of SK farmland is low. As soon as we do something as short-sighted and foolish as allow non-residents or pension funds/investment groups to buy farmland we will be selling out the future of SK residents to buy farmland for a price at which you can afford to farm, and we will move in the direction of becoming vassals in a province owned by foreign overlords. I do hope that the government is not foolish enough to permit the erosion of our independence and irreparably damage the future of SK agriculture by giving in to the pressure of those who stand on the sidelines rubbing their hands to get pieces of our province which they can exploit to their gain. BC has allowed this and now ranchers in the central interior are seeing hay land and pastureland being turned into tree production for fossil fuel credits. How can the rancher looking to expand compete with these foreign investors?
478.	We worked hard to grow our farm... We paid a fair price for the land we purchased and expect the same when we sell. If my son wanted to own a shoe store, he would have to pay a fair price for that business.... Perhaps a low interest loan for new business owners. But if he couldn't afford it or manage it to pay for itself.... Too bad. Don't buy it. Same for farmland. have a farm start program with low interest loans in place, but you can't expect people to give their land away and retire and live on inflated cost of living in the city.
479.	There need to be some stricter rules to who can and can't own land here. It is understandable that we needed to relax the rules of the past just for the sake of stimulating the local economy. There was a time when someone from the next province over was unable to buy land here to move to and farm. That means that someone from here could not sell his/her land to retire because there weren't any buyers to be found locally. In that example, the rules were too strict. Now, we've tipped the scales over to the other side. Rules are more relaxed, we have foreigners coming over here to try and farm but are making a complete mess of the land and doing more damage than good to the local economy. They are not spending the year here other than seeding-harvest, meaning their children are not attending our schools or extracurricular activities, they aren't shopping at the local grocery store or supporting any community events, which is what keeps the rural pulse of the province going. Furthermore, I can pinpoint more than a couple of different groups (from differing countries) that are right on our doorstep where they have bought land to farm it without having a clue how to - made the land into a complete disaster for weeds which are now a noxious problem to us (and costing us more money to control) and decided not to pay bills to local suppliers. How is that helping anyone here? Then there are foreigners who have bought land just to rent it out to local farmers. For the most part in our area, they have all bought land at prices

for which they cannot rent the land out at the rate of return they need in order to turn a profit. The result? They do not negotiate a lower rental rate just for the sake of at least having something out of it. Instead, they choose to let it go to weeds, forcing RMs to have to take action to control them and causing noxious weed problems for the neighbors. Plus, we are watching perfectly good land go to waste - even after one year of not being farmed or looked after, that piece of land will need at least 3-4 years before anyone can clean it up to the condition it was in before.

480. Countries where the resources are protected from foreign ownership and big commercial exploitation are on the whole better off than countries where reliance is placed on out-of-country funds resulting in a loss of Canadian ownership and benefit. There are too many examples of Canadian companies and resource industries taken over by outside money, depleted of their wealth through fraudulent activities and then left bankrupt. I like to consider Norway where they now have over six billion dollars in their oil heritage fund saved for future generations. We need to be more vigilant in this country and not give it all away for a quick buck, leaving little for future generations.

481. There is a fine line between cash and inventory valuation. High real estate values do not necessarily reflect the purpose of producing food.

Giving 9 Billion people a place to stand- may deplete enough inventory of area to limit the ability to produce enough food to feed them.

Putting the management of interest in farmland in absent interested parties hands may not be the best way to put the area to use.

Laundering numbers (money) to benefit the economy will come back to bite political will in the , and it may be too late to retain the actual producers who show an interest in producing food.

I'm told we have till 2050 to decide .

Example: There is a piece of scrap iron in the rock pile not far from here that is a mirror image of a " new and improved" seeding tool part. It came off a machine circa 1915 . A century ago the rocks were not cleaned up from the last glacial period - the part broke and was abandoned for better technologie. After generations of removing the rocks the part shows a remarkable resemblance to a seeding tool common today.

I did a measurement of the angle of the part in relation to the horizontal plane of the surface of soil-- best I could tell a century ago they goofed by about two degrees. (compared to the modern version) [A steam tractor probably proceeded at a lesser pace than modern oil powered iron ,which might explain the discrepancy] Nothing wrong with change - but consideration of the consequence might be hard to evaluate . circa 2050

In looking at the next question- value is based on a numerical figure comprising of digits arranged in sequence to reflect a means of exchange. If the money representing the value will buy less - the value actually does not change- the cash value only changes in representation., not in worth.

482. I believe outside investment if they own our farm land they will be the people who end up making the money from the land

Young farmers would just end up making a living by farming and have nothing to pass to

	<p>future generations if they aren't able to own the land or can't afford to purchase it.</p> <p>The investors are going to charge for land rent what the market will bear</p>
483.	The challenge is to provide regulations for the next generation to have an opportunity to be able to afford to buy in to the family farm .
484.	I do NOT want our provincial land owned by other countries or big corporations As I don't want to repeat history with the Futile system
485.	I believe farmland can be owned by anyone and would improve the economic outlook of the province.the land it self cannot be psychically be moved and ultimately can always be controled by the people of sask. or Canadians.
486.	The issue is food security management policy
487.	Farmland belongs in the hands of farmers, not a group of doctors in an office tower in Vancouver who have no idea what a farm really is.
488.	Foreign investment in sask farm land will kill rural sask. Foreign investors owning farm land here will only reside here long enough for the crop cycle.
489.	By restricting the land ownership it will provide a healthier environment for the primary producers to grow or expand their businesses. This has been proven method of agriculture. The large corporate farms (excluding farm corporations) have not done well as they have no primary link to physically growing the crop. They are involved as investors not producers and as Broadacre has shown it is a difference.
490.	Consideration should be also taken for "What is best for the soils of Saskatchewan". Non-resident landowner are not always the best stewards of the land and tend to be only profit motivated.
491.	Do we really want our province owned by the Chinese, Irish, Canadian government, or oil barons out of alberta? I'm proud to be from Saskatchewan and I'd like my kids to have a chance to make a living in the farming industry if they decided too. I want to see the province prosper but not at the expense of selling the backbone of the province.
492.	<p>Non-Canadians and foreign investors are still limited to 10 acres even after 2002 changes opened ownership to other Canadians. Average age of Sk Farmers is 54 yrs. It's time to open it up to more out of country farmers. Land should be seen as an investment.</p> <p>Local farmers will pay premium dollars for seed and fertilizer and chemicals but they don't want to pay a fair lease price.</p>
493.	<p>There have been many examples within the last decade of farms having to "shut down" because they lost their rented land base. All the contract language, comfort, or good faith in the world cannot guarantee that a landlord will not sell the land out from under his tenant. An "investor" has an agenda and cares not about any hardship his tenant may face when making his investment decisions. Every farm needs to have a reasonable opportunity to own a land "base" that can provide a foundation for operations. It's true that a farmer does not need to own land to farm, he just needs access to land, but he does need the stability of knowing his land base is his before taking on the risk required (operating credit, equipment, labor, etc) to farm a land base that may not secure.</p> <p>Farmers take far too much financial risk each year to not have the comfort of knowing that</p>

	part of their operation cannot be yanked away from them at any time.
494.	Some of the earlier questions appear to lead us to agree to something that has already taken place. When you say "remains" you are indicating that what has happened with cppib will remain because we "Agree ". It is our belief that farmland ownership rules revert to the 1974-2002 period.
495.	With investment groups owning the land , they do very little for the community. In this area we have people come in twice a year ,don't buy a thing locally ,and leave .
496.	I'm bothered by the use of the word "tradition" which seems to imply maintaining something just because we always did it rather than because there are apparent benefits in not changing.
497.	Farmers should be able to run their business and sell to the highest bidder when they are ready to sell.
498.	I HAVE NO OPPOSITION TO ANYONE CANADIAN OR NOT OWNING FARMLAND IF THEY MOVE TO SASK. -LIVE ON THE LAND&FARM AS ALL SASK. FARMERS DO AS IT WOULD BENIFIT SASK. A LOT MORE THAN JUST HAVING AN INVESTMENT IN FARMLAND AND NO INPUT.
499.	Plenty of farmers rent land; it should not matter who the landlord is. Ownership restrictions shrink the potential market in terms of buyers, thereby depriving land owners of some of the true value of their land. Land is not a commodity that can be picked up and moved, and foreign owners are still subject to property taxes, immigration, labor and all the other laws that locals comply with, so the only reason to restrict ownership is to buy votes from earth muffins, but you are doing it at the cost of farmers who have put their lives into their farms. Shame on you, gubbermint. What you are doing is institutionalized theft.
500.	I am wishing to retire and am simply looking after no 1
501.	if there are no local land owners, then there would be no local people living there in the rural areas.
502.	I do not agree with non-Saskatchewan residents being able to own land. I'm not in complete agreement that the Canada Pension Plan owns land in Saskatchewan either. I like the idea of there being a maximum number of acres a person or company can own (like PEI).
503.	Saskatchewan farm land should be owned by saskatchewan farmers who actually farm the land or have farmed it in the past.
504.	The present day government in Saskatchewan, those who make up the Sask. party, its predecessors and supporters, fought bitterly against the Sask. NDP and the landbank . That process was to have the crown own the land and lease it to Sask farmers. If they viewed that was so wrong, how then the present day Sask party feel land ownership by out of province or for that matter out of our country investment funds, then lease it back to large corporate farming interests be so good. Are we not then moving back to the feudal system that our for fathers and mothers left to come to Canada to create this new country.
505.	I find it odd that we look at letting investment companies come in and own land yet on the other hand we wonder why young people aren't getting into agriculture and were facing an aging farm population if most farmers go back 3 or 4 generations our ancestors emigrated to canada to have a chance to own land versus being tenants. Now here we are going back to

	<p>what we came from. The feudal system. I think we have to ask ourselves what we want rural sask to look like I don't think a few landlords with workers is what we want our communities to look like I also don't think the next generation should have to compete with some investment company to become our future farmers</p>
506.	<p>Our young people can't compete with others coming in to this province with tons of money</p>
507.	<p>We love where we live. We love the land. When you love something you take care of it and it takes care of you. By fostering this feeling in farmers in Saskatchewan we preserve and care for the land we make a living from. This is absolutely essential to preserving the land for many years to come. You can not guarantee this level of commitment from people who do not live here. Not that they are bad people, you just care for something more when it is home.</p>
508.	<p>Land is a Saskatchewan resource that should not be controlled by foreign interests.</p>
509.	<p>What is your net worth if you own nothing and just lease everything down to your shorts</p>
510.	<p>Not interested in selling any of our land in this province to outside investors, especially farmland. If you want to own land here, live and work here.</p>
511.	<p>I think we are losing a lot with the loss of the family farm. It is a way of life that is no longer practical, and to a degree this is inevitable, but it means that a growing number of SK residents don't understand where their food comes from. I also see that large farms, especially those run by corporations, seem to care less about environmental concerns. They are much more likely to level land, drain wetlands and water ways, and thereby reduce habitats for wildlife and increase the amount of water draining onto neighboring property & potentially adding to flooding issues.</p>
512.	<p>Outside ownership drains all the profit from the farm land to outside places and does not support the rural communities.</p>
513.	<p>Purchase of farmland for development in my area has had a tremendous impact on my community. All landowners in the area consider their quarters to be worth upwards of \$350,000 despite a moratorium on development. Absentee landowners do not ensure that the properties are maintained, weeds are sprayed etc. As a farmer, I feel like I am treated as a serf when it comes to renting land from these parties who have no regard for the value of my livestock, my equipment that gets damaged by hidden hazards left by previous tenants or value for my inputs.</p>
514.	<p>Rather than seeking external investments, that will just drive up land prices, it is important that we invest and develop our agricultural resources ourselves.</p> <p>Land investments do not increase agricultural output, it only drains profits from farmers with increased costs.</p>
515.	<p>I do not believe that asks land owners are being protected from non-canadian investors because canadian residents are just purchasing the land and being subsidized by non-Canadians anyways. More needs to be looked into this problem.</p>
516.	<p>Young farmers need to build there financial assets and land is the majority of it, that's why the old farts want top dollar for there land. Provides a basis of terrible financial planning as well as poor agronomics which reduce food production. It also creates a more volatile and less</p>

	supportive industry for the operators. All risk no reward.
517.	All money paid in rent to investors could be being used to build equity in purchased land
518.	I think the ownership of the land should fall under residents of Saskatchewan or other parts of Canada. Selling our land to foreign investors is a terrible idea. Farmland should be handed down to the next generation of Sask. farmers.
519.	I don't believe pension funds and investment trusts should own Saskatchewan farmland
520.	As Saskatchewan government already maintains most strict farmland ownership rule among major provinces, additional tightening may hurt Saskatchewan economy under low oil and low grain prices, which will shrinken farmland value and eventually tax revenue.
521.	As stated before investment in farmland for speculative purposes and land grabs by foreign interests is of great concern to me. Foreign interest can change the local/provincial economy by producing goods for foreign interests with foreign workers here in Saskatchewan; land ownership can be disguised by legal schemes.
522.	<p>The idea of trying to keep the value of farmland lower for farmers to buy can be very counter productive, when you keep the value lower then there asset does not grow. How can a young operator go to a bank to borrow monies to purchase more lands when the asset value he has is either static or decreasing.</p> <p>Along with this price of farmland will still be controlled by the farmers, the Investor needs the farmer to rent the land, the amount he can afford to pay in rent will be dictated by commodity price and profitability. Therefore the land value will be controlled by the amount of anticipated return, and what the farmer is willing to pay in rent.</p>
523.	I am a true believer of a free market. Anytime you try to influence a market, you distort it. Let the market dictate it self and it will balance itself out. So todote in Saskatchewan I see purchases of farmland by Canadian Chinese people, companies like Vale Potash, Cargill and Richardson Internation Grain and finally the pension fund. What's up? The current rules dont allow this, how come it was allowed? Not that I am saying I agree with the rules, as I don't but I am wondering how these companies were able to buy when they clearly don't meet the guidelines...
524.	In Saskatchewan we have seen several large corporate farms set up, often owned by Canadian companies or foreign companies with Canadian operations to get around the rules. This also includes hutterite colonies. Not only do these companies sour the market for farmland by paying more than market value, but often times these companies are not proper stewards of the land in terms of their agronomic practices. As a result, a lot of these companies have gone bankrupt or have pulled their investment entirely. The hutterite colonies that I have had experience with have proven to be unwilling to participate in the community. Yet they pay no taxes and because of their corporate structure can outbid local farm families for farmland. And you can bet that very few of their profits actually stay in Saskatchewan.
525.	Ok with Canadian ownership, prefer Saskatchewan.
526.	We don't need huge land owners and more commercial farms. Young farmers need a chance to grow and add to economic diversity.
527.	I do not want farmers to be serfs of the land as it was it Europe when they came to

	Saskatchewan. Farmers need to own their own land and have control of their work-farm enterprise as much as possible.
528.	Restrictions / regulations relating to ownership should be at level of Canadians as opposed to Saskatchewan residents
529.	I feel it is important to keep the farmland owned and managed by the individuals and families who make their living off the land. Individuals and groups who buy land just for investments and rental income will not make decisions based on what is best for the resources (soil health, water quality, forage quality, etc.) the land has. It also makes it difficult for the people leasing the land from investors to get the financing and means to purchase their own land if they wish to do so. Investment groups also create competition that is difficult for most families to financially compete with.
530.	I see a huge problem with foreign ownership right now. Allowing CPP, Canadians, and permanent residents to purchase farmland, forces me to compete with them for land which is becoming so expensive, that it is hardly feasible to grow a crop that will allow you to make a living and ever pay for the land in your lifetime. The investors do not care about anything but the few percentage points of profit that they can make in a year and nothing else. This will ruin the province, as the only way to retain wealth in the province is to keep the profits in the province. With CPP the profits go to all Canadians, and with foreign ownership, all of the profits go to China.
531.	Landowners benefiting from higher land prices from sales to out of province buyers may not reinvest the proceeds in agriculture or in other ventures in SK. Many retiring landowners or sellers of land will invest income from land sales in out of province real estate - BC, USA, Mexico etc.
532.	I'm in the position to expand and grow the farm and I'd like to do it by owning the land
533.	Don't want these pension funds and investors in here that do nothing for the community. Don't pay any local income tax.
534.	Questions are very skewed to allowing foreign ownership of land. Why don't you allow china to buy the potash in the ground for their exploitation also?
535.	<p>Land and agriculture must be owned by the people of the country and not used as a market commodity by foreign investors and speculators to enrich themselves. The neo-liberal model of commodifying everything under the sun is what has led to severe environmental degradation and the worse rich-poor economic gaps seen in many decades.</p> <p>Not surprisingly, the right wing Federal and Sask governments have cut funding on every manner of scientific research and something as simple as knowing what land is foreign owned is nearly a complete unknown. "We found no agency keeps track of this in Canada. We are the first to analyze investor ownership." (Andre Magnan, Univ of Regina http://www.country-guide.ca/2015/02/10/whos-buying-up-canadian-farmland/45783/)</p> <p>Its simply not that difficult to fund a proper provincial study for each province. The geography departments and related research institutes at each major university are well equipped to undertake such work.</p>
536.	I am close to retirement and have no one to take over the farm. I want to maximize the value of my farm by giving everyone an opportunity to purchase it.

537.	The price of farm land has increased so much that young farmers cannot afford land to expand their operations. I believe this is due to foreign investment.
538.	Outside investors who purchase large tracts of farmland inflate the price of land. While this may assist retiring farmers, it makes it very difficult for new farmers to take over farms. As the average age of Saskatchewan farmers is 54 we need to consider the long-term viability of farming as an occupation and economic driver in this province. Outside investors who don't even have a responsibility to farm the land but simply use it as an investment, should be discouraged. Please keep the strict no more than 10 acres policy you have and invest in regulating and enforcing this. Thank you for this excellent and clearly written survey!
539.	Many of these responses depend on rule changes or not. example Farm land ownership from within in the province by people living on the land they bought is a win win for the province. Local ownership, local shopping, more people. I do not know of one corporate farm or ranch that has not had the grass/dirt nearly destroyed from overgrazing or overproducing. The land is the beneficiary of the destruction and nobody is around to police it or even give a damn. If you look after your land your land will look after you- no corporations live by that motto. The examples are plentiful!
540.	I feel as a Saskatchewan culture and to improve the chances of continuing that culture and tradition of small and large farmers growing together. The existing restrictions on foreign ownership need to stay in place. One only needs to look at the lower mainland of BC housing crises to see the effects of allowing foreign dollars into play.
541.	<p>I want to be able to sell my farm to whomever I want (as long as they are Canadian residents.) I do have a problem with selling to foreigners - otherwise any rogue state could buy up all our land and compromise our food supply. However, as long as any Canadian resident anywhere in the country or any Canadian pension or investment fund owned by Canadians wants to invest in farmland, I should not be restricted who I sell it to. I want the most money for my life-long work and farmland that I've sweated over that I can get and it's not right that anyone else has a say in that (except if it's to non-residents).</p> <p>Youth seems to be worshipped these days and don't want to make a life-time commitment that all our farming ancestors made when they decided to go farming. Why should I have to take the hit for young farmers who want the easy way into farming? These so-called young farmers already have special financing plans (FCC) not available to everyone and they seem to have no problem when it comes to purchasing or leasing very, very expensive equipment. I don't see any plans in place to restrict the cost of combines or tractors for these young farmers!!!</p>
542.	look at minnesota the most beautiful state imo in usa. only residents of the state and family trusts can own land. they have a very robust land market with no outside investment what so ever. we can be the same
543.	Farmland is cared for and more productive when handled by boots on the ground producers
544.	I do not believe that foreign investors of any kind should be able to purchase farmland. It will end up like the housing market in Vancouver, affluent Asian people with no limit of money to spend will outbid the hard working families that have built this province for many years. If these investors with no limit of money to spend are allowed to buy up large tracts of land as an investment it will end up like Europe and the reason our ancestors moved here. The fuedal

	system where a few owned all the land and wealth and everyone else was a serf.
545.	I can only speak from my experience. I really don't care who I rent land from as long as I can make it work on my farm. I think any Canadian citizen should be allowed to own land in Saskatchewan but limit foreign investment.
546.	Farmland is always viewed as too expensive by buyers and too inexpensive by sellers. However, foreign buyers with huge wealth may buy at any price just because they want it. Also, we should not have to compete with our own money (pensions) to buy land. Overall, the free market generally works well but farmland is unique.
547.	Many farms in my area have thrived in the past eight years. They were able to purchase and lease land at reasonable rates and expand their operations. Many of the younger generation myself included returned home during this time to make a new life on the farm. We started families and had children. Once again the school bus routes are expanding instead of shrinking and rural saskatchewan has new life. This is due to many other factors as well but it has become clear to me that this new spark is threatened. There is less profit and harder times ahead for farmers in Saskatchewan if things continue as they are. While we must accept that not every year will be profitable and there will be hardships it is discouraging to look at the profitability of the farm and discover that the high cost of land and rent make it more profitable to sell or rent out the land than it does a to continue to farm it.
548.	The rate of return on farmland is to long for corporations, therefore always comes back on the market. Pension funds want to own for 30 years and then sell, this gives young farmers who do not have the capital to buy a chance to rent and then buy. Farmland has never been easy to buy in relative terms. Farmland always comes up for sale sooner or later, the one exception is the Hutterite Colony. A lot of farmers could not retire 10 years ago as there were not buyers now there are and they can retire. As an old friend of mine said "I finally figured out how to make money on my farm after 50 years of trying; I sold it" There is nothing wrong with the concept of "a willing buyer and a willing seller doing a deal" especially for a free enterprise system.
549.	Ownership of farm land is not as critical to successful farming operations as it may have been in the past. New forms of agriculture may emerge that put a more commercial value on the land than in the past. This may bring changes to rural communities but overall if the land is used more productively (though more efficient farming structures) it will benefit the province.
550.	The same as I said to start with.
551.	Long term farming operations need to continue to own farmland and ensuring that operations can do that on a fair and competitive basis will ensure the long term viability of our agriculture operations in Saskatchewan. If we sell off our one main asset (farmland) we will eventually lose a very important link in the value of chain of providing safe, healthy food.
552.	Farming should not be a social program, and at some point we should let the market determine land value, not public policy. It is scary though to have so much capital tied up in equipment, crop inputs and infrastructure when the owner of the real asset can just quit on you.

553.	For me, this is more of a long term Canadian food security issue than a short term land value issue. I am fine with Canadian residents or funds owning land in SK. Perhaps it should be governed but fairly loosely. What I am most concerned about is foreign entities either directly or indirectly buying Canadian/SK farmland in large tracts. Looking globally at 9 billion people by 2050, this starts to present a large threat to North American food security.
554.	Do NOT let non-Canadians own Saskatchewan farmland. Look to BC as an example of the dangers. Saskatchewan should NOT be sold to outsiders. Once an asset is sold, you lose all control and benefit of it, do you want that to happen to Saskatchewan and Canada? Do you want outsiders to control Saskatchewan and Canada whose interests and agenda is in contrast to current Saskatchewan and Canadian residents?
555.	I am strongly pro-family farm. I also disagree with out of province entities owning large blocks of Saskatchewan farmland. The Saskatchewan economy would profit by keeping Saskatchewan based money in the province. Out-of-province ownership sends money out-of-province. And restrictions on out-of-province ownership could potentially increase rural residency.
556.	I believe that farm land ownership should remain in the individuals hands not big corp or pension plans etc. Foreign ownership will eventually lead to loss of natural resources.
557.	Protect our land for our citizens. Equity is important for farmer's. This is particularly true in events that put stress on farming operations such as, climate change, world markets, input prices and transportation issues.
558.	Preserving our greatest resource for our people and our country is of most importance. No one can farm as efficiently as our own farmers who have a stake in their business and not people merely working for wages. Look to the failed investor mega farms. We must have the people that truly care and put everything on the line year in and year out in control of these resources.
559.	The greater the land base owned by absentee land owners the more money that leaves the local (and provincial) economy.
560.	Farmland is different from commercial real estate. 100,000 acres of new commercial real estate could be added tomorrow and would totally disrupt the market. 1,000,000 acres of new farmland could not be added so easily and wouldn't make much difference on the market.
561.	Pride in ownership. That is it.
562.	As a farming cattle feeding business in Alberta and Saskatchewan that has to compete to buy land it is my opinion that all Canadian residents and especially those along provincial borders see the right to grow as they see fit. In the light of changing needs by consumers to have food that is local, sustainable, natural, grass fed, antibiotic free and the list goes on the challenge for governments is larger than whom can own land but also who can be competitive. Lastly it is important to remember that when the price of land is regulated in any manner that then creates winners and losers. I believe that any large change could create a loss for sellers of the land.

563.	Investment in farmland brings extra dollars in the country and in the hands of retired farmers helping SK economy to grow. Leasing land you can change more quickly
564.	Farming in Saskatchewan is being described solely as a business and I understand that profit is the aim of all operators of farms (you cant keep losing money). However there is lifestyle and heritage and other personal factors that are in play when people decide to pursue farming as a way to make a living.
565.	Keep it Sask
566.	Ownership of land is where producers place equity traditionally that gives them the ability to overcome downturns in the production cycle. Leasing rates generally do not follow grain markets but rather land prices. Investors always wanting 5% return on land that was priced unrealistically from the start. Also lets keep the profits from farming in the hands of Saskatchewan people rather than out of province investors. Long term investors are no good for the land itself as all they are worried about is short term ROI rather than the sustainability and health of the land.
567.	I believe that ownership of Sask. farmland should be restricted to Canadian Citizens and then it is important that ownership be at the local level as much as is possible. By keeping ownership at the local level ie. farmer/operator , the local community is maintained and strengthened economically and socially. If we want to retain rural communities and rural life it is essential that there be a vibrant committed rural population. I believe that can be the situation only if there is strong local ownership of the land base.
568.	I think that farmland should only be owned by permanent Saskatchewan residents and in this way land values will tied to the income that farmers are able to make off the land.
569.	<p>We should tax the pension funds and large investment trusts differently to bring more money back to the local Rural Municipalities.</p> <p>The tradition of farmland ownership is an archaic notion that keeps Saskatchewan in the dark ages of NDP governance.</p> <p>Although I am not a fan of the Hutterite Bretheren expanding operations and farming most of the land in Saskatchewan it is not advisable to legislate against certain segments of the population's ability to own land.</p> <p>When First Nations purchase land it should be legislated that they pay the local taxes on that property to maintain roads, schools and infrastructure the same as the previous owner.</p>
570.	Can't you see what will happen. If other foreign countries come to Canada and farm the land they will not have any intention of selling grain in Canada. They will not be taxed on it because they will directly send it back to their country. Therefore Canadian residents will loose out. Grain sold in Canada will be worthless! That is if you allow Investors in!
571.	i believe farmland should be available only to canadians with restrictions (in terms of amount of acres for those outside saskatchewan.) it is a benefit for saskatchewan communities to have young farmers entering the industry. with no restrictions on our farmland the price is driven up to the point where these young people are not able to begin farming. just as many of our other resources are restrsicted so should farmland be.
572.	Owner operators have more connection to the necessity of long-term land management and 'husbandry' than corporate executives in another part of the world. The land resource, as

	with other natural resources are irreplaceable if destroyed. See the history of some ancient civilizations.
573.	<p>Once it is owned by foreign investors, it has the capability of never getting turned back into the hands of Canadians or Saskatchewanians. They can build industries in our country from the field to the fork, leaving no room for Canadians or government to cash in on the supply chain.</p> <p>ie: bring in their own labours- out goes the Saskatchewan farmer and Saskatchewan farm worker.</p> <p>ie: own the markets- they are already buying up railway companies and most likely grain elevators too in the future.</p> <p>ie: own the supply chain- then own the market!</p>
574.	Farm land is a strategic resource, more so than potash, or other minerals. We live in a developed country, preservation and growth / development of our culture and heritage is something we owe our forefathers. Norway, Saudi etc protect everything we should as well!
575.	Should go back to only residents of Saskatchewan can own farmland. And possibly only so much. Our communities would benefit from this.
576.	<p>If we sell to outside investors, land prices become too steep for Saskatchewan families to continue with farming, or for any new farmer to start up without the benefit of inheritance. We have a responsibility to feed our citizens, but not at the expense of becoming factory farms. We are farmers because we love our animals and respect their right to a good life just as we have a right. When owners who don't live on the property are motivated only by profit, they don't suffer the consequences of living day to day with animal suffering and inhumane practices. Farmers will no longer be farmers but rather factory workers. This is the antithesis of what farming and respect for the land is about. Overuse of the land will destroy it, and we will be left with nothing for our children and grandchildren to inherit. Farming is not just about making money. It is about making a healthy living, not only for the farmers but also for the community. This is our own heritage and not something to squander for the short-sighted benefits of non-farmers to be able to buy more "things." We are not really in danger of having a shortage of produce to feed people; rather people could perhaps think about eating a little less every day. It's a healthier life all around, and does more good than money does. The extra profit would not be going to the people who need it most anyway, so how would that improve our economy?</p>
577.	<p>Agriculture in this province was founded on and continues to survive on the principle of local ownership and operation at the farm level. "Big business" and "corporate farming" continues to fail economically because without local ownership the operators don't care or have incentives to be viable. We have seen already, a few large corporate operations in Saskatchewan dissolve over the last few years. Local knowledge of the land and how it is best used is lost in the "bigger is better" mantra. But local farmers who own, operate and understand their land base continue to survive. Farm sizes may continue to increase to remain viable, but the "local farmer" and his land is still needed to produce sustainable food for the world.</p>
578.	<p>Outside investment ensures land will hold its value. If restricted land values will be lower and make the value of the land too low for farmers to leverage against it for purchases as farm purchases will not go down in value. Lease is a good viable option for local farmers to farm local land and put money in the local economy even if the actual ownership of that land is by</p>

	some one or group not based in Saskatchewan. If ownership is restricted too much all our land will decrease in value and as most farmers equity is tied up in their land, the farmer or land owner will have lost their equity and retirement money.
579.	sask farmland should be owned by farmers-- or the province and leased back to farmer_ not held by foreigners-- in the 80s there were land holding companies that leased land to farmers but I believe they had a time frame to sell land back to farmers-- also pension plans, income trust companies should not EVER be able to purchase large holdings of land
580.	Farmers need friends, investors generate greed
581.	The laws should not allow non-Canadians from owning Saskatchewan farmland. Should Canadians be renting back their own resources? We would like to own more land in our area and investors own it all and we can't expand, that is not a good thing.
582.	Bring in new investment dollars ie for value added purposes NOT to take over land ownership. Hopefully owner will do what is important for land - not misuse it.
583.	this is insane. YOU CANNOT TRY AND REGULATE MARKET PRICES!!!! You are only kidding yourself. Five to ten years ago the western producer had 3-4 pages in classifieds of farmland in Saskatchewan that was for sale, and didn't sell. Now everyone and their dog is buying land. But the blame on increase in prices is outside investors???? No, it is the farmer who is buying 95% of the land. They bid up the neighbor. Don't be so short sighted that you think you can control markets. It never goes as planned. Government should do what government is supposed to do, stay out of business!!!!
584.	Like any supply-managed resource, the market benefits more given fewer restrictions on the ownership of property. Let the property owner decide what they prefer to do with their own property rather than try to satisfy some arbitrarily chosen ideological or political metric.
585.	We are willing to auction off oil leases as well as allow ownership for uranium coal and a whole other range of things without question what does farming have over these the day of 2 quarter farmer is gone and it is not the backbone of the community
586.	By letting non Canadians purchase land, will hurt our economy in the long run. They want to buy our land because it's cheap and expect I sell or make a profit off us locals or Canadians. They expect a return on investment by either when they resell it or lease it out at high value. Leasing outcast high values hurts the Ag economy by driving lease rates higher and cutting our bottom dollar return.
587.	Seeing farmland as a land transaction/investment instead of a finite and precious resource is the path to food insecurity and self destruction. We can and should control farmland for farm production.
588.	My Grandfather and five of his brothers fled a country where their land was being taken away and they became renters this is now what is happening here. Large tracts of land are being bought up by corporations and are presently trying to rent this land out to local farmers at a price that they are not prepared to pay. In the last two years these corporations thought they could run a large Corp farms out of a corporate office in Toronto or Calgary and what happened both went broke leaving a lot of small business holding the unsecured debt (check the list of creditors for Broadacre farms). Maxcrop only because it has deep pockets (probably

	<p>funded by the Government of China) is trying to farm leaving thousands of weed infested acres next to their sign "Maxcrop Friends of the Earth" I wonder if anyone has checked into how many acres Maxcrop has purchased and how many acres are left unseeded and in a deplorable weed infested state. Has anyone looked at the Farmland Security Board Comparable land sales report and seen hundreds of quarters of land purchased one day and immediately transferred to a private name the next day for the same price? What company operates this type of business to sell for what you bought it for? How many of the Buyers purchased land, came to Canada and now reside in Vancouver. As a REALTOR I have spoke to REALTORS who represented clients and they don't deny that this is happening. I have asked the Minister of Agriculture to check into this but there are thousands of transactions and only two investigators to check every transaction it will take years to do this in the mean time people have jumped the que and have entered Canada in my opinion illegally.</p>
589.	<p>Residents of Saskatchewan care more about the long term impact that farming and agriculture have on the province. Once the land is gone we have no control over how it is managed. As long as we have the land we have food.</p>
590.	<p>I disagree with the move to huge farms run by people from far away or people not living (read - connected to) the land. Protect the small farmers. Protect nature. Huge operations don't consider saving bush that is home to wildlife. My fear is we will raze the entire grain-belt and the loss will be that we also lose the beauty and diversity of our natural world. Bigger isn't better.</p>
591.	<p>I think for the strength of rural towns villages and rural tax bases the land ownership is better in hands of local farmers which support these local economies as well as schools and hospitals. Land demand is growing among farmers and more young people are showing interest in farming again. Let's support these young families and encourage them to move to rural sask and grow those areas. We cannot depend on the large cities to carry the load for the whole province. We need growth in the rural communities</p>
592.	<p>I work part time in Alberta and BC; I've seen what has happened to farming industry and land ownership when it's opened up to anyone. Corporate farms take over; investment group and irrigation districts take over and run the family farms out. In BC; new Canadian citizens (immigrants) have taken over all the old fruit orchards and taken them out to grow grapes for wine and now control all the interior BC. Saskatchewan is known for its farmers; you change that heritage on us and I'll be moving to Hawaii to farm.</p>
593.	<p>For the most part you can actually pay for farmland in Saskatchewan by farming it, there are few places in the world left where that is possible. It is extremely tough if a farmer has to compete with non-agricultural capital to purchase land. Also the ability to own the land is critical to long-term viability and stability of future generations of farmers!</p>
594.	<p>owning land is the only stable way to build equity in a farm. In my opinion it's far more important now to own land than ever before.</p>
595.	<p>I agree that there needs to be restrictions in place and that pension funds, investment trusts and non-Canadians should not be able to farmland. Even the relaxing of the rules several years ago was detrimental to rural farmland ownership.</p>
596.	<p>The best stewards of the land are family farms. Non-Saskatchewan farmland ownership should be strongly regulated and non-Canadian</p>

	<p>ownership should be eliminated.</p> <p>Pension funds and investment groups who find loopholes should be stopped from buying farmland. CPPIB, Chinese investors, etc.</p>
597.	Only farmers who want to farm the land should be able to buy the land.....and not investors
598.	The Saskatchewan Party will pay I hope if they give away our farmlands to foreign interests. The Short sighted plan to sell sask farmers out could destroy our Ag industry in 30 years or 50. Absentee ownership encourages bitterness and resentment, just study the Israeli/Palastinian region.
599.	Bringing in outside investors does nothing but raise the price of farmland to an extent that may make it unaffordable to local producers. High farm land values do not benefit saskatchewan agriculture in any way. It creates a situation where younger generations may not be able to afford to get into primary production. If they can, renting may be the only option. Being a serf and relying on investors to secure your land base puts a ceiling on profits and severely prohibits a young farmer from growing his or her operation.
600.	There's only so much land in Sask. And it should not be owned by any arm of the government or foreign investors. Farmers can't survive landowners squeezing them for more rent year after year. Because the farmers can't afford to compete with these investors for buying the land, they must rent. They can't afford to buy machinery for small acres, so they have to make better use of the machinery investment by renting because land prices will only increase if pension plans, government and foreign investors continue to compete for the available land.
601.	Stop making a small group of bureaucrats the nanny over farmland. The province provides the stability of law, order and land title security. Land for sale is worth what people are willing to pay for it. Land for rent is what farmers are willing to rent it for.
602.	<p>I think foreign ownership or ownership by pension funds and large investment trust is generally good economically, but I'm not sure its a good idea to throw open the door to market forces entirely. Put caps on the amount of land a pension fund or foreign owner can buy, but not 10 acres!! Maybe 10 sections/year.</p> <p>I suspect the romanticized idea of local farmers is a bit of a myth since to farm full-time you need almost to be an argi-business anyway (average land holding is over 600 acres), and you need to inherit a lot of land. Protecting this relatively small group of large land holders so they can expand even more is protectionist for a privileged group.</p>
603.	I think that Saskatchewan has thrived by having a lot of independent people working "for themselves". I think that it would be a terrible step back to create a system that resulted in a lot of tenant farmers (less secure, less invested in the long term health of the land), rather than owner-operators.
604.	it is important for food security reasons to ensure that land is not controlled by foreign/out of province entities.
605.	Too much of the year-to-year cycle in terms of cash and financing requirements in farming is related to owned assets, which is basically tied to farmland ownership and value.
606.	Our 'tradition' of farmland ownership is a fairly new concept if we ask our Aboriginal friends. Economic competition and access would be good for all, not just for some families and their

	descendants.
607.	I think outside investment is fine but we need to make sure that there are farmers still around to farm it. As a younger producer the risks associated with buying farmland are higher than ever at the current values. There is too much unpredictability in the weather to guarantee that the land will pay for itself.
608.	I don't think we should leave much if any room for anyone other than Saskatchewan people who can grow food for the world's growing population. With increasing concern over food sovereignty, Saskatchewan would be ridiculous to open up farmland for sale any more than it already has. By looking after Saskatchewan farmers' ability to own and manage farmland, we will look after the populations depending on our commodities for food.
609.	Ownership is important in terms of less rent. However, when rent is less than interest rates plus is more stable then it sometimes is the only option. The principles in the land bank program were actually the best of this transition world.
610.	Do we really need China buying up the land for example
611.	Farm land is taxed differently than commercial property. The tax is lower due to the expectation the land owner/ farmer is paying taxes in SK on all income off of it. With out of province investors you take that money/profit out of local communities seriously hurting the rural areas.
612.	if foreigners can own farmland why cant they own potash, oil or uranium. does there have to be 2 sets of rules one for gov and one for private sector. if gov cant manage productive value of farmland maybe they should sell of all resources???
613.	Farmland should maintain affordable and profitable for those who farm it, the costs associated with running an avg. size farm today are in the millions and involving another player in the game would only create uncertainty for farmers who are farming that land already. The real problem is on rented farmland, it maybe owned by someone who does not farm and therefore traded to an investment company and rented back to whomever is farming it. When the investment company sees profit in selling it 2 or 3 years down the road and that purchaser might rent it to a different farmer. Then who is left holding a massive investment in machinery and equipment costs???. The poor farmer that had a 3 year lease deal (which is what most farmland contracts are). If he could have afforded that land in the first place he more than likely would have bought it. The reality of it is there is too much financial risk in farming already this just adds a bigger piece to the puzzle.
614.	When governments interfere in markets it always sways the pendulum to far in any one direction
615.	Large corporate farms are not proving to be successful as shown by the Broad Acre example. Local ownership always makes for better motivation to be profitable. Farming is a hands on job and good management decisions have to be made daily...weather issues, weeds, insects and disease need to be recognized and dealt with very quickly or the bottom line suffers. When land is owned by investors the primary goal is to make a profit with or without producing a crop. When land is owned by the farmer the only way to make a profit is to produce a crop, thus feeding the world.
616.	having outside provincial investors in land does in no way help rural saskatchewan. It doesn't create more people in the rural areas to fill schools, buy at local stores or have a community.

	<p>What large land investors do is they go to the biggest farmer and asks them to rent more land. They rarely if ever go to the small or medium size producer that wouldnt mind to get another section of land or a couple of quarters more so their operation is more viable in the long run. Out of province land investors are only worried about getting paid their return, they dont care about community or the viability of the farmer that is farming it</p>
617.	<p>The romantic notion of Agriculture has run its course. Agriculture is no longer about one farmer one cow, one field. It is a business more now than ever.</p>
618.	<p>Other invetors buying land makes it unaffordable for young people to purchase land. Driving the price of land up through competition raises the land values which raise tax rates for those who farm the land and have no intetions of selling adding to the cost of farming.</p>
619.	<p>CDN institutions are ideal owners for farmland. They are long term capital sources with a much lower cost of capital than farmers. These instiutions are activley seeking domestically denominated income streams to pay pensions. They are investing in farmland globally but can't seem to penetrate Canada.</p>
620.	<p>While foreign investment might be good for the province in theory, we have seen first hand, and strongly disagree with the practice. Farmland should remain affordable for the farmers of THIS province - not investors from China or other provinces. It is important to protect the family farm - to preserve for future generations.</p>
621.	<p>Consolidation of farmland, processing of ag. products, collection and shipping of ag. products with time will lead to monopolies and have to much influence. This will drive up the cost of food stuffs, weaken our social support system and strip Provincial and Federal powers to dictate ag. policies and collect taxes. People left Europe a 100 years ago since the aristocrats, wealthy and the powerful controlled most of the ag. land, manufacturing and transportation of ag. products. Do we as a society want to return to that indebted way of farming?</p>
622.	<p>there is very little chance for young farmers to be buying land at these inflated prices unless they are willing to go far into debt.</p>
623.	<p>Would not want to see people outside of province or Canada be allowed to purchase land, nor pension plans own land in Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan residents should be the only people allowed to own land within the province. There will never be more land made!!</p>
624.	<p>Only Canadian citizens should be allowed to buy Saskatchewan farm land</p>
625.	<p>The government has a free enterprise and deregulation philosophy. Young entrepreneurial farmers desire freedom and deregulation. Why would government then interfere in the market place and prevent sellers from achieving the maximum?</p>
626.	<p>If these Chinese investors keep buying up our farm land their will be no future for all us young farmers its pretty depressing.</p>
627.	<p>You never gave an option of farmland ownership being better for care of the land and for communities.</p>
628.	<p>Think there should be more benefits and help for young/small farmers to get in By saying that I mean there should be restrictions on big corporations getting big loans for each and every kid in the family and there wife/husband Where a small farmer has to come up with cash to try buy land for the down payment</p>

629.	Farm land needs to be opened up for outside investors. Farmers need to have the option to sell land to all of Canada and investment companies.
630.	Farming will become impossible to get into for young men and women if anyone can buy. A farm cannot start from scratch when it costs 5 million to purchase. Farming needs to quit being a business and get back to being a way of life again in Saskatchewan.
631.	<p>Saskatchewan has a long history of raising excellent employees many of which were raised on the family farm. The traditional farm family is being threatened by overseas investment money who have little interest in our great province. These investors seem more interested in currency hedging and their own interests rather than what is good for our province.</p> <p>Something tells me that I would find restrictions in my ability to purchase farmland in many countries around the world as an investment.</p> <p>Farmland is a precious resource that needs to be protected for future Saskatchewan farm families</p>
632.	<p>1) The agriculture 'industry' should be separated from 'farming' . . . farming means 'good stewardship' of the land - 'industry', on the other hand, cares only about MONEY!</p> <p>2) True 'farm land' is increasingly at risk of exploitation by greedy, bottom-liners in the AG INDUSTRY, BIG OIL & GAS, POTASH, etc. - none of which produce clean (ORGANIC) and nutritious non-GMO 'food'. True 'farm land' is precious and needs to be appreciated and protected so it can continue to feed us!</p>
633.	We let outside people in to doctor, run business, outside money is investing in our potash, oil and mineral mining. But for some reason farmers work a lifetime to pass a good deal to the neighbours. Some of the big farmers take over an area, kill the economy. With nobody left to compete they buy the neighbour out cheap because there is no competition left. We might be better with 25 small foreigners buying as opposed to two big farmers in the area.
634.	Seriously concerned about converting top producing farmland to suburbs and commercial endeavours i.e. the global transportation hub!!!! a location in an existing industrial park would have made better sense. I view this as an indicator of short sighted poor land management decisions.
635.	Farmland ownership is an important caveat to farm ownership and management. Ownership allows farmers to maintain capital with which to finance a farm, and leasing is not an affordable or feasible option for those who wish to maintain and grow a farm, not only as an investment for retirement, but as a business.
636.	<p>I believe that a farmer that owns his own land is the best caretaker possible for the long term health of the land.</p> <p>I also believe it is unfair to allow RSP's to purchase land with before-tax dollars, while a farmer will be paying with after-tax dollars. Needs to be a level playing field.</p>
637.	In order to grow a economy outside money needs to flow in. The pricing around leasing or purchase should be market place driven. It allows farmers to keep up with investments of technology to ensure economical viability for their operation with extra collateral available to help with financing.
638.	Had dealings with maxcrop in our rm. It brought nothing but hard feelings to the young

	famers in the area. No one benefitted...farmed for two years went bankrupt told all the farmers that were here for generations that we were doing it all wrong....well they ate their words and have nothing but uncared for land and a mess of debt and enemies
639.	Communities suffer when people aren't living on the land.
640.	The true market signals must be allowed to be enacted. ownership should be allowed outside of Sask. but to true agriculture producers that produce... and interact with value adding that product in Canada,
641.	When the provincial requirement was lifted in 2002 it brought a lot other province investment in to help vitalize the Ag sector into what it is today
642.	how does one reconcile the advantages and disadvantages? Until the province decides the bigger picture of what they want the province to look like and be about, it is a moot point to discuss land ownership. Step back and ask what the vision is for province otherwise there will never be a solid plan for ownership. Further, it depends on the person... as someone who may have family kids enter ag keep the prices at entry level... for the investor who wants top dollar on leases and sales, increase the price. You will never satisfy all stakeholders. Just decide on where this province is going, and what you would be proud of having as a province.
643.	The primary use for ag land should be to grow food and provide public environmental benefits, not to provide maximum return for investors. The market and non market values that ag land provides are best fostered by people who have a local interest in how the land is managed. I feel that large corporate owners are more likely to destroy shelterbelts and drain sloughs. Decisions made by shareholders will be different than those made by family farms.
644.	The size of land ownership should be severely restricted to about one section,for none Sask. residents.
645.	Keep the families on the farm, corporations turn us into peasants
646.	<p>I grew up on a small family farm (1/2 Section). Later I pioneered the development of management software for the largest farm in Western Canada (90,000 acres+). I have seen from inside both environments the challenges of farm land ownership and the impact to operations.</p> <p>Farm land ownership in Saskatchewan is not just a matter of investment dollars, land pricing or tradition. It is core to two larger issues, food security and provincial sovereignty.</p> <p>Farming in Saskatchewan is key to feeding the world. Traditional farmers hold that purpose dear to their hearts, corporate farms are too heavily influenced by share value.</p> <p>Uncontrolled land ownership will permanently shift the sovereignty of the province away from the people of Saskatchewan.</p> <p>Already there is an ever riding gap in the wealth holdings between the average Canadian and the Super rich. Opening the door to outside investment will trade away future generations ability to have ownership and self determination.</p> <p>Saskatchewan people have an incredible track record for self reliance and innovation. Do we want to continue to develop this great province to serve it's people? Or do we want to become a province focused on working for someone else?</p> <p>Maintaining local ownership is a corner piece to ensuring that we are able to maintain strong</p>

	local economies.
647.	There is a higher level of stewardship on owned land or land leased from a "present" landlord. Landowners that have no personal ties or interest in the land other than from an investment perspective sometimes do not understand the "big picture" or long term benefit of decisions made.
648.	as a young farmer I support the expansion of local farmers. for a farmer to build a net worth, a farmer needs to own the land, not to lease the land. in twenty years, you can have paid as much rent as it would have cost to buy the quarter and make the payments, and you still do not own the land. I disagree with needing new investment dollars because farmland is already very highly priced compared to what you can make from it. it would also be helpful if the government had more power to enforce whatever ownership laws it sets up. the family farm is generally passed down from generation to generation, and it should stay that way as it supports individual entrepreneurship of the family members who take over the farm, or from the fellow farmers in the area who buy that farm. I want farmland to stay affordable for me and the young farmers like me that are in their twenties or just exiting high school. if we need to try and bid on land against RRSP funds that pay no tax on the land, we will not be able to compete as we are required to taxes. the current owners of farmland are very well compensated for their farmland already. the farmers future farmers in Saskatchewan would quickly become shut out of owning land in Saskatchewan and will quickly become renters. farmland does not have the same uses as other forms of real estate, and should be regulated under a policy of local ownership. pension and trust funds buying land drives up the price of said land, and makes it very difficult for individual farmers to buy more land. non-Canadians buying the land also drives up the price of land like pension and trust funds, but the main difference is that they take the money they make on our soil and put it into their economy. farmland is very important to the operation of the farm. if you are injured as a land owner, you can rent out your fields to pay for your inability to continue farming for whatever time period you are incapacitated. a renter does not have anything to fall back on if they get injured, and if they sell all of their equipment for medical care they will have a very difficult future in agriculture. the preserving of farmland ownership is as important to Saskatchewan as economic considerations because it is an economic consideration. we can leave the money in Saskatchewan to stimulate our economy or sell our land to outside corporations to do what they wish.
649.	You try to compare it to other commercial types of real estate. laws regulate our health industry, our retirement rules etc. I don't know how it fair for a retirement group to be able to buy land under different rules that I can't buy land and use my investments by. you talk a double standard.
650.	To much land in our area is being bought by out of prov. buyer that have no interest in the stewardship of the land.
651.	Farmland ownership should be available 'Only' to Canadian Citizens and those Permanent Residents who are willing to become Canadian Citizens within 5 years.. The Ownership of Farmland by Corporations, Funding Entities, or Foreigners, should not be allowed.. to allow these above entities to own, even small farms, is to allow Genetic material from Corporate Seed developers, to debase or render 'Sterile' our historic varietals of seeds.. This way they can set the future prices of food, oilseeds, and textile crops...

652.	In many cases leasing the land works well for all parties. Investors make a decent return and farmers have a stable base on which to grow the business. The more investment in the industry the better.
653.	if farmers can't afford to own their land, there will be no long term benefit to staying through tough times.
654.	There is no way for a local grain/livestock producer to compete with managed money (tax breaks/credits), or with foreign money (they will buy SK land all day with current interest rates). This farm ownership decision will dictate what rural Saskatchewan will look like in fifty years. If its decided that their should be no restrictions then that is fine, but I feel that the government should support the people living in the province who buy groceries at the local store, support the minor hockey team or volunteer on the local fire department instead.
655.	<p>Only a few generations ago our ancestors left homes around the world to come to Canada for opportunity. A big reason was for land ownership. Property ownership in their country was concentrated among wealthy absentee landlords.</p> <p>Please establish a structure that gives ownership priority to individual Canadian owner operators. Absentee corporate owners or investors will provide no value to the community, Saskatchewan or Canada.</p>
656.	Farmland should not be bought by investors, regardless of their nationality. Only farmers and farm corporations should be able to purchase farm land. Farmers are the best stewards of the land and the best at ensuring the sustainability of the land for future generations. Investors only care about making a profit and are not concerned at all about sustainability and stewardship.
657.	I feel there needs to be restrictions in place as to who can own farmland in the province, only residents of Saskatchewan should be allowed to purchase farmland. This will ensure that the market value stays at a reasonable level and that it remains possible for young farmers to operate in the province
658.	Saskatchewan was settled people who worked hard for the future of their descendants not for some greedy investors and pension plans to take control of our sask future
659.	Many of these questions could have the answer interpreted differently than I intend the answer to be. To be clear I feel that a market based price established by any participant is fine. Not many years ago the joke was would the last person to leave sask please turn out the light. Now the province and agriculture is flourishing. Why do want to turn our backs on injections of cash into our province. Also why is this questionnaire offered to non farmers or non landowners? why is farmland regulated by the province and not residential or business land in cities?
660.	I beleive any business that conducts business in Saskatchewan and keeps the majority of income and thus highly skilled workers in the province is a good thing. I beleive if you researched success of farming operation in the past you are likely to find that operations that have a higher percentage of owned land and assets are more likely to succeed. As an operation gets larger with rented land I think it will get increasingly hard to maintain lease agreements into the future, especially if there is a change in ownership of the business that is acutally performing the farming operations. If your lease agreement is with a friend or someone you get along with well they are less likely to be as accomodating to someone else

	<p>renting their land under the same terms. Lease agreements that are strictly based on the highest bidder gets the land are likely best suited to the long term profit of the leasor not the leasee therefore the long term sustainability of leased operations suffers. One of my biggest concerns with bigger operations is the continued depletion in the number of people who are raised participating with the operations. There is no doubt in my mind that farm kids have the potential to be the best farmers in the future. Farm families are somewhat of an endangered species these days. (Apply ranting to any question applicable) This way of life and all that goes with it should be protected, however I would not be in favour of making it easy enough that the risk to reward ratio was reversed.</p>
661.	Leave land to farmers - do not encourage feudal system.
662.	We need to try to protect family farms.
663.	<p>The end result of foreign ownership will be that the profits off that property will end up in a foreign country. I believe this is not in the best long term interest of the Saskatchewan economy.</p> <p>Another consequence of foreign ownership will be that farm size will greatly increase and most Saskatchewan people working on these farms will become minimum wage seasonal employees. This is not in the best interest for Saskatchewan's economy and its residents.</p>
664.	<p>Everything we buy is based on what an American farmer can buy and afford. Without on par subsidies, it doesn't make sense to keep farming in Canada regardless of restrictions and regulations. I didn't sweat, spill blood, and stress my self to an unhealthy state to have a government tell me I can't sell my land for maximum profit. Where was this government when we needed and still need a fair for farmers ag program. Not for industry, for farmers. Go to _____ if you think I have to subsidize the next generation of farmer just because they are from saskatchewan. I don't have the answers for what will happen in the future. That is for analysts that can play the economic chess game. For today though, it is about those who own the land and want to maximize their profit in retirement. Remember, not all will feel the same as I do and will sell at a lower price, be it for family, friend or love of state. But some don't have these options or desires. If government wants to step in and do something, start looking at subsidies (swear word in Canada, the only first world country not subsidizing their farmers)</p>
665.	<p>Im a young farmer working a regular job as well to try to save up to buy farmland so that I have enough land base to start farming on a more full time base. In my area land has shot upwards and almost out of reach for someone like myself who is trying to get more into farming. If I wasn't farming with my father it would be without a doubt impossible to get into farming. With non farming people investing in farmland its making the problem exponentially worse. I believe pension funds, investment trusts, and foreign investors should not be able to purchase land. The family farm in Saskatchewan is slowly starting to diminish and will continue if prices continue the way they are going</p>
666.	<p>Saskatchewan farmland is a matter of national food security. It should be owned by Canadians for Canadians. Foreigners can buy the land and not do anything with it, creating shortages in crops. It's not just about the land, but also about food production and maintaining independence from the effects of global trade. Saskatchewan should preserve its heritage as a breadbasket to the world and encourage value added processes to increase provincial GDP.</p>

667.	if the government allows any more foreign or out of province or non farming ownership it will totally destroy the farming communities and eventually the whole province .when a Saskatchewan farmer buys land the money raised off the land stays in the community and the province and helps our local economy grow . if foreign or out of province or pension funds own land in the province the money raised from the land leaves the province therefore hurting the local economy .
668.	Due to the rapid inflation of costs for crop inputs and field equipment machinery, the need is paramount that the value of farmland under operations is competitive with neighboring Provinces and States to insure a level and fair financial field is witnessed.
669.	We can agree that Saskatchewan needs to have rules around foreign ownership, and that Saskatchewan needs to be competitive with our neighboring provinces. We do need to be open mind to allowing new financing methods to allow the next generation of farmers to grow and control their own destiny.
670.	I believe that only local farmers should own farm land, not corporations, not pension funds, not foreign investors. If land values go too high "like they have" local family farms cannot afford to pass the land on to future generations thus leaving it open for corporate farms and pushing the family farms out of the picture eventually modeling farming after the feudal system but replacing the monarch with corporations.
671.	I do not believe the government understand what has happened to other industries regarding foreign land owners and non Canadians. These investors do not understand agriculture, they are looking only at investments. The Saskatchewan government should take a look a what has happened to other industries. Many foreign investors are just trying to "hide stolen money" and many are from China. In places like British Columbia, people cannot afford housing since foreign investors purchase land and leave it bare and not used. People have purchased farmland only to bring in foreign and mistreat those they bring in and often revenue is not maintained in Canada.
672.	<p>We live in a global society, land ownership is no longer tied to the "tribe", farmers whom cannot afford to buy land at their current prices will be no more helped by keeping the land within the tribe, or as you put it, in this survey "preserving the tradition" than they would be by foreign owners buying land and leasing to them.</p> <p>In my opinion, farmers leasing lands and or share cropping with land owners take less risk and create a higher yield and income for themselves.</p> <p>Our study and reference to income in Saskatchewan provides evidence to support this theory.</p>
673.	I was born and raised on a Saskatchewan farm, although I now reside outside of the province. Farming is a way of life, not just an economic pastime. It should be strongly linked to family and community life. That requires a policy approach shaped by many things, but not by viewing land as a commodity like steel ingots, to be bought and sold at the highest possible price. That policy should aim to maximize the number of people who live and work on the land and its associated communities. That policy must also be developed in consultation with Aboriginal peoples.
674.	We see farmers being hired to custom farm the land and all the grain is directly shipped to port and to foreign lands. What about security for our children in the future. Norway owns all their resources and all the citizens are well looked after. Our govt is extremely short sighted.

	Why was our potash sold off?? We need to look to the best for everyone not just a few.
675.	Preserving the "tradition of farmland ownership" is an important economic consideration. Continuing and accelerating divestiture of our farmland to outside interests will have serious negative economic consequences. Our agriculture industry does not need to attract further inflationary and concentrating investment by outside interests. The necessary capacity exists through savings, equity and conventional financing to continue an orderly generational transfer of farmland.
676.	I think farmland ownership should be restricted to Sask residents just like the restrictions in North Dakota limits their ownership to North Dakota residents and I think it work well for them. We rent land from both HCI and CPPIB and find that at times their expectations are unreasonable. I feel that if you are going to own land as a investment here you should live here and contribute to the economy of this province with one caveat that if it is land owned by family that used to farm it that should be allowed no matter where they live.
677.	the next generations of actual producers will never be able to start farming with extremely high prices .investors do not know how to farm and it is not economically feasible to pay the rents they require to get high returns on investment.
678.	Farmland ownership by local farmers ensures the best long term stewardship of the land and the best viability of rural communities. The market price of land is not the only factor to drive local economies. You need people living in the the community as well.
679.	My Great Great Grandfather & 7 brothers left a rock pile in Ireland in 1820 to come to NBrunswick to OWN land. Grandfather went to Stockton MB to OWN land in 1880s. He was late - got sand. In 1906 came to Milden SK to OWN good clay land. The long term benefit in farming is owning enough land to provide the core of the operation. Big corporate farms controlled by greedy supposed land barons never works - but upsets the market as they do there thing e.g One Earth, Broadcaces.
680.	Some of the older farmers in the area that lease land are not looking out for the future generation. They are just trying to maximize profit for the next years or two with no concern for the next farmer who will lease the land after them(rotation and disease control) . If they owned the land they would look at it differently because it would reflect on their farmland sale value.
681.	outside investors only care about their own pocketbook, they don't care about properly caring for land for future generations.
682.	There needs to be demand from outside the province when times are tough to provide a market for those farmers needing to exit.
683.	Saskatchewan people are here part of our communities and want to have the opportunity to earn a living. Corporate and arms length ownership does not support communities, farms or people. These other types of ownership could skew farmland values to be based on factors other than productive capacity such as speculation.
684.	Farmland should be highly regulated and stay in the hands of Saskatchewan residents. I currently have 3 landlords I rent land from. They are all out of province to me it seems I'm sending money to other provinces. There is no net benefit to Saskatchewan to money is

	helping the economies of other provinces. At the minimum we should implement a system like PEI where out of province land owners pay double the property taxes
685.	I don't believe in government controlling prices on any land or real estate. Let market factors decide. If you are going to set prices on farmland for the younger farmers whom want to buy then you must also control housing prices .
686.	Agricultural land in Saskatchewan is a precious resource, and should be owned and operated by the people of this province. The most efficient operators are owners with a vested interest. We are the best land stewards, the most innovative and productive farmers in the world. Let us keep it that way. The profits generated through the agriculture industry are kept in the province, when the farms are owned and operated by Saskatchewan residents. Profits generated by large corporations are shared amongst shareholders who may not be Saskatchewan or Canadian residents if land ownership rules are not restricted.
687.	Land should be recognized for its long-term value as a resource for cultivation and grazing that feed the world. Farm land should not be marketed as a commodity.
688.	Land investments opportunities should be available for Canadian Citizens
689.	no comment.
690.	People that don't live here will only care about profits, not about the land and the people.
691.	We do not need investment groups and foreigners owning our land for investment purposes. If foreigners want to buy and farm the land that is okay
692.	Farmland needs to stay with Canadians and not with foreign investors
693.	land is no longer affordable because a new canadian citizen is buying land with out of country money
694.	Farmland is a resource that should stay in Canadian hands for the benefit of Canadians
695.	Saskatchewan was built by farming family's and communities. With continually rising prices it's becoming increasingly difficult for the younger generation, whom are the descendants of those farmers who helped build our province, to purchase land and continue the family tradition of farming. We should want to support the Saskatchewan citizens in their endeavours, instead of encouraging foreign investment groups to buy the land.
696.	If farming was more affordable then there would be more farming. Who has Millions of dollars to start a farm. Seems the only farmers are ones who had the farms for generations. How can someone start a farm today? It's virtually impossible without having a million dollars in the bank. Then the return on the investment is non existent. Unless you already have an established farm from when it was affordable.
697.	People owning the farmland who are not familiar with our country or region may not possess the knowledge or skill to maintain the land properly. The land may be rented out or farmed by people brand new to the region. This could be a severe detriment to the land that they are specifically farming as well as to the land surrounding it. Once the land is harmed it is very difficult to restore it. Cost of fixing the problem would be greater than what the province would bring in from selling the land.
698.	Maintain the ability of young farmers to purchase land and not get into a bind like happened

	in the 80s, as happened to their parents grandparents.
699.	<p>Answer:</p> <p>The farmland in Saskatchewan is a resource that is limited in amount and is a way for the Saskatchewan residents to generate income and maintain control of their resource and possibly make more at home decisions about what is most important to the people of Saskatchewan. It is an interesting fact that the recent oil spill in Alberta is an example of a Canadian company owned by an outsider, in this case China as indicated in the press.</p> <p>I used to prepare questions for research questionnaires and the structure of these questions are set up to be difficult to understand. With such an important issue as land ownership, if the question is open ended there is a need to respond to that question before moving on. I am saddened that with such a fundamental and crucial issue as this that this questionnaire is what will determine our future.</p>
700.	Huge corporations put a false long term value on a volatile industry that could hamper sustainability of affordable food production for both ends.
701.	<p>The main problem with farm land ownership these days is that many of the so called "Canadian owned companies" are only a front for foreign owners. This has to be policed.</p> <p>Farm land values no longer reflect the productive value of the land but rather an artificially high value based on the potential for profit from continually increasing value.</p>
702.	Owning land gives farmers security and backup during bad years. Without something to fall back on many farms would go bankrupt without government assistance with only a couple bad crops or weather events in a row. So if farms start to own less land in the future the industry and food supply chain will suffer during rough times. Which will happen as history will repeat itself.
703.	I am a third generation farmer. I would like to expand my current operation without having to compete with investors that are interested in a return on investment. I would also like a chance to buy land so I may continue to raise my family in the community I grew up in without having to compete with pension funds that are also only looking for a return on investment. For me, this isn't an opportunity to make a few dollars while I play with market values. It's a way of life. Investors that do not have ties to the community do not increase anything but the current value of land. We need families to stay in agriculture so that future generations know how to feed the world.
704.	When you own something you will be more apt to look after it and care for it for future generations. when leasing you are just using and taking what you need...not caring to make the land better for future generations. smaller farm ownership is the best. sure, if someone needs some extra pasture to rent, they look after it but crop farming leased land is just chemical and more chemical...
705.	There is no opportunity for young farmers when land is being sold to investment companies by the previous generation of farming. The only real value u have at the end of your farming career is the value of the land itself.
706.	We are running out of ranchers especially I think farming can be done with less as to bigger tractors g p s but so far no bigger horses or more hours in a day at calving on our ranch and good luck getting a hired hand to get the work required for a ranch hand ask a farmer who

	used to have cattle what they think. Or better yet feel free to come out any time you want to our place to lounge around with us, and we are small in today's version of ranches. Just send me info and will give directions.
707.	I am not opposed to new comers to Saskatchewan, but in the area of farm land ownership I like to see the people actually living here in Saskatchewan, being a part of our rural fabric.
708.	Absentee landlords aren't committed to caring for the land like someone who is invested and living on it.
709.	I think any political party that doesn't recognize the deep belief of Saskatchewan residents to their right to the lands has not grasped the mood of the province. The future of the province should be determined by those that poured their lives, sweat and blood into the land. Those that built this province, rather than those who arrived much later with fat wallets.
710.	The farmland is Canadian and Canadians should be the ones benefiting from it.
711.	Some of the questions are very poorly worded and require clarification and discussion in Orders to be properly answered
712.	The focus MUST be on what benefits Sk farmers who want to own land, that way land buyers are forced to live here and put their money where there mouth is
713.	Foreign investors do not have the same level of concern for Saskatchewan agriculture stability.
714.	We have a rich farming history. More than that, I believe it is more advantageous when farmers own at least a large portion of the land they farm. It lends value and respect to a resource that is theirs to keep in good condition if they wish to make a profit from it. This is less often the case with leased land. Also with out of province ownership comes lack of care for land not leased. This leads to maintenance costs for surrounding farms due to a lack of diligence on the part of the owner of the offending property for they are not immediately available to see the effects of lack of care for their property. I myself am interested in one day owning farmland here. The market for farmland is too high for young people like myself to buy in. This cannot always continue as such, the current farmers are aging, many with children uninterested in pursuing farming. By allowing even out of province purchase of land it inflates land prices further to the point where no one can even afford to lease the land, let alone purchase.
715.	Farmland is land you produce and grow something it has a productive value where commercial land is used mainly for construction of physical assets
716.	do NOT sell off our greatest resource, our land, to foreign investors!! Saskatchewan is prosperous because of our ability to self sustain, if we lose our land to foreign investors, we will lose our power to produce grain, and the economy will be in trouble. Plus, our beautiful province is based on tradition, keep our local farmers doing the work and carrying on the legacy of our agricultural province!!
717.	The market should set farmland prices
718.	The more land that is owned by large investors drives prices up for smaller farmers who may not have the funds available to purchase more high priced land. Investors are driving land and rent prices higher than many farmers can afford.

719.	I think it is important to have a balance between the amount of investment coming from outside the province, and to maintain affordability for farmers within the province. In order for our local farmers to make a living, we have to ensure that they can expand and grow their operations. Often local farmers are more likely to look after the land because they live in the province.
720.	The Government should take steps to give farmers (individuals) opportunities to prosper and grow their business. Non-resident investment means more focus on monetary gain, and less importance on whole picture rights and responsibilities of citizens and our society.
721.	Canada's economy is based largely on raw materials, if we allow foreign entities to purchase land our gain is far shorter than the long term loss of sales and revenue. Local ownership builds up local economy.
722.	When the investment groups started to purchase land in approx. 2006 or 2007 it resulted in a lot of young farmers being able to rent land that was not available to them prior. In my experience selling land to investment groups they have never been involved in driving land prices up. They had their returns they wanted to achieve and would not make any exceptions. I feel they provide a good option for some farmers wishing to remain farming for a few years but need some capital. I have never been involved in a sale where an investor was involved in a bidding war over a piece of land.
723.	We need to have our farmland owned by SK residents who will have an interest in our province, raise families in the rural areas.
724.	I'm in favor of anyone from anywhere who wants to come to Canada and use land to produce food for the Canadian food system as a Canadian citizen. Who owns the land also controls its use and we do not want to as a society lose control of our ability to feed ourselves and participate in the growing need to feed the world.
725.	farming would boom if we opened up to anyone in the world who wanted to own land or farm.
726.	Prefer to keep ownership Canadian
727.	The fact that non resident and particular foreign ownership has no other ties means a lack of stewardship of this resource and we already seen wrecks and resource damage by their actions or lack thereof. It is like letting shell drill oil wells with no restrictions. Land stewardship trumps economics in the short term and all other considerations. We seem to forget we had land surveys in the past to which we pay no heed and let other things like perception driven economics cloud our response in activities. Our present municipal assessment system of farmland is an example.
728.	i see no reason how this would help young farmers to buy land if the rules change. are we actually living in a world where we feel Canadian because we use Canadian money at walmart. is it not what ww11 was all about living space to the east of germany. this is canada because it has Canadian soil. i would hate to lose ww11 without even a fight. yes its an exaturation to make a piont.
729.	Outside investors make a one time investment in the province then siphon all of the future revenues out of the province/country with no involvement in the community or province itself.

	<p>Farmland is a finite resource. If we let the rest of the world take ownership/control of it there will be nothing left for the residents of the province. We will be nothing more than serfs to absentee landlords.</p> <p>A strong farm industry depends on ownership of land. Large farmers who have tried to operate on mainly leased land have failed, leaving long lists of creditors ie Broadacres. Without equity in your farmland your farm has no strength to withstand the ups and downs of already turbulent world markets.</p> <p>If we want strong communities and a family oriented province we need to ensure Saskatchewan residents own and control the land for the future generations of the province.</p>
730.	Please keep farmland in farmers' hands.
731.	<p>when supporting local farmers it should be the young small farmer!!! I can not figure out why the huge corporate farms get more tax breaks from the government than the smaller farmer. He already gets all his inputs at a lower cost. I paid more income tax this year on my 3400 acre farm than two huge corporate farms together????? If the support ends up in the hands of these corporations then we might as well sell to the highest bidder Canadian or not. Corporate farms don't need any government help.</p>
732.	<p>Although my wife and I have now spend 17+ years living outside Saskatchewan, we still consider it home and although we may never intend to move back to Saskatchewan, we want to continue to invest in Saskatchewan through the purchase of farmland. Not only would it be a sound business decision but also strengthens our ties to the province and the farming background that we both grew up in.</p>
733.	as I said before family farms will be better in the long run
734.	Land prices would be stronger if we let foreign investment to purchase farm land in Saskatchewan.
735.	Saskatchewan farms should be owned by Canadian citizens not foreign investors
736.	n/a
737.	<p>Do we want to go back to the serfs and peasants? where the land is all owned by the rich and the farmers remain peasants. How does a farmer get operating capital in place from a lender if he has no ownership in land? Are they going to give operating credit based on wore out depreciated farm equipment? Highly unlikely. The CPP should be forced to divest the land it purchased as if that was an individual that purchased it illegally he would be forced to sell i bet. How does a farmer compete with a pension fund with billions of dollars to play with? Isn't that communism when the state owns all the land and the people become puppets on a string?</p>
738.	<p>I think we should think about the present and future. farmland ownership is a very important economic decision and should not be based on emotions related to tradition. Our farming industry must remain globally competitive and opening it up in the right way is critical to ensure that the right resources, knowledge and other factors are invested to insure its global competitiveness.</p>
739.	<p>I believe Saskatchewan farm land should be owned by Saskatchewan residents. If they want to lease it to whom ever, go ahead. I don't want another country owning our farm land.</p>

740.	Farmland is a normal commodity that has no monopolized market and should be traded in a capitalistic way.
741.	Saskatchewan should not open it's farmland for foreign ownership in any regard. Other jurisdictions do not allow foreign ownership and for good reason. Owner should be the farmers, not speculating investors. Note: These questions are worded funny. Almost as if the desired result is to increase foreign ownership of farmland.
742.	I support agricultural industry in Sask. Landownership should be open to all PROVEN CANADIANS NOT TO FORGIEN OWNERSHIP or to companies that are on the stock market.
743.	I do not want to see the situation like in Argentina where the land owners all live in the city living off the rent collected from farmers. This would be a bad reversal back to the land lord/peasant farmer situation that happened in parts of Europe and led thousands of people to leave for Canada and the USA.
744.	So much for our current government being open for business when it comes to farm land ownership. I can tell by the questions the government wants to maintain the status quo.
745.	we don't need doctor's from Toronto or investor's from China owning land in Saskatchewan
746.	Ownership of farmland by foreign investors or pension funds does nothing to benefit farmers except the farmer selling the land. They drive up prices simply because they can. They don't have to rely on the land to live off of or feed their families. They are using someone else's money and simply hope for land prices to increase more so they can dump it and make a profit. They cause rental rates to increase as well as they are wanting a return on their investment. The farmers who try and rent from these operations have no guarantee year to year if they will have the land as it's "highest bid gets it" attitude. Making it extremely difficult to plan cropping rotations etc.
747.	I don't believe that big corporation or investment companies should be able to purchase large tracts of land in Sask. I believe we need to have land available for young farmers who want to expand but can't compete with these large companies. I think there should be a limit on the number of acres any one farmer should be able to own.
748.	I think stewards of the land should be the "hands on" owners not investors that may not care whether the land is properly preserved.
749.	It is not about farmland values and bringing outside money into the province. It is about maintaining and sustaining our small rural communities. We want to see the little villages of St. Benedict, Middle Lake, Pilger etc. We want our province of Saskatchewan to be peppered with small thriving communities that centre around the farming communities. That is our history and we want this to be here for generations to come. It is our responsibility to continue to use the land within our province as the gift from God that it was meant as. Pension plans and large corporations do not add to communities. Keep and support the individual farmer and their families. It reduces crime and social dependence. It provides work for entire families.
750.	Any type of foreign ownership lessens the availability of land to Canadians, land is a limited

	resource.
751.	I think that land in SK should belong to the people who live here, otherwise we will be tenants in our own home.
752.	Numbered companies, with Chinese owners, have been purchasing land in Saskatchewan for years (ask for MaxCrop information). As this continues, there will be no need for marketing boards for agricultural output, as the owners from foreign countries will sell the Saskatchewan agricultural output to their own countries directly.
753.	I'm a young guy. The price has been driven high in our area just due to the neighbors competing for it. If Pension funds and foreign investors are thrown into that mix my dream of continuing and building the family farm are not able to be reached with the size of investment that would be needed.
754.	Farmland should be owned by Saskatchewan farmers and not by pension plans, big corporations or foreign investors. For example, Canada Pension Plan bought land and then ripped out 5 miles of shelter belt. This belt provided shelter and homes for wildlife, as well as helped prevent soil erosion in summer and traps snow in winter.
755.	I'm a young farmer. If these investment people come and purchase farmland for inflated prices how am I going to make a go of it when I can't afford to purchase the land or even the rent there asking
756.	In order for an industry to continue to grow the economic benefits from that industry should be reinvested in that industry and not skimmed off to investment groups.
757.	It is what has kept agriculture going through the years and it is the only thing that will allow it to remain that way.
758.	Saskatchewan land should be owned and farmed by hard working Saskatchewan farmers, not by foreign investors or Canadian investors. Land values have tripled since these ppl have started buying up huge amounts of land. Good luck pronouncing the names on the RM map.
759.	Non-residents operating farmland have an interest in the property that can easily become at odds with the interests of the province and its residents as a whole. Farmland differs from other real estate both in its scale and purpose - unlike typical real estate, farmland makes up a substantial portion of the province as a thing; the land IS the province. Unlike rights to minerals, farmland is the land. How could, for example, the government of Saskatchewan force foreign ownership to farm land in a year with low crop prices that would create a deficit situation for the company or a year in which a companies other foreign holdings could produce greater earnings for the same input? Particularly, if the company is a limited liability with shareholders, the managements would be caught between the interests of the province in which they do not reside and the legal interests of their ownership. Regardless of the economic impact on Saskatchewan, such a situation must be avoided at all cost.
760.	as a farmer I take all the risk in growing crops. i should also benefit when it comes time to sell my land.
761.	Not sure of restrictions on real estate

762.	Owning, occupying, and reaping a living on farmland has become critical for farmers and their families in our era of resource extraction, raping the soil of nutrients, polluting air and water, and contributing more than our share to global warming and climate change! The persons who own their land, live on it, and make their living from it are guaranteed to be good stewards as their future and the future of their families depends on it.
763.	our land prices are largely determined by economic return of said land not but increased investor interest.
764.	International investors are not welcome to buy Saskatchewan farmland. They only run up land prices and run farmers off their land. The rules should not be relaxed.
765.	Really want people attached to the land being farmed so we have people in our communities.
766.	Who do you think the sask government should be looking after? I believe it should be the Saskatchewan residents who live on and work the land. Money that Saskatchewan farmers make stays right here. The same can't be said for out of province or foreign investment.
767.	local farmers and young farmers wanting to expand cannot because of large tracts owned by out of province owners and locally managed. These out of province owners do not contribute in any way to life style enhancemnets or longevity to the rural communities. When asked for local donations , their answer is most often NO
768.	I believe you should live in sask ,work in sask,kids go to school in the local towns or city in sask support local buisnesses in sask .
769.	If the goal is to keep small communities going you need to have restrictions on farmland owner ship
770.	If people in the business of agriculture are EXPECTED to MAKE A LIVING in agriculture then we need restrictions on who can purchase agricultural land. The people driving land prices up have never had to depend on rain for their income, but they sure have enjoyed CHEAP food for decades at the expense of the farmers! If you continue to let foreigners (and yes I mean out-of-province people) buy up Saskatchewan land, they drive the prices up so that REAL Saskatchewan farmers cannot compete. Other provinces have let too many non-ag people/corporations etc. buy up their land. Selling land to non Saskatchewan farmers takes that land OUT OF PRODUCTION to the current SK. Landowners. We've been operating on a shoestring for too many years, and in many many cases have had to have a 2nd income job to meet expenses. How many of the non-SK people trying to buy land in SK can accurately claim this! We've had over a decade of poor prices to recover from. We've had an influx of people who think Saskatchewan land can produce like BC and Alberta land, with no ideas of climate or soil conservation. They fail miserably, then sell to the next non-SK person with the same big ideas. The government needs to have foresight in what will happen to SK farmers if this keeps happening. Compare it to letting foreigners (say Chinese) buying up all the down towns of all the cities. Or for that matter... what if they bought up a 50 mile radius around the major cities...What do you think is going to happen!
771.	New Investment dollars into Ag? That's a temporary fix! Agriculture has been the root of money in SK. What other industry spends in every other industry? Agriculture is the only one. No other industry supports EVERY OTHER INDUSTRY. Selling off SK lands means disaster for SK farmers. Already too much land is being owned by NON-RESIDENTS. An influx of money by

	<p>way of selling SK lands is a temporary fix that Sask. will never recover from. The government should have foresight and put the control of the land in the EXPERTS...the SK farmers themselves. Not CPP or any other investment outfits, and not even non-residential farmers. Do not sell off SK.!</p>
772.	no comment
773.	<p>There are a lot of x-farmers who couldn't afford the value of farmland in the past, and the province lost many of them. No one seemed to care about that, so why should we worry about protecting the ones that help drive us smaller farms out of business. People that have land to sell for retirement need more than the two or three farm families in each community to sell to!</p>
774.	<p>When the land is owned it is better protected better controlled and better used meaning when you own the land it is personal there is pride and family. When it's owed or leased by a commercial group ect it becomes all about big profit with little to no importance put on wild life or the land. Land should be treated as a non renewable resource as once you damage the lands from over use or removing trees and trenching it's gone for a long time. THERE SHOULD BE MORE REGULATIONS PUT IN PLACE FOR BOTH FARMERS AND COMMERCIAL ON REMOVING BUSH, DRAINAGE, AND TRENCHING OR LEVELING LANDS.</p>
775.	<p>outside investment money would mainly go to retiring farmers. Retired farmers don't invest in ag infrastructure -active/younger farmers do. The notion that outside investment in land would benefit anybody other than a few retirees seems wrong. Our ancestors immigrated here because they didn't have the ability to own their land. It's very difficult for real farmers to own their land now, any loosening of rules will make it impossible. The land is our country-allowing foreign and large investment to own it is wrong.</p>
776.	<p>I believe in a free market however that looks and I don't like government interference in markets because that never seems to work out for the better. Markets will regulate themselves and don't need government regulation. That being said, something just feels wrong about farmland in Canada owned by Chinese Nationals or by members of the Russian mob or by large pension plans or investment firms. I guess it's just easier to give my money to a retired farmer or farming family that understands what farmers go through than someone who has never farmed who looks at renting land just to squeeze the last cent from their tennant farmer. It also seems easier to compete with other farmers to buy land than with huge multinational corporations with big and really deep pockets.</p>
777.	<p>what is the difference if a pension fund owns the land or huge private investor??? the value of the land is going to reflect how much someone would be willing to pay to rent/farm the land and still make money</p>
778.	<p>If the Saskatchewan government were to allow foreign persons or entities to purchase farmland in the province, it would be detrimental to the smaller farmers in the province. If pension plans and investment trusts were to be allowed to buy large amounts of land, it would drive up land prices even higher and make it nigh on impossible for me to start farming or for my father to expand our small family farm. By allowing foreign nationals or non-Canadian corporations to own farmland in Saskatchewan, it would not only drive up land prices and make farming a harder and less attractive industry to get into, but it would also take money away from the local economy.</p>

779.	A higher amount of land is leased today because of the cost of land. This drives the smaller farmers out of business. These same people do not want to let go of it so they rent it out.
780.	To let non Canadians own land is equivalent to giving up sovereignty of our great nation; in other words invasion by the most evil army; money. Shame on anyone who ever allow this. Our forefathers bled and died to keep this country whole. Do not let GREED of a few persons destroy this great NATION. As for pension funds and investment companies, this is WRONG! Who benefits from their 'economic investment?' They do!! They will pillage the land to gain more and more PROFIT! Do they care about sustainability? Environmental impact ? Of course not! Their bottom line is ALL that matters.
781.	large corporate megafarms destroy the community they are in there are no farmers just landowners and employees
782.	We have seen operations from other provinces come to Saskatchewan, the prices for rent and ownership have increased. But then these operations cease or go into receivership because they do not understand the farming methods used here and the risks due to weather. One good example is Broadacres. Have seen other individuals with no farming background move in and quit farming after a year or 2. Then try to sell the land or lease at a high rate. Some of this land is only growing weeds, because the price and rental rates exceed the ability to make a profit
783.	I can understand that foreign investment can be positive in the sense that it could create economic stimulation and encourage other foreign investment in value added processes that ultimately could create jobs. However, I think a more likely scenario is that foreign ownership will prevent value added processes from being encouraged in Saskatchewan as the foreign affiliate would rather take resources from Saskatchewan and add the value in their own jurisdiction which would ultimately hurt the Saskatchewan economy in the terms of resource management and economic growth in the long term and it would create a situation of less control over our own resources in the long term. This is a very slippery slope and the short term may look greener but over the long term foreign investment means loss of resources and loss of control. Currently the rules are being circumvented anyway and the loopholes need to be enforced. There is foreign investment that is offside right now but little or nothing to my knowledge is being done to rectify these issues.
784.	Farmland should be left for farmers to own. Currently farmland is unaffordable for many family farms, due to outside interest (this province should not be sold off).
785.	Some of the questions above do not fully provide a comprehensive erudition of the reasoning necessary to determine best policies or practice. It is so imperative that the Family Farm is maintained and nurtured because this is the heart, soul and lifeblood of agriculture. The worst thing that can happen to our food supply is to have food production strictly operated on a bottom line basis. While profitability is crucial to successful farming, it cannot be sustainable using conventional farming practices that is destroying the nutritional value and life energy of our food. Furthermore, the strength and vitality of any nation is dependent on it's grassroots people owning the land, for they are the best stewards of the land, & ultimately, of the nation's society. A nation's true freedom and prosperity is deeply rooted in the ownership,

stewardship and preservation of it's nonrenewable land resources. This is priceless.

786. Restrict land ownership to prevent the creation of the class economic and social system in Saskatchewan.

My ancestors came to Saskatchewan to get away from the cast system that was terribly oppressive in Europe. Why should we stand by and let it be re established now?

My neighbour sold to "investors " rather than the renter to get a higher price. Two years later, the "investor" has it for sale at double the price. How does that help Saskatchewan?

How can farmers compete with untaxed pension money while they trying to make a living?

Farm land is not like stocks or city real estate where if you don't like one house, you can go down the street to buy another. Farmers can't go so far between fields to farm. Farmers can't get a job for a few years and live at home until the market rationalizes. They have to move. The future of farming is with more drainage AND irrigation. Only ownership gets land improvement work done and higher value crops grown and jobs in value added processing.

Argentina is the opposite of what I want for Saskatchewan.

The land is owned by the elites. Farmers put the minimum of inputs in because they don't know if they will be able to rent it next year.

They don't improve the land in any way because if they do, the rent will go up and make the land lord rich.

They can't afford to buy the land as rental rates are so high that they stay poor their entire lives.

Land lords stay rich because land does not wear out (unlike the people who farm it).

The class system is sustained by the educational and job opportunities and social connections that the rich will always have in cities, and that the people in rural areas can't have.

Absentee landlords is the most efficient way to create a class social and economic system in Saskatchewan.

787. Too many of our natural resources are being owned and controlled by non Canadians

788. What is the point in farming land you don't own, or don't foresee owning in the future? Your just a tenet, same as a 19 year old graduate is when they first move out of home. Sure renting is a useful tool to have, but isn't everyone's dream to own something worth owning? I suppose some people prefer not to have any risk in their operations, but those are also not the people that vote for the Sask Party. The western mentality has always been to go out and make something of yourself. Especially in Alberta under previous governments. In country investment is bad enough to compete with, out of country investment makes it all but impossible. I'm not against outside investment, I'm against the poor jobs of farming these large acre operators are doing because of a lack of responsible management and well trained responsible labour. When they go broke, we're the ones paying back the lenders their losses. Not the citizens of the country in which these investors come from! Doesn't madder if one guy with 10 combines is farming the land or 10 farmers with 1 combine each. It's still 10 combines being sold, and in the smaller operations the accounts manager is often the one also in the field. Getting a first hand look at things to make more positive management decisions. Why don't we support our local economies instead of sending profits out of country

	to someone who didnt work for it?
789.	It would be nice to see Saskatchewan land in the hands of people that live in Saskatchewan. Although, I am aware that this would be extremely difficult to enforce.
790.	Due to the high costs of farm supplies and equipment, Family farmers are finding that there is a need for more land to maintain the family farm at the same level as it used to be. Also with foreign ownership the land is usually rented out and it is more likely to be abused
791.	I have a off farm job that allows me to work with farmers all over the province It has obvious that the average land owner does a significantly better job of farming which puts alot more money in to our economy than the farmer who rents large quanities and does a poor job of it. the perfect example is Broad Acres. With foreign ownership of land the profits from rent, appreciation in land value or from farming the land it self will leave the country therefore the province doesn't benefit from all the economic spin offs that currently exist.
792.	Decreasing margins further for farmers by forcing them to rent because they cannot compete financially with non-resident investors will aggravate issues with rural infrastructure, drive down the number of producers, and encourage poor land management practices. Land rents are already not viable in many regions. Where the economics of production no longer exist, we can begin to have food security issues even in a net export economy very quickly with a non resident land base.
793.	I think by allowing outside investors to purchase farmland, there are a few issues that may arise. Firstly, once the farmland is purchased, who is to say that the land will remain farmland. There is the potential for re-zoning and that land being used for other types of business ventures. Secondly, by allowing outside investors to come in an buy farmland, it has the potential to cause the price of farmland to increase drastically. This may be in the form of a quick increase and then it will level back out, or it may then stay higher and cause less existing farmers to purchase land in the future. Thirdly, there is the potential to put a cash injection into those farms that currently own the land and choose to sell to an outside investor and then lease the land back, however, it will be a one-time cash injection and could result in a boost in the economy in the short term, but once those funds are depleted....then what. Take a look back to the later part of the 1990's when the CROW rate was eliminated and farmers were given a pay out then. Many used the injected cash to replace older equipment or expand the land base....but eventually those funds run out and we saw quite a few farmers choosing to retire shortly thereafter.
794.	As stated above, people came to canada to escape the peasant / landowner sytems of europe. Without having your own land, you can never be able to have a stable farm, because the next guy may have the land you rent next year. Why would we sell our land to foriegn investors, yes you get money now, but all the future money goes out of the country? Even at the current situation, people are buying land as an investment who have no buisness bieng involved, and who have no knowlegde of the costs and buisness of farming. There is also the issue that as investors buy land, the odds of that land ever becoming available to the next generation of farmers, or farmers starting out is next to impossible. How can we have a stable ag economy with that type of ownership? Ownership rules should limit ownership to the active farmer only.
795.	Our farm is no different than any other property, it is owned by us and we fully expect to be able to achieve the highest price that we wish to accept, that is called capitalism. I DO NOT

	<p>ever want to take less for my property and for my family just so my oversized big shot neighbors can buy my land cheap. Did they offer less money to prospective sellers when they bought land or leased it ? No, they simply outbid all the smaller guys but now they have met their match with some of this outside money coming in and are whining. Getting a dose of their own medicine they dished out so well for so long.</p>
796.	<p>These questions are very slanted and I totally disagree with the way they are worded and framed. It is obvious where intentions lie from SK Ministry of Agriculture and Govt of SK wanting to open up this land ownership to any and all in a free-for-all system. These questions would be worded much different if you were simply looking to capture peoples genuine thoughts. This is a tainted survey. This response applies for all questions as you can feel the flow and thought pattern of the creators of the questions.</p>
797.	<p>Ownership of land promotes motivation and having a direct interest in producing and maintaining a high quality product and a food system that you have a vested interest in. Foreign ownership and ownership by individuals who live in places other than Saskatchewan do not put children in our schools, buying in our local grocery stores etc.</p>
798.	<p>In the long run, keeping local ownership is more important than making money off land sales. Non-local ownership of land and resources can only result in serfdom and degradation for those who live on that land.</p>
799.	<p>Long and short I feel you should have to farm it to own it with the only exception being a retired farmer. That being the only exception. Even when there families get it willed they should have 5 years to sell it or farm it. It's an important to have farm land in the hands of the producers so they are properly looked after and food production can continue to increase.</p>
800.	<p>Although the trend has been leaning toward young farmers renting or leasing land at the end of the day farmland ownership allows for more stability for farmers. Its hard to make a huge investment in a home and settling down if you dont at least own some of the land you plan on farming.</p>
801.	<p>It's hard to say if outside investors would positively impact the market. It's a risky decision. Personally I would need to do more research into it. Ultimately though, I think it would be better if farmland remained in the hands of the local farmers.</p>
802.	<p>Implement similar land ownership policies based in Ontario and British Columbia. Free Market!</p>
803.	<p>Hard to imagine but local ownership that's manageable by a family farm will be a greater investment then corporate farms. Hudderite's do not invest in community hockey or curling rinks and nor do any other foreign or local non farmer owners. I am literally on the tractor now writing this survey trying to get ahead.</p>
804.	<p>We do not want to see Saskatchewan land being owned by non Canadians not to mention people who live outside of this province. Saskatchewan land should be owned by residents of Saskatchewan.</p>
805.	<p>Outside of Saskatchewan investment in farmland only benefits the seller most profits leave Saskatchewan leaving empty towns and farm houses if you want to own farmland in Sask you should have to sit in the tractors seat</p>

806.	The farmland prices and big business investment is pushing the possibility of the individual farmer to purchase or make a living on the farm.
807.	I believe that a Saskatchewan person should have the first opportunity to buy in province. Non-Canadians should not be able to invest in the farmland because it should be owned by someone that was born and is a citizen of Canada.
808.	If you want to farm get on the farm and farm it and become a canadian citizen. We do not want a feudal system to return.
809.	Government should not own farmland. Domestic or foreign.
810.	Ask cargill and red head if they liked having to give one earth co deep discounts or getting stung when they went bankrupt.
811.	Because renting has become of a big factor in many farmers' lives.
812.	You should have to be a Saskatchewan resident to own farmland in Saskatchewan and you should also be limited on how much farmland you can own and lease!
813.	Sask.farm land should be for farmers making a living farming not speculators and out of province interests
814.	Again I say land should be owned by the people who work it.
815.	I BELIEVE THAT FARMLAND IS OUR HERITAGE AND HOME. IT SHOULD NOT BE TRADED ABOUT FOR ECONOMIC GAIN. IT SHOULD BE OWNED BY THE PEOPLE WHO FARM IT AND/OR LIVE ON IT. IT IS NOT A RENEWABLE RESOURCE. IT IS NOT THE SAME AS OTHER REAL ESTATE. WHEN I SELL LAND TO OTHER FARMERS THEY SHOULD NOT HAVE TO COMPETE WITH INVESTORS, JUST OTHER FARMERS. THIS SHOULD CREATE A REAL "LAND VALUE".
816.	If we open up farmland to foreign ownership it will rapidly become a wholly foreign owned entity, because there is so much foreign capital available and our farmland is so good. This would have a terrible effect as foreign owners simply wouldn't care about taking care of the soil for future generations. They would predictably do what many corporations do, which is maximize current profits at the expense of the future. By restricting foreign ownership we make that land unappealing for corporations to exploit, and thus preserve it. This may well be one of the greatest decisions the Wall government will make. It is the difference between Saskatchewan residents being able to feed themselves in the future or being serfs of faceless foreign owners.
817.	Farmland should be owned by sask people ,farmers or none farmers
818.	It is the very important for Saskatchewan farm land to remain in hands of Saskatchewan residents who own and are farming the land.
819.	We need to look no further than Vancouver to see the negative effects of outside investors that do not reside locally or even within the country. When values increase beyond the point of affordability locals simply vacate to somewhere cheaper. If rural farmers cannot make a living in the agricultural industry in their small town they will leave that town.
820.	Put the land into the hands of the farmers. The land will get farmed from local farmers who

	buy equipment at local dealers. What good is CPP ownership. They charge a high rental rate cause they want guaranteed returns on what they bought, forcing all the disposable income from a farmer to put to rent. And the farmer needs to pay or their land base shrinks and he's out of business. It doesn't add up. The returns on a farm are low if a farmer has payments on equipment and land rents including owned land payments.
821.	Farmland has become to expensive to allow new , young farms to start up. Investors typically want enough rent to make payments. If that is the case the farmer actual operator should own the land.
822.	The key issue is to have farmland ownership rules support the vitality and sustainability of family farms and rural communities. Maximizing non-farmer investment should not be a priority. Please restrict farmland ownership to Sask. citizens and create tax incentives that will tend to increase farmland ownership by farmers, and to decrease farmland ownership by investors.
823.	I believe if you farm here you should be here supporting our economy
824.	It's good to have some investment in the land but I think it can be done within Canada
825.	Why would you even consider selling off a large part of your country, to a foreign nation. The world is getting smaller by the day, what makes you think that a foreign nation would do with farmland. They would bring in their own inputs, and people, and export the crops, possibly exclude all local business in ag. How does that bode for the ag sector economy?
826.	Agricultural land should not be for sale to foreign investors. corporations,
827.	Farmers should be able to sell their land to whomever they want, at whatever price they want.
828.	Almost every attempt to impose artificial rules to inhibit a free market ends in failure. See for example the disastrous attempts by the EU to manipulate the EU sugar production industry, which cost a great deal of money and ended as a complete failure leaving the EU unable to meet its internal requirements for sugar! If draconian rules are introduced to "regulate" the market in Saskatchewan farmland the predictable outcome is that farmers will be worse off since they will be unable to expand (there being no increase in their equity in their land holdings) and the industry will be starved of investment.
829.	Need to keep land prices affordable enough that the younger people that have the knowledge and want to farm can afford to get into the business. If you do not then pretty soon there will be No one that knows what to do or willing to put in the hours it takes to run a farm. Also if no small farms and just big industrial farms there will no longer be small town saskatchewan and no more people to keep the economy going as sask is a agricultural province.
830.	If potash Corp was a state guy resource and was protected by the provincial and federal governments . Then there is a case to be made for farmland being a state guy resource.
831.	These rules didn't stop Chinese investors from buying land in the southwest corner. Nor had it stopped Mexican Mennonites being funded from outside of Canada paying way over market value. Combined with land companies they are destroying Sask. agriculture

832.	<p>Outside investors that would buy large land tracts are only concerned with return on investment.</p> <p>They will create bidding wars on land and artificially inflate surrounding land values and rents. These actions do not encourage new local investment or foster a environment where young people want to stay on the farm and make it difficult or impossible for local farmers to compete to purchase land against large investor dollars.</p> <p>These actions do not promote growth in population or spur on the economy.</p>
833.	<p>I believe you should let the market dictate what land is worth. if investors want to buy land, let them. if they drive up the price to high and expect a certain rate of return and this puts rent to high, farmers will not lease it if they cannot make a profit off of it, therefore driving lease rates and land values down. Farmers are not dumb, let the market take care of itself. Part of my retirement plan is to have my land values appreciate and i would not like it if the government meddled in it to keep values artificially low. If the government wants to do this, they should also meddle in rental homes, house values. They don't regulate this and the market does what it is suppose to do. Home owners are no smarter than farmers but somehow there are groups that believe that farmers cannot make wise decisions on there own without the governments help. Please keep government out of the market and let land values do what they do much like home values.</p>
834.	<p>Farmland should be owned and controlled by those living in the province. Farmland can be owned by the state and leased to local farmers. This could help young people get into farming. Farmland is a special commodity as it is the key to human survival.</p>
835.	<p>Foreign ownership of land has the potential to increase the cost of farm land. The effect of this is either farmers must borrow more money to purchase land (which is good for the banks) or they must rent the land from the foreign owner (effectively funneling money out of the province of Saskatchewan)</p>
836.	<p>Do not agree with ownership of land by pension and investment funds. The people become tenant farmers. What will happen to our young farmers?</p>
837.	<p>When we sell our land and retire..we want the most \$\$\$\$ for yrs of hard work and stress, and suppling cheap food for the world..NO deals for us when we started in the 80's?</p>
838.	<p>Having foreign ownership has placed an unfair and unrealistic price on farm land and made it just about impossible for real farmers to buy and expand</p>
839.	<p>I think that if greater restrictions on land ownership are imposed then land values will fall drastically. With less equity (and money) farmers will cut back on spending and this will effect everyone in Sask. Our economy will suffer because of a political interference, let the markets decide!</p>
840.	<p>I truly believe there is economic and socio-economic benefit to controlling outside investment in farmland. The cost of land is making it increasingly difficult for young/new farmers to compete and grow a business in this industry. On another related matter, the increasing farm sizes are placing much stress on the economy of small towns, due to the associated decrease in rural population; that said, there should also be controls on the amount of land someone is allowed to purchase.</p>
841.	<p>Farmland belongs in the hands of local farmers mostly farming the land themselves.</p>

	Corporations or other investors who are not farming the land should not own any farmland at all.
842.	sask farmland should be owned by people who will keep there money in the province and reinvest it in saskatchewan
843.	There is no shortage of capital for farm operations in Saskatchewan. An influx of foreign capital is not required and I struggle to understand under what circumstances this would benefit any producer or Saskatchewan Resident.
844.	My biggest concern as a southwest farmer is the very rapid increase of religious groups buying up land. In saying this i must also state that i am not a prejudice person, and in fact are friends with many of these people. But the long and the short of it is that they are destroying are communities, and repairing the damage is not possible as the land is forever gone from the marketplace.
845.	I truly believe that the agricultural industry would deteriorate if we opened up ownership to Non-Canadian residents/corporations. I have seen first hand how so-called big corporate farms have failed due to lack of "on the ground" ownership and management. These were not good experiences and the local suppliers had to absorb huge losses as a result of these failures.
846.	Farmland isn't real estate, it's someone's livelihood.
847.	our youth cant compete with outside investors. small towns ,schools,hospitals, etc.are dying because retiring farmers jump at foreign dollars.
848.	We need to have people living on the land in Sask. Only land owners will care for the land for the next generation. Land owners living and working on the land will have families that support local schools, hospitals, businesses in local communities. Rural people do not want to be dictated to by large centers.
849.	We need to own our land so other countries don't take over and we have nothing left.
850.	Farm land value has to reflect farm profitability . Not farm land value speculation. Farm land value stability is very important to finance farm operation.Steady growth is better ,for the industry .
851.	expect maximum return on my farmland when i sell. why am i obligated to subsidize any future buyers? more potential buyers = higher values.
852.	I think farmland is become ridiculously overpriced - I am sickened to learn that foreigners are buying up Saskatchewan as investment opportunities.. We are losing sight of values and an affordable and healthy way of life.. We have to think about helping our citizens.. not the millionaires from China and India... Also - the PFRA decision is horrid.. we should not be selling community pastures.. we need to preserve some prairie!!! grazings one things.. but again those looking to make big money will cultivate quicker that you blink an eye..
853.	Outside investment is hurting local farmers. Speculators and investors are driving up the price of land so it is not affordable to local farmers to buy it.
854.	The whole economy of the province benefits from ownership restrictions. The only people who benefit from the foreign investment are selling or retiring farmers.

855.	The current regulations are not stringent enough. Saskatchewan residents and farmers who have lived in the province through the ups and downs and supported the provincial economy as well as paid the taxes are penalized because they did not leave the province to earn better money or have better opportunities. People who wish the provinces farm land be sold to whomever and where ever do not have children (the future residents of Sask) who would love and be great caretakers of our land and thus they don't really care where our food will come from. Once our land is sold to non-residents of Saskatchewan, it will not ever be able for our children to farm. Think about it why do heavily populated countries want to buy our land -it is not for the benefit of Saskatchewan residents!
856.	I am the child of a lifetime farmer who will inherit some of the farmland. I think it is important for farmland to be close to the people who work it, whether it is farmed by the owners or owned and leased by someone who has history in the area. It creates an obligation to maintain and care for the land that would not be there if it was owned by a corporation looking after thier bottom line.
857.	My roots are in Canada, although I grew up in the city and know about immigration and foreign investors I don't believe we should expose ourselves to other investors who don't want to live their earnings and impacts. I have family that fought in WWII, my great grandfather was Tommy Douglas's neighbour/friend throughout thier lives, why would we let foreigners invest in a country they had no part in creating? They would not take kindly if we did the same. Canada needs to get back to the basics and maximize the local opportunity of its founders. I am a Canadian with true roots, If outside investors want a part of our land they better allow us to do the same with there's or get lost.
858.	To most farmers owning land is our pension plan because we're self employed. It also keeps farming in the family and it gives us borrowing power to purchase equipment, buildings, bins and more land. Rented land comes and goes so we cannot rely on it more than the contract date therefore it's out stable land base. Owning land also guarantees that it is maintained and improved in for the long term. Foreign or local investors cause the same problem for farmers, it depletes our sources of land ownership and inflates prices. Please do something to help our industry because land prices are on the verge of being no longer economical for purchasing as a farmer.
859.	From my prospective, I would consider non farm/foreign purchase of farm land to be exactly the same as B H P's attempted purchase of Potash Corp.
860.	Having foreign ownership of Canadian resources is a short-sighted solution for growing Canada's global economy. By removing supports to farmers (e.g. crow subsidy) and by allowing the rampant transformation of the agricultural process (e.g. One cannot sustainably farm without the use of chemicals and fertilizers), farmers are squeezed into making decisions for economic reasons that are not compatible with land husbandry/organic food production. Subsidizing the grain industry with decent prices and regulating the use of pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers would do the world a favour and make agriculture an industry with a clean conscience.
861.	Most farmers rely on owning land an then selling as part of there pension, if they only leasing they rely on life insurance to pay of their debt and farm until a very old age.
862.	A local farmer who owns farm land is more likely to invest in that said farmland benefiting the local economy as a land owner that doesn't live here

863.	Buy local , support local
864.	Land is still the strong base for a long term successful farm. Looking at the last 10 years the land that has been bought by investors and rented out is not treated as well as land that is owned- all the emphasis is placed on roi and not on sustainability. Letting big countries like china and india come in and buy up Canadian land is a mistake I think and may have repercussions in the future that no one has thought of yet.
865.	From examples of foreign ownership of farmland in Australia, there is a terrible loss of jobs and economic growth, lost to foreign companies who end up importing their own workers who send all of their wages back to their home country. I'd hate for the same impact to occur in Saskatchewan.
866.	Outside investors have the ability to drive up prices on farmland. As farmers, that is our livelihood, whereas these other investor's livelihoods do not.
867.	Agriculture will benefit in the long run by not allowing non Canadian or fund ownership of farm land in Saskatchewan. These entities are usually only interested in the rate of return on their investment. They are not usually interested in the local economy or the community or the people who live there. When you let ownership such as this happen our young farmers cannot compete in any way with these entities who are financed by large amounts of money available to them. I agree that farmland ownership in Saskatchewan should be regulated differently than other types of commercial real estate. If we do not preserve the tradition of farmland ownership and let our land be sold to outside interests we will own nothing and will be under the rule of foreign interests.
868.	N/A
869.	In my opinion, saskatchewan owned farm land will benefit us better by keeping dollars in the province. Profits from ownership by someone outside the province will be spent outside the province. I dont want someone owning the land that knows nothing about farming to tell me what needs to be done with their land or how to farm it.
870.	it would be very tough for young farmers to expand their operations if we were competing against foreign investors.
871.	I managed agricultural portfolio's in the banking industry and work in the farm equipment business and know that financially stable farm business always own the majority of their land base. Saskatchewan farms have very low net margins and there is little room for additional mis-informed costing.
872.	It will be terrible to return to tenant farming for absentee, faceless, kings/lords
873.	This is a very poorly designed survey and a pitiful method of deriving feedback for such an important topic in our industry. Most of the responses gathered so far can be construed to provide support for either side of the argument--therefore for whatever the government decides, and continue to line the pockets of the chosen few involved.
874.	I do not know why this is even a issue when land is sold outside of the province the income also goes outside of the province. The only good that this would do is there would be a few people get rich in the short term but in the long term the province and its people would suffer from all that income leaving. It would also end all small family farms for good.

875.	Times change as the world moves on, the romanticized version of farming is no longer applicable.
876.	Keep farmland ownership of more than 10 acres for Saskatchewan Residents
877.	I find the suggestions to be ambiguous, ie, " preserving the tradition of farmland ownership", what does that mean?
878.	If we sell our farmland to china then we lose our ability to make money off of it. We have a precious resource in terms of food production that the world wants and we can profit from it. Selling it to the end user gives us nothing in return. If we do that might as well turn saskatchewan into a Chinese province.
879.	Because there is NOT a level playing field in the investment world farmers are at a disadvantage in competing with outside investors. The printing of fiat money in the USA causes extreme inflation in equity markets and at the same time allows unlimited shorting of commodity futures, which holds grain prices lower than they would be otherwise. True free market enterprise in grain prices disappeared after the 1990's. Until this unethical market manipulation is eliminated Saskatchewan farmland needs to be limited to residents of Canada. American farmers are protected from this attack on prices, where Saskatchewan farmers are left on their own.
880.	Saskatchewan farmland is for Saskatchewan residents. To ensure families populate rural areas that will be contributing year round to all the labour it takes to keep a community thriving, with volunteer labour or low paid community jobs like RM counsellor, which no Albertan or absent landlord, or hired farm labourers for absent owners would be willing to do. edam,sk
881.	The more investment the better if we don't want open investment then go back to a land bank style program We already have that with crown leases.
882.	government control on foreign ownership is fine Open to Canadian ownership like Alberta . Canadian investment firms should be able to purchase farmland. I have invested in farmland in my life and am not interested in distorting the market value by restrictions on ownership.
883.	I feel the the foreign ownership of farm land will only bring in a mentality of Corporate Business and Big Industry and promote "large machinery" for these Hugh tracts of land and equipment is far too expensive! With this kind of mentality...I fear the family farm will disappear and even now young farmers are struggling to start their farms!!
884.	Farmland should only be bought by farmers. No big companies or non- saskatchewan residents should be able to come in and buy land. We have to keep the farm land for us. If we start selling this all out our farmers will have to sell there operation and quit there whole life's. We as farmers have been working really hard every year to keep making money and to grow bigger to make more and to afford more we have to keep this in saskatchewan for the farmers and for the young farmers that are being raised in saskatchewan
885.	The lack of custodianship of the land itself and the lack of legislation to preserve that land from exploiters is of a greater issue than who owns the land at any particular time. When we are dead and gone the land will still be here It is up to the legislators to ensure that this 'borrowed from our grandchildren' earth isn't destroyed by profit-mongers.

886. investment money coming in is absolutely necessary. we want investment money in everything and in grain companies, why not farmland. for governments to control farmland is very very dangerous, look at all the socialistic countries that did that they are dead or bankrupt. we elected a govt that i thought was free enterprise!

887. In most cases if a farmer can own his farmland that would be their preference. However most farmers are prepared to supplement their operations with rented land as has been the case for decades.

However, ownership provides more operational security over renting a large proportion of total acres.

In recent years the very large operations have a higher ratio of rented land than they did 10 or 15 year ago. However, even these larger farms readily purchase land to expand their operations if the opportunity to do so becomes available.

I believe that history has shown that land values, under previous ownership restrictions, increased, albeit more slowly and sustainably, and provided exiting land owners with a reasonable capital gain if they chose to sell.

I believe there is merit in maintaining traditional farmland ownership. This province's farms and agricultural industry were developed by settlers from other jurisdictions, including Europe who came here because of the opportunity to own and develop the own farms and to raise their families here. Many did not have this opportunity because of unaffordable prices, or ownership regimes that fostered absentee landlords and high rents.

Investment dollars may be slower to come but that doesn't mean that those dollars will not come in a sustainable and manageable fashion, without having a rapid and detrimental effect on our rural culture, communities and values.

I believe it is important to maintain a system by which Saskatchewan resident farmers can have access that affordable farmland to purchase and lease.

I do not understand why we need to sell off our limited farmland resource to entries outside the province. I am not sure that the price of loss of ownership outweighs the perceived benefit to the agricultural industry of Saskatchewan.

I believe that the Saskatchewan agricultural industry and Saskatchewan as a whole would benefit by having restrictions pertaining to farmland ownership by non-Canadians in particular, as well as non residents of Saskatchewan. All efforts should be maintained to keep ownership in the hands of those who live, work and raise their families in Saskatchewan, those that support their communities by serving, volunteering and investing. Saskatchewan ownership would help insure that more profits stay in Saskatchewan rather than being exported.

Although the Saskatchewan agriculture industry has always been evolving, I believe that maintaining farmland ownership within the province is more important than economic considerations. Not every thing can be measured in dollars or the most dollars

Yes farmland should be treated differently than types of real estate. Farmland was and is the bases of our rural communities and culture. It should remain in the control of those who perceive as more than an investment but also as part of their heritage, part of their being a resident of Saskatchewan, part of their contribution to Saskatchewan.

There is the notion that Saskatchewan farmland has become a good investment since 2002 when ownership rules were relaxed, mainly because of improved agricultural profits. This is partially true and Saskatchewan farmers responded by wanting to expand their operations by purchasing or leasing. However, I believe that the main reason that non-Saskatchewan entities are interested in investing in Saskatchewan farmland is two-fold: firstly, they want to take advantage of the fact that Saskatchewan land values were less than other jurisdictions as a result of the previous farmland ownership restrictions. It is a prime cherry-picking opportunity. And secondly, those investors have not been obtaining the satisfactory returns from the more usual types of investments such as equities or commercial real estate.

Pension funds are entities created by governments and I do not believe beginning or expanding farmers should have to compete with government entities for farmland ownership. A reasonable person would not see the distinction between a pension fund and the pension fund's investment board! Let's lift the corporate veil and see who is really there. Changes to the legislation must prevent such convoluted hair-splitting definitions.

I would suggest that large investment trusts have lots of other opportunities to make their investments. Saskatchewan should not be selling off its limited farmland resource to these types of non-residents.

I fully endorse changes to the legislation that would give the government full ability to investigate and enforce ownership and financing compliance to the law.

888. Without some ownership our communities are dying. No schools, no health care facilities, no grocery stores. NO ECONOMY.

889. Ownership of our land should remain in the hands of the people who live here. Foreign ownership benefits the foreign investor, not the local farmer. It skims off the cream to other countries and leaves Saskatchewan with a smaller return.

We need to be masters in our own land, not work for non-Canadians.

890. I believe farmers should not have to compete with pension plans from outside the province of Saskatchewan.

891. I believe that ownership of agricultural land in Saskatchewan should be by Saskatchewanians because then when big corporations want to come in and change things, i.e. install wind towers too close to occupied land where it could be devastating to the health of people, then they are a face that can attend the meetings and have a vested interest in the health and well-being of the area. Foreign entities, even Canadian, e.g. pension plans, they are only interested in the return on their investment, but have no care for the people that are trying to make a living from their land.

892. Money not earned in farming introduces undesirable competition for farm families who wish to remain in the business over several generations.

893. It's a tough call. Indeed, it would bring in significant investment dollars into the province if outside interests were allowed to purchase large quantities of land. However, the way I see it is that these outside interests are looking at land as a safe investment, not in the risk-taking of actual farming. If farmland prices were to become out of reach for Saskatchewan farmers, I believe it would be a detriment to the ag industry. I.e. "why should I take all the risk of frost and insects and low prices, if there is no chance of purchasing the land?" It's hard already to

	justify land prices, unless you are a well established farmer.
894.	<p>Currently the statistics say that 80% of land transactions are between local land owners and farmers. However, the statistics don't relay the fact that very often the purchasing farmer has to compete against non-farming interests. These non-farming interests could be investors, residential interests, or industrial interests. I have made 2 land purchases in the last 6 years. Both times I had to compete against non-farming parties.</p> <p>Having an environment where individual farmers have to compete against publicly traded companies and investors will eventually lead to a very large portion of land being owned by large corporations. That is exactly the type of land ownership environment that existed in Britain in the late 1800's that encouraged so many young families to come to Canada. However, this time instead of Dukes and Earls owning the land it will be pension funds and publicly traded companies.</p>
895.	look at the lower mainland of bc, vancouver it could be a suburb of hong kong, toykyo or china; look at kelowna and the okanogan it is a suburb of new dehli; do not want or need that here in saskatchewan. yes we are a mixture of immigrants but we are proud people of saskatchewan, we are canadians, we came to work the land, not hide tax dollars, buy our citizenship with a million dollar investment or get rich flipping cheap land. keep it simple
896.	I truly believe Saskatchewan farmland should be owned by Saskatchewan Farmers.
897.	Stewardship of the land is best managed by those who live close and can monitor the impact of changing weather patterns.
898.	I'm unsure that restrictions from outside the province is good as it does allow actual farmers to come and invest in our province. As far as corporate groups and pension funds I believe they may bring farmland values out of reach for younger farmers to expand.
899.	by opening the restrictions beyond sask borders it helps create a stronger more realistic value for the farmland. By restricting ownership you drive down market price of land. The caution with the open ownership is that it will not allow potentially negative ownership groups from buying up land in Saskatchewan (i.e. Russian or Chinese governments for false front companies for these organizations). The land will still be farmed by farmers but it opens up the ownership to people who might see land as a good investment.
900.	Saskatchewan was built on the innovation, resilience and perseverance of rural people. The land is our heritage. To allow Saskatchewan land to be taken out of it's people's hands is to irrevocably change this province. It will change tax structures, it will diminish the strength of our rural communities. We do not wish to reduce agriculture to a tenant farm structure. The land base is finite. We must protect agricultural land from those who have no connection to Saskatchewan, and have opportunistic motives. The family farm, an integral part of Saskatchewan's dynamic, will be undermined if we allow foreign or significant out-of-province land ownership.
901.	farmland needs to be affordable for the younger generation farmer. The way its going soon it will be big corporations owning the land and having hired people go out and farm it. We need to keep the land in saskatchewan hands. Give the younger generation a chance. bring back the farmer. The one whos out there not for the money but for the freedom for the love of the land for the love of the animals. Who has passion for what they do and does everything to save a new born calf. big corporations just look at that as a write off. We need farmers,

	farmers who care.
902.	It is important to me that land values stay firm. I also believe a move to devalue farmland will cause another batch of foreclosures for any farms that are carrying debt loads and mess with ratios. I however am not sure about pension plans need to or should own farmland. The upside of large pools of money owning land is they would have to absorb cost of deflating land values and probably can afford it more than local farmers. But that is no reason to allow it
903.	Farm land should be protected from market speculation to preserve our industry.
904.	I agree with restrictions on foreign ownership of farmland including both individuals and corporations but Canadians and wholly owned Canadian corporations should be allowed to own as much farmland as they want. Consumers must realize they have to pay more for food because the cost of farm inputs, including land, has been increasing steadily over the years. Why shouldn't retiring farmers reap the benefit of rising land prices; after all land is a commodity just like an urban dwellers home!
905.	Keep foreign ownership of farmland away we don't need to be invaded one 1/4 section at a time.
906.	I am concerned about pension plan and investment corporation ownership and I am not in favour of foreign ownership of Sk land. It is important to keep lease fees for land affordable for farmers.
907.	I put more value in supporting local farmers and preserving communities. These big investment companies and foreign investors are eroding the tradition of farming.
908.	None of these investment groups are bringing anything to the community. It takes young families to keep schools and hockey rinks afloat. They bring nothing but competition and no community interaction.
909.	When the Canadian pension plan took over Assinboia Land my land rent from them went up 30%. In their letter, I had three days to respond or it would go to land auction. They wanted to be named beneficiaries on my Agri-Insurance and responsible for any environmental disaster that could happen on the land being my fault or not. I feel very strongly that is not good for Saskatchewan. Everybody wants a chunk when times are good - will they be here in a five year drought?? Will the government have to bail them out? I'll be here!
910.	This is more a question of preserving the history of our country. If we allow non-Canadians and investment companies to purchase farmland, it could get to the point that family farms in Saskatchewan will entirely disappear. Agriculture is one of the main industries in rural Saskatchewan. Without this, small towns will disappear. This is already starting to happen as farm land bases grow. There are not as many families around. Land as a pure investment does not bring money into our small towns in rural Saskatchewan. Instead, it goes to people in the cities that are not tied to the land. Their heart is not in it. They are not raising their children in this rural community. We would prefer keeping land ownership restrictions in place. Without them, I believe farming will become a very difficult career choice to make. And perhaps even impossible to

	continue carrying on any family farm legacies into the future.
911.	The economics of the industry is one thing. The lifestyle of our people is another.
912.	opening investment wide open to outside investors and non farmer investors is killing the tradition way of life in saskatchewan , its raising the prices too high for regular farmers , no new people are going to get into the industry , i believe that once it has run the course with no new people to farm it will crash, or big industry will run our food industry and consumers will suffer by paying ex orbit prices for food , they only ones benefiting from the current relaxation of ownership rules are the same people who brought the in in the early 70s so they could buy the land for themselves . now they are being greedy and selling to the big corporations for their won gain
913.	<p>Even though I am retired I continue to volunteer on West Central Municipal Government (WCMG) for the village of _____ and the RM of _____. Within that group I am a member of the Area Transportation Planning Committee, (ATPC). I have witnessed the continuing decline in the structure of rural Saskatchewan since I retired from farming.</p> <p>Outside farmland ownership and larger farms have left rural communities scrambling for volunteers for recreation facilities, ambulance services and fire services. Schools are struggling to stay open. Promises to fix rural highways have not been honored and the TMS highways have declined to the point of danger and vehicle damage. They are so bad that tourism facilities can not attract the public as they won't drive on the highways anymore.</p>
914.	local ownership makes the youth able to enter agriculture as a viable option for a career
915.	Tongue in cheek I'll say, "The Saskatchewan peasant is ended to his Chinese master." If some foreign country tried to take Saskatchewan lands with gunpowder, we would give blood to stop them. If some foreign country tries to take Saskatchewan lands with money, we welcome them!
916.	Farmland in Saskatchewan should be held for Saskatchewan farmers who have worked there whole life on land to one day have a chance to own or at least rent it. For startup farmers and 5th generation starting farmers, the opportunity to purchase farmland with current prices is difficult enough already as it is, us young Saskatchewan farmers need all the help we can to retain our chances of owning nearby land.
917.	Allowing ownership of farmland by those who are not actively farming creates enormous problems. Absentee farmland owners in our area, the vast majority of whom are from foreign countries or from other provinces, do not concern themselves with the manner in which their land is operated or the quality of the renters that they secure. It appears to be all about the financial aspect of ownership. Consequently, we see land that is left uncultivated, pastures that are rented to people who do not repair fences resulting in livestock running at large, land which is fit for only poor pasture being tilled for purposes of attempting to grow another bushel of grain, and abandoned yard sites being left overgrown and attracting rodents and vermin (both of the animal and human variety). In addition, absentee landowners are generally difficult to contact, making it very difficult for local governments to complete necessary work such as road construction and maintenance adjacent to the private property. Most land is purchased sight-unseen and then the purchaser calls around to the neighbouring land owners to find out what they have purchased and to get advise on who they might call to rent the land. It seems reasonably ludicrous that an investor would not research what they are investing in, as one would do in a money market transaction, but that is what has

	happened repeatedly in the last five years while the land frenzy has been taking place.
918.	must.be.saskatchewan.resident.to.farm.land.or.canadian.to.own.
919.	Land needs to be owned by people that will add to the economy but also to the community. Pension fund or foreign ownership will be the demise of the rural community.
920.	The source of Canadian food has to be owned by individual Canadians regardless if they are farming otherwise those who farm will become akin to the serfs in Britain in the past, or those working on government owned farms under Communism, etc. I am aware that some highly populated countries, like China, are buying land where ever they can in order to feed their masses. if we open up our land to foreign ownership it is gone forever and we have no control..
921.	I believe that young farmers should be given financial for start up to maintain family farm ownership. Our resources should be maintained by Saskatchewan ownership.
922.	When foreign interests own SK farm land then rent payments leave the country. How does that benefit Canada? When investors buy land they bring money from other industries with higher profit margins than agriculture and expect similar returns. Land rents are determined not on soil productive capacity or crop prices but what investors could earn with a dollar invested elsewhere. Last I checked, people don't enjoy paying large sums of money for food so that caps commodity prices. Investors don't like losing money so that raises rent. That leaves the farmer to scrape by with decreasing returns.
923.	Landlords from out of province do not pay income tax in Saskatchewan to the best of my knowledge. In my experience the landowner often makes as much or more profit from the land as the farmer. If the landowner is from out of province that is significant tax dollars lost. Also, I feel it is often the case that relationships are not as long term with distant landlords and as such a farmer is less inclined to invest to improve the land. By investing less into improvements the province loses. The province loses again because the land will not produce as much grain without the improvements. This is less grain being put through processing facilities and elevators and contributing less taxes to the economy.
924.	Keep land affordable so young farmers like myself can carry on the tradition of the family farm. No place for investment and real estate brokers to line there pockets at the expense of the farmer
925.	The current rules have kept speculative investment outside the "demand pool" for SK farmland, essentially keeping prices at levels affordable to farmers and ensuring most farmland transactions take place for the purpose of farming. The fact that SK farmland has remained relatively affordable while the price of grain has increased over the past few years, pushing the rental prices up in the process, is the very reason why investment funds and institutional investors want to grab SK farmland so badly: it makes a very lucrative Return on Investment (ROI), in relation to the risk taken when leasing the land out on a "cash rent" basis. If this market opens to holding investors, the demand and transaction volume will also rise making it an excellent platform for speculative trading, further inflating the prices artificially. While the banking system wants to set off a bubble to capitalize on the burst, real farmers on the field lease their land for productive causes, such as revenue diversification,

risk management, and to fund other farming activities. The more the grain prices and thus the potential cash rent ROI increases, the more the banking system is pushing the politicians to let them in, so they can profit on the opportunity. This is why the government is reevaluating SK farmland ownership rules today. However, it is clear that relaxing the current rules is not in the interest of the local farmers and not in the interest of Canadians in general, and the politicians should not bend to the bankers' efforts. It is of paramount importance to ensure farmland remains affordable to local farmers so they are not wiped out by giant holding entities. Permitting non-Canadian entities or pension / investment funds to purchase Saskatchewan farmland will most certainly result in a speculative environment and will very quickly appreciate the value of land, effectively preventing the expansion of current farmers, and worse, pricing out entirely the future generations. New land acquisitions will require even higher levels of financing, more interest profits for the banks but higher operational costs and risk for the farmers, reduced margins, and ultimately the replacement of local farmers by giant monolithic operators. Realtors will make sure prices are inflated even further by driving the hand of retiring farmers to sell at ever increasing all time highs, pocketing a fatter sales commission in the process while providing very little real economic benefit. When the banking system and speculative traders make enough on the expense of everyone else, they will eventually pull out right when the grain prices start to weaken and just before the Saskatchewan Farmland Investment bubble bursts, leaving behind indebted pension funds and a crippled farming industry with large international operators owning most of the land. Family farming operations will by and large disappear. The effects of relaxing SK farmland ownership rules extend beyond the farmers and their families, and essentially affect every Canadian: Permitting oligopolies to emerge in farming is very dangerous for our food pricing and security. It is a mistake to try to influence unsuspecting farmers to allow a crack in SK farmland ownership, by presenting to them comparisons with other provinces of more relaxed rules, or by using other marketing and PR gimmicks. The economics of those provinces are different, they have alternative revenue sources, the ROI opportunities that will create a farmland speculative bubble do not exist there, and generally the food security of the entire country does not depend on them to the same extent.

926. It is important that land prices stay where they are economically viable for the production of crops. If we loose this we will soon loose the family farm to "outside" corporations

927. Farmers nearing retirement will benefit the most from foreign ownership however they get a double benefit the rules on foreign ownership came into play when they were starting up and now they are retiring they want to sell their land at a higher level and disadvantage farmers trying to start up. Farmland is not like other real estate it covers vast areas and needs to be looked after if the profits aren't there the farmers leasing the land won't be either. It cost a lot of money to take care of the land and even more money if it's not looked after every year.

928. The people that farm Sask. land should live in Sask.. It is a beautiful thing to see the farm sites occupied with families. Our towns survive, our communities survive and our way of life survives.

Please don't let foreigners invest in our heart and sole for their own profits. Please don't let Hutterite colonys take over the land base either. They provide little return to a community and think nothing of watching your hometown die.

929. The rules were already relaxed to allow any Canadians to own farm land. The rules were put in place to protect farmers and our rights. All government seems to care about is money

	coming into the province. That act is our "right". It shouldn't just be taken away on us.
930.	I believe that increasing ag industry can be done with better infrastructure such as irrigation and roads versus opening up land ownership
931.	Leave the business of farming to the family farms. Outside investors r not there for long term stability for farmers or the province. Our farm is 102 years old. These are the farms that keep farming. We have seen corporate farms come and go. then our governments start favouring these corporate farms indirectly through Golden opportunities fund and Saskworks (15% Federal tax credit and a 20% Provincial tax credit to the investors) These are RRSP eligible. Hardly seems fair that a farmer has to use tax paid dollars to buy his farmland!! how do we expect young farmers to compete against these unfair policies. These young farmers need our governments to have a plan to ensure the next generation can continue to be the farmers and own the land
932.	the sell off of Sask. most precious resource to outside, and foreign investors provides no economic value when measured against the negative effects.
933.	You have to ask yourself what type of agriculture you want in the province in the next 50 years. do you want strong, independant, viable agricultural businesses or do you want a yeoman farmer situation like most of us left behind when we immigrated? Land is a strategic asset that they aren't making more of. It is ridiculous to sell that to foreign nationals when food security and sovereignty are growing global issues. Its also ridiculous to allow pension plans to buy. Why should I compete for land with an organization using tax-free dollars? Keep Sask farmland in the hands of Sask farmers.
934.	farmland ownership has been a great investment and made people a good return. The question is should it be my neighbor or myself making that return or a outside entity. I prefer to deal with local people first, then absentee landlords, then investment companies. I really do not want to see foreign ownership and I think allowing pension funds to buy land was a mistake.
935.	Foreign, investors, pension funds etc. Should be strictly regulated when acquiring land. How can you own farmland when your tractor is an office somewhere; and your "plow" is a pencil?
936.	Investment dollars are portable. The restrictive rules in Saskatchewan are preventing investment in agriculture, including productivity enhancements, improved farming practices, yields and other benefits. These are dated regulations that may have been relevant at one time but have no place in a modern economy. Most Canadians would likely be very interested in participating in farmland ownership as part of their retirement planning (CPP, Omers, AIMCO) and in the US this asset class is widely accepted as part of a portfolio risk approach. SK is out of step with the rest of Canada and the world.
937.	You shouldn't be trying to win the lottery with selling farmland. Farmland should be more of a savings account where you get out what you put in when you sell. That way you can pass it on to the next generation of farmers instead of handcuffing young farmers to high rent to investors which leads to lots of money leaving the province instead of going towards owning land. Getting the same money out what you bought it for is a farmer's retirement. That paired with the money made off the land is more than enough. Old farmers need to stop being greedy and selling out to investors just to head south to Arizona and take all their money with

	<p>them. They need to allow the next generation to carry on the farming tradition and sell to them for reasonable amounts just like they had that opportunity when they started farming. We need to keep farmers farming or there will be no one left to farm all of this land that ends up going to waste when investors own it all.</p>
938.	<p>Farmland owned by large investment trusts opens the door to a feudal system.</p>
939.	<p>When you say bringing new investment dollars into the province, it depends where these investment dollars are coming from. If they are going to interfere with the progress of our Saskatchewan farmers than it is not needed. Farmland in Saskatchewan should not be purchased by investors who do not live in the province or contribute to the economy of the Saskatchewan communities.</p>
940.	<p>We will benefit from returning to being "the bread basket of the world", an economic power based on our commodities - we need to add value to the food production future ahead.</p>
941.	<p>I do not like to see foreign investors purchase large amounts of land if they are not going to contribute to the local economy. And I strongly am against absentee farmers. Our province was built by small farmers and business people who helped and supported each other. Our province is strongly invested in the local community and volunteerism. Absentee farmers basically do not care about Saskatchewan. They are only interested in themselves and the profit that they make....that maybe the goal of Big Business but it is not beneficial for Saskatchewan and its people.</p>
942.	<p>In our area, investors have bought a lot of land, which has inflated the prices, which makes it difficult for farmers to compete.</p>
943.	<p>WE CAN NOT ALLOW NON CANADIANS TO BE TAKING OVER OUR COUNTRY THAT OUR PARENT'S WORKED SO HARD TO GET TO WHERE WE ARE NOW; AND THAT IS EXACTLY WHAT IS HAPPENING SO CALLED GREED .THIS COUNTRY WAS FOUGHT FOR BY OUR PARENT'S ETC. AND WE ARE LETTING IT SLIP AWAY FROM UNDER US .WE WILL BE ANOTHER 3RD. WORLD COUNTRY IF WE DON'T STAND UP TO OUR GOV'T AND STOP THEM VERY SOON. I WAS JUST TOLD THAT THE VANCOVER GROUP THAT BOUGHT MY LAND HAS SOLD EVERYTHING TO THE CHINESE /I REST MY CASE;;;;;</p>
944.	<p>Larger corporate farms are now taking over and will in time own all the land. More needs to be done to make small and mid size farms more viable. Small communities would benefit from more small and mid size farms and help diversify the economy.</p>
945.	<p>Farm land in Saskatchewan should be owned by residents of Saskatchewan. If outside interests I.e. Large non farming corps own the land any profit from that farm land will not stay in Saskatchewan</p>
946.	<p>I feel that the price of land is already climbing. Just with the competition between farmers. With a more industrial farm equipment less manpower is required to run a farm. So two or three people can run a 10,000+ acre farm.</p> <p>What I'm getting at is land value is going up already. I don't think further pressure on buying new land on farmers is necessary. Thanks</p>
947.	<p>For young farmers wanting to expand or enter farming, competing with foreign and commercial investors is a huge deterrent, if not roadblock, for those producers and this type of investment needs to be stopped. By allowing young farmers to invest and grow land base</p>

	they will contribute more to the economy and sustainability of the province than outside investors.
948.	Foreign nationals such as the Chinese should Not be allowed to purchase our critical resource. Shell companies that skirt the rules should not be allowed. Grow some balls and keep our land for citizens who will toil here for the betterment of the country.
949.	I believe the Saskatchewan agricultural industry would, in the short term, benefit from having very little restrictions on investments in land purchases from out of province. But I believe in the long term it would be detrimental to future Saskatchewan generations that would like to carry on the tradition and important work of sustainable agriculture. Once land starts selling to out of country investors and land prices go up, it is unlikely that much of it will ever get sold back into the hands of Saskatchewan farmers. Regardless of who is doing the work of farming the land, the owner can make the decisions on what is farmed, how it is farmed and how the farm is run. I find it unnerving to think that foreign investors would have that kind of control in our agriculture industry. Never mind the fact that my children and grandchildren may never have the opportunity to run a farm, if they so choose, because they would be unable to compete with foreign investors.
950.	Foreign and corporate investors would be interested in profits only. They would mine the soil. Environmental issues would be ignored. The workers would be serfs, not farmers who care about the long term health of the land, livestock, non-agricultural environment, current and future generations of the Province. If our farming industry goes to non-resident farmers, there is no future for agriculture in "the bread basket of the world".
951.	Nothing good can come from big multi-national corporations owning the land which we use to sustain our own country and provincial economy
952.	Protectionist measures hurt the economy of the country that imposes them is one of the oldest but still most startling insights that Economics has to offer. Ref: 1 Adam Smith "The Wealth of Nations" and 2 the experience in ex communist countries and 3 the experience in the EU which removed protectionism as a condition of membership.
953.	I believe maintaining a large portion of farm land as Saskatchewan resident owned is important for the long term food security of our province and country. At the same time I believe we also need to take a detailed look at such issues as farmland drainage and other issues that are affecting farmland and the long term health of Saskatchewan's economy. Decisions need to made and regulations implemented affecting farmland for the long term economic health of the province not just the short term economic needs of private owners. Maintaining a high percentage of the ownership of Saskatchewan farmland by residents of Saskatchewan I believe in the best interest of the long term economic interests of the people of Saskatchewan.
954.	Why is this just on farm land? Sounds like the province is trying to restrict a small farmer from getting top dollar for his land
955.	In our area One Earth Farms has bought up numerous acres of farmland- in most cases they bought very inferior land at high inflated prices which drove up the price of good arable land

	<p>thus making it very difficult for a young farmer to compete. These foreign buyers showed their ignorance of good farming practices by hiring poor farm managers and having no idea about seeding, fertilizing or harvesting practices. Furthermore these same people funneled any profits out of Canada. The communities suffered as well as these foreign landowners did nothing to contribute to local businesses, schools, hospitals, etc.</p>
956.	<p>Farmland has to be affordable to entice young people into the industry, they have to make a profit, but those that are exiting the industry have to make a proper profit as well. The problem I see now is that with the investment climate out there has created huge windfall for those exiting with little thought for the next generation, or the communities that they live in. In our community the sellers not only are leaving the community, but the investors are only renting to a couple out of the area large farmers, which don't support the local economies, or help in the upkeep of such things as the cemeteries, churches, hockey and curling rinks.</p>
957.	<p>I have worked in tourism for many years and also dealing with refugee/immigrant groups. I KNOW that they do not understand the care and nurturing required to keep our land and water in good condition. All we need is poor soil/cropping/water/social management processes to ruin the good quality living conditions available in rural Sask. for everyone. When the rest of the world is highly contaminated in many ways, there are pristine/virgin lands still available here. Once gone, they can never be recovered. Our land is too valuable to determine solely in economic terms.</p>
958.	<p>Saskatchewan farm land should be owned by people who wish to farm and reside in this province.</p>
959.	<p>I like the Canadian ownership rules with one exception the owners that don't use after tax dollars to pay for land, for example pension funds or conservation groups. In other words it costs a farmer about 40% more to buy the same land than these agencies, in some cases these groups buy land with money that was tax deductible to someone else that may or may not be a Canadian. How are farmers to compete for land ownership under these rules. I do think it is important to keep land ownership Canadian.</p>
960.	<p>Purchase and ownership of Saskatchewan farmland by out of province and foreign interests (often being absentee land lords) hurts the Saskatchewan economy and rural population.</p> <p>Saskatchewan must do more to support rural populations and a diversified economy - how? - in part by taking greater responsibility for maintaining existing the PFRA pastures and keeping the best for Saskatchewan cattle producers.</p>
961.	<p>More care should be taken into the research of Canadian companies that say they are 100% Canadian owned.</p>
962.	<p>Consolidation and foreign ownership does not add to any local community and may not be in the best interests of long term land use as the "landlords" are much further removed from the land.</p>
963.	<p>It should be noted in particular that there is a danger that if very narrow restrictions on ownership are introduced they may crash the market to the detriment of farmers who are seeking to divest on retirement, and also scare off potential investors (whether Canadian or not) who provide a means for farmers to rent land, make operating profits and eventually</p>

	acquire their own holdings out of retained earnings.
964.	Our young beginning farmers have to become "tenant farmers" if the current trend were to continue. Many of our early pioneers opened up this land for settlement so they could own property and not be at the mercy of landlords.
965.	Without young farmers being able to own land rural communities will suffer even more. Environmental stewardship is so important and is best looked after by owners.
966.	Times change, farming methods change, and ownership patterns have changed (especially in size of operations and an increasingly industrial style of farming). These changes are acceptable, but opening the door to out-of-province and especially out-of-country investment is fraught with the potential to see land price increases driven by non-agricultural industry factors. An example of that being a potential negative can be seen in the current Vancouver housing market, where unbridled Asian investment distorts the Canadian reality. Canada (and Saskatchewan especially) cannot afford to have their essential agricultural land base driven by forces outside of the industry itself.
967.	We see too much farmland left idle by absentee land owners. This land is out of production and is not contributing to food production.
968.	There are less and less young people taking up farming as it's generally seen as a less desirable lifestyle. That being said having mega farms without enough competition can cause our food prices to increase.
969.	Although there may be economic benefits for Saskatchewan if outside investor groups buy Saskatchewan farmland that is where the benefits end. If these types of groups become major portions of farmland ownership in Saskatchewan it will force traditional farmland owners and the new generation of young farmers out because land prices will be too high. It is nearly impossible for farmlands to maximize their profitability with owners who are not present on-farm and have little investment in the production other than on a balance sheet.
970.	my farm land is my personal retirement fund .
971.	What you need to do is let me sell my land to who ever will pay me the most money inside or outside of the province or country.
972.	Compromise is not an option. I would support the Government legislating a divestiture of the current institution farmland holdings in Saskatchewan. As farmers we face more than enough extreme out of control input costs
973.	only sask residents not even corporations should own farm land. The ag industry in sask is a way of life not a business. If you can't tell the difference you should not be in the ag industry. corporations and outside of sask people do not care about the land they just want to use it to make money they just see greed and not the whole picture.
974.	Investment from non farming interests drives up the price of land with no correlation to actual land values. This artificial increase in price hurts the younger producers that are trying to expand their operation.
975.	We are selling off our future to China and government. Bigger corporations take it over and add nothing to our rural towns. Everyone loses

976.	I feel land ownership by saskatchewan resededents is the key to the seival of the small farm
977.	Opening farmland ownership for various unrelated funds or foreign ownership eventually leads to residents becoming slaves to non resident owners. We would be serfs in our own land. Land ownership would result in less poverty.
978.	The sask govt should not be involved in setting farmland values. The market will decide the farmland price
979.	profits from farming by non sask.res. Gets funneled out of the prov. and country a stable and strong tax base can only be created by resident s who farm and live full time in the prov. These are the people who really pay the taxes that support our health and education systems
980.	If farmers own their land they are likely to explore new innovative options to increase the quality and production of grain per acre. Leased land is usually abused and the best options usually aren't explored. Leased land is usually just a money grab by big corporate farmers, and no care is taken for the environment or the improvement of the land.
981.	I find it amazing that people want to supress the value of farm land to make it accessable to farmers. Farming is a business and should only be regulated as such. I find it is restrictive to limit who I will be able to sell to when I choose to sell. I am sure there would be a human outcry if other businesses were regulated as to who they could sell their business to.
982.	I believe that with out ownership the whole fibre of farming changes. Absentee landlords and landlords from other countries (corporations included) neither benefit agriculture or Saskatchewan.
983.	Farmers need to own their land to be able to provide community, and to foster stewardship of the soil and to plan their own livelihood. Farmland should not be owned foreign investors or grain companies who want to control markets.
984.	I believe that farmland should have restrictions in place to protect it from outside investment. Farmers should be able to own the land they farm not lease it from some major corporation or outside identity. Please protect our farmland from being gobbled up by foreigners or big corporate identities.
985.	Outside investment in farmland would take the profits from that land outside of the community and outside of the province, instead of a local owner spending the land profits back into their local businesses and communities
986.	As a young farmer attempting to make his place in this extremely competitive industry, the last thing I want is to have financial competition coming from foreign investment. It is often discussed that the age of farmers in the province is rising. Well, when land rent and purchase prices get pushed up by foreign investment it becomes very difficult for a young farmer to operate.
987.	It is crucial to have a strong viable agricultural sector. Some counties export food so the multinational corporations can profit and the local people can not even afford to buy the food.

988.	Outside influence may create a bubble and may not be relative to the actual price of farmland. When this happens you eliminate much of your base and create a less stable client that is not as interested in farming and more interested in flipping and creating a profit and not as concerned about the land/farmer and communities that survive off of the farm economy.
989.	We must not allow foreign interest and foreign dollars dictate our policy at home as if we are some impoverished puppet state. Foreign investors do not have Saskatchewan's best interest in mind; they do not have to live with the consequences of irresponsible but profitable farming practices that foreign and temporary farmers will likely chose to employ. Additionally, we are gambling with something much more than Saskatchewan's economy, and that is Saskatchewan's rich heritage. Keep farming domestic and personal for the citizens of Saskatchewan.
990.	Ownership of farmland in Saskatchewan should remain in the hands of those who reside in the province and farm the actively farm the land. Ownership by investors Canadian or foreign should not be allowed. Foreign ownership puts food security at risk and increases the cost to domestic farmers by driving up the cost of farmland.
991.	Keep the farmland in Saskatchewan. We have such a beautiful and unique province and we should take care and pride to preserve our rich heritage.
992.	Saskatchewan land should be owned by Saskatchewan residents. It is unjust to the first Canadian settlers from Europe to sell off the land to corporations from foreign countries.
993.	<p>I am not to concerned about Canada Pension Plan owning Sask Farmland. Money from the plan is used to fund retirement of Canadian.</p> <p>My biggest concern is that we have large portions of farmland being purchased by recent immigrants to Canada who have become citizens. They bring large amounts of money (including money that is provided to them by friends and relatives from their home countries.) and bid up the price of land so that local farmers are not able to compete. The above purchasers new Canadians are not restricted by a required return on investment (willing to even take a loss in the short run)) while local farmers can only pay what is economically viable for their situation.</p> <p>My concern is that several decades from now, or sooner, a large portion of our farmland will be not be owned by local Saskatchewan people who want to farm. They will become tenant farmers.</p> <p>I believe that the best situation for Saskatchewan economically and the best situation for Saskatchewan farmers is a situation in which the farmers own the land.</p> <p>Farmers who sell to the highest bidder share in this responsibility. They want the most they can get jeopardizing the future for the next generation.</p>
994.	Farmers want to own their own land and not be leasing from a government organization such as the Canada pension fund. We do not want to be competing for land from foreign investors or from CPP as they purchase land at ridiculous prices that farmers cannot compete with.
995.	Farm ownership, by Saskatchewan residents only, facilitates the preservation of our agricultural traditions. It helps to stabilize land values and reduce the fragmentation of farmland. Perhaps one of the most compelling reasons for maintaining local farm ownership

	regulations is the fact that the individuals who own and work the land have a vested interest in preserving environmental values.
996.	Farmers in Saskatchewan know how to farm the land here. If you let foreign companies in to buy land, what's to stop them from destroying our farming practices
997.	Firstly midsize farms are far better economically for the province. There are more people involved in the operations who are benefiting from the wealth created by the land. Along with that our smaller rural communities begin to thrive again. Large farms are drawn to have fewer people involved and rely on large equipment and possibly one or two employees. I believe the greatest economic benefit to our province would come by keeping our midsize farms,(3000-6000 acres) the true family operations the most efficient farms in the world.
998.	foreign ownership and investment groups do nothing to support and grow already dying rural towns which farming relies on
999.	SK needs more rural population. Foreign ownership depletes the population base even if the land is farmed locally, more acres need to be farmed to generate the same profit for the local farmer. Therefore more acres required per local person.
1000.	My opinion of traditional farmland ownership is that to own farmland you must be a farmer not a pension fund or investment fund or foreigner. There are plenty of opportunities out there for investors in other real estate. The ag business is unique. Always has been and always will be
1001.	Disagreeing because residing in the province/country you farm your own land is very important to us farmers. Based on our love and pride for our land with our future generations. Who will learn to respect, appreciate, and farm honestly, empathetic ally, productively, etc, with respect for neighbors, land etc.
1002.	Saskatchewan farmers should be able to afford to own the land they work not just rent it if they want because then it grows there assets and gives them more financial stability in the future not over seas companies or the extremely rich becoming richer.
1003.	Farming is more of a business today than ever, and the open market will dictate what values will be. There is lots of money in this province, we don't need pension funds to buy the land when there are plenty of people here who would love to buy the land if only they could also use the tax saving benefits of rrsp and tsfa's. I personally would cash in my stocks that I have invested in and buy farm land if I could hold that property in a tax saving vehicle. The rules need to be changed so we can invest in ourselves instead others. These tax saving vehicles are designed to send our money away to others when a lot of people would rather do some of these dealings ourselves.
1004.	As CPP investment is all working/farm people it is our Canadian heritage. CPP investment is us!
1005.	Stewardship of the land is important to our family. It is our belief that a farmer who owns the land will take care to protect the integrity of the soil to promote, and ensure that future generations will have good land land forever. A farmer who rents land is more likely to grow cash crops without good crop rotation practices for the long term.
1006.	By allowing foreign investors into farmland you are raising the base price of land perhaps out

	of the reach of new farmers that are Canadian. There is also the question of how much land are you going to fire sale to these foreign investors, will there be a percentage of land and how much oversight are you going to have to ensure that those lands are not contaminated? Judging from all the cutbacks we always seem to face I would estimate probably not much.
1007.	I our area younger farmers are finding it difficult to get started farming at all. Large corporate farms drive up the rent and then either go broke or move on when the profits are no longer there In that time younger families move on who may have stayed in the area if they could have found land to own or operate.
1008.	We need to take a very long term view of agriculture in SK and Canada. Short term decisions often result in stupidity for the long term. Greed has become a very prevalent factor in decision-making. We need to plan for many future generations.
1009.	The problem with pension managers is they chase historical returns and make bad decisions. You only have to look at what they paid in the last ten years for oilfield services companies and their existing profitability. Down the road the funds will be deficient for payment of the actual pensions of teachers and the like and government will step in to cover the losses instead of making them unload assets as a farmer who overextends would be forced to do.
1010.	Ownership gives long term stability; to expect anything less would be unreasonable because in a free market society almost all interest would be looking for profit for themselves.
1011.	Residents need to own the land to ensure we are never held hostage to food supply
1012.	My concern is that relaxing the rules would lead to an increase in foreign ownership that would trigger a loss of control over our land base; profits leaving the province; more unstable land pricing, i.e. the condos in Vancouver scenario whereby foreign investors blow in buy and leave town; loss/change in the social fabric in rural SK, I do not want to see us become employees of foreign buyers, feeding the world while foreigners walk off with the profits. Farmland in SK is our bedrock and it's difficult to compare with what other provinces are doing with their land base. Further we have of the majority of arable Canadian farmland we need to manage this resource to benefit SK people not only for the short-term but taking a long-term approach. (A quick sale at a high price may give some short-term benefit to a few but may result in problems over the longer term.)
1013.	I believe there is absolutely nothing wrong with foreigners buying land in sask as long as they are going to move here, live here and farm the land themselves. This contributes a lot more to the provincial economy and also rural Saskatchewan. Land should be owned by the people who farm it that's why our forefathers left Europe and came to this wonderful province.
1014.	Saskatchewan farmland should NOT be sold to non-Canadian outside foreign investors. Saskatchewan farmland should only be allowed to be sold preferably to Saskatchewan born people or at least be Canadian (not foreign investors for the sake of making an investment).
1015.	I believe it is very important to prevent large companies ie Monsanto from purchasing and investing in farmland. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To maintain healthy food supply for Canadian citizens. 2. To maintain economy because other counties are refusing to purchase genetically modified foodstuff. 3. To maintain lifestyle of farm workers. To prevent what our forefathers left when the absentee landlords placed profit before the health of the farmer.

1016. Not sure if there is any difference between Sask. Corporate Farmers owning the land or outside corporations.
1017. Land should be owned by Saskatchewan residents. There should be limits for Canadian residents. No one outside of Canada should be allowed to own land. The money generated from these acres should stay within our communities. If you want the privilege of being on Saskatchewan land you should live in our communities as well. This is our food source and not an investment opportunity. Do not take this for granted as history will teach you about food security.
1018. It's not like canda to let the 3rd and 4th generation farmers who lived here there whole live to being put under the bus by there own government allowing foreign investors buy our land. Is that land still considered cAndian then?
1019. We need to think about what farm land ownership will look like in 25 - 50 years. There are areas of the world where people are exiting because the chance of land ownership is nil. As well if totally unrestricted, all the farm land in Saskatchewan could be purchased by large multinational interests. For example, a foreign country could purchase farm land as a form of food security. Perhaps not probable, but possible. If there is no chance of a farmer owning the land which he/she operates, the is less incentive for that person to enter the industry in the first place.
1020. I am 29 yrs old and I moved from Ab in 2008 to buy my own dirt and put down roots here ! U can't make more land and we need to control the land in this province to ensure a financial and environmental benefits to local farmers and communities ! I support my town and rm by sitting on rm council on fire department , watershed board , wildlife club and active in curling and hockey! My children will attend schools and as a family support a town of 500 ppl! I don't think out of province or country investors will do this ! Not a chance ! If u want to own and live in this beautiful province and support the local economy and towns then I welcome with open arms as I was welcomed ! This province offered me a chance to OWN land and it was not a reality in Alberta. I also think the retirees who say I should sell to highest offer who cares? I guess go live in city when u retire bc in this town the hospital and homes are mostly supported by local farm ladies! Guess what the boys can't make a go the ladies ain't driving out to small town! It will kill rural sk! Another argument I hear well some one must work land for foreign investors? Ha I lost a job at local feedlot to a Mexican bc he will work for \$12 / hr ! Total crap they advertised in local paper for workers \$12 / hr no one applied so they go to goverent program bring them in ! 4 locals lost \$20 / hr jobs u think this is fair! They are AB investors and the Chinese and others will do the same ! The farmers equity is in his land his pride and heart the locals will take care of it bc it feeds them it's not just an investment to play with ! This is how I feel and I am glad this online survey was set up ! Thanks I am a supporter of sask party but I am not sure what to think of you open up or relax rules it may be political suicide! Thanks again sk
1021. I'm saying this now and I've said it before. If you want to own land in this province you and your family live here fulltime, your kids go to school in this province and you are involved in community activities in this province, end of story!!!

1022.	i think there should be restrictions on farm land purchasing from out of country investors and any type of large corporation coming to buy up our land and raising the prices of it or just using it to have another income and or tax right offs in there portfolio
1023.	Someone who has a direct interest in the ongoing health and profitability of it is best suited to treat it with the care that society expects.
1024.	we don't want off shore money coming in disguised as some cdn company or identity buying are land as in our rm we have names with no people attached to them who are they where is the money coming from
1025.	I strongly disagree with allowing large corporations & off shore investors having the right to own our farmland.
1026.	Looking well into the future I would like to see farmers always having a stake in land ownership. By having something at stake you tend to be better stewards of the land. The problem with outside investment is large capital portfolios tend to be in these purchases for a fast dollar and sometimes good farm stewardship practices aren't always followed. They want a good return all the time. Sometimes that means shortening crop rotations with no regards to disease and insect pressures , which in turn affects farmers who do try to maintain proper rotations and stewardship. Sometimes proper stewardship does not always align with the best return in the short term.
1027.	I want Sask. to maintain its rural routes
1028.	Do not agree with pension funds and investment funds owning land ,including large corporations.
1029.	if you think foreign investment will benefit rural sask give your head a shake
1030.	My wise father-in-law once said that there are many ways to wage war. Loose land ownership laws fall into this catagory in my opinion.
1031.	in my opinion sask farmland should be owned by residents of sask, with the provision that land can be passed down to the next generation as long as they are Canadian citizens and live in Canada.
1032.	Farm land ownership should stay in the hands of Sask residents. The land is currently being polluted by chemical applications, which will only get worse if it simply becomes a commodity owned by investors. Land needs to be farmed by those owning the land.
1033.	Land in our area has doubled in price over the last three years because of foreign investors using loop holes in the law to purchase farm land. Chinese investors have left some of the land go to weeds because of poor management.
1034.	Non-farm ownership allows outside interests to extort/extract large returns from farmers who need extra acres to be viable. This money often leaves the area or province. If ownership is held by non-farming interests the gain in farmland values over time does not benefit the farming community!!!
1035.	I believe that farming is no different then home ownership or renting. We all know who is going to come out best in the end and that is almost always an owner. An owner has the freedom and ability to plant what he needs to be efficient. The capability to maximize his profits and minimize the damages when he needs to. Renting your always negotiating terms,

paying them what they want to keep landlords happy, unsure of your own ability to upgrade equipment (in case your land base decreases) and may not have a say in what you grow or if you summer follow (a big expense with no chance of profit) or not. I am not saying to own only I think diversity is good but for security you need to own a land base that can support you and the lease land is a bonus. The opposite of what we have now, which makes us nervous young farmers.

I think the supply of farmland needs to be assessed. Is there land that we can't find a buyer for that we have to look for outsiders to sell to. If it's a good investment for them I bet it's a good investment for your people currently in your province. Sure, land changes hands from time to time but are we looking us farmers first? Or last if we allow foreign or investment owners? What will that do to the prices of land that young farmers are already having a hard time competing for? If you have high demand, you have high prices. To me that means land goes for high prices to big corporations and everyone else can move to the city and get different jobs. As if, these rural communities can survive that, too.

I am unclear about how investors and foreigners are going to bring money to Saskatchewan. If a chunk of land is for sale and an investment firm buys it instead of the local farmer. unless they pay double fair market value and leave a lot more then just the farmers cut, Which I doubt would happen, it's no different or worse then the local farmer because that money goes home to wherever they call home at the end of the day.

1036. Don't let foreign countries buy up all our land and reap the profit. It's a horrible decision in the long run.

1037. Growth and economic viability of a farm business also relies heavily on farm gate prices. I feel that the commodity price paid to us as producers has not kept pace with the cost of operating a farm business. The answer to farm land ownership is ineffective if the price of grain doesn't keep pace with the cost of production. If I were paid properly for my commodities, farm land ownership/values would be of less concern, because I could afford the higher price tag.

1038. Producers benefit from a direct attachment to the land they are cultivating. When a farmer owns the land they are producing on, they have not only a fully economical investment in it, but also an emotional investment. While economists and policy analysts may chuckle at the idea of emotions playing an important role, they would do well to realize that a farmer's attachment to land can mean the difference between going above and beyond or merely meeting the bare minimum for regulations that protect our environment (i.e. chemical disposal, following proper pesticide rates). Additionally, absent land owners make for a slow process to make large and important land decisions.

1039. non Canadian owners will likely grow and ship food to their country's which in essence takes jobs away from Canadians not to mention food. Food will be a large part of political power in the future.

1040. Family farms are needed to maintain our rural communities. A family farm should be no larger than can be worked and managed by direct family members, if outside resources are used it should be termed as commercial and fall under much more strict ownership restraints.

1041. Farmers generally pay the highest prices for farmland.

Owning farmland gives family farms stability to build up an operation (buildings, machinery, etc)

	<p>If farmers own the land they have an incentive to improve it. Things such as cropping the land based on what it needs, reducing erosion, improving the soil so that it will produce better in the future. These incentives are not there if you are farming someone else's land, and will not benefit from it in the long run. Owning the land allows family farms to have stability from generation to generation. One of the main reasons that I am starting to farm is because my family has concentrated on buying land over several generations. If we were based on mostly leased land it may not be guaranteed that I would have the opportunity to access all the land for my farming career. Family farms have built this province and provided stability through good and bad times. This stability has not been demonstrated through newer farming models such as One Earth farms, and Broadacre which have failed, and left a trail of unpaid bills, and unfarmed land in their wake.</p>
1042.	<p>We don't need more absent land lords sitting on land while the local farmers struggle to make it work.</p>
1043.	<p>Ownership is always better than renting. In our neck of the woods oil revenue is a big factor in the ownership of farmland.</p>
1044.	<p>I think SK has to move forward and that we can't do so by building a wall around the province/farmland and saying "You can't play." I do, however, not want unlimited restrictions where most farmland is run from outside the province by conglomerates.</p>
1045.	<p>Young farmers cannot compete with the dollars of pension funds, investment companies and foreign investors. The huge corporate farms do not seem to be successful. Allowing these investors may well jeopardize the future of any young farmers.</p>
1046.	<p>Selling land to investors promotes large corporate farms that will have nothing to do with the communities and areas that they farm in. Smaller family farms will be dead and the communities will follow</p>
1047.	<p>too unspecific in questions.</p>
1048.	<p>It is more about economic considerations. Preserving the tradition of farmland ownership ensures food security for all Saskatchewan and Canadian citizens. If it was only about economics, then no consideration would be given for what is good for the quarter's health. Since economics does not consider all social and environmental factors, the traditional farmers are the best way to safeguard our food supply and the health of our land.</p>
1049.	<p>I call upon, and expect the Saskatchewan Party to enact legislation to protect the family farm.</p>
1050.	<p>Saskatchewan farm land belongs to the people of Saskatchewan. It does not belong to pension plans or foreign investment especially out of country investment we need to take a stand that Canada and Saskatchewan is NOT for sale. This government needs to wake up and see this</p>
1051.	<p>I think preserving the tradition of farmland ownership is very important. Once land is sold to an investment group or pension fund it will not likely change hands again or ever (do a study on that, I would like to see a statistic that shows how long a group like that will hold onto that land). A one time sale of property will never generate the funds (on average) that land which say changes hands every 25 years will (how often on average is a chunk of land sold, another study).</p>

1052.	I think there should also be a limit to farm size to encourage family farms over corporate mega-farms.
1053.	There is no pride in farming left when foreign ownership comes into play. The lands are left looking totally disgusting and weed infested. The foreign owners do nothing to support the communities or RM's that they own land in. There is no economic value in foreign ownership whatsoever.
1054.	i think owning land should be only by 100 percent canadians and 80 percent saskatchewan residents. i feel high land values helps the economy and is fair.
1055.	Keep big farms and foreign investors out of our land as its a resource and will be destroyed by people and or companies that DO NOT have to live in the chemical wasteland they leave us here to deal with.
1056.	It's an archaic serfdom system, create an artificial aristocracy, force out all the people who are building, remove their land value, leave the few big farmers who have some money able to squeeze the little guys out, land being reduced to nearly worthless, use of fertilizer becomes un-affordable, its cheaper to subsistence farm a larger than progressively farm a small one. productivity across province drops. farm workers become slaves to the landed gentry as there is no other expansion option.
1057.	I came here as an immigrant under the SNIP program taking an amount of capital with me I personally would lead a class action suit against the province if they effectively bankrupt me by closing the market
1058.	We as a province lose enough arable acres to hydro power and urban sprawl due to the economics of it already i feel no need for foriegn investment doing the same..... i just want to run my family farm and keep it viable in the future
1059.	If we allow big out of province groups to purchase Saskatchewan land, then the future of our young Saskatchewan farmers is in danger. Big investors are not interested in the history or tradition that many generations have worked tirelessly in SK to provide. The future of our young will be hindered by large investment companies. We simply can not compete.
1060.	Investors buying land recently allowed my equity and leverage to improve but also hurts when renting back. Most investors are wanting return on investment rent some in some cases is to high. Market will decide and if they don't get it they will get out. Brought all land values up and yea I want to buy land cheap but I want mine worth something too. Need the right balance
1061.	The problem without side investment in farm land is they are more likely to look at it from a strict profit/loss point of view. They are more likely to mismanage the land. A farmer does not look at the land with what it can give him now he also understands proper management the long term profitability of the land increases
1062.	I believe that farms should be operated by people and families keeping corporations out of it because that will keep prices of food realistic. If corporations get involved food prices will sky rocket.
1063.	Strongly believe in ownership by Canadian Citizens
1064.	Young saskatchewan resident from urban backgrounds should have opportunity to purchase

	or lease farm land before wealthy foreign corporations. As the government you should regulate who can purchase farmland and for what purposes.
1065.	Any Canadians or Canadian companies & pension funds should be allowed to own land in Sask.
1066.	How would driving the prices of farm land up for the farmer benefit him? Unless he is selling out...to foreign ownership, etc. How would that then benefit middle class farming Canadians? We would all be controlled by foreign landlords who would then take over our country and what my father and grandfather fought for in WWI and WWII. Freedom... The land that they fought for would be controlled by foreigners not Canadians.
1067.	The land owned or rented by SK producers will be far more productive. New money into the economy, through foreign investment will generate wealth in the short term, and for the few.
1068.	If you want to keep agriculture sustainable for future generations of Saskatchewan citizens then restrict the amount of foreign investment in the land. We only have so much dirt and there are historical failures by the dozens of corporate ownership. Commodities do not support a fund manager's goals consistently. Failure to perform will cause them to dump the land at some point. If you drive all the family based operators out of the industry through external corporate ownership you will not have a base to sell the land back to when the corporate owners have moved on to the next dream of future dividends and profits. Farmers are a rare commodity and allowing foreign/external investment to drive the price beyond them will force them to exit. Without the family based owner that is willing to do what it takes to make sure that their future generations have a livelihood to look forward to, Saskatchewan is in danger of depopulation and desolation in the vast majority of geographic regions.
1069.	I have seen the price of land driven up by non farming investment pricing it out of reach of smaller farmers and making it much more difficult for larger operations to buy and lease as well. Maintain farm land for Sask farmers.
1070.	It is getting harder and harder to become a farmer as land prices are increasing and the input costs being so high. The province would benefit more if farmers could lower costs and gain more profit instead of having to have a second job just to support the farm. What ever happened to farmers with 2 or 3 quarters of land being able to live off of it? Now you have to have at least 8-10 quarters just to support the payments of the farm.
1071.	Government involvement in something that should be regarded as free enterprise is wrong. People always perform better when they have real goals to strive for rather than simply expecting life to be given to them because it has always been that way. Farming has changed dramatically in the last forty years. We will not go back to family farms on every section. If we want Saskatchewan to be taken seriously we have to get over our need to be mollycoddled.
1072.	How can a person sign a five year lease, buy all the equipment to farm the land. Which operating expenses can top 1 million dollars and then in five years lose out on the renewal of the land. No I have 500 K. Worth of cattle and 200K worth of machinery.
1073.	I think it would be beneficial if there were programs to help young people to get into farming. Most farmers in Saskatchewan are close to retirement age but can't get out because no one but investors can afford to get into farming. The land and equipment are far too expensive.
1074.	Food is a necessity of life. Food production affords farmers the ability to fill this valuable

	need. Keeping land ownership local, to Saskatchewan farmers and land owners allows the money to remain in the province, thus building the Saskatchewan economy. Definitely a trickle down effect on the economy as well as assisting with economic diversification.
1075.	It should be a lifestyle, where children can grow up and have lots of space to run around, and learn to take responsibility for certain aspects of the farm operation.
1076.	I think the farm land values in Saskatchewan should not be held artificially low by regulations prohibiting foreign ownership. In fact our land prices are some of the lowest in the world.
1077.	In my opinion the family farm is important. Large corporations should not have the monopoly on farms. They should be taxed heavily and let the small farmer make a living as they have in the past thus being a benefit to everyone not just one person or large company
1078.	Investment in land outside the province without out at least a 50%(+1) Saskatchewan resident ownership would make land even more expensive to purchase and take the current governance and consideration to local farmers and Sask residents away, and would divide the gap of ownership away from aboriginal people even further while turning the land into commercialized versions of historical England's original ownership system whereby every farmer was taxed to use land owned by royalty and had to pay a form of rent as well. In this case it would cause tax dollars to go outside the province to non-resident owners.
1079.	Don't let other countries purchase farmland, you r staving out the little family farms
1080.	There is more than enough domestic interest in Sk farmland to produce high values for sellers.
1081.	Any investment in farmland is welcome provided it is NOT corporate or pension fund money. It is a pity that the small farmer is becoming extinct.
1082.	<p>I believe that Saskatchewan land should be bought and owned by Saskatchewan residents, keeping money in our provinces pockets. I don't believe foreigners should be allowed to own the land to never use, or to farm and take profit away. Nor should corporations be able to own the land.</p> <p>While my views say that a person from out of province should be able to lease land, I also think a limit of years, like say 5-10 years could be in contract, with options to renew and price increase and such.</p> <p>I see enough houses/cabins owned by foreigners and non Saskatchewan residents sit empty year after year, or only visited one or twice a year, that it effects the economy of that area. Foreign investment? A one-time payment and a piddly amount of taxes? How about generations of taxes and expenditures and the livelihood of our province?</p> <p>Please allow free market to determine value of property and land, so no artificial bubble develops.</p>
1083.	If there is too much foreign ownership or fund investment it makes it difficult for young farmers to get started.
1084.	We need all the investment we can get
1085.	By allowing non-canadians to purchase large amounts of farmland it will hurt small rural communities. There will be little to no money going into that community after the sale. That land being sold to local producers will help sustain a rural community by keeping population

	in the areas up.
1086.	Chinese are taking up residency in Sask..... Purchasing farm land ... Not residing on farm or in community ...in our area have become absent land owners and have not been good stewards of the land ..ex.. Will not spray for leafy spurge. As a farmer very close to retirement it is reassuring to finally see land prices and commodities rise so that perhaps finally there is a light at the end of the tunnel but the idea if corporate farms concerns me greatly... Our child wants to take over the family farm ... The industry should be viable enough that she can afford to pay us fair market value
1087.	Farmland values go up with money from other provinces, but it no longer is viable to pay for it with agriculture dollars making it impossible for a farmer to compete buying land.
1088.	Please don't sell our land to foreign investors. It will make us slaves to the demands of other countries.
1089.	Farmland in Saskatchewan is essential to Saskatchewan today and in the future. It is our province's ways and means of sustaining our food supply. Allowing foreign investment is ludicrous, because we then relinquish control over our food supply to a foreign body that has no interest in keeping Saskatchewan residents well-fed, only in making profits that then leave the province.
1090.	I believe sask farm land should only be sold to prairie province farmers
1091.	Saskatchewan farmland should be made available for Saskatchewan residents only. Save the family farm.
1092.	I know there is a thin line between too many and not enough restrictions. A balance needs to be put in place that insures enough liquidity in the market place to allow retiring farmers a fair price but at the same time doesn't allow large upward pressure on land values due to speculators in the market making it unaffordable to real farmers.
1093.	I don't believe that we should have people coming to our province from Africa, China and many other places to purchase land. If we went there would we be able to purchase land? No we would not be able to cause they want that land for there people. I feel we should keep our land and they shouldn't be able to come over here and buy what they want. Just because they have money isn't right for us to give up our land. We want our children to farm so give better rates for young farmers who are just starting in the business. Otherwise we will see all our land taken away from us which is not right.
1094.	I believe to own land in this province you should live in this province . Which in turn supports the local economy.
1095.	See first comment earlier in survey.... I recommend that farmland ownership be restricted to individuals who are either residents of Saskatchewan or incorporated farming operations that are owned by individuals who reside in Saskatchewan.
1096.	We do not need outside ownership of farmland. We need people living in our communities and supporting our towns. It should not be looked on as an opportunity for personal gain for pension funds.
1097.	Referring to "agricultural industry" is a poor choice a assessing value of foreign ownership. The better measure is "local economy" as in economic health at the rural municipiaity level.

	<p>More foreign ownership leads to more corporate farm models resulting in fewer land owners living in the RM to pay taxes, put kids in schools, support local businesses, etc. The bigger the farms the lower the percentage permanent residents in the RM to operate the farm.</p> <p>I believe economic activity at the RM local is an important factor looking 30 years ahead. There continues to be a downward trend in rural population and reducing number of local land owners by replacing them with foreign owners will only accelerate that trend.</p>
1098.	<p>Large corporations (that are not "hands on" operators) do not contribute to the local economy, keeping small communities viable. I believe that the oil & gas companies in the area contribute more to small communities than large farmland corporations. As more corporations gain control of farmland, smaller farms in the area with young children, are being forced to bus their children farther to school, because young people are no longer able to compete financially with the outside investors. We seem to be moving backwards as in the industrial revolution when the farmers moved to the cities.</p>
1099.	<p>Ownership and leasing of the land generally insures good stewardship. Pension plans do not contribute financially through taxes as other land owners.</p>
1100.	<p>Farming is a business. As an owner - operator you have to assess your financial position and understand the risks that affect your business. Purchasing assets should reflect a rate of return that provides a reasonable profit to your investment. When you limit ownership you limit investment dollars which then limits your rate of return on that asset especially during down turns in the industry.</p>
1101.	<p>If farming stays as profitable as it has been in the past 10-20 yrs we will have lots of young farmers with-in our province to carry on the wonderful farm life style of our ancestors. Farming is not only a method of making a living, it is also a life style. Having grown up on a farm, it bothers me when I hear of foreign ownership. I also do not agree with huge farm (not family) operations that buy up land at prices young farmers can not afford because of a smaller land base to fall back on.</p>
1102.	<p>Having land ownership outside of the province doesn't promote the family farm. It promotes corporate farming enterprises who's only concern is profit.</p>
1103.	<p>The land rent process works.</p>
1104.	<p>By farmer owning farm land, we reduce the need for government aid. Many times I've gone to the bank with land titles in hand, for an operating loan. It also stabilizes land prices and prevents a low priced, foreign feeding frenzy.</p>
1105.	<p>Farmland is where we grow our food (both for our own use and for export). Like clean water and breathable air, it is necessary to life. It is risky to put ownership of something this valuable to us in the hands of people or corporations whose interests may conflict with our own.</p>
1106.	<p>By the time the year 2050 hits, we are going to need to produce DOUBLE the amount of food that we do now.</p> <p>If you were to take an average of all foreign investors who have come over or sent someone over to farm or ranch our land, my guess is about 50% ran operations into the ground.</p> <p>Sure, it's a great pay out for the farmer that gets the offer, but it's only going to hurt the</p>

	<p>entire country in the end.</p> <p>For a person looking at things money wise, sure, it's a great idea. Take you 1.7 million and run to Arizona for half a year, but when our great grandkids kids don't have enough food on the table, we will have no one to blame but ourselves. Beef and feed prices are already through the roof, imagine if we let a foreign investor come in and swoop up all pasture land and run it into the ground. Beef prices get higher, cost of production becomes higher, and feed becomes a hard found commodity.</p> <p>I understand that people who get bought out sometimes make a rent or lease deal, but when you then have 1.7 million to dabble with, and aren't farming your own land, you aren't doing things to 100% of your ability. Causing yield drops, and less grain going through the market.</p>
1107.	Would be more stable, investors tend to roll farm land of they be leave the market is at a high
1108.	with this surrey you are not putting farmers imputs first.
1109.	<p>Only time it helps a farmer to have outside competition on land is when they sell out</p> <p>Other than that outside compitition can only lead to over priced land which a farmer can't lead to the demise of the sask farmer</p>
1110.	I believe in the family farm is the best way to ensure the highest quality in product this country can provide. Also helps the future generations grow with the land and new farming techniques, unfortunately I cannot compete with big operations bank roll. I just hope that I may expand my operation without operating at a loss so I may do more in my community.
1111.	Having investors from out of country raises the value of farmland. As a young farmer, that makes it impossible for me to make a living at farming if I cannot afford to own my land that I farm.
1112.	I can not see how anybody can see good coming from land being owned by none Sask owners. They are buying this land to make money. So more money will leave the province than ever came in on a one time buy. They want to own land here for the profite return on there investment. So we Sask people will lose tax dollars as well. They will pay tax in there own province or country. Meaning ever person in Sask wil pay more tax in long term. There is only 2 winners out of selling to out side owners. The guy selling land for an extra buck and moving out of Sask. And out side owners making money of Sask farmers.
1113.	Canada has limited arable land. The increasing move to cover productive farm land with housing developments is unconscionable. Farm land is about a means of food production....it is not about "investment" which implies "only thing that matters is the bottom line and shareholder income". It is also very necessary to set in place regulations which make farm land affordable for the next generation. We do not need "bidding wars" on our farmland by non-Canadian investors.
1114.	Sask folks should maintain ownership
1115.	Farmland makes food, which is vitally important to all the people of the world. I have seen much land taken out of production because investors didn't care if it was farmed, they only cared about owning the asset. This is causing 2 problems, 1- less food available for people, and 2- the land actually decreases in value due to weeds and lack of care. Farmland is too

	important to treat like other investment real estate.
1116.	Landowners in Saskatchewan need to live and be active in the community! More people on the land more money being spend in small communities, schools! Not money being carried away for large operations or out of province! Doesn't build anything for Saskatchewan.
1117.	farmland should never be considered commercial real estate and therefore should never be considered outside the perimeters of producing food. farmland and the people who produce are food are just too important to be left at the whim of investment/ huge profit/capital gains manipulators. Just look at how one of these investors is already trying to find loop holes and manipulate what is in place today. They wouldn't even bother if there wasn't the potential for a huge windfall at the end of the day at someone elses expense. We also need to consider what will happen to the social fabric of rural Saskatchewan in regards to community---rinks, halls churches, post offices, small town stores, etc.
1118.	Emphatic NO to foreign ownership of Sask. farmland. Nor to pension funds or other.
1119.	<p>I think there are 2 issues; how do we maintain the free market, and what is the vision of the future of farming.</p> <p>Maintaining the Free Market</p> <p>I think that with institutional investors like CPP, or if maybe a large corporation like Microsoft decided to diversify into farmland, that any land involved is no longer part of the free market. Certainly it is possible that market forces will shift and CPP will sell the land at some point, but if the future of farming is positive, and commodity prices continue to trend up, then, honestly, there is only a small chance that CPP will ever sell. Allowing a large corporation to own lots of land is no different than allowing Government to own all land, whether it be the Saskatchewan Government, or the New Brunswick Government, or the Chinese Government. The reason all are the same is that neither large businesses nor Governments die in 3-4 generations.</p> <p>However, I don't mind, as much, a group of individual investors joining up and purchasing a block of land, since in a period of time, market forces may mean they have to sell some or all of it. Since they are all human, they have human issues, such as divorce or health issues, that affect the entity, and so that land will foreseeably come back onto the market.</p> <p>But either of those scenarios is still not the best: that is when the land is farmed by those who own it.</p> <p>Sure it may be that, currently, only 1% of total farmland in Saskatchewan is held by large investors, but what amount is appropriate? When all the land around me is owned by CPP, and there is no chance for me to expand without moving my operation, then that is too much owned by one entity. It's different if all the land is owned by one big farmer, since he has been buying land over time, and I can compete with him for it if I want. That is what is happening in my RM; a number of different farming operations are all looking to expand, and so land prices improve, but if only one entity owned all the land then prices would stagnate since if all the land is rented, there is no incentive to improve it.</p> <p>Buying is always preferable to renting, since then you can improve the operation over time. Renting is not the ideal long-term solution. Renting means there is no Pride of Ownership – just as residential housing properties deteriorate more rapidly than those inhabited by the</p>

owner, so too farmland is negatively affected by renters or caretakers.

Renting land forever would be like portions of radio frequencies being bought and sold. Imagine a company had a licence to operate a radio frequency at say, 650 AM, and had various talk shows on it. Yet in the early 1990's, the company was experiencing financial difficulties, and the law allowed it to sell a portion of its frequency. So the talk show host at that time for the 8:30-12:30 slot bought the rights to the timeslot, named it The Roy Norris Show, and decided the format to be used as long as he owned the timeslot. Even though he may decide not to be a talk show host and retires, the new, or returning, person at the mike will have to maintain the same format since Roy Norris Inc. does not want to sell the rights, at any price. It's easy to see that the new host would soon become frustrated since he, or she, would not be able to make changes to the show that they think appropriate, and either the show might deteriorate, or the listeners would. Yet the talk show host should not be frustrated, since he is still making money at the job, and is generally doing what he loves to do, but the truth is that for him to have any control, he would have to move to a different station, or a different city, since most cities or regions could only handle one talk radio station. Yet, all other time slots in all other cities were sold off to institutional investors, or to large talk show entities, and there are no time slots available, unless one goes to a small town radio station.

So with large entities owning all the land, new or existing farmers can only hope to expand by renting, and the incentive to farm is reduced. May as well move somewhere else that I can own my own land and have something to pass on to the next generation.

The Future of Farming in Saskatchewan

If you foresee Saskatchewan as one big farm and two cities, then one owner of all 62 million acres is fine, or five entities holding around 15 million acres each, and renting it all out to large operators.

However, I foresee more and more small or even tiny farms. I see the local food movement as only getting larger. More and more young people are asking about the ingredients in our food, and the local food movement encourages small farms. But many small farms can only happen with a vigorous free market.

I have 12 acres, and from research I have done about Joel Salatin, Geoff Lawton, Sepp Holzer, and permaculture principles (ignoring the tree-hugging sect), one can do a lot on small acreages, and I see more and more of that happening. Yet if CPP buys every acre in an RM, why would they want to sell one quarter, or even 10 acres, to me? But even if many large farmers are bidding on local land, I still may be able to buy it since it's too far away from their operations. I can operate in a niche, and then, as my operation becomes successful, by the time I want to expand, one of the large farmers may be retiring, and I can buy some of his land, and other small farmers can too. The point is that I have a hope of buying land if humans own it, since things happen, divorce, death, change of heart. But if an institutional owner has locked it up for all time, then why bother?

So with large entities owning all the land, there is no incentive for small farmers to operate, since they can't own even 10 acres without paying exorbitant prices, while new or existing farmers can only hope to expand by renting, and the incentive to farm is reduced. May as well move somewhere else that I can own my own land and have something to pass on to the next generation.

1120. Ag land is a precious commodity that is critical to ensure food security now and into the future. Stewardship is a huge component of ownership and proper stewardship is essential by owners. Selling our saskatchewan land to those elsewhere does not allow for proper stewardship and a security in land being maintained for the interest of agriculture and saskatchewan.

1121. I have had land bought in our municipality by a investor out of country and rented out the owner has no clue as to its proper use he was talking about a condo unit in the middle of nowhere and a dry milk factory to send back to japan this is who i compete with as a young farmer/rancher when the neighbor wants to retire and sell ive had investors come approach me to buy up large blocks of land and rent back to me at unrealistic prices with 10 yr agreements that will sink a well managed family farm when they are forced to out bid neighbors for lease agreements then have comoditiy prices dive.

1122. i have had a small family farm for 44 years. 44 years ago there were NOT as many large or corporate farms like there are now. To me, on the small family farm, that when i purchased my input such as gas, fertilizer, chemical, even in some instances like cultivator shovels, the first question asked by most retailers is "how much" or " how many do you need?"

Seeing as i dont require i do not require many of these i pay full price. If i farmed on a larger scale like most farmers today, i would receive a discount, sometime quite a bit less than what i have paid!

this i have had to compete with most of my life, the two things that have kept me going in this business after all these years, is that i love what i am doing and now that i am finally going to be able to sell my land a decent price.

Now, you and your government have come along and now want to put restrictions on who can purchase that farm land; and will definitely, in my opinion, drop the price of farm land in Saskatchewan, therefor taking money right out of my pocket. I dont know how you feel about someone taking money out of your pocket, but it pisses me off!!

After all these years of not catching a break and paying full retail on most of the inputs on my farm, because i cant buy in large volumes, I have someone come along and put restrictions on who can buy my land. This will make it easier for the same people i have competed with all my life to get a good deal on my farm when i retire!!

When house prices in this province soared and young people just starting out, like my children, were buying a house, why didnt your government put restrictions on who bought them then? Examples:

More wealthy people flipping houses just so they could become wealthier!

Out of province people buying apartments and condos that had lower income tenants that could afford to live there, renovating them and then charging exuberant rent that those people couldnt afford? you dont want anyone restricting people who can buy your house do you ? i dont want anyone to be restricting me either.

1123. as a farmer and farm land owner sask farm land and canadian farm land must be kept affordable so farmers such as myself and other sask farmers can expand our operations. land ownership must be retained by sask farmers as we will be the ones that will take the best care of the land for future generations in sask and canada. plus we are the ones that will invest and keep are local communities strong and growing. invespters that only care about profits will

	not care about protecting the land and growing the local communities.
1124.	I believe in the power and importance of our small towns in rural Saskatchewan. I think the productivity of our provinces soils should play a pretty big role in shaping our future agricultural scene. I understand some of the problem you as politicians must face
1125.	If all we want in this life is to measure our success in dollars then sell our province to the highest bidder on a world wide market would probably be the way. However that selfish way of doing business is not one I want any part of, I voted to grow Saskatchewan not sell out our children's and grandchildren's futures
1126.	having foreign ownership just means that sask people will lose control of their own province and eventually become peasant farmers to large corporations who will take the money they make and spend it in foreign economies thereby further bankrupting our province
1127.	The farmland ownership has changed in the past years at an accelerated pace. It's a constant, there will never be more made but it should be for producing of food, not for investment purposes only. We farmed, we retired, and sold/rented to a young neighbour to allow him to pursue his desire of farming. This resulted in adding a family to the local community, rink, church, added a nurse to the local hospital/home care and so on!
1128.	Farm land should not be treated as a commodity, but be viewed as an important resource for our food security. China gets it, the Saudi's get it, that is why there is so much interest in our farmland and grain terminals. The future generations will look back and say, wow how could they allow so much foreign interest in something as important as food production. And there is much more foreign investment than any of your charts indicate. Too many loopholes, the source of the money should be from Canada. Not foreign money funneled through complicated corporations and individuals that have foreign interest.
1129.	Restrictions are good and should be enforced. Canadians came to this country to OWN and FARM their own land!!
1130.	The people and/or investors from outside of Saskatchewan and Canada do not have any invested interest in the land itself, it is only about making money. Also when you have foreign investment/ownership in farm land in Saskatchewan, how long will it be until some other country controls Saskatchewan and Canada.
1131.	having high value on farmland benefits those retiring but limits those who actually farm it, its a double edged sword. Commodity prices and input costs will regulate what farmers will or should pay.
1132.	I believe that land should be owned by Saskatchewan farmers. It creates stability in our communities and in the future of farming. I believe there is better stewardship of the land by the people who own and farm it than from corporate owners. We need to repopulate our rural areas; that will be mostly ensured by farmers owning their land.
1133.	I am totally against foreign ownership of farm land whether it be someone from outside Saskatchewan or a multi-national corporation or a foreign country. The reason is that they can accumulate vast areas of crop land and now that the Wheat Board is gone these big conglomerates could sell large amounts of grain back to their home country leaving us to depend on other countries for our crops shortages in Saskatchewan.

	Multi - nationals will eventually own most of the crop land in Saskatchewan. Back to the Surf System here we come.
1134.	I feel very strongly that Saskatchewan farmland should be owned by Saskatchewan land owners. We have future children growing up that will want to continue with the family farm. Why should our children's futures be sold off to the highest bidder that may not have clue on how to operate a farm or to turn that valuable asset in to nothing. We need to keep our land in our provinces and owned by people who live in Canada and are Canadian citizens. There is nothing else to be discussed. This country has all ready sold a lot of companies to out of country buyers. It is a disgrace!
1135.	Farmland is a strategic resource, just like potash and other natural resources. Allowing too much outside ownership will lead to the lack of control of this strategic resource!
1136.	I strongly feel that farm land in Saskatchewan should be owned by people who live in Saskatchewan, and who are looking to actually farm it. Too much of the revenue generated by farm land will leave the province and even the country if we allow investment companies, or foreign investors to own it.
1137.	Allowing investors to own land is adding a extra middle man to the cost of food world wide why should a 5th generation farmer have to compete with people trying to make a quick easy buck
1138.	farm land should not be treated as a commodity
1139.	Farmland is an asset and I think that it should therefor be sold or purchased by anyone in the world. If the farming economy is good farmers will be the purchasers as it is not an attractive asset investment for foreign ownership, and if the farming economy goes down the foreign ownership will create a floor for the biggest trading asset on a farms balance sheet.
1140.	I have a unique experience with the canada pension formerly know as Assiniboia farmland corp Back in 2009 they had put up a yard site for sale so I bought it and that's where we called home. Fast forward to the following spring I requested to buy the remaing land of the 1/4 that the yard was on and they sold it to me
1141.	Any successfully business has assets that pay for themselves and have a return on the investment over the life of the asset. This should also be said for farmland. If I want to farm land, it needs to pay for itself and make me a return, otherwise it does not make financial sense to take the risk. Allowing money to flow into farm land from other areas of the world will put the ability of land to be a viable asset at risk, which in effect puts my farm business, and many other farm business, at risk of being unprofitable. If my business is unprofitable and unsustainable, it will no longer be a contributing to the local and provincial economy
1142.	If, by the ag. "industry" you mean the grain trade, rail roads/transportation, input suppliers etc. these groups benefit from the production from our farms regardless who owns the land. The value of having local people own their farm land is in the level of commitment to and the active participation in our local communities. I cannot anticipate that our rural life style will increase by having absentee landlords. I really don't care who owns the farm next door, I just desire them to be resident owners able to bring their personal abilities and gifts to our community.

1143.	<p>Making a living from farming remains an economic challenge. Higher land prices do not help.</p> <p>Enlarged farm sizes and increased leasing of land does nothing to improve land stewardship or flexibility in farming. Farmers get pushed into larger equipment and more industrial sized operations that reduce the diversity of land use and make the farming operation more vulnerable to low commodity prices and poor growing conditions as the farm operation is less diverse and carries a higher debt load.</p>
1144.	<p>Farmland is vital to food production. Ownership of farmland as strictly an investment asset destabilizes the industry as investment dollars can flow as quickly to another more productive sector if there is a downturn in return on investment. The tradition of farmland ownership has always been an important goal for farmers everywhere; this ownership carries tangible benefits of career & livelihood, but also those of environmental stewardship, sustainability & heritage.</p>
1145.	<p>FARMLAND SHOULD BE FOR FARMERS NOT HUGE COMPANIES</p>
1146.	<p>It is hard to buy land if you are competing with large companies or outside investors</p>
1147.	<p>Outside ownership benefits the groups that purchase as the values rise for them. Outside ownership drives prices up, and makes it unaffordable for local farmers to purchase and in many cases lease land. The extra costs associated with acquiring land to use for agriculture, means less money is available for sufficient inputs for maximizing yields on crop and grazing lands.</p>
1148.	<p>If the majority of farmland or anything else for that matter is leased their is no problem walking away when things go bad. sooner or later it will and where would that leave the industry?</p>
1149.	<p>There are growing number of very large scale farmers (>20,000 acres) that have investors funding them that make it difficult for small farms to grow and almost impossible for someone to get into farming.</p>
1150.	<p>Farming & ranching has always been a volatile industry and it has become even more volatile as input costs continue to increase as well as equipment and land. In addition, the weather is changing and we can no longer count on historical local weather patterns for timing various events in farming (seeding, spraying, haying, harvest, etc). We in Sask also face the longest distance (highest costs) to transport grain and cattle to markets and that will not change.</p> <p>I work in the banking industry and for 9yrs I was in Agricultural lending and for another 9yrs in commerical lending. Cash flow is king. Period. Keeping farm land reasonably priced so active farmers can own the land allows them to build up some equity to carry them through bad years. Paying cash rent to "investors" does not allow a farmer to build up equity to borrow against during bad years. A financial institution will be more willing to lend a farmer money in bad years if there is farmland as security than against equipment or inventory.</p> <p>Non-farming "investors" in land only want cash rent and are placing restrictions on how the farmer can farm the rented land, such as not allowing any grass to be planted, even though the land, or portions of it, are better suited as pasture / hay land. I know - this is happening right now back where my family farm was. This is transferring all the risk to the active farmer (and even more so if restrictions on farming are being placed on the farmer), without the ability to build equity in land to carry you through bad years.</p>

Agriculture is well known for capitalizing any gains from the market into land appreciation. However if this goes to outside investors, the farmer cannot draw upon that equity in down years. Outside "investors" have lots of opportunities to invest in Sask other than farmland. Residential or commercial real estate and businesses are available for investing in, as well as mineral rights.

I do not buy the argument that farmers, especially those just starting out, need to rent land therefore outside investors should be able to own the land and rent it to them. That land will be available for farming whether or not a pension fund, investment fund, or private investors own it. The question is who will own it and what restrictions will be placed upon the land. The exiting farmer or estate can just as easily rent the land to a new farmer as can a pension fund.

Outside investors are not interested in the social aspects of farm land ownership and the implications for the local economy. Local ownership has a bigger vested interest in the success of a farm unit than an outside investor.

1151. It is not about tradition. It is about not returning to serfdom. Feudalism was advantageous to the lords and ladies. Boards of directors are responsible to their shareholders first. Leases may start out reasonable, however, when other investments are suffering, or the land value has plateaued, the area the board will have as flexible upside will be lease rates. Boards in high rises are not aware of the intricacies of land ownership. Managing land responsibly is best done by the women and men living on the land. They are aware of the variations of soil, carrying capacity, weather etc. Cash rent is the swiftest way to soil degradation. When the farmer is not invested in the future of the soil, and only has to make his rent, long term husbandry does not happen.

1152. Many overseas investors have already bought land here, you must have legislation in place with teeth to back up what has already happened. This has been left to realtors to manage and money talks as we know. Land prices are still behind the rest of the world, so they will continue to rise, no matter who is buying.

1153. Smaller more efficient family farms need to make a comeback. Monster farms made up of rented foreign owned land are not nearly as well cared for as private land is. No economic stimulation for local areas with outside ownership. Should have to live on the land you own.

1154. The future generation of Saskatchewan farmers needs to have affordable land available to them if not the future generation won't be able to support themselves and their families.

1155. Land values continue to reflect the conditions the industry is surrounded by. Trying to increase values through artificial outside investment creates the instability that is not needed. The market is determining values depending on local conditions. Ability to access capital is the largest impediment to allowing more local investment from local farmers (and younger ones) who desperately want to expand and can't with lenders "policy on ag lending".

1156. Ownership encourages caring about the quality of the soil, the quality of life of the surrounding communities, and the stake in protecting drinking water and habitats for native species of plants and animals in a sustainable approach to agriculture.

1157. If outside investors are coming into the province they should be strictly controlled in terms of how much land they can own, the use of that land, the contribution to local and provincial community social and economic development. Farmland should go back to the requirement of restriction of ownership only to Saskatchewan residents. And, incorporated farming

	operations and cooperatives owned by individuals who reside in Saskatchewan
1158.	The person who farms the land should own the land.
1159.	I worry about absentee owners contributing to further depopulation of rural areas and poor stewardship of land, and about speculators driving up the price of land so locals cannot afford it. While leasing can be valuable for new farmers, without the ability to eventually sell land, retirement can be hard to fund.
1160.	Non-Canadians should not be allowed to own farmland.
1161.	Times are always changing, and trying to hold onto old ways of doing things will hold this province back. Open up the gates for big money to enter the province, and watch it trickle down into other parts of the economy. Rural and Urban centers alike would benefit from investment money flowing into the province.
1162.	Would love to see current restrictions continue. We have had out of province investors buy land and try to rent to highest bidder. Hurts local farmers and they contribute NOTHING to our local communities. As well corporate farms are a scary thought as they will control the prices of finished i.e. Bread in the future. We do not want to pay 9\$ for a loaf of bread anymore than the next person. It's also hurting small communities as farms get bigger and bigger and the population decreases.
1163.	Buyers with deep pockets (i.e. pension plans) can afford to play the long game by investing in extremely high land prices. It makes it quite difficult for individual farmers with fewer cash resources to make competitive offers for land when they have to still make enough to live on each year and are not just balancing out their investment portfolio. As land prices go up, profit margins tighten which leads farmers to expand. This then also drives demand for land and prices will go up even further. It makes it very difficult for a younger farmer or a new farmer with few resources to start into farming. It becomes very discouraging and ultimately will favor the larger corporate farming model. Vibrant rural communities benefit from farming operations with a vested interest in the community, environment and economic development of the area. I do not feel that large corporation farms owned by interests outside of Saskatchewan will focus on rural community development and employee satisfaction. Immigrant labor for low cost and minimal benefits may unfortunately become the new norm on SK farms if this trend continues.
1164.	small farms decide to sell to investors because they can get a lot of money as a result their are less and less small farmers
1165.	<p>People came to Canada from Europe to escape being small tenants. Allowing foreign and large corporations to own land puts us back on the track of having land owned by a single owner and the farmers being only tenants (peasant, serfs).</p> <p>Farmlands is not just real estate - it is the means by which we grow our food that we need in order to live. Having a diverse range of ownership is important to maintaining openness and opportunity.</p> <p>Some land, such as PFRA, and provincial pastures, is already publicly owned and should remain that way. Other land that is privately owned should remain in the hands of small local farmers.</p> <p>Foreign owners won't respect things we are trying to do like respecting the First Nations, from</p>

whom the settlers took the land in the first place.

Foreign owners have no allegiance to Saskatchewan or our cultural or environmental goals. Even people from Alberta who have come to Saskatchewan have been known to do things such as cultivate original unbroken prairie - this happened in southwest Saskatchewan just last year.

The size of land that can be owned by corporations should be limited. All corporations and owners should be publicly identifiable - not hiding behind numbered companies. This is very important for accountability for respect of our agricultural and environmental laws and policies.

Local Saskatchewan residents should be able to purchase farmland. This should be a priority.

Large corporations owning land contributes to rural depopulation vs having many local families (or co-ops) owning land and contributing to local communities.

1166. 1. Agricultural census data shows that many farmers in Saskatchewan depend on both owned and leased land, with the specific of proportion of each in a given operation varying with the farmer. For Saskatchewan farmers as a whole, the proportion of farmland that is leased (versus owned) in the province has been slowly increasing. At the present juncture, it is important that 'affordability' be maintained on both fronts. Nonetheless, there should be no assumption that leased land can easily be substituted for owned without implications for Saskatchewan's farming operations. Some degree of landownership (i.e. equity) will be important for maintaining farmers' access to credit, cash flow, security of tenure, and ability to withstand temporary (market, weather or pest related) downturns, among other factors.
2. Predictability and stability in farmland markets is key to effective farm planning. The issues here include not only land price (i.e. financial access to land), but also the material availability of land (i.e. physical access to land) in such locations as it is needed for farm expansion or the establishment of new operations.
3. With respect to the 'new investment dollars' argument, it is unclear to what extent capital access is currently an issue for Saskatchewan farmers, given that we are now several years into a period of low interest rates and relaxed lending policies. Quite besides this, it is clear that rather than adopting a 'more capital=better' perspective, one must look at the terms on which capital is offered and accessed, and at how those terms may impact the current and future sustainability of Saskatchewan's farms and rural communities. In some cases, the replacement of a farmer by an investor with improved access to capital may also result in the removal of capital from rural communities.
4. It is also clear that farmland ownership is also a cultural and political issue, as well as an economic one. It is indeed a matter of 'tradition, one that is closely linked to rural identities and family life. It is also a strategic concern for residents of the province and the country. Such values cannot be disregarded in favour of a simple economic analysis.
5. Certainly one of the most challenging issues regards the shifting demographics of farming in Saskatchewan which, together with past processes of farm consolidation, means that there are (or in any case have been) a large number of farmers looking to retire and/or exit farming. There are also farmers who may need to sell some of their land to reduce leverage. And there are farm descendants who have held onto the land. All of these individuals would like to receive fair value of their land and the investments they (or their families) have made in their operations over the years. Nonetheless, the needs of such individuals must be balanced

against those of farmers who need to expand their operations and those individuals that are seeking to establish new farms or a new career in farming. The latter, of course, will benefit from lower land prices.

6. To a degree, it matters less whether the outside investor in or owner of prairie farmland is located in Calgary, Toronto, Frankfurt, Hong Kong, or Dubai (although many may find the first two more palatable). Rather what matters more is the terms of specific investments, as well as the overall proportion of farmland held by farmers, farm descendants, and non-farmers.

1167. Only active farmers who live in the province of Saskatchewan , should be allowed to own land, 10 year transition allowed on family farm take overs

1168. Outside investors only care about return. They do NOT care about new young farmers who have family's and support their local school, rink or town. The real estate salesmen would have us believe that outside investors are helping new farmers when in reality they are lining there own pockets.

1169. Outside investment is fine by not if it means ownership is held outside of the province. Need to take up residence in Saskatchewan or establish an office. (Need to have a presence in Saskatchewan).

1170. I feel that basic economics would prove that putting restrictions on ownership that will negatively impact land values would have an overall negative impact on Saskatchewan. Restrictions on land values will likely lead to a lower land values which will hurt farmers looking to sell their most valuable asset. Less people buying land will lead to less money flowing into Saskatchewan.

Saskatchewan farmers looking to start a new farm or expand their operation will not be left behind if we choose to keep land ownership rules the same or loosen them. It appears the structure of farm organizations are changing and leasing land is proving to have a lot of upside (farmers can leverage themselves more than they could if they only relied on financing for purchasing land). As far as ownership, they still have the opportunity to purchase land.

Why should farm land have more or less restrictions than any other real estate asset? For example, young and growing farmers wanting restrictions in place to keep land values low so they can purchase the land is the same as young adults asking their city or province to put restrictions in place on residential properties so they are able to buy a home rather than rent. I don't see why one real estate asset class would get regulation that favors the young and growing farmers and another real estate asset class would not...

1171. Skyline Specific Responses to the above Questions:

1. Rate the relative importance of the following when considering any potential changes to Saskatchewan farmland ownership rules:

i. Maximize the market value of farmland for current farmland owners:

Regardless of the farmland ownership rules, Skyline's business activities will not directly affect market prices of farmland. As a Canadian financial institution, Skyline will finance the purchase of land by a farmer after the farmer has agreed to a purchase price with the vendor. As such, Skyline's financial services create opportunities for both the purchaser and seller of the land.

ii. Ensure predictability and stability of the market value of farmland:

As stated above, Skyline is a Canadian financial institution and will not have a direct impact on the market value of farmland.

iii. Maintain the tradition of farmland ownership in Saskatchewan:

Skyline not only helps maintain this tradition, but furthers it by creating new opportunities for Saskatchewan resident farmers to purchase farmland in the province that farmers might not have been able to purchase using traditional financing sources.

iv. Bring new investment dollars into the province:

Farming is a capital intensive business and investment dollars can be important for producers. Skyline's business model achieves the goal of bringing additional investment into the province and does it in a way that benefits the farming community and the province - Skyline uses the investment dollars to help farmers acquire and own additional farmland.

v. Ensure farmland remains affordable for Saskatchewan farmers who wish to lease land:

Skyline is a Canadian financial institution and will not buy and lease farmland, nor will it have a direct impact on the market value of farmland which can influence land lease rates.

vi. Support expansion of operations for local farmers:

Skyline was approached by Saskatchewan farmers to specifically help with this issue. Many farmers want to expand operations and become full time growers but they often lack the necessary capital to do so. Skyline developed a financing product, with the assistance of the farming community, to give farmers the opportunity to achieve the scale they desire through increased land ownership.

vii. Support the government's ability to enforce compliance with ownership requirements:

Skyline intends that its financial services offering be fully compliant with both the legal text and spirit of the legislation and Skyline supports the government's ability to enforce compliance.

viii. Ensure farmland remains affordable for Saskatchewan farmers who wish to purchase land:

As a Canadian financial institution, Skyline finances the acquisition of farmland by its farming clients. Skyline does not buy farmland and therefore is not a price-setter – Skyline has no direct impact on farmland prices in the province.

2. State your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

i. Preserving the tradition of farmland ownership in Saskatchewan is as important as economic considerations:

Skyline's financing model helps to preserve the tradition of farmland ownership in Saskatchewan, while at the same time it assists farmers in achieving their economic objectives. Skyline helps to ensure that farmland remains owned and operated by Saskatchewan resident farmers by providing farmers with the necessary capital to acquire land in their community. This, in turn, creates more opportunities for retiring farmers to sell their land. As a result, Skyline is helping to transition Saskatchewan land from the current to the next generation.

ii. Owning farmland is less important to the operation than it used to be:

Skyline believes owning farmland versus renting farmland should be a choice left to the individual farmer, with each option having specific benefits; however, Skyline's goal is to offer farmers a new form of financing that gives farmers more flexibility to expand their operations by acquiring additional farmland rather than expanding through renting land.

iii. The agriculture industry in Saskatchewan benefits as a result of having restrictions in place around ownership of farmland by non-Canadians:

Not Applicable to Skyline - Skyline is financing Saskatchewan and Canadian resident farmers to own Saskatchewan's farmland.

iv. The agricultural industry in Saskatchewan would benefit from a greater share of investment in land purchases coming from outside the province:

The agricultural industry, in particular its farmers, require access to significant amounts of capital in order to expand their operations and take advantage of economies of scale. By using Skyline's financial services farmers can benefit from capital invested from outside the province by using it to acquire additional farmland. Despite using external capital, Saskatchewan's farmland will continue to be owned and operated by local resident farmers.

v. The agriculture industry in Saskatchewan benefits as a result of having restrictions in place around ownership of farmland by pension funds and large investment trusts:

For some farmers expanding their operations by leasing additional land fits well within their overall business strategy. For these farmers, ownership of farmland by pension funds and large investment trusts may create longer-term leasing opportunities that would not otherwise exist. However, many farmers may prefer to grow their operations by increasing their land ownership and Skyline can help these farmers to achieve this goal. Skyline could use capital sourced from various investment groups to the benefit of Saskatchewan resident farmers by financing the farmer to purchase and operate the optimal number of acres.

1172. I believe that out of province owners are mostly absent from the community & do nothing to help agriculture in Saskatchewan. Most of their business is done out of province also.

1173. Foreign people, organizations, trusts etc should not be allowed to purchase farmland in Saskatchewan. It is important for Saskatchewan farmers to be able to purchase land and expand their operation. Foreign ownership drives prices up and makes it so that the farmer can't make the land produce enough to pay for itself. It also makes it so that the farmer cannot expand as the farmland around him is being bought up by foreign owners. It is very near sighted to think that you should allow foreign ownership of your land.

1174. Much of the land around our farm is now owned by either out of country or out of province investors, and leased back. The land is poorly farmed, quickly farmed for the short haul return, and no investment is being made into the future of the soil, which is a living thing. The general agreement from long term farmers is that land used like this will be depleted within five years. We will then be looking at a supply challenge, and a price collapse is possible.

1175. Land is an increasingly demanded and contested resource. This land 'is the only land we have,' we must protect though public institutions that take a long-term, economic- and ecological sustainability point of view. It is urgent in my mind to restrict foreign ownership. If I was a foreigner, I would resist living up to Saskatchewan expectations where I could when

	these contradict my private benefits, and would not care so much about maintaining land quality and access to future Saskatchewan peoples.
1176.	Farm land in sask should not be able to be owned by someone from another country when our own residents are wanting to buy. With the out of province or country people coming in willing to pay higher prices it leaves us local farmers that are looking at acquiring new land in a very tough position
1177.	We suffered and will suffer if government places restrictions on land ownership that are unique in Sask. only. Our land values are just trying to align to provinces that have not had government interference. As in any industry or asset that Government artificially disrupts distortion occur that are negative in the long run.
1178.	Out of province land owners don't help the economy much, better to have the owners/lessees living here to bolster the local economy. Absolutely no land owned by foreign interest, as we get nothing out of them but a single sale. After that they put the crop in, and take it off by foreign workers and the entire crop is shipped back to China, not even a sale. This is happening by Sheho right now.
1179.	When the time comes for me to bid on a parcel of land against the CPP or any other trust company, the depth of my pocket will be smaller than theirs every time. If the CPP or any other trust company wants to support agriculture in this province, why not loan us the money to buy land rather than compete against us to buy land? And then later they come back to us asking for an astronomical amount to rent it from them. When one farmer retires and sells his land to another farmer, the equity gained by that first farmer stays in Saskatchewan most of the time because he buys a house or a condo in the nearest town, and lives here for the rest of his days spending that money in our communities here in Saskatchewan. When the CPP buys land here from an investment group, that equity that was made by the investment group is returned to the investors wherever they may be and that money is spent outside of Saskatchewan and never benefits our economy here. When the CPP sells that investment in farmland, again the equity gained will benefit the people in the CPP, the majority of which do not live in Saskatchewan and the majority of which will spend that money which was made in Saskatchewan somewhere other than Saskatchewan.
1180.	We have a tradition of family ownership and I think that this needs to be supported
1181.	farmland should be farmed by sask residents
1182.	Farmland is not a renewable resource and therefore it should not be allowed to be taken over by outside sources.
1183.	Need to keep the Saskatchewan Farmland owned by Saskatchewan Farmers. If you make your living from the land and live on the land you look after the land. Saskatchewan Farmers threw the pride of ownership look after the land.
1184.	You need to own a land base to be able to access loans. Farmland should be regulated differently because it affects the country's food supply and the cost of food. Why sell out from under us a non renewable resource. Money is only paper.
1185.	Owning the land is not as important as affording the land rent. Outside investors only care

	about maximum cash flow and maximum capital gains in the shortest time frame.
1186.	I figured the land should be open only to Saskatchewan residents especially farmers
1187.	Why restrict a persons retirement in either form
1188.	Saskatchewan residents benefits as a result of having restrictions around ownership of farmland. Pension funds and large investment trusts SHOULD NOT OWN land in Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan should be owned by Saskatchewan residents not corporations. Land should be allowed to be inherited by one generation living outside of Saskatchewan.
1189.	The idea that farmland might be cheaper to rent if the investors are kept out is ridiculous. There won't be much land for the smaller guy to rent if the investors are shut out as the big wealthy farmers and Hutterite colonies will buy the land and they will of course farm the land themselves.
1190.	Will go back into the feudal system of large corporations can buy farm land. No system can beat farm ownership. They have more liability and risk. Corporations only see in dollars now while a farmer takes into consideration the long term agronomic principles to ensure his farm is sustainable.
1191.	It is my belief that the ownership of the fundamental resource should be in the hands of those who have a direct interest in the operation of the land. I believe it is also better for communities to have land owned by those closest to that community. I am not sure what is meant by "Support the government's ability to enforce compliance with ownership requirements", but if it is meant that I support the SK Government's right to restrict farm ownership, then my answer is definitely and strongly 'yes'.
1192.	With the many farmers retiring in the next five years, land needs to be reasonably priced for the next generation to be able to farm while being able to have a chance of earning a profit. If lease/buy rates sky-rocket, no one can afford to get into farming. It's costly enough as it is with the large capital expenditure requirements alone.
1193.	Being a young farmer I believe that having to compete with large trust funds will make it impossible to purchase land. Also the trust/pension funds are taking land away never to return to local ownership and they do not add anything to the local community/infrastructure. They don't donate their time or money to any local investments or developments like local farmers do.
1194.	As a new farmer it is very hard to grow or even start when investors drive the price of land up. I also do not like the fact that the money the investors make does not necessarily stay in sask
1195.	Pension funds by land with before tax dollars if they are allowed to do so, farmers should be able to buy land as a tax deductible expense.
1196.	Definitely would not like to see more farmland owned by foreign individuals and/or foreign-controlled corporate entities.
1197.	Type of ownership of the land strongly influences the level of food security and food sovereignty. Legal entity that owns the land, controls the food production. Control of food production has a significant impact on the level of national security – nation that does not have control of its food production, does not have control of its destiny (this is especially true if foreign investors are allowed to own the land in Saskatchewan). Food producers must have

access to fertile land and have secure means to receive stable income for their own survival and to be able to feed the nation. Locally owned land supports development of small communities where income is circulated among local businesses. If the land is owned by absentee landowner(s), income generated by the agricultural production is transferred to distant communities & businesses.

1198. In my opinion foreign ownership does not promote good land stewardship

1199. Owning farmland is very important!

6) In your opinion, what effect would relaxing the requirements for ownership of Saskatchewan farmland...?

#	Response
1.	Land is increasingly being sold by auction or open tender. The highest bidder is who sets the price. More often than not, land will go to a farmer rather than an investor. However, when large tracts of land come for sale it will be the investors, rather than the farmers who will have the competitive advantage as they usually have greater access to capital.
2.	Relaxing ownership would allow more outside investors to buy farm land which would drive up demand and therefore drive up the market value of farmland. As a local farmland owner who lives and works in the community in which I own land and farm the land, an increase in the market value of land will make it difficult for me as a local land owner to afford to purchase any additional farm land from neighbors or retiring family members. When a group of Chinese lawyers from Alberta buy land at the end of my drive way for \$150,000/ quarter and rent it back to a neighbor for high rental rates, I simply can not compete. When I try to get a loan to purchase that \$150,000 quarter of land at 5% interest rates I am going to pay \$230,000 for that same quarter of land over 20 years. Whereas investors have the cash on hand to pay outright for the land so they are not accruing interest and they would requiring a different annual return than a person financing the same amount of money. A couple bad years of farming and I can not make my payment or my lessee can't pay their rent then I will default on the loan. It is a high risk to take for the average local person.
3.	This will spur investment by other countries, and push out the Canadian people that want to farm the land in their own country. Why do we need to sell our land to investors from other countries? Are the people within our own province not good enough to own the land that is here? We have sold enough of our raw resources to other countries already cannot we not keep even the land that the farmers make their living from?
4.	I don't see this driving the price up too much
5.	It would bring outside. Only to help farmers with their retirement (down in the United States) and make it further harder for the next generation (who are business people) to start up/continue the family farm.
6.	It would increase the value, definitely in the short to medium term, possibly into the longer term...as long as investors continue to be interested.
7.	Relaxing the requirements could easily decrease the value of farmland. Who wants to farm or live next door to a huge potash mining operation owned by China? The government should

	quit selling our farmland to foreign countries who want Saskatchewan's resources. The increased amount of resource exploration and extraction is destroying Saskatchewan farmland and destroying peoples homes.
8.	It would all but certainly increase the value of farmland, as more funds enter the picture. Requiring a certain return, as funds do, would also more likely ensure the value stays high, as they can simply out-wait any dips in the value over the decades. More valuable, in this case, equals less affordable in the long run.
9.	Increasing the price makes it harder and harder to start out
10.	The key driver of farmland value should be the productivity of the underlying land. If land in North Dakota and land in Saskatchewan is equally as productive with the same time of crops then one would expect their respective farmland values to be similar. In my view, Saskatchewan farmland in general does not reflect market rates -- this hurts current farmers who want to sell their land, but it's also tough for young farmers to buy land. Hence the need for new business models to help ensure that farmers have some ownership of land. But the bottom line is that land prices must reflect the market rate.
11.	Price will make locally owned land a thing of the past
12.	Market dictates value.
13.	Farmers will pay the same money for the land as investment companies.
14.	We saw this happen in our RM when an outside investor purchase a number of 1/4's for sale. The land was lower quality and the investor over paid. This has resulted in higher land prices across the RM and higher rentals.
15.	It will force out the family run farms to big corporations. This will inflate pricing, forcing out new buyers and current farmers
16.	It would increase, but price out local farmers who need the land to expand their operations. Keeping land in the hands of local producers ensures job stability in rural areas, and ensures local producers are supporting local businesses. Large scale operations will lead to fewer jobs for small rural areas, as farmers will not be able to support themselves and be forced to sell and move to urban areas. This puts increased pressure on social supports for those unable to find work.
17.	Short term increase, long term decrease
18.	Would increase the value to a point where it would no longer be affordable for the average farmer to continue farming with out carrying major debt load that would more than likely be passed to future generations
19.	Land would become more valuable but it would be in the hands of big companies and pension plans who would rent at high prices and make farming unsustainable.
20.	Price would go up but due to the farming practices the land would not be taken care of correctly and the of the land quality would decrease
21.	Strategic investors such as a neighbour or family member will pay as much or perhaps more for purchasing land, restricting institutional investors should have little impact on the price retiring farmers would receive.

22.	Farm land prices are getting so high its near impossible to make money with production agriculture unless you are a big farmer.
23.	Would open it up for big corporations to come in and buy up land. Actual farmers can't compete.
24.	Land prices will sky rocket until interest rates go bad and everything will fall
25.	Investors buying would increase land values, making it difficult for actual farmers to buy land
26.	Small parcels bought by farmer often go for higher price than large parcels by investors and large producers
27.	While the land would increase in value I think that we should maintain the restrictions. This helps keep the land local and diverse and keeps the money being made off the land in Canada with the people.
28.	Land is expensive enough with local ppl trying to attain more, we don't need investors driving up the prices
29.	cause
30.	The 2002 modification in requirements showed that relaxing the requirements for ownership will increase the market value of farmland in Saskatchewan. Many people will agree that this is a positive for Saskatchewan residents; however, I believe that it is very near-sighted and close-minded. I believe that if the requirements are relaxed, then the sustainability of the agricultural industry will be doomed over the long term and the Province of Saskatchewan will ultimately suffer losses in the triple bottom line accounting.
31.	may make it unaffordable for young, beginning Saskatchewan born farmers
32.	I believe that it would increase the value however this would be negative for the Saskatchewan farmers and their families who wish to continue farming, expand and leave/pass on an agricultural legacy to their children. Already within the province, we are hearing that small and medium farm families are struggling to be able to expand and grow their operations as they are competing with much larger, wealthier farming corporations including the Hutterites. There are also many who have lived in rural settings their entire lives that would appreciate the opportunity to purchase a small acerage but cannot based on the price of agricultural land. While the market value increase would be great for those looking to sell, I truly believe that it would be a backwards move for Saskatchewan.
33.	It would become a very competitive market.
34.	Sale to the highest bidder.
35.	However the market participants will change. Agriculture is on the cusp of not being competitive in land. Sadly I am a right wing vote in favor of a me regulation.
36.	Increase it more than it already has. Has become unaffordable. Foreign owners pay high dollars then want high money for rent. When no one can afford to pay it. It sits unarmed, leading to bad weed situations etc.
37.	By restricting the ownership requirements of farmland in Canada there will be less interested parties. Less demand of farmland will decrease the price of farmland, which is good for young

	producers who want to get involved in the industry.
38.	If opened to the world market... our land would become totally not affordable....much like what is happening to housing in Vancouver.
39.	If commodity markets stay good, the value will go up, as people are willing to pay the rents. When prices fall, the investor will panic and sell, causing the bubble to burst. It causes uncertainty for long term investors (farmers).
40.	It would increase the price drastically if allowed because there are large amounts of land available here unlike most places in the world. Foreign buying would undoubtedly sky rocket.
41.	It would increase the value but to a point where it would be out of the reach of current/new local Saskatchewan farmers. I am a person who would be interested in owning farmland but even as it is now, my best chance of obtaining land would be marrying into it or inheriting it; the cost of farmland is too high to buy enough land to make a sustainable/profitable farm.
42.	It would make the farmland too expensive for the average farmer to purchase
43.	As a farm kid attempting to get back into agriculture, the foreign ownership of Sask. land is sickening and detrimental.
44.	Increase it in a bad way as farmers would be in bidding wars against big corporations and the only one benefitting would be the seller. It drives up land and rent prices province wide, and gets people wanting big money for even the poorest of land.
45.	Would drive up the value, making it unaffordable to expand.
46.	Cash Rental will determine land values, it is an Investment, and is all about return.
47.	Two years of drought would have a greater impact on land values than present market drivers. Saskatchewan farm land will always have value but like most commodities will rise and fall.
48.	Land is viewed as a fail safe commodity especially in the current energy downturn. Certainly immediate investment increases the value of farmland in the short term but decreases its overall value to the province by forcing rural populations away from their livelihood or potential for continued growth.
49.	Initially numbers will increase as foreigners buy up all the land they can get they're hands on, forcing the market value too high for local home grown farmers to afford, even though they've been raised on this land. Then once it plateaus and no one can afford it, not even to rent the land to farm it, we will continue to lose more and more family farmers, more corporations will take over and expand, leading to more great examples such as filing for creditor protection.
50.	I feel like if we let outside investors in, the prices would become unaffordable for local farmers, so increasing the value but decreasing the ability for us to be able to farm our own land or compete with foreign entities.
51.	I think that the foreigners are driving up the price in the short term however they will soon realize that you can only pay a certain amount for land before you can't make a profit on it.
52.	The Real Estate market would be a free for all the same as it was when the Big Real Estate firms moved into Saskatchewan and started on line bidding wars for housing and justifying

the price gouging by stating Free Market blather and tried telling everyone there was a housing shortage in Saskatoon and Regina. There were suddenly more Real Estate businesses opening doors in our Province and small towns than we've ever seen before. Some of those have since closed down, but will reopen with a flourish if land is the next speculators dream purchase! Real Estate businesses should be required to treat land purchases in a different way. Land should be sold per piece (quarter or section), not parceled and according to assessed value there is a reason some land is assessed so low!

Real Estate agents should not be allowed "Percentage" commissions on Agricultural Land, but a flat fee so as not to unduly influence the market and raise their commissions. Real Estate agencies should never be allowed to approach or harass land owners. Obituary calls, walk ins and tell neighbours their neighbours are selling out (when they are not,) etc. This was a big problem with people in B.C., when unscrupulous Realtors tried buying up smaller orchards for housing developments.

- | | |
|-----|--|
| 53. | Much like the city real-estate, the prices keep getting drove higher by people and companies with borrowed money. We are heading for a crash similar to the U.S. if things don't change. |
| 54. | Increased competition = increase price. It seems like these land investment companies don't care about the productive capacity of the land. They have a certain amount to spend and will keep buying no matter the price. |
| 55. | simple supply and demand. |
| 56. | Increase it beyond most real farmers means. |
| 57. | It will go up in value and pass hands between investors making it harder and harder for smaller farms |
| 58. | But with relaxing ownership rules, the problem would be that family farms would disappear and in worst case scenario that when invest groups aren't getting their returns there maybe not enough farmers to take over |
| 59. | But Canada would lose their most valuable commodity, being land, to outside investors. |
| 60. | local farmers would not be able to compete with big corporations in purchase of land. |
| 61. | Increase the value so that the people from Saskatchewan can't afford to buy land. Then you see more people on social assistance. |
| 62. | 80% of farmers have a hard enough time to buy land! But oil company's, investors, foreign farmers have the cash for it |
| 63. | <p>There is a significant role for investors in SK farmland as in any industry.</p> <p>If you preclude one type of investor, the others will think they are next and stop investing all together.</p> <p>CPPIB is not publicly traded & 100% Canadian owned. They are extremely responsible stewards of the land. They don't drive the price of land up, they support existing prices. Farmers & net farm income drive changes in farmland values.</p> |

	The existing market is working. Don't mess with it by restricting it or over regulating it.
64.	If we relax the rules around farmland ownership, the land prices will sky rocket even higher, as we know there is plenty of interest in our farmland to outside investment. If the price of land goes up, it makes buying land very tough for a well-established farm, let alone a young farmer staring out or trying to make ends meet.
65.	Relaxed restrictions would see an influx of investment into the economy through farmland divestitures and acquisitions and also an increase in opportunities for growth and economic activity in industry.
66.	Large outside corporations would buy up huge tracts of land with all their money and therefore decrease the value. Also make it impossible for the local farmers in the next generation to own land.
67.	there are enough investors out there with more money than they can spend, why not buy land drive prices up ,who gains the most, they do...wealthy people do we want land prices and a country similar to Europe ?
68.	like I said above, you must measure "value" by more then just Dollars
69.	Farm land is being traded as a commodity with little interest in the productivity of the land itself. Investors are buying land in hopes it increases in value totally out bidding young farmers who need to generate a profit off that land to be able to afford to farm
70.	If we got rid of the investors/ colonies that are moving in all over, farmers would be more happy knowing there is land still for sale at decent price not investors and colonies driving everything up.
71.	The value of land is based on any given buyer's return on investment expectations, regardless of renting or farming it. What relaxation are you talking about? No restrictions at all? Foreign Governmental agencies? CPP being ok for a year and now suspended?
72.	Farmland values have already risen significantly. The concern here is that foreign owners take over the land limiting farmers like us who have farmed this land since 1909.
73.	We should have a chance to buy. There is a lot if people that would like the small family farms brought back the quality is starting to matter to people now they want to be healthier. The factory farms are going to be the past.
74.	It depends on the world economy.....with interest rates low, investors are looking for a place to make a return
75.	There is a massive amount of capital around the world hungry for a place to be secured away from currency, even if it means a low ROI.
76.	MOST RANCH LAND IS SO HIGH IN PRICE HERE YOU COULD NEVER PAY FOR IT BY RANCHING. IT HAS MORE THEN TRIPLED IN PRICE IN MY LIFE TIME.

77.	Increase the value from investors to a point where no one from Sask. will own any land; it will all be owned from over seas and I feel that is the way things are heading now
78.	Stop selling us out to the highest bidder. Remember that saying "Buy Land. They aren't making anymore of it." So seriously, you want to sell the key asset that this province has?
79.	It would increase the value to a level which is even more out of reach for local farmers/ranchers/residents. How can a farmer compete with wealthy foreign investors? Or corporations? Land is already at an extremely high cost. Relaxing the rules will surely compound that problem.
80.	Market value will mean nothing as the foreign buyers will now name the price and buy up all the land.
81.	Relaxing the requirement would definitely increase the value because of investors trying to make a better return on their money.
82.	Increase but doesn't benefit farmers.
83.	Foreign money, large corporations and other groups with large amounts of cash will drive the price to historic values. What will they do with this land? Rent it out at the highest price they can. This may work if you assumed that every year you get a record crop. But if you are a farmer, you would know that the climate is not always perfect, and rarely is. If you take the opportunity of land ownership away from the farmer, he is left with no tangible assets. All he has are liabilities in the form of equipment and expenses in the form of inputs and labour. Do not take away the life and blood of a farmer, the soil. Keep the soil for the farmers.
84.	Investors like pension funds and investment trusts would not buy enough land to increase values across the province. The main reason farmland is more expensive is because of low interest rates and bigger profits on the farm.
85.	There would be an initial increase but like all markets it would find its place then remain relatively constant and predictable along side other markets.
86.	it already has!!!
87.	speculation is fuel to fire we can't control
88.	More off shore interest (China), which I'm not in favor
89.	The majority of foreigners buying land is for investment purposes only which means they do not care about the stewardship of the land and when it gets leased back to a farmer at high lease rates they cannot afford to use sustainable farming practices.
90.	The increasing value of the land makes it difficult to start a new operation or expand unless you rent.
91.	As outside investors enter our market, we will begin to see the introduction of outside sub par practices that will smear the good name of Saskatchewan crops globally. The free-market is no place for Saskatchewan farmland.
92.	Great for guys retiring, not for guys buying
93.	Kiss the family farm goodbye!

94.	Long term the same but investor ownership would lead to wide market swings in the short term, like the stock market.
95.	Will have more outside money driving up price, turning farms into larger and larger operations which is not good for rural communities
96.	The industry is capital-starved. Just look at the success of _____ !
97.	In the short term it will increase value as foreign interests grab up land to promote their own food security interests. It will be a quick payout and a forever loss to the Canadian economy.
98.	Returns will dictate price – a guy won't rent if he can't make money and investors won't buy it if they can't make a return.
99.	The more people or groups interested in buying, the mugged the price will be. These realtors that solicit foreign ownership or investor groups are only interested in padding their own bank account. I feel there are enough young farmers locally that would keep the value of farmland at a respectable value.
100.	Making it unaffordable for the little guy. This was the same problem back in the Land Bank days.
101.	I think with outside investors, whether they are foreign or domestic, the value would increase but this will result in less small farms and more giant corporate farms and I don't think this is good for Saskatchewan farmers or its residents
102.	Farmland values are tied more to world demand for food. I think that will influence the direction of farm land values.
103.	Increasing the value may be fine for the farmers who are looking to retire, but I would much rather see the land go to young farmers in the area than investment companies. If investment companies buy the land, it will drive up prices putting the land out of the reach of local farmers.
104.	Land shouldn't be out for grabs for capital. If land is going to be a part of the economy, there should be more sustainable practices in place.
105.	Farm land is currently over inflated and will correct itself either with government intervention, via changes in restricting ownership, or without, based on slumping grain prices.
106.	It would probably increase the value of the land in the short term, but after they see things are not as rosy as they look from paper, they would dump the land, but in the meantime a full generation of true farmers will have missed out. Let's learn what happened to the hog barns Sask. built years ago. Where are those barns now? An owner will stay after hours if something goes sideways, whereas a renter or hired hand will say its quitting time will fix after weekend.
107.	I think this might put us at risk of large takeovers
108.	While I believe that relaxing the requirements would increase the value of farmland, I would be concerned that it would only be temporary while the "bad blood" among farmers who sold "out of province" instead of to renting or selling to another farmer would last for generations. Agriculture is the foundation on which our Province was built - it is my belief that we should

	be preserving and encouraging our local agricultural industry instead of artificially inflating it and creating a "land bubble".
109.	Value should be a function of productive capability not who owns it - though there is an opportunity for a little Vancouver to develop in farmland. I'm not sure foreign owners can wait for the equity to build up like local owner operators can.
110.	It would increase the value but what value would that really add for the GOS? Taking opportunity away from the people who would farm it, because they have unfair competition like CPPIB.
111.	Investment buyers are able to use before tax dollars while farmers are not. No fair!
112.	If anyone can buy the land, the people with the most money will. It'll make it impossible for families to stay afloat.
113.	Allowing more people to own land would result in higher land values, as we have seen in the past 10 years.
114.	At least initially, but land stewardship would partly determine what happens afterward.
115.	Foreign or corporate ownership of land inflates the value beyond what those who operate that land can feasibly pay for it. Good for those who are exiting the business but bad for those who are starting or expanding. We don't want a climate that only favours those exiting the industry.
116.	People will look for places to invest their dollars and land is safe.
117.	It increases the value but puts it out of reach for traditional farmer to purchase.
118.	Our land is the cheapest in the world and there is a wealth of investors that know this and would come and invest here.
119.	I think there will be short term equalizing of land quality and value similar to Alberta but long run the market will flow closer to a free market. It will go up and down relative to grain prices and relaxing the requirements will allow other stakeholders to mitigate land value risk and allow farmers to maximize their crop year inputs.
120.	As there will be more investors, then for sure Farmland value will increase.
121.	The restrictions need to be enforced if you want agriculture in Saskatchewan.
122.	Outside investment money will only come if the return looks good. I think we are at that land value now. More people in the ag land market could stabilize prices more.
123.	Investment entities can afford to pay more for farm land than can a young farmer. Increased demand equals increased price, an elementary tenet of economics.
124.	Don't make it so difficult for farmers to own their land and it might help them out on the long run by being able to keep their land and farm their own land instead of renting it out.
125.	Not only would the value decrease, the level of connection to that land would decrease. People from elsewhere do not have the same stake in this as we do. Also, MARKET VALUE is not the ONLY value of land. While farming is a job, it is mostly a WAY OF LIFE. The land is worth so much more than money.

126.	Owning a farm is already a risky and expensive venture! Now that land prices are so high my son will probably never be able to purchase his own land!
127.	Land is one of the only things I believe will never decrease in value. The more people that have the opportunity to buy the higher the bids and the more the value will increase. I am strongly against letting foreign investment come in and be able to buy farm land.
128.	I think land would stabilize. We can all afford a few expensive quarters, but I also remember the bank phoning to please make an offer on the neighbours land(after the 80's boom) cause he's behind. People seem to forget. It wasn't that long ago.
129.	Economics of supply and demand would indicate that more people being allowed to purchase Sask. farmland would drive up value. However, the purchase of farmland has to provide a rate of return whether the purchaser is an investor or farmer. Therefore, Sask. farmland values will be mostly dictated by commodity prices, crop yield from year to year, and interest rates- NOT how many purchasers are allowed to own Sask. farmland.
130.	The value of the land would go up as there are investors who want to buy land at high values and many of these acres are remaining idle, going to weeds, since they want a high rental price that is not feasible.
131.	International investors would jump at the opportunity.
132.	The price would be too high for the average farm making smaller farms sell to huge farming corporations with zero family values or care for their communities. Big farming corporations (not including family owned corporate farms) do not work! was the biggest joke around!
133.	And make it unaffordable. Don't do it!
134.	Outside investors will bid up values - looking for an investment, not management. This will distort the market and make it more difficult for existing farmers to acquire land at a price that will provide a reasonable return when being farmed.
135.	There are more factors than who can own the land that influence the price. Right now, I think prices are relatively high without foreign ownership and that this should not be a factor in determining whether the rules should be changed. Saskatchewan farmland should be owned by Canadians.
136.	If there are less restrictions, there are more potential investors which is a supply & demand concept. Problem is the quality of land management, accountability etc. when the people with that land are simply viewing the land as a \$. I believe the wishes of most, other than some business people, would be to encourage traditional farming/ranching with capabilities of generational family turnover. Farmers/ranchers have never been about the money, they would much rather see young people with a desire for that lifestyle take over and get a fair value for their assets to live comfortably. Not to mention keeping small communities alive! If there were mostly investment-owned land, the smaller towns would definitely suffer and dry up.
137.	The price of farmland would go up if foreigners and investment companies were allowed unrestricted access because they want strategic access to food-producing land and they expect shortages in the future -- thus they are willing to pay on speculative value rather than productive value. Their deep pockets mean that they will out-bid farmers who must pencil out the return from farming the land and only buy if they can expect to make a return within a

	reasonable time.
138.	Land has been increasing in value in years, with the current restrictions stopping pension plans and investment groups on purchasing land has caused a de-valuation and still the local farmers are not buying as it's cheaper for them to rent.
139.	Outside Canada ownership of large parts of this province prohibits a fully made in Sask model for the use and productivity of farmland. We cannot afford to allow large parts of this province to be bought and traded on the world market as such a move would skyrocket prices to the point that even urban expansion could become jeopardized.
140.	I don't want speculators driving up prices and making the land unaffordable for those who were born here and have stewardship by right of Canadian citizenship. Capitalism has no care for sustainability. Those who care only about money lose sight of what is really important in this debate.
141.	We don't want the value increased any more since it is already not affordable for small farmers to buy land now.
142.	Given the current age of farmers in Sask. a move that increases potential investors can only be a good thing.
143.	Drive the price up To a certain extent..
144.	Money talks for most people. If I offer my neighbor \$100/acre and some foreign-based investment company offers him \$300/acre, it's quite obvious which way he would go, regardless of personal feelings towards local guys.
145.	I have personally seen how investors drive up the price of land.... for everyone.
146.	at the expense of ensuring Sask's ag future
147.	Foreign governments would purchase the entire land base either directly, or through proxies. I don't see the public benefit to that.
148.	Simple supply and demand. Opening the floodgates will increase demand and with a decreasing supply of farmland, prices will skyrocket.
149.	investment by pension funds would likely increase farmland values, primarily because Saskatchewan farmland values are still below other provinces and states.
150.	In what time period and in what commodity price future? If you restrict grain prices, fuel prices and input costs, and eliminate weather risk and restrict on-farm income and restrict land rental rates, then we could project the land value.
151.	Wealthy corporations would buy the land at prices beyond the reach of individual farmers. Farmers will become serfs to the corporations.
152.	Values would become more aligned with the productive value of the land as opposed to the speculative value. This would make it easier for new young farmers to get into the industry as farm investor owners.

	The alternative will be an industry owned by institutional investors operated by farm laborers. Becoming a farm laborer has never been a career choice in this province.
153.	China or some of the other countries who depend on us for grain would buy the land instead of the grain because they have lots of money but no more land to use to feed the population.
154.	Outside investors will hamper our ability to provide our own population with food. Saskatchewan land should reside in the hands of the people living here . I think our government has too many outside investor interests as a priority. Hopefully I am proven wrong.
155.	This is a misleading question. The PRICE would go up if you let large investors purchase. The value of the land as a resource would still be the same. We need the land to produce crops. There is no guarantee large investors will continue to use it for that purpose. Plus, if they decide to rent for profit, many farmers may not be able to afford the rent. I heard the rent tripled for some of the land purchased by the Company.
156.	I believe there is currently enough competition amongst local farmers and Canadian investors to ensure that market values properly reflect supply and demand forces. Although opening up ownership requirements would certainly not likely hurt property values, I believe the significant increase in land prices over the last 5 or 6 years has priced out a lot of the 'upside' for investors in terms of capital appreciation and investment returns, which would temper demand from external investors.
157.	The value of farmland would increase, however, this will force traditional family farms out of the agriculture sector and drive inflation and cost of living much higher, which will decrease the purchasing power of average farmers.
158.	Short term value would go up. Long term creating a biodesert, everything dies, the land has no value. It is time politicians thought beyond the next 4 year term.
159.	http://www.producer.com/2014/11/lack-of-capital-to-blame- / This is not how our forefathers founded the agriculture industry in this province. Its embarrassing. If you're asking if we should have more of this going on in our province, my answer is NO!
160.	The sky is the limit!
161.	It may artificially, temporarily inflate farmland prices, but there will be a crash coming - because with prices so high no one can make any money farming unless you inherit a lot of land or have the backing of a huge corporate farm.
162.	If farmland is used for something other than crops or livestock or hunting, chances are it will be made into commercial property.
163.	Seeing what land values have done in Alberta, I expect the land value to continue to climb significantly year over year especially considering the investment potential.
164.	There is no question that reduced demand would reduce the price, it is simple economics. However, slow steady growth can be preferable to bubbles and speculation over the long run.
165.	Competition with foreign investors

166.	Sask. farmland is worth less than our neighboring provinces, so it would attract investors. Having a larger pool of potential purchasers to draw from will only increase the land price.
167.	It would artificially increase the value of farmland. The value would then not be based on what the land could produce but would be based on the depth of the pockets of the one buying it.
168.	More buyers with more money who want what is being deemed a scarce resource (land) will increase the market price for land. It's great for the people who are selling to them, but bad for SK farmers looking to expand through ownership and potentially deadly to the livelihood and communities that built this province. The question that also needs to be asked is what happens after land is in control of non SK ownership. To not perform an arduous evaluation of the potential and likely consequences would be extremely short-sighted and narrow-minded.
169.	Land values should be determined by its source of income, not by speculators.
170.	How are we local farmers supposed to compete purchasing sections when we are up against multi million dollar companies. We offer market value and they offer a higher price than the quarter is worth knowing that in 30 years when they liquidate they will at worst cover their initial input purchase. It will inflate our land prices in a very negative way.
171.	Prices will be inflated, rent will increase, and the farmers who have lived here our whole lives will not be able to expand. Towns will die as families move away and new families cannot afford to move into the small towns to keep them alive. Rural centres will die.
172.	If multiple foreign investors or big corporations can back up their bids with big money, the average Canadian will not be able to compete.
173.	Prices would likely skyrocket as prime land would be sought after by many and not just those interested in farming.
174.	There certainly would not be less competition with more eligible players in the field.
175.	Saskatchewan is basically the 'last frontier' when it comes to farmland. It looks like a good investment compared to other provinces, but based on productivity, it should remain slightly lower than either Manitoba or Alberta generally speaking. By having investors come in, a local competing farmer knows he can't justify paying that high a price based on his return on investment. How in the world is a young farmer going to ever begin when the banks can't even come close to loaning the kind of money these investment companies can offer?
176.	The markets float with supply and demand. Just look at housing in Saskatchewan. Farmland should be no different.
177.	More people would be able to buy, driving the price higher.
178.	Farmers know the value of farm land. They will pay and finance a fair dollar amount that provides a return and enable a return to pay for the land. Funds have the ability to spread risk in other ventures and offset potential losses when they outbid local farmers to make a purchase.
179.	Because land has already sky rocketed because of the foreign people, the little guy doesn't even have a chance nowadays. Yes it's great if you are a big farmer already but if you want to

	start somewhere you can't! You have to be inherited in or a billionaire to start farming. Young people can't start from scratch anymore, and high prices on everything is a huge part of the problem.
180.	More investors from outside Canada would purchase land and go into bidding wars, increasing the prices significantly, but also making it impossible for local farmers to compete at the same time. It would be a huge disservice to local farmers and the economy of this province.
181.	By allowing those that don't wish to farm land to purchase it only with the intent to rent it up will just drive prices up, making it even more difficult for younger farmers or those who wish to begin farming without having previously owned land to get a foot in the door.
182.	But make it unaffordable unless you're CCPIB.
183.	Saskatchewan is one of the few places left in the world where land can be bought.. Farm land is one of our resources that can create long term exports and we are supposed to be able to process and increase the vale of our food exports. If others own the land they will take the production elsewhere for processing and we lose the value added in Saskatchewan.
184.	Land prices I believe are determined by commodity prices and will fluctuate accordingly. More buyers in the market may stabilize values in downturns and may provide more leasing opportunity to establishing producers.
185.	Yes it would increase values, but would make it impossible for newer farmer or smaller farmers to complete and make a fair living. The province was built on farmers backs, now they're starting to step on them.
186.	Foreign investment would be huge. They don't make any more land.
187.	By having less rules would make it easier for people to purchase land
188.	liii
189.	External ownership is very, very small and most land transfer are between farmers. The Government should NOT interfere with attempting to influence farmland values. This very BAD public policy.
190.	it would follow true market signals...up or down in value...like it should be.
191.	Local farmers are more responsible for pushing up prices than outsiders. Institutional investors have 140,000 acres of land of more than 60 million acres of farmland...now could they be responsible for increasing prices when they are such a small percentage of the pie? Local farmers tend to bid up neighboring land because it is strategic to their existing operations and institutions are bottom feeders, not interested in bidding wars. They'll buy what no one else wants.
192.	Sask. farmland values are lower then our neighbours(we have been catching up)... and the only reason for that is the past restrictive policies of the NDP
193.	Billionaires would bid it up and own vast tracks of land. Ah Saskatchewan would then be back to the Serf system. Don't go there.
194.	O it still has to be a good investment

195.	Farmland is like any other investment opportunity -- there will be times when it is good and times not so good. Falling commodity prices and drought along with rising interest rates will bring prices down.
196.	Land value will stay the same, investment inflated the price. It may come down a bit but not much as the farmer expects the inflated price.
197.	in the short term it will probably increase the value. longer term is an unknown - it would probably end up decreasing the land values and it falls into outside hands.
198.	This does increase the value, we have seen it. However, it then makes the land not affordable for local younger farmers because they have to compete with corporations with deep pockets.
199.	This will most definitely increase! Alberta people for instance have already had a huge impact in some places of selling and having a lot of buying power in Saskatchewan.
200.	It would increase albeit temporarily and would mortgage future food security.
201.	Having our farm for sale for a year now has given us a bit of insight. We have had a half dozen potential buyers come look not one has been an investor, all have been european, Ontario, Alberta people looking to come here and farm. What they all say is they see opportunity here.
202.	I believe the value will be driven by the productive value and price of the commodity produced on that land.
203.	Farmland may go up in value but will find it's own level based on supply and demand. Export challenges and transportation costs will define the value of land. Investors will need to assure that the properties are managed to get a ROR on capital. Topnotch managers or leaseholders will need to be savvy about being efficient and building economies of scale to squeeze high income levels. Precision farming is setting standards well above yesteryears and will be the trend going forward. If a farmer can't get capital to do his farming practices with these tools, he will be left in the dust and fail. So what is fair?
204.	Foreign investment should not be allowed, this would result in money being taken out of saskatchewan economy.
205.	There will be more speculators buying land so will increase the prices making it harder for actual farmers to buy.
206.	By relaxing restrictions, it will allow for more investment firms to buy farmland which will drive the price up. This will make it increasingly difficult for producers to purchase land.
207.	Increase the value to keep young farmers such as myself from being able to actually afford it!
208.	Due to the funds available from investors they can afford to pay more for land than a farmer who has to make sure his farm generates sufficient revenue to pay a price he can afford. Opening up ownership would allow these type of investors to increase their land holdings and eventually lead to those farming the land to be unable to expand their land holdings due to the competitive nature of the investors. The investors will lease/rent the land to existing farmers, however, they want a decent return on their investment and since they have paid more than the local farmer would pay the rents they want don't make economic sense. Many are 5 year cash leases with a 5% return on investment. Due to the nature of farming it is a

	risky venture to sign into this type of lease.
209.	Land is already hard to afford. Increasing land prices will only make it more difficult for younger farmers who don't have the financial reserves to afford higher land costs.
210.	not a good thing for a young farmer like myself.
211.	I know it would increase the value but most of the farm land would be owned by non Saskatchewan residents and large corporate farms. There would be very little chance for farmers to expand.
212.	Increase the value of farmland but cripple small towns in Sask economy's.
213.	There are a lot of questions if more farmland was owned by non Canadians let alone non Saskatchewan farmers. There has been a lot of successful ventures so far as investors teaming up with Saskatchewan farmers but the timing has been very convenient. We cant forget the volatility of farming. Along with success there has been failures as well. I think changes to the legislation will result is more turnover is leasing and ownership and many labour concerns
214.	This will have a negative impact on our young farmers ability to enter into farm land ownership. This is a huge risk in the farming industry. As you are aware the grain/cattle operations are very cyclical. There are often times during a down turn in the cycle that the farmer is required to draw upon his/her equity to allow continuation of their operation. If and when there is a down turn, and there is no equity, this operation will ultimately fail.
215.	Farmland values have already increased dramatically to make up some of the gap with similarly productive land in neighboring provinces. In a efficient market, it is the economics of the business which will dictate. At current prices, the farmers are making a good profit, as are investors, therefore the only cause of major increase in land values would be if there was excess profit that farmers are currently making due to low land values and rents. Let the market and the economics dictate.
216.	More people vying for the land that is up for sale will increase the purchase price.
217.	A lot of our grain is being shipped out of Canada to other countries now, so what is the difference as to who owns the land?
218.	I have seen examples in the past where local farmers try to exploit farmland owners by dictating land rental values and purchase prices. We need more competition. Allowing outside bidding enhances this effect.
219.	What do you mean? Relaxing the requirements as they are now -- i.e., outside investment is okay -- or otherwise -- outside investment is not okay
220.	If there are no restrictions of who can buy land, investors will come and inflate the price of land to the point that local farmers can't afford to buy expand or get into farming. The average age of farmers is increasing steadily and young farmers can't afford to get into farming. Also baby boomers are coming to the age they can retire and won't work until they are 70+ like previous farmers. Also baby boomers will be able to retire if they sell off at these prices. Leaving less people to farm the land. !
221.	I believe that relaxing current requirements would greatly increase speculation on farmland leading to decreased stability of market values.

222.	Who can afford farmland right now even at 1000 \$ an acre plus makes it pretty tough for young guys to purchase land and make payments on it the only people that can are established century family farms and this is coming from a farmer that farms 10000 acres and 600 head of cattle!
223.	It would make farmland out of reach for Saskatchewan farm kids wanting to farm- nothing good would come out of it!
224.	Unrestricted ownership bring more buyers. More buyers mean more offers and higher prices. Higher prices means better retirement.
225.	Farms would become unaffordable for most Saskatchewan residents. Foreign ownership would drive money away from the province (money would be going elsewhere as there would be no ties to the province) and potentially raise the price of farms in the province (similar to what is happening to real estate in BC).
226.	as above
227.	Money isn't everything.
228.	The price would inflate artificially as demand grew.
229.	Just take a look at the real estate market in Vancouver for the effects of foreign investment.
230.	See above
231.	Don't think values would change a lot. Always seems to be an abundance of buyers.
232.	if you have foreign investment in farm land we could see other countries by pass the inputs and grain handling system in Canada losing not only our land but our the economic dollars at home.
233.	Increases value so sask born people can't afford and the owner gets tax deduction.
234.	Larger multinational corporations would be flooding the market
235.	They aren't making anymore land in this world! We need to own our own land so we have control over what goes into the land and how we can grow food to feed our people.
236.	ALTHOUGH value might increase this doesn't transfer into affordable land. There is no accountability by lessors to manage the land properly. Furthermore the one time land purchase by a foreign investor or pension fund does not provide long term benefit to Saskatchewan.
237.	Make it extremely difficult to expand our holdings and a lot more difficult to finance the farm entity without good security in land. Want us to go broke? Take away our land ownership and watch the downfall.
238.	Make it harder for young farmers and young families that stand on their own and didn't inherit anything to start. My brother got everything and I didn't I have start with what I got.

239.	Farmland increases in value over time. So if farmers can't participate in that value adding, they will have less farm revenue=less ability to buy farmland in the future.
240.	Farmers will always buy the section(s) down the road.
241.	Increase the value- but increase the price for Saskatchewan farmers trying to buy.
242.	This question misses the point. While allowing unfettered ownership of Saskatchewan farm land by the Chinese or Saudis may increase the price of farmland, that would be the last time Canadians would own the land. It would stay in foreign hands forever. Why would your government favour foreigners over our own Saskatchewan residents/Canadians?
243.	Agricultural land is in demand, and if there are fewer restrictions to purchase, the market should expand driving the price up
244.	It would make unaffordable for young new farmers like myself
245.	The land values would increase as more wealthy investors buy . I believe less land would be owned buy farms and Sask. residents because we cannot compete with the mega rich investors? The land being worth more only is good for buying and selling the land. Not farming it to make a living.
246.	let the market work itself out on prices
247.	Who is setting the high prices right now? Not the active farmers, but investors ready to either make more than bank interest or walk away. The concept of riding out the highs and lows Isn't in their interest. Owner/ operators are in it for the long run. Good or bad. I've been in farming for over 40 years.
248.	Out of country and other business have access to more funds than local Saskatchewan farmers
249.	I believe that relaxing current requirements would likely have a negative effect on SK farmland. Allowing outside investors would likely increase value of farmland making it more difficult for Saskatchewan farmers to rent or purchase.
250.	Foreign owners with excess money will easily drive up land prices beyond what a local farmer can afford.
251.	It may increase the value short term with outside ownership. Long term no one knows what may happen
252.	I only own 8 quarters of land. I need as much as I can get to pay off all my loans and still retire.
253.	There is a lot of money held by investors willing to speculate, will likely drive prices up, maybe the price of food will go up to ? for a person to have "roots" "community involvement" local ownership is important . Lets save what's left of small SK farm towns.
254.	There has already been a lot of non farmer investment in farmland. Which has been a good thing
255.	I think they would initially rise, and then fall as the new ownership starts to realize the problems getting labour that is 'invested' in the operation. If you don't literally have skin in

	the game, you will not be able to survive with the investment only. When farm commodities go down, farm values follow, and foreign ownership will destabilize land values for those actually relying on the farming operation the make a living.
256.	The market had already made its big move up. Most of the land bought and sold is still to farmers
257.	Some areas increase value others would not.. average the same.
258.	We don't need higher farm land values. They are already too inflated.
259.	It would increase the purchase cost, which makes it harder for Saskatchewan farmers to be able to survive.
260.	Big corporations only look at the bottom line! They don't know how to farm! They treat the land like a venture or a commodity; buy low sell high. Not in it for the long haul! Not very good for land management! Generational farmers preserve and protect their land! It's their livelihood!
261.	increase the value of land in the short term but once rent becomes too high the only ones who will afford to farm will be large corporations like and then watch the price of food skyrocket. Big corporations will not sell wheat for \$5.00 bushel will be much high more ppl will not be able afford food
262.	Canada is a politically stable country which is a great place for foreign investors to invest.
263.	They offer a price that smaller farmers cannot compete with. Look at Alberta.
264.	Prices would become unrealistic.
265.	It would make farmland unavailable for young local farmers to afford farmland. Local control of farmland would be gone
266.	Land for residential becomes more important as the population increases and it is often not the actual ownership that becomes a driving force but the fact that Canadian residency can be gained via property ownership. The competition and price increases will be less determined by production and more so by population location.
267.	Relaxing the rules would allow farmland values to behave like any other asset class in a free market scenario. Land prices have generally increased over the longer term with periodic significant downward corrections. Again, farmland is not unique in how market values respond over extended periods of time. Inflationary factors have ensured that all assets classes generally go up in price over time in "absolute" dollars.
268.	We are the only place in Canada with cheap land relative to other jurisdictions. People from other areas think that land here is good value, and are willing to pay more.
269.	As Sask farmland is still undervalued relative to neighboring provinces bringing a wider pool of land buyers into the mix would increase values.
270.	The scramble to own land would increase the value, but at the same time take away from the power of the renter or leaser. The leaser could become the one who follows the rules and wants of the landowner.

271.	Demand for this great asset is increasing but that doesn't mean we should remove restrictions.
272.	Land and water are the future most valuable commodities in Western Canada.
273.	The world knows the real value of land.
274.	Its being artificially pushed up in value when large money moves in and they no personal attachment or care how its farmed as long as it has financial return.
275.	Outside investment will further drive up already spiking land prices making it almost impossible for young farmers and young families to secure their future.
276.	only the rich non farmers would buy and bid to unaffordable prices for Saskatchewan residents
277.	I believe that our Saskatchewan farmers are willing to pay top dollars for good agricultural land. For foreign investors to come in and pay huge inflated land prices does not make any economic sense and would make it much more difficult for young people to buy farm land
278.	depends on commodity prices and where outside money is looking to speculate at that time
279.	The price would remain roughly the same to slightly higher but it would take it out of the hands of the farmers. The lease price of the land would also rise slightly but more importantly is the disconnect with agriculture with the investment companies.
280.	Make family farms disappear and corporations take over
281.	See above comments.
282.	it may increase the market value of farmland, but at what expense. Sask. landscape is rapidly changing - larger cities and bedroom communities nearby the cities - more acreages and less people living in rural areas - city people need to be more connected with how their food is supplied and care about where agriculture is headed in western Canada. Large corporate farms are not necessarily the answer; as for the cattle business - there are many older ranchers and few younger people wanting to ranch - no one wants that lifestyle where you are tied down. Most people under 40 prefer to have weekends off - go camping/boating and not work more than 40 hours a week - the Canadian population want instant everything now - instant new home, new furniture, new camper/trailer/boat/Mexican holidays and instant food. Agriculture in general in western Canada will see many changes in the next 10-15 years - there are just so many farmers/ranchers near retirement age - and few to succeed them other than corporations/large land owners. Perhaps Canadians will wake up soon and realize that they have the best beef in the world to eat and they should care about what direction agriculture is taking in western Canada.
283.	I fear that relaxed rules on farmland ownership would drive the price of farmland too high for most farms. As a young expanding farmer, we need access to fair market value land. The financial investment required to farm is too high to rely on land that we do not own, especially when the landlords tend to have little consideration for the renter or the investment that goes into production farming.
284.	My concern here is that foreign ownership would increase drastically

285.	increase it to the point where a young farmer can't even hope of buying land
286.	The value of land may go up with demand, but demand for what purpose? How is Saskatchewan as a whole and food security to gain from that?
287.	It would increase the number of interested parties when land comes up for sale, which typically increases the price because purchasers know it will be more competitive.
288.	I see an increase in the value of farmland as something that restricts opportunities for people to be farmers, thereby contributing to rural depopulation, putting control into the hands of fewer individuals and reducing peoples' commitment to the long term well being of land and communities.
289.	Land values have risen dramatically. They should stay where they are or drop a little. Over time, inflation will correct the price again. If the rules are relaxed then the land will rise more. Yes, I will benefit from the increase in land value but both my brother and father would be crushed. Creating lax ownership laws should not happen.
290.	The price of farmland in Saskatchewan is already unrealistically high, making it truly impossible for young farmers to ever get started on their own.
291.	We are already seeing this - speculators get involved, with no clue as to intrinsic value. Their money destroys any rational structure that might serve actual producers.
292.	Foreign interests have large investment funds and everyone from Jeff Rubin to your neighbour are saying buy more land.
293.	competition is good
294.	Increasing the market value and therefore squeezing out the small or young farmer.
295.	Relaxation of ownership requirements would increase the PRICE of farmland but have no relationship to the value of farmland for farmers.
296.	If there is increased demand, which there would be, and the same amount of supply the price would increase.
297.	More competition for land bids would drive the prices up
298.	It would likely increase the value where it may become unaffordable for young farmers to own land locally .
299.	If the commodity prices are good the land prices will reflect that. As the population of the world grows so will the land price that produced food.
300.	Saskatchewan farmers would not be able to compete with well off Foreign investors that inflate land prices as they know local farmers can't compete financially.
301.	Supply of land is limited. Increasing demand by allowing other investors into the market would raise prices.
302.	Supply and demand.
303.	competition makes you stronger and better. Land values will find the best balance without the government control. If farmers can make the money in order to farm and others can't, government control is not the answer to fix it for the poor farmer.

304.	The restrictions have kept our land the lowest in Canada and the world. An open market has excellent economic impact on the entire Province.
305.	Of course it would decrease the value over time, it won't be long before all the farmland here is dead due to chemicals and relaxing the rules would encourage rather than discourage chemical use.
306.	The short term gain does not justify the long term pain.
307.	More buyers in the market place will increase the price. The banks will lend these new producers/land owners money and that will increase the land prices. I think the government support programs- agristability and crop insurance while stabilizing income has also had an effect on driving up land prices as the banks are more willing to lend on a more guaranteed business. I do not feel the government's job is to drive land prices up so maybe the government should get rid of their programs.... but keep them until I retire!
308.	supply and demand
309.	If we allow large groups of investors to pool money, there is no way local individual farmers can compete. These investors take all their profit elsewhere. We lose jobs, and corporate knowledge as small farmers are forced out of farming.
310.	More buyers, land prices will go up.
311.	More buyers higher prices
312.	Its a simple supply demand relationship. SK farmland is undervalued relative to other similarly productive land worldwide. It can only remain undervalued as long as some potential buyers are precluded from purchasing SK farmland by virtue of their citizenship.
313.	I want to continue living and raising my family here. Now farmland prices have more than doubled, and always the justification "we heard that so-and-so" received it from the foreign backed investor. I can't compete with foreign government backed credit reserves or pension funds worth too much money on their hands.
314.	Depends upon other investment options available to investors.
315.	I think it would increase the value because it seems that the pension plans and investment groups have way more money then farmers and if they are competing for land the value will increase simply based on demand.
316.	See my earlier comments. I think the price would rise and then stabilize. I think the only difference in the price in about five years is that the rise would be sharper, but the endpoint would be the same.
317.	Farmland in Saskatchewan is some of the lowest cost land in the developed world. Partly because of our farmland ownership rulers.
318.	Relaxing the requirement for ownership would bring on a true market value of our land. Why should we want to maintain a low land value for the current farmer so he can farm 90 quarters instead of 60. How many farmers do you think are left in any area? We did not vacation in Hawaii every winter we barely got a week at the lake in the summer but you want me to help this poor guy out

319.	Farmland would be a commodity that outsiders would lick their lips over.
320.	In our area when investment funds came in and bought land the price of land went up and farm size increased. They only want rent to one operation so only the bigger farms can have a chance.
321.	I believe that if the rules were relaxed it would allow outside financial interests to increase the demand for land, thereby increasing the cost.
322.	Many of the land sales are farmer to farmer. The pension funds are just getting started with these purchases and it will snowball once they have free rein to continue on.
323.	competition generally will raise the value of a commodity when that commodity is limited. Supply and demand.
324.	there are lots of young farmers to buy the farms at a reasonable price or market price.
325.	Many people have told me that if the restrictions come off, there are plenty of buyers just waiting for that.
326.	We'll see even more foreign governments and investors
327.	Owners would not maintain appropriate stewardship of the land -
328.	It would increase the value of farmland, but it would price out the young farmer looking to start up. Also, once foreign owned corporations are allowed to hold large sums of land they would not be so willing to work with and sell portions of land here or there on a small scale for existing farmers in the same areas. Why would a foreign-owned corporation or pension fund controlling vast amounts of land engage in such small transactions... out of the goodness of their heart?! What heart?
329.	There is nowhere in the world that can produce the quality of protein grains that we can and other countries such as China would pay dearly to own such valuable food producing resources.
330.	The prices have already gone up so much farmers right now can not compete against corporation with deeper pockets
331.	No ownership of land to be allowed for a non resident of Saskatchewan.
332.	An old law of economics, when demand exceeds supply, the price goes up. It also causes a frenzy of demand, not a real market force. And when prices go up, they usually do not recede. Land ownership is more than line in balance sheet, or mere economics. Land is basis of all security and livelihood of a population. Erode land ownership to favour people and forces outside of Canada, you no longer have Canada as it's own country.
333.	The price of grain and oilseeds have a bigger effect on land values than who is allowed to buy it
334.	As usual when arms length operations and decision making takes place there is detrimental, abuse and using up the land and resources.
335.	The values are so far out of line now, I am not sure what will happen. All this because of the Chinese buying . They came in and were an exit plan for some farmers and huge hindrance for

	others. As usual, outside influences come in and were going to show us how to operate properly and then leave in a couple of years when they are unsuccessful.
336.	Land values traditionally increase as productivity and product price increases
337.	Due to the good work of our Premier and his government Saskatchewan is great place to invest money from Alberta will be wanting to come here
338.	Will probably price it out of the context of the local farmer.
339.	Relaxing the rules would allow farm land values to increase, but that would seriously affect the affordability for farmers and especially young farmers. As I'm a young farmer (32) and came to Saskatchewan to start farming in an affordable location I see value in keeping land values in line with the cost of production and remove the investors from the real estate market.
340.	It would increase the value of the good land(flat and open) and leave the rest available to the peasant farmers
341.	Land speculation / ownership by non-farming owners or entities would increase the price (if not the value) of farmland and potentially price it out of range of the smaller / beginning / sustainable farmers.
342.	if you have multi-million dollar investors/pension plans buying land, they will bid the land up to high levels they can afford where the average person will not
343.	Foreign money has no limits.
344.	Land may increase in the short term but when these investors find they can make more money elsewhere they will dump land but in the meantime the farmers that live on the land will disappear leaving no buyers for the land. I could see a new wave of settlers coming to farm the vast openness.
345.	good for existing land owners but final destruction of small individual farms
346.	It would make it harder for Sask farmers to compete.
347.	There are enough young farm people wanting extra land, since farming has been profitable that it would maintain the current value as difficult as that maybe to pay for.
348.	In the region of southern Sask , one Chinese investor paid something like \$1.6 million dollars for 6000 acres. What's left for locals to expand their operations ? (I'm pasteing in a newspaper article) That's all still a ways off, and new immigrants represent only a portion of the roughly 30,000 annual farmland sales in Saskatchewan. But real estate agents say the number of deals to non-residents has soared in the past couple of years and the influx of Chinese immigrants in particular is getting noticed. "For farmland, especially Saskatchewan farmland, they think it is much, much undervalued," said Justin Yin, a real estate agent in Saskatoon who immigrated from China in 2004 and specializes in selling farmland to Chinese immigrants in Toronto and Vancouver. "So they

think that's the best place to put their money." Mr. Yin, who also owns nearly 2,000 acres, has been in business for four months but he already has roughly 100 clients including a group of 10 investors who have put up \$20-million and told him to buy whatever he can find.

The influx is creating mixed feelings in many communities. There is a long history of Chinese immigrants coming to Western Canada and good part of it is unhappy: a head tax, as well as prohibitions on voting and on owning farmland. Chinese immigrants still represent only a fraction of the province's population, but the number has been growing particularly in the past couple of years as buyers arrive by the busload to scout out farmland. While older farmers planning to retire are thrilled to have a growing pool of new potential buyers, many worry about the long-term impact of so many new immigrants arriving with little knowledge of agriculture and often overpaying for farms.

Still others wonder where all the money is coming from.

Saskatchewan has the strictest rules in the country when it comes to farm ownership. Only Canadian citizens, permanent residents and 100-per-cent Canadian-owned companies are allowed to hold title to more than 10 acres of farmland. There are some exemptions and it's not clear if titleholders can be backed by foreign investors. Whatever the case, the province doesn't do much checking. Saskatchewan doesn't even keep track of the number of non-residents buying land and officials don't probe too deeply into how the transactions are financed or whether offshore investors are involved.

"We check basically what's on the title," said Mark Folk, general manager of the Saskatchewan Farmland Security Board, which regulates non-resident farmland ownership. "We do some verifications that they comply with residency [rules]. After that it's a little bit more difficult to follow up farther than that."

That changed a couple of years ago when Andy Hu came to town. Mr. Hu, 38, grew up on a farm in China and immigrated to Canada in 2004, launching a commercial real estate business in Calgary. After a few visits to Saskatchewan, he turned his attention to farmland and launched MaxCrop Farm Canada Inc., a Regina-based company that specializes in finding farmland investors among new immigrants from China and South Korea. "I thought [farmland] was very, very undervalued," Mr. Hu said in a recent interview. "Also at the same time I saw the strong [interest] by new Canadians to own farmland. Sometimes they come from a country where they were not allowed to own farmland."

Mr. Hu met with Ogema mayor Wayne Myren, who runs the local Napa Auto Parts store. The meeting went well and Mr. Hu returned a few weeks later with four investors, all recent arrivals from China. They too met with Mr. Myren and talked about farming, land values and the local rail line that makes shipping grain directly to Asia feasible. That became even more crucial to MaxCrop last year after the federal government announced it was ending the Wheat Board's monopoly. "Their idea was there's a link now with the Wheat Board gone, they have a flow through right through to China with grain," Mr. Myren recalled. He explained that

there are half a dozen farmer-owned elevators along the line, making it relatively easy to load cars destined for ports on the West Coast. Another option is to truck grain to Regina and send it on a container car to Asia.

Within months, several MaxCrop investors began buying up farms and driving up prices, doubling values overnight in some cases. The company ran ads in local Saskatchewan papers seeking farm sellers, promising a “quick closing” and “no commission.” It also puts ads in Chinese-language papers in Toronto, Vancouver and elsewhere looking for investors.

MaxCrop has grown rapidly across the province since Mr. Hu’s visit in 2010. The company has attracted roughly 40 investors, all new immigrants, and manages around 70,000 acres across the province. It also operates a 7,000-acre farm, with separate investors, and it is looking into acquiring processing facilities. The company’s plan is to use the connections of its investors to open new markets in China and ship grain directly to buyers, via container ships. It is already working on a deal to ship malt barley grown on the MaxCrop farm to buyers in Shanghai.

Seed capital: How immigrants are reshaping Saskatchewan's farmland

PAUL WALDIE

OGEMA, SASK. — The Globe and Mail

Published Friday, Oct. 12 2012, 7:27 PM EDT

Last updated Saturday, Oct. 13 2012, 9:53 AM EDT

349. test

350. test

351. Worldwide investors would drive the prices up to the point where local farmers can't compete, possibly forcing them out of the business.

352. Give me one good reason why if I invested in farmland can I not have a right to sell to the highest bidder? It's my retirement fund. I don't have any other option to ensure my stake is secure.

353. Land typically goes up in value over time even though there are short term fluctuations. The more purchasers in the market the greater the increase in value.

354. If there are fewer requirements that need to be met when purchasing farmland, there will be more purchasers which would translate to higher prices.

355. Keep our farmers and local industries in control. Bidding farmland out of productive prices for actual farmers is wrong! wrong! wrong!

356. It would increase the cost, not the value. To only measure sale price misses most of the picture for the future of agriculture.

357. it would ruin the abilities of farmers to farm.

358. increase the competition for purchase

359.	Increase the cost of farming any amount of acres due to increase prices to buy land and increasing lease prices due to non farmers or farm relatives buying the land and leasing back just to make a quick buck.
360.	If anyone can buy farmland in the province everyone will be trying to buy farmland. Most likely pension plans and investment funds that can come up with enough capital to pay whatever the land owner is asking.
361.	But that is not necessarily a good thing. We should not sell out our land to foreigners, or we might just as well sell the country to foreign control.
362.	test
363.	The marketplace will dictate the price, the same as any other entity. Foreign ownership scrutinize their purchases very carefully, no different than a farmer would. They are looking for a stable long term investment.
364.	If you increase the opportunity for more buyers to purchase SK farmland, I think the value would also increase. That makes it great for the land owners looking to sell, but to a young, average sized farmer, it makes a decision to purchase a lot riskier. Margins are extremely tight to make a living off of such parcels of land. A land purchase at the wrong time in advance of some poor crop years could finish his/her career in farming. To a pension fund, the land value may depreciate and they may decide to sell or not sell at a loss... I don't pretend to know the portion of the portfolio the land may occupy in their fund, but likely any loss would be negligible in their big picture.
365.	Although relaxing the requirements for ownership would increase the value of land for those selling land, the negative social and economic consequences of doing that would far outweigh any benefits to the farming sector and the province as a whole.
366.	With more demand, the price will increase. We own farmland near the Saskatchewan and US borders and it is desirable for Americans.
367.	As mentioned I like the current model as long as it is regulated.....our land prices are still some of the cheapest in the developed world and they will continue to rise.
368.	The rest of the world would own Saskatchewan. I received a legit email from a sheik in Dubai who read my website and was "deeply moved" to contact me and meet in person about possibly partnering up on a cow/calf operation and feedlot. Crazy? yes, but not unrealistic. China would bring the red army over to farm Saskatchewan, direct quote from western producer.
369.	It may increase the value in the short term, but long term it would not change as the price will eventually get to the point where the returns to the land owner must be balanced with the returns to the farmer. Prices may rise over time, but I do not believe that over the long term they will differ whether farmers own the land or investors do.
370.	Increasing the value beyond productive capacity is setting things up for a crash.
371.	There would be increased demand for farmland from outside investors.
372.	From a farmer's perspective, the value of farmland is directly related to the value of the production from that land. Investment groups see farmland as an appreciating asset and will often overestimate the rental revenue as they fail to consider farm produce market price

	fluctuations. This leads to investment groups willing to pay more per acre than local operators will. There is nothing wrong with this if you are retirement age and wanting to cash out to fund your retirement but it guarantees the next generation of farmers will forever be renters and not owners of the land they farm. How can this possibly be a good thing for the province as a whole?
373.	It would of course increase value as foreign interests would be bidding. Remember we have never starved to any degree in this country and most really don't care what happens as long as they got the almighty buck. I have often wonder how much a starving person would pay for a meal if they had a million dollars... remember you can't eat money!! Many overseas countries have destroyed their land through war, pollution, over building in prime areas and they still have to feed their people somehow. I think we should keep farm land in the province and let our farmers look after it as they seem to be good guardians of our land and food.
374.	I do not believe that opening up our farmlands to foreign investments would NOT in the long run help Saskatchewan.
375.	Increase today, however cause a drop down the road. Not a good thing for the Province.
376.	The price of land would go up because anyone who is not a part of agriculture currently generally has money to invest and so they are going to want to invest in something that makes them money or why else invest in it? With money backing it raises the price and puts the price too high for young farmers to purchase the land, which is unfair to the resident farmers of Saskatchewan.
377.	I believe the market should dictate the value of land, not the gov't.
378.	The price of land is constantly climbing in the last few years because big business has brought the price up, to the point that young people can't afford it. (That's why we are purchasing land at our age(65 & 71)to give them a hand!
379.	It would attract world wide investment
380.	Selling to outside sources has been the major factor in farmland value increases.
381.	more speculation
382.	Investors are more able to withstand fluctuations in their returns than are farmers who must pay their bills each year. Therefore they can afford to pay more and will drive up the price. I believe that is happening already with immigrant farmers who have purchased farm land more as an investment.
383.	Most land has to be able to generate a return. Paying inflated prices that do not earn a return will drive out speculators.
384.	This would cause farmland to increase and this would have a devastating affect on the ability of new farmers to be able to start up a new operation as it is very expensive to start out as a farmer in Saskatchewan.
385.	How can people compete with pension plans and multi national companies. What we want Chinese companies coming in buying up land.
386.	It would increase the value to the point actual farmers could not survive.

387.	We have already seen to higher cost of farm land in the past 5 to 7 years with more outside investors from Alberta selling their and purchasing here. Have 4 large expansions in our area all from Alberta purchasing much of what comes up for sale or rent .
388.	artificially increase the value and keep our young people from being able to afford to buy farmland.
389.	If land was more available to more people, awareness would likely increase, as would interest from potential buyers, so demand would increase, and naturally, price would also increase. But I still don't think it's a good idea.
390.	Depends on availability of land, availability of credit, interest rates, markets, etc.
391.	Value would be based on productivity not speculation.
392.	If your selling great! But retired farmers don't contribute to the economy of a small community like a local farmer. Foreign investors don't send kids to a community school, buy groceries at a local store, play on a local hockey team!
393.	However, that is not all it takes to retain long term benefits for the province. Our ag business model is sound enough we should sit on the current policies of Canadian investors only except that we should reassess pension fund impacts on land purchases and farming operations here.
394.	If they do not look after it!! It wrecks All sask!! And it makes the prices so high for rent how can one young farmer ever start !
395.	I see it as increase the cost not value
396.	Would allow developers and investors to acquire more land for development
397.	If everyone can buy it - there will be no way farmers can actually own a piece of property. The farmer will always be working for another person and you will see the drive and motivation of farmers deteriorate to a level that will ultimately affect the overall industry. The "will" of the farmer is what makes the business run. If the farmer does not own the land - what benefit is it to work 20 hrs a day during spring and harvest. The carrot will be gone.
398.	Making it harder for farmers to buy land to farm
399.	Relaxing the ownership requirements would price Saskatchewan farmland too high for Saskatchewan farmers to be able to afford to buy it.
400.	Price is not always the biggest concern. Availability becomes the problem
401.	The past 5 years in agriculture have been relatively good. Investment companies have been great to those selling land. Will there come a time where agriculture will have multiple bad years in row? If investment companies choose to sell their land in a situation like this, which is usually in large tracts, who is likely they would sell too? Another investment firm? Or would they be open to sell to multiple farmers that have weathered the storm?
402.	More bidders vying for limited assets... but the inflated proceeds are not necessarily reinvested in the Sk. economy....or even spent here...particularly in the case of retiring farmers. In other words inflated asset values are unlikely to be an engine of growth for the Sk. economy, whereas interested, vested owner operators are likely to invest in the economy by virtue of their proximity and involvement in their business, communities and their provincial

	pride....
403.	Economics for buying are the same for a pension as a farmer so no incentive for them to bid values up
404.	Keeping the family farm is important. We don't need a bunch of corporations owning our assets
405.	As long as interest rates stay low and the value is still increasing there will be outside investors that buy the story that our land is undervalued compared to the land in other more highly productive per acre regions. Long term as we cycle into lower crop prices and or droughts this may create a huge bubble that will threaten the viability of our industry. We must remember that the lease prices that the actual farmer pays to these investors for the privilege to farm our Saskatchewan land are based usually on a set rate of return (commonly 6%) times the land value. As the value of the land moves up that means that a greater amount of money leaves the province and the margin for the farmer goes down. That's less money for that farmer to spend in his community. example : An Alberta family from bought 1000 acres of land back in 2008 valued at \$500. They leased it back to the farmer they bought it from at a rate of 6% of that value . That's \$30 per acre or \$30000 total. Amount of investment into Saskatchewan is \$500000. At the rate of \$30 / ac they earn back the principle portion in 17 years. The \$30000 leaves the province and is not spent or donated to projects in the community as when the farmer owned it himself. That same land in 2015 is now worth \$2000 per acre and the rental rate is very near the desired 6% return. It is 5% so we will use the actual value of \$100/ac lease. The total rent paid is \$100000. That is \$70000 more that now leaves the province and not towards our economy. It also isn't here to help with community projects . With the increase in land value and therefore the lease paid per year, the investor has now dropped his time required to pay off the principle to as few as 5 to 10 years. There is great benefit to these investors for realtors and speculators to mislead others into the fallacy of underpriced land. If the family decides to cash in their capital gain and sell today, the \$150000 capital gain leaves the province to Alberta and if it was another outside investor that bought it then any further increase in value will also leave the province. As will the cash paid on yearly leases. The only addition investment into Saskatchewan came from the initial purchase and that was quickly overcome by the cash leaving the province in lease payments.
406.	More investors means increased competition
407.	It is hard enough as a young farmer now. If you ease the restrictions. It will make it more difficult and you will lose the young entrepreneurs that are trying to make a living from farming
408.	pension and investment trusts are only interested in rate of return (land value appreciation) and are often willing to pay higher than market value which in turn pushes up the value of the land beyond what it will produce.
409.	It's dependent on so many factors - if cattle prices remain high with grain steady, then land is the best investment available, and relaxed ownership will drive up the price. If grain prices decrease and there is a continued inability to ship product as a result of rail troubles, then relaxing investment may smooth the pricing in the short-term for those looking to retire.
410.	Large corporations would come in and buy up large parcels of land. This would cause land

	values to spike in some areas because typically these farming corporations want to keep land centralized. A few guys will hold out and maybe get a better price yet or may be forced to sell out low because there are no other bidders. Hutterite colonies have done this for years.
411.	The value of the land would be increased to a level that is unattainable by young, local farmers who are the future of agriculture.
412.	An increase in farmland price may occur but an increase in value is another issue which needs to be asked in terms of whether the consumer is prepared to place a higher value on their food and pay more for it.
413.	Bringing in foreign investment would increase the demand and price for land making it harder for actual farmers to get into farming and expand their operations, as we are already seeing.
414.	It would depend on price of commodities and that's the way it should be now it doesn't seem to matter what the price of commodities is land prices still go up
415.	We think it would increase value but we aren't sure
416.	Farmers won't be able to buy farmland because of the cost of the land, and would end up being renters having again to compete amongst themselves to rent which would drive the cost up.
417.	The larger the investment pool, the more buyers for land IN GOOD TIMES. Notice the investors have disappeared from the market. They think their biggest problem is finding renters who will actually pay the rent. What they don't realize is their biggest problem is what the renters are doing to their land. Luckily for them, there is another boatload of buyers willing to buy land with knowledge.
418.	We have experienced enormous increases in the value of land in our area because of outside investors (in particular investors from Alberta).
419.	Outside interests have more money and cash flow than locals.
420.	I think the value would skyrocket and become unrealistic for local farmers to even consider purchasing for fear of strong financial burdens on themselves.
421.	Simply put it would be a bidding war to ensure food supply in a foreign land that has short term goals rooted in pure economics, rather than sustainability, accountability, and integrity.
422.	I would increase it but I'm fine with the value now to secure tire future for my sons to farm
423.	As they say, "They aren't making any more land!" and as a result, those buying it strictly for investment purposes will price it totally out of viability and farming will, consequently, collapse in disaster to the farming industry and the investors.
424.	Whom ever buys land has to do so sustainably otherwise they won't stay in business for very long. The market determines what land is worth and economics will penalize those that pay more than land is worth.
425.	take land ownership out of the local farmers
426.	Foreign ownership will lead to increased speculation and will lead to higher prices which will create a bubble that will ultimately burst and then values will fall again.

427.	If the price of land gets driven up it will put many young small farmers out of business. The same young small farmers that keep our rural communities alive.
428.	Investors with lots of money would flood to Saskatchewan to buy Saskatchewan land. Farmer would be hard pressed to keep up with large investors money.
429.	It would be similar to a gold rush but more long term
430.	It would increase the value of farmland with the current hype around agriculture- but what will happen when the sexiness of agriculture is gone and they want to quickly jump to a new type of investment?? We will see the prices fall drastically as a glut of land hits the market. They are not known to be patient sellers. This scenario, will cause a very serious blow to the networth of all Sask Farmland owners. So really, is there a 'Net Benefit'? I say NO!
431.	my grandfather left Europe to escape the lack of opportunity. Lets not create the same system for my grandchildren
432.	A foreign company with no clue about the trials of western Canadian farming, weather, markets, etc., has money to burn, and pay far too much for borderline productive land, pushing local farmers aside, who know the limitations of farmland here. Thus the values get far over inflated relative to actual productivity potential.
433.	Large corporations have more access to cash and borrowing than average farmers
434.	we should not allow any non sask residents to purchase any of our land
435.	I am 26 years old, and trying to make a living grain farming. I bought my first quarter off my grandfather, I am looking to buy another at the end of the year. the land prices in this province are so inflated it sickens me. my land is in RM , where the going price for a section (640 acres) of land is in excess of 1.2 million. I ask the sask party how am I to make a living with land payments at that price? the sask party is killing the small family operated farms one by one. When I approach the old couples in my area to inquire about purchasing land they all tell me the same thing why do you want to get into farm? there is no money to be made, and you cant pay top dollar like the potash companies nor the out of country buyers. why would you take ownership away from the ones working the land I feel you guys want to make us serfs. these companies or out of country owners don't care for the land nor do guys that lease the land, people who own and live on the land are the best for the stewardship of the land, they care for it, how cant you see this? the sask party needs to look to Europe and learn how there farming operations are where the little guys are supported and encouraged. These family operated farms in sask that are 10000+ acres are not a family farm they are corporations. also I am an electrician I work 21days straight, this job alone is over six figures. I would give it up in a heart beat to be on the land 24/7, but unfortunately I don't see this ever happening with land prices like this. I would love to hear back from a sask party,
436.	The value of land would increase but most land would be owned by non Farmers. Rent is extra expense for producers
437.	Land is a finite commodity no more is being made
438.	As indicated above, I believe that outside funds such as US and Canadian money held by China, would jump for the opportunity to own Saskatchewan.

439.	Look at the Corn belt in the USA
440.	It would staple land values and increase slowly over the years, we would have boom and bust
441.	It would increase the value because local residents would be competing against other countries and other businesses whose only concern is the dollar and not the survival of employment in local Saskatchewan. And the farmer's rights to own his own land and provide for himself and his family. As an individual a farmer cannot compete with the money available to a country or corporation when looking for a place to invest and economically rape the way the U.S. has done to Taiwan, Hong Kong, Vietnam, Mexico, Thailand, etc. and soon the corporations would not be paying the tax bill on the land. And we would have no source of municipal tax base to take care of local schools and hospitals and roads. It would create a domino effect toward destruction.
442.	More buyers in the market with deeper pockets and no consideration for the productive capability of the land because it is just an investment. They don't need to grow a crop on it to make the payments or work hard to keep afloat. But in the market it is all about previous sales in the area so the market in general will go through the roof.
443.	If the Sask party is that ignorant and does this I will never vote for them again
444.	More people would be in the market for farmland which would increase prices.
445.	Do we want corporate and foreign ownership of all of Sk. ? That is why people homesteaded so they could have land of their own which was unattainable in the countries they came from. Ownership makes for better stewardship.
446.	Pension funds and large corp have more money to spend than farmers
447.	Purchasers are unlikely to pay more for the land than can be financed from lease income. Pension funds may be an exception if they are pursuing long term gain of capital. However, I doubt they can pay much more than the current productive value of the land with any hope for significant long term return on investment.
448.	At this point in time they would probably stay stable as the economics of farming the land play a role in what people are willing to pay. The majority of rising prices have most likely already taken place.
449.	It would skyrocket and within a generation most Saskatchewan farmers would be sharecroppers. The value of land in my district today in no way reflects either the productive capacity of the land or any risk margin in terms of crop failure or external shocks such as interest rate hikes.
450.	I earn my money from the land.....investors take the money out
451.	Short term would see increase but long term could have chaotic effect as seen in some European countries
452.	when u say relax I would hear take off the restrictions and there will be more investor groups buying in and jacking the price up which is good for government income but not for the future of the people who actually farming it because its like buying a truck does it make sense to rent for 20 years or buy it and what happens when there is a large area of land owned by investors and nobody to farm it u will never get someone to just farm rented land our land is

	like our pension
453.	See comments above: investors and their agents are interested in profiting from inflation. Initially prices will spike -- until the bubble bursts. Saskatchewan residents including farmers will likely bear the greatest loss from this.
454.	It would increase the value of my current land, but make buying more impossible!!
455.	More bidders at a sale typically increases the price. It would also decrease Canada's food security.
456.	I have to use after tax dollars to purchase land unlike rrsp funds. Also countries like China have the ability to buy land at unrealistic values that farmers like me could never ever hope to afford to pay
457.	Supply and demand relationships are very simple. Therefore, it will increase demand and price as there is no added supply.
458.	This would make it unaffordable for our own children/ residents to purchase land Foreign investors only here to make money and not care for the land and community values we have as Sask residents- no sense of sponsorship for programs etc
459.	More bad news for locals.
460.	If more people are able to buy land, it has to increase the value because there will be more bidders in the market.
461.	outside investors are able to pay much more than most farmers can.
462.	More buyers mean more competition, those with deeper pockets may be willing to pay prices that allow for no return over a 10-15 year time period, with a hope of land appreciation based on speculation
463.	common sense!!! it will go higher
464.	I would think it would stay close to where it is or up a bit. It may help some buy land that couldn't before.
465.	It would probably increase the value, but might therefore make it unaffordable for local farmers to carry on the farming tradition.
466.	Relaxed requirements would result in further consolidation by larger firms who leverage that value against smaller players thus driving up the value and restricting access to the market and economic contribution.
467.	more foreign investment will buy large tracts of land. sask farmers will disappear.
468.	There would be more outside investments
469.	It would make it hard for family farms to expand. Due to increased land costs.
470.	The question Of ownership of farm land should be changed we do not want to put our farm families in a situation where we do not own the farm land and just work for someone else. Long term if you do not own the farmland you are just a peasant working for someone else.
471.	We only have to look at Vancouver's housing market to see that foreign money makes

	ownership almost possible for ordinary working people.
472.	Farmland's value is about more than it's economic assessment, it's about the way it allows Saskatchewan farmers to make a living and continue to feed Canada and the rest of the world. If land costs become prohibitively high, the ability of farmers to continue to do this will be affected.
473.	What happened in our area was it increased the value of some of the land until he had purchased a certain amount then no one wanted to be next to him so he could buy it for as little as possible
474.	Value of land will increase, putting it out of reach of current farmers as well the next generation farmers. This will kill the family farm in Saskatchewan, which is already happening to some extent.
475.	Investors have easier access to the money required for purchasing farmland. They can also afford to pay more than farmers can justify.
476.	The future farming population in Sask. would take on a totally new meaning to the benefit of the foreign investor who cares more about his return than the price of grain.
477.	small farmers will never compete with the bigger farmers to purchase land or to the big corporations that are taking over the province. relaxing ownership rules will be good for the big guys and for the retiring farms due to higher selling returns.
478.	There would be a large increase in value as wealthy outside investors seek to buy land. Values would jump immediately and would continue to increase. Land cannot be manufactured and it has a limited quantity potentially making it a limitless increase - especially since Alberta and Manitoba still regulate foreign ownership.
479.	Look what relaxing it a little bit did. This is a no brainer.
480.	Probably would increase values but may make it unaffordable for young farmers.
481.	Farmland value is always determined by commodity prices and in recent times even with investors buying more the vast majority is bought by local farmers
482.	More competition
483.	More competition will increase the value
484.	For now till the wealthy take over everything or foreign countries own all the land
485.	Corporate entities that purchase the land would be able to hold the young farmers up for unheard of prices. Only persons residing within Saskatchewan should be allowed to own more than 10 acres of farmland
486.	Make it unaffordable for young farmers starting up
487.	Land value will increase with demand and interest of investors.
488.	When you allow over rich investors to buy farm land you kill family farms and small communities
489.	If there are no restrictions, foreign money will push up the price of land.

490.	making it unobtainable to locals
491.	It will increase values in the short term, but if the market value of grains does not increase each year, then investors will leave. The problem is the people with the expertise to farm the land may also leave, due to the hard work, high investment and risk, and poor return on risk.
492.	Many people in the world look at Sask land as cheap and don't look at economic returns
493.	The market price for farmland would inevitably go up, driven by the ability of wealthy pension plans, investment trusts, or individually wealthy non-Canadian or Canadian citizens to bid up prices beyond what local farmers are able to pay.
494.	The more investors are involved, the higher the price of land goes up. A farmer sells his land to an investor for big money. His neighbor feels his land is worth just as much, he/she puts it up for sale at that same price tag. Everyone else sees that increase in land price and feels they are just as capable of selling their land that high as well.
495.	outside investment would drive market prices up and make it very difficult for local farmers to compete with large outside investors.
496.	Increase may be short lived, then depending on markets and other factors, it can have a downward value
497.	I believe some large moneyed interests mistakenly think that Sask farm land is undervalued. They would like to buy up large tracts as an investment. They do not care or understand the productive capabilities of the land. They are kind of being fooled by real estate people. There is a reason why, up until lately, farmland is cheaper here. It has less productive ability than other regions of the world. Also, farming is more expensive here than almost anywhere. We have high taxes, very high input costs, a limiting climate and no meaningful farm programs. Land should be cheaper here because net returns are lower.
498.	Take money out of Saskatchewan hands into others, lowering the tax money and over time lowering economic prosperity of Saskatchewan families.
499.	not sure how my response will be used and don't want my answer used to support change i disagree with
500.	I find this to be a leading question. It is rather irrelevant if you believe that farmland in the province should be owned by residents of this province - which I do.
501.	Saskatchewan needs to ensure the quality and safety of the land. Farmers need to replenish the almost infertile lands they farm. Once the land is poisoned we can't fix it. Pray God has mercy on our souls. This must be Saskatchewan's biggest priority.
502.	due to BSE, drought, and COOL, profits on a cattle operation have been historically low
503.	Raising the value of farmland only benefits the few who want to exit the agricultural sector. For the rest who are trying to stay in or enter into it, high farmland values are a barrier to expansion/start-up. I do not want to see my children beg at the boardroom of some foreign corporation so they can try and make their living in the province of their birth. Norway, as an example, does not allow foreign farmland ownership. They also have a Heritage Fund from their oil and gas industry which will enable future prosperity for their citizens. We in Canada have exploited our oil and gas resources for the primary gain of foreign investors. Let us not

	make the same mistake with our farmland.
504.	More competition=higher price
505.	As mentioned above, we have so much land in the area owned by investors that has just gone wild due to the fact to they can't find a renter because of the rental rate they are asking. By letting more people in and able to buy land, I'm not sure that it would really drive prices up when current investors can't even make the rate of return that they want to be.
506.	Not sure because experience has shown that outside money doesn't necessarily become a benefit for us Canadians in the long run.
507.	<p>Foreign money has been added to farmland in our area . Local young farmers from accredited families of a century of generations living here must now bid aggressively to expand. [bidding war]</p> <p>The expansion is necessary to keep pace with increasing production costs [machinery, fuel etc]</p> <p>Based on productive value - the young [and old > experienced] can not justify paying the rent to farm (actually produce food) on the exorbitant values paid with foreign (non-experienced) money. Unfortunately for the buyers they have not the experience within this area to acimatize to</p> <p>the actual act of producing food here. It caused kind of a wreck - with the young being frozen out by the sudden high valuation- the old (retiring) being quick to accept the new found valuation - and some (not all) of the foreign purchased land going barren.</p> <p>Simply put : they paid too much too soon for the transformation.</p> <p>On paper the value can be assumed . In the field there are surprises waiting.</p> <p>We had our first appreciable moisture for the season June 12-- in the form of hail.</p> <p>Insurance value does not feed the world.</p>
508.	I am more concerned with who owns the land, where they are from, where there primary residence is if they own Saskatchewan land rather than market value.
509.	<p>It will no longer be valued by the productive capacity of the land</p> <p>That is how farmers buy land by what they can expect it to produce</p> <p>Investors see buy it and they force the values up and they charge higher rent</p>
510.	Great option for the land owners that want to cash in and retire . This would have a negative impact on younger farmers that intend to invest and expand family farming operations .
511.	An example I know is the increased value of cottages when rich people from Alberta came into our area and paid outrageous prices for them. Increasing taxes so many residents could not afford to retain theirs.
512.	Relaxing the laws would open it up to outside investors who do not understand the way of the Saskatchewan farm. Farmers would now have to compete with big corporations for land

	and would lose because of a lack of funds.
513.	the simple law of supply and demand tells us that a larger investor pool with same supply increases price.
514.	AGAIN SASK FARMERS WILL BE COMPETEING WITH THEIR OWN TAX DOLLARS, NEVER SHOULD ANY PENSION OR FOREIGN OWNERSHIP BE ALLOWED
515.	The question forces an answer built on a bias. Actually, I do know and I am sure; but there is no applicable option that allows me to say that. This is a close ended question without sufficient options. Food security is the core parameter affecting market value. Without addressing that issue in the question, it is moot.
516.	This would ultimately create a more competitive market for producers which will hyper inflate the land prices. Which will not allow for younger producers to enter the business that may put the future of agriculture in a weaker position. Without healthy attrition there could be a gap in who is available to produce the crops.
517.	Local farmers would have to compete with the wealthy of the world.
518.	relaxing rules would increase land value however would mean foreign ownership would dramatically increase. To improve some nations perceived food security there will be increased interest in Saskatchewan farmland. I prefer for their food security to be purchasing commodities in the open market than via land ownership.
519.	Initially, and for short term, it will raise through speculation The result of this is that local people will be unable to afford to purchase land and it will be lost to foreign ownership who have no commitment to the people or province of Saskatchewan
520.	Saskatchewan's ownership restrictions have depressed land values making Saskatchewan land prices lower than Alberta and Manitoba. We should be at least equal to their prices.
521.	There are not enough young farmers in our area to buy farmland so I think investors should be allowed to buy farm land
522.	Sask farmland is still relatively the cheapest land in Canada, and because of our political stability combined with it's low market value (relative to other areas of Canada), Sask farmland would see a continued rapid pace of appreciation should ownership rules be further relaxed.
523.	Although the "relaxing" of requirements may have an influence on farmland value, I have concerns over allowing foreign ownership or corporate ownership, which would negatively impact the opportunity for Saskatchewan farmers to expand their farming operation by owing or renting more land.
524.	Out of farm experience, out of province, out of Canada, out of agricultural knowledge, highly funded investors would likely see farmland here as cheap and bid prices above productive value.
525.	THERE ALWAYS HAS BEEN FARMERS WHO LIKE TO EXPAND AND WHO WOULD BE BIDDING AGAINST OTHER FARMERS.OTHERS WHO WOULD LIKE TO FARM HERE WOULD HAVE THE SAME INVESTMENT AS JUST INVESTORS
526.	More buyers, higher demand, higher prices. Good for the retiring farmer, who owns and

	spent his life working the land. If "society" wants only locals to own it, they should put their money where their mouths is, and buy the land themselves. But that's not what they want, they just want a nanny state, where they can run everybody else's lives, because they have appointed themselves the "intelligentsia" when the truth is, they are simpletons and half-wits too lazy to read a basic book on economics or think a little deeper than the pablum spoon fed to them by the left.
527.	Like the housing market, foreign investment would move the price of farmland out of reach of the average farmer. Those who sell would benefit, but Saskatchewan farmers could not compete with foreign interests.
528.	I do not believe in government interference in markets. A real Conservative government would keep out of such areas.
529.	It would make it harder for a young farmer to get started.
530.	Relaxing the laws on growing drugs will also have the same effect, does not mean that it is good for society.
531.	there is no way to be sure what would happen for sure.
532.	People or countries who have lots of money drive up the land value so regular farmers can't afford it.
533.	Anytime you open the door to new investments who really don't intend to actually farm to pay for the land. This will chase up the value of the farmland, since compared to other materialistic investments it will be a lucrative investment.
534.	Letting anyone purchase farmland drives the price up.
535.	I am not sure and I don't care. Farmland needs to stay owned by the people here in Saskatchewan and at the very least Canada. This will preserve the province we love. Not all things can be measured in dollars and cents. That is what makes the prairies so great - most of if not all of the wonderful things here have nothing to do with money.
536.	Land prices have already risen with the change to Canadian ownership. they would further increase if opened to anyone. Land is a finite resource. If we sell the farmland to foreign ownership, you wont be able to buy it back.
537.	I believe it would decrease the value but insure the longevity of young farmers
538.	There is already over 2 million acres from to across to that is in the hands of foreigners. Of course they will grab more because it is a stable secure investment.
539.	Making farmland open to anyone so they can buy it as a tax right off and destroy the land by letting weeds grow so no future farming can be done will be wasted land and wasted crop income for the province as well as the country. It seems like the importance of the farmer and the food they provide is overlooked by many. Would like to see the world survive without food.
540.	It would probably increase the value. It would also have a negative impact on young people who want to start farming. It could potentially reduce the number of family farms further and increase the number of mega-sized operations. Bigger isn't necessarily better.

541.	In the context of global land prices, Saskatchewan farmland is cheap. Local producers would lose out to investors on purchasing land and have a much harder time weathering the market 'storms' with less equity in farmland. I believe you would see more farmers going broke. Land held by foreign investment would often not be properly managed, decreasing the long term health and value.
542.	Could create larger swings in pricing as "hot money" from investor \$\$ either comes in and drives the prices up as farmland seems like a good investment or goes out as investors sell quickly to put \$\$ elsewhere and drive the prices down.
543.	Speculators would have a hay day with Saskatchewan land only lessened by a dramatic decline in commodity prices or a substantial increase in interest rates; or both. In the long run, rural Saskatchewan would be abandoned and left in ruin.
544.	it has already increased the value of farmland making it impossible for young people to get started in farming.
545.	External access will increase demand for the land, drive up prices and create a price bubble, making the land less accessible and more costly for farmers.
546.	I don't know if it would increase the land value because land value have already inflated so much already. Foreign investors/corporate farms have proven time and again that they cannot manage a farm properly and put out a less then satisfactory commodity. Farm land should be kept for the local farmer who produces above standard product with less of an environmental impact.
547.	Farm land is quite inflated already it's hard to say if it would increase the value or decrease the value if rules were relaxed.
548.	Apple could buy all the farmland in Saskatchewan with cash, in one day. There is more money out there, it would be a joke to think that all the money would stay in the province by relaxing the rules. All the new landowners would go purchase other assets/products/etc outside of Saskatchewan, hence a double whammy for the economy.
549.	We have experienced the land price jump in my area from a investor purchasing large parcels of land
550.	by relaxing requirements of ownership would put the price for farmland out of reach of some farmers wanting to expand
551.	Relaxing of ownership rules can induce more investment and it will increase farmland value which is good for old farmers who consider to retire. As investors have more interest on capital gain rather than rental income and investor increase supply of farmland for rent, young farmer can get benefits from low rental rate and they can focus more on farming operation.
552.	Will increase the value of land initially to the point where local farmers cannot afford to acquire land; if the economy takes a downturn the local owner loses financial value as well no body may be interested to operate. Farmers may become servants to the large scale investors taking most of the risks of production. Large scale devaluation may have a huge impact on provincial economy, especially in rural areas.
553.	I believe we would see a steady growth in value, but nothing compared to the past few years.

	<p>Saskatchewan values were so much lower than any other Province because of the restrictions, this caused Saskatchewan to be the best place for an investor to buy and get a R.O.I.</p> <p>It also created a opportunity for certain Investors to make some very large profits from flipping this land portfolios. Which has caused some apprehension amongst farmers.</p> <p>I believe that farmers will still have the ability to control the land value increase, through rent affordability.</p> <p>One other point I feel the Government could have taken better control of this would have been through the exemption programs that exist already. Had they allowed more Investment through the exemption program they could have readily controlled who or what was bought. However this program was so complicated it was easier for some to circumvent the system rather than be denied an exemption and red flagged.</p>
554.	Let the market determine the value of land in Saskatchewan.
555.	We would see foreign companies and Hutterite colonies raise the value of farmland rates to levels that are far too high and unsustainable for family farms to be able to afford. This would result in less young people getting into farming as the initial start-up costs would be enormous. We need more young family farmers to grow rural Saskatchewan and sustain our industry. Company farms and Hutterite colonies have no interest in the community or the long-term viability of rural Saskatchewan
556.	Large unions have financial backing that family farms can not compete with nor can they run a farm with unreasonable overhead.
557.	When land becomes an investment for non-farmers it makes it impossible for the farmers to afford the land. The prices become inflated and out of reach for the actual farmers.
558.	I think it would initially increase the value of the land, but over time investment groups would come to own enough land to satisfy there shareholders need, or these groups would own almost all the farmland in Saskatchewan and begin trading it as a commodity. If these groups are not from Saskatchewan, valuable income tax dollars will be funneled out of our province.
559.	I am opposed to more relaxed rules on foreign ownership. I want to protect Saskatchewanians.
560.	US dollar investors would be able to leverage current low CAD:USD exchange rates as would some other nations. Buyers from some foreign jurisdiction could invest funds of the state, of state owned enterprises, of corporations, from wealthy individuals and criminal interests. Assessing if foreign funds invested are in fact being 'laundered' likely to be difficult for Govt SK.
561.	young people who want to farm can not afford to. It is very expensive to start up now.Do not relax ownership requirements.
562.	Open the doors to more competition and create more bidding wars over land.
563.	The market and productive value of the land should determine its value not speculators!!
564.	I imagine it would drive up prices as tens of thousands of mainland Chinese investors and venture capitalists seek out places to invest their dirty money. Many mainland China investors appear to be private companies, but in fact are backed by the state and have essentially limitless economic resources. I lived there for 12 years as a researcher and know what I'm

	<p>talking about. They possess the ability to purchase vast tracts of farmland here simply for speculation. They have no interest in Sask except to become rich and such investors never care at all about the detrimental effects of their "market-driven" purchases have on local economies. Protective government policies preventing foreign ownership of land are necessary.</p>
565.	<p>I believe that market value of farmland would increase in the short term, but eventually decrease as a result of fewer farmers remaining to compete for land after the large investors have chased them away</p>
566.	<p>We need to keep land affordable so young farmers can afford to keep farming. We need to keep control of our food source.</p>
567.	<p>This is an artificial increase in value that is driven by economics.</p>
568.	<p>Relaxing the ownership requirements will drive prices higher yet if that's even possible and destroy the landscape, environment, wildlife even farther than it has already. Less people will be living on the land which means less land management.</p>
569.	<p>There would be an end to innovation in agriculture if we allow people other than farmers to own land. Saskatchewan is the world leader in seeding technology for a reason!</p>
570.	<p>It would increase value but would make it harder for most farmers to carry on with their livelihood.</p>
571.	<p>it will turn into a pump and dump situation</p>
572.	<p>This is OK but not sustainable as the land will deteriorate too fast if handled as an investment. Renters are not concerned with long term sustainability.</p>
573.	<p>As I stated before if the rules are relaxed, people with endless pocketbooks will snap up land as an investment and therefore keep young farmers out of the market.</p>
574.	<p>Farmland is cheap when compared to other investments and the average farmer can't compete with outside investors.</p>
575.	<p>I do not wish to see foreign investors drive up the price of Saskatchewan land as they have done in B.C. and Ontario. In those provinces people who were born and raised there, who became trained trades people can't afford to live in the neighbourhoods where they work because foreign investors raised the price of home ownership beyond any achievable realm. I am afraid the same thing will happen with our farmland.</p>
576.	<p>fair market value would find its own level, there are SK farmers that pay way too much for land because they don't want their neighbor getting it.</p>
577.	<p>As Saskatchewan land owners we will become extinct! Quickly!</p>
578.	<p>There is a large demand that is being artificially limited by the ownership restrictions. Removing the restrictions will let supply and demand balance - since supply is limited, increased demand will raise prices.</p>
579.	<p>The prices would probably increase until the majority was foreign owned and then it wouldn't matter the government would have to cater to foreign interests. This is the colonial economic structure that keeps Canada poor.</p>

580.	Outside individuals/groups see the value in owning one of our most sought after assets and therefore will drive the price up in order to get it so that they can have more control in primary agriculture and control what and how we produce our products. They tend to have no care for stewardship and protecting our environment, rather greed and commercialism drive their motivation and will eventually ruin our farming landscape.
581.	at current interest rates farmland is an attractive investment. what other investment provides a virtually guaranteed rate of return (rent) and requires almost no ongoing investment (taxes rarely increase, landlords don't even provide grain storage)
582.	It would inflate the value! It wouldn't make it realistic and rapid inflation could result in a potential bust. This is not great for the local farmers who still want to farm or the young farmers just starting out.
583.	may increase the value of farm land at the expense of agriculture as a whole as well as rural communities. the resource industries contribute to the economic well being of the province , but the division of wealth is of concern when income from resource employment can earn a living as well as purchase farm land where operating the land will not, in the same time frame.
584.	It would temporarily increase the value but cause more damage in the long run. By damage I mean it would harm the business interests of Saskatchewan farmers and the general public. Look at what happens when mergers and acquisitions take place in corporate Canada, initially it is a good thing but causes more damage by job loses and hollowing out, etc. Do NOT relax requirements of Saskatchewan farmland ownership!!! The Government of Canada (with Saskatchewan Government support) did not approve the takeover of Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan by a foreign company since it wasn't in the public's best interests, so would it not be the same thing when it comes to farmland and foreign ownership?
585.	Although increasing the value of farm property would benefit retiring farmers it also makes it more difficult for young people to take up farming leading to a proliferation of corporate farms which, again, sends profits out of the province and reduces the potential for increased rural residency.
586.	it will increase the prices as it is right now therefore will drive Saskatchewan residents out of the market for land.
587.	What is the use of asking people's opinion about what might happen? I certainly hope that the policy decision is not based on individual's hunches.
588.	Why should Saskatchewan farmers have to compete with multi national investors who have no interest in the well being of the rural areas of this province? There are ruthless investors from many parts of the world who would like to control the economic climate of agriculture in Saskatchewan. There will be 'more people driven off the land if there are rules changed to allow these multinational investors to control our great province by owning the farm land.
589.	There is a lot of competition already with only local farmers
590.	It creates a market where investment vehicles can park money to avoid tax charges and creates an artificially high cost of ownership for working farms because this type of purchase doesn't have to earn a return on investment.
591.	Foreign interests, cartel dollars, "free money"eg.gov of Canada sponsored, to list a few would

	raise market value of farmland. This is short term thinking which can jeopardize food supply for Canadians. Countries like China have long term outlook on resources and Canadians need to protect themselves from loss of farmland as well as other resources such as oil, minerals, potash and water.
592.	<p>The reason is that as drought, falling commodity values and the access to funding all have a bearing. One needs to remember that where one lives doesn't make a parcel of land in 100 kilometers away on the other side of a provincial boundary more valuable.</p> <p>The value of the property is a moving target and therefore it is our opinion that the rules as they are are workable and fair. Relaxing them is a loose term and each issue pension plans etc would need to be discussed individually.</p>
593.	The value of farmland is made by the market, if there is good income in farming, land value goes up, if there is less income, farmers and other investors would not buy farmland.
594.	More people allowed to buy means price goes higher
595.	There would be an increase in values for a time and that may encourage many to take the profit from increased prices. But in the long view I feel that farming in any form would be affected detrimentally. Young people can hardly afford to start up a farm operation at this time and price levels, if land values increase due to outside investment on speculation even for a short term, investment by local young people would suffer and may end any hope they have of realizing their goals. What would the future hold for land prices and local ownership when values "max out" and profitability from operations is minimized forcing a halt to many farm operations? This answer is too important to farming and the risk to pursue this course of irreversible action and speculation is too great for the future of affordable food production.
596.	Purchasing of land by investment corporations that have different tax implications and motives is not a fair playing field. There maybe short term gains, but I think there will be long term losses. Both in productivity and investment.
597.	<p>Those with deep pockets would buy the land</p> <p>Many countries want food security so would buy the land and have us as their (slaves/peons) operators with them controlling all they could</p>
598.	Presently farmland values have already surpassed the intrinsic value.
599.	Current land owners will always be trying to squeeze every dollar out of their sale and with more buyers in the market it will drive land prices to even higher levels than the current high prices
600.	Initially the market value of farmland would increase beyond the ability of local, small and beginning farmers to participate to purchase farmland. They would not be able to compete with the deep pockets of investment firms and/or private investors. Within a short time a great percentage of land would be held by non-farmers who would have no interest in the land or in the surrounding communities which in turn would cease to be vibrant communities. We already have seen the depopulation of rural areas as a result of the increase in size of farms; I believe the trend would be accelerated under a system of unrestricted ownership.
601.	It would cause more foreign investors to purchase land.
602.	It will increase the value of the land far above what the land is worth in terms of return on

	investment from the produce sold by the farmer.
603.	The big corps will weed out the little guys and small farm operations won't have a chance.
604.	More investment dollars competing for a scarce resource means the price will go up.
605.	Increase the value to a point where it would be unaffordable to Saskatchewan residents
606.	There would be more outsiders having a bidding war on land, with no boundaries things would get out of control.
607.	like an auction more buyers higher price.
608.	If the land is to remain in place for agricultural use, land prices will be correlated, more or less, to profitability.
609.	it will cause volatility in prices. Unfortunately, I feel like the corporations and land investment companies will take advantage of only to expand more as they have the money to do so., which by the way I also consider Hutterite colonies land investment companies. as they seem to just keep expanding and "splitting" their colonies instead of their land ever being offered to other "farmers".
610.	At what cost to our economy now and in the future?
611.	Only the ultra-rich will own land if this continues.
612.	I'm not sure if "value" is the right word here. It would certainly drive up the " cost."
613.	Competition from foreign entities will obviously drive up values. We see that everywhere that Chinese money is involved. It does not mean that the ag industry as a whole will be better off however.
614.	Land is not going to increase or decrease in value very much with relaxed rules. More restrictions will definitely devalue the land.
615.	big companies would fuel artificial prices-- making it impossible for farmers to compete against-- and creating unreal prices to rent land
616.	land is the most secure investment in the world, that is why it is valuable
617.	The value is already insane due to investors. The problem will be when the farming cycle turns down and investor start to dump
618.	I know it would increase value but that is going to happen anyway over time. I still don't think it is a good thing.
619.	Farmland prices increase when farming is profitable and farmers are actively buying land. NOT WHEN OUTSIDE INVESTORS ARE BUYING!! Look at history, we had restrictions in place for a very long time, kept prices artificially low (couldn't buy unless from SK). When that was lifted, it coincided with increase in profitability in farming. We are so reactive as society. Let us be proactive. DON'T INSTITUTE RESTRICTIONS.
620.	It's an irrelevant question. Whether the value of the farmland increases or decreases, what is necessary is to allow for the best use of the land given any market condition.

621.	I think Sask is a small enough market that outside purchasers would be seen as stiff competition that could potentially have an endless supply of money. I feel that this mentality would create a sense of fear and prices would climb quickly.
622.	it is currently happening with people knowing the only true hedge against inflation is property ownership
623.	Price would go high to start and lower in the end. Too many people have access and floods the market
624.	This is a leading question. It's not about what will happen. This is about what should happen.
625.	Once you remove a buyer who was paying (in some case 2 to 3 times) what the market place can support naturally the prices will decrease.
626.	Companies, out of province or country investors have more money to purchase than the small farmers in Saskatchewan. Can't compete
627.	I don't really know about prices. What I fear is that the government is more interested in money than in protecting nature and protecting the small farmers. Foreign investors may come in and pay large sums to create huge grain farms, in the same way we see the factory farms all around us. Money is made for a few people, but the cost to the earth, the animals and locals is too high. Promises are made to the people about jobs and benefits and the good of all, but really only a few people really benefit.
628.	Corporations and private investments would take over and drive the hard working family farms that make Saskatchewan...Saskatchewan. Don't follow what the other guys did wrong.
629.	farmland is over priced
630.	Right now farmland is a very stable place to invest. With low interest rates this makes investing in farmland even more attractive to people outside of agriculture, especially large investment trusts and pension funds.
631.	Other countries would come drive up prices to a point that Saskatchewan farmers couldn't compete to buy land. It's already happening with pension funds outbidding farmers.
632.	May increase value short term , but in long term would not be much different
633.	I am not sure but I do think if the value increases because of these billion dollar companies starting to invest, there will just be several large landowners in the province and small farms will disappear along with small communities.
634.	If investors aren't able to buy land it will keep farm land prices the same and won't cause it to inflate so high and drastically
635.	Would become unaffordable for Sask residents
636.	There's people outside of Saskatchewan that see land as a great investment and have no problem putting down a few million dollars as an investment. This is kind of an ignorant question as anyone with a clue of Saskatchewan agriculture knows what money from outside investors will do to the price of land.
637.	Relaxing requirements of farmland ownership would bring it closer to market value, which is a significantly higher value than its current state.

638.	This is not about petty theories. Investment funds have proven to pay less than individuals or Colonies so what are you asking about?
639.	More demand more value. Saskatchewan has some of the best farmland in the world and it is still vastly underpriced. Even government coffers would increase substantially if its holdings in land increased in value. The profit could go towards benefiting all citizens of Saskatchewan (especially when oil and potash prices fail).
640.	While this would likely increase the value of the land, it would make it even more difficult for people to expand their operations without crushing debt. Any policy to increase the value of the land should be weighed against the number of livelihoods that it supports.
641.	it would increase the value making it more difficult for farmers to purchase to expand or improve their operations.
642.	increase in value is not the only goal. Keeping local people on farms keeps communities strong. It's better if they own the land, which gives them equity for retirement.
643.	Over the short term would cause land to spike then level out over the course of next 5-10 years.
644.	The amount available wouldn't change, but the eligible demand would skyrocket.
645.	Tough to tell. When interest rates are low, it would possibly increase it, however if global economies get stronger or Saskatchewan experiences severe drought periods (i.e. 5-10 years) this will drop prices and the farmers resilient enough still farming will be left to pick up the pieces.
646.	Financial markets can over whelm the farmers in terms of competing in a market economy. The value of farmland lies in its ability to produce food. As the finance takes control access to food will become a privilege for the wealthy as has been shown in the past including the mass starvation in Ireland and in the Ukraine. We need to recognize the long term impact.
647.	When bad years in ag come (and they will) it will reduce local farmers from securing equity to tide them through and they will be unable to compete with bargain hunting investors.
648.	it would kill rural communities. owners would leave the province and locals would be serfs.
649.	Farm profitability more dependent on market power than land market value
650.	Mutual funds and investments in the banks are returning on average less then 1 percent the last 5 years. Look at the increase in value of farmland in the last 5 years. Where do you think the investors will go create a bullish market???
651.	Making a profit off farmland has nothing to do with producing a crop for non-agricultural investors like pension funds, etc. It doesn't matter to them if the cost of the land negates the ability to produce a profitable crop. All that matters is that the value of the land continues to increase. How will agricultural producers be able to make a profit if they have to purchase/lease in competition with non-agricultural investors. Farmers need to see a profit from their crops.
652.	Land values in my area are already past the point of making a profit unless you have great yields, quality and market the crop at the peak with any chance to make money on it.

653.	the farmer still has to be able to work the land regardless of ownership for rent and sustain a profit just to continue to operate. If land lease prices become too high, farmers will not be able to afford to operate.
654.	Open it wide open and people with wealth from other parts of the world could buy up the land. Production on that land could be shipped back to other countries to feed their people bringing no trade wealth back to Saskatchewan and Canada for that matter. These people could choose to not support local businesses to carry out their farming. Problems all around.
655.	Values have already spiked...now it's about long term stability of pricing and moderate growth.
656.	Land is being extremely overvalued - quarters of poor soil class and rock are selling for two times the assessment - without the ability to make that return.
657.	More buyers only bid up the price of any commodity. You only need to go to a farm auction sale to see that with more bidders the price of any thing goes up.
658.	If pension funds are going to come in and throw a bunch of money at land investments, local people will have no chance at buying land, and eventually other countries will be allowed to buy all the land as well. Even though we will be retiring within 10 years, I don't want to see my son unable to purchase land.
659.	Even the most educated financial advisors can not predict how the markets will react at all times. We can only "assume" how changes could affect markets.
660.	I am trying to sell my land but I told the realtor do not bring any Chinese offers I would like to see local young farmers buy it up.
661.	It's not necessarily worth it to sell off all of Saskatchewan just to make a quick buck in the short term
662.	Let the market place decide
663.	I believe that allowing more foreign ownership of farmland would increase the cost of farmland and therefore put ownership of the land out of reach for average farmers. This would turn farmers into operators instead of owners. I believe that the success that farmers have had in Saskatchewan comes from their ability to hold assets that have lasting value, the ability for farmers to sell the land they've used to earn a living supports their retirement making them less dependent on social programs and increasing the long-term prosperity for all Saskatchewan residents.
664.	It becomes just a commodity then.
665.	People know what can be made off of a lot of land and anyone will take the chance at that if they can afford it and the price will only go up if there is competition for purchasing.
666.	Don't think it should always be about the money
667.	Sounds like 'greed'.
668.	More competition leads to supply and demand.
669.	Sadly This country is witnessing an influx of foreign wealth from countries with no social conscience.

670.	Pension plans and investment firms can not only offer higher prices for land, they have amassed large amounts of capital and are able to buy land in bulk. This causes large amounts of land to then be owned by a single, large entity dictated by free market economics, who would simply not be willing to divest of land without the promise of large returns, which would not be possible coming from farmers who wish to own and farm the land, rather than use it as an investment hedge.
671.	Economics would say that values would go up- however I don't think it would be a drastic increase as profitability would have the final say in land prices being able to sustain a higher value.
672.	It allows investors whether they are other farmers or funds to invest in the land. They are looking for buying opportunity.
673.	Land has never devalued ...
674.	Money not made in agriculture would be buying land, most likely pushing up the price. Generally environmental concerns farmer have for land they own don't apply to land that's rented and investor just want the max return. ie grassed water ways are farmed, marginal soils are cultivated when better left in grass.
675.	Again it would follow market signals. Values would increase or decrease as markets dictated .
676.	Farmland is fully valued at the moment, I feel allowing the Canadian Pension Plan and other pension plans to own farmland won't substantially increase farmland prices from their current prices. However, restricting ownership will act to reduce farmland value as new investors from out of province will be reluctant to invest. Investors fear uncertainty.
677.	Foreign ownership will drive land prices beyond that affordable by young Saskatchewan farmers, and in all likelihood, Canadians.
678.	No comment
679.	Create instability that is in reflective of what the actual profitability of the farm is.
680.	Big corporations would buy the land and want way too much money for rent to get their return on investment
681.	More foreign money would enter the province (ie, China, USA etc.) which would bring up the price of land.
682.	When commodity prices are high, interest is low and tenants are willing to pay high rent, the market value will be high. I have yet to see anyone selling land in our area unable to get a fair market value or not find a buyer.
683.	Would make the value artificially high and not a reflection of what can actually be produced from the land
684.	If farmland ownership rules are relaxed, a mad scramble from international buyers, pension funds, and investment trusts would buy all the land at prices far above what we have already seen, to prices that would make it uneconomic for farmers to own it.
685.	Young Sask farmers can not compete with large investors.
686.	It would artificially inflate prices. You can't tell me owning land and losing money in poor

	production years is good business. I can see where some have the money to purchase large packages of land just to own the land. For what purpose????? Been trying to get ahead then you have this B.S..... Try living the ups and downs first.
687.	It will drive land values. Force those in the area to pay more for services, community structures and a close local schools. with opening the land to opportunist it will create an environment where you will no longer have people working for common goals for the community.
688.	Not sure how it is affected it in the long run, if may increase the land price now but if the land isn't looked after will it effect the prices down the road?
689.	Commodity prices and weather conditions have more to do with farmland values than anything else
690.	Once again as a young farmer, how am I supposed to compete against pension groups or investors for the land.
691.	The run up in current farm land prices is unsustainable, but I believe that if farm cash receipts stay about the same so will the price of farm land.
692.	It would increase Saskatchewan land value today. When the western Canada agriculture income cycle turns down it would create an extreme exodus of value. It would create wider swings in land values as economic cycles come and go.
693.	Taking into account the current grain prices which has not changed since the 1970 s , increasing land prices make it not affordable to purchase
694.	it stabilize the market
695.	More participants would likely increase value and add stability to prices. This is a good thing, and I say this even though I plan to purchase land the rest of my career.
696.	As the world population continues to increase they will consume more food. There is no reason why agricultural assets, including land, should not continue to grow with demand for food. If the belief that global warming is actually happening comes true then Saskatchewan will be more of the proverbial bread basket that we have been toted since the settlement of the province however long ago. There is definitely a point of balance that is likely to never be attained where investment from outside the province helps to maintain the rural way of life. One thing I know is that I will work 10 times as hard to keep my own operation going verses working for a large corporation, and maybe 20 times if you throw unions into the mix.
697.	Pension plans are most worrisome. Using farmers own tax money to unfairly compete in a resulting skewed market. Farmers can't write off land purchases tax wise.
698.	The price of farmland would increase dramatically making it difficult for the next generation of Saskatchewan farmers to enter the industry.
699.	Relaxing the ownership requirement would introduce a huge pool of potential buyers and therefore increase land value.
700.	simple supply and demand economics. foreigners could bid up the prices just to move capital into Canada... see the situation in Vancouver re: housing. Lots of million dollar homes, few homeowners... restricting locals from owning homes. not a productive situation

701.	it would increase the value to a point of farmers not affording to purchase land and hurting small communities .
702.	The farmland security depresses Saskatchewan farmland values and creates far to much Government involvement in financial backdrop of farming in Saskatchewan.
703.	It would allow foreign capital to participate in the marketplace.
704.	The Chinese will buy every square inch they can get their hands on because it is cheap food producing land. Eventually they will own our food source and we will be buying wheat grown here from them. This may sounds racist but this is reality.
705.	We can't compete with large investors and foreign investment!
706.	No one that invests actually know to take proper ownership and manage farming. They just look for a place to hide their money. If anyone invests in farmland they should personally work it.
707.	Opening up the market will create scarcity and increased demand, therefore the price will increase. this may make land more expensive than a small farmer can afford, which may force that farm owner to sell their land for a large profit, and rent it back from the land owner to farm. In this case they may be able to farm more land, with less risk. Utilizing their machinery more efficiently as well as creating higher incomes for those farmers.
708.	It is not about money it should be about food security and having a future for the generations to come. We went to war for our homeland and now we are willing to sell it off to foreign countries and let them own us. They do not have to invade anymore they can simply buy us out. Why bother with Remembrance Day if this continues ???
709.	Relaxing farm ownership restrictions will dramatically increase the price of our farmland. That is an obvious "no-brainer".
710.	Increase the value- too many ill informed people unaware of what they are purchasing would drive the price of land beyond the ability for an active farmer to purchase and provide no future for that farmer
711.	It would of course increase the market value as outside ownership would allow investors with more money to come in and buy up farmland. This makes it difficult for local and young farmers to compete and to get established.
712.	How will the small or even medium size farm survive when competing against outside investors for land.....we will not grow....you do need young people such as myself to have the ability to grow and expand...because I want to live here...I don't want to see further demise of rural Saskatchewan.
713.	Until the price of land gets to a point where investors can not see the ROI that they need farmland prices will continue to increase.
714.	It would increase the price in the short term until there's only a few corporate farms remaining. Medium size farmers do a much better job at farming for the future.
715.	I believe outside ownership will lead to less farmers and less local people to support communities.

716.	The values still must correspond with the return on investment
717.	Market value would increase due to speculation from investors, particularly investors from Asia and other foreign countries, and other entities, including parties looking to launder money. Legal and corporate structures are so intricate and complex, it would be very hard to determine where the source of funding for the purchases originates and therefore difficult to regulate and/or enforce.
718.	Increase value in the short-term.
719.	Land prices may increase to a point where it is more attractive to sell/retire rather than keep farming. High land prices may also make it more restrictive for young farmers to enter/grow as a business. Land prices should be based on productive capability rather than speculative investments.
720.	<p>There is a competitive market for land today. Canadian farmers know what its worth. They have bid for it and are winning the bids. The ultra-low interest rates that are unsustainable and high farm incomes stemmed from strong global demand - biofuels in particular- drove the face value of land higher.</p> <p>From a government stand point, a significant fear is a loss in farm equity and farmers asking for money again. Hoping outside/foreign land investors come to the rescue is irresponsible. Domestic farmers have no control over exchange rates. Although the foreign investors wouldn't pay anymore in Canadian dollars than a domestic farmer, central bank decisions to erode the purchasing power of the Lonnie could place domestic farmers at a competitive disadvantage.</p>
721.	no comment
722.	It would increase it but to levels that would leave it out of reach for new farmers, young farmers and small farms. It would ensure that only large farms survive, and that new farmers couldn't own their own land, they'd be at the mercy of landlords. Effectively meaning they'd be serfs
723.	It would increase the value and increase the hardships faced by farmers who are young and starting out, or who are hoping to expand.
724.	Has nothing to do with land. It's really the cost of fuel, equipment, consumables, taxes.....outweighing the money made on the farm.
725.	It would more than likely increase as a competition for land would occur. But as previously stated, not be worth it.
726.	I just know it could limit the ability of new farmers from purchasing land to start unless they came from an industry which gave them a lot of income not related to farming.
727.	It will increase the value of farmland just like the urban housing and price home grown Canadians out if the market just like it's doing in Vancouver and Toronto. Even in Saskatoon many foreigners are helping to drive prices of urban housing up. Canada and the U.S. are areas of the world where the fleeing rich from other parts of the world are trying to find places to protect their money.
728.	Local farmers drive the price more than investors

729.	Relaxing the requirements will only drive prices higher. Once owned outside the province or country, it is unlikely that the ownership will every revert to Saskatchewan.
730.	Short term it will increase values but long term values will decrease. If an investor is looking for max returns and isn't worried about caring for the land, eventually the land will be mismanaged to mine agricultural profits from land. This leads to poorer quality land that brings less revenue and increased costs to manage. This hurts the value of land long term. This is not worth the short term increase in value that would come from outside investors
731.	Who owns farmland in Saskatchewan is a more important consideration than market value. Farmland should be owned mainly by Saskatchewan residents. Ownership by Canadian citizens is imperative.
732.	It would more than likely raise the value but I don't believe that is what we want or need here.
733.	It will be an increase that will make the land unsustainable for families to expand. I do not have investors line up to foot the purchase price of hyper-inflated land.
734.	Which ultimately will end young and local farmers.
735.	If large corporations with more buying power buy farmland, there will be less of it for local farmers with a capped budget to purchase, and more competition for purchase among local farmers that are being priced out by corporations with deeper pockets.
736.	It would fluctuate more with the grain and cattle markets like it used to with land people setting prices. We don't get farmers to set the price of new trucks; no the company that makes them does that so why do we let suits set the price of my land.
737.	bad idea
738.	If more people are looking to buy the land its logical that its value would be more. If we were to retire, it would be very unfair for gov't to restrict our land values or the amount we have to retire with. Will the gov't be willing to top up what retiring farmers would have received if over regulated by gov't interference?
739.	relaxing the requirements would mean prices would sky rocket due to foreign and businesses able to put more \$ up for it while homebred youths who wish to continue the farming tradition are frozen out.
740.	In good times as we have seen in the recent past allowing investment people in, would have values go up. Times however are not always good. They are in it for the return.
741.	I assume it could drive the market value up which makes it even more difficult for young farmers. The amount of immigrants who now own the dairy units around as increased significantly as has the price for dairy operations.
742.	Outside investment will artificially drive the value, let us think about history, not greed.
743.	There is plenty of competition for land now if you want to own land in the province feel free to join us pay taxes here support our schools grocery stores rinks etc more people in the province is way more beneficial.
744.	Investor just push land prices making impossible for local farmers to purchase land

745.	It would drive up prices which may make it more difficult for local farmers to acquire and expand.
746.	Farmland is an investment and big corporations would come in and drive the price by competing with the local farmer.
747.	Makes it unaffordable
748.	the more you open it up to non Canadians the higher the price will get therefore closing the door for my children ever to buy land. It has to be stopped now
749.	While I believe market price would increase, I believe that in the long term it is not a sustainable path. Eventually something is going to give and it will be the land prices. In other words, though market price increases does not mean the value of that land increases. In this case, few people would be interested in the future of purchasing land they simply cannot afford. And this would significantly change the scope of farming in Saskatchewan.
750.	You would get more outside investment based purely on what they have to pay for land in there region and see a deal here never mind agronomic differences in the regions and what the true value of the land is based on production
751.	I think it would decrease it at first, because there's a lot of it, foreign investors would buy it for cheap, but as its bought for less money, it will increase in value for local farmers to try and buy it back, making it unaffordable for them....you will lose people who cannot afford to buy farmland, and the province will suffer
752.	Competition over a finite resource would increase prices (simple economics here). But this would squeeze out Saskatchewan farmers & make it a less sustainable lifestyle.
753.	Investor groups and foreign ownership have more resources and bank roll behind them.
754.	Allowing foreign/out of province investors to purchase Saskatchewan farm land will drive the price up on farm land and put it out of reach for Saskatchewan residents that want to begin or expand their farming operation.
755.	Land is higher in Manitoba and Alberta
756.	It would likely increase the value of the land it would likely increase the demand. However, individuals from outside the province may buy the land, but this does not mean that they are going to live in the province. A local farmer will continue to live in the province and support the economy here. Local farmers are more likely to look after the land.
757.	Those of us who live here, work here and have farmed on this land since our Grandfather homesteaded in 1908 value the heritage and ownership and historical value of our land and farm it to the best of our ability. This heritage we value.
758.	The high end investors and purchasers would railroad prices and edge out local farmers. . .decreasing local economy and small town viability.
759.	At the present time and in the past Investment groups have not driven up land prices. The individual farmers will get into a bidding war over land. Investors make sound business decisions and if the return they wish to achieve is not there they will not proceed.
760.	If any joe blow in the city or another country that hasn't the slightest clue about farming can

	buy up land, you're going to have prices that are too high for actual farmers.
761.	Outside corporations would not have the same idea of maintaining the condition of the land. Usually will not have a hands on experience. Only in it for the money and not have an interest in the rural area and communities.
762.	Just because it would increase in value it doesn't make it better.
763.	I could have more buyers I would not be restricted to a few neighbours.
764.	Obvious
765.	Land values would vary widely year to year and instability would result being harmful to agriculture and long term stewardship. In short you would destroy what you need to protect and that is the resource. Wake up!
766.	I would definitely benefit from increased value. but what about leaving a decent legacy for the next generation.
767.	We expect the best case to be stay the same but suspect the values would increase.
768.	Foreign money and they have lots of it and pay anything to get it.
769.	Working in the agricultural industry in Ontario, I have first hand knowledge on the value of farmland as well as the cost to rent land in Ontario. The rate of return in Ontario for renting land is almost negligible and foreign investors would be far more attracted to Saskatchewan were the rate of return appears to be in the 3% range and have the benefit of the land appreciating as well.
770.	they will keep going up till the land can no longer support the need to make the money investors, companies need. then it's to late the land is no longer good land.
771.	Higher land values for farmers that want to retire.
772.	outside investors would drive up land prices
773.	If a province is allowed to be sold off to the rich people of the world, then of course its going to increase considering we have the cheapest land in the world right now.
774.	it is important to realize that the current value of farmland in saskatchewan is not fixed. prices could deteriorate if other areas such as eastern europe and africa start to catch up on production technology. other parts of the world are still attractive destinations for investment in agriculture and therefore I suspect Saskatchewan would not have a major inflation in land value and even if that happens it would be corrected with time.
775.	I would be afraid if another country owned our farm land they would want an over inflated price making it unobtainable for local farmers.
776.	If foreign buyers think that owning farmland is profitable, then anybody should be able to profitably own it including the current farmers or other farmers in the area. The market price is the market price.
777.	Loaded and obvious answer for all respondents. Again, seems to be a loaded question just to get a desired result. Short term gain for long term loss for the provinces and our agriculture will be the result of relaxing foreign ownership restrictions.

778.	Farmland has been undervalued in Sask. Producers have to accept. that farmland is the # 1 requirement for producing. We have to be competitive in the world markets. Saskatchewan and Canadians need to maintain ownership of our land.
779.	Speculators buy and try to extract as much as they can from the land for their investors. The money does not stay in Saskatchewan.
780.	Would bring into line with international markets and make more reflective of changing commodity prices.
781.	more buyers for limited land base
782.	Please read my previous response.
783.	without any regulations more Investors would try to buy land and compete with local buyers
784.	Land prices would increase because large investment companies would compete with each other for the land. this would make it nearly impossible for small local farmers to purchase the land. They are the ones staying in Sask and supporting other businesses within this province.
785.	Of course outside investors would drive the price up as long as they could get better than bank interest from rentals .
786.	Land prices should be inline with the ability to make a living from the land on a regular basis. Bonafide farmers will want to earn a living from the land that they own or lease. Investors may or may not care in the large scheme of things which would perhaps eliminate the smaller operators. Small operators would become sharecroppers (not ever able to make a decent living from their share)
787.	As an investor ourselves, we do not see any investment opportunities out there right now. GICs do not encourage saving, tax free savings funds are a joke with the interest rates being so low, there is no tax to pay on them anyway, mutual funds are constantly falling due to market corrections; if one invests in land your return is better and at the end of the day you still physically have your investment, the land.
788.	Relaxing the requirements of ownership would drive up the cost of land for farm families who cannot compete against wealthy non Canadians.
789.	The amount of farmland worldwide is decreasing and population is increasing, so opening ownership to everyone could lead to prices being bid very high
790.	It will increase the value of the land to the point that residents of Saskatchewan may no longer afford to own Saskatchewan farm land -- it will be out of reach. Just look at what has happened with real estate in British Columbia...once that Chinese money started to roll in, the price of real estate is out of reach for middle income earners. This will happen to Saskatchewan farmland if foreign ownership rules are not tightened.
791.	More demand, same supply, higher prices.
792.	These funds and foreign buyers have the money to throw at land. For them another hundred grand is pocket change. For me it's putting my life, my work, and my family at risk.
793.	It is true that the market value will increase however this is not a positive, as local/farmer

	ownership will decrease as a result.
794.	I think you would have more investors coming in and scooping things up
795.	The land value would probably increase but the net return to the producer for the crops produced would decrease.
796.	It might give Hedge fund managers control over agriculture.
797.	It would definitely increase it for a period of time because it is a good investment if you have money and are using it as a write off
798.	Maybe we should go to china and start buying up their resources for 3 times a reasonable value. See how they feel.
799.	It would create a more open market for an inherently limited supply.
800.	When you allow foreign investors and pension plans to own the land and people with unlimited money it will drive the price up. As a young farmer borrowing the money to pay for the land I can't compete with the prices because interest will kill me
801.	The rest of the world wants and needs our space, clean air, clean water, and resources for profit! Of course they will be here as soon as it is available. They will drive the prices up so resident farmers will not be able to compete! Investors will see the potential as anyone can, and flock to get a piece of the pie. I say we hang onto the pile and save it for ourselves and our descendants. Fast profit benefits only a tiny percentage, the 1%, and the majority lose!
802.	Price of land may go up for a few years but level out after which will make it harder for local farmers to own land vs renting
803.	There are gov'ts of countries around the world that would like to own land in Sask where food destined for their country comes from. Ownership of Sask land would provide increased food security to those countries where their land prices are much higher than in Sask. Foreign gov'ts like India and China would have billions of dollars to invest in Sask farmland. They easily can bid up the price of the land
804.	there would be so much money come from outside sources from people that just want to buy some land in sask that the average people could not afford it just think what the rural communities will look like if this were to happen they would be ruined
805.	Putting out a for sale sign for anyone to bid on would definitely generate more revenue out of the land, but farmers would own less and less of the land.
806.	More buyers and more money equals increase in prices.
807.	It would make it even harder for the local rancher and farmer to take over the family ranch or farm.
808.	more consideration than monetary and damaging in the long term of the province for short term benefit
809.	It will only increase the MARKET or DOLLAR value... It WILL NOT make the land MORE VALUABLE. The land is only as good as its production. Any additional value is only an inflation of price which will make it UNATTAINABLE for REAL AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS! In what other industry DOES IT TAKE 20 YEARS TO PAY FOR CAPITAL PURCHASES! And 20 years is AT a

	market value based on production value, not INFLATED Market prices. If CANADIANS want a SAFE RELIABLE AFFORDABLE FOOD SUPPLY, the government cannot keep allowing NON AGRICULTURAL people/companies etc. to keep purchasing land and gaining control of something THEY KNOW NOTHING ABOUT!
810.	Would make SK land unattainable for the SK farmers. This is happening already. The people buying SK land have never had to wait for SK rainfall. The result when a bigger percentage is sold off will be disastrous. SK is giving up too much control to Non-residents.
811.	everyone gets a higher price from out of province investors and makes it harder to purchase a piece of land that becomes available.
812.	It would allow the value to find the true world market price, just like houses in Vancouver or Toronto.
813.	The problem with commercial or foreign ownership I believe is mostly to use the lands for other purposes than farming such as investing where they hold the land and drive up price. There is also large foreign purchasers that buy land farm half in order to create a false market and drive up demand or land price. In any event lets just keep our land local that way we don't need to speculate what anyone will do with the land as local owners ARE THERE TO FARM AND FARM ONLY ALSO LIVE ON THESE FARMS OR AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE.
814.	once you give up ownership the land is gone forever if it is sold to large investment groups. no chance for a young farmer to purchase it. if large investment group are allowed to purchase land they should have to put up a percentage of land up for sale each year.
815.	I think that it's an investment tool that hasn't been allowed and, if there becomes widespread interest, it could take off which would lead to hugely inflated prices which would be a barrier to new farmers or smaller farms wanting to expand.
816.	opening it up to Canadian investors has already helped to increase the price of farm land
817.	Relaxing the requirements of farmland ownership would increase the value of farmland. This is because when you have a large amount of people interested in buying your land, someone who is looking to get out of farming will be able to sell the land to a pension fund, investment trust, or foreign national for a lot more money than a farmer near them. Then by selling land for the highest price, land prices will continue to inflate, making it harder for people to get into the business.
818.	If you are trying to maximize your profits of selling your land then this would seem like a good idea. I am not in agreement with relaxing the rules. By doing that, I like we are giving away our land to foreigners that might have the best interest of our province in mind.
819.	Again as I said before the rich will get richer and the farmer will stay poor.
820.	No one buyer can compete with Agricore or the Chinese Government
821.	Could possibly drive down prices in the end, if profits are not meeting expectations and large amounts of land are to be on the market all at the same time. Might increase values for a short time after regulations are changed.
822.	Over time it would absolutely increase the value.

823.	And make it unaffordable for small/medium sized farmers to purchase land.
824.	Ownership outside the province spikes up the prices where the ordinary farmer finds it difficult to buy or rent.
825.	A free marketplace is imperative, however, as we have seen land prices skyrocket over a very short period of time as a result of outside investment has created a truly noncompetitive climate for our own people who have tilled and toiled the land and made this province the great place that it is. The people of this province who have remained here through thick and thin are severely disadvantaged. Agriculture cannot be at the mercy of only those that have the capital to acquire it. There is so much to say, but I think you get the message.
826.	Investors just want to park their money in a safe place right now. Hence, zero percent return after inflation is acceptable. Farmers have to make a living and pay taxes, and pension funds do not.
827.	short term increase but could lead to long term bubble that will have to burst
828.	It is just going to raise the value, it already has. Exchange rates between countries, out of country wealth and the desire to own land when most people don't even know what to do with it, has and will continue to push land values up.
829.	We currently have a great deal of land owned by parties outside of the province and country, that purchase through holding companies, lawyers offices, etc. so I don't know if changes would make a difference to values but they would possibly make it more transparent as to who actually owns the land. Looking at ISC reports of businesses that own land, you can often see that the company directors live outside of the province. Unfortunately, under current circumstances, young farmers that live in Saskatchewan often are unable to compete with the values that outside investors can pay for farmland...Its good for the sellers to maximize their profit, but bad for potential buyers.
830.	The value will go up which benefits the generation that is selling but hurts the future of or province economically. The fact that this is even being considered is unbelievable I am a conservative but this can only hurt the province. I am guessing that this is being put forth by certain members of the conservative party who have something to gain from this and don't have any consideration for the future of this province.
831.	I expect land prices and rents have peaked. If interest rates increase, those speculators and non farmer owners paying mortgages won't find persons to rent for the amount they paid on their investment. Economic investment will move back to other areas, and some land may be left abandoned for a period of time if investors do not recover their purchase price.
832.	I think the value would increase because outside investors who do not know the value of farmland in Saskatchewan with money needing to be invested for various reasons (ex. tax benefits, investment reasons, etc) would be willing to pay the amount needing to be "spent" is what they are willing to pay regardless of the value of the land and what it related to in proportion to the profits the land is able to produce. This may also cause an increase in lease rates as once these foreign owners realize the rate of returns on the investment, they may have to increase lease rates so they are in a profitability position as well.
833.	Investors see land as a stable investment that pays interest. Yes it makes good investment sense, but why would we allow it when it will end up crippling our agricultural economy?

834.	Initially values could possibly increase, but having large trusts controlling large blocks of farmland would rapidly reduce values because the trusts and pension funds would control the prices.
835.	It is about where it should be, let the market dictate
836.	And this matters to whom???? Obvious answer: current landowners. Which I am one of. Obvious rebuttal: one can never have enough money and greed always fosters higher and more greed. This should be about sovereign, tradition, cultural and protecting our future. Not about the price of farmland. Agriculture is something you don't screw around with and give away. It is a pillar of our economy and going down this road is very very dangerous. You can't outdo what will be done. Let our youth and new generation have a chance to live as we did.
837.	It won't increase the value, it will increase the pricing.
838.	The land value should be based on what the land is going to give as a return on what it is producing.
839.	Rich outside investors always drive up land values when speculating, to the detriment of those that live there and cannot afford their own farms or homes.
840.	more competition for locals
841.	It's a risky decision. I think ownership of the provinces farmland should stay in the hands of the provinces residents. That would ensure more stability.
842.	Bigger consolidated farm operations will be more efficient and productive; and should lead to higher competition and demand from foreign funds or trust funds that have the resources to scale their operations, which should increase land values.
843.	It's hard to say what changes may have effect
844.	It would increase for a time but profits would leave Saskatchewan and are leaving
845.	If investors can see the value in owning SK farmland, why can't we? SK would be stupid to sell it! It's our food security. It's similar to not selling off our potash mines - he saw the value the investors saw. "You gotta know when to hold 'em."
846.	It will make it harder for someone from this province with limited funds to buy farmland. People from Saskatchewan who have been farming for years know what it takes to care for the land in this province whereas foreigners do not.
847.	The government would once again be giving your natural resources away.
848.	The price of land will skyrocket as investors will compete for our land
849.	Unless you are also going to regulate the prices of agriculture inputs and increase the amount we get for our product, neither of which you will or should do, you should not artificially drive up the value of the land.
850.	Artificially increasing land values doesn't benefit the industry as a whole, only those selling out and leaving the industry
851.	Because as demand increases (due to an expansion in the buyers market), price will also

	increase.
852.	I think it would increase the value making it unattainable for anyone else. You would have big companies buying it all up at outrageous prices and then the farmers would all get screwed!
853.	A large portion of the farmland around Saskatoon is being bought by land speculators from Alberta and Ontario - this has driven prices up beyond the ability of normal farm operations to pay for the land. Additionally, all these acreages and their owners are often in direct conflict farmers and traditional land use by rural residents.
854.	I believe it would increase the value of the land beyond what the average Saskatchewan small-to-mid-size farmer could afford to purchase to expand their operation. Non-Saskatchewan & non-Canadian purchases would make Saskatchewan land too expensive for Saskatchewan residents.
855.	Too many speculators and non farmers would buy up farm land and take it away from young farmers
856.	Not sure where the market would go. Ideally more buyers on the market increase the price but who's the buyers? farmers or ag related investors? or are they investors or CPP as an example? outside influences on the price of land are good but the farmer needs to be able to farm and make a profit. Farmers are at the bottom of the food chain and this needs to be protected in order for them to succeed. Our land price needs to stay in check with our gross potential per acre. Opening buyers to outside investors will have negative effects on the slim margins that farmers face everyday.
857.	There are areas in the world with wealth. They want to invest in our resource, but would likely not even see the land if they bought it.
858.	But increasing the value would price out locals and startups.
859.	THE MORE COMPETITION TO OWN LAND, THE HIGHER THE PRICE WILL BE. THIS ALSO WOULD APPLY TO FARMERS ONLY BEING ALLOWED TO BUY. THE MORE BUYERS YOU HAVE THE HIGHER THE PRICE WILL LIKELY BE. TALK TO AN HONEST REALTOR (IF YOU CAN FIND ONE). THIS ISN'T ROCKET SCIENCE.
860.	Current owners would cash in, and then it would all be gone.
861.	Increase the value which may hinder any persons looking into purchasing land and making a living from it, which would deter new farmers or existing to go into this business.
862.	It would increase the selling price and out of the reach of farmers and other people in Sask.
863.	Increasing the possibilities of who can buy farmland will drive up the price as people use it as an investment vehicle.
864.	There is enough competition between farmers to keep prices the same or even higher in some areas.
865.	It may change the value of land to the point Sask people may not be able to own and operate their own farm.
866.	Creating a bubble in farmland values is not a good thing. Incentivizing Sask. residents to divest land to non-residents is not a good thing. There have been periods of farm prosperity in the past--these have not come as a result of spiking land prices, but rather as a result of fair

	and sustainable net incomes.
867.	It would be a bidding war of millionaires from over seas. Saskatchewan would no longer be owned by anyone in Saskatchewan
868.	I think most people outside of the province or country feel our land is undervalued
869.	It would get so high, a large percentage would sell out, leaving a large part of saskatchewan not even owned by canadians.
870.	<p>Relaxing requirements would basically put Saskatchewan farmland up for a bidding war. With poor returns in other investment opportunities investors from around the World could potentially decide to purchase land. As the old saying goes "They aren't making any more of it." Escalating land prices would put most farmland out of reach for those that actually try to make a living off the land. Investors however would be able to sit on it and ride the tide of over inflated land values for awhile and still make a decent return on their investment . Farmland would begin to mirror what happens in the housing industry. The bubble would eventually burst but when? The effect on a sustainable agriculture industry would be devastating and long-lasting. Our shrinking Rural Communities would be dealt a crippling blow that they may never recover from.</p> <p>We are already creating a system of "Land Owners" and employees who just work the land. Our forefathers came to this country(Saskatchewan) with the dream of owning something for themselves. We are headed back to a Feudal System that everyone so desperately wanted to get away from.</p>
871.	It will increase the value for a bit then it will become a real mess when nobody will lease this land to give the owner a 5% return on there investment. \$150/acre cash rent on \$3000/acre land then a drought or flood year, how does this get covered??
872.	If a farmer did not care whom he sold to, an investor would buy his land for more than what another farmer could give him.
873.	If the Saskatchewan government relaxed the ownership rules as it appears that they are doing large companies and other countries will move and end up owning the farmland in this province
874.	Because interest rates on deposits are at a historically low level an investor will see farm land yielding say 2 or 3% per annum in rent as a decent investment and will be willing to move cash into such an investment.
875.	It is a capital market that drive the price of the farmland I think opening up the ownership to outside investors will create much larger swings both up and down in the prices of farmland. They will run price up when good times and flood the market with sales when times are tough in agriculture. Farmer or local investors will not do that.
876.	Has more to do with productive capacity related to grain prices.
877.	you can't predict the market, value will be what it will be. Might go up but farmers will lease it back at a place where they can make money and if that does not support the value then the price of land will go down.
878.	I believe that lots of non-residents with lots of money would buy up as much as they could and there would be nothing left for Sask residents who want to start out or the price would

	be much too high.
879.	I can not compete with foreign buyers
880.	There is too much speculation in farmland by wealthy people. Look at Alberta. Farmers can't farm if land prices are too high.
881.	If a large foreign owner pulls out it could cause a lot of instability to land prices.
882.	Its not so much that the price is driven up by these ownership groups as that great big pieces of land has no one living on them to support communities
883.	more competition the better when we sell..
884.	I think it would probably increase the price and would eliminate any young farmer trying to get a start in the business.
885.	If ownership rules are relaxed then more foreign owners will look at our land as an enviable asset. These owners aren't going to farm this soil, they will probably have the land rented back to the former owner(s) or young guys just starting out with no equity. Over time, gradually more and more land in Sask is going to be leased rather than owned. We will slowly forget the nostalgic view of farm land ownership and accept the new reality.
886.	Relaxing the requirements would increase the competition for land and therefore increase the value.
887.	It would likely decrease the value to a more appropriate level, affordable for farmers to buy and sell safely at realistic values that can be supported by the land itself. Right now farmers cannot afford to buy land as it cannot pay for itself and therefore lacks a good enough reason to buy.
888.	Who ever wants to buy it no matter who they are or what country there from sell to the highest bidder .
889.	The value of the farmland has already seen a separation from the revenue potential from the land. Even if there was a large increase in value as large properties are bought up, the sustainable prices of the land will soon correct itself.
890.	I believe it could have all varying effects depending on various scenarios. Having said that, I do believe that there will come a day when we may have to relax the ownership rules when there are less and less farmers available to acquire the land
891.	It would increase the value to the point, no actual farmer would be able to compete with these mega corporations. One failed crop year means the little guy is out and he's what society wants, not faceless corporations.
892.	Land is a finite resource. Doesn't it follow that greater demand = greater prices???
893.	its not would land increase, it already has.
894.	Value of farmland may be so high young people have no chance to buy in.
895.	So what. If it goes up no one here can own land. Money is not everything but owning our own land and caring about our province and how it is taken care of does. We who live here

	care.
896.	I think a lot of off shore money would ,for lack of a better word "laundered" here. Farmers who own their operations, I think take pride in them. Often in agriculture pride of doing a good job is all that's left .BSE crisis for example. It will take another five years of high cattle prices to make up for the CFIA's boondoggle handling of it.
897.	Short term increase price . Long term if farms loss the equity growth ?
898.	see previous response.
899.	Increasing value if you are getting out.. but what about those wanting to get in??? A quarter in SK should not be \$250k and right now it is!! Ridiculous!
900.	Investors drive up the price of land and make it less affordable.
901.	Artificially low interest rates support the borrowing of money to invest in all forms of real estate as owners of capital seek a return on that capital, often in the form of asset value appreciation. This creates a negative environment for those trying to make a profit off of the productive value of the asset.
902.	Remember with a \$.75 dollar, no Saskatchewan resident will be able to afford to buy farmland. Non-residents will buy our land cheaply and ship the grain and livestock directly to their countries. Just let them buy elevators and railroads and there will be no control over the food grown here. They will buy equipment and products from their countries and ship the grain or livestock without providing any economic spin off here or food and water security for own residents
903.	Outside investors will bring more instability to land prices. It will temporarily drive prices up, but when agriculture gets tough again, they will dump land crashing values. Making it impossible for farmers to borrow against their land to put a Crop in. Which will require massive subsidies from the province to keep agriculture going.
904.	as long as land investment remains more attractive than low interest investments
905.	China has more money than we can match.
906.	It would drive prices through the roof and force a lot of people into retirement and cash their land in instead of renting it out (or passing it on to future generations) once retired.
907.	By relaxing the requirements would increase the value. The negative of this is you would have even more owners that don't care about the land, and only be in it for profit. We rent now from owners that live in B.C. They are only concerned about getting their cash rent and do not care about how the land is farmed or if it is farmed.
908.	While it would clearly increase the value of the land, it is so obviously the WRONG choice for Canadians. We will have less ability to influence the direction of agriculture production, and we will be selling our natural resource to foreign owners. We need to maintain our natural resources and benefit from their manufacture as Canadians.
909.	Chinese investors, , drove the price of land up to a level that is not sustainable to rent it at. Very hard to deal with these people. It's not like dealing with a retired farmer.
910.	Value may go up or down, but also affects the rural towns and RM and the people that rely on local home based farms to support them. Large corporations do not live or support their

	local communities
911.	Would increase value but a negative impact on local communities
912.	More outside investment
913.	More bidders usually results in a higher price.
914.	Inflated value of farmland only makes it harder to grow as a farm, but it also creates a reality where more money can be made by leaving the land sit un-farmed and selling it, than actually farming.
915.	Same as the above answer.
916.	Make it too expensive to start farming
917.	I think that the market would stay similar to current situations but that there would be more larger farms and less family farms.
918.	The economic value of SK farmland might increase if ownership requirements were relaxed, but at what long-term cost to our farmers and communities?
919.	I agree that by relaxing the requirements of land ownership in Saskatchewan would probably increase the value of farmland, but only to a comparable value of some other areas in Canada. Some areas in Saskatchewan are already priced comparatively to these areas now. So why let non Canadian ownership happen if there will not be much increase in farmland value, and take away opportunity from our young farmers who want to farm
920.	Outside sources have more cash to spend than local farmers so land prices go up
921.	N/A
922.	Companies with deep pockets will come in and buy land out from under us and we might not be able to afford to compete with them. This will make it a struggle for us to buy our own farm land.
923.	Land values have already increased.
924.	Increase the number of buyers the price goes up as well.
925.	Land prices are going to be ultimately decided by commodity prices. We are off the highs that have been experienced the last few years however other inputs have not followed suit. If something is not affordable it won't sustain itself.
926.	There is speculative interest the world over to hold land. This is because there is a finite amount that is food producing and there is a growing population. If we relax the ownership rules then the prices shall surely increase.
927.	Short term increase in price, long term decrease in value as more land would continue to be neglected. More widespread noxious weed problems would go undetected and large operations renting the land are unable to cope with specific requirements to identify and correct such problems.
928.	It would drive the prices up so no sask farmer could afford it
929.	Market value is not the same as True Value. Don't sell your country out to corporations and other countries or you will no longer have a country. Without restrictions eventually

	everything will be owned by corporations and we will have returned to a feudal-serf system with no small ownership. Read your history.
930.	Supply and Demand.
931.	Some parts of the world would pay almost anything to own land in Sask. If they want to live here have at it!
932.	By increasing the number of permissible buyers, you increase the demand for farmland
933.	farmland goes up and down with grain production and price when things turn down we don't need investors coming in and buying up land. As soon as they buy rent starts to go up and keeps going up squeezing the one that's farming the land . farmyards are left to weeds and local towns go south.
934.	Increasing the value far beyond the economic value, makes it extremely difficult for experienced farmers to compete and expand acres as is always needed to stay competitive with other farmers in the world.
935.	It would increase values and destroy rural areas, and ruin most young farmers with smaller farms, with increased taxes and greater risk on land that is already overpriced for its productive value in many areas.
936.	Profitability and commodity prices have more to do with farmland values
937.	Government has to have some control on foreign ownership and be able to review it but no restrictions on Canadians.
938.	A world of greed is out there.
939.	If we relax the requirements we are saying anybody can come in and take everything away from us We do not want this. We want to keep it for our family's and for our young farmers in our families
940.	Without custodianship safeguard legislation, the price of the dirt will eventually be irrelevant.
941.	Outside investors and the real estate industry are driving up land prices.
942.	would be a boom for ag all around
943.	As stated above I believe that the increase in farmland value in Saskatchewan since 2002 until today is not solely to do with improve economic returns in the agricultural industry, but is more to do with outside investors looking to take advantage of statutorily suppressed land values and there dissatisfaction investment return elsewhere.
944.	We can't compete with Chinese or European funds.
945.	Investors don't cause prices to go up, profitability and revenues do.
946.	If ownership becomes wide open the land could be priced at a level that a small Canadian farmer can't afford. We could be priced out of the market for our own farmland. There's competition among Saskatchewan farmers for land. That should be the driving force.
947.	Existing farm families gradually become tenants and eventually serfs
948.	I can tell you right now we have investors buying land through a certain real estate agent.

	They are outbidding anyone local by 50%. Now I am not saying it is not Canadian owned, but I don't think anyone really knows where the financing is really coming from.
949.	The more wealthy bidders there are the higher the price will be.
950.	it would drive the prices up to where only the rich and the companies could afford it. keep it simple and keep it in the hand of our farmers. we are the best stewards of the land. big companies want big profits, they don't give a damn about the health of the land just the profits. the rise and fall would be volatile and conglomerates, corporations and bankers would drive the value of our farmland up and down just like they do with potash, grain, oil, beef...etc...etc...etc we would be at their mercy
951.	Of course the price would go up Sask Farmers would be competing with Chinese Billionaires for land
952.	An increase in land value benefits those retiring from farming but makes it harder for young people wanting to farm
953.	In the short term, there is potential to increase the market value of farmland by relaxing the requirements for ownership of Saskatchewan farmland as a result of increased competition for land ownership and a possible boost in dollars available for investment. However, I also believe that the value of our Saskatchewan farmland resides in its stewardship and, thus, am confident of its decreased market value in the long term should we extend this privilege of land ownership to individuals prioritizing short term economic gain over those making sound agronomic decisions.
954.	Although, in the current agricultural economy, we have seen significant increase in land values, where large parcels of agriculture land have been purchased by "investment" land owners, it is hard to say what the future effects might be in an agriculture downturn.
955.	Supply and demand. Increase the demand by allowing more buyers while the supply stays the same will drive prices up even higher then what they are now. As a young farmer trying to take over the family farm and expand the farm its impossible with the going rates.
956.	Land prices seem to follow crop size and commodity prices, so not sure what it might do to prices, but we are still cheap compared to some areas
957.	All revenue has to be paid by our commodity does not matter if this is called rent-lease or interest.
958.	There would be an upsurge in prices in the short term; it would be devastating in the long term changing the farm land into a commodity. The long term effect would destroy Canada's food security.
959.	More buyers; more upward pressure on price.
960.	There already instances of Chinese Nationals buying land thru Canadian citizens. They buy poor land at high prices and then do not maintain and manage it well. This has the effect of driving up land prices on all land for local producers with no production gains.
961.	The more buyers with \$ that they're are the higher the price will be.
962.	I have witnessed foreign investor come into our community and inflate land value beyond its worth. Making it almost impossible for a local farmer to buy and be able to pay for it.

963.	It would force the average farmer to compete against well funded corporations and fund companies.
964.	The increase would be beyond the cost of production and the investors would be interested in a return on there money regardless if there is a return to the producer.
965.	It may increase in short term but when more money is pulled out than the land will produce how long can that go? And that will happen! Who picks up the pieces after a five year drought? Sask farmers have and still will be there!!!
966.	This would increase the value of farmland which would inhibit growth for smaller family farms. We have already witnessed this in our area with investment companies purchasing land at an inflated price. Farmers purchasing land at these inflated prices places too much risk on family farms with a much smaller profit margin. Farmers already have great risk in place due to weather fluctuations.
967.	It artificially increases the value in the short term As for long term, ultimately the productivity and profitability of farming determines the value As such Foreign investment could in the long term reduce the value as well as the quality of the land because finding good production managers to rent/lease may become increasingly difficult If over paying for lease won't be motivated to take good care of the land We are already seeing this in our area
968.	Not necessarily a good thing.
969.	if foreign investors start buying and competing for land it would drive the price out of reach for the average farmer , end of story
970.	No farmer can compete with big pension funds or corporations that have no idea what the land can produce and pay for.
971.	While it would increase the value it has and would continue to be devastating for rural communities. In my opinion there is no difference between the CPP owning farmland and inviting the government of China to come and purchase farmland. got it all wrong here. We need to think about the province and its future along with personal gain.
972.	supply and demand
973.	Agriculture is a very volatile industry. The value of farmland has become very high over the past few years because the returns from agriculture have been very good. It appears that this profitable time may well be coming to an end. When investors in farmland are not able to find a renter that will make the payments necessary to satisfy the needs of the investor, that investor will most likely not be willing to incur annual losses on the investment. And so the value of farmland will decrease. This is a trend that has occurred repeatedly in history and will continue forever. The difference is that when the farmer owns the land, that farmer can make the necessary management choices to ensure that land is cared for in some way or another. A landlord requiring a specific level of return will not likely have the resources to care for the land and, consequently, the land and the people who own neighbouring land will suffer the results of abandoned land. This is already happening in our local area as absentee

	landowners are not able to find renters and are not willing to hire custom businesses to tend the land, so the land is simply left to grow weeds and negatively impact the neighbour's fields. Saskatchewan farmers are fully aware of the value of farmland and they make purchases based on their long-term ability to pay. Driving the market with foreign money or fund money will not change the ability of those who are actually making a living off the land to make that living. If foreign money or fund money is going to dictate the market value of farmland, this same money should be used to ensure that the commodities produced from the land have a correlating market value.
974.	Renters would mine the soil
975.	I think it would increase the value, however in the end the market will decide what the valuation should be. Investors will generally look for at least 4-6% return year over year through a farmland lease. The lease market and price of grain/ranching etc will produce fair market value.
976.	It will increase the value but in the same sense it will limit young Saskatchewan farmers from being able to afford farmland and having to compete with greedy outside investors.
977.	There already was an attempt by an un-named party to purchase all the available land in our area. If we give in to personal greed, it will be very detrimental to Canada and especially Sask. in the long run. We have to have some vision here.
978.	I don't know, but it would be bad if it drove the price up and had people buying land as speculation.
979.	If foreign interests are allowed to buy Canada 160 acs at a time there will be a flood of competition to own land thus raising prices.
980.	Most land is still being bought by producers. Values have went up sharply as producer returns have increased. The perception that investors pay more than farmers can influence people to call and investment company to sell their land rather than letting the local farmers compete for it and keep the ownership in Saskatchewan residents hands.
981.	It will make land like the usa, unaffordable for those who want to farm so the stock market/investment brokers can profit, and one day crash when grain prices don't line up with rent
982.	see comment above
983.	Increase competitiveness increase values
984.	If opened up to foreign ownership I think China and the United States would own most of the farmland in Saskatchewan within 10 years.
985.	When I value farmland, I see what I can grow to make a profit. When business buys farmland, they don't care what the land can produce, only hope its value appreciates over time.
986.	Land has tripled in value in my area since 2002 when ownership was opened up to outside of Saskatchewan residents. I currently rent 4 quarters from an investor from Quebec because I couldn't afford to buy it.
987.	I am concerned that pools of money that need to be parked somewhere could inflate the value and take profit and control from Sask residents. I am not as concerned with possible

	pension funds (if Canadian) owning land as they need to show an annual return versus speculating for future capital gains
988.	This issue seems to be all about economics, what about the loss of our culture. We should not be selling off our land resource like we do with potash and oil for example.
989.	This would cause a massive spike in farmland price due to speculative pressure from non-agricultural interests. After the spike, you would see profit taking and a massive drop as the market is flooded and prices try to correct. You want to recreate the bubble of the 1980s, this is the perfect way to do it and absolutely cripple the industry.
990.	If interest rates stay low farmland is a good investment, that is why people are looking at it.
991.	It's already here.....lots is owned by "lax" government policies.
992.	Values should increase over time as the current heavy discount on SK farmland will disappear due to a more normalized, predictable and rationale market behavior. However, value will still depend on productivity of the land - it will depend on location, history and other factors like any other category of real estate. As of now the arbitrary restrictions are keeping prices down and hurting farmers who wish to sell.
993.	It would increase the value but there would be no new farmers buying land so farmers would be dying out.
994.	Difficult to answer. Intuition says it will increase the value of land making it impossible for independent farmers to compete with large corporations and investors who are interested only in monetary gains. Monsanto is an obvious comparison.
995.	It will increase the value of the land but there will be no more family farms. There will just be corporate farms in the province. What is the difference between the old Saskatchewan land bank system than having mult-national corporations now own land? The government did away with the Saskatchewan land bank system because it was not popular but now they are letting mult-nationals buy land.
996.	Outside investors will pay whatever the going rate is if it is - and it will be - a good investment.
997.	Increase the value so the price is out of reach for most local Saskatchewan famers and it erases the future of the family farm.
998.	More people would buy land who just want to invest, and not farm themselves, increasing competition for available land, inflating prices
999.	Like I said before making it unaffordable for the average person
1000.	JUST LIKE THE GAS/OIL PRICES ONCE IT CLIMB'S TO THE PEAK IT WILL NEVER GO DOWN /OIL HAS BOTTOMED OUT AND OUR GAS PRICES HAVE NOT DROPPED BECAUSE THE GOV'T WILL NOT LET THAT HAPPEN /TAXES ARE TO GREAT FOR THEM THE MONEY TALK'S.WITH OUR MODERN TECH. OUR VEHICLES SHOULD BE GETTING AT LEAST 60 MPG. NOT 10 MPG. BUT THE TAXES Again do the talking.
1001.	No doubt it would increase land values but would result in more ownership of people that don't live here.

1002.	Opening up farm land ownership to outside investors could increase value as large corps have more funds to invest so may pay more to get it. They can afford to outbid smaller farmers and beginning farmers.
1003.	The land value I think would go up short term but long term once these large investment corps decide to put their money elsewhere and large parcels of land are dumped onto the market I think there will be more land for sale than buyers and the price of land will drop. This may be 5 years or 50 years I don't know.
1004.	If land is sold to big investors there is no way ordinary folks who would like to farm could finance purchase of land. Furthermore, corporate ownership will lead to degradation of the soil and the environment in general and the value of the land will rapidly decline.
1005.	Local farmers would no longer be able to compete with larger companies or trusts who come in and buy up land
1006.	Enables the farmer to derive optimal benefit from ownership of a free market valued asset which would more readily facilitate the financing of the business and underpin his security and life's work.
1007.	More potential buyers would probably increase the price of farmland in Saskatchewan which of course is in the best interests of the owners of the farmland that is being sold. However as I have stated above the best short term interests of the owners of the farmland is not the same as what are the best long term decisions for farmland ownership for the Saskatchewan public.
1008.	The gov't should relax the rules. This is not right. Do this to homeowners in Saskatoon and Regina and the gov't will see what a backlash would happen.
1009.	SK farmers cannot compete with large corporations or investors whose interests are in making \$\$s only.
1010.	If the price of farmland is driven up beyond its capacity to make payments, extra hardship is placed on the farmer, financial institutions and even governments.
1011.	Relaxing the rules would only accelerate the investors into the market, further restricting the local young people from entering and expanding their operation.
1012.	I think it would price Saskatchewan families out of the market. I think it's a scary thought having one of our most valuable resources in the province in the hands of foreign investors and people who do not have direct ties to the land to ensure that it is taken care of.
1013.	Money can buy many things, but not health, cleanliness, or good water and soil. Local people who understand and appreciate the land for more than crop production are a resource we cannot do without.
1014.	The strength of Saskatchewan lies in the people who live and farm in Saskatchewan, outside investors (farmers) do not provide stability to this province.
1015.	It might move prices up at least in short term but not a good idea as far as Canadian food sovereignty. It could happen that food produced here by foreign interests and our people go hungry, that's a stretch I know but possible.
1016.	Would increase value cuz there would be more competition to get the land but therefore make it harder for those farming the land to afford it and keep going

1017.	Foreign and other out of province interests want to shelter their money in a safe place. Saskatchewan farmland is believed to be a good investment.
1018.	Therefore raising the price of farmland so that us local farmers and ranchers cannot ever expand.
1019.	In the 1980s I saw land in Ontario that was owned by foreigners and not beings farmed. It was too expensive for local farmers to buy, as everyone hoped to sell it more much more money that they bought it for.
1020.	The value of farmland will always be dictated by the farmer, the land rent is dictated by the farmer and his ability to pay that rent.
1021.	Large corporations have unlimited access to funding. There isn't any more land being produced and Saskatchewan/Canada should be looking to the future and securing our own food sources.
1022.	investors have already bought land that is marginal for extreme prices as they have relied on a salesman's advice.
1023.	See my response to the previous question. Also, I question the use of the word "value" in this question; you should use the word "price". The value of agricultural land is related to its productivity, but the price can be distorted by other factors.
1024.	Investors with deep pockets are able to purchase land more easily than those who must pay for their land with the income generated by the land.
1025.	Generally food producing land is becoming more and more valuable as food prices go up. If it sounds like a good investment, business men, no matter where they are in the world, will be interested in purchasing stock. Either physically in the form of direct property purchasing, or in a fund that owns and manages farmland.
1026.	It will increase values because groups see these as a smart investment move, however this will result in local farmers being unable to expand or maintain their operations. There is no way that a local farmer can compete at increased land prices.
1027.	there would be more of a market.
1028.	There is a lot of money floating around the world. Land is the basic resource a farm needs to operate. Young farmers need the chance to own land and respect the use of it. Farmers that are ready to retire right now have had a major increase in land value and more is not required.
1029.	for those who like to speculate there is lots of industries to choose from other than farm land.
1030.	do you see the value of land as currency (money) or value, there is a difference and until one owns land they won't know the difference
1031.	Would make it even more difficult for young farmers to start their business.
1032.	Land is already difficult to purchase because of the cost. As a rancher in mid career, it is difficult to grow the operation, or become self sufficient. We have to work off "farm" to make it work.

1033.	This would be an artificial increase because it is strictly a speculation on the value of the land.
1034.	If opened up to the world market more people would be bidding which means more competition
1035.	Foreigners and greed would explode land values outside the realistic domain. By the way they are already there today. Some values have zero relationship towards their actual production ability. These inflated prices of land would move more residents into the poverty domain.
1036.	The market place will set the price
1037.	farmland would become attainable only to the rich. Farm owners and/operators would become a thing of the past. once multi nationals get control we would only be hired help. Gov. already has trouble when foreign companies decide make their own rules. Ownership of Canadian resources like farmland needs to stay in the hand s of Canadians
1038.	Value would increase and cause more farmers to sell out. Most of the money would probably be lost elsewhere since retirees would likely not stay in Saskatchewan as the standard of living in Saskatchewan is quite low when compared to other places in the world. The economy would not benefit, land would be lost and money would be lost through the land transfer to foreign ownership. Foreign investors don't spend money in saskatchewan and retirees will be enjoying life somewhere with a much milder climate, especially if they had the extra money to do so.
1039.	Keep sask farms canadian
1040.	in a open market system the value is set at the highest bidder.
1041.	To this point, with the rules in place, Saskatchewan farmers and retired farmers have had a stable retirement and land prices have certainly gone skyward.
1042.	Probably drive the cost up to where farmers could not afford to purchase land. Farmers do not make enough money to compete with corporations or speculators.
1043.	If the laws are relaxed I think land could become too expensive for farmers to purchase.
1044.	I think relaxing restrictions would lead to a large amount of investment, but out of province investors would capitalize on the increases and leave a higher price of land for farmers looking to invest or leave rent prices unreasonable considering the cost of production, as they are already almost out of the range of feasibility.
1045.	In some areas it may result in an increase, but in some areas the value of land surrounding the foreign owned land may actually decrease because I have heard of some foreign owned land being farmed so poorly that it is just a spreading ground for weeds and insects
1046.	Large investors are always looking for a stable profitable investment, unless those investors are local the profit leaves and doesn't come back.
1047.	In my opinion land would become expensive as the demand became higher with new buyers entering the market. After some time the land may dip below the original value due to poor management by commercialized farming.
1048.	investors take surplus funds and invest in farmland which drives prices to unrealistic values. There is no relationship to the productive value of the land.

1049.	Supply and demand
1050.	Corporations would be able to sell property for a higher value. Traditional family farmers would not be able to afford such property, only other corporations.
1051.	Increases enough that sask farmers can no longer afford to purchase or lease land
1052.	in the short term
1053.	<p>It would be devastating if the rules were not in place. Investments funds and speculators will always seek to increase the value of their holdings. Even when seeking to purchase land they will pay more than market value to show an increase in the value of the holdings they previously purchased.</p> <p>Thus in a very short time the value of the land will exceed the earning potential of the land. The expected rental rates may make the land uneconomic to farm by any farm operation. However during this time most of the wealth created by the land goes to the land lord who likely is not a Saskatchewan resident or even Canadian.</p> <p>So, how is a return to Serfdom good for the province.</p>
1054.	investors can pay almost any drive for land as long as they get a certain % return. young farmers cannot compete with that. And only have one lifetime to pay for it
1055.	The land becomes an investment vehicle rather than an input to crop production. Ontario is a good example of overvalued land compared to value of crop produced.
1056.	Your changing the rules on farmland ownership has already increased the market value of farmland, therefore making it unaffordable for younger farmers to enter into the business
1057.	<p>if the farm land went into hands of rich investor who lease / rent the land the \$\$ would increase the cost of purchasing land</p> <p>making it extremely difficult for ones who reside here and r trying to make a future in farming and or to be able to farm in there own country/province. Making farming here more challenging for local farmers</p>
1058.	I feel that the market value of agricultural land should be based on the agricultural activities that take place on the land. The land value should reflect the income that the land can produce. Ultimately, Saskatchewan and Canadian Farms need to be able to feed our province and nation while being economically self-sufficient.
1059.	For a person to own Saskatchewan farm land they should have to be a Saskatchewan resident and have farming interests not just people over seas trying to make money by leasing land back to Saskatchewan farmers.
1060.	I think there would be a initial increase but then drop off as available land is purchased. The true long term value of land is linked with Ag commodity prices. The rent values will dictate what land sells for. Investors from anywhere are going to look at rate of return. People will not pay \$200000 for a quarter section of land if they are only getting \$35/ acre rent. It still will go back to what the farmer can afford to pay and that's as open market as it gets.
1061.	Pension plans and individuals unfamiliar with farming may buy and sell to others outside of the country for a quick profit. If land prices drop this might result in undesirable countries slowly acquiring Canadian land. This might lead to unsafe economic outcomes in Canada.

	Yikes.
1062.	There has been a lot of land bought by outside investors. In the last 10 years the land values have the tripled.
1063.	Entities that see a short term gain in investment income could push up the value of farmland. However, as soon as income starts to decrease the land will go back on the market and who knows what could happen.
1064.	But that is beside the point. Sovereignty is more important than market value.
1065.	Increase the price
1066.	As net returns flatten in the farming sector and land doesn't appreciate as quickly, all the money looking for big returns will chase a sector which is seeing higher net returns and asset appreciation.
1067.	Farm land is an asset within it self and investment is another class of assets relating just to dollars. As world wide investment gets more troublesome, it looks to hard core assets which increase the value of the farmland while distorting the farmer's means to make a living putting Saskatchewan in a weaker position.
1068.	My concern is that relaxing the rules would lead to an increase in foreign ownership that would trigger a loss of control over our land base, profits leaving the province, more unstable land pricing, condos in Vancouver scenario whereby foreign investors blow in buy and leave town, loss of social fabric in rural SK,I do not want to see us become employees of foreign buyers, feeding the world while foreigners walk off with the profits. Farmland in SK is our bedrock and it's difficult to compare with what other provinces are doing with their land base. Further we have of the majority of arable Canadian farmland we need to manage this resource to benefit SK people not only for the short-term but taking a long-term approach.
1069.	Simple economics: more demand, without increased supply = higher prices
1070.	What it would do is make it very unaffordable for any young Saskatchewan farmers wanting to get into the business of farming.
1071.	This is not important so question is non relative.
1072.	Land is a commodity and can only produce so much income.
1073.	The value of the land will be reflective of the revenue it will generate. However the current level of land price is well above what the land can generate in revenue.
1074.	If anything we need strict rules who can and can't buy saskatchewn farmland
1075.	With completely relaxed requirements, farmland becomes a commodity, to be bought and held until the next best safe haven for capital comes along. Does that serve our province or industry well ?
1076.	If this government doesn't have the brains to realize that opening up farmland sales will erode our way of life then you don't deserve to be in power. In no uncertain terms do I want to see foreigners or non-residents of this province owning our land, our richest resource, and our only way to control the preservation of life in this province.
1077.	it would raise the price so high that up and coming farmers wouldn't have a chance at

	becoming farmers. It's already so high that your average person couldn't even get started. There is no more land to be had so I think that the land that belongs to saskatchewan residents should stay in sask.
1078.	increase value until it would not be profitable to farm
1079.	It would allow investors to purchase land and at some point control the rental value of land as well.
1080.	It would increase the value until commodity prices fell. Then the investors would want out and prices would plummet. Why are we even considering selling our country to another country. Generations of hardworking farmers have built this country only to sell it to another?? Once it is gone it is gone. This will never end well
1081.	Corporate & off shore ownership of farmland will just turn our young farmers into serfs. They will just work all their life & build no equity.
1082.	Increase the value but at what cost????? Anyone that has farmed in Saskatchewan for many years knows that there is more to farming in Saskatchewan than just making a buck. We farm because it is a way of life and we love doing it.
1083.	Farmers trying to compete against folks who have lots already and are basically looking for more.
1084.	Speculators and foreign investors would drive up the price of the land and Saskatchewan and its farmland would be mere tenants.
1085.	The average Sask. farmer or son/daughter cannot compete with large pension funds and wealthy international investors
1086.	Don't need offshore money.
1087.	When foreign investment finds the returns of farming they will back away
1088.	I farm in an area that has been overrun by investors within the last ten years. In many cases the land packages are becoming too large for an individual to handle at the current prices. I believe that if we put individual farmers back in the game, prices would remain strong. If there are no farmers left however, farmland values will decline somewhat.
1089.	with the increase in value ,new generations of farmers will not be able to afford to own land thus making them serfs to the landowners which is what many of their ancestors left behind to have a dream of being able to work the land that THEY owned.
1090.	Out of province investors have already increased the price of land to the point where the ordinary farmer cannot compete; letting non-Canadian investors purchase land would result in all farmland in the province eventually being foreign owned and farmed mostly by local tenant farmers.
1091.	Our young farmers cannot compete against the treasuries of other countries who are presently trying to buy Saskatchewan farm land.
1092.	The ownership requirements are not being followed properly. Rules for owning land are being broken or ignored.
1093.	Short term it would increase. After all the farmers have lost the ability to own their land and

	become disenchanted, the investors returns will wane. Excessive land rents will continue to diminish the farm's viability. If there are no farmers, the investors investment will not be profitable.
1094.	All the land will be bought by foreign business people.
1095.	which is good if all you're interested is cashing in and moving out of the area. What about the next generation? how can they afford to purchase when their up against this spiraling land values? rarely do you find a person of substance that will sell to not the highest bidder, but rather a younger person, or young family who needs a landbase to work from. those people are far and few, the human greed factor knows no bounds.
1096.	some people and company's have a lot of money to invest with leaving the farmer outside looking in. Tyson foods or Cargill are examples, their subsidiary companies could buy land taking the raw product from start to finish...what do they need me for?
1097.	An increase in price should not be confused with an economic benefit if these benefits are removed from the local economy.
1098.	That's bad.
1099.	at the expense of the farmers doing the actual work
1100.	over sea investors, mostly government backed, have different priorities than local farmers. Also deep pockets. Price of the land is almost irrelevant. Lose control of the land and we lose control of the country and become a state of Asia
1101.	Even though it would be a good thing for those selling the farmland it would not benefit the young Sask farmers looking to increase their acreage size.
1102.	By allowing more potential for land purchase to more people there is a strong chance of land prices increasing due to supply and demand. Which is wonderful for those wishing to sell but not good for young potential farmers such as us who have a difficult time affording land costs as is.
1103.	Big organizations with lots of resources would outbid others, increasing the overall costs.
1104.	There is still lots of competition for land from local farmers but if you allow investors to buy in the future those farms will be gone and then the prices will drop
1105.	allowing foreign investment may allow large corporations such as Monsanto or foreign governments to purchase land for their own supplies. farmers would become extinct.
1106.	We would have a peasant/slave culture in farming if ownership requirements were relaxed. The best way to ensure the safety of our food supply is to ensure diversity through traditional farmers owning the land, and diversity of seed too.
1107.	Relaxing ownership rules opens the Province up to absentee landowners. The result would likely be a further decrease in rural population. This has significantly negative impact on the ability of small businesses, schools, and community based organizations.
1108.	Demand for land is high and it is only going to get worse with more demand. The young farmers who want to farm already can only do it if they have millions, a family farm with parents willing to help or willed land. That leaves anyone else who may want to be a farmer

	out of luck.
1109.	Demand is already there, and high prices are making banks rich.
1110.	of course land values will rise but land should only be owned by Canadians then 80 percent owned by Saskatchewan residents. Canadians residents can only own a portion of land in Saskatchewan and not sole ownership
1111.	It would spike the cost so no human or local farmer could afford such land and would be farmed by companies that do not live in the area to take ownership of the damages industrialised farming can do to the landscape
1112.	there simply isn't enough money in Saskatchewan to buy its land, not without starving other businesses, the decline in the economy would be catastrophic.
1113.	Initially 10 years ago Sask land was way under valued relative to the provinces either side. This was in part due to distance from CWB delivery point and higher freight charges after the abolition of the CROW. The CWB is no more. Grain leave by the same routes it used but SK farmers don't pay so much freight and handling. So SK prices will still reflect lower value due to distance from best markets but they have closed up substantially. Return on investment will go down as price rises so rental demands will be more reasonable and begin to reflect the farm return.
1114.	Investors typically have more liquid assets and look at it as an investment.....not land but money....not to grow food but to grow money that is not what agriculture in Sask has been nor should it be
1115.	would make it harder for small farmers to expand and new farmers start out
1116.	I don't know what it would do to the price but it will in the long run definitely hurt the future of our young.
1117.	Ours land has been held down and is cheaper than most
1118.	While the short term value may rise, the inability for farmers to pay inflated land values would cause the value to decrease
1119.	Because there will be a huge increase in food pricing, which in turn will make farming very attractive to greedy corporations, thus farm land will be a lot more valuable than it is now.
1120.	Desperate foreign corporations or foreign nationals will pay whatever farmers want in order to use the land base for immigration scams.
1121.	Simple - supply & demand
1122.	If owners aren't concerned with the burdens, requirements and responsibilities it would greatly increase land value compared to other places where it isn't so strict.
1123.	The values have been increasing, but foreign ownership would put the market values out of reach for the Saskatchewan farmer.

1124.	The land will eventually be gobbled up by corporations, and wealthy foreigners. If these people actually farmed the land, and take the risks that farmers do every year, the land prices wouldn't stay high very long.
1125.	This is a time sensitive question. In the short term it may increase the value. In the long term though it may decrease the value or at least return it to the realistic economics the land can support in a sustainable way.
1126.	It will continue to drive it higher initially and it wont be based on production capabilities.
1127.	It would increase the value, driving up the prices of farmland, making it much harder for family farms to exist. Pretty soon it will be only big corporations or companies able to afford farmland.
1128.	Depends on the circumstances. That's a loaded question. Farmers that own land would hike their prices through the roof so that big companies had to pay high prices for their land would be my opinion.
1129.	It will increase the value of land, but the costs to the province the people and the economy would be detrimental to our province in the long term.
1130.	Believe in a free and open market for selling farm production and contracting to do custom farm work and farmland should be the same.
1131.	It would increase and create an imbalance where owners would no longer be the farmers. Farmers in saskatchewan should own their own land
1132.	Big pension funds and major corporations can pay more for land than the average farmer and will put the little operator out of business.
1133.	It would make the prices unaffordable for Saskatchewan farmers. We would turn into alberta and have unaffordable farm land prices. Do not let foreign investors in!
1134.	Serious farmers are currently competing effectively in our existing markets. Farming is big business and serious farmers are good businessmen.
1135.	Increase the cost of land decrease affordability for farmers hurts family farm
1136.	Land cannot increase. If it were easier to buy land more people would. The higher the demand the higher the price. Unfortunately that does not work for me. Land prices are already too high and I'm having a hard time figuring out how to afford land.
1137.	Would probably increase the value so that smaller and beginning farmers are not able to compete.
1138.	for local farmers to buy
1139.	It could well become unaffordable for a smaller farmer to ever buy more land.
1140.	Depending on what changes in the law means. We all must compete on a world commodity price and that includes land prices.
1141.	Making it impossible for young local farmers who do not want huge operations to buy land
1142.	In an economic climate where fewer things hold value land is important. Allowing outsiders to own is an invitation to speculation and abuse by absentee landlords

1143.	My answer does not imply approval of the effect.
1144.	Would probably create a bubble in land prices which would not reflect the productive capacity of the land
1145.	Young individuals would not have a chance to purchase if corporate or pension funds are competing for land.
1146.	It may increase the value short term, as a land grab scramble starts, but as they have no intention of raising families and spending money rurally, areas will die out and giant farmers will push out everyone else, and trusts and wealthy foreigners won't allow that land to be passed on to other people for generations.
1147.	If foreigners can invest there are more buyers and puts prices out of reach for local people.
1148.	Farmers won't be able to afford the land. There will be less and less farmers in Saskatchewan
1149.	Commodity prices and interest rates are the true drivers of price
1150.	And make it financially unattainable for new/young producers in the ag industry.
1151.	People from other locations want to get their hands on Sask. farmland and will pay any amount to purchase it.
1152.	Make it too high priced for private local ownership
1153.	Which would make it less affordable for farmers like myself.
1154.	That would seriously hurt the family farm
1155.	The more leverage you give foreigners over our agricultural operations (like who we can sell grain to etc.) The more valuable the land becomes, making it unaffordable for locals.
1156.	It would make it more difficult for young people to farm in Saskatchewan. It would be detrimental to the family farm.
1157.	It would force family farms out of business by driving up the value of land to a level that is unattainable by younger farmers. Further to that, rural communities would die as the younger generations leave, because buying land to start farming is so expensive it is unaffordable. Small towns and businessmen therein would suffer, so too would the whole Provincial economy.
1158.	All I think would happen is family owned farms would be bought out by corporate entities and the tradition and historical value of family farming would become extinct in our province. Land values would not fluctuate much in my opinion...but a loss of our heritage and culture would be gone. Also the new family farmer, like myself, who is trying desperately to build up his farm and purchase land would not be able to compete against the buying power of the foreign corporate entity and foreign investors.
1159.	If land is up for bid to anyone it can bring a lot of money but most likely from outside Saskatchewan making it hard for young farmers to grow
1160.	I don't think there is any doubt that lower restrictions would raise prices overall.
1161.	It can go either way -but we need farmland to come down in price where young farmers can

	buy to get started
1162.	Short term gain long term no family farms left.
1163.	Consortium purchase of farmland, foreign ownership of land resulting in loss of economic activity in smaller communities.
1164.	It has increased the market value of land and is pricing it out of reach.
1165.	Value will increase during a boom cycle, during a bust cycle I believe such ownership will lead to additional devaluation of land values as investor types sell land to get their money out to invest it in the next profitable sector.
1166.	Historically local farmers are unable to compete with overseas bidders that have access to large capital to buy land and have no interest in protecting the environment because it's all about profit.
1167.	Presently land values are high due to having had many consecutive years of very good crop production. If we are subjected to weather conditions not conducive to producing good crops for a few years the price of land will likely drop. In other words the market place will set the price as it should be.
1168.	Over time land values will increase as farming practices change. I'm not sure that relaxing the ownership rules will be the only factor that will increase land values but it certainly be a contributing factor. If you look at other industries you will see that as more investment dollars are available to the industry high values in that industry occur.
1169.	Simple answer, supply and demand, the more buyers the higher the price. great for the selling out retired farmer. Terrible for the young future farmer. The retired farmer has already got special capital gains tax advantages to greatly assist them financially. there are enough farmers here to keep the price high enough for retirement purposes
1170.	I believe it would cause less stability in farm land prices.
1171.	Would not be affordable for young farmers that want to stay and farm
1172.	International \$ will inflate land value and local farmer cannot compete to purchase. Land rent will have to go up to compensate high land purchase.
1173.	That would be totally insane. It wouldn't be obvious at the start, but over time it would create a welfare state and bankrupt our government. Other places in the world don't have as high a % agriculture exposure.
1174.	If more people or corporations were allowed to buy it, there would be more competition and this would cause prices to rise. This would make it harder for local residents to purchase farm land and local farmers to expand.
1175.	relaxing the restrictions on farmland ownership would drive the price up extremely high. All the investment would come in from other countries and eliminate saskatchewan farm families.
1176.	Depends on what the oil is doing.
1177.	Farm land would be to expensive for young farmers to buy

1178.	cannot compete with large investors drives the smaller farms out
1179.	farm land prices should be affordable to primary producers.
1180.	The higher goes from outside interests the less sask farmers will own. In the end a land owning farmer will become a thing of the past
1181.	I believe prices of land will go up, but the grain prices will possibly be driven down.
1182.	more non farmer competition would force the price of land to inflate to levels that are not profitable for local farmers to compete
1183.	It would drive up prices too high for farmers
1184.	If the requirements stay the same, investors will continue to pay and compete more which will increase the value of land
1185.	Will double the short term value.
1186.	But if another country owned it how can the be beneficial to canada
1187.	It has increased already
1188.	It's great if you're trying to get out of farming but if you're trying to start or expand makes a very hard
1189.	I am afraid it would drive up prices....witness what is happening to the housing market in Vancouver. Again...higher price is not the be all and end all....
1190.	Competition for land would increase prices
1191.	I'm more concerned about the people attached to the investment rather than the land value fluctuations. Canada should remain Canadian!
1192.	So far relaxing of ownership rules has inflated the price, in many cases beyond the value of what it can produce, so more relaxing would presumably inflate prices even greater
1193.	the value of farmland today has almost out priced what young producers are capable of securing in regards to acquiring loans to purchase. Does it make any sense to slacken the ownership rules that are in place today so that these young farmers have to compete against that kind of huge investment dollars and in the case of pension funds; there own money handled by CPP?
1194.	Although I believe the land value would increase as there is a large demand for our land the negative effects to our soil, water and ability for the next generation to be able to farm and make a living without needing large numbers of acres to me is a greater loss. Our roots were founded on the ability to thrive on small farms.
1195.	Negative farming practices decrease land nutrients and value.
1196.	Certainly the land values would go up initially since more investors can compete for the land. I do think that, over time, if all the land is owned by a few companies, and everyone who wants to farm has to rent the land, then the quality of the land will deteriorate, as there will be no Pride of Ownership, and then the dollar value of the land will, in the long term, decrease. This would then lead to those institutional investors selling some land, and it might become available for the small farmer, which is what I would like now.

1197.	Competition of foreign owners against sask farmers
1198.	Land is already unaffordable at \$250000 a quarter or more who can afford to buy land
1199.	seems there are already outside investors and restricting this ownership to someone that has an added interest in this dirt we call home. let them come farm it invest and move here build this province with those that want to be here not those that will export their profits and bid neighbor against neighbor
1200.	Simple: more people interested in buying, the higher the price!
1201.	it would increase the value but that would put it out of reach of most farmers in sask in other words the people that would best look after the land and keep local communities strong and growing would be pushed aside by speculators that only care about profits. keep the control of farmland local that will keep sask and canada strong.
1202.	relaxing ownership requirements might draw investors and increase value of land in the short term but would likely not be in the best interest of farmers in the long term. I believe that most people in agriculture in Saskatchewan are more interested in passing their farms on to future generations than selling the land for a profit.
1203.	I think the added number of potential buyers would increase the price. I feel that Saskatchewan is going to boom and it might as well be the sask residents that get the benefit of the situation. They are likely the best suited to return this good turn back into their local community.
1204.	Saskatchewan is rated one of the safest places in the world to raise a family, considering the turmoil many countries are facing at this present moment of course land values would increase
1205.	I understand the value in land will drop, and for the people selling, they will not benefit. I firmly believe these are the people who have no ties to a family farm, and in some cases have no family left around to have their farm taken over by family. Possibly because the way the industry has been in the past, they have chosen to "leave and never come back". With a decrease in values, it makes it feasible to own or lease again, and continue on the legacy of the family farms, and rural community.
1206.	I think farmland values would fluctuate greatly because if farming was good everybody wants in but if they are only there for money when commodity prices fall they will get out or make bad decisions for the long term good of the land
1207.	Pension funds, or other very wealthy individuals would make it difficult for locals to compete!
1208.	Of course it will increase the value, and all current land owners will benefit. But we are all so selfish and have no regard for our next generation of farmers. I was incredibly lucky to grow up on a farm and have the opportunity to purchase land. I do not think my children will be so lucky.
1209.	Relaxing the requirements would allow massive investing from all countries and then the land is no longer owned by a Canadian. Then who would have the say in how things are to be done.
1210.	It would put the prices of farmland even higher and above what any young farmer could pay

1211.	Its a supply and demand principal. Regardless of the reasoning for the land acquisition, which is a limited resource, demand increases and so does the price.
1212.	This would open up important agricultural land to speculation. Wealthy people and corporations around the world are acquiring massive tracts of land in Africa on a large scale. This is counterproductive to sustainable local communities; and economically viable farming livelihoods.
1213.	Market value isn't the only value that the land in our province has. I believe that to sustain strong rural communities, that the people who own the land need to live in this province.
1214.	There is only so much good crop land in Saskatchewan and we are loosing to much valuable land to urban sprawl.
1215.	Canadian citizens can look after their own county
1216.	I feel it would decrease the value because there are too many things that can go wrong. The land could be left vacant and unfarmed because people are tired of foreigners buying the land and wanting high lease prices. The land could be farmed poorly or have many things done to it like illegal trenching because the owners never actually come out to look at the land they own. The list goes on
1217.	Farm land price should be a direct reflection of what commodities can be produced on them
1218.	I believe that it would drive the value of land up an OUT of the range of anyone wishing to expand farming business or start farming. Investors care little about maintaining the stability of OUR economy or food supply.
1219.	out side investment would sharply increase because of greed by corporations
1220.	If outside investors like CPP and other investment companies continue to have the opportunity to purchase farmland , it may help the older generation now selling out , but what happens to the next generation of young people who want to farm ,where do they buy the land from and at what cost ,maybe no one can afford ,because we have to compete with big corporations. Investor companies want to make a profit, on any product they have. Also, the next generation of retiring farmers will not have land to sell.
1221.	In all areas that I purchase and farm in Saskatchewan farms are my main competitor of land not foreign investors or pension funds.
1222.	more people would want to buy it
1223.	I feel that having more outside ownership would probably drive the market up for a bit, but it would gradually find stability. The biggest problem that I can see is what we see now in the southwestern corner, that of investors driving the price to levels where the normal operation of a farm can never pay off the land investment.
1224.	If there isn't some competition between investors /large farmers the Hutterites will own all the land that to me is the worst corp that we should be worried about. At least with the canada pension they give people like me a chance
1225.	Initially, the value would increase as more competition for land arrives and is sought after from foreign investment. After that, i see one of two things happening. 1) More investors look for land and values continue to rise to level unprofitable for local ownership. or 2) The

	tenants can no longer pay the rental rates, and investors start to liquidate large tracts of land that will cause a large scale decrease in values of all land in the province.
1226.	Opening land sales to foreign investors would destroy our small rural communities. Young growing farmers would not have the opportunity to purchase land. It has been well documented that the best stewards are the farmers themselves.
1227.	It may increase value but other factors are more important interest rates commodity prices etc
1228.	as a "grey hair" I suppose my only concern should be maximizing the value of my land base and then bailing out if no children want to farm. However, as we consider the enormous global wealth that has accumulated in the hands of very few people, if we open the province's land for sale to anyone or any institution anywhere, without restriction, we will certainly see the ownership and therefore the control of our land move to non residents.
1229.	Higher prices would result from increased demand. This is already true for agricultural land close to urban centers that could be developed for industrial or residential purposes. Many RMs view higher land prices or even the potential for higher land prices as an opportunity to raise taxes.
1230.	More demand as very wealthy foreign individuals, companies and trust companies look for a home for their money. Consider Vancouver - 8 / 10 home purchases are foreign and there is a believe that much of the money is 'dirty' money.
1231.	As long as the economic climate in agriculture produces a return superior to other investments, there will be increased competition for the productive asset. However, for a farmer looking to borrow money, lenders should be more interested in cash flow than fixed asset value.
1232.	Takes it outside the influence of the local market. Farmers will be going back to being surfs on the land.
1233.	Farmland in Canada is already challenged by continued urban sprawl and acreage development and these two stresses have caused the value of land to go beyond what agricultural income can support and sustain. Allowing investment groups to purchase agricultural land will only serve to further artificially increase the value of agricultural lands making it even more unlikely that agricultural income could sustain the costs associated with purchase of new lands for expanding young farmers.
1234.	IT WOULD INCREASE THE PRICE PUTTING IT ABOVE PRODUCTION VALUE AND INCREASE THE SIZE OF PARCELS FOR SALE PUTTING IT ABOVE WHAT A FARMER CAN AFFORD TO BUY
1235.	making it potentially out of the grasp of young local farmers trying to start there careers and raise a family on the farm.
1236.	Relaxing rules on foreign ownership would drive values up, and make land unaffordable for producers much like the oil industry has created in pockets around calgary for instance.
1237.	Without regulations I feel that more non-Saskatchewan investors will invest into large farming operations and only drive the already high land prices even higher
1238.	Outside investors are only interested in the risk vs return equation. There is very little risk in owning farmland from the point of no depreciation, cannot be stolen like equipment, etc and

	<p>the returns from cash rent have been less volatile than investing in the stock market when the land appreciation has been factored in. Farmland has garnered great interest as the stock markets have had major hits over the last 10yrs while farmland has gone up. Farmland is often quoted as being negatively correlated with stock market returns.</p>
1239.	<p>But it would have a very detrimental effect on farming, foreign owners would not care how the land was cared for , all about profit margins. we see this already with dairy industry, BC people are buying dairy right in my neighborhood, expanding them, then it all becomes a matter of least cost, most profit , money all moves to BC! On top of that, they have no respect for local regulations and bylaws. "we can do what we want, sue me if you don't like it."</p>
1240.	<p>If they relax the requirements it would allow conservation groups to purchase the land for the possibility of wildlife areas thus taking the land our of production for Agriculture</p>
1241.	<p>It will increase the value, short term. As various boards of directors are responsible to their shareholders, they will try to maximize the productivity of the soil in order to satisfy the bottom line. When annual reports begin to govern land husbandry, it will suffer and long term, land will become less valuable, because it becomes less productive.</p>
1242.	<p>Makes more competition for land, we have to live here and make a living here, then watch outsiders buy our land as an investment</p>
1243.	<p>If land increases by much more the young generation of farmers won't be able to afford it. The current land prices make it hard enough to purchase land and make enough money to cover the payments.</p>
1244.	<p>Prices artificially increased due to speculation and timing of "investment". What happens when investors pull out because returns are more lucrative elsewhere and land values drop?? Then lenders would be more reluctant to loan money on land because it's not increasing in value....</p> <p>The market exists and is working for us.</p>
1245.	<p>But drive more local resident family operations off the farms in favor of industrial, foreign destruction of the land.</p>
1246.	<p>Young people starting out can't compete against investors. Help the local young people get started. If you don't have backing or a farm or ranch handed down to you it is almost impossible to get started in agriculture</p>
1247.	<p>Relaxing the requirement or ownership will inflate the land costs prohibiting younger farmers from being to buy land to farm or forcing people into long term debt in order to pay for the land.</p>
1248.	<p>People who are not connected to the production of food for Canadians SHOULD NOT OWN LAND OR BE IN A POSITION TO CONTROL WHAT HAPPENS TO OUR LAND AND OUR FOOD SUPPLY. We must make sure that our food supply in Canada remains secure so that we can feed our own people, not give control to foreigners who may take our production and leave Canadian citizens starving!</p>
1249.	<p>We'd see speculation for sure - the value would be increased for them, and for some people getting out of farming, but it would place undue hardship on those hoping to expand/enter the industry.</p>

1250.	Bigger pockets will dominate and drive prices up, driving out the little guy. Anyone complaining needs to revamp their business plan and find a way to make a living with the way things are today in the now, not trying to hold onto old ways of doing things which could in turn hurt the province as a whole.
1251.	Destroy the Saskatchewan farmer
1252.	Not a benefit!! It'll drive up prices for investors so the middle man makes more money and farmers who can't secure financing for overinflated land prices are forced to lease at unrealistic prices in comparison to profitability.
1253.	Not so much as increasing the value, but increasing the cost.
1254.	Outside Investors will cause an increase in value when compared to land prices in Canada or even North America. Saskatchewan land values have a lot of catching up to do.
1255.	Canada is one of the more financially secure countries in the developed world and has strong laws to protect invested financial interests. The general understanding in the agriculture world is that with growing demand for food by an expanding population (at least until 2050), there will be increasing pressure on farmland to produce and prices are generally expected to rise to reflect this demand. As countries such as China see a stronger middle class, the demand for meat will also rise, which will also put pressure on grain supplies. As a long term investment, I expect that Saskatchewan farmland will do very well in the long run, but in the short term, growers still have to make a business case with decent cash flow.
1256.	there would be more competition in the market
1257.	Farmland is not just a commodity. It is much more important than that. And it concerns me that your survey questions seem to be treating it as such. We are given the land to be stewards of it.
1258.	Agricultural land is limited in the world. Foreign owners would be only too happy to snap up our agricultural land, driving up the prices and making it impossible for young local farmers to get into farming.
1259.	Obviously, there are many factors that contribute to current agricultural land values in Saskatchewan as elsewhere in the world. These include (but are not limited to) several years of high commodity prices (and, at least until very recently, the sense of optimism around the possibility of continuing high prices), improvements in farm productivity (and the relative rate of such improvements), a fairly prolonged period of low interest rates and relatively relaxed lending policies, a favourable tax regime for farmers and farmland owners, and a historical reliance on off-farm income. In regions of the province where there is significant potential for the development of other resources (e.g. potash, uranium, oil and gas), that are close to urban areas, and/or that would be popular spots for a rural acreage or recreational property, the possibility of using farmland for these purposes may also have driven up the price of farmland. Nonetheless, it is quite clear that the level of investment interest - as well as speculation about impending changes in the regulation of farmland ownership - also influences farmland values. Relaxing the regulations will almost certainly lead to a further jump in farmland values since it will effectively widen the pool of potential investors, and will also spur the 'innovation' of financial vehicles that will aim to enhance the liquidity of farmland as an asset (potentially introducing volatility into farmland prices and markets more generally). Whether such values would ultimately be supported in the long run is an open

	question, but both farmers and Saskatchewanian/Canadian taxpayers could be pinched in the ramp up and/or potential volatility that follows.
1260.	It would increase but money isn't everything. Farmland ownership is a lifestyle tradition for people of Saskatchewan.
1261.	No foreign ownership
1262.	Would over-inflate it
1263.	Values should stay the same. Most family farms are starting to back away from renting land owned by investors. They want top cash rent with no safety in the term of lease.
1264.	A greater pool of outside investment would drive up bidding and make it unattainable for local stakeholders.
1265.	Potential of fewer buyers.
1266.	If regulations of land ownership were relaxed there would likely be a large increase in land values. Current ownership laws still cut out a large number of potential investment dollars.
1267.	The application of _____'s financial services would have no direct effect on the market prices of farmland. As a Canadian financial institution, _____ finances the acquisition of farmland by its farming clients. _____ does not buy land and therefore is not a price-setter. Farmers source land available for sale and negotiate what they believe to be a fair price, after which they can approach _____ for financing, in much the same way they would approach another lender. As a result, farmers dictate the final sale value of farmland.
1268.	Why do we want to sell off a precious resource to people who aren't farming it? There is no net benefit and the farmer losses and so do small rural community's
1269.	Farmland in Alberta & BC is much higher than Saskatchewan therefore they are willing to pay much more than the land is worth.
1270.	I think land would stay around the same price because: a) the farmer selling doesn't have to sell till he receives the price he wants and b) all it takes is two buyers to drive the price of land up
1271.	It may increase value to bring in foreign ownership but overtime it will decrease potential for Saskatchewan people.
1272.	Speculation will drive up prices
1273.	The recent trend in land grabbing is disturbing. I applaud the SK government taking action on this to protect our Saskatchewan interests and way of life now and in the future. [Rulli, M. C., Antonio Savori, and Paolo D'Odorico (2013). "Global land and water grabbing." PNAS 110(3): 892-897.
1274.	Saskatchewan has the cheapest land in North America because of restrictions that were in place.
1275.	Who cares. Don't do it. Of course the investors want that to happen but who are our elected officials elected to serve? Are they elected to serve the people who elected them to office? Or are they there to serve the best interests of foreigners, pension funds, foreign pension funds, corporations, foreign corporations and the like? "We the people" elect people to office to

	what "we the people" want them to do, and long term economically there is no net benefit to opening the door to world, except for the world to extract as much profits from our economy as fast as possible.
1276.	Foreign buyers will pay what ever price, then local or young farmers can afford to buy. The land sits cause no one will rent land from foreign buyers cause it is too expensive
1277.	young farmers could not buy land if open to non residents
1278.	These outsiders are finding loopholes to buy land anyways. They will just continue to drive land prices up
1279.	Investment funds and off shore investors would increase their presence in the province searching for new opportunities to increase their profits from the appreciation of farm land. Just like the urban real estate bubble that exists in some of Canada's major cities this does nothing to increase the wealth or security of the local residents.
1280.	Outside investment would possibly increase the value of farmland because there would be more competition for farmers who are familiar with conditions and operate the land responsibly.
1281.	There would be a short term gain, but in the long run it would hurt the industry and the damage to family farms would be irreversible.
1282.	It would raise the price. Eventually it would no longer be feasible to buy it to farm because the commodity prices wouldn't bring back anything on your investment, thus making it not viable. Non farming investors in land want a certain % return on investment, thus they raise the rent. Farmers desperate for land take the gamble, but with climate change, including the more severe weather events, this makes it an ever greater risk for the farmer. They could easily go bankrupt from one crop failure. Why be such a gambler when you can loose everything so easily. It was only a few years ago when there were so many farm bankruptcies in the province. How short is everyone's memory..
1283.	most people came to this country because of the land being affordable not to have other people or companies own the land like they do in other countries as i have a son and daughter that might want to farm some day i do not want them having to compete against pension funds and people that do not even live in canada
1284.	Just look at residential markets popular with foreign investors...out of reach for most local residents
1285.	it could increase the value quite a bit as the investors would want more for rent.
1286.	Look what has happened in the last few years. Nobody wanted farmland ten years ago
1287.	Southeastern and western Saskatchewan would be purchased by oil companies. The next generation of farmer wouldn't be able to expand their operations by purchasing land, their only option would be to lease if their was land available to lease.
1288.	I feel that when investors outside of the province come in, they have resources of money that saskatchewan farmer do not, thus the farmers not being able to afford expansion and owing their own property.
1289.	They are never making more land why wouldn't foreign countries pay for the opportunity to

	own land in another country. Only way to keep sovereignty is to maintain control on ownership
1290.	More demand would translate into higher prices than if the ownership rules were left the same or tightened.
1291.	Less demand reduces supply. But I would rather see a sustainable industry than more investment by 3rd party communities
1292.	There is little doubt that the world recognized that the most valuable resource is not minerals or petroleum resources, but land and there are many investors from elsewhere who would like to be able to own some of the best land in the world. To some extent that has already taken place by the changes done some years ago allowing Canadians to own Saskatchewan land. It has resulted in nominal ownership by Canadians but with the money really coming from elsewhere. Such investors have not interest in the well-being of Saskatchewan or its communities but only in their investment.
1293.	Investors can pay more , think about it they don't have to make payments !
1294.	Basic economics. Prices will sky rocket if there is deregulation. Will only hurt the new generation of farmers.
1295.	It will drive the prices up to a point where it is not profitable for local farmers to purchase. And with high prices come higher lease prices so the investors get a stable return.
1296.	In my area, is wanting to establish a potash mine. Everyone in the area is against it due to the environmental impact it will have. I believe over time it will devalue our property
1297.	Increase in land value is good except when it is the result of unfair competition from pension funds.
1298.	This would open up the market considerably to more "outsiders" (wealthy foreigners).
1299.	Relaxation of ownership would promote land speculation and treatment of land as a commodity to be traded on open markets. Agricultural land would not be valued for its food-production capacity (and other multi-function properties), but rather as source of investment income. The agricultural land would not be treated with due respect, or with long-term goal of sustainable food production
1300.	Competition from foreign investors would drive up the land prices
1301.	To the detriment of new starting young farmers.

7) Which of the following changes in the market value of farmland would benefit you the most financially?

#	Response
1.	As a young, beginning farmer looking to purchase land, any decrease would be beneficial to me.
2.	A decrease in farmland values would benefit local people who do not have such huge pots of money to play with as investors. A decrease in the value of farmland would help retain the

	agricultural way of life as we have known it over the past 100 years where people live and work in the communities in which they own farm land.
3.	As a young person that has been trying to enter farming for the last 8yrs it is very frustrating watching investment companies buy up land around you at an inflated price. There is no thought or care about stewardship of the land as long as they are making a profit. When 160ac of land sells for over \$450,000 and durum wheat is \$6.00/bushel how are you going to pay for that land? Renting land is not seen as a secure way of farming as that land could take out of your land base at any given time if the landlord decides so.
4.	I do not own or lease land.
5.	I'm a young farmer looking for land to be a full time farmer and not need off farm income to pay bills.
6.	I would like to imagine that an increase would benefit through increased tax revenue but I suspect that the power of large investors to influence policy could potentially be costly.
7.	I don't particularly care about the value of my farmland. History tells us that real estate always goes up no matter what. What matters to me is that farmland in Saskatchewan remains in the hands of Saskatchewan residents. The increased amount of exploration and extraction of resources in the last 5 years by foreign countries like is disgusting and is destroying the homes and lives of many people. Quit selling our land to foreign countries and take pride in what we have here in Saskatchewan, the land to be used for agricultural purposes rather than being and pillaged for resources that benefit some foreign country.
8.	I only own two quarters, but their value would certainly go up.
9.	I've been able to re-leverage my land investments as values increase.
10.	Cheaper makes it easier for a young guy.
11.	As a prospective investor, I would be interested in buying land more cheaply. But over the long term I want the land to better reflect the productivity of the land at market rates.
12.	Current markets seem sustainable and farmers can expand current operations.
13.	I don't want to experience that benefit - I would rather have more neighbours.
14.	This is a double edge sword. Increase in farm land price would benefit the people who own farm land. (Older) but as a younger farmer coming up (22 years old) how do you expect me to make a go of it with 1500 to 2000 dollar an acre land prices. It doesn't make sense.
15.	We need land prices to stabilize. A decrease in market value now would hurt anyone who purchased land in the past 5 years. An increase will hurt our farms and make land ownership impossible.
16.	The better priced the land the more diversified the product we can grow. More people would have the chance to become farmers. This would build community.
17.	Would have better chance to obtain any ownership and still afford equipment to farm the land and still have some left to put food on the table at the end of the day.
18.	Cheaper land would allow me to get my foot in the door and purchase land.

19.	Currently own farmland.
20.	With high land prices the price on land rent is so high you need a bumper crop to make any money.
21.	As a young farmer land right now has overpriced itself that it cannot pay to own and farm it and investors want such high rents that you can't make money renting.
22.	If land values decreased it would make it tuff for investors to make their money and easier for the young farmers to purchase land.
23.	Younger farmer with more rented land, looking to purchase more.
24.	With a decrease I would buy land and then lease/rent it. Ideally I'd just like some land to retire to.
25.	Keep the markets where they are. To low not worth anything. Too high and guys can't expand.
26.	Getting into farming is nearly impossible with inflated land prices. It should be possible to purchase farmland at a reasonable price for potential future farmers.
27.	Cause.
28.	It is very difficult as it is to make the move from the city to the country - especially after a valuable post-secondary education. An increase in market value of farmland will crush my dreams of being a hard-working Saskatchewan resident who can help pave a better way for the future of Saskatchewan and its agricultural industry.
29.	I retired and sold my land to young local farmers.
30.	I am one who grew up in a rural setting and would love to have a small farm to work and pass along to my children. As someone who did not have a family farm to inherit, this is proving to be quite impossible due to the financial expense. It would seem that there are always dollars for the larger corporations but not for the small guy. While this is understandable financially, it would be nice to have some small risk opportunities for those wishing to purchase and start a small farm.
31.	A decrease would help me to be able to afford land and also other farmers in my area to be able to add to their current land base.
32.	We expect a fair price for the sale of the land as dictated by the market.
33.	We have sons and grandsons that want to farm. We want to expand and so need to buy and don't intend on selling our family farm ever so we don't care what the sales value is. We are the 3rd 4th and 5th gens. On farm and plan to keep it.
34.	I do not plan to sell. I need the land to access equity, An increase or decrease does not affect my operation.
35.	It wouldn't change much because if it decreases it would make the land already owned worth less therefore not as high valued to use as security on more too purchase and devalue already high priced land putting down the net worth of my farm. If it increases it will be even more of a financial strain and make it unavailable to purchase any amount if any at all.
36.	Being as I do not currently have farmland a decrease in value would benefit me the most financially but I also understand that it would not benefit current farmers as much. A small

	decrease would probably benefit current farmers the most as it would allow them easier expansion of their current operations.
37.	Make purchasing land easier.
38.	As a young farmer trying to get established it is next to impossible to compete with investors when land. Having people and investment firms own land without actively farm it is leading to the decline in rural population and the dying of small towns.
39.	If price goes down, I could expand, and run more acres.
40.	In a better position to purchase farm land.
41.	Stability in any market is KEY.
42.	Many areas have already been artificially inflated too fast for the rest of the economy to keep up, due to foreign investors moving into the area. New owners would be financially devastated if land value dropped, but a stabilized land value with slower steady increases would help the most Saskatchewan farm families out. Keep our province and all of its rural areas alive.
43.	I'm a young farmer trying to increase but prices are too high to buy right now.
44.	I really want to purchase our family farm from my parents someday, so if the price of land continues to go up, I may not be able to afford to do so.
45.	I am currently not a land owner. I worry about the next generation and the family farm concept. Most of our forefathers moved here so we could own land not work for land barons.
46.	Due to extensive Parceling of land and higher land prices as land is being sold per parcel instead of per quarter or section, this puts a lot of pressure on farmers in the area who would like to buy land closer to them when other land is mixed in which is too many miles away to make economical or time use sense. The parceling of large tracts/blocks of land also puts financing out of the picture for some farmers who cannot afford to bid on large blocks of land. A decrease in market value might help; however taking "parceling of large tracts" out of the equation would be also beneficial. Also to note that Factory Farms send out armadas of equipment to land that is sometimes an hour away, this convoy of oversized vehicles on highways are dangerous and a nuisance. It is easier to drive around a single combine or large tractor than it is to try to dodge in and out of five or more combines or seeding units plus their trucks, trailers etc.
47.	Higher prices give a farmer the ability to borrow more money, retire with more money, but does that give you the ability to run a profitable farm or just push you into borrowing more than is possible to repay? Especially in the event of the economy going downhill or a natural disaster such as drought.
48.	The present situation simply confiscates money out of my pocket when I decide to sell. What else is new in semi communist Saskatchewan?
49.	Need to expand but can't afford to. Son and his family are trying to farm but really struggling.
50.	The decision should not just be about who benefits financially in the short term. Preserving the farmland in Saskatchewan, which is some of the best in the world, for the farmers and residents of the Province for generations to come, should be the government's highest

	priority. Allowing foreign investors, like those from , or out of province investment trusts may increase the value of the farmland and benefit current owners in the short term, but in the long term it robs the residents of this province of a valuable resource and relinquishes control to outside interests.
51.	Which we are beginning to see with the ability to ship south.
52.	Yes the land I own would be worth more when I sell it but it will not produce more grain. Unfortunately some of the investors that I lease land from want to set the rental rates based on the value of the land so my expenses will probably increase as they increase the land rent.
53.	Prices are too high for smaller farm operations as is and bringing outside investment dollars into the picture would make it impossible to expand.
54.	A decrease in value so I could afford to buy some.
55.	My farm can grow!
56.	<p>A decrease in farmland market value would help me as I am a young person who would like to purchase farmland back on or near the farm where I grew up. I do not consider myself an investor as I can afford buy 1 or 2 quarters (at a normal price), and not large amounts of land. Owning the land would be the closest thing to farming for me and that is something that I deeply miss and am equally passionate about.</p> <p>Saskatchewan farmland needs to be kept in local hands as that benefits that local communities and keeps the averaged size farm viable, instead of this push for large, corporate farms. Investors need to realize and respect this.</p> <p>Thanks for reading my comments.</p>
57.	Land is currently overvalued and unaffordable for small operators.
58.	I don't own farm land. I would like the opportunity to participate in the potential growth in value through various investment vehicles including the Canada Pension Plan.
59.	if I don't have an answer I shouldn't be forced to tick the circle, it's not about me attitude, short term gains, but the future of Saskatchewan people.
60.	Looking to buy land. Margins on grain farming are tightening especially on land side. Financing the last couple of years is tied in with assets owned with the banks preferring land
61.	More affordable.
62.	As a young farmer (32) I can't afford to buy land on speculation that it will increase in value I need to make enough profit to at least service the interest but should be able to pay for itself off of the net profit in 20 years to make it a smart economic investment.
63.	If prices pull back from the recent highs I may buy, if they move up I may sell, or I may step away from farmland and look at city properties unless you start wanting to control the stability and predictability of that market too. Alberta messed with oil royalties and paid the price and now you are doing the same to land?
64.	Farmland should stay in Saskatchewan farm families if Saskatchewan is going to remain strong, otherwise farmers will become mainly serfs, unable to support the existing towns and villages - outside investors and Hutterites will only terribly inflate the farm values with no

	support provided to community vitality.
65.	We are close to retiring so will be thinking about selling.
66.	This is about much more than the value of my land. It's about doing what's right for Saskatchewan and not losing the very land we call home to foreign ownership and investment that often is short sighted in their focus on stewardship etc.
67.	Too much subdividing is being done which is driving farmland prices up.
68.	Obviously an increase in land value would benefit me if I was to sell. If the land is bought up by foreign money and leased back to farmers, I think it could ruin a lot of farm families who may get caught later on if or when those same people chose to resell the land to another developer or stop leasing it to a farm family who has invested potentially millions of dollars in machinery and bins etc.
69.	Some stability in prices or a slight decrease would be beneficial.
70.	Doesn't matter not selling.
71.	Land priced at productive value is much more stable in the long run. Most business functions that way otherwise the shareholders would leave; common sense.
72.	More farm equity is good for the industry, including input sellers, equipment sellers & manufacturers, etc. A thriving farm economy with strong balance sheets is more important than trying to keep it cheap for future generations. Higher prices and growing home equity had helped positively transform our urban real estate market in Saskatchewan - why should farmers not benefit from the same market dynamics?
73.	As a marketing professional, I hope you realize that your survey questions are biased and leading. I'd seriously question what the results will be.
74.	I am trying to expand my land base as my neighbours retire, as I have a young family and am striving to get to the point where I can sustain a living without an additional off-farm job. Yet with skyrocketing prices, there is no hope of that. And renting isn't a good option in every case. If it were, then there would neither be such a thing as home ownership in towns and cities.
75.	It would keep all of the foreign investors out of the province (where they belong) and open up major opportunities for our farm family youth to carry on the tradition.
76.	The risk is getting greater. Of making a living and not making a living because the prices are so high now.
77.	Do not own farmland.
78.	We have recently purchased land at very high value but would still like to see land value go down so we can purchase more and rent less. It's always better paying toward owning rather than renting in my opinion. But high cost really limits our ownership.
79.	The values of the services I provide as a lawyer are relative to the value of the land.
80.	My children want to invest in our operation.
81.	Response to change in market value depends which side of the equation you're on buying or

	selling/retiring.
82.	I sell real estate.
83.	Buying land would pencil out much better.
84.	I own over 12,000 acres so an increase in land values would benefit while I'm still able to purchase more at high prices. My situation is very rare as most farmers find it difficult to purchase land as the price is uneconomical for their farm size or they are unable to borrow the money limiting the opportunity to farmers like myself, completely eliminating the young, start up farmer. Difficult situation, I don't know how anyone would solve. Maybe it's becoming a luxury to be a land owner?
85.	I am a young farmer trying to take over the family farm and there are so many high risks that are out of the farmer's control and putting us in competition with large corporations is setting us up for failure.
86.	I'm not planning to sell our family's land, so increases in value only serve to make it more difficult for my children to start farming.
87.	Most of the land that is being bought by out of province they think it's cheap and they have big money backing them so price is irrelevant for them. And tough to buy land when FCC is a joke company.
88.	My son and I own land.
89.	I own land and if the prices go up my net worth goes up however it's not just about that, I want to continue to see Saskatchewan people own and farm the land. If the prices keep going up it won't be affordable for any young people to remain on the farm. And what good will it do anyone here if prices keep going up but it is all owned by multibillion dollar companies.
90.	As a retiring farmer increased land values would benefit me but I believe this is not good for agriculture or rural communities in the long run.
91.	This will take time as the capital has always been shy of Saskatchewan due to the socialist leanings so over time as confidence grows the values will rise which is great!
92.	Land value at this time in our area is beyond what can reasonably be returned in a reasonable time frame. In order for me to be long term viable I will need a larger owned land base. Studies have shown that rented land does not lend itself to long term viability. In order for me to manage the risk I would need to see land closer in line with the ability it has to create revenue.
93.	We would be able to buy more land. I realize that increased value would increase our equity but feel being able to buy more land would outweigh that.
94.	I own the land with the intent of giving it to my sons.
95.	Sure my land would increase in value but would that benefit us? If every decision that we or our government makes is strictly based on the almighty dollar we are all doomed. Decisions should be made to benefit us as a whole. We should be able to make a profit but God help us if our land is all owned by absentee land owners.
96.	Because we and other young couples are trying to buy and own land to make a living and get

	a start in the business, it would be nice if land was more attainable to people starting out.
97.	Own my land and near retirement age.
98.	We are nearing retirement age, so the current prices would benefit us. However, our children wish to farm so lower prices would benefit them. Our children have tried to buy land recently and cannot do so because they realize they cannot earn enough on the land to make the payments. This is equally true for renting land as the rental rates are too high to leave any money left to justify the rental.
99.	Saskatchewan needs to move towards more sustainable and environmentally friendly economics.
100.	Affordability of farm land for young farmers.
101.	It would help me in the short term, but as a true farmer I'm looking ahead. Looking out for my family, but mostly for the land.
102.	I prefer not to answer this question as my response (i.e. increase/decrease) has the potential to create the perception of a bias in my responses.
103.	A rising tide floats all boats.
104.	I am a younger farmer so lower values will help me purchase more, but it also lowers my lending potential on the land.
105.	Just because opening farmland ownership to more outside investment would probably help me when I sell at retirement doesn't mean that is the right thing to do.
106.	Will likely sell to our renter who will not need to pay top dollar.
107.	I am unable to find affordable land to purchase, so this question is irrelevant to me.
108.	Depends if we want to buy or lease more land in the future.
109.	If market value increased slowly at the same rate as inflation we could help our children start out. If it is a rapid increase greater than inflation they have no hope.
110.	As a resident only, the changes would not affect me - only the present farmers would be affected.
111.	Increases my equity, net worth and enables me to better finance and maintain operations.
112.	As I plan to purchase more land I will be forced to pay more if the land value goes up but it also means my long-term strategy of owning it I plan on the land appreciating in value.
113.	Consider land as an input cost. Any increase in input costs results in a negative effect on profitability for Saskatchewan farmers.
114.	If There will be increase of farmland value then it will bring more money to Saskatchewan if any non-Saskatchewan resident is paying more money to own will benefit locals.
115.	I'm at a point where I could be buying some land, could be selling some land. I can deal with open market fluctuations; hate the idea of government intervention changing the rules all of a sudden.....that would be like owning land in a 3rd world communist country.
116.	We are close to retirement age so I would be lying if I said increased land value wouldn't help

	us financially, but I do want to see our young neighbours able to keep farming, we intend to rent our land out and not sell.
117.	Need to buy so cheaper is better right now.
118.	Naturally as a land owner I would benefit from an increase in my land's market value.
119.	This isn't about me, it's about the farmers and their lives/jobs etc.
120.	Having no change would benefit me and my family farm. It's ALL about the money, hey?
121.	As we are starting out a decrease would help. However, I realize on the other side those selling would like to be able to retire comfortably as well.
122.	Land prices only matter if you are buying or selling. My net worth statement might look better but it is all only on paper. We had a friend brag to us about how much he was worth now so he went out and bought a whack of expensive land. Only time will prove if he was smart or dumb, but the land may have been easier to pay for a few years ago when both he and his new farmland were worth a lot less. The same quarter that was 70'000 a few years ago and now worth 210'000 doesn't magically produce more.
123.	A strong market that is rising is good for any current landowner and new purchaser who will see their equity increase. It is also good for the farmland real estate industry and individual realtors to have an active market as it provides jobs and helps the economy as a whole.
124.	Our son is young and would like to farm, but at the price that land is going in the area and with the closure of the PFRA pastures we are unlikely able to expand.
125.	I could afford to buy some more land.
126.	It would not affect me one way or another.
127.	Young farmer trying to expand can't compete with outside investors.
128.	I am not looking to sell my farmland, however, I might buy. A lower price might be beneficial for me.
129.	I don't own farmland.
130.	No change would be fine. We are still hoping to buy, which means lower prices are better in that case, although it doesn't much matter as if we use other land as equity, that equity value stays equivalent to fair market value of the land we are buying. One thing I know is we don't want it to skyrocket. Although it would make the land we own worth that much more, I want my kids & their kids to have the ability to carry on!
131.	We are not interested in selling. We are concerned that if more land is owned by large owners and leased to contract operators, we will lose many of our neighbours and as a result many of the businesses we rely upon to operate our farm will go under. For example, we need nearby parts dealers, seed cleaners, fuel suppliers, etc. If the land goes to big operators that are dealing directly with centralized suppliers we will be left high and dry or will have to put more time and money into getting the services we need for our farm to succeed.
132.	I am retiring I want to pay off my debts so but subdivide my yard which is close to the city. And move into the city.

133.	I have no present interest in farmland.
134.	MONEY ISN'T EVERYTHING. Rapid growth without thought, like cancer, will eventually kill the host.
135.	We wish to buy more. Very difficult for small producers to buy land at high prices. Foreign investors raise prices just to ensure they buy it and drive local residents out.
136.	Land is extremely overpriced because of the last 6 years of good farming ... Couple bad years and prices will settle out.
137.	If it decreases it makes it harder for us to purchase new land by using owned land as collateral. But if it becomes more expensive we will not be able to afford more land.
138.	I'm starting out farming. Of course the cheaper land is the better for me.
139.	As long as the land is valued by what it produces it is reasonably priced.
140.	I want to buy land not sell it.
141.	As a younger farmer, cheaper land will benefit me greatly.
142.	As a farmland owner, the price of land will increase for sales to farmers looking to expand or individual investors. Large funds typically pay below market value for large tracks of land and also make a good return on investment.
143.	Directly - no change. Screwing around causing investment dollars to flow away from the Province will hurt us all.
144.	This being said a fair value in farm land is the right answer.
145.	A decrease in market values would enable more young farmers to start farming.
146.	As I said, I'm just starting out so I want to grow and have land available for my kids when they want to go farming.
147.	An increase in what our family may make is not always the best course of action.
148.	I have no plans to sell at the moment. I am happy with the farmer renting my land, and know if I sold it he would not have the same opportunity.
149.	Although I am not planning on selling my property, presumably an increase in land values would also maintain upward pressure on lease rates, which would be beneficial to me in renting out my quarter.
150.	If our children and future generations can't drink the water, haven't got food to eat, or it's polluted with chemicals leaving them sick or dying then only a fool would think about the market value at this moment in time. Finances are not everything.
151.	Being third generation, yes all the old machines that are now 30 + years old are paid off to purchase new equipment or land or anything is beyond reach and the retired would need more than just government pension to survive and forced to sell as well as being a young buyer millions of dollars is hard to get approved for.
152.	As I am planning on purchasing the lower the value the better.
153.	Will be buying instead of selling in the coming years, though an increase in value helps farm

	equity.
154.	If it was more affordable to buy, I may choose to invest in it with family members and others in the future.
155.	I am not a farmer, if value/prices were to drop I would be able to think more seriously about buying some land I could rent out.
156.	This would hopefully correlate to lower cash rent. It would also mean I could afford to buy land.
157.	It sounds counterintuitive but a decrease in land prices today would make it a possibility for my farm to afford to purchase land again. I understand that my operations net worth would decrease as a result due to the equity in the land I already owned decreasing, but for the long term this would be a benefit for myself and many other farmers who are in this business for the long term.
158.	Farmland prices are a huge barrier to entry into the farming industry.
159.	If land was more affordable for smaller farmers their costs would go down, which I hope would mean lower prices for me.
160.	I want to buy some, so higher the price means no opportunity.
161.	And I don't care! Contrary to what you are suggesting, some things are more important than money. This question is a red herring attempting to steer respondents away from more important considerations and reduce it to a simple personal monetary issue. Are you just conducting a poll, are there more potential sellers or more potential buyers?
162.	As a land owner, an increase in market value increases my equity position, which if you are borrowing money as most farmers must, is a positive thing. On the other hand, if I want to purchase land, and decrease in market value would be to my benefit. Since Saskatchewan farmland values have increased so quickly over the past few years, it would be best to have no change, and see if they can stabilize.
163.	Looking at future expenses for urban housing and potentially support services such as nursing homes, I really would hate to be a farmer that is restricted in the sale of their business. The unions negotiate, the developers build, why restrict farmers.
164.	See above.
165.	The equity we have in our land would enable us to cosign loans for our children to purchase however overpaying for parcels of land does not enable the land to pay for itself and requires money from already owned land to subsidize it. This does not work in the farming world. That's how you go broke!!
166.	There would be no change because we would never sell. Nor can any little guy afford to buy anything either.
167.	I would like to by ranch of people soon to retire beat my parents operation, and actually take over my parents land as well. I make well over \$100,000/year working as an original, yet the business optics of getting into the farming industry are daunting at best. A huge part of this is the ludicrous debt supported rise in housing and land costs over the last decade in Canada. This has eroded a huge chunk of what could have been savings for the entire population. We

	need the real estate over valuation to collapse across the province and county.
168.	Start to bring the cost of production into line with the ability of the land to produce.
169.	I am presently renting part of my land base to my nephew. I am not ready sell yet but who knows where prices are going. Even under current restrictions in ownership back in the 80's land values got overinflated and lots of producers, financial institutions and gov'ts lost money. That hurt lasted a lot of years.
170.	Farmland too expensive.
171.	I would be in a position to maybe be able to purchase land if it came available.
172.	Would make it more financially beneficial for me to expand my farm operation.
173.	mmm.
174.	This is a silly question. It takes many to make a market. We need buyers and sellers, internal and external to have a free market.
175.	You want to be in a market that what you're buying has chance of increasing...or why would you buy land ... a house... an investment...would you like it if your wages would never increase????Crazy?
176.	It would enhance my net worth.
177.	It is always good when an asset increases in value, especially when it rises to the value it holds in the neighbouring provinces.
178.	As a farmer I find it very difficult to compete with a large investor that already has the money sitting there to by land and I have to jump through the hoops to apply for financing.
179.	Not interested in buying and when my land is worth more the banker is easier to deal with.
180.	Right now I am an active farmer so I can go either way by expanding if there is opportunity or selling if there is opportunity. Why out of all the business out there is farmland being targeted to keep the value artificially low? Why is this sector of people who chose to invest in this livelihood being penalized for making a good investment and not able to maximize its full potential?
181.	A decrease would mean I could afford land but it would also decrease the artificial value of my current land.
182.	We are looking to sell out within the next 10 years. Of course, an increase in value is good for us. However, if this is at a cost to younger farmers who actually want to farm, then it is not a good thing. There needs to be a balance because younger farmers want to own land, not just be tenant farmers renting from big companies.
183.	The price of land now is crippling my ability to start farming right now. My parents will have to help me a lot and that is all the more reason why ownership is important.
184.	We want to buy out the family ranch so the change in price will not help or hurt us in transition but to expand it will be very difficult.
185.	In the short term. But we need to think into the future.

186.	I see an increase benefit every one who is a land owner, only in agriculture would you expect someone to say if only the price of my farm was half of what it's worth now would I be better off.
187.	Because I'm a land owner, increased prices increase my net worth. And I don't have aggressive expansion plans.
188.	It would make out work easier, knowing there are capital resources available through these investment groups to change infrastructure and create economies of scale, a shorter path to profit, however ownership lies. At the end a dollar is a dollar no matter how it was done; we all have mouths to feed. Agriculture is undergoing a sort of creative destruction, get rid of the old and changing to new forms of income streams. There is a book by Joseph Schumpeter on creative destruction, it is not a threat, and it occurs and is occurring now.
189.	Shareholders in global conglomerates owning Saskatchewan farmland are not spending the profits in Saskatchewan.
190.	We are a small farm that started with nothing from the ground up. We would like to start expanding but right now prices for farmland are outrageous because big corporate farm operations are paying it. Not even sure how most farmers are making anything and are probably on the verge of disaster. Once they pay the land rent or purchase price they can't afford to put a crop in. The family farms are really going to struggle if something is not done.
191.	As a producer trying to get started, and buy some land of my own; lower land prices will help me pay off my loans faster and make me more profitable. By doing so, I will have more disposable income to invest back into the provincial economy.
192.	I grew up in a small town where my dad had a small farm and I do not farm and now live in a small city with many of my friends actively farming. If I was retirement age with no family the increased value would be of benefit to me. I know from personal experience there is no way many of my friends benefit from what I would call artificially inflated land prices that they can't afford to compete with. No benefit to them.
193.	Land is already hard to afford. Increasing land prices will only make it more difficult for younger farmers who don't have the financial reserves to afford higher land costs. Lower land prices would help younger farmers like me expand and move forward. The average age in Saskatchewan is 54 according to your documents. This is a problem that is getting worse each year. We need to support the smaller younger farmers, or agricultural production will suffer as young people won't be able to afford to farm, even if they want to.
194.	As I no longer farm but still own my land I still do not feel the need to have my land value be extraordinarily high. I am happy to let it be what it will be as I plan to hand it down from generation to generation.
195.	We are young and trying to expand. The prices in this area make it very hard. We have a well-established farm with strong financials and we find it challenging and questionable whether we should be spending as much on land. Other farmers who are not as fortunate are not even close to being in the market. I feel their family farms will die within a generation from stagnation.
196.	I don't plan on selling my land but higher values help with borrowing power.

197.	Provide the ability to afford.
198.	A change either way would not impact my current position. I do work in the Agriculture industry but do not directly own farm land. What benefits me, as well as most people in the Ag industry is a healthy industry. A healthy Ag industry is most likely found in an unregulated industry where the economics can dictate.
199.	An increase in market value is always a good thing, as long as it doesn't skyrocket. Increasing the value of your owned acres increases the equity available in your operation to assist with further purchases or to assist with termed out losses in the operation.
200.	I am 72 years old. I spent millions of dollars in Saskatchewan and now that I would like to retire I have been trying to sell my land for at least 6 years. I could have sold it years ago for \$10,000,000 more to an American buyer, but I still can't find a Canadian buyer to come up with the money to buy it. (Who would want to invest money in Saskatchewan with a problem like this when it comes time to sell?)
201.	Since the recent escalation in farmland values it has become easier for me to negotiate fair lease rates for my property instead of having the values dictated to me. I have also had more appropriate purchase offers. Saskatchewan farmland still remains a bargain at current prices.
202.	After tax money is not everything.
203.	Of course an increase in farm land will benefit my net worth but I believe there will be consequences on future generations if farm land becomes unaffordable to the average farmer.
204.	At present and for the foreseeable future I do not have a financial stake in the market value of farmland.
205.	Both our boys are joining the farm, but they have not been able to purchase more than 1 quarter each because of outrageous prices and competition by non-Saskatchewan residents. Mexican Mennonites are only the latest to come looking, leaving NO land affordable or available for our Saskatchewan raised farm boys.
206.	If farmland was less expensive, I would be able to purchase or lease land.
207.	I feel the prices are artificially high.
208.	I sell land. I make more money if people buy. But that doesn't mean I agree with it.
209.	Lower land payments mean lower cost of production.
210.	On land owned we benefit more if market value increases as our equity position increases. In purchasing new land it is more a benefit for the market value to be less so it is less output of cost to purchase.
211.	Since I could retire and sell, increase personally best for me. Since I have no plans to sell at present, no change.
212.	Right now land price is relative to commodity price and production.
213.	They say you pay for the land twice before it's paid off at the bank. \$160,000 for a quarter will take a life time to pay for especially if it gets dry out.

214.	We'd like to buy more land around our home 1/4 the land values have increased astronomically since we bought our farm 9 years ago.
215.	My parents own a 107 year old family farm. We hobby farmed 1/4 section up until last year. Sadly we went into hay land. In a century Saskatchewan has gone from the land of the opportunity and small farms to be overrun by greed. In our area land has tripled in the past 5 years. For a middle age person to start out farming today is near impossible. Farmers' median age is almost 60 and there are no good programs to help new farmers who don't have the large family farm to build upon. Corporate farms don't put money into rural growth and sustainability.
216.	Land prices go up.
217.	Net worth increase. Stupid question.
218.	The market is higher now than ever before.
219.	We would finally be able to afford land again, and our sons might be able to make a living on the farm as well, not have to work because they don't have enough land to have enough cows to make a living.
220.	An increase in land values would definitely increase our equity position but that only matters when we sell. An increase in values limits the potential for expansion based on ownership but may increase the opportunity to lease land at production relevant prices. Over the long term and increase in land values will be to our benefit as commodity markets are so variable and not always profitable.
221.	As I am trying to expand my farm a decrease in farmland prices would be beneficial. However, I'm not expecting it to happen regardless of what the future holds. Land has been changing hands at above its productive capacity for some time now - probably the last five years. With commodity prices falling it is becoming impossible to generate a profit on the farm. But, it is possible to continue to grow equity as payments are made and debts are reduced. That is if you own the land. With interest rates at rock bottom levels and financing readily available farmers are going into a lot of debt to buy high-priced land and this cannot end well. If we see commodity prices slide further and if interest rates were go up by a significant amount we would see farmland prices come down. But that is still a big "if".
222.	If I were planning to sell, an increase would help me financially, but more expensive land would significantly limit the people who can purchase it, and I would prefer to see farmers be able to purchase it and not be outbid by foreign investors.
223.	As a farmer looking to sell and retire in the next few years, it is important to get the maximum return that I can, for the benefit of my family. I have waited all my life to finally get some money and all this does is restrict my income, since when did the Saskatchewan Party become the NDP? It is MY land and I am entitled to get as much as I can from it, just like any other private real estate owner.
224.	Cheaper land makes buying and making profits much less risky for farm families.
225.	If land is affordable younger people who have the passion would have the option of continuing on a family operation rather than chasing jobs either in the city or oil fields.
226.	We would really like to buy our lease land to continue future farming viability of our place to

	keep our 4 boys involved if they want.
227.	Intend to pass it on therefore a decrease would reduce income taxes on capital gains at time of transfer.
228.	As indicated earlier, it is my intention to allow my children to inherit current Saskatchewan farmland. It will continue to be farmed by family.
229.	There is always more profit on land that is cheaper to buy. Currently land is \$2,500/ac and is the limit that it makes sense to continue buying. At \$2,000/ac every farmer in the area would consider buying land.
230.	If there is someone out there willing to pay more for my land they should be able to buy it.
231.	Not sure what you want to know? What benefits most financially? Easy answer is if land prices increase, also an increase in commodity prices is quick to add financially, cheaper input costs would benefit, prices now are too high.
232.	An increase in equity means an increase in borrowing and expanding power. This is the part the government doesn't get.
233.	Since I am nearing retirement, higher values would benefit me personally, but the future of farming in Saskatchewan would barely benefit my family more.
234.	I want to buy not sell at this point.
235.	Increase our equity and ability to purchase more land.
236.	Land is not for sale so no value.
237.	Land I have purchased will go up in value. Sure it makes it tough to purchase new land but land that is paid for can help offset cost of new purchases.
238.	Decrease in market value would allow us to purchase more farm land which in the end would allow Saskatchewan born and raised farming families to survive.
239.	I don't care what it's worth! My father's 75 years of blood, sweat, and tears are in that land. It's not for sale at any amount! Not today not tomorrow not ever. I will leave that land to the next generation of filthy farmers! End of story. This whole survey explains way the government should protect the family farm! The dedication of independent small farm operators surpasses all integrity of the law and ensures stability of families and private enterprises and pride of ownership! It should never come down to the "almighty dollar"! Or we are all in trouble! Big trouble! Our fore fathers who settled this land came from the feudal system! It didn't work then for the majority and it won't work now! Why must we continually remind government if past mistake in history!!! You want stability, give people a chance at carving out their own little piece of heaven on earth! They will be happy productive energized people with real goals and real success! Most of this survey has been made by people who don't get farming! U can tell by the bogus questions!
240.	Don't own land.
241.	A decrease in value would allow me to expand my current painfully small farm.
242.	The true value of any asset is not the cash you can sell it for but what income your family can get from it and for how many years.

243.	As we try to make a living on our ranch, possibly expand, possibly set up our kids to do this in the future we cannot possibly compete with foreign investors. We simply don't have the money to do that. We chose this occupation for the lifestyle for us and our kids. If we had wanted to "get rich" we could have spent our life working the rigs and not had family at all. When we hit retirement age we hope to have children who choose this lifestyle too and the inflated price for land we could get will not be a consideration as we will be passing ownership to the next generation. I know we could never have made our way here if it weren't for my dad and uncle helping us out and selling us the land at a very reasonable price, but it is still sometimes a struggle.
244.	Currently we own 1250 acres and rent 3750. Most of our rent has gone up to 60 an acre. Which where we are from is very expensive. It's getting hard for the small and young farmer to afford to start farming let alone expand in the future.
245.	I wish to expand my operation.
246.	I am trying to develop and economical production unit based on GRASS and livestock and the economics of the unit more so depends on production unit prices into the market I integrate into.
247.	Individual buyers and sellers should not logically expect to be a "beneficiary" from any restrictive or limiting government policy. Wealth and potential wealth (most often accumulated by individuals and multi-generational farmers) should not negatively impact retiring/selling farm land holder to the benefit of an ever decreasing and small number of farmers who wish to expand via increased land ownership. Leasing, as always, is a logical option for existing and expanding farmers. Maximizing land ownership is not always the best strategy for the most successful farm operations.
248.	It's hard to expand when land in our area is 3-4 times of what it was 8 years ago, now the people that are buying land for a investment expect rental rates that are a lot higher than what rent has been in the area because they hear canola is worth big money and think that's all we grow and think the farmers are making big profits. It's hard to deal with people that own the land that don't know anything about farming.
249.	As I near retirement the more I can get for my land the more I will have to retire on.
250.	Though in the short term the demand for my assets would rise, in the longer term, if the pool of farm operators is severely rationalized as a result, an extreme concentration of "farm controllers" may not be beneficial for existing land owners.
251.	If land was more affordable, we would purchase it rather than rent it. We are also limited at how much we would be able to finance at current high prices.
252.	Land values are at a level that allows far value on both sides of the equation.
253.	This is my retirement. This is my life long investment. It shouldn't be devalued at a local level.
254.	Trying to buy for the first time a decrease in value would benefit me
255.	Just let those in Saskatchewan determine the value not outside money. Already have that with Albertans selling their land around there and coming here buying up here. Same as Europeans selling over there for big money come here buying up land. Again no natural ebb and flow of prices.

256.	Currently I only own one quarter of farmland, a decrease in prices would allow me to increase my land base more quickly.
257.	Not selling, son will try to continue to tradition.
258.	Willing to pay competitive dollars for farmland. Bidding against corporations or colonies will make it hard to compete and stay competitive in farming for medium size farmers like myself.
259.	I only own one quarter section of pastureland that I have no intentions of selling so land prices make no difference to me.
260.	More reasonable cost to expand the farm.
261.	Very stupid question.
262.	I have been expanding aggressively and since I'm in my late 20's it would provide me with the means to purchase more land which will make it easier to expand more with the extra assets I would hold.
263.	A small decrease would help keep farming affordable and help to not take on more debt when purchasing land.
264.	Only because we are in our 50's and no one wants to take over the farm in the family.
265.	Of course lower values make purchasing easier, however it also affects our asset position as our current owned land would also decrease in price. My biggest concerns are keeping the value of the land within reason and keeping the management and ownership with people who are capable of understanding the productive value of the land and the financial risks involved for those who farm it.
266.	I'm not concerned about personal benefits; I am concerned about the future of Saskatchewan farmers.
267.	I just care about our farmland staying productive, food security, our wildlife and our ecosystem. And in my view, the economy doesn't have to mean compromise for any of those things. Find a way. Please.
268.	Increasing land values would make land harder to purchase because it would be much more risk, but drastically reducing land values wouldn't help either because the number of bids per parcel of land would increase. I don't think the answer is to cap the land values, I think the answer is just to allow only farmers (the people producing the crop and taking the risk) to own the land. That way land values will reflect farm income.
269.	We could afford from ensure that we can pass the farm onto the generation that grew up on it.
270.	Although an increase would benefit me, it is not something I want. The increase in market value will hurt the farmers as a whole. Please, do not enact law that will increase the land values anymore.
271.	As a Saskatchewan resident, I would like restrictions to be put in place so only Saskatchewan Farmers can own Saskatchewan Farmland.
272.	Then I could buy more land, be more prosperous, but most importantly, then my children could farm too! Their prosperity would also be mine. An increase in market value would

	provide a short term (and short sighted) benefit only!
273.	I could retire and sell benefiting from foreign ownership money but do not wish to do that. Current prices are high enough.
274.	No matter what you own if it increases in price that is good. Probably the dumbest question so far.
275.	As we are looking to expand our family farm by buying we would be able to purchase more land if the price decreased.
276.	I'm not technically a farmer; I would be renting the land out not using or selling it.
277.	A decrease in land prices would mean a decrease in the amount of capital required to mortgage land. Making it easier for the young generation of farmers to get started if they don't have land equity in the family.
278.	I am not intending to buy more land, so I would benefit when I sell in 10 to 20 years.
279.	This is a stupid question!
280.	A lot of people have debt ratios based on current market values so a decrease would be detrimental to their overall worth.
281.	I am looking to sell land so an increase in price helps but it helps at a time in life when it's not needed. it is the younger farmers and those starting out that need affordable land.
282.	I own 10000+ acres.
283.	I will need to take out a mortgage on anything that I buy, if the prices are lower the profitability is better. With current land prices I can buy land but it leaves me \$0.00 to spend capital purchases like equipment which is needed to put in a crop or take it off.
284.	As someone outside the Ag industry an open market drives the economic impact on the entire Province. Also Investors help the smaller farmers be able to LEASE land rather than the Large farmer buying up all the land leaving nothing for the lower income farmer that can't afford to buy land but can rent.
285.	Organic increase because of Saskatchewan farmers buying is the only growth I want to see.
286.	Interested in expanding, can't compete with investors.
287.	I guess I am thinking more about retiring these days also!! It will increase the equity I have in my land.
288.	Let the market decide.
289.	I win either way prices go down I buy. They go up I sell. Called FREE enterprise.
290.	My average purchase price is much lower than current prices. I own land but do not farm it.
291.	Strong asset values in SK benefit all residents.
292.	Prices are too close to the overdone values of the late 70's. I was too young then but I watched the re-correction of the 80's drought high interest rates and US - EU price war crush too many Canadian farmers.

293.	Answer depends whether one is buying or selling.
294.	This is a loaded question. If the value increases then the equity of my land goes up, however land is more expensive to purchase I can't afford to expand or I have to run my operation on a tighter margin to try and make money.
295.	I don't farm personally and my client base is from all sizes of farm already.
296.	Higher market value doesn't totally help until you sell but it can help the challenges of borrowing money to operate or expand when you have higher backing dollars in your financial statement.
297.	Land value needs to be valued by the productive value not by investment speculation.
298.	Farmland is far too expensive to buy now, as it is.
299.	Myself and other farmers young or old can and will buy land at market value. We can compete with others in the same playing field. A pension fund that uses someone else's cash with no financing charges is not in the same field. Pension funds buying farmland is basically a pyramid scheme managed by a few.
300.	i invested in land with paying a mortgage over 15 years I have not benefited money wise at all. I pay extra personal income tax because I have to claim the income on my personal income I only get to claim interest and land tax deductions. So with that the return will be land rental after the mortgage is paid or when the land is sold for an appreciated value. The other beef I have is that when I sell my land I cannot claim any of it within my personal capital gains I have to pay more tax and the farmer producer gets all the benefits when they sell again if it wasn't for the 36% investor land base the farmer would not be able to operate
301.	I am not selling and unsure if I would buy as I do not want to go into debt.
302.	People should be able to afford farmland from the crops that it produces.... I.E. the revenue generated from farm crops grown on the respective property/properties).
303.	As a 27 year old trying to get on my feet, we just can't compete to foreign government/ investors.
304.	If land prices keep going up, leases cost more, and that, along with other increasing input costs make farmers less able to make a profit, especially when they can't even get their world class product to market.
305.	I am getting near the end of my farming. My boy would have like to farm but price is too high to get started for my size of farm. I hope I do not need sell my farm to retire so market price does not really affect me.
306.	Be able to buy land at a more reasonable value for expansion.
307.	I wish to buy some farmland to retire and live my life as a small farmer. High prices do not work for me in my own personal interests.
308.	If land values go up it gives you more buying power to buy more land because it increases the value of your entire farm.
309.	I could better afford to buy it.

310.	It would make land easier to buy and sell.
311.	I am an owner.
312.	We own 6400 acres so when it goes up so does our net worth.
313.	I/We spent our lives farming and being stewards of our land, keeping it in shape, not using harmful pesticides or ammonias etc.... which, in time kill microbes in soil, insects, birds and other wildlife.... I would take a lesser sale price, just for the knowledge that it is not sold to a large corporation where the \$\$\$ bottom line is the only thing of importance.
314.	I will not be selling with an interest in taking over the farm.
315.	Keeping land in line with the value of grain will keep farming affordable for current and new farmers. Some places (USA and Australia) have a lot of farms that are managed by young people but owned by investors. This prevents the young/current generation from building assets. It also takes any financial gain outside of the province or country.
316.	If you are selling it is good if you are buying it is bad but the lack of opportunity for young people is the killer.
317.	I'm not planning on selling my land for many, many years; the land I'm hoping to acquire is marginal at best, so I don't think its value would increase much. But I'm not only interested in my own financial interests or benefit; rather I would like to see more small farmers acquire smaller land holdings and farm them in a sustainable, organic way, and an increase in value will make this more difficult than it already is.
318.	If I can acquire more land at affordable costs, it will ultimately increase my ability to make my operation financially successful.
319.	The value of land in our area is so volatile because of purchases by a few large corporations that we are almost out of the market to purchase any more farmland.
320.	We are actively looking for a farmland. We would like to be farmers as soon as possible. As the young generation (Under age 30), we hope the price of the farmland can keep at a stable level. The farmland's core value should be on the crop producing, not on the investment. No one should change the core value of farmland; otherwise it will bring lots of negative effects. For example, young generation can no longer afford to purchase the farmland so that they won't become farmers. Eventually, there will not be enough good farmers left in Saskatchewan.
321.	I am a farmer looking to buy so cheaper is better for me.
322.	Would rather give smaller or beginning farmers a chance than have a larger bank account.
323.	As a small farmer trying to raise a family it is already hard to expand to make our farming viable.
324.	I hope to sell my land to my children at a price that will meet my retirement needs, not my greed needs.
325.	The world demands to be fed are only going to increase, land prices will naturally rise on their own without foreigners, backed by corporations, buying everything up and leaving nothing for locals who are interested in owning a small piece to retire on.

326.	test
327.	test
328.	I feel land is overvalued considering the expense and risk of producing a crop.
329.	Because I don't own much land, personally a decrease would benefit me the most because it would allow me to have more opportunities to purchase land and grow my farm.
330.	As I plan to sell in the near future, it is natural for me to have land prices increase, but at the same time I would like to see someone living here, especially a young family.
331.	Young farmers in the family.
332.	For our younger generation to be able to farm, reasonable farmland prices most be paramount. Recent spikes in farmland prices on top of unmonitored increases in input prices makes it hard to maintain a local profitable farm. If there is money to be made from farming LET IT BE GO TO THE FARMER who does the work and not the investor simply waiting for dollars he is not willing to actually work for!
333.	The price of farmland is good now but it will come back to haunt us.
334.	The current land prices are high but restrict the big farmers getting bigger but can also help the smaller farm acquire some land or prevent being overtook by bigger farmers.
335.	A decrease in farmland value would benefit me the most making it affordable to purchase farm land to grow my operation. A decrease would also make farmland look less attractive as an investment and probably keep groups that should not own farmland from buying land.
336.	test
337.	As I said let the global marketplace set the price, the same as other real estate in this province.
338.	A high market value looks good in my net worth, but it is hard to consider additional acres at the current market prices to purchase or rent land in our area.
339.	As we currently own farmland and want to purchase more, we are not currently interested in prices increasing. The status quo, while high, is still at a place where we can afford to purchase more land.
340.	As we wish to purchase land, we do not want the price of land to increase; we will pay a fair price.
341.	Not a land owner.
342.	Of course I would like the buy land cheaper, who doesn't. Problem with this market is if interest rises, a drought year or two, slip in commodity prices, investors will see more return elsewhere and dump their farmland, which will lead to huge price slumps. When the bubble bursts and people who bought at high prices suddenly have land un-secured and the bank wants more security, but they don't have any more because their other net equity is worth less and loans get called. You will see the 80's revisited and possibly worse. That is the problem with the high land prices, market conditions change and for a person who needs to leverage the value, it makes it very risky to enter market place where your peers are no longer your competition and the market movers.

343.	Land values are not financially viable if you look at average prices and input cost and yields over a 10 year period, as such even though I own land unless I want to sell right now; it is not in my best interests to continue purchasing land at the current values, something fundamental must change to support these valuations.
344.	I do not plan on ever selling. So the price of land is moot. I do not plan on buying any either so the price does not affect me much.
345.	I hope the land will stay in the family and that they will make sure that it is treated properly and still will produce food for our people and the people of the world.
346.	When I am ready to purchase farmland in Saskatchewan I know I will have to pay market value.... no matter what happens.
347.	Inflation similar to the rest of the economy is reasonable, however to much is not good.
348.	Both answers could potentially. Having a decrease would help me now by being able to afford to purchase land, but in 35-40 years of I want to sell my land, an increase would help.
349.	I own land for a purpose and right now have no plans to sell. I'm not a land speculator.
350.	I know we are lagging behind other parts of Saskatchewan. But we still finding paying over 200,000.00 per quarter just doesn't add up.
351.	Would like to add more property to our operation, but cannot afford at current prices.
352.	I'm a potential seller.
353.	I am retiring.
354.	Not buying or selling.
355.	We have retired and still own a small amount of land. However I prefer that the next generation be able to buy land at an affordable rate.
356.	I am a potential buyer not seller.
357.	If we don't get rain soon there will be a lot of changes.
358.	An increase if we as farmers are forced out by investors. A decrease if there is to be a next generation of farmers.
359.	It's impossible to say a decrease when prices have already been set, but been able to expand without having to bid against outside investors would at least give us a better advantage than opening up the border to anyone.
360.	Farmland prices are all over the map and a number of people including real estate agents are not being truthful of values, the quality of the land and using tactics like the will pay more or are going to buy it.
361.	Its high enough right now and we're buying. Let it increase in 10-15 years when we're ready to sell.
362.	We are quite stable in our purchase of land, not planning large changes. Any increase in value would be offset by increased borrowing power.
363.	Net worth is only good for leveraging/borrowing money, cash flowing and obtaining down

	<p>payments on property in volatile markets is another matter.</p> <p>Until worldwide finances reflect where true wealth creation comes from (and not the volatilities of speculation), guessing net worth and cash flows realities are a trivial matter.</p>
364.	At present, farm land is overvalued.
365.	Make it affordable to expand!
366.	I do understand that opening the provinces farm land to investment by large funds and foreign interests will increase the value of the land we own but I feel scared for the next generation or anyone wanting to enter the industry. I don't know what the answer is to this issue and I don't want to be a hypocrite. May GOD help us with this?
367.	Could land acquired for rental purposes still preserve the farmland for its intended use?
368.	Would like to buy land instead of rent.
369.	I have no plans to ever sell my land to some investor who doesn't understand the REAL value of farm land
370.	Appreciation in the values of land are great if you already own. As a young farmer trying to expand there comes a tipping point where expansion becomes a noose if values are too high
371.	As a retiring farmer, higher land values increase my return on investment....but I would never sell to a foreign entity or even a land trust....I would sell to a young aspiring entrepreneur because I was once one myself.
372.	This is hard to say. My net worth would go up as my land increases in value, but that only helps me if I want to sell it, which I don't. I'd like to expand my operation which is nearly impossible with the way current land prices keep raising.
373.	With my mix of owned versus leased any increase in the value of my land is offset by the increase in lease payments. An increase in land values affects my long term investment positively but is negative for my short term viability and cash flow.
374.	I would be able to afford some.
375.	Although we are significant land holders we are also in expansion mode so may be value neutral.
376.	We have a lot of oil in our region and it is already causing a major rise in value due to the oil people wanting just a piece of land to have as a hobby or a place to quad on and store stuff
377.	Due to our position in the life cycle, and our desire to continue farming, a decrease in market value would help us expand our operation, resulting in greater economies of scale and ultimately greater profit. However, we have bought some land at extremely high prices and a decrease in value would hinder our current net worth and limit our borrowing capacity to pursue expansion.
378.	Let the land follow commodity prices and farm profitability.
379.	As a young farmer, the current land values pose a large challenge for the future of my operation.
380.	Farmland has gone up too fast in relation to the commodity prices being produced which

	fluctuate greatly.
381.	As someone who is wanting to get into farming and expand the operation, it would be more beneficial to have lower land values, especially since I will use the land to actually farm and not as a financial investment.
382.	In my area land prices are at the point where you need other land to help pay for it the land should be able to pay for itself.
383.	We could buy more land for the same buck.
384.	I don't plan to sell land so no change other than our rural communities would slowly disappear.
385.	We have been selling our large land base over the past 15 years to our farming family members at a price equal to our original cost.
386.	As active producers we think that a decrease in land value would benefit us. Rental rates would decrease, speculation by investors would be reduced and we would see more stability in the industry. However, we do not believe that land prices will fall to levels we saw 5 or so years ago. But with some of the recent sale prices we have witnessed it would be impossible to pay for this land with current commodity prices.
387.	Looking to possibly buy more.
388.	Our farm land will be left to our sons.
389.	My answer would be different if I was selling but some of the farmland in the market is way overpriced and the owners of the land are to blind to realize the actual value sometimes. They pressure a person to the point of if you want it you have to pay well above what the land is worth because there is an investor waiting to pay whatever they want just to add it to their portfolio even they want nothing to do with the land but own it.
390.	Under the assumption that today is a fair market price, one should be able to have the ability to make a living on the land with sustainable practices and not have to compromise the health and safety of workers, environment, and community in order to provide for ones family/self.
391.	Old farmers saying if it isn't broke don't fix it
392.	In our case, we are merely estate owners, thus making it more viable for a farmer to have land readily available to farm, rather than being saddled with high ownership charges as well as high operation charges. In time this land may be sold.
393.	The value of farmland is only one consideration. Farmers also care about how the land is farmed - the methods used to maintain the fertility over many decades. On a trip to the UK a few years ago we were pleasantly surprised to learn that farmers were paid a certain amount a year to maintain their land - they were judged the best stewards of the land. Not absentee landlords or corporations. Local farmers care about the long-term sustainability of their land.
394.	I own farmland so an increase in value would benefit me. However it's not for sale currently.
395.	I don't need to sell.
396.	We are trying to help our family to stay; in agriculture so need to buy more land.

397.	Farmland is currently priced beyond its productive ability to pay for itself. Farmers cannot compete with pension funds for land.
398.	Right now it would be impossible for someone out of high school or university to start their own farm without the help of family or friends. If the price of land continues to raise it will make it impossible for those with help to start farming.
399.	The large corporate farming model is broken. The family farm is the most effective model.
400.	Only if I were to sell of course or use the land for investment purposes.
401.	Obviously saying no increase isn't what I would want, (there wasn't the right choice) a gradual one that the farm economy can support would be ideal for farmers looking to enter and exit the market. The foreign investment adds volatility that wouldn't be beneficial over the long run.
402.	Land is priced beyond economic production.
403.	Personally would be much better off if price increased. Societally not so good.
404.	I cannot afford to buy land that is valued higher than its productive potential.
405.	The value of farm land should reflect productivity.
406.	We would like to sell to our children.
407.	I am 26 years old, and trying to make living grain farming. I bought my first quarter off my grandfather; I am looking to buy another at the end of the year. The land prices in this province are so inflated it sickens me. My land is in RM 128, where the going price for a section (640 acres) of land is in excess of 1.2 million. I ask the Saskatchewan Party how am I to make a living with land payments at that price? The Saskatchewan Party is killing the small family operated farms one by one. When I approach the old couples in my area to inquire about purchasing land they all tell me the same thing why do you want to get into farm? There is no money to be made, and you can't pay top dollar like the potash companies nor the out of country buyers. why would you take ownership away from the ones working the land I feel you guys want to make us serfs. these companies or out of country owners don't care for the land nor do guys that lease the land, people who own and live on the land are the best for the stewardship of the land, they care for it, how can't you see this? The Saskatchewan Party needs to look to Europe and learn how there farming operations are where the little guys are supported and encouraged. These family operated farms in Saskatchewan that are 10,000+ acres are not a family farm they are corporations. Also I am an electrician I work 21 days straight, this job alone is over six figures. I would give it up in a heartbeat to be on the land 24/7, but unfortunately I don't see this ever happening with land prices like this. I would love to hear back from a Saskatchewan Party representative.
408.	More equity different than the housing market.
409.	As a retiring farmer higher prices would give me more. But do I need more and do I want to grab more when I know that the purchaser, be it my son or another farmer, might be stressed or beaten in trying to pay off his debt. Of course, if I sell to a corporation I don't care if they get burnt, but I know too that they will extract painful rent from their defenseless tenants.
410.	Land would be affordable by young farmers if the land value decreased.

411.	If commodity prices stay in line with land values. The price is almost irrelevant but if land goes way up and commodities don't follow then economic crash for farmers is inevitable
412.	obviously if you own land an increase in value would be of most financial value...but it's not just about \$
413.	I will be passing land over to sons so market value will not matter.
414.	If I were to say it would benefit me. Then the powers that be will say let's sell out Saskatchewan it benefits the people!
415.	I don't need an increase in farm land to retire in modest luxury.
416.	Retirement looms. If my son chooses not to farm I will probably liquidate the real estate.
417.	Changes in ownership are what bring me an income as I work in the Real Estate industry. Changes may come from rising or falling prices but the size or number of transactions usually dictates our annual income.
418.	I am uncomfortable with the present value of farmland but realize it increases my net worth significantly.
419.	I have no plans to sell ...a drop in land price may give me an opportunity to grow. An increase in price would most likely end the succession of my farm to my kids.
420.	As stated earlier our land will be farmed by our family.
421.	Decrease for sure because I want it buy more and it would get land paid for quicker but if land is out of reach for a 10 quarters of land farm like me it makes it real hard it make enough to keep up with all the rising expenses.
422.	Stable land prices that keep pace with inflation are best for me and my neighbors. As a hobby farmer looking to build a land base I do not wish to compete with ridiculously high prices on marginal agricultural land and I also do not want to face a situation in future where the land I paid for with my hard work becomes worthless when the land investment bubble bursts.
423.	As someone who is just finishing school for agrology, purchasing farmland is not achievable on my own. Either the cost has to go down, I purchase a smaller or lower quality piece of land, or I purchase a piece of land with a parent as a co-signer.
424.	I wouldn't like to see a crash in land value, but rather moderation. A healthy business environment is one where we can grow. With land values where they are, farms simply put cannot grow a land ownership base without some serious financial risk. Let's take your house in Regina for example, sure you bought it for \$50,000 in the seventies and now it is worth \$400,000. That's an increase of 8 times. Now how about your kids looking to buy a house, what if the value was all of a sudden 8x higher again? They would never be able to own it. How do you feel about your kids not having the security of owning a house and having to rent for the rest of their life because outside forces have pushed the value out of their reach?
425.	To stay the same or decrease would benefit me. I hate to see it decrease as it would affect my ability to finance however, I could potentially be able to expand easier and compete more effectively with larger operations.
426.	I want to buy land to expand but simply cannot afford to do so.

427.	Would make it more accessible for the farmer to purchase.
428.	For young farmers we'd benefit from lower prices so we can build our dreams and farm like our last 3+ generations have before us.
429.	If we do not plan to sell no reason to have market value increase - taxes etc. would increase
430.	Land costs are too low for sellers and too high for buyers. If regulations for land ownership are left wide open retiring farmers will make a huge windfall which locals can't match. Land is the farmers' retirement plan. I want my neighbours and friends to retire in comfort. I would hope that they would want local farmers to farm their land.
431.	Our farm would be able to expand more easily, spreading our costs over more acres.
432.	I already own some land, have used it to finance my operation. If the price of land goes down, my equity will go down as well. It will also make it less expensive to buy land to expand. If the price of land goes up, my equity goes up as well, but any land I have the chance to buy will be more expensive. For me, the most important thing is that land prices don't increase or decrease rapidly. A slow, predictable, consistent increase would be best for me.
433.	Will be thinking about retirement in a few years.
434.	Price of crops should dictate price of land.
435.	I'm 24 years old. Moved a long ways from where I'm from. Cheaper land would be a huge benefit as I could consider more.
436.	Short term benefits differ greatly from long term benefits. An increase would have near term financial benefits only in terms of real-estate transactions which always cap out at some point because there is no actual product produced, just shuffling of money through transactions and leverage. Keeping market value affordable and accessible allows for new entrants to the market and innovation which leads to real and steady GDP growth over the long term.
437.	If i ever planned on selling. Which is Not an option
438.	<p>My answer to the above question is high commodity prices and low interest rate have inflated price more than ownership. The true margin in agriculture after all costs are calculated is very small. Some large farms work on smaller margins but also increase their financial risk.</p> <p>Retiring farmers who are seeking a high price for their land should be considerate of young farmers starting out. The retiring farmer was able to buy land at a price he could make money and run their business and not put young farmers in financial japery.</p> <p>I do believe in a competitive market amount farmers.</p>
439.	I would benefit form a decrease in market value since it would make it possible for more new farmers to establish themselves with the security of land ownership. It would also protect Saskatchewan residents from global market fluctuations that could result in the land being misused or mismanaged.
440.	Would benefit personally an increase but it is not just about what is good for us but what about our children and grandchildren. We have to be responsible for the future generations as well and if we want them to succeed we have to make sure things are viable for them.

441.	A decrease would make it easier for farmers to acquire the land that they require.
442.	Obviously if there was a decrease in value I would be able to afford to farm my land if I owned it and paid the mortgage off on it faster. Having the land increase in value only helps me if I sell it and I am not old enough to retire yet nor would I wish to sell the land to retire anyway.
443.	Can help the new farming generation make more sound decisions.
444.	I already own my land. My operational profit would likely not change but my net worth would jump. However, I would have to sell my land in order to take advantage of its new higher worth. If I sell my land, my farm size will decrease and my annual income would decrease (unless I rented back the land that I sold but rental availability and prices are uncertain).
445.	Cheaper values would allow me and younger people to buy farmland again. Buying farmland and cheaper values would allow for more expansion.
446.	But if farmland values increase too much, it will restrict young farmers. We need young farmers since they are our future. This will be a detriment to our small communities since younger farm families have children and support schools and hospitals in small communities.
447.	Increase help everyone even if you are buying the more equity the better I came through the 1980s and low land prices helped no one.
448.	Easier to buy.
449.	Market value is important but too high now, especially for young farmers unless you are a millionaire.
450.	It is to the point where very few can purchase farmland without major sacrifice. If farmland values increase any more, no one will buy.
451.	I would like to afford to get into farming.
452.	Depends on which way you look at it. Net worth would be up big so would taxes.
453.	If it was substantially decreased maybe my son and I could afford to enlarge.
454.	Want to buy - cheaper is better.
455.	I am a full time farmer. I have always made my living off farming. The problem is I must make a profit, with today's prices for farmland and input and the style of farming that is becoming increasingly difficult. And we have just had 7 good years, what if we enter a drought period.
456.	I could possibly expand.
457.	As a young Saskatchewan resident who will be inheriting farmland in the future, a decrease from the current market value of farmland would benefit me the most by allowing me to potentially expand my land base. At current land prices, I would be unable to expand without taking on an unmanageable debt load.
458.	I am still capable of buying farmland at the price it is now. If it decreased, that is just fine as well. Any higher, it will be almost impossible to make the payments at the stage my farm is now. My passion will be ruined.

459.	I am a young farmer and if the market were to soften it would give me an opportunity to build more of a land base.
460.	have already sold my land.
461.	Neutral - future inheritance may increase, but may create another barrier to my entry into the industry.
462.	As I am not on the retiring end of things I would be able to expand my land base if the land market value decreased.
463.	Increasing the market value of land that I currently own but have no intention of selling only benefits me in one way. That is my ability to borrow against that land. I currently can borrow more than I need or want so increased market value only serves to make new purchases more expensive or impractical altogether.
464.	Not sure how my response will be used and don't want my answer used to support change i disagree with.
465.	Only when the last tree has been cut down, When the last river has been poisoned, When the last fish has been caught, Only then will you realize you cannot eat your money.
466.	Land prices need to be based on production returns not speculation and speculators.
467.	I do not want to exit the industry or sell land, so the value of the land I own is immaterial to me. As I would like to purchase more land, high land values becomes a major obstacle to expansion of my farm.
468.	Like any investor.... This farm is our life's work.... It is our pension plan. We worked hard, on and off the farm to increase our farm assets, we lived on next to nothing for years. Now, as we near retirement, the value of this farm will determine our quality of life until death. Farmland values are not over inflated in Saskatchewan.... They are just finally catching up.
469.	Increasing the market value would close the door on us ever being able to buy more land. However, decreasing from where it is now would close the door on a lot of borrowing power, which we need if we won't be able to buy more land. We are more or less caught in the middle.
470.	Land has many different values - commercial, recreational, biological, spiritual are just a few examples. Land is rated as to what the benefits can be. So increasing the value of buying a piece for some type of farming means that the farming done on that land needs to compensate for the cost of the purchase as well as the farming costs.
471.	Market value is represented by the real estate agents ' assumption that land is a chattel. The fact is that without production records -- this may be a false assumption. So remember I mentioned a hail storm. What would the potential value of this years ' crop have been if the ice had been rain and the insured value not added to the calculation?
472.	If land was cheaper I would be closer to being able to afford to buy land.

473.	When I retire it would be worth more.
474.	This depends on land availability and future plans with next generation.
475.	Prices will prohibit our children from farming. Our rural areas will be more depopulated. Roads will have more holes due to heavy loads, communities will be ghost areas with many dilapidated buildings and junk deposits.
476.	At this point pricing is already making it difficult for farmers to be profitable in many parts of the province.
477.	We own land and we are looking to buy land so a stable market is most important. As it is in every commodity and business.
478.	THE MARKET FOR FARMLAND IS ALREADY IN A BUBBLE BECAUSE EVERYONE IS LOOKING FOR SOMEWHERE TO INVEST THEY HAVE NO CARE OF Land or care for employment etc. Keep the pension plans out of land ownership.
479.	As a young farmer starting out, lower lease and purchase prices would benefit me more.
480.	This would lower taxes on land.
481.	The question forces an answer built on a bias. Actually, I do know and I am sure; but there is no applicable option that allows me to say that. This is a close ended question without sufficient options. Food security is the core parameter affecting market value. Without addressing that issue in the question, it is moot.
482.	Current prices are definitely higher than the past but it does still provide a healthy return for older producers to exit the market. Plus without external competition land prices would be dictated by economic returns on individual farms and create a more realistic S/D for farm land based on the crop returns NOT investment returns.
483.	Plan on retiring in the next 5-7 years and likely selling the land.
484.	Speculation on land/foreign ownership of land will not benefit me in any measure. It is a loss of resources and tradition.
485.	I'm a young farmer and to compete with deep pockets of a foreign investor or investment company is extremely hard. I'm sure by the time I'm retirement age and wanted to sell, farmland will increase in value on its own without the foreign investment. It always has. I know I could never buy land for what my grandpa or dad did.
486.	Our farm has been for sale and offers received from local farmers does not come close to the 2x - 2 1/2x assessment that our land is valued at.
487.	trying to sell land in a market with not enough young farmers to buy
488.	As a future acquirer of farm land, I need a decrease in value. Currently, many areas of the province have seen land values increase beyond what is reasonable based on the land's productive capability.
489.	My family farm needs a decrease in land values so that we can make living farming.
490.	The land is overpriced & will not pay for itself .
491.	As one soon to sell, higher value means a bigger payoff.

492.	Who wrote this question? An increase if you are selling is the obvious answer.
493.	AT THE PRESENT SHARP INCREASE IN FARMLAND AND FARM INPUTS YOUNG AND BEGINNING FARMERS CANNOT AFFORD TO FARM .LOOK AT AVERAGE AGE OF SASKATCHEWAN FARMERS, IN 15 YRS WHO IS GOING TO FARM OUR LAND-WHO WILL OPERATE THE LARGE TRACTS OF INVESTOR OWNED LAND -WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO SASKATCHEWAN AGRICULTURAL TRADE AND FINANCES.PLAN FOR THE FUTURE NOT FOR THE PRESENT IF INVESTORS CAN MAKE MORE MONEY ELSEWHERE IN THE FUTURE WHAT HAPPENS TO THEIR LAND INVESTMENT .DO LAND VALUES CRASH WHEN THEY WANT OUT!
494.	I would be a buyer, not a seller, so I would benefit from a decrease now, and an increase later after more of the commies and socialists have fled to Alberta to destroy that province the way they did Saskatchewan for almost a century.
495.	Again I think about myself.
496.	I'm a small farmer looking to expand his operation so that i do not have to continue working off the farm to support my family. i need to grow in order to make it worthwhile farming full time.
497.	Life is far more than just about maximum short-term financial gain. Optimal life of the land should be the paramount guiding principle.
498.	Could afford to buy land.
499.	If an increase in out of province investment happens it will likely run up the land price. However that so often changes the dynamics of a community so the hidden costs are what I'm not sure about.
500.	We would like to expand as my sons would like to start farming but we can't afford to rent or purchase.
501.	Staying the same makes it affordable to consider the purchase of more land. A decrease would negatively impact out net worth and an increase would make it hard to purchase more acres.
502.	I am a farmland purchaser, so lower prices benefit.
503.	Want to buy land to farm, can't afford to compete with foreigners that have 10 family members joining funds and who's dollar is worth more, own thousands of acres and have no clue how to farm or care to try to farm it so they just abandon it.
504.	Outside investment would only be beneficial for farmers who want to sell. It makes it difficult or impossible for young farmers to begin or expand.
505.	As a producer a decrease in value would mean a decrease in current equity which would put many farms at risk. An increase in value would make it difficult to turn a profit above borrowing costs (at current market prices) of any new land purchases.
506.	I want to buy land, but there are getting to be much fewer opportunities where the return either in crop or carrying capacity (livestock) makes economic sense.
507.	I have interest in purchasing some for personal projects so cheaper land would be nice, but sable prices are just as important.

508.	My land will not be sold during my lifetime. My son inherits if I survive my husband.
509.	Decrease because we are young (under 30) and it is hard for us to purchase land at the value it is at right now.
510.	As a young farmer a decrease in value would give us more ability to purchase more land.
511.	Everyone who wants to farm would benefit to lower farmland values, doesn't help when there is an asset bubble that is not even close to the fundamentals of crop production.
512.	If only farmers were able to buy the land we would be on a level playing field.
513.	We are not interested in selling our land.
514.	It would drive up the price of farmland.
515.	Increase in market value would benefit landowner and it will benefit provincial government because most property taxes are calculated based on land value.
516.	<p>A decrease for us could well be better, as we are involved with buying and selling farms. A decrease in value will and is causing concern within the market. This in turn will cause more farmers to decide to sell, some of which could be pressure from financial institutions who may start to have concerns about farm balance sheets which could come under pressure through a lower land value.</p> <p>Therefore I believe if we see a decrease in value we will see every bit as much a problem as if we see and increase. As a matter of fact it may cause more land to come on the market, which in turn will give buyers more choice then ultimately a decrease in value.</p> <p>More investors will decide that they can get a better return elsewhere which again will start the cycle of lowering values. To the farmer the land is his life; to the investor it's just another investment.</p>
517.	Increased market value would generate equity for all people involved in farmland and would help the Saskatchewan economy hugely.
518.	As I'm looking to purchase farm land, it would be very difficult to do so if a company farm or a Hutterite colony simply comes to the seller with a far larger offer than what I can afford. We have already seen a number of local farmers refuse the offers of Hutterite colonies because they want to sell to local farmers invested in the community and even accepting lesser offers to do so. This should be entrenched in legislation as Hutterite colonies are based in Alberta and Montana, not here as they declare for ownership purposes.
519.	At keeping the current value we can still consider upsizing our operation.
520.	I may benefit personally but it would not be good for the farm economy. Farmers carry heavy debt now. The debt would increase as land prices increase making it very difficult to farm and own the land that is being farmed.
521.	In my current situation, increased value would only benefit me if I could buy land in an area where market value was much less or decreasing. However any decrease would also have a negative impact on the equity I have worked to build into my operation.
522.	If land values were more affordable I could farm full time, and not have to farm and have an off farm job, and have my wife have an off farm job.

523.	A decrease in market value would also decrease high rent prices. This would allow for more profit on rented land, but more importantly, make non-farming land owners consider selling rather than renting. For me, owning rather than leasing ensures my family farm for future generations. Carry on the legacy that I take so much price in.
524.	I own more land than I would be buying so I would be better off financial if land prices were higher.
525.	As stated earlier, proceeds from SK farmland sales are not necessarily reinvested in SK. Maintaining a healthy economy that includes agriculture is critical for the economic, financial and social 'health' of this province and it of its residents, the majority of whom are not direct beneficiaries of the agricultural economy, and in particular, proceeds from land sales.
526.	Depends if you're looking to sell or buy land. So long as farmland continues to rise and not collapse we should be in good shape.
527.	I'm not a farmer, but work as a researcher or teacher. This is a rather overly-simple question. Do you think people only of personal economic gain when it comes to how people envisage this province and its future?
528.	Farming is such a low margin business that is very capital intensive. The only way I see to make money farming is the appreciation of land values to enhance equity.
529.	I am a young farmer trying to increase my land base, but it's very difficult to do so when I have to compete with large corporations and pension funds.
530.	People have lost sight of the real value of land (all most are seeing is bigger acres equals bigger dollar signs, this is obvious). At current prices my boys will likely be living in Calgary, Regina, Saskatoon, like most others children while they both would love to live off the land. For people who are living rural every dime they make goes back locally, the land is mostly looked after and managed well. Today's large land stakeholders are not concerned about working with the neighbor, keeping their fences up , managing noxious weeds like leafy spurge- they feel it is irrelevant to their operations and an unnecessary expense they should incur.
531.	Already land is expensive enough. To purchase additional land it needs to be affordable. Commodity prices will not rise fast enough to afford new land and if they do rise, land prices will only further sky rocket.
532.	A decrease in market value of farm land should reduce the long term cost of food.
533.	I'm getting older and want to be able to sell it in the next 10 years.
534.	I am not planning on expanding my farm and may quit farming in the next five years
535.	Looking to expand to a small family farm as they used to be with a couple sections of land. This is the most productive and profitable per acre situation there can be and it gets families on the farms. With steady or slowly rising prices it enables young farmers to get involved.
536.	An increase in market value would make my land worth more but I could not afford to buy any more.
537.	If values rise, so does our equity. However, we are not and will not be selling so the value of what we own really doesn't matter much.

538.	At current grain prices with very good yields and low interest rates the purchase of farmland is still a good option given the ever increasing cost of land rent and the risk that comes with it. If land values held steady and growing conditions and grain markets remained favourable it would be live-able. Obviously some amount of decrease in values would be detrimental to the balance sheet of any farms that own land but it would also make it much more affordable to expand the farm.
539.	I would say financially, I would benefit from an increase, but then it would affect my ability to buy more farmland, possibly hurting any possible future investment.
540.	I am not in the market, and do not speculate on land. As for my son, a decrease may help but hard to say.
541.	Financially gain, I or We measure in some much more than money!
542.	As a farm land owner, I would benefit from an increase in market value.
543.	I'm not selling my land. It is for my daughter and then her children.
544.	In my position, slightly higher interest rates would go a long way to stabilizing the market. Maybe not so much money would be directed to ag.
545.	Short term or long term? If I ever decide to leave farming then yes it may benefit me. However if I decide to grow the family farm, it would not. We currently have a demographic in farming where the majority may be looking to exit. There are still family farms looking to expand in order to make the economics work, and leasing doesn't always work long term (risks involved).
546.	Due to my age I may have to sell in the relatively near future and who doesn't want/need extra money at that time.
547.	Right now I work for a financial institution. Farmers do not have a large margin to work with due to the high cost of land or leases. If the prices continue to increase these margins will shrink even further or drive up the cost of goods for the consumer which will impact every resident in a negative way.
548.	I'm trying to buy my first pieces of land, but I'm unable to compete with better backed farms and investors.
549.	I'm not farming for money. It's a family heritage I very much enjoy.
550.	Current land prices, even with recent increases, are affordable and would still be able to generate positive income.
551.	Cheaper land is always better as buyer but unless it is the true market value then the regulations are not doing their job, Farmland needs to be traded at fair value. The one place is near large urban areas and when farmland is rezoned for urban use. In some cases some farm land may need to be deemed for agricultural use only. Not sure who would decide this but in some cases it could limit the value of the property.
552.	Young farmer starting out that would like to buy land

553.	As we are not currently in the market as seller or buyer stability of land values suits our position and that of others in this position in the ability to make sound decisions on our future.
554.	I am a 58 year old farm, increasing land values has helped my financial position, I don't need extra help though anymore, the next generation does and we have crippled them with these higher land values. They need to rent as they can only buy one quarter. We had the system functioning well for the first century here in western Canada. Let's keep non-farm investors out of the farmland game.
555.	Market value should be based on the productivity and the capacity to make a return from the land.
556.	Am at retirement but if decreased would buy for the family.
557.	Cost of land is out of control. Unfortunately there will be some people hurt by this as they are borrowing against the inflated value of their properties.
558.	We are young farmers just starting out.
559.	As a young farmer a decrease in market value is very important in being able to grow my successful farming operation.
560.	I may be looking at selling my farm in the next few years so obviously an increase in value in the intervening time is to my advantage. But I like to think I also have an obligation to see try to see that the right thing is done for the greater good and for the future of a province which has been so good to me and my family.
561.	It would make it more affordable for me to own land. I'm a young farmer and I don't plan on retiring for many years.
562.	A decrease would allow me to expand because I could justify paying a more reasonable price. I hope to have enough equity in my existing ownership to be able to expand and buy more land for my cattle operation, rather than leasing.
563.	I could leverage my existing land base more to purchase more land if I wanted to. As my land is far away from a major population centre the value of the land will most likely reflect the agricultural value related to the rental rate possible or the productive capability of that land. Land that is purchased for recreation or strictly investment should be taxed more.
564.	Hard to make a living when it takes twenty years to pay for it.
565.	I'm borrowing against my land for expansion on my farm; this is why I like higher market value. But my son wants to purchase land and cannot afford the higher market value. We need land to level out. As Saskatchewan land values have been low compared to other provinces for many years.
566.	Not retiring so it doesn't matter.
567.	We do not intend to obtain gain by increased land prices as it is a working farm.
568.	Just let us catch up to the current price. if it doubles or triples, with the grain prices not doing the same it is only letting the companies that have alternative income- i.e. investment of some sort. Prosper and buy land.

569.	If I pay \$60/acre for rent that money is completely gone. If I pay \$60/acre for a mortgage 4% of the interest paid is gone. The rest is retained in equity. At the end of my farming career which way am I better off? Obviously owning land. Which regulations make it more beneficial for me to purchase land instead of leasing it?
570.	Today our farm competes with other counties around the world. Increasingly we are forced to compete with many competitive disadvantages, chemical purchases, and freight to ocean, excessive railway and exporter margins. We are captive.
571.	Only the super-rich can afford land.
572.	Make farmland more affordable to purchase. Would also make leasing more affordable because landlords looking at return on investment.
573.	Land is already expensive, making it difficult to expand operations. At the same time, I need to put retirement plans in place. The more my own land is valued, the more I will have to live off in retirement. My land is my pension; but I don't need excessive amounts to live comfortably.
574.	Long term STEADY increase in farmland value would benefit everyone the most. Short term spikes or long term stagnation (as we had in the province for decades until recently) is less beneficial.
575.	If the value goes up our equity goes up and thus our retirement fund.
576.	who can afford to pay more than 70000\$ for a quarter of land-- if prices continue to rise and interest rates increase, along with poor prices and dry conditions-- is setting conditions for a perfect storm- and with the dollars invested in agriculture today the bankrupt rates will soar affecting a lot of people in the industry
577.	Transfer to family.
578.	It would benefit us but I would forgo that if I could.
579.	Any land owner must reside within the Province of Saskatchewan.
580.	No change in the long run.
581.	This is a dumb question. Sorry. But what are you looking for here????? Of course I want to buy land as cheap as I can. And of course I want to sell land for as much as I can. But government trying to regulate this is insane.
582.	Limited supply management benefits all related markets, not just that of farmland. A healthy market benefits all of us.
583.	Possibly a slight decrease, but overall I would keep things as they are.
584.	More value more realistic expectation to produce the best crops.
585.	Easier to hit some more land to increase our land base.
586.	Naturally if you are a seller an increase in value is great if you are a buyer not so great. Land needs to be priced so that it can pay for itself. I have spoken to lenders and asked can you make the numbers work? In most cases not without backing from a retiring father who

	prepared to back the mortgage with either assets or cash. Do we want to risk a generation or two of our young farmers by putting them into debt? I recall what happened in the late 70s and early 80s. What would happen today if interest rates reached those levels? We need to be careful on what we are doing. The Federal Government allowed a foreign country to buy an energy company but said that would be the last deal of that kind. The Provincial Gov't stopped a deal on a potash company because there was no benefit to the people of Saskatchewan but our most precious resource (land) is being sold off and no one is paying attention. I welcome a call from the sponsors of this survey.
587.	I would have the opportunity to purchase more land. Have no intention of selling.
588.	If we do move off the land, and the children don't want to live here, obviously we would want a good price. However, I would not want my land to be sold for a factory farm or to be part of a huge enterprise.
589.	I would be able to expand.
590.	I'm not looking to have an increased value in my land as we do not plan to sell anytime soon unless Saskatchewan changes its laws on land ownership; if it changes for the worse; we will take out 100 year farming history somewhere else.
591.	The only way the market value of land will decrease sharply is if primary producers have negative margins for a fairly long period of time. This will lessen the demand to purchase or rent land. So if I don't make money for 5 or 6 years farming is that a financial benefit?? Only if I can survive through the tough times to purchase land when the price dips. So don't know/not sure I guess.
592.	I own my land, so an increase in market value would obviously benefit me the most.
593.	Naturally a decrease would benefit us as we are a small farm trying to expand and the competition for farmland in our area is fierce already.
594.	None of the options would benefit me as I do not own farmland.
595.	Cheaper land in turn puts more money in farmers' pockets.
596.	Lowering the price of farmland will create a favourable market for a young farmer like me to buy land.
597.	Up capital gain, down buying opportunity. What kind of child logic question is this?
598.	If I needed to I could subdivide the land, but mainly I want to leave my children something of value.
599.	Market value of the land needs to keep pace with inflation.
600.	This is a stupid question.
601.	It would allow me to purchase land instead of having to lease so much of it
602.	Economic growth in Saskatchewan is good for all.
603.	As a younger producer the money saved can be put back into my farming operation. Increasing my assets.
604.	While an increase would make my net worth look more attractive and allow me access to

	more financing, a decrease would enable me to purchase more land sooner.
605.	In the short term increased value helps when I would sell or my heirs sell. Problem is that is really bad social policy and the only way I can make a statement on this is keeping rent low and not selling. Fortunately I have no debt.
606.	Increase in value would mean farming is profitable, benefiting me. Decrease would mean less profit for my farm, but would mean more land available to expand
607.	If the land I own is more open to the worlds capital it allows me yo compete in the worlds trade markets
608.	The price of land in our area is currently very close to the breakeven point for making a profit growing crops when you factor in expenses.
609.	Personally increase in market value would be most beneficial but for the sake of the young up and coming farmer it puts them at risk to being never profitable and farming for 25-30 years. If all we do is send rent cheques to Toronto it doesn't help Saskatchewan. What is more important than my retirement is that the young farmers are able to be profitable farming operation and the #1 thing that effects this is how much one pays for land or rent.
610.	The long-term ownership of farmland is only viable by producers if it is possible to pay for the property they're buying. Other sources of ownership looking for a reasonable return on the investment. If there is no long-term consistent return on the investment that there will be no outside investment in the farmland.
611.	If I intend to buy, lower prices would help. Lower prices would bring down values and my taxes should drop.
612.	I am less interested in value, but I am interested in stable income.
613.	If we look to expand our farming operation, then obviously lower prices would benefit us.
614.	To a degree. Always repercussions.
615.	Locally-grown sustainable farming appeals more to me than just selling farmland to foreign investors.
616.	Obvious. Increase in land value would benefit financially.
617.	Let the next generation take over farming without being in the hole for life.
618.	The market value of farmland would have no impact on me financially.
619.	I'm looking more for best long term benefits to the land and opportunities for new entrants into agriculture.
620.	I want to raise cattle and to do so I need land and a decrease in farmland would help me purchase not only the land but the equipment needed.
621.	No doubt an increase would benefit me financially but that is not in the best interest of maintaining family farms in Saskatchewan.
622.	See above re: FARMLAND LEGACIES
623.	Higher land values equals higher rent.

624.	It's always about the \$\$\$???? I can make more for my farmland at times, but I will also pay more of the profit in tax... let's think beyond the immediate \$\$\$\$. What is sustainable for a healthy society????
625.	A decrease in market value would benefit those who are buying farmland but not as an investment.
626.	I own enough land that an increase in land prices would be a benefit if I was content with the status quo. However, overall I feel confident in my abilities to properly manage a larger acreage base.
627.	Since I purchased the land at a low price. It would increase my equity significantly.
628.	Kind of a redundant question. An increase in value benefits the economy also.
629.	We would benefit with higher prices on the land we already own, but we would also buy more farmland if the prices were lower (under the current ownership rules where pension plans are able to buy farmland).
630.	I am not in a position to buy farmland. Already too expensive.
631.	We could afford to buy land and the land would be able to pay for itself.
632.	I will never be able to afford these land prices, which is sad that a 5 generation farm could be swallowed up by a corporation that's just after a rate of return.
633.	I do believe the older generation of farmers who wish to retire should be able to get a fair price. But from what I've seen I cannot expand my farm with the current price of owning and renting land.
634.	A strong but even market will benefit all - as long as it is reasonable in relation to the productive capacity of the land.
635.	Would allow me to buy more land and have more crop and have more cattle.
636.	I am a young farmer trying to expand my operation. Current prices make it hard to expand, let alone if outside investment increases farmland value.
637.	Let the markets decide.
638.	I'm not asking for you to drop prices to give me a break. I'm asking for the marketplace to run like it has in good years advance, in the bad years decline as market conditions set. As in the past some farmers will adapt to always find new ways for their operations to grow. It's not right to have government set or change laws to open and close opportunities. When Lorne Calvert changed the laws it left every farmer at risk. The laws change only enabled retiring farmers to seek to quick dollar. Our local RM administrator put it this way. He saw local farmers who built their operations grow bit by bit by purchasing land and increasing their ability to make it thru tough times with the borrowing potential and spread costs over more acres. When this group wanted out they avoided how land normally sold to source foreign ownership or corporate money. The left the community to deal with events the never thought of and local schools to struggle. The youth of these farmer where chased of by the tough times and hate towards farming. Some have come back to farm, raise their children but now are facing increase competition and at times almost forced rental agreements. The investors don't spend money improving the area, there purchases, and worse don't control rodents,

	noxious weeds and aren't good neighbour's overall.
639.	Retiring but son couldn't increase land ownership. Prices are too high now if we have a market slump or a poor crop.
640.	As young farm it is next to impossible to expand my operation.
641.	Increased value helps everyone, buyers and sellers. The more equity the farmer has the better. Remember we are all investors Low land prices really helps no one I lived through declining values and that did not work at all.
642.	Cheaper land means the ability to expand easier. Allow leaves more profit margins.
643.	I own land and want to purchase... so net zero.
644.	No government can manipulate land value, economic cycles or wealth. Any person or institution that thinks they are bigger than world economics is very naïve.
645.	Land prices do not reflect the current price of grain, and taking into account weather related disasters.
646.	While a decrease would benefit me, I am indifferent to land prices. My main concern is that investors stop exploiting the land.
647.	I am young farmer looking to expand my farm so a decrease in market value would allow me to be able to purchase land more easily.
648.	This is our retirement fund.
649.	Grain prices will dictate the price of land not speculators.
650.	No explanation required here.
651.	A decrease would be better for me currently assuming that it will increase in the future again. This idea goes back to the simple idea that you should buy low and sell high. Since I am a young farmer that is growing and investing in my operation I am at the base level that would benefit from a drop in the market. There must be some rise and fall in the market of land and the corresponding prices of agriculture prices in order to spur new investment in different areas and to reward those producers which are more efficient.
652.	Let young farmers start farming.
653.	Dumb question! Have knowledge research here of no social value!
654.	Land in my area is fully priced as to its productive value.
655.	Incremental inflation adjusted increases are beneficial for the agricultural industry.
656.	I am looking to get more into farming and purchase more land so I can actually farm full time so a decrease in land value to where prices should be will benefit me
657.	I'm not a current owner of farmland, and so this question isn't relative to me.
658.	it is all about the production from the land rather than the one-time bump up in price. Think long term....
659.	a decrease would help more young farmers start to give them stability and help put people

	back into rural Saskatchewan.
660.	Increase value of farmland enhances the worth capital asset based to support high value specialty crops and state of the art field equipment / farming technics.
661.	This is a poor question, only applies to the retiring farmer. We are not selling so how could a increase or decrease affect us?
662.	It would improve our balance sheet but make it more difficult to continue farming. Who do we want to own the land? What is the objective?
663.	I hope to buy farm land to farm.
664.	Farmland values need to be sustainable so that for the grain that the land grows the land will pay for itself (or at least be closer to it like it used to be in the past).
665.	Learn to understand the cost involve in producing crops (food). Investing to increase market value does not provide a pension, money in the bank account and provide financial stability. Saying your investment is "outstanding" and then actually finding there is little monetary value unless land is sold needs to be addressed.
666.	Might need to sell.
667.	Our investment relies on the increase in the value of land, which on a global scale is cheaper than any other farmland available to the public for purchase today. Regardless of the price per acre, the value is still far below the relative value in neighbouring provinces and states, and must reach parity, or relative parity.
668.	As we refuse to ever let our land into the hands of large corporations. Land value will never be a factor for us. We will rent out to local young farmers whom are honest hard working Canadians.
669.	That is a complicated question. Financial benefit has many facets (capital appreciation, operational viability, etc.) Rapidly inflating land values is not completely positive, despite the increase in equity that arises.
670.	I own land so if values increase that would benefit me, but I believe that there are more important issues than money we need to have a thriving rural population which I think is harmed by ownership of farmland by investment groups.
671.	The price of farmland in my area has reached an unsustainable level.
672.	Of course an increase in market value would benefit our operation financially by increasing the value of our land should we wish to sell. However, we do not view land like stocks to buy and sell as the market rises or falls. It is rather a long term and possibly generational investment in our community, our roots and in food production.
673.	The land I now own is not for sale - at any price. City slickers in 3 piece suits do not understand. Farmland and ownership is what made Saskatchewan. DO NOT SCREW IT UP.
674.	My own land is still mortgaged so I do not have the equity to purchase land at current land prices.

675.	A decrease would mean i might be able to cover my land mortgage payments without the support of off farm income.
676.	Are farm is stable. My biggest concern is the future of rural Saskatchewan for my kids if ownership is not local. Investors are taking profits out of Saskatchewan and this is going to have a negative effect on growth in years to come.
677.	In my area land value is based on economic opportunity because there are local people competing for land.
678.	I would be able to expand my farm if land prices were more reasonable.
679.	Having retired we want to sell in the next few years as do a lot of my neighbours. Our children are not farming so we will sell.
680.	The land I currently own is an asset that is good it's worth more, but for future purchases I don't want inflated prices as cash is still king.
681.	This is a double edge sword.....there are pros and cons either way. Increase in farmland market values would make current financial statements appear healthier and therefore increase the owner's borrowing capabilities. However, cash is king and increased debt equates to increased risk. There is no guaranteed revenue stream in a farming operation....farming is subject to so many outside risks that producers have no control over....i.e. weather, commodity prices, transportation issues, input costs, etc. The fair market value of land should be based on its productive capacity, not on speculation in the marketplace by third party investors.
682.	Do to my limited capital cheap land might be affordable.
683.	It to ally depends on whether or not we take over the family farm (110 years old now) or sell our land in the coming years.
684.	I could expand the farm easier and not have to worry as much about financing.
685.	As a young Saskatchewan citizen, my husband and I want to peruse the ownership of more agriculture land to strengthen our business, but with high prices, largely due to people buying land as an "investment", it makes it hard to be able to afford to do so.
686.	Land is land. Still have to farm it.
687.	Obviously my land being worth more is a benefit as I own all, not rent.
688.	At the current selling price of land in our area the only ones buying land are those with a large base to subsidize the purchase or Hutterites who never will sell the land as it is a purchase by them for generation to come, so they are not looking at the ability of the land to make the payments.
689.	There would be an increase in tax to the provincial government but if foreign investment becomes the controlling interest they will tell us what to grow and we will lose control of our own environment. I have no idea who you are and who is reading this but you can be assured of the following. In the next 20 years: those countries that control their water and food production will have a better chance of surviving the growing upheaval in world economies.
690.	As long as interest rates are low high values are sustainable. One year of bad crops and higher

	interest would crumple a lot of outfits.
691.	There would be positives and negatives with both an increase and decrease. Increase would help to finance operations but hurt ability to acquire more land as it is already overpriced in my area. Would take 30 years of good crops to pay off if everything went good. Decrease would hurt financing at times but make acquiring land easier.
692.	I am more interested in preserving Saskatchewan farmland for future generations of Saskatchewan residents and Canadians than I am in any financial benefit I might receive from changing the ownership rules.
693.	Current land prices make it impossible to cover costs and make land payments.
694.	The quality of land where I live isn't priced at a level where I could pay it back without another form of income.
695.	With no plans of expansion in the near future, an increase in market value would make selling a more attractive option financially.
696.	Increases cost us more in property taxes, and make it harder for the younger generation of farmers/ranchers taking over. If you are just wanting markets higher to sell out, then it isn't good for the ag community at all. also the larger the farm, when it falls, it takes down the businesses around it too like the coops that extend credit to them....and injuring smaller farmers that need those coops to survive. With no future farmers being able to afford to farm, we have no food. Keep that in the front of all discussions.
697.	It really makes no difference to me as long as the land is not sold to non-farming groups and rented back to farmers. The value of farmland has exploded in price and young farmers can't compete with that.
698.	Stability in the markets just like said before we will set price same as we had done for 100 years prior.
699.	An increase would benefit every land owner/farmer.
700.	Moderate increase is best for the majority of our citizens.
701.	I think farmland is already higher than what is profitable. I recently purchased land that will take 20 years to pay for.
702.	We have 160 acres of pasture and hay land and that's all we want. The market won't really impact us until we go to sell in about 30 years.
703.	I'm currently not sure whether or not I should be selling my farmland. Therefore, I'm not currently sure if I'd prefer a decrease in land values, so I could expand my farm, if I keep farming; or if I should prefer an increase in values to benefit me if I sell my land.
704.	As a family farm, we never intend to sell the land so the benefits of a higher net worth is never realized. any farmer who retires and decides to sell it all usually walks away with wads of cash anyway, so somewhat reducing his departing net worth likely won't be as noticeable for him
705.	Farmer. The cheaper the land the more money there is to be made.

706.	May be able to buy a piece of land at a reasonable price.
707.	The lower price would make it easier to expand by reducing the amount of capital required up front and give a person the ability to pay for the land by farming or ranching on the land
708.	I am a young farmer and I can't afford to over extend myself or my family business to increase our farmland footprint.
709.	As a young farmer a decrease in the price of farm land would allow me to expand my operation.
710.	Selling.
711.	I do not farm, but my father does.
712.	Currently land values are not based on production. It has become a commodity on its own.
713.	As a Farm Realtor if land prices fall then the market is flooded with land and people over react and want to sell and exit or retire. As a result a lot more sales for myself.
714.	An increase in value 'sounds' good but not if you're sacrificing the future of the land; which will happen if the land is allowed to be sold to people who have no interest in the future of the land, just the now and the dollar signs.
715.	Plan to be selling land in the future but also I work at a financial institute. Land will be out of reach for local farmers if it continues to increase.
716.	We need more to live on every year.
717.	An increase means immediate financial gain but long term may mean the end for our resource.
718.	It's not always about the money. we must do the right thing not just go for the money
719.	Due to the fact that we are an established farm that owns land an increase in the value of land would increase our equity but will make it nearly impossible for the next generation.
720.	Don't own farmland, but the economic spinoffs likely would affect most people in the province.
721.	No change so you get a steady return on investment.
722.	Not selling so don't need increase, buying so would like to buy cheaper, but do need higher land values so my place is worth more when I take a loan (farm machinery and buildings) and show my assets are higher.
723.	Cheaper land means less cost per acre. Land prices are too high they need to cool off a bit but not fall of a cliff.
724.	We currently own some farmland in Saskatchewan but intend to purchase more in the future. A lower market value in the near future benefits me; however, I would prefer an increase in the market value over the long term (20+ years).
725.	Land prices should go with the ability to make a living and pay for the land, not paying big money and burning the land out to make money. So land prices can go up if farmers can still make money and keep the land in good shape, if not it should go down.

726.	My land would increase in value as would rents if i were to rent it out
727.	Hard to predict that as it depends if you are buying or selling. Of course a retiring farmer wants to see it increase so he can afford to retire but a young farmer buying is going to want a decrease so he has an opportunity to buy into some ownership. It's a tough decision no doubt!!
728.	I am interested in buying land.
729.	Our land is bought and paid for so when we are ready to sell, it would be nice to get a good price. That being said, we would not sell to out of country parties even if their price was the highest.
730.	Farmland is worth what it is worth, no more or less. Foreign money is only changing the situation if they think the value of the land is worth investing in. If it is worth investing in then Saskatchewan farmer's should invest in it and reap the benefits, or the foreign buyers should invest in it (and pay the Saskatchewan farmer's for it who own it currently) and reap benefits. Market price is market price.
731.	These are loaded questions. Of course an increase in farmland value would benefit someone financially.
732.	If I can receive a reasonable rent lease on my land I can retain ownership and pass it down to family that helps keep it Saskatchewan owned.
733.	Farmland value needs to be tied to productive capability of the land.
734.	Rental returns will always be reflective of commodity prices. Land value increases will be closer tied to world equity markets or alternate opportunity investments.
735.	Buy land and expand.
736.	As I have elderly landlords looking to sell me their farmland after years of renting, a decrease in farmland values would make it considerably easier for me to secure financing to purchase it. Since all I do is farm, I still need the land to be able to pay for itself and afford me to live and raise my family.
737.	Since I don't want to sell land I don't have a interest in a higher market value.
738.	Since we are not planning to sell our land it would not impact us at all.
739.	If I was selling an increase is best, if I'm buying a decrease is best. A silly question, depends on your purpose. I said no change only so I could advance!
740.	Would be able to expand farm size without having to compete with investors (cannot compete with investor groups).
741.	With this farm now moving to the fourth generation, we are in no position to be selling but need to be buying to maintain the farm as a viable independent operation for our son. When you pay \$2000.00 per acre for farmland, those who have seen the numbers financially know that the young farmers will be in trouble without farm values decreasing.
742.	Our land is NEVER TO BE SOLD!
743.	I might be able to afford to buy some.

744.	Had sold our farmland years ago, would like to invest in land today but values are higher than lease/rent rates so not sure it's a good way to generate cash flow.
745.	That way I could possibly purchase more to expand.
746.	An increase in market value would benefit me the most financially because I am getting close to retirement age but would be detrimental to our young farmers trying to get started in the ag industry.
747.	An increase in market value is great for the farmers trying to sell and retire. However, if the farming industry is trying to bring in young farmers to take over the land instead of huge corporations that only care about the money and don't give a sh:# about the land and the culture behind farming it, then they should look very closely at the situation at hand. If things go badly in farming the next few years, those corporations would just cut their losses and dump it all. Whereas the young farmers that grew up here, have lived through the tough times and know what it takes to make it through them. They don't quit very easily. It is scary to think that the people running our agriculture industry may not even be from our province and not care about Saskatchewan, unlike the people that grew up here and made a life here. Just a thought.
748.	I'm a young rancher trying to build a cow herd and a land base. Just trying to make a honest living.
749.	I plan to sell land. I would rather make less and have ownership remain within the province.
750.	the more my land is valued at, the more I can use the land as security when expanding.
751.	Need land prices to come down to afford to buy with all other input prices so high.
752.	It's already too expensive for many small farmers who have to take jobs on the side to pay for the farm. Parents can hardly pass the farm onto their sons as the sons could never afford it. Also, parents who built the farm and stand to gain a lot of profit due to rising land costs, may not be able to cash in on their retirement plan by selling their land because it is too expensive. Hmmm, perhaps the price of land in Saskatchewan should go down just a bit so both of these could still be achieved.
753.	My taxes would be lower.
754.	As a land owner holding land and a buyer of land i am looking for slow increases in the value of land. This would make the land a good investment but also make the land purchases financially viable.
755.	I bought most of my land at relatively low prices, and if prices were allowed to stabilize at a point that remains profitable with current commodity prices, then more land could be purchased. When land is allowed to be bought by investors or speculators with cash, then the true productive value of the land no longer influences the price of the land. This will always take away the chance for someone who needs to borrow the money to buy land.
756.	Since it is a family farm with no plan to ever sell and a need for expansion with the next generation splitting up land, lower prices would mean more production per dollar invested.
757.	Land needs to go down in value so it is easier for the next generation of farmers to purchase farmland and continue the tradition of farming that built this province.

758.	Would give you more borrowing power. A better retirement fund if you were actually selling. A decrease in market value would maybe help if you are turning it over to one of your kids.
759.	A decrease in market value would let young farmers enter the game. Look at the average age of Saskatchewan farmers. This is not sustainable.
760.	We do not need out of province or out of Canada investors buying our land. The out of Canada investors are already `sneaking through the back door and buying our land`. There is going to be a train wreck and we need to stop it now.
761.	We have two sons interested in ranching, but present land prices are far too high for them to get started in ranching.
762.	But I do not care about that compared to harmful effects for the long term of the province.
763.	Farmland should be valued by its ability to produce. Already it is over-inflated by NON SASKASTCHEWAN buyers (who don't have a clue about SK soil conditions and climate) or its production ability. It should not be an industry where it takes a 2nd job and 20+years to pay for capital costs such as land.
764.	Already land prices are inflated by Albertans and British Columbians who never got their money from waiting for timely precipitation. The land is basically being taken out of production from the SK farmers because these big dollar buyers expect big dollars rent! Unaffordable.
765.	Keeping the price of land within reason because the price of the product we grow still remains low and it's hard enough to make ends meet.
766.	As a land owner, an increase in value would increase rent prices as well.
767.	Of course an increase in market value would help everyone one a onetime sale only. What helps all of use or farmer would be a stable market for the products we grow on the farms. Keep the land local let's promote more family farms that are affordable and where owners have to live on a farm as well would be suit all and everyone. If you live on a farm and that is your main income your choices for the land become natural.
768.	Because I'd like to possibly buy land in the future. If I was looking to sell, I'd likely say the opposite.
769.	stability would be the best, coupled with less major upswings.
770.	I hope to start farming alongside my father within a few years of graduating from the U of S, and if land prices were to continue to rise the way they are, there is no way either of us could afford to get me started.
771.	I am interested in farming more land, not selling.
772.	Stable prices are best for everybody.
773.	Depends if we expand or not.
774.	I have some land that would increase in value but I do not intend to sell it so it's merely equity increase not an increase in cash flow which is the driver of true value. It may impede my ability to acquire more land in the future should land values go up but in either scenario it will not change my lifestyle or career choices substantially.

	I am taking the time to write this not for personal gain but to express my view as to what I feel is best for our economy long term as a province and as a country.
775.	Selfishly, a drop in land prices would greatly benefit me to return to being a land owner. Any person who has the passion for agriculture like I do is in it for the long haul and for a number of reasons that far more important and valuable than just money. It is extremely said when value of anything is only equated to money. With that being said, lower priced land would give me the opportunity to enter the marketplace, otherwise, I will not be able to realize on this goal.
776.	As a farmer I make a living by selling grain, not by speculation on land prices.
777.	I don't want to see my land decrease in value, however if it doubles again, selling may be a better option than expanding.
778.	Not selling our land.
779.	The guys exiting have to get their return; the guys getting in have to pay their dues. But why one should be pushed to the brink while the other sits on his pile of gold. Can't the guys getting out have a comfortable retirement at a fair return on their investment? While the young guy can still support himself and his family. None of these guys retiring expected to get 10 fold returns on their investments when they started out. And not to say I wouldn't be interested in some land even at that, however I as a young farmer can't be paying out of pocket for land. I need the land at a price in which it can pay for itself for the most part. Good lands still worth lots, and it always will be, threw inflation of the commodities grown or produced.
780.	A decrease in values would allow us to enter the farmland market and look at getting into farming. Although, this is unlikely to happen anytime soon. It's a dream.
781.	As long as farmland values stay within reason it is beneficial for financing for farmland to have a higher value as long as it is not overinflated to the point where financial institutions will not loan the entire value
782.	Of course, a person looking to purchase land would best benefit from a decrease in land prices; however, I can't foresee that even being a possibility at this point.
783.	As stated above, for a young farmer to buy land, they would have to work off the farm for their livelihood, because the farm returns would not cover the cost of the land.
784.	I am not an owner of farm land.
785.	We farmed for the past 35 years and are preparing to retire and thus will lease or sell our land.
786.	I own Saskatchewan farm land but I don't think it should be able to be purchased by large foreign organizations even if it may benefit me personally!
787.	Again.... a very tainted question. It is obvious what you want the answers to read to back up a decision that appears to be made already.
788.	As we are getting close to retirement age an increase would benefit us most financially, but is not necessarily the most advantageous to continue our community and province having young families in agriculture.

789.	Of course I'd make more money when I sold. But is life all about making money when you sell the farm and die? Perhaps for some.
790.	A decrease would be cool but if land could stay at current price I would like to see it stay here as I can manage at this price but it's almost at the threshold of being a land lord and serf system which is why my ancestors left their home land 105 years ago in the first place.
791.	I want to buy to farm
792.	I don't own any farmland at the moment, so it wouldn't directly affect me.
793.	Currently leasing 3 quarters of farmland, wanting to sell in the next couple of years and invest elsewhere in the province of Saskatchewan.
794.	Living by the lakes people pay 140 thousand for marginal land. And the assessment is maybe 26 thousand. They buy it to go quadding... But soon through mine or neighbors crop. I think assessment plus a certain value would be reasonable and restrictions on turning farm land into recreational land.
795.	Currently it is impossible to expand since foreign investments seem to be driving prices up too high.
796.	If a young farmer (younger than average age of farmers)wants to expand he must be able to have his investment pay for itself in his life time.
797.	More people would be able to buy land.
798.	I don't intend on increasing my rental rates beyond what my brother can afford to pay, regardless of market price.
799.	When buying land a decrease would be beneficial. If selling an increase would be beneficial, therefore, keeping it the same would benefit both parties equally.
800.	If farming was what it should be you should be able to put enough money away without selling the farm to non-farmers thus giving the hard work of the agricultural economy way to those who have not earned it. And once again would evolve to a feudal like system." REGRESSION"
801.	It would make farmland more affordable for those wanting to get into farming.
802.	If the value decreased some then it would make it more affordable for the average Saskatchewan family and maybe some of the bigger guys who bought at ridiculous prices would have to sell some!
803.	There needs to be a way for young people to start farming. Other than inheritance. The average young family can't be farmers without also working dual full time income... how can you be a good farmer while also working full time?
804.	While my land will increase in value adding to my financial portfolio I would much rather see things stay the way they are - the last thing my area around Saskatoon needs is more acreages or some foreign owned holding company speculating on further increasing land prices.
805.	Farmland prices have risen therefore the average price of land (pasture, grass & not cleared/bush) is higher & more unattainable.

806.	Want the market of the land to coincide with the production capability of our land. As varieties and gross margins gain over years then land will go up. But it should not increase due non-ag related investors/buyers or companies.
807.	Lower land privilege would mean it would be more affordable for me the farmer to purchase it.
808.	I AM NOT LOOKING TO BUY LAND AS AN INVESTMENT. ANY LAND I LOOK TO OWN WOULD BE TO FARM AND LIVE ON, NOT TO SELL. SASKATCHEWAN FARM LAND SHOULD NOT BE A SIMPLE "INVESTMENT".
809.	Would increase the value of pasture land that I currently own, however would make it impossible for new families to obtain land or able to afford land on which to make a living.
810.	I am a farm employee. The land that is worked now that would not change the same amount of workers would not change.
811.	An increase would make my current land worth more; however it would also increase any potential land that I would want to buy in the future.
812.	I rented land from a guy from Alberta and he wanted to sell at \$2150/acre. He picked up the phone and called Hudderites and they bought it. Now, they are essentially a buying group as they buy land together all over Saskatchewan. How do you compete with that? So now I'm down 1000 acres cause what does a guy from Alberta really care? If farmland price was lower given the risk taken, maybe I could have bought at a reasonable money making price. Not a buying group inflated price.
813.	Farmland values are what they are. Trying to manipulate or influence land values just makes a mess of the market. Land Bank is an example. The operators and owners set the value of land by how much they can make and supply and demand. Simple Economics 101.
814.	I am willing to forego unearned windfall profits for the long-term health of our farms and rural communities.
815.	We expect to neither buy nor sell in the next fifteen years so price fluctuations are not a priority.
816.	The less the value the more likely I am able to afford to purchase land.
817.	Let the market within Saskatchewan determine land values.
818.	Food security is a part of any nation's future. could potentially buy a large percentage for their own needs, and ship it out in containers while local mills go empty.
819.	This is a very hypothetical question: If I wanted to sell land it would be beneficial to have an increase in market value, everyone wants the most out of their investment. Those of us looking to retire could take this position quite easily. I believe however, that we must look further than our selfish interests and at least try to leave a thriving industry for the next generation. If I were to purchase land it would be more beneficial to see a decrease in market value. If commodity prices were to stay stable this would allow a better return on the initial investment and allow for easier repayment on a loan.

	The bottom line that Land Pricing should reflect the actual production value of the land and not investor speculation. Investor speculation creates a gross distortion of actual value!!
820.	That is a six sided question with no real way to answer it in one way. Increase good if selling, decrease good if buying, and no change is not a big deal also.
821.	Agriculture is a long term investment. There is no rapid return on the investment. The return is a gradual one that slowly occurs each year in a viable farm or ranch operation.
822.	As a potential investor an increase in prices now would not be in my favour.
823.	I could purchase more farmland and farm more land being more profitable, hence paying more local taxes to our province and country benefiting everyone that lives in Saskatchewan.
824.	Already sold so would not affect us.
825.	If you take a myopic view as an individual the choice is obvious but if you look at rural communities it's not that simple.
826.	The market value of ag land is going to increase no matter who buys it; the demand is always going to be there. I would rather have the price set by farmers rather competing against foreign money.
827.	Increasing equity is what everyone in every line of business strives for. Why should farming be any different than any other business?
828.	Currently interested in purchasing land, so if the market value went down right now that would benefit us.
829.	I no longer own farmland.
830.	As someone who would like to soon take over the family farming operation I would like land prices to remain relatively stable. Foreign ownership does not benefit Saskatchewan or its farmers and should not be allowed.
831.	Don't think the increase in value of land should be top priority.
832.	I am a young farmer trying to purchase land but the land cannot support the value of it.
833.	I have farmed and I have seen prices go up and down, a decrease will hurt everyone (including the young guys trying to borrow money from reluctant bankers.)
834.	If the cost of land was less, I would likely start a small farm.
835.	Like any other business I should realize the value of my investment to the fullest. It's a business the same as any other business. There are no restrictions on owning a business and selling it at its max value why is farmland any different. Current owners should not have to subsidize future or present farmers as it is no different from any other business (it's no longer a family farm and it think it's time to keep that in prospective as we are not back in the 1950's).
836.	Obviously since I own farmland I would benefit from an increase in value as that would increase my borrowing ability and the eventual resale of the land, no brainer. I would still like the values to reflect the ability of the land to support the cost and still make profit for the farmer.

837.	This is because I'm nearing the end of my farming career. But I've had the benefit of farming my whole career on cheap land, and neither need to sell or lease out land to have a comfortable retirement.
838.	Farmland has reached uneconomical values.
839.	I believe that the price of land is somewhat fair today. I am not intending on selling land in the near future.
840.	Common sense would tell me that increased values will always have an indirect favourable spin off to the rest of the economy. "When the farmers have money, everyone wins"
841.	It would mean less risk.
842.	As an owner an increase in value is an obvious benefit. I am not considering buying land at this time; it has already priced itself past its productive value.
843.	I would be able to acquire more land and, therefore, produce more products for the same input costs.
844.	It's not just about financial benefit .we take pride in the stewardship of our grassland. An absentee will not care. To them it's just real-estate. Do we want Saskatchewan to be barren of people, wildlife, scenery, etc. or young families staying here to make a living and take care of what's here.
845.	We do not expect to buy or sell land now or in the future; our son will inherit the land when we are done with it. However we have concern for other young people in Saskatchewan who wish to be land owners and we hope land will be within their reach financially.
846.	A person always want more money, but not at the expense of foreign investors.
847.	N
848.	To have land for the next generation to own and farm benefits the people of this province. Once we do not own it we have no benefit it is no longer ours.
849.	Not buying not selling.
850.	Increase at a pace the allowed young farmers to own the land.
851.	Not everything is about \$. I hate your government. You are ruining this province. The End.
852.	Really?
853.	I own two quarter sections of farmland which I rent to my son and that will continue as long as he wants to farm or until he can afford to buy the land from me.
854.	I want to buy, but can't afford it, so a decrease would help me.
855.	I would like to see farmland bought and sold between local farmers so the price reflects the productivity and profitability of the land.

856.	A hugely complicated question for which I have no definitive answer. There are pros and cons for all of those scenarios. We simply need to adapt to which ever scenario comes to pass.
857.	If land decreased in value then I would have more of a chance of purchasing or have affordable rent thus allowing me to have cash to purchase goods and services which are produced or manufactured in Canada. Would be able to ensure we would food security for future generations.
858.	I want to buy land, starting up is nearly impossible this day and age without the help of any kind of inheritance.
859.	A small decrease in farm land value would help (15%).
860.	It feels like this survey is collapsing the responders' ability to offer an opinion. What thinking person could not answer this question affirmatively??? Yet, knowing that increasing the value of farm land will benefit individual farmers, presumably by allowing foreign ownership, does not mean it is the right alternative for the industry.
861.	Maxcrop inflated the price in my area. It is nothing more than a scheme. They contribute nothing to our communities' schools, churches and recreation. They continue to live in Vancouver, Ottawa and Toronto. Meanwhile our rural communities will continue to die.
862.	Son wants to farm both grain and beef. If he could purchase he would buy more land. My wife also works off the farm if we could purchase more land she could give up her job for someone else.
863.	Not looking to buy massive amounts of land and not planning to sell any.
864.	I'm the first generation off our farm, so I was only raised partially on the farm. I do not own, nor am I entitled farm land.
865.	Do not plan to buy or sell land.
866.	Land needs to remain affordable for small and medium scale SK farmers. It is important that exiting farmers get a fair value for their land, but foreign ownership is not the solution. Also, the current price of land is a deterrent for young/ entering farmers. An increase in the price of land would worsen this situation. We need to encourage rather than discourage young farmers.
867.	Not a fair question. We all know that an increase in farmland value helps every farmer, but as I just stated some areas will not increase that much, compare that to the future implications this will bring to our young people we will all be better off if it stays in the hands of those that want to farm it.
868.	Value will go up therefore increased market value.
869.	N/A
870.	I am still looking to buy farmland so I would like the price to stay lower. Long term I would definitely like to see farm land value increase.
871.	Giving to my daughter.
872.	Inability to expand, having land costs (lease prices) determined by misinformed owners forcing good business people out of the business and this will spill into other segments of the

	industry (i.e. suppliers, service providers, etc.).
873.	I'm looking to expand, lower land price is beneficial.
874.	Ideally in my situation cheaper land would help to expand.
875.	A decrease in market value would encourage another generation to continue the core activity that has made Saskatchewan such a great place to live and work.
876.	Land is only "worth" its potential productive value. Investors have learned this the hard way in the past, and will again learn this in the near future.
877.	Most owners want 5% of market value for their land. Land rent won't follow the farmers' ability to pay.
878.	Land prices are to the point already that an average farmer can and should not be buying.
879.	Canadians do not want to return to the feudal-serf system of their ancestors. The ability for future generations to buy farmland is important. An artificially-increased "market value" will not benefit future generations of farmers.
880.	Not planning on selling any of my farm land.
881.	As we are closer to retirement and will be leaving the farm, an increase would be beneficial to not only us but our three non-farming children. We are not interested in subsidizing the farming children of families at the expense of our own children's and grandchildren's inheritance as well. As a comfortable retirement after many trying years on the farm. This only makes complete sense of course.
882.	would like to farm full time but can't find the land to do so, young farmers already have a tough time getting started, opening up to foreign investment will kill the Saskatchewan way of life.
883.	Price of land doesn't affect me financially.
884.	I am a relatively small land holder; as an aging farmer I will need to sell and move to a town or city where housing costs are extremely high.
885.	Having 2 sons that are continuing the farming tradition, I would be better off if they can afford to farm and expand as necessary. This would allow them to continue to pay for the land and equipment they have purchased already, some directly from me.
886.	Increases are always better We all need more equity in our farms.
887.	Both would have an effect the land i own would be worth more but it would also cost more to purchase new land.
888.	I own land and will not sell but want to see a good value to keep me interested.
889.	Promote the family farm. Strongly feel the 10,000 acre farms are really not "farms" but just corporate business deals. This only brings about more expensive machinery for one thing.
890.	We want no change we want our farmland to stay with the farmers in Saskatchewan. We won't nobody to take this away from us.

891.	Less destruction of 'marginal' land would be an asset to all of us. Filling our pockets with, quick make a buck, lack of protection of the land itself, is the wrong direction entirely. And should be criminalized.
892.	If we continue on the path we seem to be on; then intergenerational transfers of farms become impossible.
893.	Of course as a retire farmer / landowner my net worth would increase with increased land value. However that doesn't necessarily mean it would be good for the industry or other active farmers.
894.	There is enough completion between farmers without bids from pension plans from outside our province.
895.	If land was a little cheaper perhaps I could buy more grazing/hay land.
896.	Current values are inflated.
897.	I grew up on the farm, and I'd love to start myself. But people just can't afford to give a farm to the next generation. When I was growing up there wasn't much margin in farming, but enough to get by with a second income. Now all those people are getting close to retirement, and have had some of the best years they've ever had. This along with the increase in farmland will allow them to retire well. This is very fortunate for them! But of course this means they need to sell to someone able to pay market value. This means I likely may never be able to catch up.
898.	If the value increases so does my net worth. If the value increases so does my risk increase with regards to the capital I need to spend to acquire more land.
899.	I am a young farmer wanting to expand my land base. I need to purchase land to grow my farm. Owning farmland is crucial to the stability and profitability of my farm. Current land prices are highly inflated because of non-farming interests. These high prices prohibit my ability to enter the land market place.
900.	There is always a fluctuation in values depending on the quality & quantity of agriculture commodities, prices go up in the good years and down in the bad years slight changes are good violent changes are not good.
901.	At the point in my career I would like to purchase more land but at today's prices it makes it difficult to do so.
902.	I am not currently a buyer or seller of land. The value of the product being grown on the land will have a much higher impact on Saskatchewan than who owns the land.
903.	I farm leased land. If the value drops, it possibly reduces my expenses or possibly reduces the risk of increased expenses.
904.	Of course, there are pros and cons to both increase and decrease in farm land values. If ones owned land increases in value, your farm benefits from financial strength and security; however; it becomes more difficult to increase the size of your owned land base. When land values increase too much, the feasibility of purchasing land, and having it pay for itself through farming becomes an issue.

905.	I want to buy land. Cheaper land the more I can buy. Or help from the government. Help the young farmer out but help the old farmer out so they can retire.
906.	At retirement age any increase in values would be beneficial if selling. Incidentally it would also increase tax payable if selling. With economic situation in province now can government take less?
907.	I own land but would not sell, will rent it out if I quit farming.
908.	I need more information to make a rational decision.
909.	Isn't that obvious to those who prepared the questionnaire?
910.	If land price went up my profitability would also have to go up. Just because my net worth would increase it doesn't mean that I have more \$.
911.	Land has become so expensive that it is difficult for many farmers to purchase it so I hope that there is a correction resulting in lower land prices. That may impact the interest of pension plans and other investment corporations. I am very opposed to foreign ownership of Saskatchewan land. Otherwise I am okay with the Saskatchewan land ownership rules - I am not in favour of a lot of rules.
912.	I am trying to purchase/rent land to increase my farm size but cannot because the prices offered by investors make it impossible buy/rent and pay for it.
913.	Just want to farm and maybe grow my farm and make a good living for my family. What would be best for Investment company's increase or decrease? How much did we spend on this question?
914.	We are in our fourth full-time crop year. We have a succession plan in place with our parents to purchase the family land at a decreased rate. If we were to pay market prices for the land, we would not be able to take over the farm. We also had the opportunity to purchase three additional quarters of land from a neighbour. She again gave us a decreased rate compared to the current market value, as it was important for her to see that the land was taken over by a neighbouring family. If the only concern is economics and driving up the market value of Saskatchewan farmland for investors, family farms will continue to drop off as profit margins narrow in the farming industry.
915.	They both benefit us. Depending on if looking at our financial statement. Buying. Selling or leasing. The big picture is we all want our land to be worth more however at what cost.
916.	I already own some land so it would benefit me now , but will stall the farm out from growing.
917.	Prices are relatively high here but as long as no wild increases are seen then it remains affordable.
918.	I have nothing to gain or lose but rural Saskatchewan will continue to be the big loser as populations decline. Services become harder to get and in turn the highway decision makers

	in Regina further justify not repairing the highways.
919.	Don't plan to sell.
920.	As I only own 160 acres, a decrease in market value would increase my chances of buying more land. However, in the long term it would affect me negatively as I most likely stand to gradually take over 3500 acres from family.
921.	Naturally a decrease in the market value of farmland is preferable however the reality is that the market value of farmland should be based completely on the lands ability to produce a profit for the owner over the long-term. Volatility in agriculture, both grain and cattle, dictates the profits that can be reaped from any type of agriculture land. The market value of farmland should reflect fairly the long-term value that the land is able to provide for the use it is being put to. Consequently, purchasing land when agriculture is lucrative for a very high price will most likely result in financial hardship later on when agriculture becomes a financial challenge. Short-term vision on long-term value only leads to serious financial hardship in the long run.
922.	Own 1/2 our land, if market value goes up. So does the value of our land.
923.	Of course, if I was only thinking of myself, I could already get very good money for our land, but money is only money. When it is gone, its gone. Farmland keeps producing food. We need food to live. I also know that the assessment of farmland is related to the distance from a city, and only partially related to productivity. In our area, the price is determined by demand and non-farming people are already just using it as an investment tool, thinking the prices will continue to rise and bring better returns than money invested through financial institutions. For some in outlying areas, this does not apply, and their land values rise more slowly.
924.	A decrease would allow me to be able to purchase land to allow my son to join the farm.
925.	We own land so to have the value increase means the value of our farm increases.
926.	High prices equal high rent which equals lower margins and no equity.
927.	A decrease in farmland value reduces the operational costs of real farmers and opens expansion opportunities. An increase in farmland value increases financing burdens on expansion or leasing, increases risk, and squeezes margins. Some farmers will eventually be squeezed out and forced to sell. Sure, those on the business of speculation will make a killing on everyone's expense. Our food quality and price will go downhill as the resulting oligopolies will control the market.
928.	A slight decrease or a levelling off in land selling price would benefit me. A large decrease would cost me equity and make financing difficult.
929.	I do not own land.
930.	I plan to give my land to my children.
931.	I might actually be able to afford to buy my grandfather's land.
932.	I am close to retirement.

933.	Our plans are set there will be no selling off, so the value of the land is secondary to me, the practical and fiscally responsible transfer of land is primary, it enables younger farmers who are descendants of our pioneers.
934.	Steady, long-term growth is fine. Massive spikes and volatility only helps speculators and those who don't care about the land other than owning a quarter section for the fun of it.
935.	If I am looking to buy I want the lowest price, but that also means my return is likely lower. Stable prices are easier to plan on.
936.	Land is being overpaid for. Marginal land is horrendously overpriced and simply because all any investor sees is the price and have no idea what they're purchasing. Good land is worth high prices. They don't know the difference.
937.	This question misses the point. What will benefit everyone in the long run is an open market on farmland that buyers and sellers can participate in as they see fit. As of now the growth in agriculture is greatly restricted by these rules and the ability of local farmers to raise capital to acquire more land and equipment. New investment in irrigation and other innovations to enhance productivity will not be forthcoming as a result. Investors will go elsewhere and they have.
938.	A decrease in the value of farmland would put less pressure on the cash flow and debt serviceability of my operation as I continue to strive to increase my owned land base. While my balance sheet looks better with the increase in land values, my balance sheet does not pay the bills. And with the possibility of passing the farm on to the next generation, there is a very good chance the increase in land values will never be realized by me anyway.
939.	The market value of farmland has little to no effect on my financial situation.
940.	What is "benefit" in this scenario? Lifestyle and satisfaction for work well done does not have a monetary value.
941.	You don't want to control the price of farmland. If you can't compete against your neighbours to buy land, you don't deserve to own it, but if you are competing against multi-millionaires from other countries it is not fair. Many of these people from other countries do not care about our province, its economy or the future of Saskatchewan....all they care about is owning land!!!
942.	As a rural resident for many years, I am confident that when agriculture is booming, so will the local economy and I will benefit from this reality.
943.	There does need to be competition. But we as Saskatchewan residents should not have to compete against foreign investors who are willing to pay a big price just to own land. Many of these investors have little farming knowledge and want to own large amounts of land, only taking from the land and not giving back to it.
944.	I want to grow my operation, so I want to buy more land.
945.	Sure the price of land would go up but how will it benefit communities. The need for big profits already trumps the need to manage the environment effectively to prevent environmental degradation. Extensive ditching of wetlands is a serious problem. The uncontrolled use of herbicides and pesticides is another.

946.	I would be happiest with a decrease, but a stabilizing market would be more realistic and I could live with that.
947.	Decrease would make expansion more affordable.
948.	I could possibly afford it!
949.	Should not look only at financial value. There is also community value, social value and sustainability. Very few investors and pension funds purchase a hamburger at the local hockey rink. And none of their kids play hockey in that rink or set roots on the farm to keep the community alive.
950.	There is no incentive for a farmer or investor to invest in an asset which has no potential for growth. Equally only a fool would be content if the value of his land was kept depressed. It is a proven fact that Protectionism distorts markets. Protectionism is also a denial of Constitutional rights and thus has no place in a modern economy like Canada.
951.	I would benefit by increasing my farming land base, a lower farmland market value would help me to increase my farming land base.
952.	As an owner of farmland my short term interests would be best served by seeing the price of farmland increase. As in the response above, should my short term financial interests be more important than the long term economic interests of the people of this province. In my opinion the answer is a definite no.
953.	Majority of farmers are incorporated and making huge sums of money. They can afford to pay. This is not 1950.
954.	If trying to sell, an increase is a financial gain and benefit. It provides collateral for those seeking to borrow money to maintain their farming enterprise. There is no financial benefit for those who've passed on their land to the next generation.
955.	With the pending transaction of farmland from us to our son, a stable market value would benefit us both. What Saskatchewan needs is more young farmers, not necessarily big farms.
956.	A decrease would give me the ability to start my children off on their own farm.
957.	We are hoping to buy the family farm and would ideally like to expand it; however, with the market where it is in our area it will be very difficult for a young couple/family wanting to get into the farming industry.
958.	Any increase in market value will benefit me personally but it will not benefit the province if I take the profit and move out of the province.
959.	Don't own much at this time. Would by some if it was cheaper.
960.	Any dramatic increase in land values would hurt young Saskatchewan farmers entering the occupation.
961.	Make the land more affordable for the local and young people to purchase therefore keeping

	them in the area otherwise they will go elsewhere and all our rural communities are dwindling already.
962.	We are looking at current high values of commodities. What is going to happen when things go bad as in the early 2000s? I heard of renters approaching the landlords and asking them how much they were going to pay them to work their land?
963.	If I am a land owner and I wish to expand, if my assets are decreasing then how can I possibly borrow monies from the bank to buy more land.
964.	More farm land would be affordable for young beginning farmers and they would have a much lower risk involved.
965.	We need to be able to compete with the big land owners who have the resources to buy up anything that comes for sale. That only benefits their greed and does nothing for young farmers or communities.
966.	Not applicable... I am not a farmland owner.
967.	I would be more able to purchase land.
968.	If a decrease in market value makes it more affordable to produce food will it make my food cheaper? It will also make it affordable for me to purchase.
969.	Unlike other careers which have a pension fund for retirement i rely on the value of my land.
970.	I would like to meet some people that want to sell their property for less than its worth doesn't make much sense.
971.	As a farmer supporting the next generation the choice is obvious.
972.	If land money value decreases then the ag industry has hit some hard times. If land money value increases then inflation has gone up.
973.	Trying to get the next generation of farmers going is impossible when have to bid against oil money and out of country investors or government investment.
974.	Because I plan on expanding and it makes it so that the land can pay for itself in years of bad weather and/or poor market prices.
975.	Our society has become GREED and MONEY oriented with zero attention to production capabilities. Some land prices move the repayment into the multi-generational farm ownership time line which extends debt.
976.	I am not going to sell my farmland. My children will use the revenue off the land
977.	Reasonably priced farmland is good for everyone. Forcing farmers to compete with outside investors could and will create instability in farming as we saw in the Devine era. Farming is a renewable resource that needs to be protected for our children's future and not some investment opportunity for off shore billionaires who seem to mine resources until the next good thing comes along.
978.	All farm costs are going up. It would be nice if at least one expense would drop to allow young farmers who actually care about Saskatchewan to stay and farm in Saskatchewan.
979.	Keeping the family farm affordable.

980.	I do not wish to sell my land. I definitely would not sell to corporations or out of country buyers. It has always been a great investment for me.
981.	Because we have 3 sons that would like to farm in the near future, the increase in market value would restrict their ability to buy land and get established. What would be good for me as an exiting-farmer, it would not be good for my sons hoping to start.
982.	This is a ridiculous question for a farmer who wishes to remain farming for the long term,.
983.	We have considered buying more land but can't farm it and make a profit at these prices.
984.	An increase in value would make it more difficult to acquire new land, but would allow an increase in owned capital assets. A decrease in value would result in the opposite effect.
985.	While an increase in market value benefits any owner, excessive increases are bad for persons wishing to enter farming.
986.	An increase would benefit us in the short term, a decrease would benefit in the long term if we could afford to buy more.
987.	A more respective and unbiased price that is not influenced by the recent profitable years in farming and take an average view of previous crop prices would give a better influence on farm land prices. Land prices are inflated now because of outside investments that have no tie to the land or farm practices.
988.	As a younger individual starting out farming land is a large part of my expenses. To see this go down would allow me to purchase more land as I plan to do.
989.	This is a loaded question.
990.	Not looking to sell.
991.	The value of land is high, and it is a high risk to farm it. Climate threatens the land yearly. The value of the land is a suitable price for this risk.
992.	I wish to purchase farmland when done school, but won't be able to if the price drastically increases as I will already have debt from school.
993.	Obviously it would benefit me and my family. While that is good for me I want what is best the next generation of farmers.
994.	Looking to purchase land in the future.
995.	I am currently in a seller's market. If I were a young aspiring farmer looking to increase my acreage, my answer would, of course, be different.
996.	Since I want to buy land and I will have 6 years of student loans to pay off, it would be nice if it was cheaper
997.	I am a smaller- midsized farmer, if land values reflected a relationship to the actual earning potential of the land I would likely slightly expand my operation.
998.	Land price is getting so high there is no profit left in farming. It is way too risky to buy land at these high prices.
999.	As a farmer considering retirement an increase in value would benefit me personally, but an

	increase in value would make it hard for my son to expand.
1000.	To be able to afford to purchase more farmland.
1001.	As an owner of farmland, it is of benefit for my land values to increase; however, if they become superficially inflated due to people buying land for investment reasons, it could be detrimental to the agricultural industry. The market value of the land should reflect the income that the land can produce from agricultural activities.
1002.	We are always looking to acquire more land as our 4 generation family farm is becoming larger but it is quite hard to do so with the price of land at the moment.
1003.	CPP is currently a legal farm investment - keep it that way - it's ours!
1004.	A decrease in market value would make it more possible for young farmers to acquire land and increase their earning potential. The current trend toward enormous farms does not benefit small agricultural communities socially - and those small communities are rapidly disappearing. Large farming outfits purchase machines and services from cities to obtain better prices. This affects the small communities economically.
1005.	Looking to buy.
1006.	Because I am looking to break into the market an increase would put off me purchasing the land whereas a decrease would help me buy more, but if the land stayed the same price wouldn't be too bad.
1007.	While people like me will benefit greatly from increased land values, the opposite will be the results for other farmers purchasing the property.
1008.	I am not going to sell in the near future so value is only a number on a piece of paper. Younger farmers could borrow more if the value of their current assets were to rise. I do not feel this would be advantageous for them.
1009.	We would benefit if the value went up and we were in the market to sell which we are not.
1010.	My balance sheet is heavily weighted to liquid assets.
1011.	With stable farm families gives a stronger direction to Saskatchewan's economy. More diversity takes away from stream line profiteering.
1012.	I do not currently own farmland.
1013.	I don't own or intend to own farmland.
1014.	Of course it would increase the market value of farmland! Any farmer not interested in preserving a heritage farm would be glad of an increase; however, those wanting to maintain our Saskatchewan heritage farms and all Saskatchewan farmland would rather it remained affordable for Saskatchewan farmers. The government of Saskatchewan should regulate it so that there is NO foreign ownership allowed of Saskatchewan farmland!!!
1015.	Cost of food may increase.
1016.	Land values today are above what the land can generate. How can I get a mortgage for something that cannot pay for itself? I have to use profits from somewhere else. This can't continue.

1017.	Obviously, and increase in farmland values looks better on our balance sheet. However, if the value of the land is higher than the productive value, it must be subsidized. Is that where we are headed? No other industry would overpay for a capital asset, only to have to subsidize that asset from somewhere inside or outside of the operation.
1018.	Farmland payments have always been one of the major expenses for us; we spent most of our lives paying for land. When you sell the farm it is an advantage but if you are trying to pass the farm onto the next generation it has to be affordable to them too. The ridiculous low interest rates set by the government have driven inflation to ridiculous levels and make it very difficult to retire as you get next to no interest on money you put away for retirement.
1019.	Farmers aren't stupid people. We have to run our businesses based on our income/expense statements. The cost of growing food has increased dramatically and we have to be financially fiscal to survive. If we have absentee landlords and the bottom falls out of the market, cycles we have seen before, who's going to manage all this land?
1020.	I don't know if i would benefit either way but if it were to decrease or stay the same i may be able to afford some sooner.
1021.	We own enough land that it would make the most financial gain.
1022.	Would help me but not young farmers in the area.
1023.	That is a ridiculous question. Obviously we want land prices low for buying and high if we are selling. Since land prices have rose institutions are lending more then what the land is worth. The land has to pay for itself. What happens when commodity prices fall or we have a drought...
1024.	An increase in farmland prices is disastrous for the young generation of family farmers. It only benefits retiring farmers. We must choose a compromise if we are going to maintain the family farm.
1025.	Decreasing value would enable resident farmers to expand and keep the money at home.
1026.	It would benefit me mostly with an increase in market price but due to our farm now into the 5th generation with the land base handed down to the next generation I have no intention of selling the land.
1027.	Of course, my land is my most valuable asset, but what would benefit me the most financially may not benefit me or my community in the long run. Money is just money - it can and will disappear eventually. The land and its value, and its productive value is always there.
1028.	Land is priced to high now to be able to buy and produce a crop to pay for it. Land here is being bought by people who do not live here, but only as an investment from foreign governments or corporations.
1029.	The cost of farmland is skyrocketing. Anybody can figure out what that does to the viability of a farm.
1030.	If it decreased a little we could buy land and if it stayed in the \$200,000 a quarter ballpark the retirees would still have lots of profit selling their land base.
1031.	It wouldn't affect me personally.

1032.	It's already overvalued based on what it can produce. I'm a farmer, I grow grain, and I'm not subdividing it for building houses. Even those values are ridiculous.
1033.	Easier to make decisions knowing stability, increase makes more money if you sell and makes banks happier lending but makes payments tougher because commodities never follow suit.
1034.	It would benefit myself as a senior citizen and destroy any chance my children have of being successful.
1035.	Not only allow new young farmers to get in, but could affect food prices.
1036.	Looking to buy.
1037.	Will increase my net worth but long term foreign ownership will mean basically tenant farmers who work for some overseas corporation. Land needs to stay in farmers' control.
1038.	I am not a farmer, do not own land and do not intend to. I am just a long time Saskatchewanian who is interested in a progressive future.
1039.	I don't mind paying for land to own but don't like getting screwed over by investors who are greedy and want more money every time the lease is due
1040.	higher prices, better for small farmers to afford to keep the land and improve their machinery
1041.	It is not always about financial. The very big, big farms in Saskatchewan eventually go under, like that huge farm west of Regina. When the labour force has no ties to the bottom line, then the decisions made are not best for the land nor the grain/cattle produced.
1042.	A decrease would benefit us but a change in the lending laws would also. The land can pay itself off over time but with our area \$250-300k a quarter of land (this is what we were outbid at) FCC cannot lend enough above market value for us to compete. Then we have to put 25% down of a fair market price and also have the difference between what is fair market value and what we actually bid. That's a lot of cash to come up with.
1043.	Stability would be good. But a decrease would also help.
1044.	The more land is worth the more I can borrow.
1045.	Increase in value on my land is great if I want to sell it but I want to keep it and increasing its value only means more taxes for me to pay!
1046.	Same as in increase in house price, we all increase in wealth; it becomes the equity portion of our life, the cornerstone to build on.
1047.	I own land and realize that land values and rental values are only loosely connected land price inflation has been going on since enclosure inexorably an excellent store of wealth only Saskatchewan and a few third world countries have ever crushed land value with local ownership values. The reality is that Saskatchewan doesn't have enough wealth to improve farming as was proved last time round this circle. Farming is no different from another sector of business.
1048.	Maybe it could pay its own way instead of having to subsidize it with off farm income and other land already paid for.

1049.	As a younger farmer who would like to expand our land base we need market price to drop.
1050.	Obviously an increase in farmland prices is a double edged sword. An increase in prices would benefit those exiting farming or those needing to access credit as your net worth would improve. However, for farmers wishing to expand their operations the increasing prices are detrimental particularly where farmers are forced to compete with outside interests who purchase land without any awareness of its agricultural value.
1051.	If selling would get fair market value.
1052.	Again it depends if you want to sell or wanting to increase your land base. Right now are values out of reach for the average Saskatchewan farmer?
1053.	The land in Saskatchewan cannot produce enough to ever pay for itself, with the current price of land, cost of production, or any real rise in commodity values, in the forcible future. It just doesn't pencil out.
1054.	A return to economics that are realistic and reflective of production capacity would be a welcome change. For this to happen, the value has to decrease.
1055.	It would make it more affordable to purchase and farm profitably.
1056.	See above responses. It's already too costly to become a farmer... Only the huge farmers can make a go of it these days, and most of them were GIVEN or INHERITED the farms. Anyone who has to buy their land has to have another job to support it, the farm can't support itself costs are too high. Unless you want to live in the poverty level.
1057.	Right now potential buyers are not sure where the market is going to settle until this cloud is cleared up.
1058.	Obviously.
1059.	The price is all right. But I don't like companies and pension funds buying and sitting on land with no hopes of ever selling it. How can a generation of new farmers begin to farm land when there is nothing left to farm?
1060.	I sold my land and moved to Alberta. Ready to move back now that the governments have flip flopped.
1061.	I'm 25 and single. I want to start a business where I grow food and sell directly to my customers. Unfortunately being alone and being able to afford this is nearly impossible.
1062.	We cannot compete with neighbors who have extensive land holdings and gigantic machinery.
1063.	I do rent out some of my land already. I am not sure that increased land prices will directly increase rental prices.
1064.	I do not look at getting a benefit from farmland. I would just like to see the small farmer thrive again and be able to contribute to the local economy as they once did. More employment, more money in the local area. Not being taken away to other countries to be put in bank accounts where no taxes are paid.
1065.	Fair market value.

1066.	I'm 33 years old. My wife and I have two small children and we recently moved back to my home town to farm. I have a bachelor degree in agriculture and farming is my passion. I'm the quintessential future of rural Saskatchewan and agriculture. However, I'm not willing to invest my financial resources in a land market where big corporate buyers are happy with 3% returns to hedge their stock funds. Nor am I planning to stick around to be someone's serf. It is vitally important that policies around land ownership secure a future of opportunity for my generation. Otherwise Saskatchewan will continue to be the province where talented people come from.
1067.	Due to advancing age, I have little or no desire to improve my present financial status.
1068.	I am a young farmer interested in growing my operation in hope of having a viable operation to pass down to the next generation to sustain the tradition of farming in my family. If the land I need to buy will not pay for itself this will not be possible.
1069.	I own 35 acres, but plan on purchasing a quarter of land from my grandparents when they need to move into a home. Of course if land prices go up it makes me wealthy for a short time, but it also means i have to pay more for my grandparents place. Because pay i will as its their money they need for home care prices.
1070.	But I would like to keep the land in the family as an economical farm unit.
1071.	Increases help everyone, the more equity the better. Rental rates are a small part of input costs so even increased rent will not do enormous harm.
1072.	If you are to sell your land of course an increase in market value would benefit you but if you are to buy a decrease would be to your benefit.
1073.	A decrease in market value would make the land more affordable for new Saskatchewan farmers to as well as current farmers to grow their own business. With the price of inputs, machinery, maintenance, fuel costs, increased labour costs etc. it makes it hard for people to continue to make a profit in the farming industry. Family farms are going to disappear and commercial farms are going to take over. I am a 4th generation small farmer and I am worried for my business as well as the future of the family farm. I am also worried for my children as corporate farms taking over Saskatchewan is scary business for consumers and the future of Saskatchewan and the world!!!
1074.	Could afford to buy more.
1075.	To make purchase of land more affordable and on a shorter term basis.
1076.	An increase in value increases net worth, but hurts young farmers trying to expand
1077.	Not a farmer, just a proud Canadian
1078.	If the land were cheaper for Saskatchewan residents to purchase, it would enable more citizens to enter into farming, rather than a large exodus exiting the profession.
1079.	As it sits land is still somewhat affordable for younger farmers to buy.
1080.	I am hoping to purchase land...the lower the value, the more I can purchase.
1081.	I'm a young farmer looking to expand ownership.
1082.	I think it is more important to be asking what is most important to the long term viability of

	our Saskatchewan farmers and the province.
1083.	No one can afford land at \$400,000.00. Young farmers sure can't. I feel when some big farmers who know one knows how they can even afford the land keep buying land from under them. After farmers have 30 quarters it should be capped at that instead of letting them just keep buying. Our neighbour has over 150 quarters and he usually can't get it all in. I have heard lots of times that if they didn't get it in they would go to crop insurance & complain just so they would try and get a payout.
1084.	Family farms cannot afford to pay more for land than the land can produce. Recreational land buyers push the price up as well.
1085.	I'm not willing to "sell out" for my own gain at the expense of the loss my community would experience.
1086.	The land is already too high in price to be productivity-viable. There is no idea of the productivity cost ratio to the purchase price.
1087.	I would prefer a decrease in value so that there is a better representation of the profitability of farm land ownership.
1088.	This is a no brainer question. Of course, as the market value goes up you would gain financially. But for some, money isn't everything.
1089.	It would have little or no effect on me personally.
1090.	As an investor in agriculture it is always better to have values increasing.
1091.	If I was selling an increase would be nice. If I am buying a decrease would be very good. As a part owner (but retired) implement dealer a decrease would be much better to reduce farmers' debt payable. This would apply to almost ALL Saskatchewan businesses. Farmers in general would have more spendable funds.
1092.	A decrease in market values would increase the return on investment. Thus giving more opportunity to acquire more land.
1093.	Our community would die.
1094.	Land prices here are valued high enough.
1095.	On my farm, and in my investments, I try to stick to investment prices of 10 times earnings. If I can make \$80. Profit/acre I would pay \$800/acre, these kinds of valuations keep farmers and governments out of trouble. If only farmers could buy land, prices would fluctuate, but not to the ex-streams, that would be pure speculation.
1096.	I don't own any farmland so not sure if it would have any effect on me or not. There may be some spin off effects but I don't know what those would be or how they would affect me.
1097.	A decrease would help me greatly but would also hurt current farmer.
1098.	Might be able to expand a bit to make farming viable again , smaller farms had better grades in crop value due to small window allowed to get produce in ground.

1099.	I am younger and looking to increase land base for my future and children's futures. Leasing is ok but unpredictable some land owners don't like more than 1 year leases and that make cropping and grazing decisions difficult and quite often doesn't benefit the land. (No fertilizers or overgrazing). Farming and ranching is a give and take relationship with land.
1100.	it depends on which side of the equation you are standing on. Land prices should be established by production off of the land, not outside investors trading amongst themselves.
1101.	Only way I will be able to buy land is to get rid of outside interests.
1102.	The land is already worth more in my area that the crop I can afford to grow is worth. If I bought land at full market value today I would not be able to make the payment with crop alone, I would have to make off farm money.
1103.	I want the farmland I own to remain at a value that I paid. The higher it goes, the more I won't afford to pay for land.
1104.	A steady price based on what the land can produce is the best forever person in Saskatchewan.
1105.	I have s son stating farming, so low helps him high helps me.
1106.	I could buy more land.
1107.	Never plan to sell.
1108.	I have already turned down the suggestion of our ag rep to "sell your land for development because you'd make a bundle". It is that attitude which is destroying our agricultural base in this province.
1109.	Answer is self-explanatory.
1110.	our money isn't worth as much as the South Africans who come into rural Saskatchewan and drive the value of our land up, making it impossible for younger families to expand their farm at an affordable rate.
1111.	A decrease would enable me to buy land at a price that I could reasonably afford, thus enabling me to grow more food and make more money long term.
1112.	Today's market values are teetering on the edge. It's almost too high in value for a producer to buy land for ag purposes but is still a decent dollar for the producer selling. To answer your question, of course a decrease in market value would benefit a purchaser (myself and my son) but the balance has to be fair to the purchaser and seller and I think we are at that balancing point now. Any NON ag purpose investment is going to destroy the meaning full ag production investment climate.
1113.	We want to purchase additional acres for our Certified Organic operation and with the higher costs of land and the transition time required for Certified Organic status we are facing some tough decisions.
1114.	False increases by phony demand are worthless.
1115.	A decrease would help me since it would be easier to buy the adjoining 5 acres, and it would be easier to buy the 6 quarters around me.

1116.	Decrease- however steady commodity prices would be more beneficial.
1117.	of course if i was selling a increase but with our commodities and other input costs stealing my profit farming and expanding is no longer made sensible with land prices
1118.	If the control is kept locally farmland would increase at a lower sustainable rate and it would allow Saskatchewan farmers to grow their operations at sustainable rate and this would benefit all of Saskatchewan and Canada.
1119.	Likely sell land to family.
1120.	It is just on the verge of being comfortable to pay for farmland with solely farm income. If it held for a while or decreased I think that would help a lot of young farmers out. We need to look after then you think this province to ensure the future of farming.
1121.	Land more affordable would enable us to expand the farm for our sons.
1122.	I plan to expand my operation, when land becomes available, to be able to grow the farm size, to be able to farm with my family.
1123.	For sure that would make more money for me; however I'm more interested in passing this legacy to my children or to other locals to provide the opportunity to enjoy the pleasure of farming.
1124.	I hate this question. It will be interpreted as: increased investment in land will increase the current value of land and benefit all farmers that own land. Completely true but this has terrible consequences for our new farmers who want to enter the business. And terrible for a farm to expand without highly leveraging their operation. Too many people will answer this question incorrectly. The long term benefit to any farmer is a steady stable market value that increases moderately.
1125.	Would help any young person that wants to start farming be able to.
1126.	Even if the land I currently have - and borrow money against - was to de-value, so would the purchase price of land that I want to buy and since I am in a growth phase, over the long term, lower land prices would benefit me the most.
1127.	Land prices are too high right now for most new smaller-scale farmers, yet I don't want to see current farmers lose the value of their land. Keeping the market value stable is perhaps a fair balance for all farmers. The most important thing is to maintain stability so that farmers of all ages are able to live sustainably.
1128.	Again please don't focus only on market value. It is much too narrow of a view.
1129.	Good farmland is moving well it is unfortunate that the young farmer cannot compete when trying to acquire this land. He is out bid by Hutterite Colonies who are acquiring too much land in this Province and this land will never come back into the general population.
1130.	As long as the land is going to belong to a Canadian citizen, preferably a farmer/rancher.
1131.	An increase in the value of the assist is important to me, but it is much more important for our residents to have control of this resource as opposed to losing control of this strategic resource to outside investors.
1132.	Right now, a decrease in land value would help me as I am looking to buy land not sell. Also,

	the land value in our area is much too high for the quality of the land.
1133.	For us it is what we do not an investment.
1134.	I don't think that we need to CONTROL the price of farmland. Natural conditions should be allowed to dictate that. However, I feel that opening it up to outside investment (large) would drive it out of the reach of our own farmers.
1135.	Make it more affordable for the young farmer on par with commodities prices.
1136.	A decrease in market value would benefit me the most so I could expand my operation and then this would allow my sons to be part of our family farm. Where and how would these investors help me by driving the price of farm land up, it just makes it harder to find land and purchase it? We do not need the price of land to be rock bottom, but at a price which is affordable to farmers who do not have millions or billions of dollars in their pockets like CPP and investment corporations.
1137.	A modest growth of 2-3 % or the same as inflation is healthy for an appreciation asset class
1138.	It would be more affordable to own. Others buy as investment they don't actually farm/ranch for a living. it makes it hard to compete against that money if you want to expand.
1139.	I guess if land prices went stupid high I could sell the place and retire. My son would be out of luck though because it is almost impossible to start out on your own from scratch.
1140.	Pretty hard to come up with 25% down for land yet in cities they ask for 5%.
1141.	Stability is key. Land assets need to be economically viable to pay for themselves, while maintaining a stable value for equity and lending purposes.
1142.	Commodity prices are offset by the extremely high price of machinery and the always increasing cost of inputs.
1143.	I'm 69 years old.
1144.	Possible decrease in capital gains upon land transfer. Do not intend to sell land at a profit but consider the transfer of my farmland to my children.
1145.	Currently do not own farmland but am interested in preserving the 'identity' of Saskatchewan. Foreign ownership will change the Province.
1146.	The financial benefit in owning farmland for a farmer is based on the economic return of the products he produces which allow further investment into the operation & purchase of additional land/equipment; it does not lie simply in inflating the value of farmland on a balance sheet. Financial operating decisions are based on cash flow not asset value.
1147.	Could be owners of more land and be less dependent on rented land.
1148.	Increasing Value of farmland only improves farmers' retirement funds when they are ready to sell land. It hurts our ability to make a living off of those lands, as less money is available for inputs to maximize yields and create efficiencies with the saved money.
1149.	As someone looking to purchase land in the future it would be best for me if prices were to drop but there are a lot of landowners reaching retirement and the high land prices are good for them as it can create enough income for them to retire on comfortably.

1150.	<p>I want to start farming, but as land keeps appreciating, it becomes more difficult to start even if I have an off farm income to cover my living costs. I don't have farming relatives I can start with and rely upon for any kind of assistance.</p> <p>For an exiting-farmer, they often want the highest dollar for their land. However that stance is helping kill off the social aspect of farm communities. Those "retirement" funds from selling the farm flow out of the province and no longer contribute to farming.</p>
1151.	Don't want none farmer owners!
1152.	Tricky question depends if you're buying or selling.....
1153.	Farmland is already above production value. Farming, realistically, has become a real estate venture. The higher the price of farmland goes the more complicated exit and succession strategies become.
1154.	My response would be exactly the opposite in ten years. Then I will be selling instead of buying land.
1155.	More affordable land would allow my family based operation to expand.
1156.	A decrease of farmland would benefit me by making it actually affordable for me to purchase more land and cover the payments. Just being able to compete with current land price bids would be a help too.
1157.	<p>I can't answer this question because it does not give the option of considering the environmental and social values too--not just the economic.</p> <p>But I have to make a choice to continue on.</p> <p>This question needs to have another choice: Other considerations/options.</p>
1158.	<p>There should be an option: A marginal increase in market value.</p> <p>I chose No Change because it's closer to the long-term average we are experiencing. Keep your eye on the long-term vision of stability in governance and policy and the land prices will continue to prove they are sound investments for lenders to help expanding farm businesses. Trying to get more money into the hands of retiring farmers is not the goal in working towards building the agricultural economy of the province.</p>
1159.	I am an urban dweller, but I like to support local farmers by buying their produce and encouraging local business supports for them.
1160.	<p>Unfortunately because many farmers want to retire they will go for the highest price possible without thinking about the social, economic and cultural impact of selling the land to outside investors and the negative impact it would have on younger generations of farmers and farm families.</p> <p>Farm land ownership law should be amended to restrict ownership of land to people who are either residents of Saskatchewan or incorporated farming operations and cooperatives owned by individuals who reside in Saskatchewan.</p>
1161.	Land prices are inflated already due to foreign investors and as a young Saskatchewan 3rd gen farmer who would like to expand the farm it's not possible.
1162.	As a farmer for more than 30 years I have acquired most of the land that I would ever own,

	however if the farmland values increase (or even stay the same) our young farmers will not be able to own the land they farm. That is not fair to our next generation. So, even though an increase in farmland value would benefit me personally I do not wish to see that happen!
1163.	If we ever sold, an increase in market value would help - which, as indicated above, we're not intending to. So, now, it would only mean an increase in taxes paid on it.
1164.	Our inputs increase across the board but whole grain prices remain constant. A continued increase in land values isn't benefitting or helping young farmers continue to farm.... It's only helping the average 60 year old farmer who is retiring. But we also have to be conscious of the future of farming.
1165.	At present prices the land cannot pay for itself. Some farmers are destroying the quality of the land by mining the land for volume instead of growing quality food that you who are reading this are eating. Do you like eating low quality or nutritious food? Many people are starting to realize that many of their health problems are a lack of good food in Canada - yes in Canada.
1166.	No change or a decrease would benefit my family farm financially as land would be more attainable than if market values increased.
1167.	We are looking to take over the family farm, so a slight decrease in farmland value would definitely benefit us.
1168.	I'm young and want to have a little land of my own that I can afford.
1169.	There are considerations much more important than market value. I see small farmers struggling to compete with the corporate agricultural operations. Young farmers who cannot afford to purchase and farm. And farmland also affects the watershed systems in the province, as well as a diversity of species.
1170.	A decrease in market value would allow more local farmers to continue to farm and young innovative farmers to get into farming. They would be more willing to try new crops, new agricultural techniques, new direct-to-consumer marketing, supporting the buy local food movement. As oil prices increase (or as they will increase in the long term) the need for local food will become stronger. With local food we have a better chance of knowing how the food was produced and the use of organic and other innovative agricultural techniques. Already the land prices are too high for many young people to get into farming.
1171.	I do not have a financial interest in Saskatchewan farmland (or farmland elsewhere in the country) and would not be impacted financially either way.
1172.	This option makes land more affordable for those of us looking to expand farmland ownership.
1173.	What we need as a family run farm is stability in land prices not a inflated value till tough times hit then we are left to pay while the realtors and investors fold up like the Broad Acre example.
1174.	No concern.
1175.	An increase would help me if I was selling, although I wouldn't be selling anyhow to the person with the most money. I may sell for less to the right person or persons if there is a next generation there who wants to farm. It has to be affordable for them. A decrease in price would help when I need to go out and buy land I am renting now. We already have crazy high

	rental rates and land values in our area.
1176.	Do not own farm land and do not expect to own.
1177.	The Saskatchewan economy would be improved overall. More money flowing in leads to more spending in other areas of the economy.
1178.	Skyline currently has no exposure to farmland values and therefore changes in the market value of farmland will have no impact on Skyline financially. However, Skyline's goal is to finance the next generation of Western Canadian farmers as the large intergenerational transfer of land occurs over the coming decades. As Skyline rolls out its financing model, long-term sustainable increases in the value of farmland would be the most beneficial to Skyline.
1179.	If we do decide to sell we would get more money.
1180.	Or no change.
1181.	We would be able to afford to buy more land which in turn would make us able to produce more and increase our equity and cash flow.
1182.	There should be a happy balance whereby the market value is determined by the productive value of the land and not by speculation.
1183.	I would buy land possibly, but in years to come I will also be interested in selling the land we own.
1184.	We are young farmers trying to establish a good income so if it goes up it makes it that much harder for us to expand our operations.
1185.	Result of ownership.
1186.	I'd like to own more land, so not much change in price would be great and my children have expressed an interest in taking it over so we have no plans to cash out any time soon.
1187.	And any rise in land rents will negatively affect all farmers. And if the value of farmland goes up so too does the rent. High rents mean less profit for farmers and less money available to be spent by the farmer in the local community.
1188.	I don't own land right now so reduced prices would benefit me.
1189.	My sons will take over the land.
1190.	Affordable land for young farmers.
1191.	A young farmer starting out right now is virtually impossible. Albertans and investment companies like hci ventures make it impossible for us to obtain any land base
1192.	Present farmland values have already reached the current economic threshold of the productive capability of Saskatchewan farmland. Current land rents reflect this; a further increase in farmland valuation and its corresponding increase in rental rates could further jeopardize the viability of farm operations.
1193.	An increase in market value could benefit retiring landowners. These owners typically have enough resources for retirement and will not return the added funds back into the agricultural sector.

1194.	Looking for a stable long term industry. If conditions exist I feel there would be more young farmers entering agriculture.
1195.	We are sticking up for the future of the local Saskatchewan born farmers. Saskatchewan landowners who farm need to be able to have the resources to purchase more land to remain functional. In our area much of the rented land is already too expensive to rationally bid on it.
1196.	We are likely to buy some more land in future so our children can come home to help us.
1197.	Local cash rent values just barely cover costs at current prices. Plus necessary cash to expand is steep 35 to 40% down.
1198.	Starting out it would be nicer if land was a bit cheaper but still held its value.
1199.	If market values are inflated by others, not by Saskatchewan farmers, the farmers themselves wouldn't be able to purchase land.
1200.	Farmland is extremely unaffordable for anyone trying to get a start in farming or ranching without a few generation farm being passed down to them or having a large sum of backing to get them going.
1201.	So I can afford to purchase.
1202.	Investors who buy land rent it out whereas farmers who buy land farm it themselves. So there would be less opportunity for me to rent land. Increase in market value does not necessarily translate into higher land rental values. The commodity prices dictate the rental values and investors have different rates of return that they need so higher land values don't necessarily mean higher rental rates. Also as I buy land I want my asset to increase in value over time so need a good healthy market relatively free of government restrictions.
1203.	I would like to purchase pasture land in Saskatchewan within the next 5 years.
1204.	Farmers that don't have to pay an arm and a leg for land ownership will spread their money to the tractor dealerships, grain movement and crop inputs which will benefit small communities.
1205.	As a smaller and older farmer, potentially I might personally benefit in the long run from higher land values should I choose to sell. However, I have a broader view. I want local people to be able to afford local land. Already with the investors allowed by the "Canadian" rule, land has been pushed higher. I would not want to see the land prices further escalated by loosening investment rules.
1206.	Supply/demand dynamics right now are fine. Do not let more buyers into the market to skyrocket the demand.
1207.	Currently the market price is reaching a point where the land cannot pay for itself you have to have other land to make the payments.
1208.	I would like to see prices lower so I can afford to buy, however the higher values help keep the commodity values up as well.
1209.	Not planning to sell land.
1210.	As a potential investor, this would mean a lower entry price for me.

1211.	I would be able to purchase the agricultural land at a fair-market value. If the land value is reasonable, I would be able to have a reasonable return on investment and would not need to borrow money to invest into food production. With a low(er) input cost, I would be able to produce food that is affordable to a wider population of Saskatchewan residents.
1212.	A decrease in farmland value would allow me to own and manage more farmland.
1213.	This is a stupid question!!!
1214.	Not a young farmer...

8) We're interested in hearing about what you see ahead for farmland ownership in the province (PROFITABILITY and IMPACT)...

#	Response
1.	The first set of questions above result in answers of "Likely" or "Very Likely" if the Province carries down the path it is currently on. These situations will only be likely if the Government of Saskatchewan does not take action to protect Saskatchewan farm land and our local agriculture industry. I have answered likely to almost all answers, but I can only pray the government takes actions to prove my answer wrong!!!
2.	Land owners want the greatest return, and it may force farmers to cut inputs to be able to get a return and mining the soil of nutrients. Destroying the lands potential for future generations (if they even can access the land)
3.	When you own land you tend to care a little more about the impacts of the environment and how you treat the land because it's likely that you also live there or your neighbour lives there on some land that you lease and you feel responsible for how you treat the land.
4.	It is not that I think that production would fall with farms owned by non-local owners - it might even increase. I am not sure how that differs much from feudalism with a few wealthy landowners and many people working for them, never ever to own a plot of land to call their own. I think that does something to the psyche, first of people from farming culture and then eventually to everyone - like if no one could afford to buy their own home or car but always had to lease or rent - cars and homes might be better maintained in the short to medium term but eventually... It can't always be just about the money and the short term. That said, it can't stay only with small farmers depending heavily on subsidies - there must be a balance.
5.	Farming has become a capital-intensive business, and precision agriculture should be implemented by all farmers to ensure inputs are reduced and yields enhanced, while sustaining the land for the long term. The reality is that farmers need to partner with capital providers and Canadian pension funds could be excellent long-term partners to help share both the risks and the rewards with Saskatchewan farming. Leasing the land is not the only option. We need to find win-win-win solutions for both farmers and investors to ensure the long-term sustainability of Saskatchewan farmland.
6.	Please leave the land for farm family's to purchase, owning land is a lot of farmers retirement fund and opens the doors for the next generation. If land prices were what they are now 10 years ago there is a Good chance I wouldn't be farming

7.	As a young producer it is very discouraging to see these companies buy the land up around you who are just looking to turn a profit. Land ownership for the farmer provides the desire to get up in the morning and do your best to condition your land. Farming rented land is like watching Lost on Netflix for the third time in row. You do it cause there are no other options but you really want to watch something. It's the same with farming, given the opportunity I would buy land, but it is hard to compete with these investors who think every acre is worth the same, regardless of the land assessment or condition of the land.
8.	With outside investors we have two scenarios. 1) They farm the land with managers and employees. This would make it a job not a life. Care for land stretches as far as the profit. And no chance for locals to buy land. If they surround local farms the ability for the local farmer to expand and grow. The selling of this land would be on the premise of profit so the price would always rise. 2) Absent owners who just lease. That would be based on pure profit. Absent owners destroys traditional land ownership.
9.	With less farmers, there will be less local wealth. 100 years ago most of our grandparents left countries where the chances of owning their own land was slim. By allowing large pension funds and institutional investors to buy land, we are creating the same situation in Saskatchewan. Hopefully, history does not repeat itself.
10.	its gonna make it hard on farmers who rely on the farm for a living when competing with investors or corporate farms. It's not right when money I pay into cpp from my off farm job is being used against me.
11.	This question is confusing
12.	Your questions are hard to understand.
13.	cause and effect
14.	If farmland all becomes leased, then that will tie the hands of farmers to practice by conventional methods and not experiment or evolve the industry in a natural way. Additionally, it will remove the human connection to the land - the producers will be working solely to make a monetary profit regardless of the future productivity of the land and people will follow the minimum moral requirements of farm stewardship, which is drastically insufficient.
15.	Potential for any profit only decreases if the cost of purchasing/leasing land increase. The risks associated with farming are high enough as it is.
16.	Those who wish to have a farming lifestyle will continue. Not everyone is suited or capable of sustaining employment in other sectors.
17.	My grandparents came from Ukraine and escaped to a better life of being landowners and we are so proud of them being their own bosses and establishing these farms. No one takes care of it like the farmers that live on their land. We had a huge corporate farm all around us. ...arghh. When they couldn't get their huge machinery to their field cause of floods, They brought on machinery and started building a new road.....through OUR field. Thankfully some RM workers spotted them Where they stopped for dinner is right where they left their garbage from dinner. Disgraceful.

18.	renters are wiped out after one bad year. For farming to be viable, the farmer must have the ability to own the land
19.	the death of rural saskatchewan
20.	You ask the same question with different wording . Typical government . Get back to No means No. Not change the wording to make No mean maybe.
21.	These very important questions seem to state that the Government already has an "Essential Understanding of the Problems and Concerns that are being faced by Farmers", yet there may be a few who answer these questions flippantly!
22.	Farmers , especially the smaller family farms, need affordable land, owned and leased close to there home. It is important not only to the farmers themselves but the community they live in also. We are already short of farmers and farm labor, foreign ownership and large corporate farms will only worsen the problem and drain communities of people
23.	When investment companies buy big tracts of land they have no interest in renting it to a dozen local farmers, they rent it to one guy 50 miles away. The new farmer employs no local people, his kids don't go to school, they add nothing to the community.
24.	This survey is so biased it stinks. What is the SK party going to do bring back the sons of stalin's landbank ?
25.	I can't even begin to tell if the problems this has led to and will so in future even more.
26.	This will make the way for corporate farms and will end up like the oil industry. every farmer I have talked to in my area big or small agrees this means trouble
27.	A traditional family farm will no longer exist. Rural Saskatchewan will no longer be there. Stores, banks, post offices and schools will shut down which has happened in many towns including mine already.
28.	common sense!
29.	I think that I have said how I feel in the above answers.
30.	being controlled by wealth with other interests doesn't benefit the average person much
31.	Leases will peak at what farmers are willing to pay. this will even itself out. All other assets are depreciating and with the capital intensive farming practices, owned land is the only thing that will keep agriculture going.
32.	Once farm land becomes unaffordable for farmers to purchase there's less security for loans, as well there's no security for the farmer year to year. Rent prices can rise unexpectedly and with such small profit margins this can make or break an operation. Once corporations own all the land they can decide food prices, making it unaffordable to the common people. We need more small farms and locally grown produce.
33.	I know of land that the rent has gone down and land that it has gone up. If you are paying rent does it matter if the person is local or not? The barrier to owning or leasing land close to you is and will always be, are you willing to pay for it, or your neighbour will. I know farmers who buy and rent land away from their main yard as the other areas are under less competition. how do rule changes determine which of the local farmers with land equal distance away from a

	field get to rent it and at what price?
34.	This survey questions are terrible. It's like having double negatives. Brutal whoever wrote it.
35.	The family farms are gone, some are sorry it is that way
36.	This is a very slanted survey. For example, the last item - higher land prices lead to more equity, not less.
37.	As a traditional farmer, I strongly feel that allowing foreign and large scale ownership of farmland fundamental negatively affects and threatens the roots and potential survivability of local farmers.
38.	For a young farmer, losing the ability to purchase land completely takes away from the industry as a whole. Who in their right mind would invest in farm equipment if they can't be certain that they will have the land to farm with it? And who will decide to take on farming as a career if it becomes a 'job' rather than a lifestyle? And what direction do we think environmental stewardship and concern will go if the only tie to the land is disconnected from it? Owning land is a big part of farming.
39.	Of coarse farmland is harder to aquire for a Sask farmer. Between cooperation farms and Hutterites we can't compete!!!
40.	If you are an investor who cannot prove you are actively farming your land taxes should triple in price . Because you are not here to support your community
41.	There may be some change but the biggest problem is that people are too sentimental about farmland and tradition. If young farmers want to get into the industry they will find a way.
42.	We have seen it happen. People buy land around us with no intention for providing for themselves. Just an investment. And there are plenty farmers who could use the land for themselves.
43.	its obvious that on an open market the big players always win. there is no way anyone can honestly claim that on an even playing field in the global market that the average saskatchewan farmer will be a big player.
44.	Risk ratio is much higher as farmer do not own lands being farmed.
45.	In my area, most of the land that has sold, has been purchased by farmers with very little being purchased by investors. The portion purchased by investors was facilitated by real estate agents steering the land their way, likely due to simple purchase terms and high prices offered. If the land was offered by tender or sale, I think very little would have ended up in investors hands, it would have sold locally at the same price the investor was willing to pay. Maybe it's the real estate agents that are the problem?
46.	The reasons for answering severe is that outside owners do not spend their money in the local communities so it's hurting more than just the farmer who is trying to make a living as a farmer. but all the small communities will suffer as well.
47.	These situations have been happening for years already, you need owned land for equity. It is impossible for any young people to get into farming and I would advise them not to. I'm only 39 and am considering quitting because everything is so expensive. It's just ridiculous and we give away our grain.

48.	Land is farmed differently when you own it. Nobody washes a renter truck.
49.	Leasing land is not going to make farming in this province more profitable. It only splits the profits gained. Right now the trend is for many farmers to retire. Many of these retiring farmers purchased much of thier land at values far far lower than what it will be sold for to the next generation, yet crop values have risen only moderately in comparison, and input values have jumped vastly. As speculators drive land price up and farmers continually have margins squeezed, it will move land ownership away from the producer. Instead of what should be a buyers market on land right now, the rules which provided the retiring farmers a protected environment to purchase thier land affordably many years ago will be removed and expose the next generation to inflated costs when they can least afford them.
50.	Traditional ownership is already gone unless daddy has a pile of land to start you off with. Slowly building by rent is the only way to get big enough to make it viable. Retirements are going to be significant and new farmers don't have enough to buy up all the land that will be for sale with outside help.
51.	Land is the main equity in any Ag operation. Everything else depreciates.
52.	More young farmers will become less interested in farming if they can't afford to buy land. I feel frustrated that we will lose that opportunity for farmers to own land, which has been a tradition for generations before us.
53.	How can a person compete with deep pockets? We went through this with Land bank. It discouraged young people and in the end devalued the land when it was ended.
54.	Ther is nothing that can compare to owning and farming your own land. Ther will also be more successors If the land is owned by the operators.
55.	Our ancestors left Europe to get away from serfdom. We are on the road to the same type of system. Eventually all farmers will be forced to rent land if they want to expand. Shortsighted at best.
56.	Pretty simple to figure, if we get any changes, and it looks like we will one way or the other, theres going to be a lot more red tape to go thru.
57.	More outside ownership, means less Saskatchewan farmers and less money being spent in Saskatchewan. Most government bailouts in bad time goes to land owner, not person working the land. So even the bailout money would be consider a "bonus" to investment firms, who would probably make more money on farm failures than successes.
58.	All things considered, ownership enhances stewardship of the land. People generally take pride in owning, and thus will invest in improvements, etc.
59.	If you take away farmers equity, it limits the ability to leverage their business' ability to purchase crop inputs, machinery and other related purchases that make the farm go round. Equity also provides farmers the ability to pass down their greatest asset to their children and the next generation of Saskatchewan Farmers.
60.	I think costs will continue to rise as we are running out of land, but that's to be expected in any scenario. I think we are still holding onto the family farms at this time.
61.	Corporate control will drive land prices beyond what local producers can afford.

62. Farmers control what they pay for rents etc. However the one section farmer can't compete with the 3000 acre farmer who can't compete with the 10,000 acre farmer who is under pressure from the 20,000 acre farmer (the latter 2 which are most comfortable using alternative land ownership, investment funds etc. to finance their land). If they don't want to pay higher rents then don't - however when farmers complain to me that they cannot pay \$25 per acre for land rent when canola is \$10 per bushel, which amounts to 2.5 bushel per acre, I find that incredible to believe. Especially when they have millions in equipment sitting there. Time to get real boys! If you want to go back to being broke, having no money to invest, and no equity in your farm then regulate the price of land back to only Saskatchewan residents - you will see a mass exodus out of farming again, less banks willing to finance operations as there will be no equity. As well the majority of farmers who are 60 and over will be forced to sell their land they have worked all their lives for at reduced, regulated lower prices - they will not be able to afford a place to live in the cities and towns.
63. Land is an asset that must provide returns to the farmer. While some land is usually a must to have loans, owning all your own land simply does not exist anymore. Currently farmers in order to lease land must do so from small landholders or other farmers, which does not allow new farmers the ability to rent those lands ever. Leasing farmland has allowed farmers and land owners to work together to find fair value for rent and be flexible. Owning land requires a payment and leaves renters vulnerable to interest rate spikes.
64. we see large corporations (Canadian owned) purchasing land at very large prices, before it is even known that the land is available, leaving local historical family farms no chance at expanding their acreage (owned or leased).
65. We're trying to push out our farmers and bring in companies and turn this into the exact opposite of traditional farming, and it seems like farming will be lost and it wont mean anything to anyone anymore. Very sad.
66. The people/families who are doing well in agriculture today are the ones who love it. Already there is a huge decrease in young people farming as it has astronomical costs to start out and many can not afford it and so they look for other was to make a living.
- Owning your own land and producing crops off of it gives a person a sense of accomplishment and pride. Take that away and have an owner far away with people working that land that are just hired and you will start getting people who care less about the end product. The guy working the land will think...."doesn't matter to me how many bushels this land produces I get my wage anyways." And the owner probably won't have a clue how to farm.
67. small towns are dying. I rent from a Chinese man who is apparently Canadian, however never in canada. go figure. the rent doesn't stay in the local area where we are fighting to build a new hospital and community services through local guys volunteering their time and money. I haven't noticed any of these investors helping out with either. I think its sad
68. Non-farmers are buying land to rent or lease, intending on making money off the already struggling farmer who already get taxed , their crop gets downgraded! The farmer should be the one with money in their pockets for once! I'm a fifth generation farmer and my forefathers would be disgusted that all the land is being bought up by Chinese investors. when u look at a map u should be able to read the name on the quarter.
69. Outside investment competition is detrimental to the younger farmers trying to take over or

	get started in the industry. Will force many people out of agriculture forever.
70.	If you change regulations, it sure helps the retirement packages of this generation of farmers, but it sells the next generation of farmers/entrepreneurs up the creek.
71.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If the price continues to rise, only those interested in selling (ie retirements or investors looking to get out) will benefit. 2. If the price continues to rise, anyone interested in acquiring more farmland will be shut out. 3. This however should be self correcting - no one buying, prices should fall. The question is timing and at what point is the price stable? If the new stable price point is outside the reach of most, only those with successful operations and cash flow (ie established and/or large) will expand, everyone one else will contract (new and/or small).
72.	I know several young farmers who have recently bought more land in the area in which they currently own and rent land and they intend to continue to acquire more land as they are able. In some instances, it is a better decision for them to lease land than to purchase, but, for the most part, they are more likely to buy land than their farming parents were 25 to 30 years ago. We should make it possible for them to do so and prevent foreign ownership.
73.	All these would have a significant impact on a lifestyle which takes great care in land management, humane handling of animals, & producing a safe commodity for consumers. This as well as a lifestyle, quality of people, & presence of communities would be lost. You would have 2 kinds of people..very wealthy & very poor. Would be such a crime!
74.	The most severe impacts result from the loss of control over farms, land, and farming decisions that happen when farmers lose the ability to own the land they farm. I have concerns about the rising cost of land and rising lease/rent rates in terms of access to land for new and young farmers. I do not think that increasing farm size of existing, established farms is the best way to deal with these farms' economic problems - we should be finding ways to make sure farms of moderate size get enough returns to make a decent living so that they do not feel they need to aquire more land to survive.
75.	there are two types of Lease on land. one is cash where the owner has no say and the other is crop share where the owner may have a say.
76.	<p>Land rent is subject to supply and demand and is influenced by crop and livestock prices more than it is on land value. My motivation is profit and, if the rental market is such that I can't get the return I'm looking for, I won't buy the land.</p> <p>As a non-local owner I need to have a good long-term relationship with my renter. I have to trust them and feel confident that they will provide good land husbandry. I understand the risks associated with farming and I am willing to share it with the right renter and to be flexible when I need to be flexible. I won't buy the land at any price if there isn't a good renter available.</p> <p>If a farmer selling land wants to give preference to a neighbor or an existing renter then they can do that. If they want to get the best price then they should have that opportunity as well. Using legislation to keep the lid on prices ended in 2003.</p>

If you farm and your existing land base has tripled in value then your equity will have increased substantially. I would argue this is better than being able to buy additional parcels of cheap land.

The tradition of farmland ownership in Saskatchewan ended in 2003 when the current legislation was passed.

77. In all areas costs change, business plans have to adjust, product demand changes; these items will change no matter what rules get made. Impact measurement--what was the impact of prior restrictive rules? Land value suppression and retirement delays?
78. Institutional or foreign investors may come to control political decisions made in this province because of the large tracts of land they control.
79. Paramount that foreign investors, pension plans, etc are not allowed to own land. We are selling our offsprings future!
80. Without changes in the way the land is protected, more and more investors will find loopholes to allow them to take Sask. Farmland away from Sask farmers. By allowing the CPPIB to buy all that land, it sends the message to investors, that there are loopholes, you just need to find them. Why does Yancoal need 60,000 acres for their mine, when Belle Plain only needs 5600?
81. As I mentioned earlier, given the increases in land prices in Saskatchewan in recent years, I see little opportunity for further price appreciation, particularly if interest rates increase in the next several years and place upward pressure on borrowing costs for both investors and farmers. Unless investors are purchasing land for strategic reasons and ignoring economics, I do not foresee a glut of new external investment based on the returns associated with buying land at market prices today and leasing it back to farmers. As such, I do not think there will be any seismic shifts in farmland ownership patterns under the existing set of regulations.
82. The worst outcomes I foresee would happen if the same mind set as the current Sask Party and Harper Conservative govt mindsets continue. The new trade agreements planned, if not already enacted partly, would see massive takeover of Cdn land, leaving people here as wage slaves. Canada would completely lose sovereignty.
83. non-locals having ownership and control of land will have big impacts for our communities by loss of community members and people interested in the general well being of the area.
84. When land is split up between roads or forest lines, it's hard to lease land or buy land next to it due to the other guy is farming it and needs the income for it. Or they try selling sections that are far away or not easy to get to. Or it is close to a town or crown land, which most likely won't give up their space.
85. If farms have more assets in depreciable assets (equipment, automotive, computer) than farm land, it severely impacts their ability to sustain their operation in years of financial hardship. For example, if a farm was to see a financial loss and did not receive enough from crop insurance and agri-stability they will not have the equity to restructure their debts to continue on. Therefore, forcing financial institutions to foreclose and Saskatchewan government to

	spend more money on Farm Debt Mediation.
86.	if very wealthy individuals or non farming companies are allowed to continue to take land away from your local farmers by offering large amounts of money, forcing the farmer to rent the land back, we are putting this province in a very bad place.
87.	It will become harder for farmers to borrow money as ownership is transferred to lease agreements and farmers will not have equity to borrow against in order to expand. The death of small towns will accelerate as farmers sell land and new families do not move to town. Young farmers cannot compete against investment firms. Ag industry will erode.
88.	If we as residents have no opportunity to purchase, then the financial security going forward is not controlled in the Province.
89.	More leased land means fewer operators with a strong attachment to that land. It also means more operators with a single interest in the land - immediate financial return. Short term financial results do not guarantee that what is best for the long term will get done. Owners very often are willing to put in more than they get out. The result is a better farm for those who come after, and the benefits extend to more than just those who are farming the land; they extend to the community and society as a whole.
90.	All these things are already happening.
91.	Purchasing and leasing are not static business decisions. A good business person weighs the pro and cons and builds a business plan. If something is not profitable, changes must be made.
92.	Should have to be a Canadian farmer to buy sask farm land plain and simple.
93.	We are an example of being able to add 14 quarters of land to our operation while helping with the financing for 2 of our children. The land still has not been seen due to the owner now waiting for the outcome on a fund investment, as he tells us we needed another 25000.00 /quarter to compete with a fund that was interested. We were well within market value according to our bankers assessment and loan they were willing to provide.
94.	farmland being sold or leased will not be preferential to non res
95.	There are already a number of farming operations which have some sort of financing from out of province, and in many cases foreign country dollars to purchase and lease existing farm operations. These financed subsidized operations already pay higher rent and/or purchase land higher than the going market and also have the ability to "steal" land from existing local operations. These financed operations would not operate for more than a few years if they were to be depending solely on agricultural production to finance the operation. If the foreign financing gets pulled, or those that try to compete with these operations and fail create a financial hardship on local farm supply and equipment dealers, and in some cases can bankrupt dealers or suppliers creating a chain reaction, all the time the rent was being siphoned out of the province or country and the local people pick up the bills/costs left behind.
96.	Land prices and rent I believe will be as a result of commodity prices and economics. If farms can't afford leases they will not rent and rents will decrease. Not that long ago there were areas where land owners could not find a renter at virtually any price because of commodity prices.

97.	We should not put control of one of our largest natural resources possibly in the hands of foreign interest.
98.	Farmers care more about the land than most people. Especially if its owned
99.	Land has become expensive and out ratio is in rent and to purchase it
100.	hhh
101.	These are manufactured IMPACTs that I do not believe are very relevant to the future of agriculture.
102.	the grain and oilseed prices in the long run dictate rental value and land prices. be glad there is someone to sell to if you want to sell out. why create a made in sask low price. It's backwards thinking to control farm land.
103.	Not sure about the value of this particular set of questions. unclear what you're getting at and how I should respond
104.	farmland is under valued. if you consider the cost of equipment, and inputs-- and that is crazy-- sask land values should be much higher to be in line with the other farm costs.
105.	we just came off of 8 years of great prices for crops. if we get a drought or poor prices for years, the farmer who doesn't own his land and have equity is done. Phone the banks shut these super renters down in days.
106.	Times are changing and farmers need to adapt. That can be true for 100 years.
107.	Couldn't use some normal language huh? well done. confused the out of me
108.	We are seeing all of this right now. Landed Canadians purchase land, live in the province a minimum amount of time to qualify as Sask. residents. Because of their investors, they have lots of money to spend and out bid the local farmers. They then rent the land to local farmers at a premium. My grandparents left England to come here to own their land, not farm for a landlord. We are going back to this and it really concerns me. As Canadians, we are giving away our ability to manage our own food supply. This caused famine in other countries.
109.	The real barrier to leaseing or owning next to ones own land are the super farmers. investors rarely purchase land with out first contacting local farmers about leaseing the land they may purchase if they have doubts. if they want more than locals are willing to pay they usually do not buy.
110.	The market will dictate the value of leases, distance farmers are willing to travel, etc. I don't think tradition should have any role in the business of farming. Today it is a business and there are models that work just fine with 100% leased land. Land owners may need to be satisfied with very low returns to renting or leasing land, as it will be driven by the value of the commodity that is produced. (pasture rents are higher now with current cattle prices, but native grass could rent below \$10. per acre if prices decline) Owners will not make much at that, and the advantage goes to the tenant, who rents vs. owning expensive land.
111.	A business plan must be the sole reason in determining all of the above factors. Whether a farmer or foriegn owner, Pension, Trusts etc. they are all vulnerable to the market conditions, weather, drought, border issues etc. so they are on a level playing field. So shrewd and savvy business planing will determine the out come. They together will try to become more efficient

<p>and better marketers. there are so many valuation and analytics methods available if the right software programs are being used by skilled data analysts, including daily and hourly updates to determine when to buy and when to sell. It will all find itself out if there are economies of scale and a condensing of the supply and value chain. From a to z parameters, finding keypoints to change and standardize the flow stream. A single farmer-owner must have a specialized team, not just on the land but behind a device that offers information. This will make the playfield equal on land pricing. the single farmer-landowner can be a powerful force because of his experience he gained through the school of hard knocks, something investors may lack.</p>
<p>112. I have said it before, the traditional family farms will be lost and once again corporations will take over, Making decisions that will not benefit the people. It will only benefit the corporations. That will be a very scary and sad thing to see happen to Saskatchewan farms.</p>
<p>113. Investors are willing to pay more for land due to their financial resources. A farmer may compete with another farmer to purchase land and the final price would be the so called "fair market price". If investors wanted the same land they can afford to pay more than the farmers and I don't think this can be considered fair market – it's investment purposes versus the actual farming related purpose of the farmers. Inflated land prices also lead to inflated land rental/lease offered to get a decent return on the investors investment.</p>
<p>114. In our area, the land is here for lease or sale. It is sold for a price that is high for our area and then the non-local purchaser looks for higher lease rent for the over priced purchase. This decreases the profitability of the farmer, which in turn is bad for the local and provincial economy. It only allows more money to leave the province.</p>
<p>115. farmers can lease land at the proper value. The amount investors are wanting back for rent is much too high and is unsustainable. Farmers need to own non depreciating assets like land in order to borrow money and hold financial leverage.</p>
<p>116. When large blocks of land are owned by one owner who is looking to lease they will look for one operation to farm that land. They will likely not divide it up for a number of farmers to farm. This will take more people out of the rural area, less equipment purchased, less jobs, more crop disease due to same practices over large areas, etc.</p>
<p>117. The question asks - "given the current environment". By that you mean, with non-residents/trusts etc not being able to own more than 10 acres, right? Because that is the current environment. The subsequent questions lean more towards "if we open up the sale of land to non-residents/trusts etc". This is written very poorly (and most likely on purpose to deliberately skew the answers to what you want to hear).</p>
<p>118. As a businessman, I find I am discriminated against in terms of running a business. If I owned a business in the city, I can sell that business to who ever would like to buy it. Because I own a farm, the government is telling me who I can sell or not sell my business to. In 1982 Pierre Trudeau made all Canadians equal. That is not the case in Saskatchewan.</p>
<p>119. Active farmers will have an excellent opportunity to negotiate fair land leases regardless of who owns the land. Qualified farm operators will still be in demand.</p>
<p>120. The table above does not differentiate between a positive and negative impact - so it is not that useful.</p>

	<p>There can be a very positive outcome for framers if groups such as Canadian pension plans can purchase land and lease it back to farmers. Farmers can get long term access to land at lease rates that are based less upon the market vlaue of the land but rather the buyer's purchase price and low cost of capital.</p> <p>Rather than artificially holding down land prices (which in the end will never work) how about a requirement that land purchased by large purchasers has to be rented to Saskatchewan based farmers?</p>
121.	It's hard enough to get young farmers started. We can't make it worse.
122.	I already said farmland should be owned by saskpower residents only
123.	<p>Sure the cost of leases goes up. Investors want a return on their money, and knowing farmers, they will get it.</p> <p>Hard to compete against money funds for an individual farmer, as the farmer's interest costs can't compete with the wad of cash already in hand.</p>
124.	It becomes harder for us to purchase unless we have investors
125.	No ownership = Serfdom
126.	The description of the scenarios and questions in section 3 are poorly worded (nonexistent/confusing). Because of it I was unsure whether my responses reflect my feelings
127.	<p>Non-residents don't support Saskatchewan's economy. They don't live here, buy groceries here, attend schools, churches here, visit restaurants here. It's hurting small towns even more. Farms get bought up, but the yards and houses aren't used, so pushed over and burnt, then Sask kids that want to farm can't find a yard or house to purchase and live in. Setting up a new yard with power, digging a well etc is a HUGE cost that makes it nearly undoable.</p>
128.	<p>Farmers are not created equally. Each has a different ability to purchase/lease now and there is no rule governing ability to pay. The tradition of ownership has been evolving since settlement.</p> <p>The key question is what is best for the province's sovereignty and Canada's sovereignty?</p> <p>What helps Sask & Canada to have a healthy resource base to allow the agricultural producers to produce top quality products and for the Province and Country to maintain & protect its natural capital?</p>
129.	<p>The above questions were complex and likely will cause some odd responses to be recorded. My thoughts are that leaving things as they are will result in a better future for Saskatchewan farmers than will opening the borders to foreign ownership of our primary resource - our farmland.</p>
130.	<p>In some of these scenarios, we are already there. Land is already too expensive for many farmers, especially young farmers, to purchase, and traditionally owned farmland is being lost when farmers sell to the highest foreign bidders, because no one can match those prices, and it's a price the farmer cannot refuse.</p>
131.	<p>I believe that small to average size farms will be forced out of business! Large corporate farms will continue to take over. As they do they will be hiring foreign works to operate these farms. If these farms get into financial problems like we have already seen, the investors will take over</p>

<p>the operations and use the foreign staff to operate the farms. Therefore the end of Sask. owned and operated farms forever. Farmers will lease land in order to make the farms more cash flow but the bottom line is farmers want to own land. It's always been the long term goal of any farm!</p>
<p>132. read my answers and u guys figure it out !!!</p>
<p>133. If farm land is bought up By non farming corporations, Rents will be set by who will Be willing to pay the price. A year or two of poor crops and poor commodity prices will weed out the high rent payer. The last few years have been good. in my experience they don't last.</p>
<p>134. It cannot be anything but bad for Saskatchewan</p>
<p>135. Impacts long term will be dependant on productivity and returns of farming the land. As farms are already dominated by mega operators, most of the impact is already here. my answers are based on the expectation that land remains owned by Canadians not foreign interests.</p>
<p>136. The tradition of ownership of SK farmland is not lost. As prices have escalated, it has become more challenging for farmers to purchase. Well established farmers can continue to prosper and expand their portfolio. There has been moderate increase on cost of renting. It is reality that it is very difficult for someone without backing to begin farming. In our area, established farmers who are retiring will likely rent out their land and will eventually sell if no family member will continue farming,</p>
<p>137. Forcing the price of land up just for the economic benefit of the province will mean local farmers will be unable to afford to buy land. They will have to travel greater distances to find land to farm due to the creation of larger corporate farms that will have to be created due to foreign ownership. If people pay more for land they will want more money for rent of the land. In the end increasing foreign ownership will kill off the next generation of some farms because it won't be viable cost-wise during bad years</p>
<p>138. From reading the "get informed" before taking this survey. "Some Canadian pension plans, as well as other investors, have expressed interest in holding Saskatchewan farmland as an investment in their portfolios and partnering with individual producers."</p> <p>a) DOES THE GOVERNMENT WANT TO MAKE THE RULES MORE RESTRICTIVE ?</p> <p>OR</p> <p>B) open up land sales to corporations and investors ?</p> <p>from the get informed it would suggest the government want to lessen the rules, which is not a good idea.</p> <p>THE ABOVE QUESTIONS ARE " given the current environment around farmland ownership." I want to answer not sure for all. Example, farmland is already cost prohibitive. is it going to get worse under the current rules? hard to say,</p>
<p>139. No other owner out there will keep the land in prime, productive, sustainable, economical state better than a farmer who owns it and farms it himself. There is nothing better for</p>

	Saskatchewan than pride and sustainability through farm ownership.
140.	These are so badly worded so you get the answers U want! Lol I just pushed the first option so I could get to this box! Bottom line is family farms are the way to go. Stay the hell out of it! As past history has shown, gov't involvement decreases cost effectiveness and pride of ownership, which decreases drive and ambition. If you all want to live in a socialist country plan to move! Leave Canada and Saskatchewan alone!
141.	there is only so much money produced on a farm or ranch when lease payments leave the province or country or small town. this means that the people that live in these areas will have to find money to replace the money given to landlords, thus keeping the farmer in a stagnant state: a basic share cropper with no real chance to own your livelihood.
142.	If foreign investment is allowed to flow in, there is a current windfall for the potential sellers at this time. In the long term the ramifications are disastrous for the province. There is so much more to life then quick money. Having neighbours and a community and a vibrant social structure are so much more important. Governments are at a crossroads of selling out and destroying all that is unique to rural Sask., or allowing a unique system of farm families and a pride of ownership to flourish.
143.	Again look at Alberta and the problem they have. The land banks turn it into a business. They don't care about the farmer's word and trust. If the next guy offers 5 dollars more the land that farmer rented is gone and there could go a significant portion of their income since they own very little land.
144.	An increase in interest rates would have more of an negative impact than most of the above scenarios.
145.	Often, a balanced approach to investing in productive farm assets, ownership of all or most of the land assets is not a logical business approach. Leasing a portion, historically about one third of the acreage, has been the acceptable approach for many decades. Ownership of land by non-farmers does not necessarily suggest that rental costs will be affected other than by normal economic factors. As the number of economic farms continues to decline, like it has for several decades, competition for lease land should also eventually decrease.
146.	Overall farm profitability and the net income achieved by primary producers is intimately tied to the profit motive inherent in land operators being land owners. This is sometimes lost in the conversation but one only has to look at the recent dismal results of corporate (non-family) owned and operated farm legal entities in the last five years. if they could not make money in the era of record SK net farm income, then they would have a difficult time in any era. Farmers need to own the land they operate to be sufficiently motivated to ensure a thriving and profitable ag sector.
147.	What I see is land owner possessing something that the value of stays stationary or increases, and the farmers who own the machinery own something that devalues all the time and could end up with zero assets when it is retirement time.
148.	I have less concern with Saskatchewan or even Canadian ownership, but I do have a concern with foreign ownership, direct or indirect.
149.	Land has always been hard to aquire near the current operation.

150.	Definitely the less you own the less control you'll have over your operation. Some entity could wipe you out if you just lease and they decide to lease it to someone else if they want to offer more money to lease it and you can't match it.
151.	If land is not locally owned and controlled and simply goes up for rent to the highest bidder, the largest farmers with the deepest pockets will simply continue to muscle young people out of the business.
152.	All will be lost
153.	The present farm ownership rules do not work. Good example is _____ at _____. A rich US resident, _____, bought up farmland in the area where young Sask resident farmers are trying to get established.
154.	If we keep going the way we are, farm land will become so outrageously expensive, that only huge farmers and foreign investors will buy. At least if it is the huge farmers they care about the land as farmers, not just as a piece of dirt that turns a profit like foreign investors will. Why do we have to sell out to non Canadians?? (and just because you work the system and live in Canada for a few months does not make you Canadian!)
155.	I don't know.
156.	Rural Saskatchewan is strongly based on farming as a major industry. it, along with the oil and gas and mining industries, is keeping the Rural areas going. I think that it is a great thing for saskatchewan to have competitive farmland values and is a reflection of our current government and of great farming conditions. I dont want the land prices to be capped, I still believe in the bidding process that most sellers use to sell their land, however i believe that saskatchewan producers should own the majority of the land that they farm
157.	The current environment around farmland ownership already reduces opportunity for new people to enter into farming and allows reduction in local control
158.	I think you get the point.
159.	Farmland in Saskatchewan should be owned and farmed by Saskatchewan farmers, not owned by outside investors, speculators or overseas investors (non-Canadians.)
160.	We are seeing these results already.
161.	The impact regarding land ownership is REAL, not imaginary.....one of the most important factors regarding future success of family farms in sask. We do not need more competition for land than Sask farmers provide.
162.	let the market decide
163.	I don't think I fully understand the question. I assumed you meant with land purchases limited to Canadian farmers
164.	Local ownership should be given utmost confederation !!! In order to continue the standard of quality of stewardship of the land, it is imperative that non residents/ non farmers be restricted from owning large amounts of farm land . Generations have worked very hard to keep this land locally owned for more than 100 years, this government must provide leadership to ensure that this will continue for many generations to come!!

	We strongly support local farmer owned Saskatchewan land.... We hope you do too!!
165.	The corp farmers have made a difference as it's harder for the smaller farmer to acquire land.
166.	Saskatchewan farmers are stewards for the land. They don't have investments to fall back on so they manage their land knowing their livelihood depends on them doing sustainable land practices. Foreign investors wouldn't care.
167.	If the majority of land is not owned by farmers, what will happen to those rural areas? Will anybody live there?
168.	More Investors increase the Equity of older farmers that have worked their entire life to build up. More Investors allow for smaller farmers that can't afford to buy to have access to rented land. Land rent is still dictated by what the FARMER is willing to pay. If renters increase what they will pay the investors are willing to pay more for the land. Farmers ultimately still dictate the land values. Land prices have increased because it is a thriving industry and farmers are willing to pay more to buy or rent land.
169.	The price of the land is just one cost. try looking at input costs/acre and equipment costs/acre. These are also steep. The non farmer investing in farmland rents out his land and the local people will bid on it. If they bid too much they will farm it with no profit for themselves. Then they will either have to renegotiate for a lower rental or let that parcel go. The land owner will then have to find a different renter and at a different price probably lower. Some investors have owned land in the past and end up selling it unless they can make a decent return. If interest rates increase they will sell their land and move their cash to a lower risk higher yielding business or investment.
170.	Investors want their 5% return on investment. if they can't get it, they wont buy simple as that. The sask farmers can buy it all. But they won't because they're to cheap.
171.	The second portion of this question is so poorly worded that I have difficulty answering it. I'm not sure that what I think I'm answering is what you think you are asking me - in fact I guarantee that some or all of your responses to this question are irrelevant because it is simply that poorly worded.
172.	Again, farmers always reinvest their money locally, money that was produced locally. Tell your little Credit Union to compete head on with Goldman Sachs and you may understand the concept of us as farmers going head to head with foreign backed reserves, pension funds and investment funds.
173.	Smart non-local owners will defer to the locals who know the land and how to make it pay. They will set income targets ie: what they will lease the land for, but they won't tell the local how to farm other than to avoid mining the land. Groups that primarily own their land base, such as Hutterite colonies, might have a problem developing land bases, but other farms will compete for rented land the same as they do now to buy parcels. It is possible that families may establish income legacies based on farm land holdings, rather than selling off parcels when the retired farmer dies. This might actually increase the land that

	stays in the rental market, rather than coming on to the sales market.
174.	<p>So I should have less equity in my farmland now so that the upcoming farmer can have more equity in farmland. The large farmer who has squeezed out every other small farmer by buying or leasing everything in site and then hiring the small farmer to run his machinery. What would be the difference if it is a New York corporation hiring someone?</p> <p>Competition rules in a free market society. Why don't you ask the machinery companies to reduce their prices to help out the local farmer with his equity??? Grain prices will dictate the rental costs of land not ownership</p>
175.	Farmers can not compete with investment money.
176.	It is very hard to farm only rented land. To build a successful farm you need to have some continuity and assurance of your land base. How do you build up your farm by buying machinery, building bins, bringing in family members and hiring help when there is no guarantee to how much land you will be farming.
177.	I just don't understand why governments are so "gung-ho" on "new investment" and selling-out to any and every foreigner who wants to buy "Canada" It seems like they just don't care about the residents... Maybe it means more tax dollars...
178.	Non-local owners will care less about maintaining a good environment because they don't live here, so what is out of sight is out of mind. Why wouldn't they clear more trees off the land to increase their per acre used land to increase their profitability? Why wouldn't they build operations with no consideration for their neighbours?
179.	When farm land is owned it typically results in better stewardship and sustainability.
180.	The assumption in this survey for answers is that we continue down a road of allowing more owners who are not farming, but simply investing in land like any other commodity of investment. Ownership by the farmer is the best use of land and security of food production which accrues to Canada. Every time we allow investment which is Non-Canadian, we drain funds out of Canada. This effect is crucial in land and resources.
181.	The idea of making money off of others hard work by out bidding them on land just to rent it back is wrong
182.	The ever increasing price of machinery does not stop farmers from buying million dollar equipment so I think land values should also go up
183.	If I read correctly, the status quo of investors being able to buy land will turn agricultural operations into slaves of return on investment.
184.	One of the problems is that the owner wanting to sell would prefer to sell everything in a lump. That way he gets a better chance to get value for the yard. The neighbor wanting to buy has to buy it all including the yard & all of the land. The seller knows he can sell everything to one buyer
185.	Millions of urban people want to own a home in the city but can't afford it. Why would we want to do the same thing to rural people.

186.	without farmers actually owning our land, we will find it harder to borrow money to improve our operations. in our family case, we use the family land for security to afford the loans for our operation
187.	These scenarios will be the end of the family farms in Saskatchewan.
188.	These responses are based on the current environment of allowing pension plans and other institutions to invest in farmland. Australia has recently curtailed the purchase of farmland by non residents
189.	If landlords get too greedy the land won't be farmed. If the land is not farmed it will turn into a weedy mess. The land value would go down and the investor lose money. Most rented land slowly loses cultivated acres due to sloppy farming practices. As weeds and trees grow the value decreases. If we have a few years of drought land prices will also fall.
190.	those with the greater financial resources will end up with the majority of land as has happened in a lot of the world already . once that happens it never goes back to the actual farmers they will just be tenants .
191.	Farm land values have already increased enough that it is hard for small local farmers to expand. There have been a number of individuals moving in from out of province and paying more than locals can afford. In this case we still have people moving in to support the local economy. If land is bought up by investment groups our local economy and small towns will suffer.
192.	As I mentioned earlier, small farmers will continue to be small. Mom and pop operations that just get by. Large local farmers have their equity tied up in large expensive equipment, massive fuel requirements, massive seed and fertilizer costs, etc .. So they will be the future for local Sask family farms that don't need more costs associated with leasing land from their neighbors. If it's a productive harvest , everybody gets paid well; if it's a bad year the owner still gets paid but the large farmer loses out on their significant investment for that year.
193.	test
194.	test
195.	Please do not make changes to allow out of province investors to purchase farmland. It will put a false value on land and make it extremely difficult for young farmers to start in this career. It will turn back the clock 100 years to create what our farming ancestors had to leave behind in Europe. That system didn't work for them so why would it work now?
196.	It is much more beneficial to be an owner /operator than a laborer
197.	The more land that is owned by investment funds and pension plans the more land will ultimately be leased to/by farmers. Also for a farmer to compete with an institutional investor to purchase land is very difficult because that farmer has to make their land payments from earnings derived from the farm operation while the institutional investor does not. Even if the large institutional investors were to sell land, it would be very difficult for individual farmers to acquire that land for the land base is too large for most to even consider. I believe that allowing investment funds to acquire large acreages of land will prove very detrimental to Saskatchewan in the long term.
198.	Let's enable our farmers to work, to control and earn the dollars from their industry.

199.	<p>What is the impact relating to?</p> <p>I answered moderate to all as the question lacks some parameters.....</p>
200.	<p>As lease costs rise, either higher prices must be charged, which is out of the hands of individual farmers, or they must drop out of leases. There is a very limited supply of farmers, and they experience similar market conditions, so it is likely no one will take up the lease to continue production. Output will drop, raising food prices eventually, but not in time to re-lease the land and return to operations to enjoy the higher price. Only very large operations could survive this type of cash flow issue. Farmers and ranchers will become subcontractors to large operations. Owners tend to take much better care of their property than renters, so extending that to farmland can translate to soil depletion, water pollution, poor pesticide useage etc. It becomes easier to produce for short term gain and move on than to ensure the asset produces for generations. Distant investors are not known for careful oversight.</p>
201.	<p>has ruined the ability of young farmers to farm</p>
202.	<p>I believe farmers or farmers relatives should own the farmland in Saskatchewan and that will keep the industry going as it should</p>
203.	<p>When land is owned and controlled by owners who do not farm land themselves they do not know how much effort and work farming really is. They will never see the impact of a severe drought or excessive moisture. The only thing that matters is a return on investment. When you farm the land yourself you can adjust your farming practices to what is best needed to manage the land.</p>
204.	<p>I had a hard time understanding this question. I understand the question as being about the existing ownership, not the proposed. Otherwise my answers would be different.</p>
205.	<p>test</p>
206.	<p>no young farmers to carry on farms.</p>
207.	<p>If a farmer is selling his land it is 100 percent up to him who he sells to, if he doesn't want to sell to an non farmer than he doesn't have to, simply</p>
208.	<p>The transition of farmland ownership over my lifetime has been dynamic. In my hometown during the 50"s most farms were 160-320 acres. Eventually the size of the farm couldn't support the family and consolidation began, and it has never stopped. Too much emphasis is being put on ownership when the real issue is whether farming the land can be profitable. Lease rates will move up and down to support the market.</p> <p>By creating new laws narrowing who can own the land you deny the existing owner the right to realize a fair value for his/her land. That is not right.</p> <p>I am a commercial building owner. The operating company that leases these building can use their capital more effectively by not owning fixed assets. This is how the future of farming will be managed.</p>
209.	<p>I'm trying not be repetitive, but the baby boomers are hitting retirement. We need to encourage young people, (not with government programs) but with market conditions that</p>

	make it possible for entry into marketplace.
210.	The only people I can see benefiting in loosening or even keeping current regs are the investors and those farmers looking to sell. Long term looser land regulation will be a death sentence to farmer land owners, and production will eventually move to custom farm or rental agreements where very very large operations farm 90% of the land and volatility will increase exponentially in terms of profitability. Also many more communities will disappear because there will be less need for local services, less need for dealers and associated infrastructure.
211.	The outlook looks bleak for young farmers who want to expand.
212.	Money talks, and more non farmers will be purchasing farm land as an investment. Traditional farmers will become slaves to the system. I think this happened to a degree a few hundred years ago in Europe-- are we seeing the repeat of history? It's time the government steps in and keeps our provincial farms in control of Sask farmers.
213.	If foreign investors are allowed to purchase our farmland.... it will drive the small and medium sized farmers out of the market.
214.	As I stated previously.
215.	We have 3000 acres that have changed hands in the last 5 years! And the price went up from 70,000 to 250,000! And it's killing our small communities! They are not coming to our schools, helping out in our rinks, etc. We know of one huge farmer from China who bought land near McAuley, Man. who tells his neighbours he's not selling one bushel to Canada, he's shipping it all to China! Now, does that make sense???
216.	Things change. We live in a world, not just a Province and might as well get used to dealing with issues on a world wide basis.
217.	Like I said before, we want to invest in a business other than farming. Guess what there will be no restrictions to limit competition, it will be develop a business plan ,invest money and work hard. Farmers can do the same. I did when I farmed through the 25% interest days.
218.	A balance will be found if prices are higher or lower.
219.	Continued ownership of Saskatchewan farmland by Saskatchewan residents will strengthen the agriculture market and grow our province versus foreign investment that will raise prices of farmland.
220.	There is enough competition among actual farmers without having to compete with investors.
221.	Let us locals farm the land! If land is gobbled up by outsiders, locals will get off and will pack up and leave, retire early, whatever. You'll be left with nobody willing to farm the land -- and then the global food supply will have a real problem.
222.	No matter who owns the land, farmers competing with each other drives the lease rates. So far, farmers have been paying the highest purchase prices in our area, even though we are a hot zone for investment fund purchasing. There is nothing creating a barrier for farmers wanting to purchase land. Three times in the last few years we have collaborated with neighbours to jointly tender on land packages too large for us individually, and we've out competed investment companies.

223.	My parents farm in Alberta. He rents over 70% of the land he farms. Most of the land he rents he will have the ability to buy. However, there are colonies that have large financial backing that allow them to purchase many acres at top-dollar. As a result you have a seller that wants top-dollar and a large group willing to sell to highest bidder. My father can't compete with a colony let alone a pension fund. There needs to be some sort of restriction.
224.	The largest negative impacts will be to local communities and governments, and to the health of the soil/land in the scenario of non-resident ownership. Farmers may not need net worth in the future, because a lot of the practices can be leased/custom done. The tipping point will be farmer's ability to purchase inputs with no net worth, and ability to store inputs and production with out owning property/storage facilities. The land will continue to degrade (with modern practices), soil health will be compromised as producers "treat the land like its rented", with compounding "effects" on the environment and personal health downstream. No-one will be held responsible due to protection from limited liability.
225.	The investment companies have already caused considerable damage to the local farming communities. I know of several farms that are just barely hanging on because they are locked into high/longterm contracts.
226.	Non farm ownership increases rental costs and purchase costs to active farmers.
227.	We can't compete with pension funds and foreign investors who buy with CASH!
228.	The free market will regulate itself. Those that want to stay in farming will find a way to acquire land whether by lease or acquisition. Prices will likely intially rise if market regulation is removed, but they will stabalize. That shouldnt be seen as a barrier to farmers, but instead a recognition of what the land is actually worth.
229.	This is not a good survey. It seems that non-sask and even non-canada responses are solicited and accepted. The questions are too vague.
230.	the land is covenant.....selling it off to investors whose primary interest is not operational agriculture is analogous to a third world country giving their resources away to offset a debt crisis....There is neither a debt crisis here....or a liquidity crisis. There is more than enough competition to either buy or lease land from local interests..... A wide open land market will create nothing but rampant speculation without a commensurate return to provincial economic prosperity.....
231.	Local farmers are more adept at reacting to the variability of their land and also severe changes in weather or crop prices.
232.	Prices go up on land. I go away to work. I don't spend money in my community. Now times that by at least 10 farmers in this area my age. That's 10 family's gone elsewhere to survive
233.	In my opinion lease rates are directly tied to return of investment as it pertains to crop production, while farm land purchases are often driven by other factors . Consequently leased land is more conducive to good business practice.
234.	farmers do not and cannot compete with investment funds. we have to earn our down payment money, not have it given to us

235.	the land is our greatest personal asset as owner operators very often, and if we cannot compete with large corporations who wish to control this asset and industry, we are reduced to employees rather than decision making business people
236.	Once land becomes unaffordable most farmers will attempt to rent land and then are at the whim of land owners as to how much rent to pay, it will end up in a bidding war for renting land . Also our rural communities will slowly die off as more and more people leave the farm and move to cities
237.	See previous comments
238.	It will become impossible for producers to own their land and continue farming and make a profit.
239.	For investors it's all about the money not the traditions or values that local farmers have in there land. They don't care who or what practices are used just the dollar signs!
240.	Don't sell out ! Nothing is a quick fix. selling to a corporation would destroy the future of farmers
241.	Farming is a difficult way to make a living currently, particularly if you are a small farmer. The love of the land - particularly if it has been in the family for many years, is what keeps many farmers on the land. It is an asset like no other! Destroy this connection and farming will never be the same. The land will not be respected in the future if this is comes to be. Let the residents of this province continue as the best stewards of the land.
242.	This is a free market economy and so farmers will make decisions that only pencil out profitably. If someone buys land and hopes to rent it out at extreme prices local farmers won't rent it. The market will provide checks and balances not the government. Those producers raising issues with ownership want to have their cake and eat it too.
243.	We can't allow our farmers to become tenant/peasant farmers. That is the system that our ancestors left behind when they came here over 100 years ago. PLEASE LEARN FROM HISTORY!!!!!!!!!!
244.	The price of farm land rising is good for the few that are ready to retire and the short term. But long term It will hurt sask agriculture. Because essentially people that don't live in our province will have control over a community they don't live in.
245.	This section was hard to understand what you are asking
246.	As a farmer I really don't see a benefit to foreign investment. I really believe the only people wanting this change are those who will profit from sales (real estate/brokers, non Ag investors, etc) and retiring farmers who are only looking at dollars. Everyone else would be troubled in some way as to what the right thing to do is. I feel that the Ag Market is the only sector that should own our land.
247.	The future of society depends upon the health of the soil. It is not a commodity to be traded on the open market. It is a living thing that is best owned by families that farm it.
248.	I am years old, and trying to make a living grain farming. I bought my first quarter off my grandfather, I am looking to buy another at the end of the year. the land prices in this province are so inflated it sickens me. my land is in RM 128, where the going price for a section (640 acres) of land is in excess of 1.2 million. I ask the sask party how am I to make a living with land

payments at that price? the sask party is killing the small family operated farms one by one. When I approach the old couples in my area to inquire about purchasing land they all tell me the same thing why do you want to get into farm? there is no money to be made, and you cant pay top dollar like the potash companies nor the out of country buyers. why would you take ownership away from the ones working the land? I feel you guys want to make us serfs. these companies or out of country owners don't care for the land nor do guys that lease the land, people who own and live on the land are the best for the stewardship of the land, they care for it, how cant you see this? the sask party needs to look to Europe and learn how there farming operations are, where the little guys are supported and encouraged. these family operated farms in sask that are 10,000+ acres are not a family farm they are corporations. also I am an electrician I work 21 days straight, this job alone is over six figures. I would give it up in a heart beat to be on the land 24/7, but unfortunately I don't see this ever happening with land prices like this. I would love to hear back from a sask party.

249. Back in the early 1900 we had to give the land to people who had the courage to live here and develop it

we should not turn the clock back

Our fore fathers came to this province to escape all the regulations and restrictions they lived under. they were entrepreneurial. let this continue

250. Bothered by the use of the word, "tradition" . I feel that tradition is not necessarily a very valid reason to resist change. I think that farmers owning the land creates an environment which not only creates a better life for the people involved but provides an invaluable incentive to look after the land for future generations. A corporation has no conscience and can abuse and walk away.

251. What I see happen is less people in the rural areas and huge large farmers. I see it happening in the short time I have lived here.

252. If foreign ownership is allowed rural Saskatchewan is finished there will be no more small towns and businesses

253. Basically if barriers are taken Away on land ownership it will have very severe consequences for Saskatchewan farmers.

254. Without the ability to secure long term access to land it would be very difficult to: 1) obtain the business operating loans many farmers rely on to level out cash flow 2) develop long term viable business plans 3) grow equity in the farm business that could be liquidated in the future as needed.

While long term leasing of land can meet some of the needs for a farm, only access to land ownership can secure all

255. WE don't need absentee land owners

256. Big operators running several thousand acres of leased land are becoming the standard in my neighborhood. Small operators like me are content with their way of life, but often are left with the marginal land that does not interest the big corporate operations. Lacking the capital to achieve maximum profitability can be a significant issue for smaller operators.

257. These seem to be loaded questions that make the assumption that the current situation is all negative to those presently farming. That assumption couldn't be further from the truth, as

<p>investors and investment firms, pension funds, etc. are very prudent when spending their funds.</p> <p>Their objective is to make wise choices when investing and in my experiences neighboring farmers will often pay more for the same land. I've chosen the answer of "negligible" just to get past these questions.</p>
<p>258. Some of the companies purchasing land in my area only want to lease to one farm, and will deal with a large farm operation from outside the district. Land prices would have risen significantly with the old farmland ownership rules in place and provided for a significant capital gain; it is not reasonable to assume land prices are driven simply by farmer demand.</p>
<p>259. If investment firms own large tracts of land their concern lies in making profits for themselves, not for our local farmers and the communities they live in.</p>
<p>260. each of these questions really depends on the current size of the farm, but when the price is high and u can justify the price it is still going to take from the profit margin, which is naturally a piece of the governments income tax</p>
<p>261. The current trend for mainstream farmers is toward large operations with substantial capital. These larger operators are likely well able to bear increasing land cost however they may take the greatest total hit if land prices crash in future. Those most affected by inflated land prices are small and medium sized operators especially young farmers. A diversity of large, medium and small operations is best for our industry in my opinion (even though agricultural policy has favored large operators in recent times). Saskatchewan is one of the few places left where land prices are low enough that an average person can be a landowner and a person can pay off a parcel from the revenue it generates in a reasonable time-frame. This greatly contributes to our economic freedom and quality of life and we should have policies to maintain this privilege.</p>
<p>262. I think the lost tradition of farmland ownership would cost our economy and our local communities greatly. By having that wealth and benefit associated with the land ownership leave the province our communities will suffer as well as our economy</p>
<p>263. The future and control of the family farm which saskatchewan was founded on resides in land ownership being restricted to saskatchewan farmers</p>
<p>264. The market will determine lease rates.</p>
<p>265. Ownership to outsiders hurts everyone. They don't spend money in our communities.</p>
<p>266. When my grandparents came to Canada and Saskatchewan , they were looking for the opportunity to own land which they could not do in Europe or eastern Canada. History has repeated itself in that it is less likely Saskatchewan farmers will own the land they farm.</p>
<p>267. Outside ownership of farmland drives up land values, due to extra competition, drives up lease rates and results in more complex lease arrangements. Profits are removed from the province and maybe even the country. Farms that lease a greater portion of their farm, have less stability because of the threat of losing the land and therefore risk their land base shrinking. With investment in equipment and infrastructure on modern farms, this is a serious threat. It is difficult to run an efficient operation with long term goals with an ever present threat of losing leased land. With farmers owning land, the equity base allows for longer term financing arrangements, and longer term planning. Also, farmers inherently take better care of their</p>

	owned land than rented land... If there is a constant risk of losing leased land, farming practices tend to milk the land rather than nurture it.
268.	Anything that increases the cost to lease land will negatively affect farmers profitability. Farmers should be able to afford to pay as much as most other investors for land, but they probably can't handle the risk of rapid decreases in farmland values as well as other investors. If farmers can be fairly certain that land prices are going to stay consistent, or rise slowly, they can make it work to buy land.
269.	farmland rental rates are tied more to the price of grain than it is to the price of land.
270.	Impact???? There is always an impact
271.	Would the provincial government also move to place restrictions on the machinery manufacturers, considering that the cost of equipment is so exorbitant? Not a chance, and so we have a situation where a tractor is worth more than a quarter of good farmland. Machinery manufacturers, fertilizer and pesticide industries, transportation companies and all the others base their costs on what the market will bear. The same should hold true for the price of farmland both for purchase and leasing. In the free market system that this provincial government promotes, it's just another input cost.
272.	We are uncertain how to answer such ambiguous questions; are you asking our opinion on the STATUS QUO re ownership? In some communities it has become almost impossible for individual farmers to purchase land because the Hutterites can always out bid everyone. Some farmer-owned corporate farms also squeeze out individual farmers.
273.	I think there is a potential for impacts outside of the agriculture industry if investors are allowed to continue to own land in Saskatchewan. For example, tensions over water resources could escalate in the future and having investors or large corporations owning farmland may result in legal problems later on.
274.	In our area we have seen an increase in the size of farms and the equipment used to operate the farms. Schools and communities are being closed down people have to drive farther to purchase any goods they may need. Bigger machinery less people needed to operate and get same amount of work done but also less employment whether it be self employed or hired
275.	If farmland was controlled by investment of non farmers/foreigners, That would be terrible. Like having mechanics controlling restaurants and chefs working on cars. Or car salesman being doctors and doctors trying to sell cars. It just doesn't work.
276.	Farming has become almost unaffordable. An average sized farm won't cut it anymore. Input costs are outpacing returns
277.	I believe small and medium sized farms would become unaffordable and agricultural production would become concentrated in the hands of a few wealthy landowners. Future agricultural policies would be dictated by non-farming entities. Even if these entities have the best interests of agriculture at heart, their decisions will be based on computer generated models and best-case scenarios rather than hands-on experience. Farming is a continually evolving industry dealing with new/evolving pests, changing climate and an equipment revolution.

	Also, farming is headed in the direction of robotic labour. Planting and harvesting would be controlled via computer. The robots eliminate the need for human labourers; however, they are very expensive and may be unaffordable for small farmers. As the small farms disappear, the service industry also disappears (as it has with the closure of country elevators). Larger farms would buy in bulk and would be willing to truck input and output farther.
278.	As stated before. My scenario is of an Alberta investor buying all around me several years ago at prices that couldn't be matched. He then sold to BHP for 4X what he paid. Insider trading, probably. Land lost for generations? Yes.
279.	I don't totally understand the question. You are asking us to predict the future. It almost seems like you are framing the question to get the response you want
280.	Ownership is important
281.	Most of these questions are ambiguous. There is no need for farmers to own the land, but they must have security of tenure such as they had through the original Land Bank program..
282.	If you want to kill agriculture keep going in the direction you are
283.	Bad for the industry
284.	What is of particular concern to me is the fact that farmers will have less equity in the form of owned land. On-farm income will be completely dependent on rental agreements signed between farmers and wealthy, non-local land owners. Farmers will have no "back up" in that if they face financial hardship, they can not sell a quarter of land since they no longer control farm capital. If they face financial hardship, the only option is to renegotiate their lease agreement with the land owner. It is very unlikely that a individual farmer in SK would have equal negotiating power as a wealthy investor or group of investors. There is an inherent imbalance of power in this relationship favouring investor(s) and it would be naïve to believe the investor(s) would not use this imbalance of power in negotiations. The percentage of the farmer's total income dependent on the farming operation is much greater than the percentage of the investor's total income dependent on the farming operation when we are discussing farm ownership by pension funds, investment trusts, or wealthy Canadian or non-Canadian residents . The investor knows this and therefore knows he/she holds the power in rental agreement negotiations.
285.	There are many other factors that play a role into a producers bottom line than just the land but without the land you don't have any options. The land will continue to be here long after we have all passed we need to take care of it. Farmers care a great deal about their land and take pride in taking care of it. They love the smell of dirt. I doubt many people other than farmers go for a walk just to smell the dirt after a rain or first thing in spring. Investors are worried about the bottom line of return.
286.	People or institutions wanting to purchase land that do not make their income from farming have the ability to pay prices far beyond the productive capacity of the land. If you are selling, this is great. The more bidders at the auction the better. However the government needs to consider if this growing trend, that will fundamentally change agricultural operations in our province, is a good thing. We are nearing a point again, similar to the pre-2008 period, where producer margins will not allow for lease payments to landlords. Who wants to own farmland as an investment then?

287.	Don't sell out my Saskatchewan more big corporate farming operations choke out smaller sask family operations
288.	It is vital to the farmers of saskatchewan that Saskatchewan farmland be owned by Saskatchewan people. Our province is NOT for sale!!
289.	when an investment firm leases land out, the lessee can only be worried about profits in the short term and the investment company only worries about investors returns and dividends. The long time viability of the land itself is unimportant . The effect of damaging pasture land is even more damaging for the long term
290.	Seems we have found the poorly worded portion of the survey. Letting foreigner or pension/investment funds/groups own SK farmland will be recorded in history as the single biggest blunder of any SK governing party. Not the legacy one wants, and a nail in the independence coffin for future generations.
291.	While these statements may be true, the format of the survey is skewed. While prices of farmland in saskatchewan have gone up, they are still far below Alberta and Manitoba. And your scenarios have not taken into account the Saskatchewan mega-farmers who have already made it difficult for young farmers to purchase or lease land. They cannot compete. As a result the mega farmers have a monopoly.... They buy more equipment so they get faster and better service, better fuel prices, discounts on chemicals and fertilizer and they fill up the grain terminals so the smaller farmers can't even deliver and sell their grain.
292.	With the way things are going, if they are to continue on we will continue to see a mass exodus of the traditional farmers from the business. Will probably see more corporate foreign outfits start up and try to farm, last a few years, go broke, and then start the cycle all over again with a different outfit.
293.	Farming has always had its ups and downs so destabilizing the manner in which agricultural land is held will add to the stress during the down years. As the planet warms, our prairie lands will be expected to produce more of the food than ever and thus encouraging Canadian farmers to expand and train the next generation about effective farming practices should be a country-wide priority.
294.	<p>My crystal ball is broken. Perhaps the foreign money put into local area will develop a way to actually produce. Perhaps they will sell back to century generation farmers [tongue in cheek] and the pension funds and investment launderings will suffer a devaluation. This is all recent in this area and it is really too soon to know . There are consequences to any action - until it is history the true story is hard to foresee. Hindsight has 2020 vision - envisionsaries can be correct . the job of selling the perceived value falls near an old circus quote. There is one born every minute.</p> <p>Did I mention we just rented out a few acres that has no access? For over 340 days of the year the only way to get there is by way of a neighbors property - or an unimproved crossing.</p> <p>I was unable to take advantage of the newfound foreign wealth because a subdivision of the reason for the unimproved crossing was too difficult. A legacy the last ice age left us .</p> <p>For a few years (before 2002) some enterprising Americans (US of A agricultural people) leased land for production in our area . This conversation is NOT new.</p> <p>Did I mention the Americans produced food from the land - but did have a small impact on</p>

what local young people had for prospects. I do not know if it was the productive ability of the years they farmed here that caused them to leave--cease operations here -- or something written in the journals of history.

Some land near here has been acquired through "Native land claims ". Where the aboriginal peoples were given funds to address their treaty rights.

Century farmers, here for generations have been given no treaty rights that I know of .

The land was homesteaded on a promise to improve the land.

I do not know how the Queen became the right and proper owner of the land , and it's prospective value. Taxation and political will have governed how the land progressed.

Looking at the auction sale catalogues- I am reminded of an old parable---

" will the last four farmers kindly turn out the lights when they leave ? "

By way of change - clean up crews now have to be paid to cut the grass at cemeteries .

What a waste of airable land they are .- food for thought-- 9 billion people for only 80 years or so

295. If foreign ownership happens then it would be very difficult for farmers to own land and also net profits would shrink

296. I feel I did that in the last section

297. Farmers rely on commodities to pay for land whether purchased or leased. Other investors are not vulnerable to commodities as farmers are. leasing can be even more risky as they are shorter term versus buying, which is long term to pay for land. Under current laws farmers are definitely going to be put at increased risk.

298. i cant beleive we are even considering this

299. 'Severe' is a "loaded" word as an option and can easily be interpreted to mean 'Bad' or 'Harmful'. 'Severe' should read 'Very significant'.

300. Any barrier to farmers being able to access land is bad for the industry

301. Farmland will become a more competitive commodity. With more interested parties in purchasing land other than your neighbors which will drive up the market. As stated previously, ownership of the land provides security with which to base expansion off.

302. Farmers of Saskatchewan will have to pay a reasonable market value for ownership or leasing farmland if they choose to expand.

The tradition of farmland ownership in Saskatchewan has been lost for some time. Farm owners cannot afford to pass their land down to their children if they want to retire and children from farm backgrounds are not staying on the home farm because they are not able earn the same standard of living that they would be able to at other 'off-the-farm' jobs.

303. When we consider what brought the millions of European immigrants to North America, and specifically to western Canada, we must acknowledge that the reason was for the opportunity to "own land." These people fled Europe because they had no chance of doing better for

	<p>themselves or their family because all the land was owned by the ultra-wealthy and the aristocrats.</p> <p>If we in Saskatchewan permit the land to be open and available to the ultra-wealthy, we are essentially rolling out the red carpet for history to repeat itself and thereby selling the future of, and what was the promise of, Saskatchewan right out from under our noses.</p>
304.	We can not understand how leasing land can be a viable farm business model. The impact to rural areas will be severe, to the point of loss of jobs, schools, etc in small towns. There is no real incentive for young farmers to start farming when they are forced to lease land with no guarantee of ownership. This model does not offer a stable land base, and with out equity the dealerships/banks will not extend credit for purchase of equipment.
305.	As a farmer, I would be "Very Concerned" about leasing or trying to purchase additional land from a foreign or non- Saskatchewan resident. The prices would be unaffordable, their ownership conditions may not be ethical or environmentally sound and only may benefit their production standards to produce the maximum quantity of food products without consideration to the land . Saskatchewan resident-owned land would have better stewardship practices for the long-term production not just a short sighted management idea that may be degrading to the land.
306.	All product is shipped out of Canada and we are left with very high prices for food that is raised in Canada
307.	I think that the big impact of looser controls on land ownership would be higher land prices, less farmer ownership, higher rental rates and consequently more tenant farmers and transient labour as farm operations become more vulnerable to market and weather disasters.
308.	Land prices or rent will be decided by commodity prices and location.
309.	Difficult to answer this question, as you are asking for predictions in the face of current uncertainty. That is, you are asking us to provide the "then", without first providing a clear "if". The fact remains, however, that government meddling in the lives of its citizens by interfering with their property rights, whether it be land or employment income, is a drag on the economy that impedes productivity, lowers the GDP. Those countries with the strongest economies in the world are those with the most economic freedom.
310.	When you finally get what the government wants and everything is foreign owned, the cost of food will be completely unaffordable. With foreign ownership all of the money is taken out of the province and becomes nontaxable which again means living is unaffordable.
311.	These are my honest opinion's
312.	im hoping that i can afford to compete with my neighbors for land that will be coming up for sale. I CAN NOT compete with out of province/country investors. I'm already having trouble competing against large corporate farms and out of province investors.
313.	If the Saskatchewan government heads down this road they appear to be planning on, rural Saskatchewan will change like never before. And once that path is chosen there is no return. I strongly am against this province heading down this path.

314.	What happens when investment firms decide to dump all this land because something else looks more attractive? When investment companies own large tracts of land in an RM they may also dictate development. that is not in the best interest of our communities
315.	Can't compete with the price to increase. Always goes to the highest bidder
316.	Farms seem to be getting bigger and so not having farmland in your area is always a concern, but farms find a way around it. Not owning land can have a large impact in your net worth and ability to control your business. This model moves away from small farms with more accountability to larger outfits that are more dollar driven and less environmentally conscience.
317.	makes no sense to lease land hours away from your home, no profit in it but if you need land to make a living and there is none available near by then many farms will die out.
318.	THESE QUESTIONS ARE IRRELEVANT TO THE OUTCOME OF THE SURVEY.
319.	As mentioned above, regarding environmental impacts- the land and ecosystem will not be properly cared for if the producer does not have a long term investment in the land. Taking extra time, when there is no extra time, often comes down to the fact that you want to leave the land better than when you started
320.	"Impact" on what? How can you possibly use the survey responses for meaningful analysis when some of the questions are so poorly written? The results you receive will be meaningless because some questions are so vague and incoherent.
321.	Based on my responses above, I feel that many farmers will lose their desire to farm. The rewards just will not be there to justify the effort and risk that goes with farming in western Canada. Unless, huge price stabilization policies/ subsidies are instituted farming will become less attractive. I fear that rural Saskatchewan will start to look more like rural areas in the former soviet union or other parts of the world where the tradition of land ownership by farmers has not, or no longer exists.
322.	In spite of a 40 year farming history, these are difficult issues to gauge even given that these questions revolve around current environment. I was reluctant to answer the impact questions.
323.	Keep our land in Saskatchewan, the stock market is a tool for investors, not the livelihood of thousands of residents. There are better options for investment companies to match there objectives, not at the expense of rural Saskatchewan which has been in a decline since the 1930's. Gov't regulations are meant to protect its people, not exploit it for money!
324.	Often in lease situations, the owners of the land do not provide upgrades to the farm site. Old bins and equipment are left . When land is owned, the farmer takes greater interest in maintaining and improving the farm site.
325.	when outsiders own the land they will want more to lease their land than the market can bear
326.	If provincial government tighten farmland ownership rule for non-local owner, it will decrease investment and tax revenue from other provinces, which lead to lower competitiveness compared with that of other neighboring provinces and it will entail legal disputes of

	constitutional consistency with federal government.
327.	I expect outside investors with deep pockets outcompete with local interests and create a "Dutch Disease" scenario.
328.	<p>No matter what happens in farmland values, we are going to see increased costs of inputs.</p> <p>However when the land asset that a farmer is trying to buy increases so does the land he already owns. Therefore creating the ability to show profits. However if the land value decreases it effects everything.</p> <p>The farmers themselves are the ones that can control the rent. if the investor does not get a renter they have to either reduce the value they want from rent or they will need to sell the land off.</p> <p>This is happening right now as we see many Chinese investors putting land on the market because they cannot find anyone to rent the land out to not even at a lower rental value.</p> <p>Ultimately no matter what is done we still need farmers to farm the land.</p>
329.	See my previous responses. The point is we cannot allow companies, pension plans and hutterite colonies to prevent young farmers from entering the industry by making the price of owning and leasing land unaffordable.
330.	Through time we see the effects of the 'land baron' scenario. Too much power in too few hands is never beneficial.
331.	Farmers will be worse off with no restriction on farm land ownership. When farmers are worse off it trickles down to make it worse for the population that needs farm products. If corporations own the food supply price for food will skyrocket. Leave the restrictions in place so that Saskatchewan farmers own the land.
332.	As I stated earlier, I feel it is important for the land to stay in the hands of the people working the land, not an outside entity that has little or no experience or knowledge of the area or farming practices in general. If the people farming the land own the land they have a more vested interest in the health and quality of the land. Also if the investments groups are not based in Saskatchewan, valuable tax dollars will be lost. In my experience the general public and consumers believe it is important that the farm is owned by the individuals who work it, rather than an investment group("Corporate Farms", even though I know many farms are now incorporated for tax purposes)
333.	Foreign ownership and corporations will destroy traditional farming in Saskatchewan. If there are not anymore farm families, where will those people work? The current large farmers are farming up to 100,000 acres with a relatively small crew of employees.
334.	Quite simply high farmland values take the option of Saskatchewan farmers owning their land, communities dwindle, tax base decreases, money leaves the province. Saskatchewan farmland regulations are required to keep the land in the hands of the people who actually farm the land.
335.	If foreign buyers are allowed unrestricted access to purchase land, it will likely drive prices through the roof. Mainland China alone has thousands of billionaires and tens of thousands of millionaires who are constantly looking for opportunities to invest and increase their massive wealth. If the economy or political situation there takes a bad turn (highly likely), its likely we'd see a massive out-migration of people and wealth. Poor and semi-impooverished masses in

	Saskatchewan would have very little hope of competing with the super-rich for the purchase of farmland (or homes). Something very similar has happened in Vancouver where extremely rich foreigners have made home ownership in Vancouver all but impossible for the majority of youth.
336.	First of all we have to PROTECT our food source. I believe that some of the foreign ownership is so their countries can secure a food source. When land is run by a big corporation and the stewards of the land have no ownership of it the land is not cared for as well.
337.	Buying or leasing land is already difficult (getting worse every day). People are currently overspending to compete with outside money (this will have disastrous results down the road).
338.	Pride in ownership
339.	Leasing or buying land is a personal choice - just like leasing or buying a combine. No one is suggesting that machinery manufacturers should have restrictions on the crazy prices they charge for large equipment. Therefore the cry that land is unaffordable is absolutely negligible to me. Whether young farmer or old, the land (whoever owns it) will be farmed by someone under some kind of arrangement.
340.	Same as previous. Owner operators run more sustainable operations
341.	I believe that this is a very serious issue facing our province. There is much more involved than just the value of land increasing and making farmers have more equity on paper. There is much more to our way of life than just money.
342.	Most land is bought by farmers currently, and most leased land is leased from retired farmers or their descendants
343.	I am not sure what the relevance of asking every one to imagine the future is, if there is not already a set plan in place to imagine the consequences of thus set plan.
344.	If land ownership is not controlled and Corp. are allowed to continue to patent life forms which are not the creation of people but of God, farmers will likely become virtual serfs and off farm workers won't be much better off because we all have to eat and have potable water and one or two international corporations will make sure the 1% do very well and the rest get just enough to survive and work for them..
345.	Only Saskatchewan residents should be able to buy land. Just Saskatchewan.
346.	This was a very poorly worded section and no description of the current farmland rules makes it very difficult for the average individual filling this survey out to answer them correctly. I fully do not understand what the questions were asking. Basic concept is that I feel we need to restrict the foreign ownership and make sure that Saskatchewan individuals can continue to own the land that makes up our province. People that live and work here want to make sure we have a very sustainable and productive agriculture sector. Foreign individuals that do not live here are motivated by other reasons and stewardship and sustainability of the environment will not be top of mind for them. There is enough competition among farmers now that will keep the price of land at high enough values to ensure everyone properly

	compensated for their ownership in farmland.
347.	The face of ag is certainly changing. my experience with non resident landlords has been bad. they resist taxes increases, refuse to make any improvements and are out of touch with the industry
348.	Land price increases and lease rate increases in my area in NE SK are primarily related to local farmers putting pressure on the market than any outside investment. I hope this survey can adequately dissect the questions and responses on who can own farmland rather than confusing the fact that land and lease rates have gone up not only because of outside investment but primarily because the ag sector has been strong and farmers themselves are the biggest reason for increases in the marketplace (which is fine and part of capitalism).
349.	while leased land may seem more cost effective , it is hard to make long term plans based on short term leases. down turns in global economic conditions make farm land attractive at times, but when interest rates climb (which I believe they will) lease rates based on return per invested dollar will follow whether or not commodity returns will support those rates. this scenario could make an otherwise solvent business , insolvent in a relatively short period of time
350.	My main concern is getting MORE people on the land, not less. And it's not true that bigger farms are more efficient. Seeding and harvesting in a timely fashion becomes much more difficult on huge tracts of land, seed quality can be reduced and, indeed, in many cases locally, crops are left out over winter and often lost entirely. Farmers become much more dependent on insurance.
351.	This a poorly designed and difficult to understand section of the survey.
352.	Hard to answer when I don't know what the increase or decrease percentages are. if cost of leasing farmland doubles or triples...
353.	I think I answered this in previous responses
354.	Leased land rates is more between farmers and weather. Drought will bring down rates all by itself. That may also reduce outside investment if the returns aren't there like they used to be. Would also like to see what happens when interest rates go up. Should reduce demand for land as well
355.	The impact I see is that farms will continue to hold equity as land prices swell and as some take advantage of this opportunity to reap cash for retirement or reinvestment in other opportunities. the down side is less demand for equipment and their equity there will suffer. I am concerned that with ownership shifting to non-farm entities, who will control the cost of land through leases or ownership, and who will commit to long term production, or will leasing land be an easy way in and out of farming, throwing the future in this important industry into uncertainty and disarray?
356.	It is impossible to compete with the large farmer who gets invested money as some of our neighbours do. The large farmer who operates with the same principle (own money) is more reasonable to deal with and often takes better care of the land
357.	Outside investors care little for the well being of communities and people but rather just their

	ROI from the properties. CPP is a classic example of the problems. All lease's are being renewed at higher rates, removing more economic benefits from the land for people outside the province.
358.	When a farmer owns their land and has to make a living they will do the best job they can and take care of the land. When it is owned by an investor and leased out it tends to be farmed by a different farmer every couple years and the land is neglected and will become worthless in years to come.
359.	With more land being owned by non Saskatchewan investors the price of land will be less affordable for farmers to buy and less available to lease because the investor will lease large amounts of land to a single large farm that is prepared to lease all of the investor's land to simplify lease agreements.
360.	Consolidation of farmland ownership in Saskatchewan is a trend that started in the 70's and will likely continue. Businesses across the country have merged and consolidated and agriculture is not that much different.
361.	as land moves away from being owned by saskatchewan farmers their ability to control their future in farming will also decline. as more farmers are forced to lease their land it will be a turning back of the clock as well as less and less people in rural saskatchewan.
362.	Ownership is important for the stability of the moderate sized family farm. Ownership significantly impacts community stability as well.
363.	If farmers end up with less equity versus other assets in times of hardship they have nothing to fall back on to pull them through. When I started farming I also had the mentality that as long as I made my payments on my land I was making money and when I retire I would have that money. That has become no longer the case. If I make no money in a year and make my lease payments did I make any money? No.
364.	The huderite colonies split every 20 years. Effectively doubling in size. If this doubling continues, and it is exponential growth, Saskatchewan will be dominated by religious cults
365.	We will be serfs working for corporations if this continues.
366.	As already explained above.
367.	Unlikely that farm land prices will vary much from where they are right now. Local farmers will probably still farm the land at lease rates similar to what they are now. Money still kept in the communities and ease of entry for new farmers will still be possible even with forge in or out of province ownership. And groups like CPP buying land is just Canadians buying land. Keeps money in local and Canadian pockets.
368.	Farmers who lease land tend to give up in tough times. Farmers who own land are more innovative. Farmers who own land tend to be more involved in comunity
369.	Changes will lead to negative consequences. Over time farmland will increase in Saskatchewan, especially with rising grain prices, anyway. Farmers should be able to own land and make

	things for generations to come. they need to make the profit, not some investment middle man who has nothing to do with farming or Saskatchewan.
370.	Equity in the form of owned land questions - depends on the amount of land owned and the size of the farm.
371.	Again these questions are completely irrelevant. Land lease prices increase due to competition from other farmers which is a result of current prospects of profitability. Has nothing to do with foreign ownership. Land prices increase and decrease as a result of profitability, not foreign ownership.
372.	The question regarding the potential impact doesn't provide an option of "don't know/unsure." This is leading the petitioned. We cannot know what supply management will bring other than it reduces the flexibility of the land being put towards its most effective or efficient use. Speculating like this given current farm prices is simply looking at short-term impacts. We cannot know what the longer-term implications of increasing management of supply other than the use of the land would not be optimized.
373.	the market has always dictated values no matter who owns it. prior to the foreign ownership rule changes there was lots owned by nationals farmed locally and everyone was happy except the NDP
374.	Farming today is left to " the best of the best." not only have costs escalated to the point that you can't own both, you have to choose between owning land or the equipment to farm the land. so it will become increasingly more difficult for farmers to expand by either leasing or buying the land. It may be happening now but there will be a third party involvement and that will be an investor who is going to finance the operating costs(at a larger %) so you will have land owners, farm operators and private financial investment.
375.	I don't understand the situation well enough to comment
376.	Don't bring corporations or Private investment into The one thing that is Saskatchewan! We have seen over the past few years that large private equity farms do not last. It's all about dollars and making money. Farming is a lifestyle not a job. Don't take that away from us.
377.	It's already happening. Young farmers are stretched too thin competing with each other to expand with rented acres. Without equity built up in owned land, one bad year will bankrupt many of our young farmers. They've done it to themselves, but it's going to be sad when it happens.
378.	We want to purchase the land we farm.
379.	If land ownership shifts the way of outside investors, the very basis of agriculture in Saskatchewan is at risk. It creates an environment where profits would be allocated to rent payments because of investors trying to capitalize on bumper crops. If Saskatchewan farm land were to have even a 1/4 or 1/3 or total area owned by outside investors we are also opening ourselves up to a collapse in land prices during poor years. These investors are the first to ask for more money during good years and the first to bail during bad years. Simply put, for the benefit of Saskatchewan agriculture and the people of Saskatchewan, ownership needs to

	remain local and in the hands of primary producers and farmers.
380.	Regardless of if I own or lease the land I still make the decisions. If I choose to enter a partnership that is still my choice. What are you trying to hide with all this smoke and mirror stuff? Gas prices have gone up too, is that due to tourist from outside of Saskatchewan buy gas here?
381.	Its difficult to interpret what the scenarios above mean. It depends if ownership rules are opened up or not (?). Do you mean the current environment with cost of land rising and speculations about land rules? It is also difficult to anticipate what the short, medium and long term impacts will be.
382.	Tenant farmers are much more likely to need to value short-term gain over long-term sustainability and health of the land/ecosystem. This mind-set can lead to poor farming practices, which have long-term detrimental effects on the soil. Absentee land-owners are less likely to be around to enforce good farming practices, or may not even be aware of best practices.
383.	Keep ownership of farm land in the hands of actual producers.
384.	this question is much the same as the previous one. The probability and the impact are directly related. The question really is what is the role of the locally owned farmer? Is there a net societal value? if so, how is it protected by law?
385.	Farmland belongs to farmers not speculators. Q. Farmers have more barriers to leasing land.... Reply: Hope this does not happen.
386.	It depends on whom we're talking. As a province, a society and an economy, I don't see democratization of farmland access and breaking down of such isolationist policies to be a bad thing. It may have a significant impact on the acquired and hereditary privileges of farmers and ranchers.
387.	If land is valued too high it becomes too risky for farmers to operate that land.
388.	There is a consideration of scale and distance. At present we are building scale based on supply side economics and lots of cheap fossil fuel so that we have capital equipment intensive operations where they have to get bigger to survive. this is the " Saskatchewan agricultural bubble" we are in. When it collapses we need to have a safety net policy in place that doesn't enable "junk bond scavengers" to take control of one of the essential cornerstones of life itself.
389.	I farm in a different province. If it was opened up I would be expanding into SK for cheaper land, yet get all inputs and pay tax in MB
390.	Things are changing fast whether changes happen or not. To restrict ownership will hold Saskatchewan farmers under capitalized vs others in the world market.
391.	If non-agricultural investors are allowed to purchase land in Saskatchewan there will be a total shift to leasing land as is common in Europe. Big corporate run farms will become more prevalent. If non-Canadians are allowed to purchase farmland overpopulated countries like China will be able to buy land, produce food and ship it to their own country and Canadians will

	have less ability to grow their own food. Canadians could potentially have less control over what the land is used for...GMO crops, etc.
392.	long-term purchase of farmland with financing is very cash strapped in for producers. Leases are 100 percent write-offs, whereas the only component of a long term purchase that a farmer can actually write off is just the interest. The only benefit of farm land ownership is absolute control. The market will dictate the price of leasing and farmers who cannot worked their operations to afford the margins simply will not be involved.
393.	Total loss of control of what's happening in farming. Large corporations can come in to rent large tracts of land eliminating young local farmers' chance of expanding. They can drive rental rates too high for young farmers to afford to pay. At high levels of rent it can become a risk to what young farmers already own and operate. Paying too high a rent could jepordize what they already farm.
394.	Farmers have limited capital...accessing nearby land is of benefit Opening up ownership only reduces barriers to leasing adjacent lands.
395.	The larger farmers have very little problems in moving greater distances to work leased or owned land. Most absentee landlords are willing to trade larger rent returns in exchange for input into the operation.
396.	not really a clear question
397.	Not sure on Barriers that prevent farmers from owning and leasing. Small farms are almost non existent with large farms purchasing more and more land because of the equity they carry with their land and the equipment used to farm. Soon there will only be mega farms and Hutterite colonies.
398.	Saskatchewan residents shouldn't have to fight to be able to afford to start a farm or expand what they have. The small farm is gone and losing the saskatchewan born and raised farmer would be unthinkable.
399.	don't like the way survey is set up. should be asking "if loosening of ownership occurs what do you think?"
400.	We need to encourage local land ownership and true 'farming' as well as supporting local producers. Remove the 'greed' factor and people can make a comfortable living wage producing clean and nutritious non-GMO 'FOOD' - BIG AG, of course, is not interested in any of those elements.
401.	If foreigners want to pay let them. they will either make money or resell.
402.	leaving the land ownership market open leaves current Saskatchewan farmers at risk ...farming is already one of the riskiest businesses I know of.
403.	The lease prices are regulated by the market place. If it is unprofitable to farm the farmer stops leasing. The land is really a bank to store money in a secure place. The revenue of return is much smaller in Alberta with high land prices. It the user who ultimately decides what he/she is prepared to pay. We live in a global economy and I believe that allowing the value of the land to increase is an adjustment overdue.

404.	on equity of owned land versus other assets I believe more land will be rented short term from local neighbors. the price of equipment gets stupid every year. this is why I see land equity less than other assets.
405.	Saskatchewan will have more opportunity
406.	Tradition of Farmland in Saskatchewan: How would the Sask government differentiate who is a large institutional investor and who isnt? Is a farmer that owns 40-50,000 acers one? Our family farmed in Saskatchewan as of the late 1800's but we now live in BC. Are we continuing the tradition of farmland ownership in Saskatchewan or are we foreign investors? Investors fear uncertainty, and uncertainty as to who qualifies to own farmland could wind up hurting both investors and farmland owners across Saskatchewan.
407.	Farmers are subsidized and it is an industry of untruthful participants.
408.	Many Canadian farming immigrants came from countries where there was no future in farming - Ukraine, Poland etc.. thus, they came here. The farmland was owned by rich people and the work was done by poor peasants. The food industry is famous for producing food using slave labor rates. This time could come again. When the farmer can own the land they have the best incentive to learn how to grow crops using good economic practises.
409.	Not sure I understand your slant in these questions.
410.	All farmers lose with corporations. Those who farm for them become there slave and can never be big enough but yet can never do the proper job. When they go down they take everyone with them.
411.	Local land owners do benefit from increased market value for leased land. This is especially true for First Nations Owners who have been taken advantage of. However uncontrolled leased costs will put great stress and increase risk of long term farm profitability and ultimately farm viability.
412.	I'd also like add to add this: With more ownership being taken away from farmers, Larger mega farms begin to take over because they strike lease deals with the land owner (hedge funds, investors). As a result, less young people are in the community and those communities eventually will die.
413.	Questions above were answered assuming that by "current evironment around farmland ownership" it is meant that few or little restrictions on ownership would be in place.
414.	currently, the system we have works quite well. most ownership of land is by fairly local owners, farmers run into no barriers for purchasing or renting land in and around their local areas, the cost to lease farmland isn't increasing drastically, and it is still possible to buy farmland in Saskatchewan as a farmer. when multinational corporations are thrown into the mix, more barriers for Saskatchewan farmers are put up, rents will go up, and farmers will have less equity in their land compared to equipment. owning the land and having that equity from the land is and always has been an important part of the tradition of farmland ownership, and farmers not owning that land will destroy that incredibly important and historic tradition. Saskatchewan was a province built on the idea that you could own 180 acres with 10 dollars and the will to work and homestead the land for 3 years. farmers not owning the land would

	be as unbelievable as the Canadian flag without the maple leaf.
415.	As Les Henry says you can't farm from Toronto or Calgary or China for that matter. I am if you haven't already figured that out. Rural areas need to have people with invested interest in the land.
416.	I feel worried about the future of farming. it is changing with legislation that I have no control over. It's scary and most of all it is changing rural saskatchewan for the worst. For those in the city they don't realize what's happening.
417.	The land whether it is owned or leased is the inexpensive part of the business, the most important but the least costly. The production inputs and equipment and even breeding stock is where the real costs are.
418.	The main reason for farming in my mind is family... It is getting harder and harder to keep a family on the farm.
419.	if the rules are relaxed for large investors of farmland, I expect they would rather rent it to one or two very large farmers rather than several mid sized operations.
420.	Priority of ownership opportunity to resident farm operator owners is very important. It is necessary to maintain a strong Saskatchewan rural agriculture industry.
421.	Question are confusing
422.	investors will cause a major drop in production on sask farm land
423.	These questions confuse me somewhat. A world of buyers is better than restricted buyers, period.
424.	Ownership of farmland is crucial to allow producers the ability to invest in the land itself and all other farm inputs required to compete. Long-term the money exported or earned by out of province investors/non-farmers would decrease the farmers ability to make money and the value of the industry.
425.	You will lose lots of communities in rural Saskatchewan. Government and multi-national sleeping in the same bed. You will destroy farm life because of the mighty dollar government don't give a !! (Serious -)
426.	Q. 15 - Answer yes if government changes regs. - for both don't know/not sure answers. Q 16. Farmers have more barriers to leasing land... - Answer yes if Corporations own the land.
427.	The current environment provides a good balance in ownership and leasing options for most farmers. Lease rates are always dictated by grain prices and risk reward factors in the marketplace. Currently there is an abundance of farmland to lease at fair values for both the leasee and leasor.
428.	if out of province foreign or pension plans own land more money will leave Saskatchewan and Canada and have a negative influence on the economy and eventually our provincial government will lose total control of the province

429.	The tradition of farming resides in the operator of the crops and not the land ownership. The needed amendment of the farmland security act lifts all the boats and brings Saskatchewan farmland into competitive values with neighboring farming jurisdictions.
430.	When you own the land you farm, your vested interest increases and you will have better stewardship. As more non-local ownership occurs there is less vested interest in the long term and more in the short term.
431.	I believe strict Preventative measures are needed towards foreign investment and investment fund land purchases to make the Saskatchewan farmers thrive now and survive in the future!
432.	When you invest in land, you have no other monetary means for other investments.
433.	The farmer or land owner has the same ability to purchase or lease lands as the non-resident owner. more land will be leased, profits will likely increase due to larger amounts of land being farmed by fewer farmers. Scarcity will increase the value of land, in a free and open market the market will decide the price of a commodity, not government, not individuals.
434.	Allowing the growth of non-local ownership and the resulting hyper-inflation of farmland prices will have long term negative implications in all of the above categories. The reduction of land equity will leave farmers more vulnerable to economic stresses (price, production, markets). Commercial landlords will be much less flexible than local landlords, and will seek large farm operators to lease their land rather than local moderate sized farmers.
435.	Already the allowance of corporate ownership has increased the market value of land so that local farmers have difficulty competing to purchase land. Allowing Canadian citizens to own Sask. land allows for a balance of some external investment in the province, but opening it up to international investment would open a flood gate that would quickly destroy the rural fabric that we currently have. There should also be a restriction on the amount of land any one external investor or company can control.
436.	In above questions you are asking us to predict the future . I have no crystal ball. But if land is treated the same as a TSX stock - the base that built this province will be lost.
437.	I feel that when a farmer retires and wants to lease his land out, it's a very acceptable way to lease land. I am not in favor of multi million dollar corps owning land. Having someone that has never even been out to look at the land tell me that I am not farming it the right way.
438.	Foreign ownership of farmland will severely negatively impact the Saskatchewan farm operations of any size. A farmer needs to own a good part of their land to be able to be sustainable. The option of carrying extra mortgages on owned land to keep the farm financially healthy in the bad years is a nessecity. Government programs are not sufficient to help the farmers come though the tougher years. We need the backup of owned assets. That's only possible if farmland stays affordable.
439.	Current rules have helped to stabilize the need for demand when land is for sale and has provided means for new entrants to finance their operation without the burden of too much

	mortgage debt.
440.	When times are tough all you have to fall back on is the equity in your land. Without that cushion most farmers would go under with a couple bad years in a row
441.	There are fewer farmers every year and there must be a way for retiring farmers to get a fair value for their land. With less buyers, there's less demand and low prices. Saskatchewan must not hinder European farmers from coming over to carry on the farm land tradition. If there is a way for retiring farmers to gain the higher prices for land so be it. We were unrealistically behind all other areas of Canada and US as far as land prices for many years because of government controls. Only recently have we been catching up but we are still not getting the values of parts of the world. The government has no right to control the assets of farmers. Market price is Market price.
442.	If land ownership rules are relaxed allowing outside third party (ie non-farming) investors to purchase agricultural lands, land prices will be determined by competition and bidding wars, not market value based on the productive capacity of the land. As land prices escalate, the landowners will continue to raise rental rates, making leases extremely costly/prohibitive to the farm operators. Farmers will be reduced to serfdom. Is this the future we want for our province?
443.	All of these reponses depend on the governments action regarding corporate ownership, etc.
444.	no comment
445.	Investors are doing it for the all mighty buck. Farmers are doing it for the love of farming
446.	All of these scenarios mean that land will be less taken care of. it means that land won't be cared for properly, it will be neglected, ditch work won't be done properly, unsustainable practice will be the norm, since some farmers don't treat leased land the same as owned land
447.	Has nothing to do with the land. Land prices are actually reasonable. It is the farming part that costs too much. You don't make money off the value of the land. Money comes from the farming (which is unaffordable).
448.	It will go to the highest bidder without consideration to local farmers.
449.	I know specific large acreage framers who still want to own a large amount of their farmland to reduce the stress related to leasing of farm machinery, stabilizing their business lives and having something for their families to count on as they age. Those who lease everything live a very stressful life and they have very lttle to fall back on in that environment. In a balanced ecosystem whether it is a biological system or an economical system there are checks and balances that are either adhered to or there are consequences. If the system is balanced from within then things will not go out of a stable existence like Saskatoon's current housing markets. I know individuals who have had their very nice condos up for sale since January and are still looking for someone to buy their condo.
450.	If huge pension plans or massiv foreign investment owns the land it creates a false inflated value of the land. If you have to leverage your own land equity to lease equipment and land to keep up with what these overwhelming investment companies demand, that's not agriculture anymore.
451.	Ownership outside the province may well mean that decisions regarding that land will no

	longer rest within the area/municipality/province.
452.	Communities aren't made up of investment dollars. It's people. Investors do not have their children learning how to farm. Agriculture is our most vital sector of the economy. We need ties to the land.
453.	smaller local farmers look after land better and care about its future more and the environment around it than those that dont live here. like with anythinglook at the example of a rented home and a owned home....which is looked after better! same goes for saskatchewan's land.
454.	Especially ranchers, we do not have very many young ones coming for only one reason: Can't afford to be there
455.	Investment funds are our money competing against our farms.
456.	When I am ready to retire I may have very different responses. Historically farmers were always cash broke, but had significant equity in there land. I would like to pass my land down to my son. But I need to be able to make profit year to year and not just build equity. High prices mean high payments which erode net profit.
457.	If the changes occur and more farmland is purchased for investment then a few farms get big. The little to medium size farmer will have trouble accessing land and therefore won't be able to make ends meet. Thus the big farmers will get bigger and the little ones will end up dwelling in the city and hating it.
458.	Enough of the "Spin Doctors", you don't have to cloud the issue with the language you choose. Ask a simple question, "Do you believe farmlands in Saskatchewan should be owned by farmers in Saskatchewan ?" see how simple that was. Now let me ask you a question. Do you represent the constituents in your province, or big business???
459.	Once again it is very difficult to answer these questions without discussion and clarification
460.	Farmland is already unaffordable for Sk farmers to purchase
461.	In our area we have seen rent almost triple in the last five years
462.	Why change ownership rules. I Just don't understand the need for this. Stop selling out Saskatchewan please.
463.	If you're in agriculture for the money, the family values and traditions that this province was built on will be totally lost. If you don't care about the land, decisions will be money-based, not on continuing to value and care for the land so it can continue to be farmed.....
464.	Please stop this stupidity of pension plans and foreigners owning our farm land
465.	Traditional farms are the backbone of rural communities and small towns. Anything that threatens traditional farms impacts the economy and viability of the rural populations . And I Think this is becoming a concept that is far removed from the lawmakers living in an urban sprawl.

466.	I want to see that the young farmers are able to purchase land and have a good income and lifestyle. We need to grow our rural areas and maintain a good quality of life. Put a stop to the big corporate farms and for sure outside investors.
467.	Poor series of questions in this section. I can't follow them.
468.	the young farmers will still rent the land if its available. they may have to pay a bit more. they seem they have lots a money to buy new machinery.
469.	Reasons of stewardship given before. look! There is no more land and if we screw this up we go to a have nothing province.
470.	i have ansewered the two above questions as the land ownership laws stay as they are. the questions are a little confusing
471.	Because Sask. has the most farmland, if we are selling most of our land to Alberta or other provinces we really aren't Sask. anymore and if we sell to other Countries, we are no longer Canada. Once we lose our land, though we may be here to do the actual work for them, there will be no going back to getting the land back. There will be no generation to generation farming. Around me we have lots of young men wanting to farm and looking for land right now. This is enough challenge for my 3 sons without competing with another province let alone another Country. Let the people who want to actually do the farm work, own the farm land.
472.	Farm land needs to be affordable for farmers to purchase. it also needs to provide a good nest egg at retirement. The cost of land makes it impossible for new farmers to get in. There are no good government incentives for new farmers. Large corporate farms have better government incentives and will own it all probably in my life time. Back to the same ownership as medieval times.
473.	Most of the elderly farmers want to retire. they need to get more cash when they sell as this is their retirement fund. we are still under valued in Sask on land prices. We should let foreign investment buy as much land as they want in Sask, this would increase farm values. if the local big farmers want to purchase our land they have to pay the going rate like everyone else.
474.	n/a
475.	Farming used to be a way of life now it has become a business. in order for it to survive it must run like a business. Young farmers are no longer able to purchase farm land as it did become too expensive, therefore renting would be the only option. Older farmers that are retiring should have the right to get the best possible price they can for their land.
476.	Just sell the province off and let foreign investment buy it high, then kick them all out and take the land back. This way farmers can retire comfortably and then young farmers can buy it back cheap again :)
477.	I see more large farming operations leasing land as opposed to buying it. I also see lease prices rising to the point where I wonder if there is any profit margin left.
478.	There is no tradition of farmland ownership in Saskatchewan. The only reason that was the case is because nobody else would want to own the land other than farmers. Any decent farmer out there recognises the cost/benefit of owning land or leasing it. Sometimes it makes sense when the price of land is up to lease the land, sometimes when the cost of leasing is too

	high then it makes sense to own the land. Market conditions change rapidly - it is not much different then residential real estate.
479.	The days of ownership of all land required to make a viable operation are gone. Most successful operators will be farming more lease land than owned. Leasing does work in operating other businesses and will be successful in farming operations.
480.	You have to own the land to ride out market fluctuations
481.	see previous comments
482.	if large companies own the land the owners are not the stewards of their land. The people leasing it are there to make as much money off the land as they can while leasing. they do not care what condition they leave the land in after they are done leasing. The owners are looking for a return on investment - and don't care that local small communities suffer because of the lack of local ownership
483.	I am a traditionalist. I want to see rural Saskatchewan populated and thriving with neighbours and a suporting community. It makes Saskatchewan who it is! Strong and Free.
484.	Because of the above senarios we already have experienced not purchasing more land!
485.	If "ownership and control" resides with foreign interests, foreigners will produce and send the resulting agricultural output to their home countries -- a few decades down the road, it will be challenging for locals to purchase Saskatchewan produced agricultural products because it will likely be destined for export.
486.	Farmers have traditionally relied on appreciation in land values as their retirement savings program. Other equity tends to depreciate, so if higher demand for land leads to higher prices, they will still have the same "future wealth" on owned land and will not need to own more. From an operation standpoint, farmers tend to have way too much of their equity tied up in land ownership and need to use other tools to manage cash/profits.
487.	I see my farm's future in doubt, and some guy no where near here getting my neighbor to farm land for him because I can't afford the rent he will charge just to make sure he makes a buck, good crop or bad.
488.	All I have to say is, as a young rancher I have ranched along side my dad for many years and I love the life style, but the way the future is looking I have almost lost interest all together because I don't see a future in it for me at this time. I have never done it for the money, but more for the love of animals and the accomplished feeling I have at the end of the day. Too bad traditions get lost and lifestyles over economic gain. Numbers can change on a piece of paper everyday and can make an industry strong for a period of time, but it is the people that care so much about agriculture and the lifestyle that can make an industry last a lifetime. Sometimes, since we have been told over and over again how important money is, we get so caught up in the economics we forget about the big picture and what is truly important. All the money in the world can't buy food that has never been grown. Not sure if that would ever happen, but it is definitely worth a lot of thought.
489.	If investors continue to purchase Saskatchewan farm land we will be sending ourselves back in time to the feudal system in Europe. Which is the main reason my ancestors left Europe.
490.	Our biggest asset as a farmer is as a landowner. Our great grand parents came to this country

	because of the prospect of being able to own land. I believe that if we were to open the province to foreign ownership of land this land will be lost to foreign control, relegating our future generations to a renter or sharecropper status. Land is a strategic resource.
491.	more foreign workers , no care about land stewardship , no young families with ownership ,no communities, more urban crime
492.	When someone has no vested interest in what they do and don't own the land (or equipment for that matter) there is not much incentive To stick it out through the tough times. If a farmer is at risk of losing land that he owns he/she will do whatever it takes to ensure they don't lose it. If they don't own anything then there's no risk of losing anything and that's why there are so many bankruptcies even now. I believe that that trend will only worsen as farmers own less land.
493.	My wife is from australia, we have seen what outside investment has done there, and we are currently watching this grow in the states. Locals cannot afford the land. Lots end up leasing or managing places. They are at the mercy of people who often are never there and do not know the first thing about the land they own.
494.	farming is a way of life for generations in Sask. Land is being sold to out of province and out of country investors who could care less about the rural way of life. They are investors only.... case closed the demise of rural sask is advanced
495.	It all just makes it unaffordable for young people to start ranching or farming, thats why there is fewer and fewer ranchers and farmers all the time. We know very many young people who would like to ranch or farm but cannot compete with present day land prices. Once it is in the hands of non sask residents, chances of it returning to a local rancher or farmer are slim.
496.	The SK government MUST step up and amend laws so that NON-SK persons are unable to purchase agricultural land (or with a restriction of number of acres). They must have the foresight to protect SK farm operations if they wish to continue to enjoy a SAFE REALIABLE AFFORDABLE Source of Food. There are already too many situations where non-SK people/companies buy up SK. land, hold it for a year or two, then put it up for sale at 2 or 3 times the purchase price. That land is OUT OF PRODUCTION for the SK. Producer. There is also too many Ag people sourcing money from transferring 'Right-of-Ways' of their properties from outfits like The Nature Conservancy. Would the SK government sell its Legislative building to anyone... out of province or not? That is the same risk as allowing non-SK Agriculture people to non-restrictively buy SK Agricultural land.
497.	We are losing too much control of SK land. People owning land do not understand that the market value does not represent the productive value. They expect a return of investment that is unrealistic. That is because they do not understand how agriculture works and the risk involved. No other industry takes 20+yrs to pay for its capital investment. Non Agriculture people cannot comprehend this and expect too much too fast.
498.	no comment
499.	Many of the so called traditions were lost years ago. as long as long term leases are available as an alternative to owning land, the game remains the same.
500.	the price of land is put out of the reach of the young farmer because he cannot secure the

	funds to purchase the land as fast as the large groups can. most farmers do not have the time to do the proper assessment because of the pressure from large investment groups to buy right now.
501.	I think currently that things are going up and it's getting hard to compete with the really large farmers in the area to buy land. They offer millions for parcels all together and how can a smaller farmer compete with that? However, I think this could get a lot worse if other non-farming corporations are allowed to purchase farmland in SK.
502.	If commodity prices are high, you will pay more rent. When prices go down, so does rent. If rent is too high, renters will back away from the land and not farm it, until an acceptable rent is agreed upon.
503.	High farmland prices only benefit those retiring from farming, rather than those starting out. I'm unsure of what is viewed as the tradition of farming in other areas of the province, but in this area, it is seen as a business that a man hands down to whichever of his sons is willing to take over the operation of the farm. But for me, farming is not a business, nor is owning land an investment. Farming is a way of life. Farming is something you do because you love it, you do not get rich from farming. The only rich farmers are retired ones. I believe that the Saskatchewan government should place limits on the amount of land operations are allowed to work. This is because these large 'superfarms' are killing the small farms and the connection that people should have with the land they work. Farming is not a business or an investment strategy, it is a way of life, and we as a province have begun to shift away from that view. If the province relaxes regulations on land ownership, I fear I won't even be able to buy the family farm off my father, let alone have any hope of expanding it. I believe in the Saskatchewan government, and I trust that they have the best interests of the province at heart.
504.	There is always risk in losing leased land.
505.	If six corporations own all the land in your area you are not going to have a say in how anything is done
506.	free market like any other business
507.	Non farm ownership will impact all of Saskatchewan residents, wildlife and other resources. Most farmers are living in a community and contribute to that community. Will care more for the impact to the land by making decisions to protect the production in future years. Non farm ownership farming practices will be impacted more by how much profit can be made now and not caring what this will do to the land in 10 years time.
508.	I think there are too many loopholes in the current system that make it very simple to own Saskatchewan land even though you are a foreign investor. For example, someone from the UK has a lawyer in Saskatchewan set up a corporation that the lawyer would own. The person in the UK purchases an exercisable option to acquire those shares for fair value which is nominal on the inception of the Company. The company does business and buys and controls SK land. The person from Ireland essentially has beneficial ownership of that Company and that land by having the option to acquire those shares at a nominal amount. Very simple and a way to circumvent ownership rules that I believe is happening as we speak. It will absolutely increase the price and value of land and I believe as a consequence it will have the negative impacts previously mentioned, loss of control, loss of value-added business opportunities and an overall negative long term economic impact.

509.	We must guard against non-residents owning our most valuable resource. Once a nation loses control of it's land base, it soon becomes powerless and weak. I am not talking about the government owning the land, but rather the importance of it's builders and stewards having ownership for every positive reason you can think of. It is extremely short-sighted to focus and promote the value of foreign investment in our land base. There are many places to allow foreign ownership, but allowing ownership to anyone but the hard-working dedicated resident people who have deep roots in the province is analogous to selling your soul to the devil.
510.	Landlords in my area have bid up price of land and the cost of rent beyond the net revenue of the land. It is at the price you can afford pay if you subsidize it with land you already own. This is the extortion price of land. You either have to quit farming or pay up.
511.	Not sure how to respond to these questions. If non-Canadians are allowed to own farmland, no doubt land values and leases will increase. We will be back in feudal times.
512.	Leasing land is a hard thing to juggle. As far as equipment investments, To go out and get the equipment to farm the land you may not be farming again in 5 or 10 years seems crazy to me.
513.	I believe foreign ownership will cause more family farmers to perish
514.	The current land values in the province has already risen to the point where land owners are going to see a good economic return on there investment as a general rule. I see no reason to try to bring in outside investors. We already have millions of dollars leaving the province to Sask land owners from other provinces. why give more away?
515.	In the current state of farmland prices, returns from the land will not cover the cost of the land over the lifetime of a young farmer in thier 30's. How will you attract more farmers if the costs to start farming will never be recooperated? How can you have a stable farm economy, when you are already at the mercy on the markets as to what your returns are, the mercy of the weather on what will grow, and add to that the mercy of the landowner as to if you even have land to farm? Why are we selling off our most precious commodity, not to mention our very future for a few quick investment dollars? We need to wake up and stop this now before it's too late.
516.	To continue to promote agriculture as a viable industry there needs to be people who have a personal vested interest in the industry. If every time commodity prices decrease and there are rough spots in producing food for our country and world is based soley on large economic scales and the pencilling out of an investors bottom line, there could be many hungry people in this world. Personal interest in the land also promotes good stewardship of the land and the resources on the land.
517.	The questions are not clear to me. The current environment prohibits foreign ownership but for the CPP. I'm not sure how the status quo impacts the status quo or affects its probability.
518.	Farmers will try to purchase land but there will be a lack of equity to draw from to purchase land as farmers will not own it. I'd compare it to a company from another country coming here with a very cheap work force from there home country. But they can't because there are regulations and rules so they have to employ local ppl and anyone working has to have a work visa. So why would land ownership

	be different.
519.	If it became harder to purchase land close to your land, there would be more costs in equipment moving, and overall less land would be bought. I think leasing the land near where you farm should have no extra barriers, because generally the farmers that buy the lease have land close by. If larger investors and companies owned a lot of the land that would really flip the market around.
520.	Again today's farm land and equipment is so hard for young farmers to start unless your born into a well established farm. You won't find a better tender of land then the owner. On rented land I know people push rotations of crops to pillage the land Minnie fertilizer to reduce carry over only running the land down. Thus creating non farmable land down the road.
521.	Again foreign investments and ownership will make it impossible for small farmers to compete and own land.
522.	Large business owners dont have a vested interest in the land. Small farmer buisnesses provide quality stewardship of the land.
523.	I believe that Canadians should have the first opportunity to buy land in Saskatchewan and bringing in foreign investors is not in the best interest of our landowners.
524.	We need to retain agriculture as a natural resource in Saskatchewan!!!!
525.	I LIVE HERE AND IT ISN'T JUST AN INVESTMENT. THE LAND NEARBY SHOULD BE OWNED AND FARMED BY ME AND MY NEIGHBORS, REGARDLESS OF THE SIZE OF THE FARM. WHY WOULD IT BE DIFFERENT, EXCEPT FOR SOME PEOPLE TO MAKE MONEY? OUR LIVES AND LIFESTYLE ARE WORTH A LOT MORE THAN MONEY.
526.	I find this section difficult to understand. im not sure what you are getting at.
527.	The family farm is being destroyed as non farming investor based land owners are taking over Saskatchewan.
528.	If farmland ownership is lost in saskatchewan it will turn the countryside into a work camp and everyone will reside in the cities. No offense but our cities are not that nice. if I were forced into a city I would be leaving to Alberta or Quebec.
529.	The term family farm is history. Land ownership in Saskatchewan on the same path will force young farmers out because they cannot buy or lease land simply cause they cannot afford or find the land. Buying groups and corporations need to be limited as to ownership of land.
530.	Eventually Saskatchewan land is going to be owned by other countries and people if we don't ensure local residents have the opportunity and chance at successfully making a living from farming
531.	My responses are if ownership rules are relax to foreign owners. It would be devastating to any Canadian citizens wanting to get out of the city. How would a city expand and buy land to incorporate if the prices of land are cost prohibitive? what if global disasters in a far of country makes land a desperate must have, and we have such enormous price hike that the country completely loses control of who owns it, and is at the mercy of the owners? How can you guarantee that the foreign owners would use any of the local industry at all?
532.	We are rapidly losing control of our agricultural land. Foreign investors, corporate farms and

	<p>other investment groups are making it almost impossible for any of the smaller operators to expand. I believe that a ceiling cap should be implemented on how much agricultural Land that the larger producers themselves can acquire. If it isn't too late we must level the playing field somehow!!</p>
533.	<p>Individual farmers cannot compete with large corporations or countries who wish to buy large tracts of land.</p>
534.	<p>The market will (if left to its own devices) arrive at an equilibrium between the rent a farmer is able and prepared to pay and the rent that an investor is prepared to accept. That in turn will define the value and therefore the price of farm land. It is obvious that the rent a farmer is prepared to pay must leave him or her with a profit. Equally, the rent that an investor is prepared to accept must likewise leave him or her with a profit. If a farmer wishes to acquire land at the going rate, in effect he retains his own profit as a tenant and takes over the investor's profit as well so that in practice the ability of farmers to acquire land should not be damaged merely because the market restrictions are relaxed.</p> <p>In addition, if farmers hope to retire with a reasonable "pension fund" on realisation of their land holdings, they may be dismayed to discover that controls over land sales leave them with a very poor price when they come to sell their farms. Who will then pay their pensions?</p>
535.	<p>Who is me in ..." tell me about your responses"</p> <p>Is only a single person making this decision?</p>
536.	<p>I think once everything settles out farmland will be worth what it is worth no matter who owns it. I don't want to lose money on my farm land investments after farming it for all of these years just to help someone else buy it artificially cheaper. If market dictates that it is cheaper, then so be it.</p>
537.	<p>I see this where I live in rural Sask.</p>
538.	<p>In most instances farmers who own the land they farm are best able to manage and protect their most important resource, the soil. When foreign owners come in they usually only care about getting the highest rent return. Efficiency, profitability and long term planning and crop rotations is lost in search of a quick buck.</p>
539.	<p>It's not Christmas it's a business and yes the current farmer should pay current value if he wishes to purchase more farmland. Lease property will price rents according to market value if they wish to get a return, so the market will look after itself.</p>
540.	<p>It all boils down to the ability of actual local farmers being able to continue farming the land in a cost effective and efficient manner while still maintaining the formability of the land for future generations</p>
541.	<p>As foreign ownership of land increases, the number of "local" operators will decrease, overall having a negative impact on the Agricultural sector in an area and in the Province. If Saskatchewan wants to keep Agriculture Alive, we need the operators to be invested in their operations.</p>
542.	<p>My responses are based on the assumption that ownership is not opened up to foreign entities and that very little changes are made to existing rules.</p>

543.	Recent land price increases and lease price increases have been significant, both more than doubling in the past decade. If the same was to happen in the next ten years all my answers should be Very likely and Severe.
544.	If Saskatchewan is to remain a leader in the agricultural sector, it is absolutely crucial that the government reserve the right to own land in Saskatchewan for farmers.
545.	a producer leasing foreign owned land is not going to care about or care for the land as they would owning it . its human nature. Examples: care for waterways, plant trees, regrass a blowout, etc.
546.	I don't totally understand what environment you are talking about - how it is now or the way you want to change it. Thus I answered all the same because this is very confusing.
547.	Still think ownership is best
548.	ownership of land is not a given right. the free market should be the deciding factor. the new farm models will adapt to the changing structures. those who adapt with it will be successful. the government should be only minimally involved.
549.	Foreign purchase of farm land will have an effect on the whole much more than the proportion of the ownership would suggest. A small purchase of land will effect the supply demand balance for land by quickly separating the productive value from the asset value.
550.	It is getting more and more discouraging to live in a province who feels the \$ is more important than maintaining the tradition of the family farm. Remember family's usually look after the assets more than investors. Saskatchewan farmers were and are great stewards of our resources - land and water - which is why the non stewards from other countries want ownership of our land.
551.	People will expect more every year, to own or rent while the actual product is market dependant. This will drive everything to a standstill and when push comes to shove all parties involved will suffer
552.	We already see small farmers quitting because there is no opportunity for expansion. as a medium size farm we've aquired leases from several small farms that have quit. The margins on lease land are so small that if you do not have at least 4000-5000 acres you can't make a living.
553.	Governmental oversight is necessary to regulate the industry. Saskatchewan is the world's bread basket, and this reality is lost by letting private interests (chemical companies as one example) set the standard in how food is produced.
554.	IF and I stress if the ownership opened up wide open then it becomes a case of having to outbid very deep pockets to secure land. Currently if you look at land prices vs. the returns the pricing is unsustainable as you can not buy land and expect to pay for it in your lifetime. If you have investors come in that are looking to secure their food supply abroad then the sky is the limit on their purchasing it as you can't put a price on security. When coupled with the average age of farmers today this paints a very poor picture for the survival of rural Canada overall.
555.	If farmers have to travel further to access land required to make operations efficient this will have a negative impact on roads. Operating costs will increase for farm and Province.

556.	Yes farmers will have more barriers to purchasing land near land they farm if non Canadian entities are have the opportunity to purchase land as well. ownership and control will go with the land to the owner. The cost of farm land will go up to some extent as we cannot compete with entities that have large sums of cash to spend. Also the tradition of land ownership will be lost and we could eventually end up in a serfdom society that our ancestors came here to escape.
557.	N/A
558.	Control, availability, and affordability are the three things that worry me the most.
559.	The price of leased land is as big an issue, maybe bigger. I find that land owned by entities unfamiliar with Saskatchewan agriculture are overestimating the price they can charge. It will inhibit younger farms from using lease land to leverage their operation for growth.
560.	Land will go to the highest bidder which may not necessarily be the best thing for the land or the surrounding communities. Farms will become larger, supporting less families, who may have to move to larger centres to find work or even out of province altogether.
561.	Local farmers owning and operating family farms has shaped this great province. Moving away from this is not logical other than to consolidate wealth and enslave families...look at India as an example that we should never emulate.
562.	Really? This is how you plan to gauge the feedback of people possibly affected by farmland ownership rules and possible changes? This is even more pathetic than I ever imagined. I had heard this was a poor survey, but I wasn't prepared for this.
563.	stewardship of land will be lost. Large investors are banking on land prices going up they don't care about the land
564.	The "tradition of farmland ownership by farm families can only be diminished if those same people choose to sell to non farmers. I believe that is, and should always be their legal right. I believe many will want to sell to their farming neighbours
565.	the cost to lease will always be based on productivity. people wont lease land to break even, as they may with ownership. out of province ownership will ruin all pride for small farmers and they will quit as I will if the majority of land becomes owned by non farmers and non community members. We will farm in a province or country that values humans and not just dollars.
566.	The land whether owned or leased is the most inexpensive part of the operation. Inputs and equipment costs far outweigh land costs. No one has went broke just because they bought land. Many other factors are in play.
567.	Farmers will always own some of there land and lease the rest as they always did. maybe they will not own as large a percentage but will farm more acres because of equipment . This is the way the business of farming is going. I am interested in farmland ownership and farming in general and believe we should be able to buy and sell like other businesses in Canada.
568.	If we let these people come in and take what we been working our whole life's for, Everything will be way over priced and lots of farmers will have no choice but to quit because they will not be able to afford any farm land to farm on

<p>569. It is irrelevant 'who' owns the land at any given time. The only relevance is the custodianship of the land itself. That is the direction of legislative safeguards needed.</p>
<p>570. In the 12 years since 2002, when farmland ownership rules were relaxed, the amount of farmland owned by non-residents of Saskatchewan has increased 6 times. If this trend were to continue it is certainly conceivable that much more farmland would be owned by non resident entities.. There certainly appears to be a significant interest in more ownership by non Saskatchewan entities based on the recent applications to the farmland ownership board and recent court challenges to the board's decisions.</p> <p>The obvious conclusion, if more farmland is owned by non Saskatchewan entities, is that more land will have to be rented or leased by resident farmers.</p> <p>Non Saskatchewan investors appear to have vast amounts of capital they are willing to invest in Saskatchewan farmland. If allowed to continue investing they will escalate the value of farmland up to level which may create barriers, such as affordability, for active resident farmers. Unabated investment will, over time, create the same situation which the original settlers came here to avoid: unaffordable land values and absentee landlords viewing their profits as their primary goal.</p>
<p>571. I believe that by opening up the market to foreign and non-local ownership will make it difficult for current landowners to purchase or rent/lease affordable land.</p>
<p>572. Farm families become pitted against big money in place of those who understand the economics of farming</p>
<p>573. If you can't afford to buy land, how will a Saskatchewan farmer secure a loan? Will a lease count as collateral?</p>
<p>574. In the current land market, there are many opportunities to lease land. If the current land ownership rules are left in place, more non-local land owners will be wanting to lease out their land. I foresee land being very difficult to purchase but relatively easy to lease. Owning land is far better for a farm's long term profitability.</p>
<p>575. IF you keep the land ownership to saskatchewan residents, you will see more young farmers owning and farming the land...if you allow outside ownership it will be like the USA where big tracts of land are under corporate direction; the land is raped, pillaged and plundered for profit. do you think some CEO in new york or china gives a about the health and vitality of the land like a local farmer/rancher does??? the farmer who sold the land for big bucks is laughing but the future farmers of our province will have a huge and heavy burden to carry, the small local cannot effectively compete against large companies with deep pockets. think this through very carefully. do not rush through with this for you are impacting future generations. we are the bread bowl of canada</p>
<p>576. Investors want a return on their investment. That may result in changes to how land is managed. There may be short term actions that are detrimental to the long term health of the land.</p>

577.	The current pattern is not likely to change greatly, investment groups have been active for a number of years. The only change is that there potentially will be more players in the current system. Economics will dictate the values for purchasing and renting land.
578.	I did not understand the above question so I chose the most neutral reply possible.
579.	When large corporations or investment groups are allowed to buy unrestricted amounts of land, it puts pressure on land owners to sell their land at inflated prices. Local family farm operations may not be able to finance competitive bids on the land. Also they may only be able to purchase a portion of the land parcel, where investors offer to buy entire parcels, and multiple farms in one swoop. We have seen this happen already in our area.
580.	Bottom line: nowhere near enough youth coming into the industry. As a farmer at retirement age I can see where I could have trouble getting a good tenant. If I were to my existing one, I may want the option of selling. When I was younger noone gave a about me finding farmland. I just think the government was absolutley foolish to have undertaken this project
581.	Stock market commodities are volatile and would make longterm planning much more risky.
582.	We are already seeing Canadian investment companies that are purchasing a large amount of farmland in our area with the current regulations that are in place. This drives up the market value of farmland, making profit margins for farmers slimmer. If regulations are relaxed even more-so to allow additional investment by other Canadians and international investment companies, that would most certainly be the beginning of the end for the tradition of farming in Saskatchewan and Canada. We need to keep regulations in place to preserve our agriculture industry and keep profits from this industry within our country and for our people.
583.	<p>While it's clear on the negative points to foreign investment I'd like to point out a few positives from our own personal experience</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It actually becomes easier in some ways to lease local area land Foreign investors are looking for efficient production managers and aren't as tied to local politics This in turn actually makes it easier to compete However 2. Local area farmers not only may well likely not have the ability to purchase however It's also sad that local land that neighbours have leased for years not even giving locals an opportunity to purchase 3. Foreign investors are managed by big business and are actually very easy to deal with because they are used to big business type deals and ironing out details that local area farmers aren't necessarily receptive to
584.	the way the trend is heading farmers will not be able to farm the land themselves and no new people will get into the industry
585.	Every time farmland is sold to a non farming resident, no matter where they are from, rural Saskatchewan declines further.

<p>586. foreign ownership/corporate sets the province back. farmers become share croppers and profits leave the province</p>
<p>587. By opening the doors to foreign ownership and fund ownership, the feudal system seems to be inevitable. As the feudal system in Europe in historical times was very counter-productive, so seems the current movement toward establishing huge land tracts owned by someone that most likely has no idea what they own, and who relies on others to struggle so that land owner can prosper. As farmers age and exit the industry, there is no ability for younger farmers to enter the industry because they are financially unable to counter the dollars that are available from foreign sources. If greed is the driver behind all that our ancestors worked tirelessly to provide for us, this seems to be very disrespectful to all that Saskatchewan was originally built on. Agriculture is very hard work and very challenging from a financial perspective. It would appear that farmland ownership became popular only when money markets faltered. When those money markets improve, most likely farmland ownership will decline in popularity. This will mean that great tracts of farmland will be abandoned and left for rural municipalities and banks to deal with. Again, short-term decisions can not be made on long-term investments. It is very important for people who know an industry to be the pilots of that industry. Investors do not know farming. Investors know continuous profit. Typically, over the long-term, continuous profit in agriculture is not a reality.</p>
<p>588. We already compete with doctors, lawyers, and professional athletes for land. Opening the purchase of land to foreign investors will just make things more difficult for the local farmers. Already our cost of production is way out of line with third world countries who need food. Why do you think China is buying up land? They are farsighted. How gullible are we to give away our land to foreign entities? What is Canada, then? A puppet in their hands?</p>
<p>589. Depends on product price and world demand</p>
<p>590. When I was going to University I crop shared 800 ac from a man who lived in BC and inherited part of his father's farm. One day he called and said his accountant told him he wasn't making 10% on his investment and took the land away from me. A young farmer trying to get started while taking his Ag education loses land because a BC teacher isn't getting the return his accountant tells him he deserves is a shame.</p> <p>Again, consumers will not pay excessive amounts for food so squeezing farmers in the middle will not lead to a healthy ag economy. Allowing foreign interests to buy small pieces of Canada that feed us won't build a robust, diverse economy. It will lead to the long term export of money out of Canada. Allowing Canadians from outside SK will have a similar effect by sending rent outside SK.</p>
<p>591. Farmers will need to own land so that they have they possibility of drawing on the equity through poor years. Farm managers are becoming smart business people. They understand how to use their equity to manage the ups and downs of agriculture. By not having the equity and assurance of land ownership farming will become more volatile and push some producers out of agriculture and discourage new producers from entering.</p>
<p>592. Only person who profits in this scenario is the corporations investors because they make sure there profitable through guaranteed rent, and Hutterite colonies who are subsidized as low income families, which they are not.</p>

593.	If land values get outta reach compared to production income, we will see farms struggle.
594.	Farmland needs to stay in the hands of the farmer. Investors don't care about taking care of our land and enviroment. Only about profits. Taking the land out of the hands of saskatchewan people brings short term money into the province. Long term, any profits off the land will be taken out of the province. Bottom line is any money saskatchewan farmers make stays here in the province.
595.	I am concerned that if more land is owned by non residents than our communities will suffer, as the profits are not spent locally and populations may decline
596.	Farmland investment company's or absentee owners are not the people who volunteer in our local communities. If young farmers can't afford to buy or lease the land there will be no one to fill these positions.
597.	Farm land is like no other, the most economic value and cultural benefit is owner operators.
598.	Price will be the determining factor. If it goes beyond the reach of producers, especially young producers, they will have no choice but to rent. As that happens, rents go up and eventually you end up with farms with little financial strength, poor working capital, heavy reliance on gov't programs and constant turnover. This has the potential to undo over a century of growth, pride and individualism on the farm.
599.	Land ownership is not correlated to farm incomes. The premise that farmland ownership is in and of itself a desireable goal needs to be challenged. Farmers increase incomes by expanding acreage, gaining equipment, inputs and labour efficiencies and ability to diversify like any other business. Land ownership is a huge draw on capital and limits growth. Others like pension funds with relatively modest return expectations and a long term view are perfect owners of land that can be leased back to the farmer at rates that generate adequate returns for both groups. Land prices and lease rates won't necessarily go up as a result of reduced ownership restrictions and even if they do in some cases, the selling farmers deserve a premium if their land is in a premium location with above average yields etc. Why should they be penalized with these restrictions?
600.	People never care about things as much if they rent instead of owning. That leads to people not caring about the land if it is all owned by investors, which makes Saskatchewan look bad.
601.	Many good farmers immigrated from Europe to Canada so they could live in a democratic environment where they could work and earn enough money to become independent farmers. There is much historical evidence of corporations and/or governments getting rich at the expense of their tenants. Our ancestors worked hard to give our generation what they lost. We need to pass on their values to our future generations.
602.	We have a farmer from a foreign country who owns land near our farm. He hardly observes the land he owns. No one knows what he looks like. He does not take part in any community functions and does not contribute to the local economy. However he continues to seek out small farms and buy them out. Neighbours can not compete with the prices he can pay. What contributions is he making to Saskatchewan? None!!!
603.	All farmers are "millionaires" (on paper) today and the "small farmer" must be bigger in order to survive; so, they must have first kick at the cat.

604.	<p>When an investor from a foreign country decides to purchase land they usually buy large amounts. A small farmer who would like to buy a couple of quarters beside his present farm has little opportunity to compete. Foreign investors have pushed the price of land out of reach for a young or local farmer. It is wonderful that our farmland is finally worth something, but we have survived years of low grain prices and to suddenly be expected to pay an inflated price for land is not realistic.</p> <p>Another comment I feel is noteworthy is that often land leased or bought by foreign groups is not maintained properly. They are not concerned with conservation practices or in many cases the land is poorly farmed.</p>
605.	nil
606.	<p>By having outside investors they don't know farming, they want rent that is unaffordable, and they drive land values and compete against young or expanding farmers. Farmers are primary producers who generate dollars for the economy. If they are able to grow and expand their operations this will benefit the economy more than outside investors. Outside investors do not take care of the land or grow good crops and production is decreased.</p>
607.	Keep farmland for true farmers not for an investment toy.
608.	<p>Successful farmers get on with it</p> <p>Less successful farmers whine and look for help</p>
609.	<p>It is hard to answer these questions because you can imagine cases where the answers you gave are based on the scenario you are imagining, but you can also imagine scenarios where the answer you gave would be different.</p>
610.	Restricting a farmer from getting top dollar for his farm land is ludicrous.
611.	Out of province ownership is detrimental to the future of farming in Saskatchewan and for those interested in farming in the future.
612.	<p>In a lot of cases as more land is purchased by investors, the same big tenants are farming it. The landlords like this because of less people and paper work to deal with. A lot of the investors only invest in good land. therefore when poor quality, or smaller parcels are for sale the young farmers are all after that land, over paying for it, well beyond that lands ability to produce enough to make the payments, thus these young people are having to work off the farm. Also when these big farmers take over these investor lands, they only grain farm it, no haying of sloughs or do fall grazing therefore leaving land that was bringing income into a community now sits idle. If these big farmers that rent this investor land do any improvements it is usually to do drainage. If a young or small farmer does happen to get a piece of this investor land, they often have to purchase more machinery, that is okay, but usually the lease terms are 1 year or very short term, then the problem is being able to pay for that machinery after they lose the lease, and more than once have I seen these young or small farmers clean up the land to be able to make it profitable only to have one of these bigger farmers then take it on. I know it has happened to me.</p>
613.	Questions are very poor worded
614.	Some of these things can change quickly. Commodity prices, interest rates, government

	policies etc. can change things in hurry. Been in business long enough to live through different issues like that.
615.	Saskatchewan needs to protect existing crown lands to be leased to local producers. These lands include all provincial and PFRA pastures which together form an "insurance policy or bank account" for the rural economy. Benefits of keeping these lands intact are diverse - agricultural/grazing; recreation; tourism; hunting; environment; endangered wildlife populations; etc.
616.	If we cant afford to expand then we are forced to move out of our own rural areas, therefore raising the costs to us and we will no longer be able to stay in business.
617.	Same thing. the farmer will always have control either through buying or renting.
618.	A landlord places all the risk on the leasee. If you are comfortably residing in downtown Toronto or operating as a landlord from Vancouver you do not have a vested interest as to whether there's a drought, grasshoppers needing spraying or a severe blizzard in the middle of calving season. Your lease fees will have to keep being paid. There is little or no pride in ownership.
619.	Small and younger farmers and mixed operators will not compete with large operators. Only those that are born into large operations will have the resources to compete with other large operations.
620.	Talk of "tradition of farmland ownership" is a little unsettling; not all "traditions" fit the description of "best practices".
621.	Im not an economist by any means. But the percentage of income required to service land debt is at an all time high. Soon only family money will get you in.
622.	cropping 100% with profitable crops makes it possible to afford an increase in farmland,
623.	Much will depend on the quality of the farm land in question. Lower productive land will likely be less affected. The very productive land is likely to completely disappear off the market.
624.	if sask residents lose control of the land in sask we might as well move to the united states
625.	Risk is much higher if a farmer owns assets for a certain amount of land but they don't own the land.
626.	We are losing control of our asserts. Will soon be hired tennents in our own province. With more towns vacant
627.	The market place will determine who has control of the land. Market price is high, land prices go up, rent goes up. Remember 10 years ago land was rented just for the cost of taxes, farmland price went down
628.	i see farming in Sask following the path in the U S A controlled more and more by corp. giants We need to change our political phyos. We already live in a society where 1% of the pop. controls 50% of the worlds wealth .Do we really all want to become Wal Mart greeters?
629.	the value of leased land will be set by those willing to pay the price. if the cost is to high then

	the land will not be rented so the market will decide price. as it should
630.	Corporations and absentee landlords do not care about Saskatchewan or the communities that our taxes have built. They just look at the bottom line. Businesses will suffer and communities will suffer. Some Chinese farmer buy all their inputs from China and market all their products there. Where does that leave our business and communities? It leaves them without services.
631.	Not sure if we are really understanding the above scenarios-somewhat confusing.
632.	Farming is a lifetime investment and leased land can be lost at the discretion of the owner. Equity in the land is required for loans to purchase machinery and supplies.
633.	Most investment that the farmer has in the operation is in equity. If we eliminate equity and have cash rich farmers exiting the game with no one to replace, new farmers will have no equity and unable to get a loan as a result. Without the equity or liquidity, I believe there is much more risk involved in farming operations and bad years could be worse than ever before.
634.	Like i said before the profits and control of that land will be taken out of the local communities that are close to the land.
635.	Saskatchewan was built on farmers purchasing and leasing land from neighbours and fellow Saskatchewan farmers. Allowing this sort of foreign investment will take the power and business out of the hands of our own farmers and put it into the hands of large investors who have no attachment or pride for our home other then profit.
636.	less local equity in farmland results in more profit leaving the province (will flow to the owners). less equity in farmland results in less ability to purchase equipment (when leasing more equity goes to banks and equipment manufacturers = more money leaving the province)
637.	Outside investment would inflate, prices continue to deflate and eliminate small town economies, and in result the sask economy. It would create a short term benefit for the retiring farmer in land price but would be less favourable to new investing farmers and farm town economy.
638.	International interest will drive up land prices in a bidding war between foreign pocket books much too large for any private hobby farmer to ever hope to compete with. This takes away from the buying power of local Saskatchewan citizens looking to invest their own dollars, and also sets the stage for a Middle Age'esque scene of land barons and peasants for the actual farmers themselves.
639.	With non farmers owning land large corporate farms will become the norm. Life in rural Sask will suffer as a result. Governments have a responsibility to maintain our rural communities as well as urban.
640.	The barriers to purchasing land where we farm is when C.P.P. buys it so we have to compete for buying farm land against them. I have paid into CPP plan for over 40 years and now I am having to compete against a fund with our money in it.
641.	Taking the ownership of Saskatchewan land to sell to corporations from other places around the world takes money directly out of the pockets of Saskatchewan farmers and Saskatchewan residents.
642.	Already addressed this in the previous section.

643.	The cost of farmland will become unaffordable if CPP and foreign investment continue to be allowed to purchase farm land in Saskatchewan and Canada. We have paid into CPP for years and now we are having to compete against a fund with our money in it. Farmers want to own their own land and not go back to the serf days where farmers worked for someone else. That is why our ancestors came to Canada, to own their land. If you don't own your own land, you do not take pride in your work and do not do a good job.
644.	Foreign investors can do whatever they want with their land and could make it more difficult for it to be farmed
645.	<p>Already there is land that has been sitting idle because the speculator who bought the land can not find a tenant at the price he demands approximately five miles from my farm. However that speculator continues to seek more land in the area and is willing to pay more to show that his other purchases have increased in value. This is a Saskatchewan numbered company with obvious off shore financing.</p> <p>Without the rules in place proportionately the people of Saskatchewan will lose ownership of vast tracts of our land with virtually no benefit to our province. Ultimately to the detriment of our province.</p>
646.	When you have non residents owning farmland we have seen the cost of ownership and rent increase greatly, the results being proper farm practices are not being followed, for example shorter crop rotations resulting in new diseases which have the potential to destroy entire crops for the next generation (1 example, club root in canola caused by improper rotations)
647.	Because of the increased value of farmland in our area it's very difficult for us to purchase or expand our operation. Putting us in a very huge financial burden before and after our death. Which of course would be placed in hands of our surviving family who thus are forced to sell to other investors who probably don't farm
648.	Saskatchewan has a rich farming heritage but that could be lost if it is too difficult for farmers to expand or start up their operations.
649.	Open market. why give poor business people advantages? The good business people (farmers) can afford to pay.
650.	Leasing land becomes a slippery slope of economics. How much can my machinery manage before the input costs outweigh the profits? How large might my debt load be? How much will a poor crop year affect my ability to continue paying the leasing costs and other input costs against a negative profit? How many years can no profit and rising debt continue before a bankruptcy becomes necessary? The loss of the leased land against the large equipment purchased to farm the larger farm eventually makes the whole situation untenable. Disaster.
651.	These situations are already happening. Investors in some cases are being misled by real estate salespeople. These investors think that they should make 5% on land they bought for \$3000/acre. some land is being rented at \$80/acre. Only large farm operations are paying this rent. Again starting farmers can't compete.
652.	Agriculture in Canada has been decimated by some major decisions taken with short term thinking and not enough examination of the future of the industry. If SK farmland is sold to whomever, wherever, Canadian citizens will never have ownership and control again. There will always be someone with more money and their own agenda (greed).

653.	A crop insurance program mirroring Alberta's and having acreage owners recognize that their home is in an industrial site would have more impact on keeping Saskatchewan farmers competitive and therefore able to step up to own land as it comes up for sale than tinkering with whether the rules for ownership should have a Saskatchewan bias.
654.	Saskatchewan owned farmland is backbone of Saskatchewan economy. The reason why investment groups etc, want in on the action because they recognize the value of owning hard core assets. the world economics are in trouble and they will leverage their position as much as possible for their security and growth, thereby causing a servere reaction in Saskatchewan.
655.	Don't have enough information
656.	Under today's land ownership rules and environment: there will likely be more land leased as there is no other place for current farmers to invest their funds from the sale of their farmland and get a decent ROR. the cost of leasing land will be determined by the ROI and the ROR for those leasing. if there was a closer review of current farmland ownership I expect that it would reveal that there is a greater amount of foreign owned SK farmland than the stats report. foreigners and institutional investors have found ways around the current regulations and will continue to do so = more lease land available. long-term there is a loss of affordability for SK farmers to purchase land.
657.	Large Sask. Corporate Farms will dictate the same as a Pension Plan Owner.
658.	I find it pathetic this is even being discussed. The last thing I will be is a peasant to an absentee landowner. If this government doesn't have the vision to see the impact opening up any of land to outside investors then I'm selling our land and moving to a province where the politicians care. I'm talking about Canadian investors as well. Saskatchewan is so rich in natural resources, it's ludicrous this government is even thinking about giving it all away. I will campaign hard in this election against this government if they continue on this path.
659.	if we allowed rich out of country investors to come in and purchase our land it will drive the price up until it become unaffordable for the common folk and will turn into big business and the common farmer will be converted from a small business owned to a common farm hand hired to farm the land rather than owner
660.	Allowing foreign & corporate ownership of farmland is disastrous for our young farmers as they need to be able to purchase their land without this outside competition.
661.	Foreigners are only interested in profit they will not support local buissness or contribute to our rural towns
662.	The impact is the death of the family farm!
663.	large syndicates are purchasing land for its investment value, not its food producing value. They have driven the price of farmland to a level where farmers cannot compete for its purchase. The amount of land that syndicates and out of province investors own is relatively small on a provincial scale but on a local scale it has a huge impact on farmers wanting to expand or young farmers being able to start farming.
664.	We need a plan to allow local young farmers to be able to start farming without being bank rolled by parents, so we need restrictions in place. Most farmers who wish to sell do not need

	huge amounts of money.
665.	Land bought by investors is being custom farmed not leased. Productivity and efficiency is decreasing. Chinese investors plan to ship grain directly to China using their own systems killing value added possibilities for our provinces residents.
666.	It is obvious that farming will become more difficult, risky and competitive given the scenario above.
667.	Little hope for young farmers to keep farming .
668.	Why would you even consider allowing foreign businesses to own our land?
669.	Saskatchewan has the highest freight rate in the country, adding the increased expense of farm land if the ownership rules change, will only increase the difficulty of farm profitability.
670.	Leased land can have less continuity for a single producer compared to owned land. Due to this, long-term strategies for soil erosion control and environmental stability may be lost when leases are up and a new producer begins cultivating the land. This is why it has a SIGNIFICANT impact.
671.	the people farming will still own land so the tradition wont change just the amount they own will
672.	Outside ownership does not support stewardship of rural infrastructure needed to maintain our RMs.
673.	land packages are getting too large for many farm families to handle. In very few instances are land packages broken up to make it available to several farmers in the area. In many cases if the packages were broken up, the values would be higher if everybody in the area had a chance at a quarter or two that work in with their operation. This allows many farms to become stronger and better positioned at the same time. Leasing land has many risks associated with it such as: -not knowing what the price will be at the end of your term if re-renting -not having the land even offered to you at the end of the rental term -having a large operation built up for acres that you will lose -not having incentives to improve the land for the next generations of your family
674.	Most farmers in our area looking to expand, are farming 2000 to 5000 acres with a couple of million dollars of equipment. maybe they could ask John Deere or Case to build machinery for 1960s prices or maybe Monsanto could provide canola seed for a dollar a pound like the good old days
675.	In our area farmland is becoming available to buy because of an aging population. Many of the local young farmers firstly lease the land with the option to purchase at a later date. Much of the land also has oil revenue. This keeps the tradition of locally owned farms alive and well.
676.	Investors will end up driving lease prices up during profitable times and instead of farmers making that money and spending in the ag industry that money will leave the industry and

	potentially the country
677.	farming has become a big buisness, and large corperations or colonies will own all the land in 50 years
678.	In the last 20 years I have continued to witness local family farms disband, as out-of-province corporations, and in-province corporations purchase extremely large tracts of land. The Cypress-Hills Grasslands Constituency has lost almost 20% in population during these same years.
679.	It's already hard enough to compete and to me if they think it's a good investment for them That should mean it's a good investment for your Saskatchewan farmers too, who are doing the work. Farmers need the ability to diversify their businesses too with owned and leased land. If we can't own some land that we get to say what we are going to do with it. You may find that advances in efficiencies and desires to take care of the land like our own disappear. If landlords don't care to give proper incentives for these things farmers aren't going to go above and beyond for a landlords profit.
680.	i dont feel pushing farm land lower in price is good when selling land. maybe more loans given to saskatchewan residents to buy land. why make a retiring farmer pay for a non family person to farm in saskatchewan by pushing down land prices by restricting canadian ownership? noncanadian should not be allowed to own any sask farm land.
681.	Do not let corporations farm happen in sask or you WILL end up with a over farmed chemical nightmare that will destroy future growing for the young people! When local people see the destruction they at least have the option to change there ways and go about farming in more sustainable ways! Corporations will suck this place dry and the people that live here as well..
682.	The severity of this is already exemplified... there is a foreign owner of land near us. He has no community involvement, his family lives in their country of origin and he just shows up to grow the crop and harvest it and leaves. He takes no pride in proper crop rotations to benefit the land and grows crop on top of crop creating potential soil issues. But being foreign he doesn't care and when the land no longer can produce he will just sell and stay in his country with his family. NOT in the best interest for Saskatchewan nor the domestic farmer. I see this being true with big out of country corporate farms that are run improperly and can't survive anyway...
683.	I do not understand this question and the way it is framed so cannot give sensible input. the current system is unfair and unworkable, PLEASE DELETE the answers to the last 6 questions, as they had to be answered and do not provide a don't know option to a unclear question
684.	loaded questions, the way you weight impacts internally without context makes answering any of those moot.
685.	The success of South Korea was credited to crushing the Aristocracy by opening the land market during the period of US control it was and is cited as a classic example of economic management. Most of the developed world has open markets in land although highly populous areas have building controls. India for example has land values way higher than Saskatchewan. There is no direct connection between land values and economic rental values they will both establish severally.

686.	You are better to have robust agriculture community with the next generation of young farmers than to increase land values with outside investment. There are young people who want to farm however the capital required makes it very difficult.
687.	Land is going to be very expensive if corporations own it.
688.	My daughter worked on a farm in England. Her host family had no hope of ever owning their own farm and found them selves without land on occasion as a deal had been struck between the land owner and some other entity.
689.	As stated above its becoming unaffordable to be a farmer.
690.	Farmers seize opportunities and they are very wise when operating in an open market. No government guidance plan can ever cover all the situations that will arise in a province as large and diverse as Saskatchewan. Our farmland was purchased because we had a dream to have a farm business and we paid high interest rates to make our dream work. We are proud to own Saskatchewan farmland
691.	I strongly support ownership of farm land by sask residents for use by farmers. I will vote accordingly.
692.	this is 2015. We have always been able to adapt. In fact, we are good at adapting.
693.	I think higher yields and higher quality of food is produced on small farms. It benefits the local communities when there are small farmers compared to large companies.
694.	Non local owners are likely not to care much about that community and not volunteer the services for things to help the community services to remain viable.
695.	Many larger farms seem to be doing ok with large a large base of rented land.
696.	I have found that with these large corporate farms who get the same tax breaks or even larger ones then the regular farmer that the farmer of yesterday is being driven out of farming. They can't afford to compete with someone who has money to throw at the farm from tax breaks from the government over many many years. Stop giving the corporations the tax breaks and give it to the people who really count. The local small farmer, who buys local, sells local and supports the community they live in. These are the people who support everyone, who are the ones doing the community work and who are the ones who are there for the people who live around the farm. The corporations do not care. They take the money and leave. This is wrong
697.	People moved to Canada to own their land, not rent it
698.	If prices continue to go up it is very difficult to have an economical farm.
699.	Saskatchewan farmland is very unlikely to become unaffordable We are still much below everywhere else in Canada never mind the u.s.
700.	I think it should be a competitive busness, so who pays the most get the land, as long as they are canadian residents
701.	Don't want foreign or investment ownership of sask land
702.	Non local ownership creates problems because they are investors not always doing what is best for the land, only interested in the return on money

703.	Again non-resident landowners do not have a personal connection to the rural community. Schools will be closed, businesses won't thrive on local residents business. If non-resident corporations or investment firms own all the land, the community "fabric" is lost. As well as the local farmers being driven out due to being unable to compete to purchase or even lease farmland.
704.	Farmland needs to be more affordable to lease to own by the farmer
705.	Any legislation that opens the doors further to foreign or domestic buyers will only make it more difficult for local and actively farming enterprises. It may be a small windfall for retiring farmers but not so good for the younger generation.
706.	Why do we let prices get so high for farmers ready to lease to start farming. We have a son who wants more land but the prices are ridiculous. How can one compete when they are \$2000.00 a acre to rent. No young farmer has that much money to start out with. We should be giving our young farmers help threw government. Government could give a grant to them but we can't have other farmers coming from different countries trying to tell us how to run the system. This is totally wrong .
707.	We need to keep the money from the farms local to the where the farms are to support the sask. Economy, not support other countries or provinces.
708.	Outside ownership is not the answer if we want anyone to remain in this business.
709.	I see it as a very basic concept, the best situation is to have all land owned by people living and working in the immediate area. The farther one moves from that ideal the more volatile the market becomes and the greater the potential for economic failure. The only benefit to foreign ownership is the increased value in land for the person selling for retirement and the increased net worth for more financing. Of course this is only valid during a boom cycle, during a bust cycle when foreign owners are selling their land to take their money before more vlue is lost, which will drive down the price of land even more as their is more likely to be an excess supply of land therefore the person wanting to retire will not be able to sell and those that have financed based on inflated land prices will see their net worth drop immensely to the point where they may not be able to borrow money. The potential for the next bust cycle with large foreign ownership may destroy the agricultural economy. to put it simply - if things get bad it will get very bad.
710.	Corporate farms don't hire local farmers to work the land...it may be some outfit that travels 100 miles in all directions to work the land. As a result young people are no longer on the land, so there are no kids to attend the schools, the enrollment drops, the school closes and when the school closes the town will soon disappear. Another community gone!
711.	Ownership of the land will produce the best stewardship. Leased land follows that, if leasing prices are set to allow good stewardship..
712.	Over the past decades farms have been becoming larger which means the current restrictive ownership policy of farm hasn't worked. Farming is a business not a right. Farm operators must be able to assess its risk and determine financial expansion. Leasing land is a tool used by farmers to mitigate some of that risk. They should be treated as an investor in your operation be earn a rate of return on there investment. This is no different than borrowing from a financial institution, they want to earn a rate there loan. The cost to lease land is determined

	more from the value of the commodity grown not the value of the asset.
713.	More absentee landlords will control the land of the province and will have no wish to maintain or improve that land. In addition that revenue from the soil of our province will go elsewhere and circulate in the economy of somewhere else instead of staying within the province.
714.	see my previous comment
715.	Having artificially inflated purchase and lease prices will lead to at best a market correction at worst a crash in values, thus leading to more instability in the agriculture industry.
716.	Our small town is fading away as the older generation sells to corporations. The young farmers cannot afford to purchase the land as it is too expensive. The large corporations only care about return on investment so their lease rates are high and only the older, established farmers can take the risk of high lease rates.
717.	International investors has a bottomless pit of \$. Investors will buy all up.
718.	Farmers would be competing for land with organizations with deeper pockets and more ways to raise money to purchase farmland than they have. It would not be a level playing field with individual farmers being at a disadvantage.
719.	Our government say lets make saskatchewan grow. how are we making Saskatchewan grow if we keep selling it off to foreign and out of province investors. We have already sold off a lot off our natural resources but as long as the land stay's owned by Saskatchewan farmers we still as a province have some control of what is under the ground . It is time government realizes that by selling land off to foreign and out off province investors it is making Saskatchewan smaller for young farmers trying to start farming and for parents trying to help them get started. It also hurts Saskatchewan because the rent money all goes out of the province or even out of the country. KEEP SASKATCHEWAN FARM LAND OWNED BUY SASKATCHEWAN FARMERS
720.	the big corporations and secular groups have put land out of reach to the older farm families which has drove people off the land to the cities for work now that we cannot afford to expand. More people on the land: better tax base and a better way to live than the current day of farm steads few and far between.
721.	The problems with less owned land and more leased is the cost and ownership of equipment. You may have to increase you equipment and that costs a lot of money and then you may lose your lease, may see more bankrupt farmers. And on owning or lease land farther from your home base because it isn't available near your home base significantly increases costs for farms, time, labour costs, operating costs and again better quality equipment means more costs
722.	the way farmland ownership has being going is having a negative impact on farmers to make a profit and making farmland ownership a barrier for the next generation. It is absolutely critical for producers to own and give good stewardship to the farmland in Saskatchewan. A farmer should be able to make a profit from his own hardwork and investment and have non-depreciating assets in the end.
723.	This survey appears to be made by fools that know very little about farming
724.	How are people make land payments?
725.	Investors pay big money to own land. Therefore, the land surrounding the investor owned land

	becomes more unaffordable
726.	Like I said above nothing good long term will come of non farmer owned land.
727.	See previous comments... what is the difference between the present direction of outside corporate and investment ownership and control and that of the middle ages with serfs working the land of a few wealthy landowners?
728.	Land ownership should remain with Sask folks
729.	People who don't farm the land or who have never farmed the land can't possibly understand the needs of the farmers or the land.
730.	If farmers don't have the equity of the land, then all they have is equipment, but at current costs it's very difficult to acquire equipment without equity to secure the loan. If a farmer has no other equity but equipment, but needs that equipment to farm, he's one or two bad crop away from lacking the assets to continue production. It's turning into a catch 22
731.	if we change farm ownership rules from what we have today: there will be severe ramifications to the socio-economic environment that today's farming community functions in. Farm ownership through foreigners or investment funds will eventually have Saskatchewan back to the days of the old Feudal system of "landlord/tenant". People who own their land or even the city person owning their own property will better take care of that property, in most cases paying attention to detail such as environment, appearance, best management practices, etc. compared to the alternative which is strictly profit driven by someone sitting in a corporate office in Ottawa, Alberta or China. I firmly believe that a "Family Farm Corporation" is acceptable if the share holders are actively involved in that farming operation. Let us not try to "re-invent" the wheel! Our Great Grand Parents and in some cases our Parents left countries where ownership of farm land was prohibitive and came here to Saskatchewan to take up a better life free from landlords. Let us not go back in time!
732.	No,No,No to foreign investment (or other) in sask. farmland The current Sk. farmland Security Act must remain and given more power to ensure that only 320 ac. can be owned by a Canadian citizen or Corp. as per the 2002 amendment to the Act.
733.	This is what is happening now. I have neighbours who farm some land but work off-farm to support themselves. They would like to buy more land, but it has become too expensive because a few large farmers are buying everything available - but at least there is a chance of land being available since other large farmers are thinking about retiring. or a particular section may be too far from a large farmer's operation so the newer farmer can buy it. But leasing land is also expensive for any of these farmers. in fact we have auctions for Leases, since the value is so high. All of this would only be exacerbated by allowing institutional investors to buy land here. And if the farmer wishing to expand is stymied by non-residential investors, why should he stay? He may decide to leave the region, or the province, if he has no hope of supporting his family.
734.	In my area of the province, land prices are higher than they have ever been, but most of the land that has been sold has been bought by local farmers.
735.	investers who do not farm in sask will artificially inflate the value of farmland. results of that will be sask farmers will not be able to expand their operations and the land and local communities will suffer.

736.	The more wealthy investors buying farm land in Saskatchewan simply to have that investment means more competition for our young people wishing to farm. Farming is a passion and a dream for many rural people including our sons and now grandsons.
737.	farm owner operators have an interest in the farm for themselves as well as future generations meaning they are good stewards of the land. corporations etc are there for the money ONLY meaning no stewardship
738.	This government is going to take the advice of an under consideration. A guy who bankrupt a farm in some of the most profitable times ever for a farm. Our government is supposed to represent the people, not large corporations and enormous pension plans. The ability for a farmer to purchase land and support himself is slowly eroding away. The new model of land investors owning land is what our fore fathers moved to this country to avoid.
739.	The land that has been purchased by non farmers/investors wanting farmers in the area to rent the land at a great cost has risen. We have had numerous calls from these individuals to lease their land and our response to them is that if you bought it, farm it your self or sell it back to the residents of Saskatchewan. Farming is a way of life. A great way of life that we provide food from grains, meat, oil, and more to this countries economy and foreign ownership do not contribute to this countries economy. They have the financial means to ship the food that is produced in this country back to their own country.
740.	The second last question on probability depend on government policy. I don't see value in commenting on this.
741.	No comments
742.	Things need to be left as they are. It is working just fine
743.	The way things are going right now, it is going to be much more difficult to buy and own land in Saskatchewan. It will also be harder to do anything with having land surrounding you that is owned by people outside of Saskatchewan, as quite often it is extremely hard to get in contact with those who actually own the land.
744.	If too many people r taking a piece of the pie than everyone goes Hungry
745.	It is my opinion that if the land is not owned by the farmer and is not in his direct control, his farm business is not very stable. he can sign a lease for the land for a few years, but that is the duration of his stability. He will have trouble financing, as the land is used to back financing. The DIRT is what makes or breaks the REAL farmer. Not owning the land put the business of farming in a very precarious position
746.	the small family farm is not able to compete with greed of corporate farm as they push up the prices making land unattainable for young farmers
747.	Once these big companies have the land, it will be very hard for us as farmers to purchase it back at a reasonable price.
748.	The potential impact to farmers is quite a lot different than the potential impact to the agricultural industry.
749.	foreign ownership will be the demise of Saskatchewan 's agriculuture.
750.	The cost of the land either owned or leased is one of the smallest part of a farms overall cost

751.	<p>the question is ill defined. impact on who?? I assume that prov., fed., and municipal governments will continue to be able to tax the owners, where ever they live. However policies that may infringe on the profitability of land ownership will be challenged by foreign nationals, whereas local resident citizens just have to live with gov't policy. For example Chapter 11 of Nafta and the profit protecting clauses (state/investor dispute mechanisms) of the latest EU and Trans Pacific trade agreements that are being negotiated in secret.</p>
752.	<p>As long as farmers own land debt free it is far easier to ride out downturns.</p> <p>High land prices increase taxes and make it much more difficult to enter farming, even intensive small scale farming such as vegetable production. This will be needed more in the future as traditional sources of food such as California become less available and there is more emphasis on local production for local consumption.</p>
753.	<p>I don't really understand this set of questions. What are the same scenarios?</p>
754.	<p>A rise in farmland values simply drives our (farmers) costs up, making a profit harder to attain.</p>
755.	<p>Most of the time land is well paid for and if you don't take it someone else will</p>
756.	<p>Local farmers/Operators/Owners are the ones who take the most pride and care in the land that they farm. They are the ones who will fight, push and persevere through the hard times in order to keep farming and to stay on the land that they know and love.</p> <p>Investors and out of province/country investors only care about the bottom dollar and if tough times come in farming and they aren't seeing the return on investment that they expected than they will drop that investment and potentially leave that farmer and this province high and dry.</p>
757.	<p>I'm confused about answering these sections. I answered both sections as the "status quo" regarding outside ownership, with no changes to ownership laws.</p>
758.	<p>opening statement is very unclear, of "what same scenarios"</p>
759.	<p>Land prices go up with competition from foreign investors, farmers living here contributing to our economy, are trying to compete with unrelated money investing in and driving up prices. The only benefit is old farmers retiring and leaving the industry, probably to leave the province with their money</p>
760.	<p>The current land ownership laws makes it hard enough for the young generation to secure land for their operations. If any laws are relaxed then the young generation won't be able to afford to get into the business and if there is no new farmers getting into the business farmers will become a dying breed and we'll have a bigger problem on our hands with a lot of land not being farmed.</p>
761.	<p>Understanding there may be a wide variety of responses, if the Province wants to consolidate the population in two centers - Saskatoon and Regina - and leave the rural areas to companies and lenders to own farmland, then outside investment is the way to go.</p> <p>If the Province wants to enhance rural quality of life and continue attracting value added business for locally produced product, it needs to establish the environment for those already established or wanting to enter the industry a method to do it. Not being able to buy land across the road from your neighbour because an agency has millions in hand vs those of us needing to provide ridiculous amounts of security to purchase land is hardly a market</p>

	competition for land or investment. It's artificial.
762.	Do not bow to Chinese and US pressure. Protect Saskatchewan's quality of land and its people.
763.	Limit ownership by non-Saskatchewan residents and eliminate the potential for foreign ownership. This is the only way to keep our food supply safe and secure for our own people. Anything less than this would lead to control of our land being given to people/corporations/foreign governments that have no clue about production practices and no concern for our local environment and our local communities.
764.	Sometimes in life you must pay your dues. If young farmers can't buy and own their own land initially, at least with investors they have the opportunity to lease land and start their business with a long term model with a goal of eventually purchasing land after a few good years leasing. It doesn't ruin tradition. The fact is that we are entering a period in history where more mouths are on the planet that require food, and that is BIG BUSINESS. Huge businesses will oversee this giant demand, not small mom and pop operations that don't have the infrastructure or knowhow to market products on a mass scale.
765.	When a landlord is an entity, they have no cares about farm stewardship and keeping family on the farm. They are worried about the bottom line and getting more money for shareholders but only at a cost to the farmer whose income has a ceiling but risks and expenses don't!
766.	If you want to own farmland, then you should be the one working the land. More people on the land helps the community.
767.	Commodity prices do not currently reflect or support some of the land values that are trading currently. This will become unsustainable. When land prices increase so do leases and if commodity prices don't support these changes farmers will be forced to sell or lease the land they do have.
768.	traditional farms are family farms and we have mostly lost that I believe the farming community's have become smaller
769.	<p>All of these impacts lead to a concentration of farm land ownership, which in the long run will not lead to fair prices for consumers, but a stranglehold or monopoly on food by a few large corporations.</p> <p>Good commodity prices are an essential component of enabling farmers to have a reasonable sized operation, versus endless expansion. Can we continue to afford the luxury of leaving commodity prices to the open market, with farmers caught in the middle between weather, poor rail transportation, fluctuating commodity prices, and value-added processing located far from Saskatchewan thus adding to the costs of food without giving any return to farmers.</p> <p>Farmers will have to make a choice as to whether it is worthwhile to purchase land elsewhere - in terms of time, travel and wear and tear on equipment and on the farmers themselves.</p> <p>More costly land will lead to more foreign ownership (which should not be allowed) or concentration in the hands of large local corporations.</p>
770.	<p>The answers to these questions depend entirely on the timeframe in question (I have assumed 10 years) and whether the changes to the SFSA introduced in May 2015 remain in place (I have assumed at least a partial reversion to the previous legislation).</p> <p>1. As stated previously, the overall proportion of Saskatchewan farmland that is leased rather</p>

than owned has increased gradually over time. Because the last census was in 2011, we cannot assess how the later stage of this purported farmland investment boom may have influenced overall tenure patterns in Saskatchewan. Nonetheless, it seems unlikely that the general trend will shift anytime soon.

2. Although farmers do have other on-farm assets (e.g. production machinery, storage equipment), these assets generally depreciate in value over time. Land, which continues to make up the majority of most farmers' assets, tends to appreciate over time. Therefore, it is not just the balance between different types of on-farm assets, but also their ability to act as a store of value (including under different inflation scenarios), that will determine farmers longer-term sustainability. Additionally, it remains unclear the extent to which farmers may rely on off-farm assets or investments (e.g. stocks, bonds, RRSPs etc.) - whether to sustain their farming operations or as a means of personal financial security.

3. Already there are widespread reports of farmers having difficulty acquiring land, whether to expand existing farming operations or to begin farming as a new entrant to agriculture. At the same time, it is clear that other farmers are actively purchasing land. It seems likely that both trends will continue.

4. Regarding the costs of leasing, several analysts have recently suggested that leasing rates have not kept up with the rapid appreciation of land values in recent years. It seems possible that we could thus see leasing becoming more expensive. That said, we are also already seeing news reports of increasing rent strikes among farmers in the US midwest, which has a similar overall land tenure pattern to Saskatchewan. Whether such strikes will soon be seen in Saskatchewan, and whether that will act to counterbalance a potential increase in leasing charges, remains to be seen.

771. Not sure if I understand this section. My responses are based on the impact if more foreign ownership occurs.

772. These questions are hard to answer. Even with existing ownership regulations land in our area is very high, both to rent and to own. It is making it unaffordable except to the very large farms. It already isn't in the best interests of the majority of existing farmers, even before contemplating changes to open up ownership. Opening up to foreign investors will only ensure that local ownership and control is lost. Even though I stand to gain from high prices when I leave farming it is not fair to those starting out. We need to have Sask farmers owning their own operations and not having to compete against international dollars to do it.

773. Specific Responses

3. Given the current environment around farmland ownership, provide your assessment of the following scenarios:

i. Farmers have more barriers to leasing land near the land they currently farm:

By using _____'s financial services a farmer can more readily purchase land near where they currently farm, rather than lease. _____'s financial services will help facilitate the transition of land from the current to the next generation of farmers and play a key role in helping to ensure Saskatchewan farmland remains owned and operated by local residents.

ii. Farms have less equity in the form of owned land versus other assets:

_____ 's financial services create an opportunity for farmers to have significantly more equity

in land than they could under any alternative financing option. _____'s financial services help farmers to maximize their long-term equity value, giving them added financial flexibility in the future. Please review the case studies at _____ or in the Appendix of this submission for more information on how _____'s financial services can economically benefit Saskatchewan farmers.

iii. Farmland becomes unaffordable for Saskatchewan farmers to purchase:

There are two points that _____ wishes to address on this matter:

a. _____ finances the acquisition of farmland by its farming clients. _____ does not buy farmland and therefore is not a price-setter – _____ has no direct impact on farmland prices and therefore does not affect the affordability of land for Saskatchewan farmers;

b. _____'s alternative financing option lowers farmers' overall credit risk which enables farmers to purchase land that may otherwise be unaffordable.

iv. The tradition of farmland ownership in Saskatchewan is lost:

_____ supports Saskatchewan's tradition of farmland ownership and _____ sustains this tradition by helping to transition land to the next generation of local resident farmers ensuring Saskatchewan's farmland remains community owned and operated.

v. More leased land is farmed compared to owned land:

_____ 's goal is to provide farmers with the opportunity to own additional land if this fits within their business plan. Assuming more farmers would prefer to own additional land versus lease additional land, using _____'s financial services helps farmers to achieve this objective.

vi. Farmers have more barriers to purchase land near the land they currently farm:

_____ 's goal is to reduce the barriers farmers face when wanting to purchase land near the land they currently farm. To achieve this, _____ will offer farmers financing options that may otherwise be unavailable through more traditional lenders, increasing a farmer's ability to acquire land. Often when land becomes available for sale near a farmer's current operation it presents a valuable opportunity for the farmer to expand their operation. If the farmer is unable to purchase the land due to financial constraints and the land is sold to another buyer, this is an opportunity lost. _____'s financing model enables farmers to acquire land in their communities, as it becomes available for sale.

vii. Ownership and control more often resides with non-local owners who do not farm the land themselves:

_____ 's goal is to finance Saskatchewan resident farmers to acquire farmland and to ensure Saskatchewan's farmland remains community owned and operated. _____ gives local operators of farmland the opportunity to purchase additional land near where they currently farm.

774. The tradition of Government owning some land that is leased with management expectations attached to the lease has been a great asset for the land resource and farmer and ranchers being able to obtain such land. The Government should stop public land sale. It provides

	equity for Saskatchewan people and options for the future at many levels - beneficial impact.
775.	As explained in earlier question.
776.	corporate farming does not benefit communities
777.	It is almost impossible for a young farmer to start farming now because of the high cost of farm commodities, including land.
778.	The wording of this question is ambiguous. However, if the current scenario is allowed to continue with real estate brokers and investment funds circumventing the intention of the act we may end up with farm land solely owned by non farming interests who have no agendas except maximizing their own profitability. The pioneers who homesteaded this province including my own grandfathers believed the intrinsic value of their toil was rewarded by the ownership of their own land which was why they left 'the old country' to settle Saskatchewan. I do'nt think these values have changed.
779.	I feel traditional farmland ownership in Saskatchewan is very important to the future of the province. Farmers take pride in the security that their province does not value money over environmentally sustainable operation of our Saskatchewan farmland. We cannot be bought by outside investors.
780.	In order for family farms to continue they need to be able to grow and have stable conditions around farmland ownership. Corporate farms do not work and there are lots of examples of that. Eg. one earth farms. When Saskatchewan farmers don't own the land nobody is responsible and decisions are not made for the better of agriculture.
781.	As the rules now exist, purchase price and cash rent have already substantially increased as our area is very productive and highly assessed. It is one hour from a major centre and highly populated, There are doctors, lawyer, and professional athletes who are gambling that this area is a good place to invest their dollars, thus already making it difficult for local farmers to purchase land. The return these investors want has increased farm rental rates. Weather is very unpredictable and farmers need to have sufficient equipment to farm a certain acreage. Leased and may be lost at the end of the contract and it can be impossible to replace that land base, thus making it impossible to make payments on purchased equipment. It is already a big gamble. We don't want the gamble increased.
782.	i answered these questions as if you opened the farm land up to foreign investors and big companies and pension funds
783.	Less equity nearly always translates to less borrowing power and less resistance to negative trends in prices.
784.	I have answered these as if it has been opened up to outside investors.
785.	As a young farm kid that would love to be able to buy land and build the family farm acres, it is impossible these days. Between other non-farmer investors and other bigger farmers, young farmers do not stand a chance at being able to farm one day, unless they come from a big-time farming operation. Dwindles the passion!
786.	Everything will balance itself out
787.	This set of questions is very disappointing. We live in an evolving world. The question about the Tradition of farmland ownership in SASK BEING LOST is so far fetched. The day of every

	quarter in Sask having someone living on it is long gone and so should the notion that the government has to protect the ownership of farmland to protect our communities and the farmers. Things are changing. We need a lot more money pouring into Sask not turning it away. I have neighbours who have worked all their lives on the farm and their main source of retirement is their land. Why should they not be able to have a wide variety of buyer options? Houses in the city cost a fortune and retiring farmer need a lot of cash to buy them. Please loosen the rules, not tighten them any further than they already are!
788.	It's hard for a new farmer to expand because of investor groups that buy large chunks of land and not know how to farm it
789.	Farmers competing against investors whose interest in holding the land as an investment is untenable. It may eventually result in large tracts of land owned by people who will hire farmers to operate that land. The land is best farmed by those who have a personal stake in its long-term care which in the past has been owner/operators. I absolutely believe that Saskatchewan and its communities will suffer with increasing numbers of absentee landlords.
790.	Ownership needs to stay with farmers as lessors often do not understand the land like the farmer will. They will be demanding rates based on rates of neighboring properties, which won't often make sense since every piece is very different (soil quality, alkali, lots of low spots, etc). Among many other reasons, it is a must to keep ownership regulated.
791.	Am uncertain about the current ratio of owned land versus leased land, and the overall percentage of farmland owned by non-residents and foreigners.
792.	Progressive land-ownership policy that emphasizes social investment in agriculture (local ownership of the land, direct connection of food producers with the land etc.) would benefit both rural and urban communities. A policy that tends to maximize financial investment (even worse, foreign ownership of agricultural land) would reduce the level of food sovereignty and weakened the fabric of Saskatchewan society
793.	Owners who do not farm the land themselves are less likely to be good stewards/managers of the land.

9) Would you support allowing foreign ownership of farmland in Saskatchewan?

#	Response
1.	The land in Saskatchewan has only been broken and made farmable for the past 100 years or so. Our ancestors are the ones who made this possible; they are the ones who made this land valuable. Now we want to open that up to people who don't live, work, or pay tax in this country? Seems ridiculous to me.
2.	100% NO - look at what it has done in Australia where the price of farmland has increase 300% over the past ten years. How can farmers possibly afford to compete with Saudi Oil funds, or US pension funds or government of China backed companies who want to secure their own farmland base to supply their countries with food. Saskatchewan is resource rich, its is our responsibility to ensure the people of Saskatchewan bear the fruit of our beautiful and fertile soil. Selling our provinces soul to the highest bidder is the beginning of fate for the

	Saskatchewan Agriculture industry.
3.	This may happen anyway because foreign owners may just set up a corporation in Canada to purchase the land
4.	Hard enough competing with farms over 20,000 acres in size, land investors from Canada, and heaven forbid pension boards, I would never be able to farm and would have to end up selling what land we do have to them. That's a lose lose right there.
5.	Definitely not! I support the small farmer who built this province and the respect they give the land. The sweat and hard work that has gone into keeping the farms in the hands of Saskatchewan instead of selling it off.
6.	Similar to restricting funds, various foreign corporations and/or individuals have vast sums of money at their disposal; it would be more pressure against the actual farmer ever owning their own land again.
7.	Keep it local and keep it easy for young guys otherwise there will be no future for rural sask
8.	I don't believe that sovereign wealth funds or other foreign investors should be allowed to own Canadian strategic assets. Ideally Canadian investors (including all Canadian pension funds) should be allowed to own Canadian farmland.
9.	Foreigner should invest in their own country's
10.	I am vehemently against this
11.	We need to own the land for many many reasons.
12.	Absolutely not.
13.	The homestead is part of who we are. If we want to increase the economy having traditional farms with people who use the local stores and buy the local merchandise we need the farmer. The massive corporation farms get rid of that.
14.	That would only add to one time land price increases, followed by a decrease in Saskatchewan farmers and ultimately long term decline in rural populations, increased joblessness and crime in rural Saskatchewan
15.	Other industries require foreign investment. To capitalize on potential royalties revenue - something all sask residents share instead of just the agricultural sector - foreign investment should be opened up.
16.	There young farmers in sask that want and know how to farm this land. Foreign buyers make this impossible. I have seen this first hand and the outcome was not good
17.	Would support if the purchaser was actively in the business of farming and not only speculating
18.	I would drive prices even higher
19.	Saskatchewan isn't the next province of china
20.	We do not need foreign owners of our farm land
21.	I can't get more land my self why would I want foreign investors by my house?!

22.	This is completely unacceptable. Farmland is made to be farmed by local Saskatchewan residents. Farmland is not a commodity that should be sold to foreign investors. This will in no way benefit farmers and Saskatchewan residents.
23.	why I think we sold off too much of Saskatchewan
24.	Absolutely not! That goes against the very core of what I believe is best for the future of Saskatchewan, its residents, and the agricultural industry.
25.	Let's grow our economy
26.	The investors would only be here for profit reasons.
27.	ABSOLUTELY NOT.
28.	Sale to the highest bidder.
29.	They don't live here. Support local business. Have kids in school etc. They don't contribute to community. They make land overpriced beyond profitable means for us.
30.	It adds no value. Farmers are willing to buy the land, so sellers are still getting paid a premium. All they contribute is speculation and cause more people to move out of rural Saskatchewan
31.	Very few modern day foreigners actually want to purchase the land to farm themselves from what I've Seen they buy it too rent out. That is the very reason my ancestors left Poland was too too have a chance too actually own something of their own.
32.	Saskatchewan farmland ownership should remain with Saskatchewan owners (with Sask. owners preferred over Canadian owners somehow).
33.	There is lots of farmers that can purchase the land
34.	How are young farmer supposed to compete against big money from out country
35.	Some Countries are looking at securing large land holdings for production and shipping product direct to their home Country
36.	Passive ownership will not ensure land productivity.
37.	Absolutely not. I believe the current law is in place for a reason and if we allow foreign ownership in, it is only a matter of time before we are all run off our farms by massive corporations. I want my children's children to know the farm.
38.	Not needed. We have Canadians only at present and I think acres should have been limited for them.
39.	Never! As stated in past responses, too much control by outside interests, vacant properties held in speculation, overpriced leases, controlled crop inputs and market outcomes, massive emigration of farm families to city centers, destruction of small towns, smaller center governments controlled by outside investors (large land holders sit on RM's, Town Councils, Water Boards could create significant unwanted change or over expenditures for their benefits. Don't make me laugh and say Conflict of Interest holds, watched it happen in the past in different circumstances and they found a way around it!). Above all, if you want foreign ownership, then look at B.C. where nearly every vineyard and

	orchard is owned by an immigrant and 20 members of their family, they don't hire locally, they just bring over more family. (Not being prejudice, have come from long line of immigrants all the way back to the 1860's), just stating facts as they are. If this was the USA trying to buy up our land and farm it would you look at foreign investment differently...direct competition...or China buying up our land farming it, sending back their own production to themselves or others and local farmers would lose a market.
40.	I think it's a short term bonus that we, as a province, will rue as we lose control over our environment.
41.	Read the previous three portions
42.	Nothing good comes from foreign ownership. Not for farmers or the community. It helps the foreigners....
43.	If it's used for the purposes of farming or developing resources to stay in the province/country then yes.
44.	I can't believe the government is even considering this stop selling us out we as a province have been farming and owning/leasing our own land for this many years no need for a change
45.	Foreign ownership MUST NOT be allowed. Relinquishing the benefits of land ownership to foreign interests is a foolish decision, looking only at the short term. Not only must foreign ownership be restricted, the restrictions must be enforced and no exceptions allowed!
46.	I feel in a controlled situation it could work very well.
47.	In my opinion foreigners can stay in there own country and keep there money there too
48.	Why should they just be able to walk in and buy are farm land! Buy our grain not our land!
49.	There is ample investment demand from Canadians. Restricted foreign investment might be reasonable.
50.	Farmland in Saskatchewan needs to stay in the hands of locals and not foreign ownership, it will heavily change rural Saskatchewan for the worse if we let it happen.
51.	I believe in the free market - which includes permitting foreign ownership
52.	Local farmers and or Sask residents should own the land.
53.	Alberta allowed to much foreign investment, politicians didn't put enough money towards the people, they now have a NDP government , never thought in my lifetime , look at Norway , didn't sell their country (oil reserves)to investors, they have done well, the land will always be , proceed with caution
54.	Foreign ownership will break small farmers due to setting rent prices at whatever they wish
55.	Canadian land should be owned by Canadian citizens only.
56.	If that happens may's we'll get rid of the Canadian flag and hang a chinese one up
57.	As stated this is very vague, can you avoid a country or an agent of a country from taking control, while allowing individuals. How do you investigate individuals acting as an agent of a

	State?
58.	Being near to a mine site we have experienced what can happen when foreign ownership comes into play. Well it may push up land prices there are definitely some things more important than money such as our maintaining a certain lifestyle.
59.	No THEY DO NOT CARE. We have enough just trying to purchase land and then come and buy everything up.
60.	We had a hard enough time trying to compete with local farmland buyers who were using logging or Alberta oil money. Never mind adding foreigners to the mix who are looking to invest money, site unseen with no care of the people who may be displaced. If that happens, I feel we will really begin to see true corporate farms, where nobody cares about the land, only the dollar
61.	Some investment good, can't lose too much control and opportunity.
62.	If it is so good why did the present government keep foreign investors away from the ownership of potash mines, (which I supported) What is the difference with farmland. There comes a time when government must do things differently in order to protect the generations that built this great province.
63.	WHY WOULD WE LET ONE OF BEST ASSETS BE OWNED BY OTHER COUNTRY'S
64.	I would be supportive of foreign individuals owning farmland in Saskatchewan, but not foreign corporations or sovereign wealth funds.
65.	See prior answers. I do not want nor do I support a government that allows foreign ownership of our land.
66.	Land is our one resource that we need. Why would we sell our home? This question is really absurd. We don't need outside investors to take our land. We have more than enough local residents trying to purchase land as it becomes available. Look to foreign investment on industry perhaps, but not on our resource which we quite literally need to have control over in order to do what's best for our province, our resources, and our environment.
67.	You really don't want to hear this response
68.	Never . Our land is something we ourselves should keep. They don't make anymore of it.
69.	Absolutely not!
70.	Put limits on foreign ownership, like a certain % of the total land in the province.
71.	Absolutely not. Do we want to be taken over by foreign countries? Do they let us buy up their land? We've farmed this land for years and still want to. And we are having the opportunity taken away from us. How can any of us young farmers make a living doing what we love. We're getting pushed out because we can't afford.
72.	Why would we as a people give away the land that has made us rich as a people?
73.	This will not encourage new young farmers to take up the trade.
74.	In my opinion, a country like China, which has ruined a large amount of farmland and needs

	and increasing amount of food would love to get their hands on Sask. farmland. I don't think this would be a desirable situation.
75.	I do not think that just because we have land and some other country does not mean we sell our local people out by letting foreigners buy it up
76.	Its been proven over generations that the introduction of foreign ownership results in a hands off emotionless business. The end of result of this will surely be poor farming practises by hands off owners to save money, poor quality product as employees of foreign owners have no vested interest in what they produce and a forever smeared name for the Saskatchewan farm. What is happening to our country? First the Wheatboard is sold right out from under a group of Canadian farmers with a more than fair offer on the table and now this. Why are we trying globalize a country that in no way requires it for economic sustainability?
77.	It is unnecessary
78.	Long-term health of land would become less important than short-term production
79.	Does anyone want China with Chinese farmers farming Sask land and shipping the produce back to China while we sit and watch?
80.	Why would we allow foreign ownership of our most valuable Saskatchewan resource to allow potential dollars to leave the country. The government stopped the sale of potash corp to foreigners and this is a even larger resource and should be equally protected.
81.	Ownership should remain in the hands of Saskatchewan people
82.	With the additional rule the the entity farm it
83.	It serves no purpose other than to divide the value created on our farmland resource and move it outside the province or country.
84.	Canadian money only
85.	Keep all revenue in Saskatchewan
86.	I have no problem with foreigners moving here to buy land but disagree with foreign ownership
87.	What control would we have over food security?
88.	We need to keep it owned locally
89.	Allowing Saskatchewan residents to own farm land but not farm it is already pushing up the price of land, increasing the pool of potential purchasers would just push the price higher.
90.	I don't support local farmers destroying more land here.
91.	Farmland should not be treated as a commodity for foreign investment.
92.	were repeating ourselves here.
93.	Ownership should reside with those who farm it. More products need to be finished locally with our farmed goods.
94.	While I have no issue with the concept of foreign ownership, my concern would lie with the stewardship of the land owned by individuals/corporations/trusts/investors outside of the

	province.
95.	Farming has changed. We need to recognize that the old model isn't being used to the extent it was. Owner operators are rare and becoming more rare. Only large corporate style family farms and Hutterite colonies are likely to survive if we keep the existing restricted farmland ownership system as they will be the only ones who will have the capital to own their own farmland. These aren't the people whose economic interest needs to be protected by legislation.
96.	For all reasons in the survey to this point. It is not a good idea. It reeks of greed.
97.	Farm land should belong to people who are willing to see it. People who want the best for the land, not just a profit. They may also buy up a bunch of land and try to turn it into something else.
98.	That would just make to problem worse. High land prices does not benefit Saskatchewan farmers who don't own the land.
99.	Not more than the 10 acres currently allowed, although there seems to be ways that people are getting around that.
100.	We need to keep our farms in canadian ownership or we'll just become a "community pasture" for another country
101.	People that have no interest or knowledge of farming are becoming the land owners thus heading back to the old feudal system
102.	The profits from the farmland would go out of province and out of country
103.	I believe we are in a world market and want to compete with the world for our sales, our inputs, our machinery. We should compete on land as well. We don't regulate our potash price so that we get it lower than the world - why would you regulate the land price? I have no interest in sacrificing what I have worked extremely hard for over the last 30 years to "enable" the next generation to farm extremely profitably at my expense.
104.	Investment money, wherever it comes from, will be beneficial to local areas having more money to spend and allows all farmers a fair and equal opportunity at renting land from land owners.
105.	It will Bring more money to Local Economy of Saskatchewan and can bring more business will the Money Investment
106.	I like the "Canadian owned" restriction (restricts foreign government ownership of Canadian land). Otherwise, more investment money is better.
107.	Canadian sovernity and security is lost and can not be returned after it has been sold. Please think about that
108.	I explained that earlier when I pointed out why our forbears came to Western Canada.
109.	Keep it local. This question makes it sound like the Government rather see the jobs/money go elsewhere in the world rather than to their own residents.
110.	The government needs to stop trying to sell everything off. Profit is not everything.

111.	No!!!!
112.	100% absolutely NOT! We should not be selling our land but keeping it in Canadian ownership. It is in my opinion the greatest asset this country has. We would be complete idiots to allow anyone but a Canadian who belongs to this country to own any of our farm land.
113.	we need the money staying in canada to help the people who actually live here.
114.	Foreign owners won't have the same incentive to treat the land in a sustainable way.
115.	I stongly believe that you need to be a Saskatchewan resident and Canadian citizen to own land
116.	The price that they will pay is not tied to what the land can produce.
117.	It's just not right! It's downright stupid to even think about it
118.	No this should not be allowed! It should only be the people trying to make a living by farming allowed!
119.	Never. Should all be owned by the people farming it or who have farmed it in the past!!!!
120.	Absentee ownership is not the answer (Tim Horton's only franchises to hands on operators, not to corporations or passive investors).
121.	This is allowed in all other industries
122.	See previous comments.
123.	We should have the interest of our own people first and foremost
124.	If the land is owned by foreigners is it really our country anymore? The foreign owners that are in a position to buy land here do not have our best interests at heart - they are only looking to make money off our land. Foreigners have a lot more money than Saskatchewan farmers do, so they will be able to buy more and more of the land, reducing our farmers to tenants. It would be a return to serfdom. Allowing foreigners to own our farmland should not even be considered!
125.	When I was a kid foreign ownership was allowed. My father rented land from a man in the states and from people from Germany he managed to buy the land from the gentleman in the states. The people from Germany Canada and bought more land farmed.
126.	It depends on any new rules that the government puts forward
127.	I have already discussed this earlier - foreign owners have no obligation towards stewardship or sustainability of Canadian lands. Enforcement for infractions against laws would be hard to enforce, if not impossible.
128.	This will likely increase the value of land in Saskatchewan and improve the overall economy.
129.	Should stay Saskatchewan owned/ Canadian with restrictions
130.	Agriculture is still a driving factor in the Sask. economy the high standards of products produced comes because farms own land and care about what is produced. The further you

	are removed from ownership... the less people care... just look at all the big companies... employees just show up... they care less about the service they provided... big is not always better.... just let farmers make a good living at what they are doing... and this province will always prosper.
131.	We need to keep Sask land with the Sask people. We are losing far too much control of our own nation to foreign influences and popluations. This is a proud heritage that we need to hold on to
132.	If foreigners own the land they will start to control where the commodity produced ends up and what it is used for
133.	I can see a value to having non-farmers own land but not foreign entities.
134.	i support canadian pension funds and certain types of canadian companies owning farmland, but not foreign entities, grain marketing, seed, chemical, fertilizer or related companies.
135.	Define Foreign. Individuals, Countries, Canadians living abroad? I would oppose granting exceptions to any group looking to place permanent land use controls in place. USA Conservation groups creating Canadian arms to force land use restrictions in the future, I oppose.
136.	Only people who put muscle, sweat and time into farming the land should be allowed to own it.
137.	This could give foreign investors the power to influence political decisions made in this province. As an example, a threat could be made to flood the land market with the sale of lands they control if a decision being considered by the province does not go in their favor. This could have a dramatic affect on land values and the net worth of farms in the province.
138.	There are lots of Canadian people who want to farm but can't because land costs more than they will ever get from the products produced. It will only get worse with foreign ownership.
139.	This is idiotic . To allow non citizens to own should be disallowed
140.	This is a misleading question. Are you talking about Foreign investors, or are you talking about a foreign family who wants to start farming? I would have no problem with a family buying land and farming it, but totally against Foreign investors purchasing as much land as they can.
141.	never never never
142.	I would support outside investment, but also would support some sort of reasonable cap on the number of acres for each foreign owner.
143.	What selling-off assets to foreign investors boils down to is greed for the sellers. We've lost our traditional way for the all mighty dollar.
144.	As answered previously.
145.	do you want your burger from a local rancher, or from McDonalds? you decide.
146.	We have enough of this in other fieldstone
147.	We have people here who want to expand their farms -- why take away that right from them?

	Foreign money will always trump local money, but we need some protectionism here. Some conservative values.
148.	Depending on experience, they would have to learn and have the funds to start from scratch and without experience of any kind they would suffer terribly income wise
149.	only if they are active farmers.
150.	Even in the cities by allowing foreign ownership, it is becoming more and more difficult for local people to purchase homes and farms.
151.	As I have said before, it is extremely important to keep farmland owned by Saskatchewan farmers.
152.	How on earth could this be good.
153.	Foreign investment should be limited to a few acres. Leave the farmland for Saskatchewan/Canadian farmers
154.	Let's sell them what we produce on the land not give them the land to produce their own products
155.	Sometimes it is not a matter that the local farmers can't pay the asking price it is that they won't. If I had two offers close in value one was local, and one was foreign, all things being equal. I would sell to the local.
156.	I venomously say no. I will in a heartbeat
157.	NO! NO! NO! Never! Any farmer that thinks it would be okay when it comes time for him to sell is being incredibly selfish. So he will get the benefit of a higher price to sell his land but the ramifications of foreign ownership will destroy our land.
158.	I am 100% against any foreign ownership. We need to keep our land/assets ours. Family farms built this province and they will be pushed out. The profits will not stay in the province or even in Canada. Other countries don't allow foreign ownership, they put themselves first as Canada should do as well. No foreign company will put our interests first. It's all about profits and doing what's best for them financially. Saskatchewan must keep control of our assets and precious resources.
159.	If they don't live here, they shouldn't control our land and agriculture.
160.	already a problem
161.	I don't like any absentee ownership of farmland. I also don't want our domestic governments put in the position where they could come under outside pressure on certain policy issues.
162.	In order to maintain a sense of accountability we need to have the majority if not all, actual farmers as owner/operators. This can include corporations that are made up of Saskatchewan farmers.
163.	If people buy land they should have to take on risk and farm the land for at least 5 years. If they are willing to farm and support local communities it's ok. As it stands know they buy land and contribute nothing back to rural sask. They over pay for the quality of land they purchase

	and then want large amounts of rent that aren't feasible.
164.	Foreign ownership will rise and fall with profitability. Have the increase in sale prices been skewed by the sale to local developers outside the large centres and also the oil and potash companies. Several large farming corporates have gone into bankruptcy over the last decades proving even local businesses can failure. The pension plan purchase supported Canadians. It is almost impossible for the average farmer to operate at a profit due to the huge input costs over which one has very little control.
165.	I've said enough. We can't compete
166.	Land prices have skyrocketed and there is the possibility of MORE foreign ownership?! That just is not fair to the small guy. Especially to those out of country who buy and do not farm or they attempt to farm and go belly up like they all do
167.	More machinery can always be made and purchased. Land is limited and can never be increased. Once it is lost, it can never be regained. It should not be lost to investors outside of Canada.
168.	would prefer canadian but i see cwb has gone foreign so it must be good
169.	See previous comments
170.	I believe in an open market system. The same as current gov,ts did re the CWB
171.	Sask farm land should be owed buy the producer and not rich companies and government.
172.	Somehow an American has purchased 70 some quarters in our area and taken most of the land out of production as well as moving 10 or 12 families out of the community. So we have fewer people to support activities and facilities in town. It is a disaster that should never have been allowed. I am not sure how he was able to do this with the law the way it is.
173.	Go try and buy a quarter of land in a middle east country and let me know how open they are to the proposal.
174.	Keep farmland in Canadian hands. Don't sell out our country
175.	No foreign invested should own any land in saskatchewan
176.	mmmm
177.	We should expire to broader ownership, not smaller and higher restriction. Maybe the Alberta approach of 80% or 75% is reasonable.
178.	I can buy land in other countries...why have a Communist control here in Sask??? bad for reputation.
179.	Sask farmers export about 99 percent of their production around the world. By shutting out foreign investment we're basically saying to the world....we like you to buy our stuff, but don't ever, ever think you could invest here. Seems like slapping our customers in the face
180.	aren't we suppose to be an open economy
181.	Right now the Chinese are out smarting the province and owning land. You live in Canada three months and back home in china. Yet your Canadian. Really winter in china as a holiday. Your back home working and vacation in Canada is more like it. Games

182.	Money stays in Sask.
183.	NO!
184.	the land needs people populating it, supporting the schools, businesses, etc. more local ownership is good for the community, the province, for Canada as a whole.
185.	These investors are only buying the land for one reason, to control the food supply.
186.	Why can us Saskatchewan residents not own our own or lease our own land!
187.	We already see abuses of the current ownership restrictions through the SINP. Arable land sits unused and controlled outside of the country. Stewardship of the land is as important as profit.
188.	the only fair market is a free market.
189.	Assuming the definition of foreign is "not Canadian". I would not want to see Saudi Arabia buy all of Saskatchewan, so we need some limits. In the past "tradition", I was considered a foreigner because I lived in Alberta.
190.	Yes, foreign ownership will open the gates to global marketing, Canada can't consume all of our food production. Are our current marketing boards doing a good job with that, not very many are left to manage relationship as strongly as foreign investors will. We are living on global demand and however best to keep it moving and avoid government subsidies, our government isn't capable of these programs in the future.
191.	You should have to be a Canadian resident living in Canada to be able to purchase the land in Canada.
192.	I think it's unfair to producers whose forefathers built this land to allow foreign investors to come in, buy the land and then rent it back to farmers.
193.	If a country's land is owned by foreign investors then what does a country have? Our farmland is cheap compared to land elsewhere. Chinese investors could find the money in their couch cushions to buy all available land in the province!
194.	I am very pro rural Saskatchewan and see absolutely no benefit to the province as a whole in allowing this type of arrangement.
195.	Foreign land ownership should not be allowed. You must be a Canadian to own farm land, and that should also be limited. Farmers should have first say, and all other Canadian investors should be limited to how much land they can purchase.
196.	The government should be more focused on maintaining current farms, as well as the future of young Saskatchewan farmers. Keep the foreign investors out of the mix!!!!
197.	I feel if you want to own land in Saskatchewan you should have some sort of connection to it other than just a "foreign investment".
198.	As long as they actively farm the land and pay taxes here. We have neighbours who did this from South Africa. They are good people and I have no problem with what they did. They just wanted to escape a bad situation and come to a free country like or great grandfathers did.
199.	Why would we want to sell our country to another country?

200.	I think it will negatively impact the agriculture industry
201.	Foreign ownership is more complicated than Canadian ownership, due to food security and availability issues. This issue is far more complex than allowing out of province or pension plan ownership.
202.	Food security. Don't want to live in a serfdom. Family farms disappear. Opening up the rules may increase the value of farmland but that is a short term reward for a potential very long term risk.
203.	It brings investment money into the province.
204.	Foreign ownership may be a positive development as long as strict environmental legislation is drafted and enforced.
205.	Yes, however their property tax rate should be higher and there should be a special purchase tax. Also, the land must be rented to Saskatchewan based farmers.
206.	Ownership by outside investors will completely destroy a farmer's ability to make a living since the investor will ensure that they make a profit regardless of the farmer's capacity to make a living.
207.	I believe that would inflate prices for rural farmers to keep farming
208.	I believe foreign ownership of farmland would be disastrous for the people of Saskatchewan. Only Saskatchewan residents have the incentive to take care of the land here and ensure it remains healthy and productive for future generations.
209.	There are Saskatchewan farm boys wanting to farm and can't...
210.	More buyers = better retirement
211.	This is our country we are talking about selling to the highest bidder. Not okay. We need to eat!
212.	Farm land values are insane in other jurisdictions so they would all buy here and then the province is owned by foreigners
213.	This country and province has done enough of this already with other industries. Especially foreign governments buying up Canadian companies. How stupid can our people in authority be.
214.	you will be giving your country and identity away along with losses of spinoff revenue from farms since these foreign owners could go back to there home country for input and exports and not even have the grain hit the grain terminals or inputs go through Canadian retailers.
215.	Why should they benefit from our hard work and makes it harder to own land or lease
216.	We need to have control of our land! It's what supports our families and feeds our country
217.	I have heard from realtors and Fcc that a problem has been with foreign investors circumventing rules and buying land with cash without anyone in the govt having investigated the purchase.

218.	The farmers already here are the best in the business. We will continue to provide food and revenue streams for all of Sask and Canada. Don't force us off the land.
219.	I can't expand I have to move
220.	They'll drive local small farmers out.
221.	What benefit could possibly come from foreign ownership of Sask's greatest resource? It will also mean losing another valuable Sask resource- farm kids. Every company, business, trade etc can't get enough of them. They know how to work, have values and respect, and common sense...
222.	As long as the production is integrated into the Canadian system as opposed direct production into other countries, i.e. China. This has huge implications for checkoff related programs and provincial & national marketing efforts currently operating. It also has implications for Canada' manufacturing opportunities and the ability of Canada to position itself as a seller of top products as opposed to just good commodities.
223.	We should strive to have our farmland owned by us meaning Saskatchewan residents and not allow foreign ownership at all.
224.	Let the market dictate prices, not the government
225.	No because that way the actual profits leave the province and local community's.
226.	Farmland is called farmland because it's for farmers. That's why it's not called investmentland??
227.	no way would I ever support foreign land ownership
228.	Does not keep the cost fair for local farmers
229.	SK farmland primarily owned by residents of this province. There would likely be negative results with foreign ownership of SK farmland. Why would we consider giving away the the ownership to foreigners whose sole interest is profit and the best interest of Saskatchewan is likely not their interest? Let's maintain control of this precious resource. It's ours now, why would we forfeit it? Please restrict ownership to Canadians with preference given to the Saskatchewan farming community.
230.	Yes definitely open up foreign ownership. I believe it will be good for the economy and good for farmland owners as it will increase the value of land and bring money into Canada. So long as foreign investors comply with Canadian laws and there is no money laundering or other related illegal activities.
231.	Foreign ownership of our province is a bad idea.
232.	Do not want to have to compete with foreign owners for local land. I would put Hutterite colony's in this group.
233.	For the reasons previously expressed.

234.	Land is our greatest resource, we will feed the world, the money generated by our land should stay with Canadian owners, not foreign owners. Land needs to be accessible to young farmers IN Saskatchewan. Preserving our industry and encouraging new farmers to grow and expand should be the primary concern, not chunking out our province to foreign owners.
235.	Keep foreign owners out because they are not working the land.
236.	It's a terrible idea on so many levels. Keep sask dollars in sask. And keep sask farmers owning the land and our province will continue to prosper, as it has since 1906
237.	Must live in Canada
238.	Re read other comments!
239.	Why not? It works in BC and Ontario and the cost to ensure compliance is \$0 so....
240.	this would depend on how much of sask total land would be allowed
241.	Why not? Foreign companies can own other businesses. Furthermore it helps with competition.
242.	People came to Canada to settle here and have the opportunity to have their own farm. It makes such a difference in how you work and view life owning your own land.
243.	Stated why in previous comments.
244.	This does absolutely no good for Saskatchewan and Canada and severely hurts sask farmers.
245.	Land is a universal asset, Canadians live on it and should benefit from it.
246.	Leased land allows farmers to expand and farm larger acreages without the costly and sometimes non-economic, investment in land assets. This will become more of an issue as interest rates inevitably begin to rise again.
247.	Farming should remain with Canadian ownership. Selling the land to investors or foreign will forfeit OUR control of what we grow and where it is sold.
248.	I see no problem with individual foreign ownership but do not want to see Sask land owned by foreign governments.
249.	If a foreign individual / entity is sufficiently interested in owning a SK based asset they need to be here to manage the asset profitably.
250.	We need to control our own resources.
251.	We need to keep the land in the hands of those who care about it and have an invested interest in keeping it maintained and are good stewards and taxpayers ensuring the community grows and benefits from local industry as well. Foreign investment is shareholders in ivory towers whos only concern is a return on investment, they don't care about our province!!!
252.	In no way should you allow your "food source" or land be owned by foreigners. Even though we export a lot of our produce, you never want to be held ransom to something as important as food supply. Who do you think they are going to feed first?
253.	I have explained earlier.

254.	Provided the land is available to rent by sask. farmers.
255.	Always keep it sask owned and available to sask farmers.
256.	Saskatchewan farmland needs to be owned by Saskatchewan farmers, and no one else. It's always been a farmers most valuable asset, and should remain that way. Allowing outside ownership in Saskatchewan farm land will negatively impact farming in Saskatchewan forever.
257.	Saskatchewan residents only!
258.	read my last comment
259.	there is already silent investor and the current screening process hasn't worked
260.	This land was settled by people trying to get away from working for rich European land owners. They saw the chance to own land and make a better life for themselves. Foreign ownership would only reverse history and leave Sask residents as surfs once again.
261.	No foreign owners what so ever! Our land should be for Saskatchewan farmers only.
262.	Keep money in Canada
263.	I have no problems with individual families coming over and wanting to farm but disagree with big corporations etc. coming in for strictly investment opportunities.
264.	I dont believe that foreign ownership will do anything for the Saskatchewan economy. If the owners of the land live and work in Saskatchewan, they are also involved in Saskatchewan and are physically and financially supporting rural sask.
265.	This is Canada if Canadians don't own the land then this will not be Canada anymore! Our land is our most previous resource it should be kept to Saskatchewan residents.
266.	Allowing foreign ownership reduces local control. A reduction in local control also reduces concern for the long term sustainability of land and communities
267.	Foreign people driving up land to unreasonable prices. Land on paper is owned by a Canadian but all money come from overseas example the Chinese I custom farm for admit all money comes from china
268.	This would only contribute to the problem.
269.	Not in a million years. Saskatchewan farmland should only be owned by Saskatchewan Farmers.
270.	If they lived in the province. Not buying and having a address yet living in China.
271.	Too much at stake. Food security is becoming a greater issue all the time.
272.	Why let foreigners own our land???? Harper blocked the sale of a large chunk of the oil sands to China. This is more important to sask farmers!
273.	Are we open for business or not. I worked my whole life to get rid of socialism and now you want to bring it back.
274.	Absolutely not, there are large companies even other countries that would be eager to purchase Saskatchewan farmland. This would drive the price of farmland to the point of not

	being affordable for primary agricultural producers.
275.	There is no shortage of farmers looking to buy farmland in our province why encourage outside investment and drive up prices for locals, which in turn might impact food costs
276.	It would wreck tradition and change the Saskatchewan we love b
277.	There are enough young farmers in this province that are trying to make a living at farming the land! As a farmer, we do not want the land that surrounds us to be owned by foreigners!! LOCAL LAND OWNERS CARE ABOUT THE LAND THEY OWN!!
278.	That would be suicide for our future young farmers. How can they compete with a Saudi or a Russian billionaire or the Chinese government?
279.	We don't need it. Send investors to Wall St.
280.	We need good stewardship
281.	Open and free market will benefit SK the MOST, look at ON , BC and US
282.	If they want to own land here, move here.
283.	Open Market increases values which increases economic impact in and outside the ag industry.
284.	Only if they farm the land
285.	These resources belong to the people of Canada, no one else. No one has the right to sell our inherent rights.
286.	It will enhance the productivity and economic output.
287.	yes allow it they wont be around long if we get a few years of drought or poor weather and their rental dries up.
288.	let the market place raise the wealth of all land owners
289.	Keep our land in OUR control and keep the money in our local economies!
290.	Who cares we're not communists remember.
291.	I would not like to see this go beyond Canadian citizens and corporations.
292.	Farmers lease equipment from foreign controlled companies. They lease money from foreign controlled companies. Both of those situations have existed for many years and neither has precluded farmers from making money. Leasing land from foreign owners will similarly have no effect on farm profitability.
293.	Foreign ownership means money leaves and the local Saskatchewan residents become common renting tenants, just like 100 years ago in Europe.
294.	Foreign is taken to be 'non-Canadian'.
295.	I do not want to see Saskatchewan sold to other countries. Do we really want the money produced in Saskatchewan to not remain in our Saskatchewan economy?

296.	Depending on the terms under which the land is purchased, injections of capital could help the industry.
297.	I know land values rise if foreign ownership is allowed, I am not sure of the impact of foreign ownership so I am neutral on this.
298.	It will still be farmland being farmed under lease by local farmers
299.	We have enough money in Canada to keep our land Canadian owned and also make a great living for our own farmers and their families
300.	No, it is hard enough for SK people to farm. They need to be helped FIRST.
301.	Come and live and farm in our communities this what helps Saskatchewan grow.
302.	entirely unacceptable.
303.	once again, small farmers cannot compete against huge amounts of pooled cash.
304.	Absolutely not. We need to keep control of our land base. Why would we sell our assets to people who probably only care about making money and who know nothing about farming or our province and what matters to our people.
305.	As I've alluded to in previous responses - Canadian governments seem all to ready to sell-out to foreigners who just happen to come along. And, I don't agree with government junkets either - politicians traveling to foreign land to "sell Canada". It's all just a bit disgusting in the name of a "fast buck". Just look at the results in Vancouver and elsewhere. How does "bidding the market up" on real estate help Canadian families....? As I've mentioned, young Vancouver adults have been priced-out of where they were born and raised.
306.	We are already seeing foreign ownership in local land where the owners contribute nothing to already struggling rural centres. Causing even more stress on already stressed communities
307.	I think our future would be a tragic one if we allowed foreign ownership of farmland here.
308.	Maintaining our ability to control our own food supply is basic and vital to our well being.
309.	Non residents of Saskatchewan not to be allowed to own land.
310.	Ownership from outside of Canada simply moves funds out of Canada and weakens the economy in all terms of time. Short term to long term, your land base ownership moves control and funds out of Canada and benefits to Canada go to another country or business.
311.	It brings in investment and also gives young farmers the chance to lease land while they get established I leased land for many years while I was young and that way I could purchase the farm equipment I needed plus with foreign ownership not only the big farmers buy up all the land and young farmers can't get any
312.	I don't want to sell of Saskatchewan. It's very sad and more when Saskatchewan can't make it easy for their own farmers and their families to farm, stay and proudly produce food for the world. Instead farming has been made so hard and intolerable and income losing that farming children have to move off the land to make a living. And now you want to make it EASY for someone else?.....you want to make it EASY for someone from another country or who has

	never farmed. For shame.
313.	Land should be held by those who spend in and keep Sask profitable and growing
314.	If you want the rewards of farming saskatchewan land you must be canadian or saskatchewan
315.	They would have control over our food supply
316.	Unless by British Subjects.
317.	They must farm themselves and live here and take part in the community.
318.	The impact of this will be very bad.
319.	Foreigners will come in buy land and take over like they are trying to do. They want our land to grow food and send back to home countries. Canada needs to be careful with foreigners. Everyone is in it for themselves.
320.	Canadian land should be for Canadians, not for foreign ownership and speculation.
321.	let the people who live in the province that raise families and pay taxes own the land they want to make a living on... a foreign investor will not have the provinces beat interests in mind as a resident would
322.	Agricultural exports are a huge part of our economy, Sask would lose.
323.	Farmers on the land should own farmland.
324.	I support restrictions on how much anybody can own
325.	No I think if foreigners want to buy they should also have to live and farm the land here.
326.	Canada is selling off everything to foreigners, gov't calls it investment, but soon Canada won't even belong to Canadians. Farmland, real estate (most of BC), large mining companies (Inco is just one example), oil-sands, next it will be our water, then watch the people react. The 2002 Sask. Farm security act needs to be revised, and closer tabs on land titles monitored and back-ground traces done on so called immigrants with millions looking to "invest" in Canada.
327.	Test
328.	Test
329.	I believe the land should benefit the people who live and work in Saskatchewan
330.	Never. I would oppose this in the strongest possible terms.
331.	It's up to me as a farmland owner who I decide to sell to and the price. No one else in govt or resident should make my decision for me. I don't tell anyone else how they go about their business.
332.	I am in support of land ownership being in the hands of the people who make their living off of it. I think that the province needs to step in and end land purchases by investors. With today's land prices/lease prices, the land cannot produce enough to make a farm viable long term.
333.	I would support foreign ownership if they move on and operate the land.

334.	We do not need other countries owning our country.
335.	What a foolish thing to do to allow foreign ownership of this major resource and our own food security.
336.	Refer to fertile parts of Africa, where foreign investors own the land and produce solely for export to their own countries, and Thailand and Vietnam, where they have no control over the use of their land now owned by Chinese interests, who ruin surrounding land to ensure maximisation of rice crops shipped to the Mainland. Under the new trade agreements, our farmland will be part of this world production pool to be considered in the plans of very wealthy nations. We are not a very wealthy nation in comparison, and our farmers cannot compete with sovereign wealth funds or large REITs
337.	what do you want to do...give Saskatchewan away. ruin it for future generations.
338.	foreign ownership is the first step in a vertical integration of inputs and export of production look at the case of Saudia Arabia buying land in south Africa
339.	If that happens they control the cost to farm and have no clue about how much operations on a farm cost.
340.	I believe that if you want to own land in Saskatchewan you should live and farm. Foreign ownership takes away from the Saskatchewan economy and the Saskatchewan culture.
341.	I believe that it would hurt Saskatchewan economically and socially. We need to keep our land owned by Saskatchewan people if possible and by Canadians at the very least. I liked the Alberta position I read about. This does not mean I want the government to own it.
342.	Test
343.	It is what is needed to keep agriculture going for the next generation. With the average age of farmers being 55 who is going to take this land on. Do we want the next generation carrying a huge debt load or do we want viable young farmers in the industry, do the math even with today's rules and low interest rates it is tough for farmers to purchase land, machinery,etc and make a profit.
344.	I think it is fair play for ownership within Canada, but even then a potential exists for absentee landlords (as described earlier). My understanding is that currently there are loopholes already allowing foreign ownership, which I believe should be closed. I also do not feel that the pension fund scenario is a good idea for farmland ownership.
345.	Farm land should be owned by families who farm.
346.	I am challenged by where the funds come from. Whether it is Russian mafia or Chinese nationals I sense they want to do this in order to hide funds to protect them. I like the current laws.
347.	Worst idea since, I don't know what, but Canada is for Canadians as should sask. before for Saskatchewan's!
348.	The US already is basically owned by China when you looked at who has purchased their debt, why would we as a province wish to allow foreigners to own one of our most precious natural resources. Throughout history the control of food has been a key survival ingredient, why

	would we give that away, using a longer term perspective it is absolutely insane.
349.	Not at this time , we need to level the playing field , in North America we pay way more for inputs , we put money towards research , the multi nationals then sell into poorer markets for less , they produce for less , then are able to sell there commodities cheaper.
350.	The land should belong to Canadians.
351.	no no no!!!
352.	It needs to be 100% Canadian (preferably Saskatchewan) owned.
353.	foreign migrant farmers deserve a chance, after all in 1880 all farmers were migrants.
354.	Foreign owners have more money than the average farmer. I dont think it is fair to younger farmers to have to go into debt so far they can never get out when they are trying to get their feet under them to be able to produce food for the rest of the world to eat.
355.	Then we'll only be renter's,we'd be going back to the feudal system! And then we'll pay for our food!
356.	Same as previous. We live in a world and have to start getting along with the world or all is lost anyway.
357.	I want the maximum amount of buyers come sale time.
358.	depends on who they are where will they reside
359.	Farmland still has to be farmed. Ownership is only one model.
360.	I do not support this since I grew up on a farm and I see how important this industry is to the world. This land should only be owned by Canadian citizens.
361.	you need to be a Canadian citizen
362.	It wouldn't be long before all Saskatchewan farmland would be foreign or investor owned.
363.	We are families who made this province the farming communities that are struggling to survive. We can't all live in the cities so retaining ownership of farmland to Saskatchewan farmers will help keep our rural areas alive.
364.	totally against foreign ownership of Saskatchewan farmland
365.	FOREIGN OWNERS NOT WELCOME
366.	Why should we sell off our province?
367.	I think Saskatchewan land should be owned by Canadians with no exceptions.
368.	ONLY CANADIAN!
369.	It is only good for inflation, less local control, community unsustainability, and possibly market access.
370.	it appears that there is a supply of potential resident buyers
371.	No keep the profits where there needed, here!!!!!!
372.	I appreciate the higher value of my land but this could be a barrier to entry for young farmers

373.	They don't know the history of sask nor understand what makes Saskatchewan communities stong and proud. The will snatch all the land and then produce food for themselves and ship back to their native country!
374.	our ancestors came to Canada to get away from corporate farming...we are heading in that direction
375.	There is too much foreign investment in Canada already. Canadians would lose control of our assets by big corporations who only care about profits
376.	only support from myself is if those foreign owners are here in province farming the land themselves. not just speculating on lang prices.
377.	A very bad idea!
378.	No, there should NOT be foreign ownership as stated by many saskatchewan tax payers.
379.	if they can buy land it's taking it away from us the Saskatchewan Farmer
380.	Foreign ownership is a quick way to kill our farming culture. The short term gains are great for some owners wanting to sell out but in the long term the damage to our land and community will be far greater.
381.	I was brought up with a family farm mentality. Don't see it changing. Investment firms tend to bring their profits of the land they own with them to which ever likely urban area they reside in. This would include their administration costs and premiums to their share holders. Although I do believe in a free market. In terms of the health of a rural community, I see investment companies a negative factor.
382.	In our area there is a lot of Chinese foreign investment ! The price they are paying for the land is so high banks won't lend that much money for the land ! There is no way a young guy can compete ! And where is this money coming ?
383.	If we lose control of our land we lose control of our communities.
384.	Foreign money drives the prices
385.	Would depend on how the ownership is structured and if there is a Canadian content
386.	We have to. We cannot live in a bubble in a global world .
387.	Land should remain locally owned
388.	No
389.	Foreign ownership would hurt our economy as the profits leave the country and investors don't buy goods and services in our province, farmers will be fewer and they will spend less in the smaller centres as they will buy more in bulk from larger cities.
390.	Why? Just so someone can sell out their families long term equity to the highest bidder so they can buy a condo in Hawaii?
391.	Once land ownership is lost, it cannot be reclaimed. It would be a sad day when the hard work and perseverance of our forefathers is given away to someone outside of our province and country.

392.	I would be open to Canadians owing Saskatchewan farm land but would not like to see citizens of other countries owing Saskatchewan farm land.
393.	It harms the Saskatchewan farmland ownership tradition.
394.	Price of land would rise
395.	Even worse than Canadian investors. Unlimited financial backing for most foreign investors.
396.	Absolutely not. There is no vested interest in maintaining the quality of the land, the animals on it, and the ecosystems around it. Owners are not here and cannot care about the land in the way that it deserves. One could argue that foreign ownership allows for the access to the capital and sustainable practices required for this land to be used for hundreds of years, but I have little trust in the corporate values shown thus far.
397.	We're doing just fine without them.
398.	Canadian individuals only should own land. Corporations, particularly foreign, should be barred.
399.	I have expressed my feelings on foreign ownership in the previous boxes.
400.	Under certain circumstances foreign ownership could be an economic benefit to SK
401.	we let foreign ownership in everything else why not farmland
402.	Never no
403.	Rural communities are a big part of Saskatchewan. I can't see how driving the people the live in them out can benefit the province.
404.	I'm a fourth generation Saskatchewan farmer and we owe it to the next generation of Saskatchewan farmer. My great grandparents did not come to Saskatchewan with the dream of farming on someone else's land that's why they left the old country.
405.	Only if they become Saskatchewan residents.
406.	Sask farmers first
407.	I am 26 years old, and trying to make a living grain farming. I bought my first quarter off my grandfather; I am looking to buy another at the end of the year. The land prices in this province are so inflated it sickens me. My land is in RM where the going price for a section (640 acres) of land is in excess of 1.2 million. I ask the Sask Party how am I to make a living with land payments at that price? The sask party is killing the small family operated farms one by one. When I approach the old couples in my area to inquire about purchasing land they all tell me the same thing why do you want to get into farm? There is no money to be made, and you can't pay top dollar like the potash companies nor the out of country buyers. Why would you take ownership away from the ones working the land, I feel you guys want to make us serfs. These companies or out of country owners don't care for the land nor do guys that lease the land, people who own and live on the land are the best for the stewardship of the land, they care for it, how can't you see this? The Sask party needs to look to Europe and learn how there farming operations are where the little guys are supported and encouraged.

	<p>These family operated farms in Sask that are 10000+ acres are not a family farm they are corporations. Also I am an electrician I work 21days straight, this job alone is over six figures. I would give it up in a heartbeat to be on the land 24/7, but unfortunately I don't see this ever happening with land prices like this. I would love to hear back from a Sask party, .</p>
408.	<p>I believe land should be owned by its residents. That way control over what's done with it is maintained.</p>
409.	<p>More investment more prosperity</p>
410.	<p>I think my previous comments convey my feelings.</p>
411.	<p>The RM next to us is now 18% foreign owned. These foreigners tried to raise livestock and the results were both disastrous and cruel. Charges were laid, but suffering of animals could have been prevented. They do not understand how to farm the land nor do they understand livestock. These foreigners have not made the profits they were expecting and are now still holding this land as it becomes weed filled and waste land. They have left the area but still own the land.</p>
412.	<p>We are young farmers(under 35) with 2 young boys. If Saskatchewan farmland is available for foreign ownership, we will never be able to afford to buy or rent land. Our fathers who both farm will not be able to sell their land to us when they can get twice the amount from a foreign investor. Farming has been in our families since our ancestors immigrated from Europe. We will not be able to pass this tradition down to our sons.</p> <p>If foreign investors own the farmland we will discourage our sons to work for them. We will encourage them into a different career path. The land will be farmed by people that do not understand farming and the integrity of the land will decrease, resulting in poor crops. This will ultimately cause Saskatchewan's economy to fail.</p>
413.	<p>Because I want Sask people to own Sask land. Foreigners come in paying double or triple the value even though the commodity prices have not changed</p>
414.	<p>Saskatchewan land should be for Saskatchewan residents only.</p>
415.	<p>Absolutely not!</p>
416.	<p>Young people are already having trouble to get into farming and allowing foreign ownership would only increase prices and make things more difficult.</p>
417.	<p>Why sell out SK, if possible?</p>
418.	<p>Sask land needs to be owned by Sask farmers.</p>
419.	<p>Motives for foreign owners could go beyond straight financial return</p>
420.	<p>Keeping it Canadian is important for our national identity.</p>
421.	<p>Do you want the actual farmer of the land to own the land and capture the long term capital gain inherent in farm ownership or do you want the feudal system so many of our ancestors left Europe to escape?</p>
422.	<p>I believe in owner operators</p>
423.	<p>foreign ownership is the worst, I think if are buying land 1 you better be Canadian 2 you</p>

	should be from that province or if your farm is along a border you should be farming it
424.	Not sure if foreign means Canadians or non-Canadians I'm assuming non Canadians and the answer is no
425.	Before I support more foreign ownership I would need to see strict and enforceable regulations that would prevent outright control of our food producing resources by foreign interests, and perverse effects on our land values. I do not see how limited foreign investment can work, it is an all-or-nothing. Limiting foreign investment is one way to maintain Saskatchewan's sovereignty over its natural capital and is a smart long term economic move. Advocates of more liberal farm ownership laws are only seeing the short term gains and not the long term risks. Our farmlands are like money in the bank for our future -- let's keep it and reap the rewards ourselves instead of giving them away.
426.	Give our younger generation the chance to farm.
427.	My partner is from Mexico and has interest in farming alongside my family in Saskatchewan, or in Alberta where we currently live, so there is potential for him to want to own farmland.
428.	Saskatchewan based farmers are the only ones who should be allowed to own farm land!!!!
429.	I am a farmer; I would like to have kids that have the same opportunity. Please don't deprive them of this by going the way of many other places in the world where farmland cannot be purchased by the profits of the farm. Allow us farmers to compete among each other to increase the health and viability of agriculture in Saskatchewan. Just as you wouldn't introduce a new invasive weed species to your land, so why allow the loss of land ownership away from the preferred rural residents?
430.	I see no benefit as to having non-Saskatchewan entities own land in Saskatchewan.
431.	You are definitely deterring young farmers from entering farming by allowing foreign ownership. This will definitely put higher rents in place and there will be no land renter - land rentee partnership that currently exists
432.	Only long time Canadian citizens
433.	I do not support Canada moving backwards to a caste system, to reduce the likelihood of sustainable land management as corporations focus on the dollars, where no locals control Canada's exports, where the tradition of Canadian farming officially dies after 3+ generations built this country through agriculture. Don't take away my heritage, my opportunity, my dreams for the future in raising my children on the farm in a small rural community. Rural communities, already threatened, will cease to exist.
434.	Keep farmland within families and communities and affordable for all young people need to have a reason to live an affordable life where they have grown up- keep the family/community strong
435.	Poor choice
436.	Members of the Gulf States have bought land in Ethiopia and with irrigation they are growing more food than the poor Ethiopian farmer ever dreamed of. The Chinese have bought land in east Africa with the same result. I don't know how much benefit flows back to the locals but I would bet not much. Is this the model we want in Saskatchewan?

437.	Discussed earlier
438.	I think prices for farmland are already strong. I would rather keep the equity and income from farmland in Canada. There are countries where not much agricultural land is available; I don't want those countries to own our farmland. I also think that local land ownership is important to keep our food supply for Canadians secure.
439.	They do nothing for our province but take.
440.	I don't support this because ownership of our land should stay within the Canadian country. You should have to be a Canadian citizen before you buy land in any of our provinces. I feel this way because why should be able to buy land here and send the money back to their country. Our pioneers came here and started farming here so that we can farm this beautiful country. They came and cut down all the trees ,broke the land and pick roots on all of the land so why should they have done it for someone else from some other country to come here and farm and send it back to their country .
441.	We don't need foreign countries taking over our country.
442.	not necessary
443.	We already struggle with outside investors buying land then renting it back to farmer. Which then you have no equity in your farm.
444.	Once you sell off an asset you no longer have the benefit of residual income/value. Keeping ownership of this type of resource is critical for long term economic stability.
445.	you want to own the land you can live here.
446.	No.no.no.
447.	Absolutely not, government will lose tax base and put instability in farming industry. Foreign ownership will jump in and out of farming due to economic climate, driving land prices exceptionally and dumping land when commodity prices are low. Putting more pricing swing into the market rather than having a steady price. Price swing increases risk.
448.	Not a good idea to let foreign investment in our province. Farms feed the country people. control is lost when others own the land.
449.	I do not believe the economic benefits would be greater than the negatives
450.	Farm land is for Saskatchewan farmers
451.	For the long-term health of the agriculture sector as well as for the best management practices of land in Saskatchewan, I think land owners should be residents.
452.	If you're not a Canadian resident you should not be able to own Canadian farmland.
453.	What more do you need to know? The answer is NO! End of story. Foreign investors have no place in owning property in our province or country. If money is to be made off the land than WE as farmers and residents should be making it for ourselves NOT for others

454.	Absolutely not
455.	I think foreign ownership would curtail young farmers wanting to enter the industry and it would greatly reduce the number of existing small and medium sized farms.
456.	Who put this question in?? NO! This survey is not about allowing MORE foreign ownership it's about pulling back on the reigns on what's been done. Trying to rectify the irreversible damage of selling off Saskatchewan. Having something left for future generations to get a hold of and call their own. .
457.	No definitely not. In the cases that this has happened in our community it has been detrimental. We welcome foreign buyers but want them to reside in our small communities.
458.	There were no restrictions from 1910 until 1974 and did not seem to harm anyone. History tells us there were good times and bad times through that period.
459.	Not needed
460.	Farmland is to important asset to Saskatchewan agriculture. If we own it, our province will reap the benefits it provides. Foreign ownership will create a loss of control which will hurt Saskatchewan farmers and communities long term success.
461.	If you don't live here you don't have the right to own it.
462.	Absentee land ownership seems unwise
463.	This is already becoming a problem in our province.
464.	foreign ownership kills agriculture
465.	Foreign investors will out-compete local farmers in farmland sales, leading to the inability of local farmers to expand their land ownership and forcing local farmers into rental agreements with foreign investors who do not have a vested interest in rural economic development within the SK and do not face the same incentive to promote environmental stewardship. There is no guarantee these rental agreements will not decrease the social and economic welfare of local farmers, as there is an inherent imbalance of power that favours the investor.
466.	It is because of these investors that the price of land increases and makes it impossible for the farmers at heart to do their job.
467.	Farmland ownership is too vital to the food security of the country.
468.	There are a lot of farmers that are on the retiring end of things and if land values continue to increase then they can capitalize. For the young people trying to get involved this is very hard to do. However if foreign people actually want to farm then they have to apply for citizenship, yes this is a process to go through but then it ensures that they don't want to just be an investor of the land without being a citizen. Maybe the process of how foreign people can obtain citizenship should be reviewed instead?
469.	Just a bad idea. Period.
470.	Farmland usefulness and value is inherently tied to how the land is maintained and used.

	profit motivated behaviour and unfamiliarity with the land, even by leased tenants from year to year who do not have a vested interest in the land, will be very detrimental to the continued yield and corresponding maintenance that is required for farmland. Foreign ownership also by definition means the profits from such farmland are leaving Saskatchewan. Even if taxes are paid in sask, local farmers spend their money in the local economy. Foreign owners do not.
471.	Don't sell out my Saskatchewan. Protect small farm ownership
472.	Never
473.	Canadian land for Canadians; not for tax shelters.
474.	Absolutely not! If Tommy Douglas is singled out as one of the greatest SK residents, the idiot who allows foreigner land ownership in SK will go down in history as the most ignorant and short-sighted (and people will wonder how much foreign money is lining their pocket).
475.	As mentioned before - these owners do absolutely nothing for the local community.
476.	Have already expressed my concerns in earlier responses.
477.	There are seventeen origins of nationalities throughout the province. Some own farmland. Many of their ancestors came here- homesteaded because of unrest- famin - religious differences or other wrecks in the lands they came from. Some were sold a bill of goods they could not achieve. Some did well after being dumped off a train in Winnipeg [or some other "western " location] Sounds familiar--Does history repeat itself? Is there any difference between a pension fund investing - and say a fine English gentleman? [I forget the term used when family money was laundered through a young lad exported to Canada]
478.	what we have now seems to work
479.	see above answers
480.	almost every jurisdiction in the world has ownership restrictions
481.	Responsibility for food security should not be for sale. Farm operations and ownership need not be the same thing.
482.	This will weaken our agricultural economy as it will become restrictive to enter or expand in the market.
483.	This leads to speculation and pricing local people out - citizens who want to farm will be unable to
484.	I don't want our province owned by foreign investment.
485.	Yes, BUT we would want those owners to move to Saskatchewan and farm the land.
486.	As per my response in Section 3, there are trillions of dollars globally that are destined to be invested in farm land. The need to control productive land stems from a need to control the food supply. Currently there is record investment being made in Africa and South America by investment firms and large ag/food conglomerates. Their goal is clearly to achieve "vertical

	<p>integration." They invest in those continents because rules are less stringent than Canada, and because they have the backing to gain political influence there (which they cannot have in Canada.)</p> <p>We have an opportunity to not repeat history. We have the obligation to not repeat history. Ownership of Sask farmland MUST remain within Canada.</p>
487.	Allowing foreign ownership creates an unfair advantage for those that can tap endless funding.
488.	Please refer to my previous points on foreign ownership and my concerns over stewardship practices and degradation of the land from their management practices to maximize production to feed foreign demands.
489.	Only if ownership was via inheritance. IE- My son is a U.S. citizen, but I will my farmland to him.
490.	All food shipped directly out of Canada just like Africa.
491.	I see no advantages
492.	FOREIGN OWNERSHIP SHOULD ONLY HAPPEN IF THEY LIVE HERE AND FARM .WITH NO STEADY INFUSION OF FOREIGN MONEY TO EXPAND WITH LAND PURCHASES IN THE FUTURE
493.	Foreign ownership of farmland undermines the quality of life for all Saskatchewan residents because a foreign corporation just cares about profits not about the province or its citizens.
494.	Earth is earth. They can't pick it up and move it, but they do have to pay somebody in Saskatchewan to own it, so they send assets in, but can't take assets out. Then if they want to rent it to someone, they have to do so at a price that makes economic sense from year to year, or they will be sitting on an unproductive asset, paying property taxes, with no revenue to offset the capital they tied up in that asset, meaning no return on investment.
495.	I don't see a problem the land is not going to move away
496.	Profits and taxes leave province. Loss of control to foreign interests equates to loss in sovereignty. Loss to community support.
497.	I'm hoping that I can afford to compete with my neighbors for land that will be coming up for sale. I CANNOT compete with out of province/country investors. I'm already having trouble competing against large corporate farms and out of province investors.
498.	Farmers who actually farm the land should own it.
499.	Once the land was sold into foreign ownership it would never come up for sale again and would be lost the local farmer. The big companies would own it forever. Sask. farmland belongs to Sask farmers. Not the Chinese or anyone else.
500.	I am actually not opposed to foreigners buying Sask farmland if they plan on moving here to actually farm it. But that is my only condition.
501.	There's too many already.
502.	NOT at all.
503.	The majority of farmland in SK should be SK owned.

504.	If land all goes to foreigners, might as well sell the country too. We will have no profit from grain, no food cause the foreigners don't know how to farm in this country and don't care if we live or die as long as they can get what they need in their country. Sell Canada then we can all find new professions and other places to live, no economic impact there!
505.	Our farmland is an important resource, not just for farmers but for the people of Saskatchewan. We need to be able to retain control over the land. Foreign owners will have different views on how land should be used and some may use their economic influence to support policies that are good for their finances and bad for our environment.
506.	Foreign ownership ensures profits leave the domestic market while only contributing to production a negligible amount.
507.	Too much of this survey, thus far, is related to financial issues and impact. I doubt foreign, absent owners would be green stewards. You need to walk your land to know it and care for it. I suspect foreign owners would not be much concerned with caring for their land with an eye to the long term future.
508.	Terrible Idea! Only the poor farmers who choose to make bad decisions and only invest in farmland, not the worldwide stock market, have a desperate interest in money for today without any vision for the future of Agriculture in Saskatchewan. Promote entrepreneurship, new business ventures, the global stock market can provide investments. It would be a shame to transfer billions of dollars outside of the province that does not benefit each and every citizen of Saskatchewan.
509.	Sask needs to worry about getting young people to farm NOT foreigners. Being young and starting to farm seems impossible because of the foreigners
510.	as long as the acreage remains at a low level
511.	Everyone should be treated equally. We never know if the foreign people can help boost the economy and they can be source of experiences.
512.	I prefer to "no tightening and no relaxing except that government allow investment by pension fund if this fund was establish for benefits of Canadians.
513.	Needs to go through a review process on regular basis. There are foreign land owners who hold land for decades in Saskatchewan; the land is farmed by local farmers with mutual benefits to local and provincial economy. Large scale ownership by big investors often is based on short term profitability (possibly mining the soil) and appreciation of land value; if any of these are not present any longer the land may be abandoned with somebody else holding the bag (Broad acres).
514.	We need to ensure that we are competitive with other provinces. We have many young farmers that have the ability to farm, but do not have the Capital to buy all the land and equipment. This is when a foreign owner may be able to help.
515.	Its good for the market
516.	Absolutely not, for the reasons I've already stated.
517.	Why do we need to sell Saskatchewan to the highest bidder?

518.	Foreign and corporate ownership changes the agricultural environment so that farmers lose control of the land and the price of farm production will increase dramatically.
519.	Foreign ownership will lead to valuable tax dollars lost. Many of these groups by large amounts of land and prefer to deal with as few individuals as possible, resulting in less people living in rural areas, therefore less residents paying income tax. If these investors live outside of Saskatchewan, there is more tax dollars being funneled out of the province. Foreign ownership also does not support the communities in the area the same as family farms do, especially if you consider the decrease population of rural residents that would occur. This would result in even more individuals and business tax dollars disappearing. Not to mention the pressure it puts on families and individuals to purchase land that they will farm themselves.
520.	I strongly disagree with foreign ownership. Even if one person from China or the UAE becomes a Canadian citizen and then starts buying land with foreign money we lose. This removes wealth from Saskatchewan. We need to retain that wealth, not sell it just because some big corporations/farmers want it so that they can boost their profits for now by a few percent. We need to think of the long term picture here. Once its gone, we will never get it back!
521.	The foundation of our province and country is farming or ag related. If we give up ownership of our land, we give up control. Sometimes I wish the government would experience the mind frame behind farming. It's not just about money. It's the utmost honest way of life, riddled with pride. So why make it tough for our young, sask resident, farmers. They are the next link in probably the most steady, durable chunk of our economy!
522.	You would have fewer people living in rural areas.
523.	I don't want to see huge tracks of land being bought up and then leased back causing bidding wars over leased land
524.	Foreign investors have a decreased interest in development and sustainability of local and provincial economy. Owning farmland as a part of an investment portfolio by parties not directly involved in farming practices prevents farmers from having control and sustainability in their lively hoods.
525.	With investment comes lose of control. Saskatchewan could become deficient in food production if all production goes to foreigners.
526.	I've explained this in previous responses. If you're an economist, I doubt you've ever read Karl Polanyi's "The Great Transformation". Read it and understand the foundation of economic sociology.
527.	We need to keep land affordable for young Saskatchewan farmers, to keep them in our province and to have control over our food source.
528.	If they do not live and operate here it does not benefit the province and especially the land.If Saskatchewan as a province feels our land is worthless and not worth saving then we should certainly continue exactly what we are doing!
529.	Allowing any one other than farmers own and essentially control farm land has lead to the collapse of rural communities all over the world.

530.	Still much research to be completed. I would encourage analysis of ownership rules in other countries.
531.	Opening farmland ownership to foreigners wouldn't be a good thing - I've read all kinds of horror stories about China being allowed to buy farmland in Africa and other countries and the locals are moved out and another country has control over the food supply. That wouldn't be good. However, a Canadian resident, following Canadian law, (whether person, pension or trust) buying farmland is a good thing in my opinion.
532.	Unfortunately Ducks Unlimited already owns large parcels of land in the province even though they are supported by funds originating outside of the country.
533.	I absolutely do not support foreign ownership under any circumstance!!
534.	I think ownership should be limited to Canadian citizens.
535.	Depends on the parameters around it.
536.	Wealthy foreigners may buy land just to have it, at any price, and never farm it. Does not benefit the province or future farmers
537.	the land will always come back up for sale, in the mean time young CN farmer can farm land on lease basis. The land is not going anywhere.
538.	I do not believe we need foreign ownership of land. If people from around the world want to own land in Saskatchewan they should move here and farm
539.	Keep us, Saskatchewan Farmers, Saskatchewan Residents, looking after our Industry!
540.	I have told you earlier in the survey.
541.	It would take the money out of the Province. Biggest mistake ever.
542.	See previous comments in section immediately preceding this one. For the long term longevity and ensure our environment is protected we need to restrict foreign ownership.
543.	some controls seem appropriate
544.	As before, with Canadians, mostly no issue. For true foreign ownership, the long term food security risk is real and that should be governed much more closely.
545.	NO!!!!!! I would use any legal means necessary to prevent it. Any government that allows foreign ownership of farmland in Saskatchewan would also not get my vote come election time.
546.	My previous responses have already covered this!
547.	Foreign ownership is going to lead to problems with differences in cultures, values, beliefs. Foreigners do not value land the same way local farmers do, they only care about profits. They aren't interested in helping out a neighbor or working to ensure what is done on their land doesn't negatively impact the land owners around them. They are difficult to contact/reach to get permission for hunting or land access for other purposes. They typically add no value to the community, they don't support local charities or help out with making the community a better place to live and raise a family.
548.	There would have to be an acreage limit for foreign ownership

549.	control of our natural resources needs to stay with Saskatchewan residence.
550.	Foreign ownership is the ultimate combination of removing profits from the local economy while making it impossible to enter or grow a farming operation.
551.	I see what is happening to oil, mineral, water resources which are sold off to advantage stock holders looking at short term gain. We need to have a long term view of ownership of farmland.
552.	Farm land should belong to Canadians.
553.	Farmland owner should be residents of Canada or companies majority owned and working in Canada
554.	We should own it. If not then the country that buys it might as well own Saskatchewan.
555.	What is their knowledge of our heritage and industry and I don't mean financially, we have a rich history of an interwoven social and business nature that is valuable to rural life sustainability.
556.	They increase demand for farmland and drive up prices past the agricultural value of it
557.	It should be kept Sask
558.	Absolutely not.
559.	I would not like to see a revival of a feudal system of land ownership and hence social structure for rural Saskatchewan.
560.	We should keep the land to ensure we have commodities for ourselves and if enough for export and take care of our own country first.
561.	Tax loopholes erode the value and security of food production in our province.
562.	If we allow foreign ownership in Saskatchewan will not own anything. We might as well sell the province, collect a cheque and move.
563.	I think our young farmers need an opportunity to expand or to get started farming.
564.	it should only be Canadians
565.	Local societal structures will be altered and weakened.
566.	Absolutely not! How does that benefit Canada in the long run? That is short term thinking! The lease payments would be going out of Canada how is that beneficial? Canada is not struggling! Why should we sacrifice long term GDP for short term gain?
567.	Where is the line drawn? Foreign governments ownership? Say USA? Or enemy countries now or in the future?
568.	Only active farmers who are residents of Saskatchewan should own our land
569.	i would want to be sure that the owners themselves are physically involved in farming. I have no confidence in the government regulating and enforcing this requirement.
570.	If they want to purchase land, that is great. They can move here and become a resident and pay taxes and add to the economy like everyone else.

571.	If we rely totally on Sask residents or even Canadians the value of the land will never be realized and economic failure in the farm industry is possible.
572.	sask land is for sask people
573.	land is the most valuable thing in the world, every thing in life depends on it
574.	There's plenty of farmers that are willing
575.	Some as all my other answers!
576.	The local communities will be negatively impacted.
577.	Abosultley. Need to have a deeper pool of investment coming into saskatchewan.
578.	much harder to control and maintain accoubtability. it would be easy for an outsider to manipulate or break laws creating an unfair advantage without having to worry about facing the consequences.
579.	Absolutley not.
580.	I agree with it entirely
581.	if the amount is controlled.
582.	I do not wish to give up ownership of our land to a foreign country. Believe this or not I have been asked by people who represent foreign buyers on how they could load containers and ship all the production from their land to a foreign country.
583.	Canadians won't even own canada soon.
584.	for very small parcels, yes but not for large
585.	No country or province should ever allow foreign owership
586.	we should keep our borders open
587.	Why even consider it! We are developing our own markets right in the province. We are pet of a 70% ownership in a non-Gmo canola crusher in Saskatoon. Why give up allowing Saskatchewan people with roots who want to farm up to foreign investors. All your doing is create a plan set up To fail And drive all the sask farmers out. Young farmers in Alberta and BC can't even consider expanding or buy land as private investor have driven the land right up and through the roof.
588.	not fair to the younger generation
589.	I will not be able to continue to farm if I have to compete with global companies and investment funds that view Sask farmland as a very stable investment
590.	I'm completely against non-Canadians owning land in Canada, especially here in Saskatchewan. If people want to move and live here, then I'm fine with that. Keep Saskatchewan owned by Saskatchewan. Then the dollars stay in our province, people stay here, we grow together.
591.	The competition for farmland is fierce enough already without allowing foreign ownership. Foreign owners can find other ways to invest in our province but there is only so much farmland. We need to retain the small towns and farms we have left. There is already enough

	catering to large family and corporate farms by the government.
592.	Foreign ownership would drive prices up and ensure that land would NOT be affordable for the average Saskatchewan farmer or anyone who may want to farm. The regulations surrounding foreign companies would be too difficult to enforce, as we currently now see in the oil and gas industry, where most facilities are out of compliance and the government cannot enforce and the public is suffering. The same would happen with the farmers and land rules.
593.	Saskatchewan farmers should be the only ones who own farm land.
594.	No! There is no benefit, short term or long term, to allowing outside investors. Higher farmland values only favor those looking to exit the industry. I understand their interests need to be met but securing that land for the next generation of primary producers needs to be equally if not more important.
595.	Depends: Define Foreign. Non resident? Canada/Sask? Expat? Individuals? Public Corporations? Government Entities?
596.	But not unlimited ownership or investment. Set caps. Enforce environmental protections as well.
597.	I think that land in Saskatchewan should be mostly owned by locals, and at most other Canadians.
598.	keep ownership in the hands of producers.
599.	Not at all. It is too valuable in many ways, not just economically...
600.	It is a move that has been highly successful in other provinces and leads to increased revenue for the province and therefore increased budgets for education, infrastructure, healthcare, etc.
601.	Once it is sold to outside investors it may never become available for local farmers to access it.
602.	Food sovereignty! We need to provide for Saskatchewan and Canada so we can provide for others!
603.	Financial markets can over whelm the farmers in terms of competing in a market economy. The value of farmland lies in its ability to produce food. As the finance takes control access to food will become a privilege for the wealthy as has been shown in the past including the mass starvation in Ireland and in the Ukraine.
604.	We don't need Asian and Middle Eastern countries (not people) buying up our land
605.	Like to keep it in Canada at least
606.	loss of ownership results in loss of control. with gov admitting it doesn't even enforce present rules it will become free for all with high bidder winning. and that will not be sask people.
607.	For foreign owners I would allow but restrict to a nominal amount. Or 10000 acres
608.	Canadians need to own our land. Foreign owners could choose to bypass Canadian markets and leave us with a shortage of food in worst case scenarios. It could potentially be difficult to

	enforce Canadian standards for food production on foreign owned land.
609.	it would be taking money out of Saskatchewan. the more dollars left in Saskatchewan the better for the whole provincial economy
610.	Local people farming and owning land keeps things local. We purchase things local and support local businesses. We sell to export our grain and livestock, bringing wealth back into this country. Foreign ownership gives no guarentees. They can come and farm the land, not support local businesses , and send the production overseas with trade that would bring wealth back to Canada.
611.	Foreign ownership is too big a leap...Canadians should own their natural resources inc. farmland.
612.	This will lead to consolidation of ownership and loss of food production controls and supply to the public. Overly large organizations will manipulate supplies and prices of food stuff for the public. Governments will become hostages of large farm organizations and be forced to take draconian action against some of its people leading to social tensions.
613.	no, we already have a whole bunch of land in our area which was purchased by max crop then resold to other Chinese investors, who now don't want to farm the land but think its worth the world. They don't understand what they own, and the land sits idle and goes to weeds.
614.	keep the land for our youth
615.	Let the market place decide
616.	It turns land into a commodity.
617.	Saskatchewan needs to look out for its people before trying to make everything possible for foreign people.
618.	Saskatchewan farmland is a precious resource that needs to stay in control of Saskatchewan farm families
619.	If governments supported local ownership and local food producers instead of BI AG (ADM, MONSANTO, CROPLIFE and the like), you wouldn't need this 'survey'
620.	I sell to the highest bidder. I don't see goverment say no foreigners can be in politics. If they can run our country why can't they own some of it.
621.	see prior response...farmers already are at the mercy of mother nature, chemical/seed/equipment industries...take away their financial ability to buy farmland...and they can join the growing population of low paid workers in this country.
622.	Smaller parcels yes - large no
623.	I think it would be unwise to allow such an important resource (not a business- but a limited resource)- to be controlled by foreign ownership.
624.	I believe that foreign ownership will interfere with our ag policies that are potentially detrimental to our market place.
625.	I believe their long term health of the land has not been looked into. Do they what the environmental issues are or are they just looking at budgets and today's and a 5 year profit

	outlook.What about the 20-30 year plan?
626.	I support anyone being able to come to Saskatchewan and buy land to farm, What I don't support is investor buy up land just as an investment. People living on the land made Saskatchewan a great province.
627.	As long as they became involved in production and markets here.
628.	Farmland ownership should be no more, or less, protected than our other strategic Canadian assets. Similar to the Oil & Gas industry, we should allow foreign investment, but not outright state sponsored ownership
629.	This has already had the effect of making farm land unaffordable for young people in our province.
630.	Foreign ownership does nothing to help the dedicated serious farming community.
631.	China wouldn't let us steam roll in a run their country's farms and push out all there farmers so why should we? Just because some real estate jokers say it's a good thing as they line there pockets like a bunch of bandits.
632.	Because I don't want to be a surf to a land lord. When I deciding to return to the farm I came back so I can farm the land that I can own. I'm young and educated and I feel that I could be a contributing member of my community. But if I continue to face competition from mega farms that are backed by investors, and with more investors entering the picture, then I don't know if I could continue.This would be another hit to rural Saskatchewan as I would probably need to take a job in a city.
633.	As long as there is a limit to the acres owned an financing is investigated to ensure the legitimacy of the financing.
634.	Very opposed
635.	farmland in Saskatchewan should be owned by farmers in Saskatchewan or farmers on the borders of the province, who may work the land in both.
636.	Sask farmland should be owed and operated by Sask farmers.
637.	As any business it takes 3 generations to lose it. First one builds it, second one runs it, third one loses it. That's where its at in my mind. Lets build what we have. Educate our kids in Saskatchewan first about agri"CULTURE" not agri"BUSINESS" teach our youth how to live within their means in agriculture. Foreign ownership will create opportunity's for the rich only.
638.	please stop changing the rules to aid a few retiring farmers.
639.	Anyone including our govts and ag companies can sell to anyone in the world they want to, eg Sask Wheat Pool , the CWB which the federal govt sold to the middle east, Sask govt allows anyone to buy our mines and resources. City real estate owners can sell to whomever they wish as well. Farmers are the only property owners who can't sell their property to whomever they wish.
640.	Farming is more than a busniess it's a way of life.
641.	The big powers of the World are hovering like Vultures around large tracts of Farmland to

	make purchases that "Castrate" the former farmers, raise food prices, take away traditional methodologies of farmland that keep the lands themselves healthy and arable for future Farming, and leave the displaced farmers idle, and without a source of income and pride of Ownership..
642.	In certain cases could be beneficial
643.	I think the land in this province should stay in the province.
644.	I feel that farm land should be treated differently than other commercial property since its a strategic asset for the province. If the foreign ownership (a person, not a multinational corporation) wants to buy land and farm it themselves, that is fine. If a multinational corporation of person wants to own farmland and lease/rent it out to local producers they will do so in their best interests not the farmer or the province.
645.	It will destroy the important rural fabric of local ownership.
646.	Ownership of farmland should be restricted to only farmers
647.	Only Saskatchewan residents should be allowed to purchase farmland. Allowing foreign ownership drives the price of land up making it difficult for individual farmers to buy and lease land which in turn makes it tougher to operate there farms
648.	absentee owners are currently undermining traditional ways of rural life; foreign ownership would only exacerbate the problem.
649.	Once ownership has left the province it will be gone forever.
650.	our for fathers wanted to make a future for sask people farmers not greedy foreigners
651.	Stability in prices brought by a world of buyers is only a good thing. Investment in our province would help the whole economy.
652.	It would likely mean that a foreign person or company with more money than any domestic company won a bid on a set parcel of land or operation. That would in turn raise the value of all other similar sale items beyond the ability of the domestic buyer. This would mean a continual increase in the amount of capital that would be exported to other countries from the domestic market place and would also open our farm business to the volatility of foreign politics and economics.
653.	Support family farms
654.	It is not in the best interest of the province to allow foreign ownership of Saskatchewan farmland. Unfair advantages for foreigners such as currency fluctuations could create an unlevel playing field. Future generations could end up being minimum wage seasonal employees of these foreign investors.
655.	There is going to be more land for sale then homegrown farmers can handle or afford. That alone will drive the price down. Not fair to the retirees
656.	Definitely not! If this happened farmland would increase even more in value and most definitely be out of reach for almost all Saskatchewan farmers. This would be a devastating scenario.
657.	I do not support selling off the farmland in our province to foreigners. I do not support

	foreigners buying and owning my home province.
658.	its a matter of national food security. Saskatchewan must maintain control of the productive land that can be used for creating food.
659.	They can bid up the price of their own land in their own country.
660.	it would take away local people and money
661.	As Alberta has proved with the Canadian majority ownership and allowing foreign ownerships to be a part of the financial vehicle (company - limited partnership - joint venture), the agricultural industry has faired very well in the world of international agricultural.
662.	It doesn't increase the economy of the province in the long term, so doesn't really benefit the province. A high percentage of sellers would move away from Saskatchewan and no longer participate in the provincial economy.
663.	This is the worst idea I could ever imagine. People are seeing short term big dollars! This is OUR food source.
664.	Thriving Saskatchewan Farmers will support the local economy more in each community than any foreign investment or pension fund ever will through buying products from local businesses and thus keeping/making more jobs in all of our great Saskatchewan communities!
665.	Take a true look at foreign investors, they try and control how money is spent and put it into the wrong "pockets". They do not understand agriculture and what it takes to succeed. If the Premier of Saskatchewan worked 18 hour days, 7 days a week for 6 weeks to harvest, he would understand what it takes to grow food. Investors have no understanding of this. They are only trying to make money for themselves and do not care about what agriculture is really about.
666.	We were all once foreigners
667.	It makes little sense to artificially lower the price of farmland in a region just because a small group of people believe that it is their god given right to be the only ones to be able to purchase farmland. There is no "tradition" behind land ownership, but up until now, very few have been able to purchase, when you open the borders... as was the case to all Canadian residents in 2002, you saw an immediate increase in land values.
668.	We have to protect our land and allow young farmers to continue. I was so upset when during one audit I was told that a 1000 acres is to small and we should not be farming. This was a sask govt employee that stated big farmers were the only ones needed. Quantity was better than quality.
669.	Foreign ownership results in loss of control, and the transfer of equity out of farm communities. This would be a completely senseless development.
670.	I think land should be purchased by Canadian citizens and Canadian permanent residents.
671.	I you own land here you should live here.

672.	it will kill small towns even faster
673.	Definitely not!
674.	support rural Saskatchewan via family farms who want to live here
675.	The owner of the land needs to be someone who respects the land for the food it can produce not just for how much ROI can we get.
676.	Land is this Country's greatest resource, why would we give it up to people who have no real connections here.
677.	Foreign owners could care less about being good stewards of the land is about return on investment. Foreign owners aren't much support to roads, towns, rinks, restaurants, co-ops, schools, hospitals, or small business
678.	We need Sask to open its borders and not constrict them
679.	Refer previous responses.
680.	Foreign ownership would be an attractive investment for foreign investors based on the rise in farmland prices. It would be difficult to monitor if investment income would stay in Saskatchewan.
681.	Agricultural land should be earmarked for agricultural ownership and use; leasing back to ag operators is the intended purpose, but this is not always done efficiently or effectively.
682.	With very strict guidelines and restrictions.
683.	If you own it farm it. That is the best way to go for farmers. Limit the amount of land owned to be leased. Maybe even by RM if an investor wants more.
684.	I believe that population is too low in sask for farmland to stay as a sask only ownership. Also we don't see what the outside world sees in the options here. Although outsiders don't always understand the agriculture challenges here.
685.	All they will care about it the profits. No care will be about the people, the environment, or Saskatchewan.
686.	Only if they are going to actually farm the land and support the local communities
687.	In areas where foreign ownership is allowed, land prices are in the thousands to tens of thousands of dollars per acre making it unaffordable for farmers to buy their own land
688.	Should only be owned by Canadians. Soon as the farming is owned by Foreign investors, then the money (profits) leave Canada. Canada should be making money from Canadian land.
689.	I have given my answer in previous comments in this questionnaire but simply put if we lose control of a limited resource like land then we lose control of our very economic and environmental survival.
690.	The net farm income leaves the country and sask residents have no equity.
691.	Land is the backbone of farming and how this country was built. To take that away is taking away a part of Canadian pride and history. Would be a shame
692.	saskatchewan land should be saskatchewan owned....as per my previous explanations.

693.	It's not people that understand. Just investors they can distort prices.
694.	If foreign people were allowed to buy land it make it very hard for the existing farmers to maintain their farm and grow it cause other foreigners would be coming in with lots of money buying it for what ever it cost then trying to to get the farmer to farm it and him pay much more then it would have Initailly cost him in the first place so I think we should have the middle foreign man cut out of it and help save the farmers some money.
695.	Land is the most important commodity currently available. Why should we allow other countries control our food source. The media continues to emphasis the need to feeding eight billion people by 2040. At our current rate of food production it will be a difficult task to meet this food output. Any person can come to the conclusion that supply will not keep up with the demand for food. The citizens of Canada should gain the benefits of the price of food increase rather than foreign governments, and individuals.
696.	they should be Saskatchewan fulltime and Canadian citizens. Anything else is a disaster in waiting.
697.	People from countries with wealth but a shortage of real estate have a different assessment of the value of property. than those who make their living from the land.
698.	No -- absentee land lords with no local connections. Even out of province land owners is bad enough as they buy it for an investment but don't take care of it. We have trouble with that in the RM of Aberdeen.
699.	I have already addressed this in previous questions.
700.	Why do we want immigrants from other countries controlling one of our most valued resources telling us what we can and can't do with it
701.	Sask residents farm the land. We need to own it. We lose control of ownership we lose control of the farm...
702.	never, It is too expensive already. We would continue on the path to serfdome where farmers only work the land for the landowners
703.	They are not here to support and keep the rural communities going
704.	Farm land needs to be kept as farm land. Allowing investors of any kind would open land up to development. Look at B.C., especially the island and Delta areas. Farm land was sold for development and cost of food and hay increased dramatically.
705.	I feel residents should have a priority to ownership since their parents & family has maintained and improved the land.
706.	They are in it for the short term and monetary gain
707.	allowing foreign investors in rarely helps local people, again, we need to keep our best resources, our land, in Saskatchewan peoples hands!! this is also an issue of, simply put, not starving...our farmers provide our province, our country, and the world with so much of the food needed to survive...it helps the world, plus helps them economically. If foreign investors come in and own the land, it may not be used at all (who knows? they own it, they can do what they like), therefore reducing economic growth of the province....this is one resource that will NEVER not be needed!! land to grow food!

708.	As the average age of farmers in Saskatchewan is already 54 years old, there will be significant amount of land ownership transfer. If foreign investment and Investor groups such as the pension plan are allowed to purchase the land, Younger generations will be pushed off farm. Losing the younger generation of farmers will have detrimental effects on local rural economies as well as Saskatchewan economy as a whole.
709.	decisions may become driven by short term return on investment rather than a long term view of what is best for the land, local communities and farmers
710.	Saskatchewan farmland should be owned by Saskatchewan farmers.
711.	It depends on the percentage. I believe some foreign ownership is good, but local farmers should be able to have first grab at land, especially if it is located by land they already own.
712.	this will end with any one taking all profits away
713.	Empower our farmers so future residents see farming as a viable business for themselves!
714.	My experience in the past with Chinese buyers of land is that I feel most of the purchases were not Canadian buyers. The buyers were misled on the value and the quality of the land. As a result land in some areas increased drastically limiting local farmers from being able to purchase. The Chinese buyers were not like the Investment groups such as Assiniboia Farmland or others who were informed buyers. As a result a lot of the land purchased is no longer being farmed and is likely going to decrease value in some areas. These type of purchases should not be allowed in my opinion.
715.	Farmland should be owned by someone who cares about it. That means caring about the state of the land, that thinks about what that land will have on it next year. Not someone sitting in a high-rise that doesn't care about weather reports or yields. They only care about what money will be coming into their pocket and not about the people actually working the land. It's not right.
716.	Do not allow this to happen
717.	Why would you want to sell your country to big outside money.??
718.	Only if the owners become Canadian citizens tax payers etc.
719.	more money would come into sask.
720.	No ownership means loss of control which affects all levels of government
721.	Given before
722.	as i said earlier no. i refer you to my statement in section 2
723.	Farmland is finite. Selling it to foreign owners will destroy the equity Saskatchewan residents have in the province.
724.	We lose control of life's sustenance if we sell our farmland to foreigners.
725.	See previous answer
726.	It makes no sense to sell off our land to foreigners.
727.	Producers should own the land not multi- nationals

728.	Higher land prices
729.	land prices would raise too high for small medium and beginning farmers
730.	Yes for individuals not corporations
731.	If you want to be owned by the chinese and foreign banks and large corporations that dont know where to hide their money then I say go for it and let them buy all they want
732.	It has to be opened up properly and gradually. We must use measure that make our farming industry more competitive rather than try to protect it by shielding it.
733.	up to a certain # of acres per individual, eg: 1 quarter per individual. no corporations.
734.	I agree with Canadian resident ownership but not foreign ownership.
735.	As land owners, would they be allowed to dictate what occurs on that land. Would they be allowed to construct environmentally detrimental refineries etc. that would leave a negative footprint on Saskatchewan.
736.	Market conditions are market conditions. Foreign investment simply means that there is unrecognized (locally) value in the land.
737.	Serious mistake. Foreign investors will come in and buy significant amounts of land. Chinese investors in particular will buy large tracts. Agricultural products will then be earmarked for select countries, likely being sold at lower prices hurting the province. This is crazy that the provincial government is even considering this.
738.	Farmland is a non renewable resource and must remain Canadian owned.
739.	kick them out
740.	I think I've covered this in my previous comments. Foreign ownership of land means an increased cost of farming in either having to pay much higher price to buy land or high rent. Foreign owners DO NOT CARE who farms the land. One year rental deals are common. You can have it this year but no the next. This gives no stability to farmers.
741.	I am german and I farm a Family size farm in the south of Germany. My dad bought our farm in Sask many decades ago which was always leased to canadian farmers. We have a very good relationship to the Family that farms our land and they profit of the leased land as we do. We like our land and we would like to Transfer it to our 3rd Generation since I am not far from 60 yrs. I have studied agriculture at the University, worked on a farm in France and on a farm in the USA and we have friends in all of These countries and in Canada. I think some regulations are useful but not a total control of the Farmland market.
742.	I want our farmland to remain in our control. The residents of Saskatchewan and citizens of Canada.
743.	What we have now is what makes Saskatchewan unique.
744.	Decisions would be made OUTSIDE OF OUR COUNTRY!
745.	Farmland is valuable and should be owned by the people who live here
746.	And that's an Absolute "NO" -- ownership of Saskatchewan farmland, especially to non-Canadians, is dangerous to the wellbeing of Saskatchewan, and Canada.

747.	There is fundamentally no difference from someone on Bay Street in Toronto owning land, versus someone living in Shanghai...both are absentee landlords. From a Canadian perspective, have further influx of capital from off shore is a good thing.
748.	Water and food production will be very important to the Canadian economy in the near and distant future and Canadians should own these resources. Export the product not the land.
749.	i should be able to sell my land to whoever i want
750.	It should be farmers owning and farming it.
751.	Supporting foreign ownership of Saskatchewan farmland will kill the family farm as well as many small communities.
752.	If they aren't going to live on the land and spend their life farming the land they have no business owning Saskatchewan land. Investors money belongs on Wall Street.
753.	Foreign owners can not be expected nor mandated to have an interest in the lives of the residents of the province. They also do not have interest in the longterm wellbeing of the province, leading to the possibility of overproduction.
754.	All young farmers will quit. I have friends that went to the oil rigs 10 years ago and making huge money. There is little reason for young people to want to farm
755.	Land needs to remain affordable for local farmers
756.	Foreign ownership will lead to future farmers being just renters as they cant compete against foreign treasuries
757.	if you want to buy and come with family and be the owner operator I'll welcome you .
758.	Farmers, in my opinion need to be able to control their farms. The best way to do that is through farmer owned land.
759.	This is an absolute no. A country's greatest asset is it's soil. It makes no sense to allow foreign ownership.
760.	Farmland should only be owned by residents of Saskatchewan. Foreign investors and pension funds are not welcome to purchase Saskatchewan farmland.
761.	Saskatchewan should be owned by the people who live, work, and spend their money here. We have to look at the long term! NOT the short term!
762.	Absolutely not. I am not in favor of any foreign ownership of any land in Saskatchewan.
763.	With the average age of farmers getting older, having foreign buyers offer large prices for land makes it very hard for the retiring farmer to refuse. This in turn makes land purchases by younger farmers very difficult.
764.	previous answers protect what we have.. we have already sold out a lot of the province
765.	they don't contribute to local economy, they don't have the same respect for the land or the future of the land it is just real estate to them.
766.	Our small communities die if we let all of these foreign investors. It is already happening.

767.	I do like to see everything Canadian owned but thinking of myself maybe selling some land I would like to get the most for my land and think if only Canadians buy it prices would drop.
768.	Canadian investment in Sask farmland only.
769.	The market place must determine land prices not GOV.
770.	When they allow all government buildings including the Legislative buildings to be owned by foreigners, I would still not support Foreign ownership of farmland in Sask. We are on the topic of FOOD, safe, reliable, affordable Food! We must not give up CONTROL of our productive lands.
771.	Loss of control = Loss of Reliable Safe Food source
772.	no comment
773.	If we try to control or shelter the value of farmland from the world market, it will only decrease the value of farmland.
774.	In most cases Foreign ownership has been used for lots of other reasons EXCEPT FOR THE PURPOSE OF FARMING lots of foreign purchases are for a way to get to our country or control a product for sale such as soya bean lentils ect for a picific country not an open market
775.	I think I would be open to it but only to countries where Canadians are able to purchase farmland.
776.	I support it, because we will be retiring in the coming years.
777.	Farmland should be owned by either Saskatchewan residents, or by those working the land themselves.
778.	Foreign control=invasion
779.	My great grandfather came to this country so he wouldn't have be a tenant farmer now my grand kids might be again
780.	Drive up prices and don't support the local business and potential land that just produces weeds because they don't understand farming. Could cause more bankruptcy and hurt the local business even more.
781.	See comments in previous questions. Foreign land ownership is a long term economic mistake.
782.	Can we lump Hutterite colonies into this group
783.	Saskatchewan would be selling it's soul to the devil by allowing our non-renewable resource to be controlled by non-residents. There is a strong sense of pride, honesty, commitment, accountability and integrity that goes with people knowing your true neighbors (owners). Communities are much safer and have greater vitality for which greatly benefits the "Greater Good for All" when people have to commit to a higher standard of integrity through knowing thy neighbor as thyself.
784.	Not only would the owners of the land not be farmers or neighbours, they would not even pay taxes to Canada. Foreigners from oppressive regimes who don't pay taxes at home want to invest in Canada to

	hide their wealth.
785.	As I said before, enough of our natural resources are owned and controlled by foreigners.
786.	I support our local economy and our own country.
787.	We currently have foreign ownership. I would like to see the land be available to local farmers first, but foreign investment is driving prices up making land unaffordable to local producers. Young people cannot reasonably take on the financial burden of getting into farming at a time when land values are high, inputs are high, and grain prices are low...which is exactly where we are at right now.
788.	Allowing foreign ownership will diminish family farms to the point of near extinction!
789.	This would be like selling the cow to buy milk no body is that stupid are they?
790.	As stated above with regards to becoming a nation of peasants, but also why are we giving control of our food to foreign countries?
791.	Foreign ownership would increase prices and make land purchases very difficult for young farmers.
792.	Its called capitalism, last time i checked, that is what the Sask Party stood for. Restrictions are an NDP thing or a dumb idea from the failed conservatives
793.	As long as large operations are excluded
794.	Can I buy land in china or other Asian countries? Do they allow me to or our pension funds to? No they do not and they protect it. And I respect and appreciate that. We should do the same.
795.	The people of Canada are the best people to be the stewards of the land and make the decisions of what should be done with it. We have a population of the next generation of Canadians who should be able to buy farmland and make their livelihood there if they so desire. Going back to a system that has the serf that works the land and the landlords who rule as the worker of the land starves is going back a long way in history.
796.	I think I've made it clear in previous answers, but foreign speculative ownership effectively takes away our ability to control and grow our own food.
797.	It is in the provinces best interest to keep farm land ownership with the farmers not only for economic growth in ag industry but for good stewardship and maintaining high quality land
798.	That would change the market significantly, and may provide opportunities for a monopoly on farmland.
799.	Let the market find its true equilibrium in value.
800.	No because foreigners will not invest in the community.
801.	Farmland needs to stay with saskatchewan residents. If you live here then you are truly invested in every aspect.
802.	Profits already leave Saskatchewan but they still stay in Canada would it not be interesting to see what happens if another country owned a large chunk of the farmland in Saskatchewan would they take the produce to their country and leave us to starve????? Would that be

	possible??? That could never happen!!! What is the world's population? It seems the population is growing at an alarming rate would Sask farmers be able to compete with countries? Put the farmland back in the hands of the people who live and farm in Saskatchewan keep the profits at home
803.	The Sask government should be seeing that the farmers and ranchers can sell there produce to the foreign market. Not SELLING OUT TO THEM!!!!
804.	Sell our food security - no way!
805.	Allowing foreign ownership in Saskatchewan would decrease the availability of land and would increase the price making it harder for Canadians to buy the same land.
806.	I repeat we do not need a feudal system. We need to retain our agricultural resource and heritage by Canadians and Saskatchewanians.
807.	Foreign ownership of farmland will probably increase the price of farmland, due to the increase in potential buyers and fixed quantity of farmland available for purchase. Also, making Saskatchewan farmland available for foreign ownership will take away the chance for local farmers to do the job they love, supporting the economy through food production, simply because they were outbid or because a foreign investor owns the land they're interested in and is not interested in selling.
808.	You should have to live in Saskatchewan to own land in Saskatchewan!!
809.	Saskatchewan has plenty of resident farmers willing to own every acre of land. It should be sold locally.
810.	The effects of foreign ownership would cause less land physically & financially available to Saskatchewan farmers. Already, there are fewer successful small farms. Most small farms also need an off-farm income to finance the farm inputs.
811.	Farm land should be owned and farmed by Sk. farmers.
812.	No..... we are already competing with foreign ownership that is taking away from Saskatchewan owned land. Look at Max-Crop.....
813.	Should be owned by the people who work it.
814.	IF SOMEONE WANTS TO OWN IT, TELL THEM TO COME HERE AND LIVE ON IT OR FARM IT. WE HAVE LOTS OF RENEWABLE RESOURCES. FARMLAND IS NOT ONE.
815.	Having rich foreign owners of Saskatchewan farmland does nothing to help Saskatchewan farmers and the people of Saskatchewan. We are then creating a system where all the land could potentially be owned by foreign landowners getting rich off the backs of Saskatchewan farmers.
816.	In no uncertain terms foreign ownership is a terrible idea.
817.	Farmland in Sask is limited, would not be good practice to have foreign ownership....it would be like robbing Sask Residents of their land and assets....definitely would be very disturbing to have foreign ownership.

818.	The price would increase out of the hands of real farmers
819.	Land owners in the province should also be residence of the province.
820.	I think it hurts the local economy.
821.	Absolutely not. If that happens Saskatchewan is and no locals will stay living there.
822.	I know many farmers that came from other countries, bought land and are farming. This is great. All farms in Sask started this way. If you own land other than as an investment such as inheriting from grandma then that is OK also. Cannot criticise grandmother gift. If investors buy land and they typically raise the prices then it becomes more unaffordable for young aspiring farmers unless dad foots a big portion of the bill.
823.	Do not further deregulate ownership by allowing non-Canadians to own farmland. Instead, restore the pre-2003 restriction that limited ownership to Sask. residents only. Under that regime, farmland values were a function of farm profits, not investor bankrolls.
824.	I feel that if you farm here. You support the economy in which you made your money in and believe in the small farmer familys who settled here and want to grow a family farm into a sustainable business but not get greedy
825.	I would rather have ownership with in the province or canada, give our people first dibs!
826.	Selling a large part of the nation's bread basket, and potentially lose any of its ability to produce food for ourselves, and drive any local industry is absolutely absurd.
827.	We do not want to let foreign ownership of our farmland happen. it is detrimental not only to our agricultural industry but the security of food supply as well. We must keep control of natural resources. Would we sell the City of Ottawa to foreigners?
828.	Let them buy farm land in their country. None for sale there well you have to buy products from us not sell you our land then lease it back for too much to sell you product for a lower price.
829.	Too much money would be siphoned out of Saskatchewan.
830.	all foreign owners should be forced to sell and all investors
831.	Anyone should be able to buy farmland in Saskatchewan, but their land holdings should be capped at a certain level.
832.	As stated earlier, a farmer living in Saskatchewan cannot compete with large corporations or other countries that wish to purchase large tracts of land in this province.
833.	It must overall be advantageous to introduce fresh capital into the industry, irrespective of the source (provided of course the source is legitimate).
834.	As long as they are not allowed to walk away when things don't work out as an investment.
835.	Whats to stop them from dictating where the product goes?
836.	again, let markets dictate themselves. if they can't make money buying land they won't buy it,

	if farmers can't make money leasing land they won't lease it. If this is the case then they value goes down to where both purchasers and leasers can make money.
837.	A democratic country must own and control its own land.
838.	higher value for us retiring..and we will ALL retire eventually..
839.	Look at Ontario's land values where they allow foreign ownership, land is worth ten times what ours is and yet the land rents for a reasonable rate which allows young guys to farm.
840.	Investors should reside in our province, so they have a better understanding of the socio-economic impacts that their land management decisions have to the local communities.
841.	to a point, The land is here and we can always change rules and foreign owned taxation down the road such as Florida did with non-residents owning resort properties (non residents pay a much higher property tax)
842.	NO FOREIGN OWNERSHIP It is not good in the long or short run for Saskatchewan or Canada
843.	Foreign owners have little incentive to keep the land productive and keep the Agricultural Operations viable in the long term. The objective of foreign ownership is to keep the value of land high for resale or increase the lease to the maximum potential, neither option that will be sustainable in the long term.
844.	I would not support foreign ownership at this point. I still believe there is enough demand in Saskatchewan and Canada to acquire land when it becomes available for sale.
845.	They only care about the profit and couldn't care less about the land. If that means implementing significant agronomic and environmental damages, they won't think twice. Than Saskatchewan farmers are going to be left to clean up the ashes.
846.	Once government allows foreigners to own it loses control. Is a farm land purchase truly investment from the perspective of the province? No. The land is already producing. Will absentee landlords produce more that locals who own the land? All the farmers I know pay more attention to the land they own.
847.	I absolutely DO NOT support allowing foreign ownership of farmland in Saskatchewan. Since land is a finite resource, it is vital to Saskatchewan's economy and agricultural sector that farmland be reserved for Saskatchewan's farmers.
848.	my previous comments
849.	Rather have Canadians owning the land
850.	We need to keep our land. We care about our land they only want to use us.
851.	Too much oil money in Irak and Dubai.They are not farmers.
852.	This is a no minder! Who will control our industry when non- farmers own the land.
853.	those who wish to invest in Saskatchewan should be allowed providing their money is derived from legal and legitimate sources.

854.	If we start selling it off.. where is it going to end?? needs to think and care more for his residents than the foreigners... a few farmers selling out will get rich, but for the rest of us it is horrid, plus we have lost a way of life..
855.	Not at all. The government should tighten up the rules and only allow Saskatchewan residents to own more than 160 acres.
856.	Foreign land lords are not as responsible to the community and province. They are less involved and less likely to engage in municipal affairs and acts of co-operation with their neighbours like the creation of water drainage authorities.
857.	Once our land ownership leaves our province we will not get it back. Our governments need to care about our resources. The dollar will not feed you but land and water will!
858.	Can I own farmland in China? As far as I know I cannot, so why do we want to sell off this country to foreign owners, who are not at all concerned with our communities, etc. Allowing foreign ownership will cause our farmers to be serfs working for the land owning masters, something our forefathers came here to escape.
859.	They did not do anything to deserve the rights to farm the land Canadians have rightfully acquired as their own and we should not exploit it like our oil and gas industry, we will end up paying to the damages while foreign investors take the profit before leaving when things go sour. There is no accountability, it's a shame and to avoid this at all cost is necessary.
860.	I don't agree
861.	I have enough competition as is and have a family to support.
862.	Not only is this bad for farmers, but it is terrible for Canadian industry.
863.	Foreign ownership does not support rural Saskatchewan.
864.	With a limitation on the amount of acres, both per individual/corporation and per cent of total agricultural acres in the province
865.	Don't support the local communitiee
866.	Anytime you have foreign investment there profits are not spent locally thus having a negative impact on the local economy
867.	Keep family farms alive foreign investments won't allow that to happen
868.	Canadian citizens, permanent residents only
869.	For growing nations (i.e. China) which would literally own and export their produce to their home country without doing much to the economic impact in Saskatchewan. (Other than taxes, the money would leave.) Based on the experience from Australia, there isn't even a guarantee that crop inputs would be brought from local market either.
870.	That scenario is detrimental to the livelihoods of existing sask. Farmers.
871.	We need to support family farms and build communities. Allowing foreign ownership does the opposite.

872.	No I will not support foreign ownership of farmland in Saskatchewan. A lot of the foreign ownership interest in Saskatchewan land is from foreign governments and food security for their people. If we sell our land this way they own the soil we walk on in turn the own us.
873.	Canada has sold its sole in terms of almost ALL natural resources. We are the most foreign owned and controlled country of the G8 and most other western countries. The bloody right wing in this country will sell its sole for the prospects of a few more "Mcjobs" and quick votes. Have some Mr. Wall, and do not allow foreign ownership!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
874.	Farm land is cheap here compared to many places and i think that foreign investors would take over the market. One of the best things about farming is that you are your own boss and i dont want that to change.
875.	I would like to purchase land myself and I feel that the price of land will go higher if we allow foreign investors to purchase land. this will make it very tough for young Saskatchewan farmers to get started.
876.	Disagree with it.
877.	I feel we should sell our produce to other countries not let them take them home for a one time land purchase price. Canadians should control their own land.
878.	Food is one of the world's greatest commodities and should be controlled by residents of that country alone. Crops produced from the land could be exported to these foreign countries for their own food security or else have to be bought back for our own use. Pretty silly to have to buy food from a foreign country that was produced on your own land. Why not sell them our excess grain and create some jobs and income through that rather than worry about the few extra dollars that some land sales would generate?
879.	Non Saskatchewan non farmer ownership is disasterous for saskatchewan family farmers as our children shall never be able to compete for ownership.
880.	Get out of the office and take a drive. Absentee landlords are helping to destroy rural Saskatchewan.
881.	Control will be lost keep the land under farmers ownership
882.	It would end family farms forever and take a lot of money out of our province
883.	Absolutely not!
884.	I believe that this country was developed by our ancestors coming from Europe to farm, mine from Scotland and Germany. They were certainly foreigners and were encouraged to come and settle this country! I am not sure mega farms by local owners do much for the " tradition" of the Family farm so to speak anyhow.
885.	Own land only if you live here.
886.	Why is a limit of 10 acres put on foreign ownership.. I can buy farm land in the States, but I think I would be taxed more heavily upon selling it because I would be classified as a foreign investor. Open it up to all foreign investors, as long as the Capital Gains Exemption does not apply to them...Until, or if, they become Canadian Citizens

887.	you should have to live in saskatchewan to own farm land no question, when you own the land you farm you do a better job of looking after the land.
888.	That's a terrible idea and should even need to be asked all long term results would be negative.
889.	We always need more investment If we are not prepared to open up then go to a land bank system
890.	I would want some controls on it but foreigners should be able to buy and come here and farm.
891.	Detrimental to small towns
892.	I will not support foreign people coming in and taking our farmland away from us
893.	Foreigners would be allowed purchase only with the intent of immigrating.
894.	I believe that Saskatchewan is losing control of its farmland resource with the present legislation which allows Canadian residents and entities to own Saskatchewan farmland.
895.	I think that non-local ownership destroys the community, they have no face or care what is happening in the area.
896.	I see no point in opening the doors to big money. How many countries in the world would welcome the demise of their local land ownership and hand it to outside corporate interests?
897.	I think if they want to buy farmland, they should share in the risk of farming it.
898.	A landowner that actually farms the land will always care for the land better than a non-local landowner leasing land to a farmer. Farmland productivity will decrease under foreign land ownership.
899.	definetly NOT!!!!!!!
900.	If it for farmers to come here and farm or help existing farmers expand I think that would help all farmers within our province.
901.	my preference would be Canadian owned groups. Foreign Investment has the potential to create big headaches down the road. Eg. Government of China, through a shell company, owns 45% of the farmland in Saskatchewan. Or a large multinational like Cargill owns significant acres which reduce competition and drive up food prices.
902.	I believe it would irrevocably change the dynamic of our province and seriously diminish the existence of family farms.
903.	If we let foreign ownership of Saskatchewan land how can we call our province Saskatchewan when the land is not in Saskatchewan hands.
904.	WE already have in the back door. I have reason to believe there is Chinese money in our RM now.
905.	Farmer themselves decide the value of land , cause they pay the return on investment.
906.	Investment is welcome; but foreign ownership is not.

907.	Never allow foreign ownership of SK farmland.
908.	Investment farming is a short term plan. Traditional farmers are investing in the land, community and its future.
909.	We cannot purchase land in china then they should not be allowed to buy land in saskatchewan. Once they own the land it is gone there will be no more land changing in saskatchewan
910.	Sask Ag. is up and down. Investors don't like downs and farmers don't like to be told how to run their farms from an office in Fiji and giving any profits away.
911.	Refer to previous question response.
912.	I don't see how this can realistically be avoided However There will be long term negative implications to the agricultural sector But we support competitive industry in all business including agriculture and the less government involvement will yield survival of the fittest However I have indicated strongly all the negatives My issue is the Source of foreign money and the ways these foreigners are manipulating Canadian policies to go ahead and purchase under false pretenses
913.	people who dont live here or in canada dont bring anything into the province
914.	Foreign ownership would soon place us in the same position that farmers (serfs) found themselves in Europe in the 1800's. Land ownership by actual farmers is fundamental to the very way Canada and Saskatchewan were formed.
915.	local ownership creates economic stimulus in the province and retains profits here
916.	Yes if it is sold to a farmer/not a corporation. No otherwise.
917.	Farmland should be owned by farmers. Oilfields should be owned by those in the oil industry. Money markets should be operated by those in the financial industry. Attempting to convert farmland into money markets will result in complete failure.
918.	I think this would be a good thing for current farmland owners, farmers looking to expand could use the increase in value to buy more farmland through equity growth.
919.	I'm not against foreign ownership 100%, if said person from another country buys and farms the land themselves. It's the ones who buy land next to me and I don't know who they are.
920.	Foreign ownership is giving away our most valuable asset for immediate gain and great long term loss.
921.	Canadian farmers should own Canadian farmland.
922.	Not without resident status and active participation
923.	The benefits of foreign ownership end with one person selling their land to potentially a higher bidder and having greater funds for their retirement. From that point on I see no benefits to the province having land held by someone outside the province. The tax benefit

	of the land decreases as the owner will likely use the proceeds from the land in another country therefore not contributing to the Sask and Canadian economy.
924.	Would China let us buy land there and export everything we produce back home to Canada? No they wouldn't
925.	I think it is hard enough for the farmers of saskatchewan to increase the acres they farm to make ends meet. There is enough competition with other farmers in the are. Adding out of province residents with fat wallets will make it nearly impossible for new farmers to start up and existing farmers to make ends meet as the price of goods keeps increasing also.
926.	If we loose ownership of a non renewable resource we loose control of it as well.
927.	It's make nearly impossible for young farms that to get started or expand
928.	Why???? Do you really want to drive up land values so our young farmers can't afford to buy land. Thats ridiculous . Farming is hard enough work to make a profit owning your land. Now try to make a profit after sending your lease payment to someone in Quebec or China.
929.	There is no way sask farmers can compete to buy land with foreign investors.
930.	Concerned that we lose the value of our natural assets
931.	If foreign ownership is a farming family coming to farm the land and be part of our community I think it's a great thing for our province
932.	Absolutely not. Why sell off our heart and soul to those who,s only interest is ownership and control, power and authority. Think about what comes next, it is a feudal system.
933.	Not a chance.
934.	I do not want unlimited foreign ownership of sask land. I do not want to see large parcels controlled by foreign entities.
935.	Would any country ever do that?
936.	Demand for farmland in Saskatchewan is significant enough that outside investors are not needed to ensure there is a good market. Land is a strategic resource that should be owned locally to keep the wealth in rural Saskatchewan.
937.	Especially absentee people who buy large amounts of land and are not here to oversee what is happening. They do not contribute to the future of Saskatchewan.
938.	With clear limits placed on it. We do not want to become a land of absentee landlords who will control the most important economic sector - like Irish tenant serfs under English lords.
939.	Generally I would say no. However if a foreign farmer wishes to purchase a small farm and live and contribute to the community and to Saskatchewan, that is fine. We have had some groups come from England and buy a farm. They have also purchased a couple of extra quarters to enlarge it. They live on their farm, often have livestock. They volunteer and assist in the community. Their children attend the local school, they buy groceries at the village store and buy farm products from local businesses. These people are truly welcome. However I am very upset when I see a foreigner buy a large amount of land....leave the farmhouse abandoned, never set foot in the community and do not care about the neighbours around them. We in many cases do not even know what they look like . Often if

	they have cattle they are out in the neighbours field. The crops that they grow are minimal and they take little pride in the land.
940.	If owner lost a year of rent land sits idle goes to weeds then nobody wants it happened on 20 quarters in RM of Stanley
941.	I think ownership should remain in the hands of Canadians
942.	Same as before makes it unaffordable and overtime all land will be foreign owned and when another country owns all the land they now own the country
943.	I just did earlier
944.	Once it is sold to foreign investors, it is unlikely to ever get sold back to traditional Saskatchewan farmers. I think this would negatively impact the sustainability of Saskatchewan's agriculture industry.
945.	China is purchasing copious amounts of our, and other countries natural resources and businesses, they've begun purchasing land all over the world already....maybe they could just purchase all of Canada, kick us all out!
946.	My reasons are included in previous answers.
947.	should be owned by those using it for food production. our forefathers left Europe because they could not own land there and the landlords made it hard to make a living. lets not go there.
948.	Land is immovable - If ever the countries majority population and it's Government wish to change to structure of ownership they can readily do so through legislation - it is otherwise known as democracy.
949.	foreign ownership of land would only increase the cost of production of farmers who live and work on the farm. of all areas of industry farming is the only area where all fluctuations are absorbed by the farmer. Increases in seed cost, chemical cost and land cost cannot be passed onto the consumer as the buyers are setting the prices for all commodities purchased off of the farm. farmers purchase inputs at retail cost and sell commodities at wholesale prices. This is one area where the farmer can be given an advantage by the government through protection of a lower cost of farmland.
950.	I believe owning farmland with its implications for food security for our province and country have to be paramount in the decision that is made regarding foreign ownership of Saskatchewan farmland.
951.	Foreign ownership does not reward the hard work of our pioneers and kills the communities which they helped build!
952.	The lease on most farmland is now about 20-25% of the gross income off that land, either in a crop share or in cash. 20 years ago that share mostly went to the nearest larger town or city, where the older farmers retired to and that money was spent and circulated from there, now those monies will exit not only the province, but the country. How does that help our economy ?.

953.	I think we should keep ownership for Canadian's and preferably give preference to Saskatchewan residents and people who are living on and using/managing the land they own (i.e. tax breaks)
954.	Not more than 10 acres. Western European ownership is definitely preferred vs Asiatic/East Indian (etc) ownership that does not understand the difference between living in high population density environments, and with very different governance systems than western societies. Western European understand the value of fitting into other cultures and learning their cultural practices and mores. Greater understanding of water management for sanitation and quality of life.
955.	I believe if you want farmland in Saskatchewan you should live in the province.
956.	Foreign being none Canadian
957.	Taking care of the farmers and ranchers in our province should be top priority!!!! Bringing in foreign ownership will not allow us or our young people to expand our operations or start new ones.
958.	Loss of local control
959.	Historically, that is how Canada was settled. An equally valid question is "Why should foreign ownership be prevented?" In principle there seems to be no valid underlying principle or reason why, for example, a Canadian farmer could acquire unlimited tracts of land in various EU countries but an EU citizen would ostensibly be prevented from doing so in Saskatchewan.
960.	Definitely NOT!!! We would be giving away our security for safe food production not only now but for future generations to come. We would be giving away our assets for "twelve pieces of silver"; giving it away for a "mess of Pottage" if you will!
961.	Foreign ownership does nothing for rural communities and would be bad for environmental stewardship of the land.
962.	Canadian ownership.
963.	Foreign owners do not have investment in farming in Saskatchewan beyond a possible financial gain. How can this result in things such as better food safety or environmental sustainability? Every day local farmers are having to make more time consuming and expensive choices to ensure the sustainability of their products, which does not always result in financial gain although it is the better choice overall.
964.	would not like a foreign country owning canadian farmland.
965.	Certainly not as there would be following tendency to control the production market
966.	if sask residents loose control of the land then we might as well join the untied states
967.	need to live here
968.	It favors the rich getter richer, and the farmer losses profit.

969.	The tradition of the family farm has died with the rise of corporate take over. Farmers have been forced to move to cities now and farmland is less available for individuals willing to take on farming as an occupation.
970.	As a province we cannot produce any more land, what we have is all. Why would anyone want to sell off this resource.
971.	Why should I have to compete for land when in the end I still have all the risk and uncertainty
972.	We need to keep ownership of our lands ~
973.	Our ancestors came to Canada to get away from large non local land ownership and now we are leaning towards that very problem which results in small peasant workers and large land barons.
974.	Sask is not for sale to anyone that is not a legal Canadian
975.	Farming is already controlled by co. like Dow and Monsanto let's not help them out any more
976.	NO!
977.	We are a global community as Canadians. When my for fathers came to Canada they were non Canadians. I see little difference now
978.	No, we have enough investors in Saskatchewan. We do not need outside investment. Look at the example of Norway which does not allow foreign investors to own land.
979.	We have sons wanting to farm and foreign ownership would make it less likely that they could do so.
980.	I don't trust non residents to manage land properly.
981.	Because control of life style is lost; control of soil quality is lost due to profit motivated ownership, control of community if lost. Tennant farming is not desirable.
982.	Absolutely not! Foreigners will not care for our land, they will rape it. The grain will go to the country of owners' origin. Grow grain here where there is water, send it back home. A good way to export water without spilling a drop.
983.	Will definitely not support it.
984.	See above
985.	Without a local owner there isnt a sense of pride or care for what happens to that land and how the management of that land affects the surrounding community. Also the outside ownership taking the reinvestment of the land profits outside the local community
986.	Local farmers should own the land they farm.
987.	more foreign ownership translates to more revenue leaving the province
988.	If you are not a local farmer you should not have any influence on farmland price and the destruction of rural saskatchewan and the economic impact. Unless a landowner lives in his local economy they are not connected and have no interest in the rural economy.

989.	I would fear the restriction they would place on the farmer- i.e. what they plant, GMOs, price of seeds, etc.
990.	Any province or nation that would allow the sale and control of their agricultural land to foreign investors is not exercising due diligence.
991.	No.
992.	See previous responses.
993.	We need to keep the tradition of local family ownership alive in SK. What are we saying about ourselves if we just sell out to foreigners????
994.	The land will sit ideal and producers who have no interest in the land let weeds grow and do not care for the quality of the land like someone who rents from their neighbor they care about or if the land was their own
995.	AS stated
996.	We shouldn't turn Sask farm land into the Vancouver housing market where only foreigners can afford to buy.
997.	The people who use it should own it.
998.	We have a rural economy that is maintained by private and local land ownership. Relaxing the rules to allow foreign ownership would destabilize local economies as profits go elsewhere. All manner of environmental values ...soil, water, wildlife ...may be placed at risk.
999.	No, I definitely do not support foreign ownership of Canadian soil. Sure, this would be a quick way to make money, but to make money quick shouldn't take away opportunities from Canadians to own our own land!
1000.	Canadian farmers should own Canadian land.
1001.	Absolutely not there is no benefit to our province. Any influx of capital to our province would only have a short term positive effect but the long term effect would be devastating. Literally within two generations I believe we would worse off than most developing countries like Brazil and India.
1002.	We have a value asset. Lets keep it here. Do you want foreigners owning your valuable assets?
1003.	foreign ownership do nothing to grow community. And the tradition of family farming is lost. As a Canadian I should be able to buy land over foreign investors
1004.	I have no problem with foreign leading of land, but ownership should be by residents
1005.	If foreigners want to immigrate to Saskatchewan to buy and farm the land, contribute to our economy and live the Canadian dream, that I am in favour of.
1006.	We feel foreign investors wouldn't have the same, let's say feelings, towards our local lands. Farming has become more of a cooperate business by not being able to just farm only we have to of course have additional off the farm income to help. Unless you had your farmland inherited may have an advantage.
1007.	They make it difficult for Saskatchewan farmers to expand their farms or start a farm. Leasing

	land doesn't give you the asset that owning the land does so having to rent it from foreign investment agencies makes it hard for Saskatchewan farmers to get ahead.
1008.	Again give residence tax advantages to buy land
1009.	It is my belief that only an owner actively farming or currently aware of the current farming situation can understand and appreciate the importance of agriculture in our province and country.
1010.	I looked after farms for small foreign investors and trusts for a number of years. The small investors were generally excellent, the trusts not so good. I personally have rented land from a German land owner for 40 years. The experience has been excellent in every aspect.
1011.	I want my food grown by Canadian farmers and SK farmers if I live in SK. There might be proper and safe regulations then.
1012.	China will ruin our land worse than we already are. No other countries or corporations should have control of our land.
1013.	Foreign ownership has its own interests and as Saskatchewan people, we have ours; and the profit that they expect from their gains should stay in Saskatchewan.
1014.	It would be selling off our secure food source. Very very dangerous
1015.	Loss of control of the most important SK asset; loss of affordability of local farmers and new farmers to enter farming to purchase land; inflated and unstable land pricing (just try to live in Vancouver); profits drained away; rural SK decimated as farms disappear replaced by corporate and foreign owned entities; I question why the mining (potash) companies around e.g. Regina and elsewhere were allowed to purchase such large tracts of farmland when their activities are clearly not above ground(?); I don't see a long-term upside to foreign ownership!
1016.	Farmland in Saskatchewan should be Saskatchewan-owned and operated by Saskatchewan residents.
1017.	The direct descendants of Canadian resident citizens should be allowed ownership, even if they are nonresident, noncitizens,
1018.	Saskatchewan farmland SHOULD BE OWNED BY SASKATCHEWAN FARMERS.
1019.	Why would we let the safety and supply of our food be under the control of someone else. Look at who is trying to get at our land and homes. These interests don't have a secure food supply. We are not for sale!
1020.	How is the Saskatchewan government looking out for its residents if it's allowing foreigners to push all the residents out after 3 generations
1021.	I believe that at a bare minimum, a person needs to be a Canadian resident to own Saskatchewan farmland.
1022.	There is going to be increasing pressure to allow this. We have a well known example of this in our area, of skirting the present law. Land from a former federal MP was bought and is owned by a lawyer from the US along with some other land in the same area.

1023.	Absolutely not!!! Our land could be sold by 5 p.m. that day, we have a way of life most people in this world envy. Why would we give it away? I want to protect what we have for my grandchildren. If this government wants to give this life away then I'm out of here. I want my grandchildren having a better life than that. Can you imagine who they'll be working for? This is insane it's even being discussed and it makes me angry. I also don't agree with this process. A matter this important should be dealt with at open, public, well advertised meetings!!!
1024.	Food, water and shelter. Sask needs to be able to control the basics
1025.	Allowing foreign owners to buy land is taking away from the farmers that will use the land to support there families.
1026.	Refer to other responses
1027.	Sask farmland belongs in the hands of Sask farmers. I am dead against foreign ownership!
1028.	There is enough demand from local farmers for farmland...what benefit other than sheer greed would foreign ownership bring????
1029.	Land is a limited commodity. You cannot manufacture or build more. We need to maintain our basic land for Sask. people.
1030.	They will take everything home and bypass everything they can
1031.	Do we not even want to make them fight us to take over our country?
1032.	That's the worst idea. Never!
1033.	within a few decades all farm land in the province would be foreign owned farmed by local tenant farmers. If you own the land you also control the food produced on that land. The security of our food supply is also at stake here.
1034.	We need to retain local control and ownership of our most valuable assets
1035.	It has already happened.
1036.	What is foreign ownership? Canadian companies backed by money from other counties? I believe this is already happening, this rule change has already brought in foreign money, the government has no way of tracking who is backing these Canadian farm land ownership companies. Enforce the rules you have, or force the ownership companies to be a Saskatchewan company with the hope of generating indirect tax revenue for our province.
1037.	Most are speculative and do not intend to put boots on the ground in these acres they purchase and learn what farming involves. It is very hard to be a neighbour with investors who destroy all trees and water holding bodies in order to have more production acres to rent out and resell (flip).
1038.	If other countries owned land in Saskatchewan, and eventually operated it themselves it would be a great loss to the province. Produce would have the potential to flow through different paths to export, which may mean that it is not fairly valued and tax dollars are lost in Saskatchewan.
1039.	if you want rural communities to survive keep land ownership local

1040.	taxes
1041.	Absolutely no foreign ownership. They could rent but not own.
1042.	would support more leasing of farmland by outsiders.
1043.	We can't make more land. Once it is sold to foreign owners, it is lost to us.
1044.	Why would we let foreigners buy up Canadian land and remove family farms that have supported local communities
1045.	lower income for locals, if hired all. higher profits for corporations
1046.	We are not for sale
1047.	Agricultural land ownership has the potential to determine agricultural policy, and thus control our food supply. This should be predominantly determined by those who are directly impacted by the changes on the landscape.
1048.	Never as they do not live here. Do not support the local communities and certainly do not care for the land.
1049.	canadians only
1050.	No foreign ownership! We as residents must keep what we have and manage it as its OUR BACK YARD!
1051.	I'm am an immigrant, of course i support it, Saskatchewan needs more input and investment form outside, not the least because it needs to be dragged kicking and screaming into the 21 st century and new ideas and practices need to be introduced.
1052.	more money in, more money goes around and around the business at every level, the cost of land pushes development and productivity up.
1053.	The wrong people will own the land
1054.	Lets not sell out our province just yet.....it is valuable lets keep it locally owned
1055.	not at all. keep it at home
1056.	I feel like too much outside ownership may result in "tenant/peasant" farmers as in past history. Why did the world come a 100 years ago. So they could break that and own their own farms
1057.	Outside investment in land leads to land owners driven just by profit.
1058.	NO!
1059.	Should be Canadian to own land in Canada
1060.	People born here should have to rights to buy before foreigners.
1061.	If you mean outside Canada - no for ownership If you mean outside Saskatchewan - yes for ownership
1062.	My older brothers offered land for sale and the high tender was foreigners. They included a list of requirements any prospective renter would have to meet and it was completely

	unrealistic.
1063.	If we can't own our own land we may as well leave the country and start elsewhere. Letting foreign people buy our land when it's unaffordable to us is ludicrous.
1064.	Farmland is purchased with the intent to have a return on investment by farming or leasing. We need an open market in Saskatchewan so good business practices become the guide to the market
1065.	Our agricultural resources need to be for SK farmers, not foreign investors.
1066.	Investors only invest in viable business deals. Foreign investment is a vote for farmer competency.
1067.	Only for Canadians
1068.	Land should be affordable for locals. If a foreigner wants to buy land they should pay a high amount of taxes that benefit the local community. That way the Saskatchewan residents have a chance to buy land first.
1069.	The local farmer can make the best decision as to how to take care of the land.
1070.	If foreign ownership brought some one in to farm that land eventually it would be even better. I don't see enough new farmers taking the challenge as it is.
1071.	Give the advantage to the people who live in Canada and Saskatchewan to be able to purchase land to raise a family and pass it on to the next generation. Keep it in Canada thus keeping the tax dollars here, providing for us, not in some Swiss Bank account
1072.	You're starving out your little farmers, they do not need our land and they should never get it cause Canadians will never get it back after sold
1073.	Under the present foreign ownership rules.
1074.	farmers should own the land they farm
1075.	Could I go and buy land in China or Russia? Don't think so.
1076.	We do allow foreign owners in every other business and no one complains although it is not always perfect
1077.	I feel that our own people should be able to purchase the land at a reasonable price compared to what a foreigner would be willing to pay to own it.
1078.	Only if the people move to Canada
1079.	Giving up land ownership to foreign investors gives them control of Canadian industry.
1080.	It would not be healthy for rural community family farms. Small or moderate farms.
1081.	Foreign individuals and/or corporations should not have any control whatsoever in the production and maintenance of our food supply, as that threatens the autonomy and the well-being of every Saskatchewan resident.
1082.	Too much foreign ownership already exists in the core economic businesses in Canada.

	Farmland is different in that the strength of rural communities depend on local farmers thriving.
1083.	It should stay within sask
1084.	I don't think anyone farming today would be doing so had foreign ownership been allowed in Saskatchewan's history. Anyone who says that isn't true is only looking out for their own self interest not the interest of young people wanting to get a start and not considering the opportunities most of us were given by our forefathers when they held on to their land
1085.	Not a chance. We are giving up our sovereignty.
1086.	I don't feel it's right for immigrants to come into our province and take land away from us.
1087.	Why would you want another country owning you--seriously?
1088.	When there is a down turn in the ag economy having foreign ownership will make that downturn more severe.
1089.	I believe if you are going to own the land, you should be living in the province and supporting the communities in our province
1090.	I would prefer the land to be owned by Canadian citizens.
1091.	To a limited degree foreign ownership would be good. Finding investment dollars is always difficult.
1092.	That would be the worst thing that could possibly happen to this province and country
1093.	see my previous comments.
1094.	Foreign ownership should never be allowed !!!!!!!!!!!
1095.	Loose family Farm local ownership.
1096.	If they move on a farm and farm the land they buy, I have no problem
1097.	Farmland, like air and clean water, is too valuable a resource and too necessary to Saskatchewan's wellbeing to be put in the control of owners who would not be affected by the way it is used. Corporations have a legal obligation to maximize profit and that may not always be in the best interest of the land. Land is a finite resource and must be treated differently from other commodities.
1098.	I have met and seen some foreigners come from across oceans, got looped by the government are now bankrupt trying to get back to the homeland. I know of at least 3 families. Whereas we are from Saskatchewan and care about the land more and making a living off it than just letting in lying rich foreigners that have said to me, they are going to show us how its done.
1099.	We are young farmers trying to get a leg up in the industry. Land prices have tripled in our area and with foreign investment there would be no hope for us to ever expand our operation as we wouldn't be able to compete with the over inflated prices run up by foreign investors
1100.	We need to utilize every acre of land we have in order to keep food on not only Canada's table, but our export countries as well. With foreign investors coming in, there is no

	guarantee that there is going to be a lease agreement, or even that the land is going to be planted at all. It's just greedy following the oil around. And as much as this world depends on its oil supply, it depends on food more.
1101.	foreign ownership has downsized our communities in a whole
1102.	If this occurs, I will NOT be voting for the current government. Currently I fully support the current government on Most of their policies.
1103.	Foreigners own enough land and businesses in Canada and it is only for the benefit of them and there homeland. Ex: Chinese can't raise enough of there own food so let's sell food to them not land
1104.	you are considering everyone else except the Saskatchewan farmer.
1105.	I don't believe we need to sell ourselves off
1106.	I think the sask. land should be owned by farmers who live on the land. i also believe that there should be restrictions on the amount of land one farmer or corp. can own.lets populate the country again with young farmers and have viable communities
1107.	It makes it impossible to own my own land while farming
1108.	Not a chance
1109.	Under no circumstances. For all of the previous reasons.
1110.	Self explanatory
1111.	Why would I? I want to see Saskatchewan farmland stay in the hands of local farmers, those same local farmers that give back to their communities, and support them. Our community has been bombarded by foreigners, be it Koreans or South Africans, and do very little if anything to support it.
1112.	Canada should be Canadian. Selling our land is just the first step to losing it all.
1113.	From what I've seen, most foreign investors are more interested in profits than production of food.
1114.	this is our land and should only be for people living here and supporting our economy other than some outside region.
1115.	Foreigners are wanting to own Saskatchewan farmland for investment purposes only with the intent of making a profit of high lease rates and eventually capital gains upon re-sale
1116.	We have a great resource Please do not give it away
1117.	The best ownership model is that the human that works the land is the human that owns the land.
1118.	Firm believer that land is the foundation of a secure food source and sound economy (local and provincial)
1119.	think about it, foreigners have already purchased a lot of our natural resources already, so what is the problem with farm land?

	on the other hand, Canada has already invested in different things in other countries, including land.
1120.	local ownership must be retained that's how you keep the land and local communities strong, healthy and growing
1121.	We could lose the monopoly on our own food and produce and lose the ability to monitor and control the crops and farming practices. And that is a big risk.
1122.	I voted to grow Saskatchewan , not China, Middle East etc.
1123.	It is strictly an investment for foreign owners. I have seen first hand, land being bought, in this case pasture land, and the previous renters have lost this land. The "new" renter, who is managing a cattle herd who is owned by an investment company, had expressed interest in buying this land. This purchase has never gone through, but the local renters, cannot afford the price to buy. And have lost the chance to rent.
1124.	as I already said with foreign ownership there is no hands on control and stewardship has to be legislated rather than having the farmer owner, manage the farm for himself and future generations because he knows if he does a poor job it will reflect in his own bottom line
1125.	We have had local ownership(mostly) in the past years. We can continue to produce food under the same ownership in the future!
1126.	Absolutely not.
1127.	If you want to own farmland in Saskatchewan you should live here, farm the land, and be part of the whole farming sector. Foreign ownership of farmland in this province is just that FOREIGN. People from all countries came to this country and put their blood, sweat and tears into making this farmland what it is today.
1128.	Land is for producing food to feed a growing global population, not an asset to appreciate.
1129.	For all the reasons mentioned earlier. This further erodes small communities and the economic viability of family farming. I would like to see a robust rural Saskatchewan with an increase in family farms.
1130.	There is nothing to tell, leave things as they are so our future farmers have the opportunity to farm and the family farms are not ruined.
1131.	I am completely against it. I am tired of the land we stand on being sold out from under us to other countries. When land is owned by foreigners, the revenue generated from it, other than taxes, does not stay in Saskatchewan or even Canada. The money needs to stay here to help out own economy. Also, I strongly believe that if foreigners are allowed to own our farm land, it won't just make the land too costly for those here in Saskatchewan who want to buy more or start farming, that we will lost our say in what goes on around us, and what happens with land. The only foreigners I agree with owning land, are those who are moving to Saskatchewan, are applying for citizenship and going to farm it themselves. I prefer land to stay in local hands, where we know each other and work together to make a better community, province and country
1132.	None of our foreigners support anything in our community and large investment companies don't care if our small towns fall apart

1133.	Aside from the loss of our own family farms and the ability of existing farms to expand, I am fearful of allowing our own food security in the way of control of the land being sold out to the highest bidder.. Sell the crowns first. (lol)
1134.	to make Saskatchewan more viable you need community where people support each other
1135.	We do not need foreign ownership in Saskatchewan, we have enough young farmers that would like to farm, without more competition, driving the price up and trying to buy big blocks of land ,I think the price of land will stay up in this area without foreign investment .
1136.	For this province to move forward we need outside investment as there is not enough equity in the next generation of farmers to own all the land that will enter the market in the next 10-20 years
1137.	If you're not canadian shouldn't be allowed to buy
1138.	Saskatchewan is a resource rich province. We have large potash reserves, abundant oil wells and vast tracts of farmland. Why would we allow foreign ownership of farmland when it doesn't make sense for foreign ownership of our potash companies like PCS?
1139.	100 percent against. We farmed beside the corporate farms. Disaster of farming. Little wonder they went broke.
1140.	Our ancestors and us have built a great place to live and grow valuable renewable resources. Why would any representatives of the people in our legislature want to give non resident foreign nationals control over our most basic asset, the land that feeds us as well as provides a surplus for export??
1141.	Local owners are more responsive to local needs and conditions
1142.	The 'feel' and 'tradition' of the province will change - for the negative I believe
1143.	1)Investment dollars are searching for higher returns & real estate has traditionally provided this. However, these dollars can flow to other sectors with perceived higher returns at any time. 2) Canadians need to retain ownership & control of food production within its borders. Within the foreseeable future, food production will become more critical than energy production.
1144.	WHY DO WE WANT FOREIGN OWNERSHIP???
1145.	Outside ownership as strictly an investment has driven farmland prices up already. This means if I want to buy land assuring control and stability for our operation, that my expenses mean I won't make a profit.
1146.	Keep ownership local, support locally and give new farmers a fighting chance
1147.	This does not support agriculture in any way. The risk is further increased to the active farmer, while the returns are siphoned out of province. It is deception by those (such as real estate agents, etc) who say young farmers need to lease land to start farming, implying that the only way they can start farming is by leasing land from pension funds, foreign owners. Lower land costs by restricting ownership gives the option for new farmers to buy or lease, but if the ownership costs are prohibitive then the only option is

	to lease.
1148.	no NO
1149.	Ruins small communities when we have foreign ownership. Keep our fore fathers youth on the land.
1150.	Canadian land specifically Saskatchewan farm land should be owned by Saskatchewan farmers not foreign corporations, companies or individuals. If this happens you are killing the Saskatchewan farmer. Ending the hard earned life they have made for themselves and their family.
1151.	If we allow foreign ownership into our farmland then the farmer will eventually be a dying breed and no one will get into the business
1152.	Control over genetics, products, and eventually land itself would leave the Province looking at ways to reduce foreign ownership in the future. Absentee landlords are not historically leaders in community and local policy development. Interesting how locals want to invest and are finding it difficult to do this right here where they live...
1153.	Already answered earlier.
1154.	My fear is that foreign owned factory farms in Saskatchewan are going to be a reality traditional family farming will be lost
1155.	ABSOLUTELY NOT!
1156.	Our experience with foreign owners is that they do not intimately understand agriculture in Saskatchewan, do not have the same care for the land as most locals, and are often just speculating.
1157.	It would drive land prices up putting the average would-be farmer out of the market; non-residents are driven by the profit motive rather than responsibility for the long term health of the land and those living around it.
1158.	Only Saskatchewan residents should be allowed to own farmland.
1159.	Yes, but there would need to be a cap on the number of acres. This would drive Sask land and property values up to be closer to the value in other major centres, which benefits all owners of property selling, and that extra cash gets pumped back into our economy.
1160.	Absolutely not!
1161.	As said previously. Investors don't care about fa stewardship or pride in product but only the bottom line... More money for shareholders and the return on their investment. This isn't promoting a future for farming, it's giving control of the world's "bread basket" to other entities. Farm land should remain with the farmers so we can guarantee a safe product and maintain control of the product without investment driving up the price of an already risky enterprise. I for one do not want to be like other countries with \$9/ loaf bread. Leave farmland where it should be... In control of the farmers. We have enough people already driving the cost of production beyond what it should be!
1162.	If you want to own farmland get out here and work on the land.

1163.	Foreign ownership will cause land prices to increase therefore causing todays farmers to not be able to afford the increasing land values. This also opens the door for the foreign owners to grow a crop and use everything produced for their own countries use. This could change the face of agriculture in Saskatchewan.
1164.	I would like to see a vibrant prairie community that has strong, profitable farms with farmers who own and care for the land they live on. I would also like to see investment in processing here in the prairies and that SK becomes a provider of value-added food and fibre products to the world. We should be shipping the hemp cloth to clothing manufacturers, not having them farm hemp here using cheap farm labour (again, likely imported) and shipped back to the manufacturing company abroad.
1165.	that would increase the land prices for us and we don't need them
1166.	Those who live in an area, on land, in a community, have an investment in the health and wellbeing of those things. Foreign ownership has no long term benefits for the people of Saskatchewan, and is in my opinion, the equivalent of giving our birthright and our homeland, away.
1167.	Saskatchewan farm land should be owned by Saskatchewan people who can carry on the farming traditions, while incorporating respect for agricultural and environmental laws and respect for the Indigenous people from whom the land was taken. Allowing foreign ownership will also drive up land prices. Foreign owners will not care about any of these things. The government may end up spending huge amounts of money in monitoring and reinforcing laws, including expensive court cases.
1168.	I think the existing legislation and residency requirements are appropriate on this front. Farmers have clearly said that they welcome investment when it is made by individuals who intend to relocate to Saskatchewan, farm the land, and invest in local communities. (see, for example, APAS' statement on the matter). I support their assertions.
1169.	Absolutely not
1170.	I support family owned and operated
1171.	For the reasons already stated. Ownership and control is best left to the people who live in the community, not to those who have no skin in the game. Land ownership and rental needs to be affordable for existing farmers and for those who follow us. If we go to foreign investment, it will accelerate decline in the number of farms and of rural communities.
1172.	This question is not applicable to Skyline. Skyline's goal is to create local ownership of farmland by Saskatchewan farmers that plan to operate the land.
1173.	They drive the price of land (purchasing and leasing) to the point where no one can afford to farm the land.
1174.	In the case of China they think in hundreds of years it would be nice if this government did the same thing. Why would we keep selling off this precious resource? They are securing their future we should do the same.

1175.	We have foreign ownership in our area & they do not help the community in any way because they are absent .
1176.	Who is foreign? no connection whatever to SK? non residents? non citizens? Do you distinguish between land already owned --sometimes for generations-- and land that someone from outside the country wants to purchase?
1177.	Farmland should be for Saskatchewan farmers only. No foreign ownership whatsoever.
1178.	I believe land should be owned by those who live in communities and interact with our local markets.
1179.	It's already happening. Who oversees this? There are many work-arounds which are already being exploited.
1180.	Absentee landlords don't manage as well at many levels. Their interest is not the same as that of SK peoples.
1181.	We farm with my fiancés 2 brothers and dad and we are looking at acquiring more land with out of country owners that makes it harder for us to purchase farm land around home from retiring farmers and forces us to stay the same size instead of growing
1182.	Why would you allow foreigners to control farmland.?
1183.	Only if foreign ownership become greater the than 50%.
1184.	Competition for land is already intense, and foreign interests usually have a lot more money than the local guy trying to purchase land. Besides, how would you ever get permission to hunt on land owned by somebody in India or China?
1185.	They do not support our communities by spending any of the money that they earn here so no I would not support it.
1186.	Land purchases should only be allowed for Canadian citizens or one hundred percent Canadian owned businesses.
1187.	It would compound the problem with foreign buys to start our young people farming
1188.	foreign ownership only benefits foreign owners not Saskatchewan
1189.	Should be Saskatchewan residents only
1190.	Agricultural, land unlike some other sectors does not need outside money to develop
1191.	If Saskatchewan farmland can be purchased by foreign investment it will no longer be Saskatchewan land. Land is not a renewable resource. It cannot be owned, only operated for a period of time until the next operator takes over.
1192.	Need to keep farmland ownership in Saskatchewan farmer's hands.
1193.	Allowing foreign ownership is a very short-sighted choice. Farmland worldwide is a fixed entity, a non-renewable resource. We need to have a secure food source for our country. This is what other countries want too and that is why they want to lure us with seemingly big bucks to provide for themselves. Why give this away. We will never have a chance to get it back.

1194.	every farmer came to saskatchewan from somewhere else or their ancestors did so they could own land their self without competing against big corporations and other foreign investors
1195.	Foreign equates to non- Canadians. Some call non scatchies foreigners.
1196.	Why not let a farm kid that wants to farm the land a chance? Figure out an economic balance to give someone a chance instead of foreign investors coming in and upping the price. In our area where I am from, we already deal with Hutterite colonies, a doctor that gets a local farmer to farm his land, and other bigger farming operations coming into farm land. Some of those bigger operations do not even support local. Will having foreign ownership change the ways of agriculture? To an extent yes; technology and times are changing within agriculture. People get greedy and that becomes overrated for a young farmer. Growing up with a passion of agriculture, learning to seed, bale, combine...you name it. Why not keep it within our own province and promote our own ownership of our valuable land?
1197.	I don't think it's right for the younger generation to have to pay more for land to carry on their tradition of family farming and paying that money to a foreign investor
1198.	Canadian residents only
1199.	Saskatchewan was built on many people coming together and uniting. This has created a pride and understanding of the love of this land and the hard work, sweat, tears and blood people have put into it. I feel that allowing large corporations to buy land will take away from the generations that have been bred and raised in a farming community. This will allow big companies to get bigger and wipe out the small guys that this province was built on. You need a good foundation to hold a building up and the same goes for this province.
1200.	The Saudi Arabians already have ownership of the Cwb if the own the grain producing land what feeds Canadians
1201.	It seems to be working quite well in BC and Ontario, and the farmers still seem to be doing OK.
1202.	Look at Africa and China not working
1203.	I believe that the current rules are already more broad than they should be. It would be a colossal mistake to allow foreign ownership.
1204.	Highly disagree.
1205.	I think farmland should stay in the hands of the farmers
1206.	Keep the foreign investors out of Canada
1207.	Land needs to be owned by those who are willing to be part of a community, to spend their dollars in that community and to work together to improve life in that community.
1208.	We would end up losing control of a very important primary industry to outside forces.
1209.	Promoting absentee land owners means that local (rural) communities would diminish in strength. There would be fewer resources for local infrastructure, schools, quality of services and there would be a significant movement of population from rural communities to large urban centres. The quality of life and fabric what makes Saskatchewan residents to be proud

	of their province would diminish
1210.	Foreign ownership is not good for Saskatchewan farmers
1211.	This would drive up the average price of a quarter section even higher and make land purchase even more impossible for young local farmers and ranchers

10) Would you support allowing a Canadian-controlled corporation with a minority share of foreign ownership...?

#	Response
1.	Must have limits.
2.	Hard enough competing with farms over 20,000 acres in size, land investors from Canada, and heaven forbid pension boards, I would never be able to farm and would have to end up selling what land we do have to them. That's a lose lose right there.
3.	This would just be a loophole for foreign corporations to buy up land.
4.	Depending on the definition of citizen ownership - if the majority of shares are owned by a company that is registered in Canada but is owned by foreigners then no.
5.	This would be a gray area for me, "minority share" could be 49%, and "Canadian-controlled" could be some investor in Vancouver or Toronto. I believe the owner controls the land, and that it is best for Saskatchewan to maintain that control within the province, if at all possible.
6.	No. Foreigners.
7.	I don't trust these minority stakes -- can be very tricky to monitor this. I view Saskatchewan farmland (and all Canadian farmland) as a strategic Canadian asset for Canadians, not foreigners!
9.	Absolutely not.
10.	This would be exploited by the foreign investors, who would find loopholes that would take decades to close. And don't say there won't be loopholes there always are loopholes.
11.	The same applies, keep farmland ownership with farmers
12.	Would create a generation of tenant farmers and would impact rural communities drastically.
13.	corporations are only interested in farmland as an investment, this has no benefit to farmers
14.	farmland should be owned by those who live and work on the land
15.	Sask land, sask farmer owned and operated.
16.	This will would serve as a loophole for foreign investors. This should not be allowed.
17.	why I think we sold off too much of Saskatchewan
18.	This will make farmland in Saskatchewan inaccessible to Saskatchewan residents and destroy the future of the "agricultural industry" - which is much more than an industry despite the modern prevailing agribusiness approach to farming the Canadian Prairies.

19.	Again, this would be for-profit only. If you want to farm in Saskatchewan, live here and contribute.
20.	It does not matter who owns the land. The asset will be farmed under any scenario.
21.	All the reasons as above. You need farmland priced so young farmers can buy or rent. They need to raise their kids on the farm so we have a real source of farm employees. No one can work like a farm kid. Taking Indians off reserve or city kids and sending them to farming school is NEVER gonna cut it. We see it on the corporate farms and Indian farms around us. Why do you think One Earth etc went broke.....
22.	This is simply a way of manipulating foreign take over.... even in small amounts
24.	In very few select cases it is probably too allow a small amount of foreign investment too raise the necessary capital, as long as it is majority Canadian owned and not 51 49 I'm talking 80 20
25.	Saskatchewan farmland ownership should remain with Saskatchewan owners (with Sask. owners preferred over Canadian owners somehow).
26.	This is currently happening with Orientals, non voting shareholders, not GOOD
27.	Never. What is shown on paper for Minority share may not show Silent foreign ownership partnerships, or shell companies funneling in money and being used to buy up land under the Canadian Corporation, etc. etc. Canadian controlled corporations even with a minority share are more likely to be Factory Farm Corporations who are competing on a larger scale with the rest of the Farm Family or smaller Farm operations. They are dumping larger quantities of crop, essentially taking up container space, or elevator space or moving the crop out of province into another province to undermine the market there.
28.	Read previous portion
29.	It is all the same. Farmers need to own farmland.
30.	Depends on what their intent was with the land.
31.	Better this than foreign ! But problem arises that these corporations farm large and by paper and paper doesn't work with so called experts telling them what to do it just don't work no practically in their farms ! Everything can look good on paper!
32.	Why should they just be able to walk in and buy our farm land! Buy our grain not our land!
33.	Any foreign ownership, however small is bad. They will find loopholes is my fear.
34.	Under legislative oversight to ensure decisions made by Canadians for Canadians
35.	the way land is controlled today is fair
36.	Minority share could become majority share at any time.
37.	Farmland should be left for the residents here not foreign investors
38.	It's the same thing
39.	It makes me uncomfortable to think of this. Let the families farm. Its a lifestyle. No different than a SK reserve who wants to govern their own land. Leave the farmers the farm land. Let

	foreigners purchase land that is of no use to agriculture
40.	Headquarters, management? Need to be Canadian.
41.	what's the difference? The issue is simple regardless if the ownership is a Canadian Co or not the fact remains that ownership is relinquished away from the families that built their communities in the first place.
42.	Corporations futures are not certain. Buyouts by foreign owned companies are possible. Don't fix what isn't broken.
43.	From what I understand, this has worked successfully in Alberta for a long time.
44.	My personal experience is that this approach is a mere veil of foreign ownership and is a means by which foreign ownership is "excepted" and "accepted."
45.	It comes back to the fact that the owner needs to have a tie to the land, other than just an arms-length investment with no real connection. People are living on this land, and trying to make a living off this land. Why would we want to give control to a corporation that is concerned only with profits, when land ownership entails so much more than that.
46.	You really don't want to hear this response
47.	An investor is an investor. They are not welcome in our community
48.	Still foreign ownership.
49.	As long as the owners are under Canadian laws who cares?
50.	we have so many farmers trying to grow, why would we destroy our local ownership in favor of foreign ownership that will in the long run take the profit away from our communities?
51.	Farmland need to remain a simple means to feed people. Not a means for corporations to enhance their bottom line.
52.	Lots of tricks could be played with this situation to hide the actual owners or money source.
53.	No I do not because the main reason in many cases that their is even a minority Canadian business involved is to get around the land ownership law in the first place
54.	If you are talking about a family farm corporation, ok. But if you are talking about Husky Oil, or an investment company, no.
55.	Saskatchewan farmland should be owned by Saskatchewan people period. I believe there is already some foreign money somehow being filtered through some of the huge farms in Saskatchewan. I was also informed of people from Saudi Arabia approaching farmers in eastern Saskatchewan about purchasing there farms but somehow getting around the paperwork and having them "manage" the operations.
56.	It would be a loophole that would quickly be exploited to the detriment of the provincial economy.
57.	Farmland should be owned and operated by the people who own them not by a corporation trying to increase their profit for shareholders
58.	I want to see farmers own land, definitely not disinterested corporations.

59.	How long would it be a minority, before they would own majority?
60.	While I have no issue with this concept, my concern would lie with the stewardship of the land owned by individuals/corporations/trusts/investors outside of the province.
61.	I have concerns about corporate farms - I think the owner operator or lessee operator with an interest in productivity best supports the broader farm economy.
62.	That would open the door to foreign investment sooner than later.
63.	Allowing a little opens the door to people finding ways around it. One family member owns this section, another owns the next and so on. Now you have a group of people controlling an area.
64.	That would just make to problem worse. High land prices does not benefit Saskatchewan farmers who don't own the land.
65.	A minority share of foreign ownership could still be 49%, which is pretty significant.
66.	That's just a loophole
68.	Free market always will be the most sustainable long term.
69.	As long as we have some control on Foreign ownership it will be beneficial
70.	with appropriate restrictions to prevent back-door ownership
73.	Corporate interests are their own. Why do we need to sell our land for someone else to make a profit?
75.	Keep foreign investment limited. we are stopping a new generation of farmers and us old guys are going to need them to take over
76.	The minority share would have to be less that 49% though- perhaps 33% maximum.
77.	The price that they will pay is not tied to the amount of money that the land will produce.
78.	no foreign ownership at all!!
79.	No!
81.	Outside the industry money will distort the marketplace.
82.	No foreign ownership.
83.	This would basically be manipulated into the same thing as foreign investment at free will
84.	Same as above. These corporations are not citizens the way regular people are. They only want to make money off the land, they are not part of our society as citizens, residents, community-members. They will be able to out-bid real people and shift our farmland to a situation of serfdom. This option should not be on the table at all!
85.	Again, It depends on any new rules that the government puts forward
86.	The big companies sold out... now there are very few fully controlled Canadian corporations running big business... don't do this to farming as well.
87.	100% Canadian or not at all

88.	I'd be concerned this simply presents a loophole or an angle for foreign ownership.
89.	Define foreign ownership. Sask Pension and Teachers Pension plan get labelled foreign in FSB rules as some of the parties are outside Canada after retirement.
90.	Corporations should not be allowed to own land unless the shareholders physically farm it, in person.
91.	Once the door is open it is only a matter of time until it is opened completely. First it is a minority share next will be a majority share. Once this happens the Saskatchewan government will lose control of the agriculture industry in this province. Foreigners will determine what is produced in this province.
92.	Once again short term gain at a cost to future generations
93.	Again, this is a misleading question. Is this an investment corporation? Is it a large farming operation? The land is meant to be farmed. You need to make it possible for that to happen.
94.	I believe this is even more palatable than the option noted above.
95.	How would you assure the minority remains the minority?????
96.	keep what we have.
97.	I have no information regarding how or why so I can't say yes or no
98.	Depends what percent minority the foreign ownership controls and if that share could increase and the corporation could still own land.
99.	What happens if the Canadian-controlled corporation suddenly changes its structure and has a larger share of foreign ownership? Who is going to keep an eye on that? It is full of logistical problems.
100.	A Canadian controlled company answers to shareholders, not the majority of people in this province whom they impact.
101.	Canadian owned corporation with minority shares maybe. But not just Canadian "controlled" corporation.
102.	Still opens the door for foreign investors ownership of our land resources.
104.	It would totally depend on the role of the minority shareholder. Money is power and even though they may have a minority of shares, if they are bankrolling things, they will have majority of the say.
105.	If this is the only option, I would answer no.
106.	Other than farming community how do individual farms compete with anything that has several investors paying more than market value just to attain land
107.	Canadian controlled
108.	I'd probably like to spend a reasonable amount of time overseas somewhere warm one day, but if I did successfully get my dream operation going it would be nice to hang onto it or help my kids or successors operate it successfully as well.
109.	It is still a siphon of annual dollars out of the province and SCIC would be sending some of

	those dollars in years of poor/insufficient crops.
110.	If land and rental prices decline they will take a hit the same as anyone else and at some point depending on circumstances that same land may come back on the market at a loss.
111.	Only Saskatchewan farmers should own and control the land
112.	mmm
113.	Of course.
114.	open market
116.	I cant go to China and own farm land why should they get to own all of ours
117.	Get the Canadian Gov out of farm land ownership.
118.	Sask should be open for business.
119.	do you mean a corporate farm? If you don't mean a corporate farm I'll repeat my previous answer, NO!! and no more number companies on RM maps.
120.	I feel that any foreign ownership allows decisions about food supply to be made outside of Canada.
121.	Keep it in Canada at least!
122.	Let the market decide if it's a good investment.
123.	Whatever way to keep supply moving. Is there more or less risk in this type of ownership, I'm not sure.
124.	Should have to be a Canadian resident living in Canada to be able to purchase or lease land. Also it should be left up to the actual farmers farming the land. Not big corporations only looking to make big money with no care for the local people.
125.	If it was strictly for investment purposes and there were no benefits to the local economy I likely would not support this type of arrangement.
126.	As long as the control of the company is Canadian based, it puts some of the major risks at bay.
127.	Yes. This scenario can create additional wealth for the province through access to additional investment dollars
129.	I believe foreign ownership would be a detriment as once they r in they would just buy out the Canadian control and down hill from there.
130.	Likewise, corporations have little incentive to practice good husbandry as they are solely interested in short term profits.
131.	Yes, as long as they are obligated to give away their farmland rights in the moment the foreign owners take over 51% of the company.
132.	still taking ownership away from SK people
133.	It's just another form of dilution.
134.	No to foreign corporations.

135.	Why? It is our business and now the government is riming us out of a job!
136.	Again we can't buy any land
137.	A farmer will always buy land available to their own.
138.	There are enough farm kids wanting to farm- if only they could afford to do so...
140.	This would be a very dangerous road to go down as it is subject to abuse. Ownership can be hidden and misstated. Any Canadian-controlled corporation that is allowed to buy Saskatchewan farmland must be 100% owned by Canadians and preferably Saskatchewan residents.
141.	No because they already control most of agribusiness. Can't let them control the whole food supply chain
142.	It's to hard to figure out if these companies are actually Canadian owed or not? Most are not if you can actually figure it out? And why should we need to have that hassle?
143.	We have enough people disguised as Canadian corporations that are like the Wal Marts of the world!!
144.	Any corporation can defeat single farmers probability for purchase
145.	Keep all foreigners out! A foot in the door likely leads to the opening of the door!
146.	Want land ownership by Saskatchewan people. The amount of money generated by farming would remain the same if owned by foreigners but the profits could go to a corporation or a different country. Keep it in Saskatchewan.
147.	This would allow foreign investors to get around the ownership rules.
148.	Minority does not control the operations.
149.	It's a terrible idea on so many levels. Keep sask dollars in sask. And keep sask farmers owning the land and our province will continue to prosper, as it has since 1906
150.	All shareholders must live in Canada
151.	Same: the only way farming works is if u love it, actually know how to do it, and have enough invested in it to hang in there!!!! This is no no brainer profession! This is big business at its best! West jet has proven this! Ask them if u can't figure it out!
152.	this would become a loop hole where foreign owners would be in a number of corporations with no real personal responsibility
153.	Absolutely. This would allow investors to select good operators and co-invest with them in farm land and in the operation.
154.	The pension plan of Ontario can stay in Ontario. Why are they buying land out here
155.	The influence from foreigners could be very detrimental to Canadians and the culture we are developing.
156.	I see this more as an opportunity for a Cdn controlled corp. to access financing to be competitive in acquiring land.

157.	That's just the first step to majority ownership by a foreign entity.
158.	Farmland should be owned and farmed by farmers. Not corporate entities. Our forefathers left their homeland to come to Canada because they could own their own land. Not be peasants working under "barons" and "lords" for the food on their table and nothing else. They fled the type of system that is being created today. We do not want to go back to that system. My grandparents were allowed to stay in a grainery shack and have the small potatoes that fell off the wagon for food. All this for 16 hours hard labour a day. Worse than most prisons today. That's what they went away from. Farmers have the right to make a living from their hard work. Not give it away to greedy corporate companies or foreign owners.
159.	No Ag focus
160.	this is where the checks and balances could be dictated in support of local farming.
161.	Corporations are not farmers. Farmers care about much more than shareholder profits and are the best stewards of the land.
162.	Saskatchewan residents only!
163.	leave our Saskatchewan farmers alone!!!!
164.	that's not crazy it down right stupid
165.	The person who owns the land and farms it himself will be more productive.
166.	Companies should not be allowed to make money off land that produces food and in turn raises the cost to purchase land for farmers.
167.	No, I believe that farmland is a valuable asset and that we should only allow Canadian investment. I also think that allowing any amount of outside investment hurts rural Saskatchewan.
168.	This will kill the family farm and foreigners will find the loopholes to take over our land.
169.	Allowing Canadian-controlled corporations with minority share of foreign ownership to purchase farmland reduces local control
170.	This would also contribute to the problem.
171.	Farmland should not be owned by corporations, it should only be owned by Saskatchewan farmers.
173.	Too much power relative to local owners. People doing this are out to profit not farm.
174.	open province
175.	Not hugely different than just letting them invest directly.
176.	Harder to moderate /control the amount of the foreign investment. Drives up prices also.
177.	Land should be owned by the farmers.
178.	Don't open the door one little bit.
179.	Take a close look at the Canadian debt. Governments make the poorest managers of all people.

180.	Keep things straight forward. Easier to monitor.
181.	A minority share of foreign ownership doesn't mean that they won't put up unlimited capital to buy land.
182.	Open Market increases values which increases economic impact in and outside the ag industry.
183.	There should be no corporate farming whatsoever
184.	The current practice is very unfair for retired farmers.
185.	What's the big deal.
186.	Canadian majority is good.
188.	Again, when excess money needs to find a home, land prices get unrealistically inflated. Commodity prices for crops can't justify the land values, but Investment managers can and do justify it. So not a level playing field.
189.	Foreign is taken to be 'non-Canadian'.
190.	Depending on the terms of purchase and ownership, I don't think these buyers are a threat.
191.	Canadian controlled funds or companies should be able to purchase farmland anywhere in Canada, as long as they remain controlled by Canadian interests it should be allowed.
192.	We need to keep farmland Canadian owned. If you want our land, come and live here and become a Canadian citizen.
193.	NO. All Canadian Or nothing. NO MORE.
194.	completely and entirely unacceptable.
195.	it's just a way to find a loophole
196.	See above. Don't even start. There are always loopholes for people to wiggle their way in to our valuable assets.
197.	What's the big deal about a minority share of foreign ownership? To repeat, what is the big hurry to "sell Canada out"....
198.	I believe there's already foreign money coming in to buy land for Canadian citizens.
199.	No way.
200.	slippery slope
201.	No agri business allowed to own farmland and compete against farmers.
202.	Ownership in company can change, easily, and foreign ownership can shift from minority to majority in a year or two.
203.	It is all good investment
204.	I don't want to sell off Saskatchewan.
205.	There is to much manipulation and fraud in our society now without greater exposure and opportunity by foreigners

206.	Why do they need to own the land? A farmer will be a good custodian of the land they own through the ups and downs of commodity cycles outside corps will not. The land is the most important asset a farmer has.
208.	Same
209.	what's the difference
210.	No these firms will find ways to get around the rules in place
211.	That's what's being done now. I've talked and dealt w the CEO of in Regina. He was straight-forward about how the process worked, a Canadian figure-head is put in place to get around the rules, and Chinese investors view the land and put out the cash. I didn't like it, but because it was an estate sale I needed the land sold quickly to finalize.
214.	That allows foreign investment that is hard to control
215.	It's my farm my choice.
216.	How long will the control last???
217.	Giant corps have the ability to skirt the rules, walk through walls and over people.
218.	This will only be exploited by accountants to get foreign control through. The CRA fights this all the time.
219.	I do not believe in farmland ownership by someone who is not related to the current or past farmer of the land
220.	This makes it easier for minority shares to be picked up as corporations are bought and traded for 1 company to potentially amass a large piece of Saskatchewan farmland
221.	Perhaps with limits and restrictions on the amount of the minority share, I may have said yes.
223.	Why not are we not an free market
224.	I think it is too difficult to control or accurately monitor/police a scenario that allows any foreign ownership.
225.	It is too easy to manipulate a balance sheet as to who the real owners are or where in fact the investment capital comes from
226.	Always loopholes. And who will police and traffic such grey areas?? Such rulings invite corruption, it human weakness.
228.	Depends how minor the share is. 49% is minor but unacceptable. 5% I might consider.
229.	Foreign ownership no!! is this country up for sale? government has to get control before it is to late.
230.	Dependent on what type of foreign ownership and where from.
231.	We don't want any foreign ownership, just Canadian farmers living off their land and living within prosperous communities.
232.	what are there goals

233.	Yes CCPC's I agree can own land these private corporations have a big impact on the agriculture industry and often have similar goals to Canadian people.
234.	Again it would take the ownership away from Saskatchewan farmers.
235.	Canadian corporations have lots of other options to invest in that have a better rate of return. Buy oil or gold stocks and go for a ride.
236.	That's still foreign. Why should they reap the benefits before us?
237.	the tradition of sask. will be gone ,why follow other prov.
238.	Only if the rules stated that the Canadian corporation could never be purchased by foreign owners down the road.
239.	No-one can be held responsible due to limited liability.
240.	It allows companies to get around the rules.
241.	The practise will be misused.
242.	Sask farmland Saskatchewan ownership!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
243.	Zero foreign ownership is my Saskatchewan.
245.	Have lack of faith in those who don't farm currently or come from a farm background. I have seen too many corporate entities who are all investors try to farm and fail miserably.
246.	if allowed a little bit it will never stop
247.	That is the same different story
248.	Foreign profits will be sask losses.
249.	The size and track record of the company would play a factor.
250.	Very tough to regulate.
251.	Foreign money is not the answer
252.	Controlled in Canada by Canadians. No problem
253.	Same as above they are only interested in growing their money and they will spend their profits in the larger cities where they live
255.	no one can guarantee the continued ownership of that corporation, therefore the % of land held by foreign hands
256.	Too much uncertainty in this scenario. What happens if this Canadian-control corporation is sold to a foreign interest???
257.	No big corporation should own land. Example to what happened to one earth farms and the corporate farm by Regina who lost all there money and couldn't manage what they were doing.
258.	Ownership levels can change and it is a mask to majority foreign ownership.
259.	If you rock the boat you will sink

260.	Majority of Canadian is ok by me.
261.	not healthy in any shape or form
262.	No the end result is the same for rural sask .
263.	sask farm families first
264.	I am 26 years old, and trying to make a living grain farming. I bought my first quarter off my grandfather, I am looking to buy another at the end of the year. the land prices in this province are so inflated it sickens me. my land is in RM , where the going price for a section (640 acres) of land is in excess of 1.2 million. I ask the sask party how am I to make a living with land payments at that price? the sask party is killing the small family operated farms one by one. When I approach the old couples in my area to inquire about purchasing land they all tell me the same thing why do you want to get into farm? there is no money to be made, and you cant pay top dollar like the potash companies nor the out of country buyers. why would you take ownership away from the ones working the land I feel you guys want to make us serfs. these companies or out of country owners don't care for the land nor do guys that lease the land, people who own and live on the land are the best for the stewardship of the land, they care for it, how cant you see this? the sask party needs to look to Europe and learn how there farming operations are where the little guys are supported and encouraged. these family operated farms in sask that are 10000+ acres are not a family farm they are corporations. also I am an electrician I work 21days straight, this job alone is over six figures. I would give it up in a heart beat to be on the land 24/7, but unfortunately I don't see this ever happening with land prices like this. I would love to hear back from a sask party, <i>(Email address removed)</i>
265.	I don't think large corporations should own farmland
266.	Regulations
267.	I see no difference, Chinese, British or Canadian, as to their negative effect on Saskatchewan farmers.
268.	How can a small farmer compete with a government company
269.	No because foreign ownership is still foreign ownership
270.	Land should only be owned in Saskatchewan by Saskatchewan people!
271.	too difficult to manage the "foreign ownership" minority share. (I agree with your comment below re: "The Saskatchewan Farm Land Security Board has faced challenges in the past ensuring that purchasers are compliant with the regulations."
272.	Farmers profits are low enough the way it is!
274.	Recent big corporate activities have been less than resoundingly successful... And they can leave a mess of unsecured creditors behind them.
275.	As in the previous question
276.	The important asset for a farmer to own in order to ensure their long-term success is not equipment, not a lease, but title to the land they farm.
279.	Saskatchewan Based FARMERS are the only ones who should be allowed to own farm land!!

280.	No, I want to be able to buy land, so I can have a farm with healthy growth, so I can do my part to keep rural Saskatchewan alive. When having lunch at the local cafe, I don't see outside investors patronizing the place, not even minority ones.
281.	Once again I do not see the need or benefit to Saskatchewan and its people, and there are far too many loopholes that can be exploited by using a corp as a shield to inquiry. IE. we will never know the ownership of the corp if they do not wish to show the board or Government.
282.	Keep away any foreign investors in any way shape and form and even canadian investors who are trying to make a dollar at the expense of saskatchewan farmers
283.	No more broadacres, we don't need corporate farming in that aspect.
284.	Same as above Corporations sell to others when the money is right or they need out
288.	but they must have someone living on each two sections of land they own.
289.	No , because even if it is a Canadian owned company with a little bit of for
290.	let foreign owners buy land in their own countries.
291.	Depending on there goals.
292.	Corporations can be taken over by foreign ownership at any time unless rules are in place to prevent foreign takeover. If the rules are not clear then it becomes the job of the government to pick winners and losers and that is rarely done fairly and honestly.
293.	No. No. No.
294.	But I would allow sask corporations
295.	When Farmers own there land they do a better job of making it pay
296.	Corporations are more interested in profits than in farmers' livelihoods or the sustainability of agriculture in Saskatchewan. In fact, these things may be in direct conflict with each other.
297.	What's to stop large corporations from buying up all the land and driving out the smaller farmers?
298.	Foreign money should not be able to own Canadian/Saskatchewan farmland.
299.	What more do you need to know? The answer is NO! End of story. Foreign investors have no place in owning property in our province or country. If money is to be made off the land than WE as farmers and residents should be making it for ourselves NOT for others
300.	I think it is too easy to circumvent laws. For instance, the same foreign entity could have minority interest in an unlimited number of Canadian-controlled corporations and thereby control a substantial amount of Saskatchewan farmland.
301.	If you think the "Canadian-controlled" corporations don't have a minority share or majority share of foreign ownership right now your sadly mistaken. Their is no follow up to where the cash is coming from or who owns it other than to look at the name on the land titles registry. has stated this is true. All you need is a Canadian or Saskatchewan front man and you own as much land as you want.
302.	Bad experience with corporate farms. RMs are saddled with controlling weeds and cant always

	find owners. We have some land in our rm and neighboring rm that still have crop out from last year. We dont need anymore corporate farms who dont care about the land and only their bank accounts.
303.	That is easy ,Canadian controlled should be allowed now
304.	Not needed
305.	There is now no room for a small farmer. Big business is the game. Buy and rent or lease to big farm sectors.
306.	If there is going to be corporate controlled farmland it should at least be controlled by 100% Canadian corporations.
307.	Too hard to police
308.	Corporations pay less taxes due to bad governments.
309.	Don't sell out any more of my Saskatchewan
310.	in reality the money will control the business; therefore foreign money will control how things are done
311.	It's the thin edge of the wedge. No foreign ownership, no investment group or pension fund ownership of SK farmland. Not now, not ever (if we regain any form of common sense).
312.	This has happened before with initial minority shares which grew into majority control - and the rest is history.
313.	Now we are talking commodities and corporations. What would be the call letters on the stock exchange? Would the board rooms be on the fifth floor of the bank building? (to maintain control) Would common shares be available? Would the mechanic who fixes the machinery to till the land be able to invest? Would that person be eligible to attend the "annual" meeting? Should he/ she expect dividends the first year? Without enough information -- I could not hazard a guess about what I would be supporting.
314.	It depends on the corporation what the nature of their business is and also the intended use of the land
316.	Foreign investors can invest in operations at all levels for a profit. Lease agreements are an option not yet proposed.
317.	Saskatchewan farmers should farm saskatchewan land.
319.	That is just a shell corporation - profits leaving the country and benefiting the few
320.	As a farmer how would we compete with that in terms of purchasing land to progress our business. What would a corporation like that bring to the local community?
321.	If federal laws around corporations were to ever change, then the minority foreign ownership in a CCPC could become majority owner and thereby earning a "back-door" ownership in Sask

	<p>farmland.</p> <p>Ownership of Sask farmland MUST remain within Canada.</p>
322.	Again, it creates an unfair advantage and virtually eliminates local farmers the opportunity to purchase land.
323.	HOW WOULD YOU CONTROL THE AMOUNT AND VALUE OF FOREIGN INPUT IN PRESENT OR FUTURE
325.	The percentage of foreign ownership can change in an instant. Look what happened to Canadian icon Tim Horton's.
326.	The land needs an owner what's the concern about who owns it?
327.	still means outside money is coming in and competing against locals.
328.	Farmers who actually farm the land should own it.
329.	This is just a way to bend the rules to get foreign investment into our farmland.
330.	100% Canadian or nothing all at. Once you start down that path of a little there will always be a push for a less % of the company being Canadian.
331.	Would have to have a limit on how much being purchased in one area
332.	You can't guarantee that the corporation will remain Canadian controlled.
333.	My original answer was yes, but it seems that this would leave to many opportunities (or loops holes) for foreign investment.
334.	Land is a Canadian resource it would be foolhardy to lose control of it. What's next - water!
335.	As long as this corporation is actually doing the farming, and is not just an investment firm
336.	Same concerns as previous section.
338.	no corporations should own farmland
339.	Anyone should be allowed to purchase a Farmland if it will be used and maximize.
340.	If Canadian can fully control that corporation, I think it can't entail serious problem.
341.	For the same reason as above, it has the ability to help some younger farmers get into the business. However we need to have a level playing field whereby we treat all on a similar basis. Not like the CPP buyout which is totally bias, and which has caused a lot of concern
342.	Not before Saskatchewan farm families have a chance at owning the land first. It's a different scenario if the company is looking to purchase the land for oil exploration or industry to provide jobs to Saskatchewan residents. But for buying farmland to simply farm it and outbid local buyers just because, that's not on.
343.	It still is a negative impact that will drive up prices and destroy the family farm.
345.	Foreign ownership will lead to valuable tax dollars lost. Many of these groups by large amounts of land and prefer to deal with as few individuals as possible, resulting in less people living in rural areas, therefore less residents paying income tax. If these investors live outside of Saskatchewan, there is more tax dollars being funneled out of the province. Foreign

	ownership also does not support the communities in the area the same as family farms do, especially if you consider the decrease population of rural residents that would occur. This would result in even more individuals and business tax dollars disappearing. Not to mention the pressure it puts on families and individuals to purchase land that they will farm themselves.
346.	Strongly disagree, see previous response.
348.	Land should not be a commodity traded on a market and bought and sold by huge investment corporations. Treating land like a commodity is exactly the problem.
349.	Again, there values do not protect the land.
350.	Just farmer should own farm land
351.	As long as our laws stated that the only a minority share ownership by foreigners was allowed. If foreigners ever got majority share, they should have to divest ownership of the land within a certain time. That way, if a time limit is put on, they would have to accept a reasonable and market based price.
352.	No Absolutely not.
353.	It would need limits to the % share.
355.	Keep Canadians in control, we are tired of all the foreign politics that some way always corrupt our legal system!
356.	I think that this would just encourage novel legal structures to bypass this requirement and allow greater than 50% ownership by foreigners.
358.	foreign money takes the profits out of the province.
359.	Again for previous reasons explained. Would be happy to discuss this further in person if you call or invite me to a meeting on the topic. See contact information at the end of the survey.
360.	thin edge of the wedge
361.	If minority meant less than 5%, then maybe. But this 49% plus back door setups to actually make it higher than that, that's a risk. Overall, I am fine with foreign investment but land to me (the basis of food supply) is in a different bucket.
362.	Why would I want corporate farms with no interest in anything other than profit? Corporations are not good environmental stewards of the land and don't give a about helping their neighbors.
363.	I believe in "Saskatchewan farmland for Saskatchewan people". And I don't believe ANY corporations should own Saskatchewan farmland.
364.	corporation are more worried about increasing member share value than the land.
365.	Foreign ownership is the ultimate combination of removing profits from the local economy while making it impossible to enter or grow a farming operation.
366.	I do not trust that the footwork to review the foreign ownership portions would be done properly of for a long term.
367.	Maybe ten percent as this may be seen as a way for farmers to access funding to grow their farms. A question is a foreign bank such as the Netherlands with a mortgage an owner if the

	client defaults.
368.	As long as the foreign ownership is not managing the farm it is o.k.
369.	The owner should be the operator solely, to maintain continuity of management and commitment to long term operation of the farm unit.
372.	We don't need or want foreign ownership of farmland.
373.	Lots of other corporations own many different types of assets in Canada. Additional investment would be good for Canada. Perhaps corporations with a focus on further production up the value chain would change the nature of our exports and create additional jobs for Canadians.
374.	Same scenario as foreign ownership
375.	Lets give our youth an opportunity. Sometimes its not all about the money, its about taking pride in what you love to do. Big Corporations are about money.
376.	again it should only be canadians that can own farmland.
377.	I would be concerned that it would be the thin edge of the wedge and would be manipulated.
378.	i dont trust the government to properly "control" it with a minority share. The land should be in farmers hands not the governments.
379.	Too many loopholes here. Canadian "control" means very little to the actual farming practices or where the money is coming from. He who has the money will dictate how the land is farmed.
380.	Keep it Canadian
381.	land is a valuable resource. it should be owned by Canadians only
382.	corporations buy out one another
383.	Allow everyone to own land unless government controlled (such as china)
384.	they live in Canada and can be held accountable under Canadian law without extra red tape.
385.	it is impossible to have enough investment without some foreign money
386.	the amount is restricted
387.	We already have this in some form I believe Maxcrop is a Canadian Co. that is backed by foreign money. I met with and another individual 6 years ago and at that time was told of their group having in excess of 100 million dollars to invest in Saskatchewan farm land and their plans of shipping all the production from their land to China.
388.	open to abuse
389.	Why? Enough immigration and foreign investments! How about we become a self-sustaining country and let Canadians and Saskatchewan people have those Opportunities.
390.	How do you know where the capital is coming from in situation like that??
392.	Same reason - it is just impossible for the younger generation to compete against any of these corporations.

393.	as long as if the ownership structure changes the land has to be put back into Canadian hands and not foreign
394.	Foreign ownership would drive prices up and ensure that land would NOT be affordable for the average Saskatchewan farmer or anyone who may want to farm. The regulations surrounding foreign companies would be too difficult to enforce, as we currently now see in the oil and gas industry, where most facilities are out of compliance and the government cannot enforce and the public is suffering. The same would happen with the farmers and land rules.
395.	Saskatchewan farmers should be the only ones who own farm land.
397.	If a minority share of foreign ownership was allowed, the minority share should be small and defined (i.e. not more than 20%, rather than up to 49%), and the corporation should be required to file a statement of ownership annually. The government would need to ensure adequate staff to check these statements, with periodic audit for accuracy.
398.	see above. I do not want foreign states or global companies to be able to take over our land. (Which includes the benefits of our water as well - perhaps a more important asset, given global warming.)
399.	We allow Canadian-controlled corporations with a minority share of foreign ownership do most everything else here.
400.	I am not interested in taking risks in any option that might open the door to having foreign interests influence land use policy etc. We have enough influence from outside the province from corporations; land ownership, even if initially just a minority share, will likely open the door to a majority share (eventually), and then policy will follow.
401.	Financial capital should not be the determinant of value of farm land nor the control of access through rents. Investment with direct involvement and living in the province.
402.	Profits going out of country
403.	another loophole with no enforcement
404.	We need to maintain Canadian ownership of land in our province. It is a resource that we are blessed with and we should not take a chance of losing it.
406.	There should be a limit but as long as it is CDN controlled.
407.	Canada is for Canadians.
408.	that's just another way to get around rules..
409.	How many Century farm families are there in Saskatchewan? The numbers are not increasing in comparison to outside owners and investors.
410.	Again it turns land into a commodity and isn't in the best interest of caring for the land long term
411.	If its not truly Canadian it's not Canadian
413.	Money talks. If you sold to the neighbour and two years latter he could make more money do you think he would return the profit.

414.	like the CWB?????....not likely
415.	It is really about the control and direction from Canadians that should Ag Policies not necessarily heavily influenced by foreign owners.
416.	Retention of control remains in Canada
417.	All investors welcome - even the fellow Americans with they're buck at \$1.27 cdn!
418.	Decisions made by shareholders are not as "land friendly" as those made by the farmer who owns the land.
419.	This promotes an unequal playing field for us farmers.
420.	No foreign ownership at all
421.	People who are active farmers are the only people who should be able to purchase the land and they should farm it themselves.
422.	This would represent a mechanism to circumvent the spirit of local ownership.
423.	But the total acres purchased must limited.
424.	Farmers not corporations should own farm land
425.	the government will not be able to properly enforce where the money came from to buy the farmland.
426.	Same not fair.
427.	they won't abide by the rules if a quick dollar is available.
428.	I see plans within plans.. Certainly a 'loaded question'.. Family-Ownership of farms is the way forward for a healthy economy, cheaper food, stable commodity prices, and fewer people unemployed and on the taxpayer's teat... Corporate ownership of farmlands will mean Robotic Farming, robust depletion of 'arability', and huge numbers of former Farm Families at the mercy of the welfare of the state..
429.	That would not be a problem.We don't worry about it in any other business.
430.	If Canadian-controlled corporations want to own SK farmland they should only be able to purchase it with tax paid dollars, just like local SK residents.
431.	all the same
432.	There would be no guarantee that the percentage of foreign control could/would not change over time, hence Canadian control would be lost.
433.	land for sask farmers not foreigners
434.	no Canadians, Saskatchewan farmers no exceptions
435.	Open this up to a world of buyers
436.	Unless the corporation is controlled by someone who is grass roots Canadian Agriculture and possess values similar to those of traditional Saskatchewan farmers (perhaps willing to put a large amount of money back into helping the Ag Industry continue to thrive) I would not be in

	favour of this.
437.	Corporation ownership could change.
438.	Corporate farms don't work. (Broad acre, One Earth)
439.	Any loosening of the current rules would be a very slippery slope ultimately allowing foreign investors to control the Sask. Ag industry.
441.	I see this as a way for legal Canadian immigrant controlled corporations to sell shares to other foreign investors.
442.	canadian corporation can still be bought by foreigners... and corporations are about adding value to shareholders... not necessarily about feeding people and the population
443.	the province would lose control of this because a minority foreign share in a company could tun into a majority share
444.	It smart business in a world of international markets and operating within international trade agreements.
445.	If allowed this would grow into more foreign ownership. It would be difficult to track and monitor ownership and control of corporations.
446.	Land prices will still rise like crazy!
447.	Again, anyone who wants to invest in farmland should actually work the land. They will figure out the cost and large effort into farming. They will not live the lifestyle they have with a paying job!! Get that!!!! , who is a Saskatoon-based financial analyst should actually quit his job and work as a farmer. He would not know what to do and bet he could not support himself and his family. STOP listening to people who actually do not keep their feet on the ground.
448.	If the CPP was able to buy over 100,000 acres of Farmland, to diversify it's holdings, as well as protect its assets for the good of the pensioners past, present and future, why would legislation be built to stop that? A Canadian investor can buy farmland in the US, a Scottish farmer can buy land in Germany... why is this different?
449.	There is no economic reason to allow foreign ownership, majority or minority. The results are the same.
450.	same reason. We have seen several examples of this lately i.e. Broadacre. We do not need to many more disasters like this one.
451.	This is a slippery slope that becomes complex and soon out of control of the government as shares in companies change.
452.	Sounds to me that it's just a back door way of full ownership(open the door for rule bending)
453.	There is no net benefit to Saskatchewan
454.	Refer previous responses.
455.	Corporations will sacrifice the sustainability of farming for greedy short-term profits.
456.	If this was acceptable, foreign corporations would structure themselves to get around this loophole. It would be difficult to monitor if investment income would stay in Saskatchewan.

457.	Or limit the amount to less than the average farm size.
458.	no comment
459.	Same as above, allowing corporations to own large land holdings means that prices will rise
460.	Conflict of interest.
461.	Canadian corporations like other large corporations are large entities that make decisions that benefit the whole corporation and may not necessarily benefit the people of Saskatchewan.
462.	Farm gate revenue doesn't support fat cats
463.	That's just allowing ways for outside investors to still invest in land.
464.	While definitely seeming like the lesser of two evils, so to speak, corporation owned land is still corporation owned land.
466.	Again not people involved in the industry why should anyone believe a suit when it comes to knowing about dirt or grass
467.	No foreign ownership of land should be allowed. Again, land is the most important asset currently available. News today showed that an Australian billionaire just bought the largest cattle company in Australia. Billionaires don't become billionaires by making illogical decisions. Land ownership and food production are essential in the near future.
468.	it would all depend on that legislation and if there were loopholes that could be manipulated to get around said rules by challenging them in court. It happens all the time.
470.	Canadian land is for Canadian people.
471.	Saskatchewan based, Saskatchewan owned.
472.	Farmers should own the land. Corporations are just looking for fat pay cheques.
473.	The changes that have happened even since corporations have been allowed to purchase farm land has made it harder for the family farm to survive. Farming is about caring for the land and environment not corporate, capitalist ideology.
474.	The use of the land should be determined by the residents of the Sask. community.
475.	Foreign investors are using Canadian companies as a front that is what is driving land prices up
476.	decisions may become driven by short term return on investment rather than a long term view of what is best for the land, local communities and farmers
477.	Yes as long as it is used to benefit Saskatchewan farmers.
478.	Again, it depends on the percentage. Perhaps there should be a time limit on this. I do not feel that a corporation would look after the land and have limited stake if the condition of the land deteriorates.
479.	There is value in ownership by individuals who are descendants of those who worked very hard, cleared this land and continue to have the same high regard for ownership, value of this amazing land and want to continue to pass it down to our descendants.
480.	They provide another option for a seller. They are well managed. They do not compete with local farmers in that they do not drive up prices. They always rent the land to local farmers so it

	is a good opportunity for younger farmers looking for rented land.
481.	Would depend on type of corporation
482.	Things change and you are opening the door for deceit
483.	Canadian land should be Canadian. we are a rich develop[ed] country not a third world
485.	Why do corporations need to own land?? So they can suck out every dime possible out of the rural areas. They already have huge amounts of money. Why doesn't the government just take back all the land and pay us farmers to work for them????
486.	As long as we let foreign investment to purchase as much land as they want I really am not concerned about any corporation buying land. The main goal is to get higher land values.
487.	this would be a slippery slope for foreign controlled companies to wedge their way in
488.	serfs and peasants. Let Monsanto buy it all then and they can rule farmers from the ground up....LITERALLY
489.	again this is one way to open up farmland ownership but has to be considered carefully. such solution may be a reasonable one.
490.	I think it would help provide additional financing
491.	This is our back yard, we live here, we have to have the controlling say in what occurs in our back yard. When you get out of country ownership, they don't care about our local people or environment. All they are concerned about is how much money they can make.
492.	Profitable Canadian Corporations with minority foreign ownership have a way of being foreign controlled. Or taken over. Must be strictly Canadian owned and controlled. There is enough Canadian investors and money to maintain a good healthy balance and ownership of our land.
493.	kick them out
494.	read previous post
495.	I am a friend of Family size farms since These farms provide more Jobs and income and Support local life than Hugh farms that don` t Need many People.
497.	The price of land would be driven up beyond what local farmers could pay.
498.	No foreign ownership should be allowed
499.	Just because a company may be "Canadian-controlled" today...doesn't mean that it will be "Canadian-controlled" tomorrow the way companies are bought and sold these days.
500.	Canada is less than 3% of the global equity markets...we need more foreign investment to drive our businesses.
501.	Canadians and Saskatchewan residents need to retain ownership of the land.
502.	How long till they get bought out?
503.	Any corporation ownership will also kill the family farm as well as many small communities. Local farmers cannot compete financially with large corporations.
504.	It would be like the first small hole in the dike.

505.	Unless they are going to own equipment and farm the land and run the risks farming entails they have no business owning Saskatchewan farm land.
506.	Only farmers should own the land
507.	again the money leaves the community no ownership for the workers
509.	Farmland is always better managed and therefore more productive when it is locally owned and owner operated. Try to convince a hired manager to be out 24 hrs a day on a long weekend to get a crop in before it rains.
510.	Corporations, no matter what nationality, should not be allowed to own farmland as an investment.
511.	If they don't live and work here why should they be able to out bid me for land?
512.	All residential land and farmland in Canada should be owned by individuals resident in Canada, or in the case of farmland, CCPC's.
513.	The foreign investors will start small and will eventually take over a larger part.
514.	previously explained .they are investors and contribute zero to the local economy other than fuel , equipment and fertilizer. THESE large conglomerates do not support their local economies..they do not reside here , they do not support small retail , they do not attend community events.. They are takers and not givers .pure greed is what drives them
515.	should be owned by ranchers and farmers only who are sask residents only.
516.	If this is allowed require rules around the continued ownership of the land if ownership of the company changes.
517.	Definitely not! An inch is as good as a mile. Start allowing little bits of foreign ownership and the ones who want control of the land will inevitably get it. What happens in the scenario where the it starts minority share of foreign ownership, purchases land, then becomes majority share foreign ownership? Are they forced to sell? How can this be done? At what price and in what time limit? HOW WOULD THIS BE ENFORCED... IMPOSSIBLE!
518.	Too many loopholes and impossible to administrate and control. Policing this system is too expensive and the cost would put more of a strain on the current law abiding SK Agricultural producers.
519.	no comment
520.	For the most part, it will still be local farmers farming the majority of the land regardless of who owns it.
521.	Allowing this would just be a way of foreign ownership to own our land as the local would be silent as there would be no way of proving where the purchase money came from so example. Foreign person give me all the money to purchase large chunk of land I put my name as owner and get paid to do that and that's it. It's already happening !!!!!
522.	What happens when the minority shares become the majority? Things change all the time in these things. I don't really trust it.
523.	have a feeling that may be hard to regulate

524.	Farmland should be owned by either Saskatchewan residents, or by those working the land themselves.
525.	Canadian corporation = Rich Dukes using farmers as serfs
527.	If there is a change to the company structure and the foreign ownership is increased, then we are still allowing foreign ownership to control the land and will effect the local production, etc.
528.	Opens the door to the interpretation of foreign ownership, minority interest on paper doesn't often represent the substance of the relationship.
529.	All this would do is allow for a way to circumvent the spirit of the law. The devious and self-serving will exploit such a corporate structure as there then becomes an unending number of ways to exploit this.
530.	My neighbour's land was sold to a "Canadian" who was given loans to him from foreigners for millions of dollars to get around foreign ownership rules. It is just a trick.
531.	Im not convinced that cooperate farming is the answer. Mega farms want, need and expect to make a lot of money year in year out, and do whatever necessary to achieve these goals for investor. Very similar to large banks. Every quarter earnings are expected to increase. This is not the reality of farming in Saskatchewan and our government, of all organizations, shouldn't help these people to build mega farms.
532.	There is nothing to stop the foreign share to increase and control.
533.	So much of how I feel about corporate ownership of land hinges on the corporations stewardship policy/goals. Are they working with producers that lease their lands to ensure good stewardship of our natural resources? If so, then it is less relevant as to who owns the company and where they are located, in my opinion. But if it is a corporation only focused on income and profit to shareholders, with no stewardship policy, then I would be concerned.
534.	Like I said earlier a farmer who owns the land is generally more environmentally responsible and grows more grain which helps the province economically.
535.	I would prefer not.
536.	As stated above with regards to becoming a nation of peasants, but also why are we giving control of our food to foreign countries?
537.	Foreign ownership would increase prices and make land purchases very difficult for young farmers.
538.	If they became foreign controlled they would be required to dispose of the land owned in Sask.
539.	No this is simply a work around of the rules.
541.	Minority ownership is lip service ownership and a means for foreign entities to slip through loop holes.
542.	Too much grey area needs to be clean and dry cut
543.	yes, when compared to foreign ownership

544.	It's risky. I would say each case would have to be decided upon.
545.	Again no if you own farmland you should have to actively or have actively farmed the land.
546.	Corporations should not own land...people should own the land.
547.	That is just a roundabout way to the same thing.
548.	Any corporation that has employees will not take care of the land because it is not theirs and it will not be taken care of like it would if the owner actually worked for themselves.
549.	Refer to latter responses.
550.	Socialism does not work. The Saskatchewan land bank is a classic example. we do not need govt owning farmland!
551.	I'm proudly Canadian and am not all in on the idea of sharing with non-Canadians.
552.	Saskatchewan land should be owned by Saskatchewan residents, not Canadian corporations with non-Saskatchewan residents.
553.	No... we as Canadians can farm all the land we don't need help with that. To immigrate don't u need to provide a service that doesn't exist? should be the same with farmland. there are enough farmers to farm the land why do we need more?
555.	It's a slippery slope. Once foreign owners have an interest in Canadian land they will lobby for more. It's already hard to say no. I mean we are doing this survey right? If it wasn't a question, we wouldn't be talking about it. The laws were originally put in place to protect our land for us. The fact that we are doing consultations proves we don't understand that.
557.	These would be shell companies.
558.	Another corporation owning land. Another investor and I do not trust any or their motive which has nothing to do with the health of Sask., Agriculture or the communities or anything else involving local economy. Their only motive is to the shareholder and profits.
559.	Keep it within saskatchewan
560.	Canada is for Canadians to live and survive on. 50 years from now with the planet at 11 billion people, what would the parries look like if it has no control over the food grown on it, and where it is sent.
561.	corporations do not support any community activities
562.	Too much money would be siphoned out of Saskatchewan.
563.	farmers should be the only ones to own it
564.	We already allow this with potash companies who pretend to have offices and live here.
565.	Large corporations do little to support rural communities. Their staff and offices are located somewhere else and decisions and plans are made anywhere but here.
566.	Again, fresh capital must be advantageous
568.	I am opposed to corporate ownership of land.
569.	large corps. don't work..Broadacre---One earth..mega farms have a lot of spillage, and labor

	who don't care..we farm by a 15000 acre farm..what a joke they are...
570.	If we don't allow them to buy then they go elsewhere to invest. Lost investment opportunities will hurt all of us in Sask.
571.	This sounds like a loop-hole to me.
572.	Canadian Controlled corporations have little incentive to keep the land productive and keep the Agricultural Operations viable in the long term. The objective of Canadian controlled corporations is to keep the value of land high for resale or increase the lease to the maximum potential, neither option that will be sustainable in the long term.
573.	Not at this point, possibly in future when the younger generation farmers are ready to sell. (Supply/Demand)
574.	They only care about the profit and couldn't care less about the land. If that means implementing significant agronomic and environmental damages, they won't think twice and than Saskatchewan farmers are going to be left to clean up the ashes.
575.	There is already sufficient competition for farm land.
576.	Again, Saskatchewan farmland should be readily available and affordable to Saskatchewan's farmers.
577.	no to government involvement
578.	Totally Canadian only.
579.	Saskatchewan land for Saskatchewan farmers
580.	Make a rule and stick to it. No foreign ownership!
581.	see previous response
582.	I don't think I like this concept.. losing faith in the feds...
583.	Not at all.
584.	Ownership of such a valuable and strategic asset that is food production should be domestic ONLY.
585.	Still the same as majority foreign owned. It would be as crooked as our current government
586.	That's just a way around the system. I don't support Canadian investors to own farm land unless they are farming operation.
588.	Selling our Canadian natural resources to foreigners is against Canadian interests.
589.	It would be the death of small town sask
592.	No again who is to say that the ownership shares don't change and then you are in a cloudy situation again
593.	Limited in size to max Provincial holding of 10,000 acres
594.	There will always be some share of foreign ownership in corporations. As far as majority share in the same company, perhaps there would have to be an auditing purpose as to where they source inputs and such.

596.	No I will not support a Canadian-controlled corporation with a minority share of foreign ownership owning farmland in Saskatchewan. What is to stop the minority shareholder from purchasing more shares in the corporation after they have purchased land and taking control of the company. Its called a hostile takeover.
597.	Already foreign entities are controlling more land in this province that anyone in officialdom will admit - i.e. the Chinese.
598.	Still the fact of a large corporation being in charge. If there is no pride of ownership you may also see quality of land dropping. If the land gets overtaken with noxious weeds the leaser may get rid of it. Then who is in charge of cleaning it up or stopping the spread to surrounding fields.
599.	Let the farmers own the land.
600.	Land needs to be managed on a closer basis, rather than having a corporation who is worried about how to increase profits and squeeze every last dollar out of it, the land has to be taken care of, crops rotated, weeds controlled, etc. Farmers shouldn't have to answer to a board concerning the decisions they make regarding land.
601.	(See above)...We must protect our way of life as it creates great members of society
602.	This would be impossible to monitor
603.	Absolutely not!
604.	Have the corporation live and farm here.
605.	Farmers always "own" their land when property taxes are due. When they want to sell it, suddenly they have restrictions on who may purchase it.
606.	There are too many loopholes in allowing this.
607.	Its a hoax to sugar coat foreign ownership, through history there have always been traitors who sell out there neighbors for personal gain (corporation).
608.	They are Canadian and land will be leased out.
609.	I will not support any foreign people coming in to saskatchewan and taking what is ours away from us
610.	Purely for profit driven ownership is the least likely custodians of the land itself.
611.	If we must allow Canadian ownership I suggest It should be limited to individual Canadian citizens and not Canadian Corporations and certainly not those with minority foreign shareholders. Enforcement and accountability would become convoluted and foreign ownership is unnecessary and needs to be prohibited.
612.	There must be a face behind the land ownership for it to have a care about the land it owns, it's actions creating effects on neighbouring landowners, and what is happening within the district
613.	This would be a slippery slope

614.	I think if they want to buy farmland in Sask. they should share in the risk of farming it.
615.	Tracking large corporate structures will be a nightmare for the farmland security board. It is hard enough for them now to discern what percentage of a Canadian corporation is owned by foreign interests.
616.	definetly NOT!!!!
617.	I think that will lead to more leased land owned by corporations who will then control what we pay for rent
618.	It would need some specific guidelines to properly identify foreign owner group. But this would be the preferred method.
619.	What is to stop a change in ownership of the corp?
620.	I believe there are loop holes available to large corporations that potentially blur the definitions for the purpose of agriculture land ownership. Let us keep the ownership regulations as transparent as possible.
621.	We need to keep the land in Saskatchewan hands. We need farmers not corporations
622.	Unsure on this as well. I have a problem with pension plans owning farmland, but on other hand we compete with them in market place if we are buying stocks
623.	If again the farmer will not sell it does not happen.
624.	Ownership should only be allowed by farm corporations,or private farms.
625.	CPP is one thing It is a good investment for all Canadians They have no intention to sell it, they will hold it for the long haul. A Canadian controlled corporation can easily be bought out and the minority share can become a majority share
626.	Only wholly Canadian owned companies should possibly own land. Saskatchewan companies should own our land.
628.	Does the million dollar CEO live in Canada? Gee let me think!!
629.	Farmers will not be able to profit if the driving force is solely market values and profit for investment. Farmland is about more than that...it has to continue to be about more than that.
630.	farming should stay with the traditional owner operator scenario
631.	Land should be owned by primary producers and former producers.
632.	I am opposed to corporations like Ducks Unlimited buying (out bidding) actual farmers for land and then putting on perpetual easements and then reselling land allowing them to do it again and again
633.	There is not a lawyer in Canada that would not figure out a way to skirt this.
634.	keep it local
635.	ANY outside interests only have to find some hand puppet who has the qualifications that the ruling body demands i.e.(Saskatchewan resident) . A mere formality that world players brush

	aside.
636.	Canadian-controlled private corporations are often a front for foreign investors. The world of accounting is extremely convoluted and the existence of mass entanglements of subsidiary corporations and trusts can easily be created to bring in significant amounts of foreign money. The only way to ensure this does not occur is to ensure that no foreign minority shares are allowed and that all corporations are backgrounded completely to ensure that only Saskatchewan citizens are shareholders. If Saskatchewan wishes to sell out to specific Oriental countries because they have financial strength, this province is heading down a path that is very negative.
637.	Leave the law the way it is.
638.	There should be zero tolerance for foreign ownership. Canadian citizens should benefit from our resources.
639.	No no
640.	It's like allowing foreign ownership, it's too easy to structure entities with nominated majority Canadian control when in fact the actual control remains on the hands of the foreign minority
641.	This model is better but I still feel we will lose control of what will happen to the goods produced on said lands
642.	Large farm corps. that move into an area to seed 20,000 acres and then move on do nothing for your community. We need family farms living here to keep our economy strong.
643.	It's the same thing. Profits being taken out of the country and given to rich investors.
644.	I would have to see what policies or laws would be in place so that the ownership is transparent and that local economies and communities benefit
645.	If you want it done and done right for the benefit of all, for the benefit of Canadians, then leave to the farmers, owner operators.
646.	Not a chance.
647.	If you want to own Canadian farmland I think you should be a Canadian.
649.	We are not sure what the end result would be and if the proper rules were implemented.
650.	It really depends on the specific corporation and their history, not only driven by the bottom line.
651.	No because we would not be sure of who the investors were. Would they really care about the community where the land was purchased? Would they help with the local economy? Who knows?
652.	Farmers should own the land
653.	This leaves room for people to try to get around bending the rules
654.	DO NOT ALLOW FOREIGN'S / PERIOD. THIS IS ALLOWING AND ASKING FOR TROUBLE THAT THE FOREIGN COUNTRY'S ALREADY HAVE AND ASKING THEM TO BRING IT OVER HERE . A PERFECT SET UP FOR TERRORIST .

655.	We all live in a Global economy - protectionism is a failed concept - consider North Korea!
656.	unless that corporation is actively farming I do not see a need to allow this
657.	Again do the short term interests of maximizing profits for the corporation always do what is in the best interests of the farmer and the people of Saskatchewan. Even our present system of land ownership in my opinion is not accomplishing that.
658.	Canadian controlled corporations are a mere figurehead and profits and produce would still be funneled out of Canada. This removes the possibility of creating any value-added jobs in Saskatchewan.
659.	I do not even support non Sask. ownership, unless that person or all shareholders farms it.
660.	Do we have a right to live on and own our own property -- or are we serf-tenants ---- heading backward to the 16-1700's in Europe? That's why our founding populations left Europe. Foreign ownership is backwards thinking.
662.	Canadian means canadian
663.	We have that happening in our area now and it has now made it impossible for us to expand or give our kids a future in agriculture in our community. Sad!!!!
664.	Future comments already support this answer.
665.	Same as last response. It does nothing positive to Sk.
666.	I worry about being on a slippery slope with this one... the challenge will be to enforce land ownership regulations if foreign shareholders obtain control over a corporation.
667.	Would need more protective legislation for Canadians.
668.	this may be the start of foreign ownership.
669.	It would simply lead to a further compromise of the rules.
670.	corporations were given tax breaks so they could employ lots of people. that is no longer the case. the only way a company should be allowed to be a corporation is if they employ more than 50 people
671.	Farming in Saskatchewan should be reserved for Saskatchewan investors. The economy in Saskatchewan should benefit from the farmland used for the agriculture industry.
672.	Farmers should farm the land, not corporations. Corporations do not last long, ie. Broad Acres and One Earth Farms.
673.	I am a YOUNG FARMER. I work hard enough for myself. I can't afford to stretch myself thin in order to compete against foreign investment
674.	It's a sell out ~ Leave our land alone
675.	When ownership share changes, can't then take back land owned. There is already companies circumventing regulations.
676.	Does not matter who controls the ownership if it is Canadian or foreign. The net result would be the same.

677.	I see no good reason for that.
678.	The financial back lash from have corp investors buy land and drive the price to unsustainable prices only hurts farmers who want to operate their own farms
679.	No, we need Saskatchewan investors. We have a wonderful province with wealth. Let's keep our land for our descendants and citizens.
680.	Current government ownership laws are not adequate to control foreign ownership and land speculators at this time.
681.	Just another way a foreign company can bypass rules and get the land.
684.	only if they invested there profits back into the province
685.	Once again you are not a landowner with the best interest of the land in mind and more focused on increasing profits and economic gain.
686.	It is not fair for farmers who are trying to make their living by farming to have to compete with Canada Pension to buy farm land. I do not want to be rent land from a government organization. I want to own it myself and make improvements on the land for myself.
687.	See previous responses.
688.	Farmers have less incentive to keep the land clean and keeping the quality up. Some land owned by corporations want top dollar and their for sits ideal and not used I.
689.	Canadian farmers should own Canadian land.
690.	<p>Funds must show a profit to the investors on an annual basis. That is a fact. Pension Fund managers and the like are always under pressure to show a value increase. Their tolerance for weather issues or commodity fluctuations is low.</p> <p>These groups have an interest in continuing an increase in land values even when in purchasing mode to show an increase in the holdings they have already acquired.</p> <p>It could even create a false economy where a small group of companies buy and sell amongst themselves showing their investors a 2 to 5 percent value increase. This of course is only virtual and dangerously unsubstantiated.</p>
691.	Increases land prices. And why should foreign investors profit off our resources which forces our generations to move to something which they may have little respect or empathy for. Just like our own native Americans had to do even if it is centuries ago
692.	It is the same principle as above.
693.	A corporation is answerable to its shareholders to provide a profit every year. In farming there will always be periods when profits are low or in the minus category. Long-term farms traditionally save grain or cash against those lean years. The owners and shareholders in a corporation will likely be more inclined to sell the non-productive portion of the portfolio and move on to something else trendy. Who then buys that farmland put on the market?
694.	This is just the wedge that will quickly expand depending on the provincial government of the day.
695.	How naïve can you be? This would be the thin edge of the wedge for the future.

696.	It's a back door.
697.	Slippery slope
698.	This is just a slippery slope for foreign and institutional investors to be worming their way around the regulations we are already seeing that now it will only get worse. You need to be clear when formulating the regulations no grey areas or as few as possible.
699.	There is enough foreign ownership in Canada and Saskatchewan already.
700.	Starts out as minor but increases quickly.
701.	If they want to experience farming get up at five in the morning every day of the year, put up with all the physical labor needed, risk all that you own with loans and credit, experience all that mother nature can deliver. If not go to the grocery store and be glad that someone else is providing you food to eat.
702.	The issue would become what would happen if the foreign shareholders gained a majority interest of the corporation in the future.
703.	Absolutely no foreign ownership and no ownership outside Saskatchewan!!!!!! Repetitive question.
704.	Don't allow them to get their foot in the door!
705.	Farmland should be owned only by resident citizens with Canadian money earned in Saskatchewan
706.	It is a slippery slope.
707.	this may be happening already. Resulting in land prices unaffordable to local farmers
708.	That would be the tip of the ice burg for total foreign ownership.
709.	This has already happened.
710.	I don't think that there is enough land to supply everyone. Show your people your loyalty to them by giving first right of refusal and creating some help removing the barriers for people to start up in the industry.
711.	Mandate that the companies be Canadian, with a Saskatchewan component to it. For example. set up the HQ in Saskatchewan and pay Saskatchewan taxes.
712.	they don't give a rats or know how to grow food, they see \$ that's it and don't care about the impact it has on small communities
713.	Either they are Saskatchewan residents or they are not. Grey areas lead to exploitation.
714.	taxes
715.	corp would likely just be another way around the rules and still have foreign gov't controlling the land
716.	No, they would find a way to sneak in the back door.
717.	do not need a government takeover!
718.	No i think this will get abused

719.	means they already own too much land already
720.	Not a fan of the idea but that's what the appeals board is for to make those individual decisions.
721.	Slippery slope
722.	yes but only up to 10 percent in any 1 rural municipality
723.	I don't understand the concern in differentiation of outside investors. either we are progressive and growing with all, or regressively trying to artificially restrict free trade.
724.	no i don't support Canadian ownership restriction as they are mostly a sham especially P otash Corp CN and Viterra in fact almost all Corps farms trade with are a sham.
725.	There are a lot of what ifs with that question.....
726.	no I we want farming to maintain affordability for younger generations then corporate farming needs to stop
727.	Already happening. Chinese Canadians have companies and own land but money is brought in from elsewhere as company shareholders
728.	HELL NO!
729.	Corporate interests do not reflect the interest of Saskatchewan farmers or agriculture in general
730.	Keep it for farmers
731.	I feel investment decisions are made based on good business practices in a regular market.
732.	That is a slippery slope, with too much government oversight needed to ensure compliance and legitimacy.
733.	As an investor, I would only want investments in sound businesses.
734.	Provided that the structure of the company does not later change
735.	I believe local farmers should be supporting their communities. Not outside companies that don't know what the communities want
736.	The farmers have built up this country, where else do you think the food in the stores comes from? So why would you think of letting corporations take that over?
737.	No not in any way shape or form. We all know that governments can and are bought on a daily basis. There would be no such thing as "control".
739.	farmers should own the land they farm
740.	Prefer land to be owned by farmers rather than investors.
741.	The more investment the better
742.	We don't need or want foreign ownership of our land
743.	I feel sask farmland should be owned by sask residents. If others feel they are missing out they can move to Saskatchewan and buy farmland

744.	A minority share can quickly become a majority - and once ownership of the land is given, it's 100% unlikely that any Government body would require the owners to sell.
745.	Still outside investment
747.	I don't feel it right for foreign people coming in and owning any part of land
748.	We need people who are actual farmers
749.	The best ag economy is to have as many people as possible living and working in their communities and spending their profits their and paying their taxes to keep the community strong.
750.	I don't believe non farming Canadian or foreign corporations should be owning farmland in the province
751.	Difficult to maintain the regulations.
752.	Absolutely not
753.	don't need Chinese, Arabian, or any other nationality owning 49.9% of our land. there will be lots of Canadians to invest.
754.	Is still foreign ownership.
755.	The markets in Saskatchewan can handle ownership.
756.	Wouldn't be able to continually monitor foreign ownership within a corporation.
757.	Saskatchewan needs to keep complete control of as much of our land as possible. I prefer it to stay under the ownership of the residents of Saskatchewan, the people most affected by its use.
758.	<p>If the head of the organization had a VERY strong back ground in agriculture and implemented some sort of rule where the land is leased out to a successfully known farmer of that area, then yes.</p> <p>On the other hand, there is always a bad egg in every corporation. There will always be a problem or fight. All of that conflict is resolved if you don't have anyone to answer too.</p>
759.	again kills the economy in the small town way of life
760.	Farm Land should be left for Sask Farmers to buy. If corporations buy farm land, that land is forever lost to the inventory of Farm land available to local farmers. If Sk Corporations are allowed to buy farm land, then they MUST be forced to list this land annually for sale in no larger than 1 section blocks for sale at Market Prices (those Sk Corporation farmland prices to be set annually by a Sk Farm Land Security Board)
761.	Minority shares turn into majority eventually
762.	It's another way to sell us off
764.	Just buy land for profit
766.	That would be opening the flood gates to increased foreign ownership in future
767.	yes Canadian controlled

768.	Again, the owners should be the people with a desire to see food produced at a profitable level, not simply profits made.
770.	If there were rules against how much each farmer could access and control over what was to be grown I may consider changing my opinion. Having said that I would like to see a reversal from the huge farms back to individuals
771.	I would limit corporate ownership to Saskatchewan residents who are actively engaged in the business of farming. In fact, only 10 acres maximum could be purchased by non-residents. If they want to farm, they can move here.
772.	What happens if ownership of the company drastically changes to foreign once all land is purchased
773.	local ownership is better
774.	Yes I think there is a time and a place for it. But it must be to governed by our govt and our people.
775.	We should be focused on ways to encourage our own citizens to purchase land. Not just farmers but all citizens. Rather we are focused on how to create opportunities for foreign investors. Ludicrous.
776.	No! You want to own or be an investor in farmland in Saskatchewan get out here and know what it is like to be a farmer of the land. It is not about a piece of paper stating that you own farmland, it is about being part of the land.
777.	There is always loop holes for and certain segments of potential corporate buyers. Give them an inch, they will take a mile. So please, just prevent it and continue the course with the farmland ownership rules that has always been there. Its working.
779.	My response to this is the same as land being owned by a foreigner. Foreign land ownership is foreign land ownership, you still drive prices to unrealistic values based on land quality, and we still lose control.
780.	Land is for farmers
781.	Once again, the land is then not owned by the farmer investing his life and his back. Corporations only leasing back can turn on a dime, again making the farm business very precarious.
782.	any type of corporation increases farm land which in turn makes it unaffordable for young farmers
783.	It does not matter we do not need foreign investors.
784.	Too many ways to get around the intent of the legislation.
785.	Only if it stays a lesser share Always
786.	Even a minority share of a incredibly large corporation can have a very large ownership of land.
787.	I believe this is happening all over. Asian and foreign money sneaking in. The real estate brokers certainly aren't going to be truthful.
788.	That will turn out to be a logistical, unenforceable night mare. Corporations with multiple

	"minority foreign owned" entities could be developed.
789.	Foreign investment just raises lands values. These investors do not care about these local communities as they push out locals who would have purchased the land. Rural communities are dieing and will continue the trend as more foreign investment grows.
790.	Need more information about the structure of the corporation. Once sold what rules would prevent a foreign takeover? (Think Sask. Wheat Pool-to Viterra- to Glencor)
791.	There have been many Canadian - controlled corporations that are no longer Canadian owned. For example, how many Canadian oil companies are there compared to 20 years ago?
792.	Other than legitimate farm corporations, corporate decision making is based on different criteria.
793.	yes if it was an active farming corp and not an investment corp
794.	Rules like this would be easily manipulated by large corporations.
795.	The sale of farmland has ample liquidity within the farming community. Allowing minority foreign shareholders is a slippery slope (next step is majority foreign ownership) with no way to turn back once it becomes evident it is not in the benefit of active farmers.
796.	no NO
797.	canadian share of investment could be sold at any time, putting complete control in foreign hands.
798.	It's so hard to regulate.
799.	Farmers living here should own the land
800.	Perhaps a Saskatchewan-controlled corporation?
801.	Need moral investment.
802.	ABSOLUTELY NOT! THIS GIVES CONTROL TO PEOPLE THAT SHOULD NOT HAVE CONTROL. THE RISK IS FAR TOO GREAT!
803.	This already happens, yes? I think there should be a size limit on corporation ownership of land.
804.	A corporation is not interested in our long term welfare; A canadian corporation is really multinational these days and ownership of the corporation might change to chinese or American at any time
805.	Yes, but there would need to be a cap on the number of acres.
806.	This leaves farmers at the mercy of the investors with no control over the cost to lease land. This increasing cost of production.
807.	Would depend on what type of corporation they were. Agriculture related or not?
808.	Depends on the structure of the company. It's seems pretty straightforward to set up a Canadian corporation simply for the farming aspect of the larger company abroad. Then this Canadian corporation would supply the raw commodities to the company abroad irregardless

	of market demand and other social/environmental interests in SK.
809.	Don't need them either
810.	There should not be any foreign ownership of Saskatchewan farm land.
811.	Perhaps a cap on the area of farmland that could be acquired could be considered.
812.	I support family owned and operated
813.	This question is not applicable to Skyline. Skyline's goal is to create local ownership of farmland by Saskatchewan farmers that plan to operate the land.
814.	Corporate ownership is and will continue to erode the agricultural economy in Saskatchewan.
815.	Stewardship of the land is going to be a serious issue in the future. People who live on or near the land are the best stewards. Food supply is the issue. Not investment value.
816.	It's too important to risk the slippery slope.
817.	Ownership allowed but does not violate current guidelines
818.	Share size changes, a minority today, majority next week.
819.	It would be just a ploy to circumvent the rules so no I would not support it.
820.	Land purchases should only be allowed for Canadian citizens or one hundred percent Canadian owned businesses.
821.	no foreign ownership whatsoever
822.	Lets keep canadian land 100% Canadian
823.	It would have to be regulated by Saskatchewan government to control foreign ownership from becoming a major shareholder.
824.	Need to keep farmland ownership in Saskatchewan farmers hands
825.	Definitely not! It just increases the difficulty for our future farmers.
826.	History tells us this scenario would likely change over time.
827.	Canadian owned only Saskatchewan owned would be even better
829.	The foreign owners would have to comprise a very small minority
830.	You can go around it
831.	And would they be required to sell the land if the control of ownership by foreign interest became the majority. I think that would not likely be possible. So let's now taint the issue by pretending otherwise.
832.	Highly disagree.
833.	keep big corporations away from the farmland
834.	Only if the corporation remains significantly Canadian-owned and controlled by say a two-thirds majority. And the minority shareholders to be individuals rather than foreign-owned Canadian subsidiary

companies.
835. Same argument of allowing an absentee land owner that does not have a direct connection to the land (and see the land only as a source of short-term speculative investment)
836. This scenario still has foreign interests

11) Would you support allowing foreign investors to provide financing...?

#	Response
1.	FCC and the Canadian banks have it covered with fair rates already. Do not need extra input.
2.	Again just another loop hole for foreign companies to get a piece of the land.
3.	If this means that if (when) residents default it becomes a loophole for foreign ownership then no.
4.	This could easily simply be a 'work-around' to foreign ownership - they would almost certainly want an interest in the land as collateral, and setting long terms to their own benefit could easily be made to result in the 'owner' never really owning it, before they sell at retirement.
5.	Use FCC and your LOCAL credit union not foreign.
6.	While it's fine to borrow money from foreigners, I think Saskatchewan farmers and Canadian investors can find a win-win situation. Why go out to foreign investors when you can have local investors supporting farmers with financing -- whether debt or equity financing. I prefer it to be a Canadian-only investment opportunity.
7.	Same.
8.	That's called a bank!!!
9.	Although I feel there are plenty of current options for financing in Canada.
10.	It's the same difference as foreign investors directly buying. They are just going thru a middle man.
11.	If the resident was active in the business of farming and maintained the ownership of the land, not the foreign investor
12.	More than enough Canadian banks to finance land.
13.	The borrower owns it then.
14.	This would also allow a certain control of Saskatchewan farmland by foreign investors.
15.	Why I think we sold off too much of Saskatchewan.
16.	It provides loopholes for people to betray the intent of the important restrictions.
17.	No I would rather our government help its own people. Foreign dollars are just that, foreign and they would only do it if they would largely benefit financially in some way.
18.	Depends if the land can end up under foreign ownership if the Canadian residents default.

19.	Where an individual acquires financing should not be a concern of the government.
20.	It is just a roundabout way of foreigners owning our land. Still makes regular people not be able to compete.
21.	See above.
22.	This is a loop hole that allows foreign money to purchase they load a certain Canadian citizens bank account with money and then use their name to purchase when that individual never had the money and never would have had it too be able to purchase a large amount of farmland.
23.	This could lead to essentially the same outcome as allowing the foreign owning of land, since the foreign investors would essentially have control of the land. Since the farmland value would go up, which would prevent other Canadian/Saskatchewan residents from purchasing the land (because the value had gone up too far). Because the Canadian/Saskatchewan residents could not afford the land they would be required to follow the 'requests' of the foreign investors with regards to the land use and farming operations. Therefore the Canadian resident would, on-paper, own it but have really no control over it.
24.	At decent lending rates.
25.	Just a back door way into ownership.
26.	On the fence about this one.
27.	No, how do you control where the money is coming from? How do you control who is collecting the money and if the money is being used to purchase land in order for that person/immediate family group to farm or to be used as an immigration scam? Is the money being funneled through a foreign bank, investment brokers, multi-national Corporations with an agenda, illegal money laundering etc.? Will land ownership be watched to see that a pattern of ownership isn't being developed around water resources (canals, lakes, creeks)/mineral resources/tree lines, borders? Who will oversee these "loans"? Will they be investigated, managed or checked on an ongoing basis to make sure they are legit? Local banks, FCC and private local mortgages should be sufficient.
28.	Because the likely result would be a clause in contract that the foreign investors take control of land, if the farmer defaults.
29.	Previous portion.
30.	I am fine if a foreign bank etc... Wanted to lend me money to purchase land.
31.	Loopholes will be found and we will be in this same boat.
32.	Are the assets staying in the country?
33.	Allowing foreign investors to provide financing to residents to buy land is simply an easy way to cheat the system. Resources should be allocated to investigate and ensure this is not happening under any circumstances.
34.	This would be away to get foreign investment money in Saskatchewan.
35.	That's what we have FCC for.
36.	It is already going on.

37.	Because in the long run it is still foreign controlled because they are controlling the money.
38.	Why should they just be able to walk in and buy are farm land! Buy our grain not our land!
39.	Financing should stay local to support the local banks, credit unions, and FCC. Provided financing to farmers is very risky and they need to realize that.
40.	Why do this? Who benefits the most?
41.	This can be dealt with in the farm corporation set up. Should be up to the individual farmers and there corporate structure
42.	Not if default = seizure of land by foreign investor.
43.	Hard to control or investigate.
44.	They end up with the foreclosures what's wrong with yours, isn't that calling the kettle black.
45.	Like the housing or commercial real estate market - we should not limit the financing alternatives available to our farm sector.
46.	No. See prior question response.
47.	This is very much like foreign ownership. Whoever provides the financing will have an interest in the land. This is basically foreign ownership, which a Saskatchewan resident's name on a piece of paper.
48.	Hey give me a break there is always a catch. Besides do we not have credit vendors in Saskatchewan?
49.	Makes it difficult for farmers to purchase land.
50.	If it is veiled foreign ownership, NO.
51.	If farmland is affordable this is not necessary.
52.	If the farmer fails to make his payment, the foreign financier moves on the collateral and it then falls into foreign hands by default
53.	I don't think it would be necessary to have foreign money to purchase land if the land values were at an affordable price in the first place.
54.	Let Canadian banks do this in the form of interest free partially forgivable loans. You want more farmers? Give people free access and training for the next 30 years. Give them interest free lines of credit to support the massive debts they are forced to carry to buy the machinery required.
55.	Only if it was to an actual farmer.
56.	What is wrong with FCC or the Banks?
57.	We have enough lending institutions here already.
58.	This is just a loophole to allow foreign ownership.
59.	This already happens as the banks get their money where ever it is the most economic.
60.	It's possible this could be beneficial in lowering interest costs. More likely it could be used as a way for foreign interests to gain a foothold and leverage themselves into Saskatchewan land in

	the future.
61.	I feel this would allow local farmers to access more options to finance buying farmland.
62.	We have banks and FCC; I can't see that allowing foreign investors in would help. And what happens if the farmer defaults?
63.	If the investors did it strictly to make money on interest, it would be a different story.
64.	Plenty of investment opportunities for locals.
65.	While I have no issue with this concept, my concern would lie with the stewardship of the land owned by individuals/corporations/trusts/investors outside of the province.
66.	Need to restrict their securitization.
67.	One can either afford to buy land or not. If not, than I also want to know how one would ever pay it back.
68.	It would depend on what rights they are given.
69.	The investors would have the right to seize assets, basically take over the land.
70.	That would just make to problem worse. High land prices do not benefit Saskatchewan farmers who don't own the land.
71.	Not if they can foreclose and take ownership in the end.
72.	How are foreign investors stopped from owning the land if the farmer cannot pay?
73.	What's the difference between a foreign investor's loan and HSBC, RBC, TD etc.?
74.	Canadian farmers are involved allowing them to learn from foreign investors and bring them closer to the markets that crops are grown for. This allows for growth and rapid adjustments to the global economy.
75.	As the more share will go to foreign countries then what will be the benefit for Canadian residents.
76.	Slippery slope.
77.	It's the slippery edge of the wedge.
78.	They will want a share and probably eventually try and gain a higher percentage in ownership eventually. This would just be a foot in the door for the foreign companies.
79.	Depends on the details of that contract. Investor tribunals must not even been considered if it is a component.
80.	This would need more explaining.
81.	There are plenty of places to borrow money from. If you can't get it from a legit Canadian source, perhaps there is a reason.
82.	It would still be foreign ownership if the funds to purchase farmland were from other countries, even though the title is in the name of a Canadian resident or corporation.
83.	In the end if foreigners are backing financing it is the foreigners who have the control.

84.	They don't own the land so that's ok.
85.	Still unfair advantage.
86.	Provided it was through a mortgage or similar investment model and would have to be resold to Saskatchewan residents in the event of a default.
87.	Outside the industry money will distort the marketplace.
88.	Defaulting on the loan provided may lead to foreign ownership. Prevent foreign ownership.
89.	This is the same as foreign investment.
90.	The lender will have control -- the lender will be getting interest payments from the borrower and will be interested in raising the price of land and pushing for higher rents so that the borrower will be able to pay more interest. The ability to obtain financing from foreign sources will have a huge influence on who can bid on land, and it will lead to Saskatchewan farmers becoming tenants instead of owners. This is not the future I want to see for our province!
91.	So long as the Canadian resident is provided a reasonable framework to repay the financing, so that any loan does not become so onerous that they are in jeopardy of default.
92.	Government has little ability to control this now.
93.	I would say Saskatchewan residents... not Canadian.
94.	If they are funding active farmers that is fine by me. Where does the money the banks lend to us come from now?
95.	I'd be concerned this simply presents a loophole or an angle for foreign ownership.
96.	Foreign Banks? Are Lenders investors?
97.	Depends what the foreign investors gain in the deal.
98.	Again, this will be no different than allowing foreign investors to purchase land. It will give them influence on the politics of this province.
99.	Follow the money and you will find the true owner this is ludicrous.
100.	Are you trying to create more loopholes? The way you put this question, I could get a large foreign company to "loan" me millions of dollars and buy all the farm land I can find. What if they do this with a person who knows nothing about farming? What happens to the land, and the value of the land?
101.	That would just let foreign ownership in the back door so to speak. There are always some willing to be bought. There were some who wanted to modernize and believed Chinese stories that they would be help. What followed was takeover and the deaths of many thousands, imprisonment and torture of more and almost complete suppression of culture. Only a very naive person would believe that could not happen here.
102.	When you have an investor the money starts to go into quantity instead of quality.
103.	People are free to get financing from wherever they want as long as it is their name on the land.
104.	Not just Canadian residents, it must be Saskatchewan farmers.

105.	Sell them the goods from the factory, not the factory itself.
106.	Ownership remains Canadian. We already use the banks imaginary created money.
107.	But only if they can't take the land they are financing as collateral.
108.	Protect our land from foreign investors from countries that do not care about us.
109.	No foreign investment, especially for a resident and not a full citizen. How long would it take for that to be abused? Foreign investors approaching residents in order to obtain land through a loop hole.
110.	This is what the "slippery slope" is, therefore no start is better. Plus I also wonder how an investor would like a system that restricts them so much.
111.	Again, I think this opens the door to possible outside political interference and would exacerbate the problem as I see it of absentee land ownership.
112.	Only if they cannot acquire ownership of the land in question if the Canadian resident defaults on repayment terms - so then who in their right mind would do that?
113.	What are the banks for? At least banks will assist in determining if the venture is viable.
114.	I have to deal with Canadian financial institutions for operating lines, loans, etc. Why does someone else get the advantage of out of county deeper pocket financing?
115.	Why not?
116.	There would have to very strict rules around this or it would just be backdoor way for foreign entities to acquire land following a bankruptcy, etc.
117.	Still removal annually of economic dollars, annual provincial GDP is dependent on dollars coming into the province, not leaving.
118.	Just provides more completion to the big banks. Competition is good.
119.	That could easily result in a loss of control for the owner.
120.	I think that only farmers should only finance themselves with the grain that they have produces on the land to purchase it.
121.	mmmm.
122.	Again, see above. More is more and better for the economy.
123.	Makes for true market...why should we stay poor in Saskatchewan.
124.	As above.
125.	Yes they will borrow to Canadian farmers then the first rough spot they repossess all the land from these Saskatchewan farmers and you have vast tracks of land owned by foreigners. FCC and the credit unions and banks offer good rates and ways to buy land.
126.	Sounds fishy, there's always strings attached. and will find a Canadian to do their work for them. This has already happened!!!

127.	I see this happening right now. It will have consequences again where the food supply is not controlled by Canadians.
128.	This end runs foreign ownership restrictions.
129.	If I can borrow money cheaper from a foreigner, than Canadian, that should be OK.
130.	Canada is not cash rich or a risk taker in investing large amounts of capital to agriculture, it is proven with cases I've been involved in, one needs a goose that can lay golden eggs for a project to be financed. Time goes by and another potential farmer gives up.
131.	If the Canadian residents were going to live in the province, farm the land and support the local economy I could see supporting this type of arrangement. If the Canadian residents were doing this for investment purposes only I couldn't see myself supporting this type of arrangement.
132.	This would skew the value of land and still lead to monopolies.
133.	This is already happening in my area.
134.	Again, this question is difficult as it would depend on the particulars.
135.	More emphasis should be placed on environmental stewardship and conservation of the land resource as opposed to who owns it regardless of nationality.
136.	See above.
137.	Once again against foreign investment. Canadian investors should support Canadian farmers.
138.	I believe this would lead to defacto foreign ownership.
139.	Foreigners still control the land.
140.	Becomes a very cloudy area. What if they have to repossess it?
141.	Canadian financial institutions loan money to farmers, don't need foreign investors for that.
142.	That is what is happening.
143.	I think it already happening in some large farms already. It is doing nothing but driving prices and rents up to the point we are almost a tipping point as to profitability.
144.	How do we do that? How can I trust them?
145.	There's no way to enforce. It's not being enforced now.
146.	This could be a trap and the financial terms be dragged out.
147.	See above.
148.	There is ample financing available to farmers at extremely favourable rates so there is no need to allow foreign investors to become financiers of farmland. It could lead to foreclosure and ultimately foreign ownership of the land through the back door.
149.	I would need more information about the details of this question, and who would technically be "owning" the land.
150.	Read all my above answers!! What is this? A young school kid made up this questionnaire!!! ?

151.	Canadians should take care of Canadians. To keep our farmers Canadian we should support them.
152.	Foreign financing could potentially result in foreign ownership.
153.	This too is a slippery slope. Any SK default would likely result in foreign ownership? Let's control ownership to remain Canadian!
154.	As above foreign investment is a bad idea. Once the land is lost to others, it will be hard for the people of Saskatchewan to get back.
155.	This would still allow foreign investors to indirectly invest in Saskatchewan farmland.
156.	Because of the following scenario: a Canadian resident, of foreign extraction, is financed by a foreign entity, and buys up very large tracts of land. That resident, having a closer tie to his or her home country, exports all of the operation's production to that financing operation. Scale that scenario up in size, and in multiple operations, and Saskatchewan and Canada have lost control of one of its greatest resources - the land that feeds us and a good deal of the world.
157.	Structure to protect local farmers.
158.	Only if the land is sold to Canadian/Saskatchewan residents if the land is ever foreclosed on.
159.	I can't think that their primary motive is to help out the little guy and even if it was and the little guy has no hands on knowledge of farming the land just goes back into the kitty! No! No! And NO!
160.	Depending on the security of the loan going to the finance companies.
161.	Yes, because you could also view RBC, CIBC, TD, BMO etc. foreign investors, as they are all publically traded, while they provide financing for farm land.
162.	Previously stated comments. It's not economically beneficial to farmers.
163.	As a loan. Money must be borrowed from somewhere. But it must be regulated that the foreign loan cannot be called without a reason, allowing the foreign company to assume ownership of the land.
164.	As long as it is not a back door to foreign ownership.
165.	Allowing the maximum number of financing options increases competition amongst lenders and should have the effect of reducing interest rates and lending terms over the extended term. See no negative impact whatsoever. Competition is always good for the consumer, in this case the purchaser of farmland.
166.	See above, only up to and Inc. a minority share, control must remain in SK/CDN hands.
167.	Banks, government organizations such as the land bank can do the financing.
168.	Our Canadian banking institutions are quite capable of providing financing to local farmers. We do not need foreigners involved because they will soon be dictating the rules. They would also be demanding the land for security. Thus foreign ownership.
169.	How would they be allowed to act on the security in the case of default?
170.	I would support loans to Saskatchewan residents buying land but not all of Canada.

171.	Have to see details in that one.
172.	FCC does a fine job.
173.	We do not need foreign investment in Saskatchewan lands period.
174.	No, no, no way.
175.	Why would we want the profits from farming to leave the country? Those who farm their own land will be returning the profits to the province and country.
176.	As long as it's not just the backdoor way of foreign land ownership.
177.	Foreign investors should absolutely not be able to provide financing. That would mean eventually it could open the door to foreigners owning large areas of land and push out Saskatchewan farmers.
178.	I believe this is just a way to get around disallowing foreign investment.
179.	It's still not Canadians that own the land.
180.	Allowing foreign investors to provide financing to Canadian residents to purchase farmland reduces local control and reliance on local community.
181.	Terrible idea.
182.	Saskatchewan farmers should be buying Saskatchewan farmland for farming (not investing) using only Canadian dollars.
183.	This appears to be happening now, although government seems disinterested or powerless to investigate. It's a major cause of current hardship.
184.	As above.
185.	Under very restricted circumstances and controls.
186.	Not unless the residents were actively farming the land themselves, because otherwise you have the same issues with price inflation
187.	No.
188.	That is just a sly way to get around the rules, and has the same effect of hurting our young people from owning farms.
189.	Take a look at countries that borrowed money from the World Bank or the IMF. No thank you, Saskatchewan farmers don't need their terms.
190.	Again you would not have that vested interest in the land.
191.	This sounds like a loophole that could be easily exploited.
192.	Open market increases values which increases economic impact in and outside the ag industry.
193.	One foot in the door? Not likely.
194.	Dangerous as there would be catches.
195.	They are putting money into our pockets.

196.	What interest rate? They can act as a bank sure why not.
197.	As long as the ownership is proper and not just a structure to get around foreign ownership rules. Canadian citizen is all good.
198.	No one questions where the shareholders of RBC or BMO live. Why should they be allowed to lend money to farmers through their respective banks but not directly?
199.	In the back ground, this is just a sneaky way to actually just own the land.
200.	Foreign is taken to be 'non-Canadian'.
201.	A bank is a bank, no matter where it is set up. I am not concerned about an inflow of or other nationals onto the prairies. If they learn how to farm, then why not let them set up here. If they simply want to make some money from farming the farmers, as long as the terms are controlled, then let them into the market. They won't be any more exploitative than Bay Street.
202.	We have lots of great financial institutions and then the thought of what happens to the land if payments are defaulted, who owns the land then.
203.	Why can't we use our own money, why is this province always going out of province? This government was elected on the issues of US, our province, and OUR people. I guarantee you will find a change in leadership if you go ahead with more foreign owned land more investors. There is already a back lash on those that sold to the Chinese at a local level.
204.	There is good financing available for farmers here in Saskatchewan.
205.	I think this could be acceptable, if regulations conditionally allowed the land to be subject to a lean; i.e. the land would have to be auctioned off, the foreign investors could not retain the title.
206.	Again, leave the foreigners out of it!
207.	So, in other words providing mortgages....? Ha!
208.	Foreign investment just causes prices to go even higher.
209.	We don't have financing problems with all of our current banks and credit unions.
210.	Slipperier slope.
211.	It allows them to own land.
212.	Finances can be manipulated to force foreclosure and take over ownership. Look at the history of Europe and Russia and a whole host of other countries.
213.	It allowed young farmers to get started.
214.	I don't want to sell off Saskatchewan.
215.	Same as above.
216.	We need to keep our agriculture supply controlled by Canadians if a foreign investor finances land here would he not get the land if the farmer defaulted on the loan?
217.	The bottom line for investors is \$\$\$, therefore the push would become huge to 'factory' farm and not respect the soil.....never giving the land a chance to rejuvenate itself,.... we already see

	huge areas of land ditched and drained, and the effects of that are just beginning to be felt by others. When the next dry years come, and they will,...what happens to all the land that has been drained and there is no significant water table to carry it through dry years.....
218.	It would just be a way to get around the rules.
219.	This could get out of control...
220.	They always find a loophole.
221.	Depends on the rules and what is all allowed. Again see above answer.
222.	Same.
223.	Depends upon the rules when there is a default on the part of the mortgagee!
224.	Just a way that's already been used to get around the existing laws.
225.	If they want to borrow the money fine, but what happens when a farmer goes broke then they will own it, and have got around the rules again.
226.	Again, that's what's happening now. One exception would be placing a limit on foreign investors' percentage of ownership, say 45%. That allows for investment, but actual ownership, land titles, remain in Canadian hands. That way our Country doesn't get sold out from beneath our feet. Plus it stops foreign owners from taking that farmland and building a mine site on it, or start drilling for oil on it, or deforesting it. Not much can be done after they own the rights to it.
227.	test
228.	test
229.	That is unfair competition.
230.	Farms are for farmers not foreign investors.
231.	Same as ownership as financing entails ROI = wrong focus.
232.	Only if they cannot take control of the farmland if it is foreclosed upon.
233.	The foreign owner could seize the property if payments aren't made.
234.	This gives those residents an unfair advantage for purchasing and still could potentially put control of farmland under a foreign entity.
235.	Why would we ever need to do that?
236.	test
237.	This would provide a huge shot in the arm for our Saskatchewan.
238.	Again, I think it opens the door to foreign influence of our farmland assets. If a person needs financing, there are plenty of institutions within Saskatchewan or Canada to do that with!
239.	Don't see why financing makes any difference, but sure, if they want farm land as security for the borrowing, makes no difference to me.
240.	As long as the caveats do not allow the financing company to own the land, if land payments are defaulted there must be regulations to force the company to put the land up for auction

	with the highest Saskatchewan farm bidder winning the land.
241.	I think foreign investors would have the control if they made the investment. That is why they should not be allowed.
242.	Rules would have to be extremely strict.
243.	This is just a back door approach to land grabbing.
244.	No, as if they are helping with the finances, first thing you know they'll want to control things here also!
245.	They do now.
246.	Big banks are not benevolent just because they are based in Toronto or Montreal.
247.	I do not think we need foreign investment. Canada is a strong country and we should be able to support our own farmers with financing.
248.	Financial institutions are able to let farmers borrow to purchase farmland in this province without foreign investors.
249.	This takes place already and should not be allowed.
250.	Foreign influence unwelcome.
251.	Only a matter of time before they own it.
252.	Already being done by certain creditors. Again, as long as foreign ownership was never a future possibility.
253.	You need to be a Canadian resident and a Canadian citizen.
254.	In the scenario it's financing the individual/partnership that will be operating the farm and participating/residing in a local community, then yes.
255.	It allows them to get around rules.
256.	Financing allows for the ability to control the property.
257.	Keep the money here, stop exporting our profits!
258.	Foreign money is no different. Zero foreign!!!!
259.	That would just be a loop hole.
260.	Would have to be through the bank of Canada.
261.	Would need to see the details and what they offer.
262.	Is it not the same as the other two questions?
263.	Foreign ownership is still foreign ownership even if it's a bank.
264.	It would open the door for finding a loop hole in foreign ownership rules.
265.	Very tough to regulate.
266.	That still drives prices. Is there a foreign investor for every farmer in the province? Then I agree.

267.	We cannot distance ourselves from reality. Global markets and financing is here to stay and is common practice in virtually every business.
268.	Financing is a business decision.
269.	If it is helping local producers finance land then it would be ok.
270.	These investors will have deeper pockets and farmers who live and farm the land will have trouble sourcing funds to buy new land against them.
271.	Only if the farmer owns the land and the "banker" holds the mortgage.
272.	Depends on the parameters.
273.	Foreign investors would then gain a great deal of control by providing financing. I do not think this is a good idea.
274.	They'd finance you but at what cost compared to local? If you can't make your payment they would take it back and own it in the end anyways.
275.	Depends on the motivation and background of the company, as well as the conditions that surround the lending. This should be encouraged by our own government!
276.	We don't need them. We have been doing great without them. Just leave well enough alone!
277.	As long as it wasn't a way to get around foreign ownership rules.
278.	If they are not part of the community they would bring unwanted change to the lives of those who live there.
279.	Under certain restrictions. They could not become the owners.
280.	No foreign investors, period.
281.	I am 26 years old, and trying to make a living grain farming. I bought my first quarter off my grandfather; I am looking to buy another at the end of the year. The land prices in this province are so inflated it sickens me. My land is in RM 128, where the going price for a section (640 acres) of land is in excess of 1.2 million. I ask the Saskatchewan Party how am I to make a living with land payments at that price? The Saskatchewan Party is killing the small family operated farms one by one. When I approach the old couples in my area to inquire about purchasing land they all tell me the same thing why do you want to get into farm? There is no money to be made, and you can't pay top dollar like the potash companies nor the out of country buyers. why would you take ownership away from the ones working the land I feel you guys want to make us serfs. these companies or out of country owners don't care for the land nor do guys that lease the land, people who own and live on the land are the best for the stewardship of the land, they care for it, how can't you see this? The Saskatchewan Party needs to look to Europe and learn how there farming operations are where the little guys are supported and encouraged. These family operated farms in Saskatchewan that are 10,000+ acres are not a family farm they are corporations. Also I am an electrician I work 21days straight, this job alone is over six figures. I would give it up in a heartbeat to be on the land 24/7, but unfortunately I don't see this ever happening with land prices like this. I would love to hear back from a Saskatchewan Party representative.
282.	Prosperity.

283.	Are our Credit Unions and Canadian banks running short of money? I think that local loan officials will be better able to judge the viability of purchases.
284.	The money trail needs to be Canadian only. Money can be laundered. Also, at what cost do we sacrifice our own citizens? It is still foreign ownership.
285.	I think I have made my opinion clear, I don't support any foreign or non-Saskatchewan investment. Our prices are getting high enough already without more buyers in the market!
286.	No. Maybe Canadian investors financing Saskatchewan residents to purchase farmland.
287.	Just another way of getting control of the land.
288.	FCC can provide all the financing needed.
289.	Again, motives are unclear.
290.	Banking institutions are operating more and more in a global environment so why prevent individuals from borrowing wherever they see fit.
291.	You start down this road and you will be opening a Pandora's Box. There will not be enough safeguards imagined to protect against abuse of this concept.
292.	Yes if it's a loan to be paid back. No if it's to have a share to keep.
293.	Money = control. Foreign financing is more or less foreign control.
294.	Please stop the notion that exporting profits is somehow beneficial to our economy. We have a sound financial sector in Canada; let them earn the financing dollars.
295.	Creditors currently in place are doing a good job.
296.	If there ever is a short fall the foreign money will own the land.
297.	No foreign investment Let us keep Canadian.
298.	Shell companies to benefit who?
299.	Discussed earlier.
300.	I think this would create a loophole that would allow foreign investors to effectively own the land.
301.	No, I wouldn't support them buying land here when our people came here and did all the hard work to get the land able to be used. If they wanted to own land then they should have been here when everything was done by our people way back when I, myself, had to break land. I spent many really hot days picking roots and I didn't do it so that some from some other country to buy our land.
302.	Same as foreign ownership.
303.	If it would help true farmers to grow at a low cost. Absolutely.
304.	It's not ideal as it's just another form of exporting our wealth with no tangible return. Very difficult to control foreign financing. Too much access to financing can overstimulate the market value of real-estate, over inflating prices/value.

305.	No. No. No.
306.	It depends on the type of relationship between residents and their investors. This feels like a slippery slope however.
307.	Might as well just let them own it if you allow this.
308.	I do not know what would happen in the event that the Canadian resident defaulted on their financial obligations -- who would own the farmland and have the right to resell or rent it? Do these foreign investors have a right to finance an unlimited amount of farmland? Who gets to influence agricultural policy - the farmer or the finance company?
309.	Its already being done, you just don't look for it. It's part of the problem now.
310.	This is already happening to some extent. The province has to become serious about enforcing the current rules. Hiring one lawyer is a joke and can't possibly work.
311.	The more investment we have the better, individual farmers would still be able to farm and perhaps better.
312.	Enough options already.
313.	With conditions.
314.	In this case Canadian residents are simply "puppets" controlled by foreign investors and the same concerns I expressed to allowing direct foreign investment are equally applicable to this situation.
315.	Would need to see the details.
316.	It would result in foreign ownership, in the event of a default. Unless the only remedy was a forced judicial sale to a valid resident, then no I wouldn't support it.
317.	Don't sell out any more of my Saskatchewan. I don't trust you.
318.	Said the spider to the fly!!
319.	Offshore shareholders in Canadian financial operations already do.
320.	It's a move in the same negative direction by which Saskatchewan farmland ownership becomes the right to a few foreign or corporate overlord and their 'yes' men/women.
321.	Depending on the terms. If those investors are dictating when and where the production can go (i.e. shipping boatloads of wheat back to without it hitting our grain handling system), then definitely no support. If they are supporting their own people who have come over and gained citizenship to buy farmland and bring more people over and never actually farm the land then no. By relaxing these rules there is just too much room for abuse of the system. And the foreign investors have taken full advantage of these loopholes.
322.	Canadians should be investing in our resource industries.
323.	That would be money laundering. It would be politically favorable -- taxation for economy sake. I suppose this scenario could be achieved all legal like - with the co-operation of the banking institutions. Foreign investors would have to be ultimately responsible for changing the legal

<p>jargon to accommodate the transactions. -- Perhaps even added to the free trade agreements.</p> <p>There we have it- the solution- buy land from Canada- and get it paid for a nickel at a time by promoting purchases of consumer goods produced in lands where those can be produced more economically.</p> <p>Foreign investors could definitely purchase food to feed those who have the misfortune of being among the starving of this world-- in my humble opinion.</p> <p>And if the investors care to try their hand at actually producing food- or improving the land - have at it. [Oh careful- attempts have been made before to "improve" the land - consequences arose]</p>
324. If the Canadian resident is involved in farming.
325. Not for purchase, only for operations or lease agreements under food security regulations.
326. This is a vague question which would provide unforeseen risks to the actual ownership.
327. Speculation and an international banking collapse would result in foreclosure. The banking system is not well regulated.
<p>328. I would support this ONLY if the foreign investor had no claim, charge, or lien to title of the land through the financing. The investor would then only be providing unsecured financing, or mezz debt, or something similar.</p> <p>In no way would I support foreign investors providing equity to a Canadian resident to purchase farmland.</p> <p>Ownership of Saskatchewan farmland MUST remain within Canada.</p>
329. "Canadian residents" is another issue. We are aware of foreign "Canadian residents" that have moved to the province, bought a home and land and have been absent for the majority of time, all the while funneling cash back to their homeland, not spending it locally.
330. This would eliminate the opportunity for young Saskatchewan resident farmers to expand their farming operation by buying and owning farmland!
331. Dependent on how reputable the financial institution is.
332. AGAIN HOW DO YOU CONTROL THE AMOUNT AND VALUE OF FOREIGN INVESTMENT?
333. Same as above.
334. If the terms are straight forward why not?
335. As my father always said "it does not matter what your title or position is, the boss is always the one with the money."
336. Provides unfair advantage to those large farms to squeeze out the little family farms. Foreign investors want a large return, which smaller farms would be unable to sign up for.
337. Straight financing, YES. Games where the increase land value accrues to foreign investors, NO.
338. Farmers who actually farm the land should own it.
339. The foreign investor would still have control over the land.

340.	In a sense that does happen already when you borrow through chartered banks to buy and pay for farmland.
341.	Land would have to Saskatchewan residents name on legal title.
342.	This has the same effect-loss of control of the farmland.
343.	It has already happened and it is what is drove land prices up already as well as lease rates and made land unavailable for young Saskatchewan people. Over 2 million acres already purchased thus way g.
344.	Would not support because if the farmer defaulted on the loan, the foreign enterprise would own the land.
345.	No foreigners!
346.	There are some scenarios where this might be ok; however, there are also many scenarios that I would not be ok with.
347.	Just a back door way to own land in Saskatchewan. Look at Dundurn's Industrial Mall backed by Asian foreign investors. Oh wait! There is nothing there yet! What kind of game is this?
348.	This can lead to citizens with foreign ties becoming a front for foreign control. It may be allowable if this can be addressed.
349.	I suspect the land itself would be collateral for such loans. Not sure how well foreign ownership issues are being policed.
350.	There's enough money in Canada to support that endeavor.
351.	No they shouldn't be allowed.
352.	Canadian financial investors already provided enough financing to Canadian residents.
353.	Why would we not, this is new monies coming into the Province, which ultimately means more tax dollars to the Province.
354.	No because that is circumventing the rules that have been put in place for a reason. Hutterite colonies have been doing this for years and getting away with it.
355.	It's still giving power over the land.
356.	FCC and banks do the lending now for viable operations. No need for alternate financing.
357.	Possibly, if the only income the investors would be making is the interest, therefore becoming another lending institution. Though at the same time still a possible avenue for lost tax revenue.
358.	Keep the wealth in Saskatchewan! We are a resource rich province, let's retain that wealth.
359.	If investments include land purchase, and the security for the purchase is the farmland, same answer as prior question. Capital/credit is already provided for equipment and machinery, storage and processing, and grain purchase through agricultural corporations from the USA.
360.	Foreign investment parties already use existing residents to purchase and farm land on behalf of foreign investors. These corporations/parties have already purchased and are in control of hundreds of thousands of acres in Saskatchewan. For example, the RM of Viscount and

	Colonsay area. As farmers, we have already been negatively impacted by the increase in price of farm land, which becomes unaffordable for farmers. This increase in price prevents existing farmers from growing their operations forcing established farmers into early retirement and disallowing new farmers to establish themselves and contribute to local economies.
361.	Are you trying to think of ways to create loop holes?
362.	No, of course not. If the Canadians cannot make payments, then the land would cede to the foreign bankers. Absolutely not.
363.	Again, outside money usually has different priorities. Outside investment drives prices up (look what Ducks Unlimited money did to families trying to expand their family operations in southwest Saskatchewan). Ducks does try to manage the land but it also sent several families packing out of province.
364.	There's plenty of financing options available now.
365.	It currently happens now. Financial institutions (banks) are often foreign funded. So are organizations such as Farm Credit Canada that sell bond issues to foreign investors. Indirect funding is already occurring.
366.	This is the same as having foreign ownership because "the bank is the boss" and a resident would be under the control of the foreign financier.
367.	Again the challenge is the alternative motives. If the land ownership is a means for immigration and the actual land is secondary then it becomes a challenge for long term tenure.
368.	Not needed. The market will determine fair market value that farmers can pay. Control of the land should not be risked to foreign entities.
369.	Same as above.
370.	Keep Canadians in control, we are tired of all the foreign politics that some way always corrupt our legal system!
371.	I doubt that such investors would be interested if they cannot foreclose on the land as security.
372.	Ditto.
373.	Takes the money out of the Province.
374.	We have enough access to capital through our Canadian owned and controlled financial institutions that we do not need foreign money. How will they offer anything better to operations than what we currently have? If you do allow foreign financing make sure that it is more expensive and that they are not treated with better tax options than local finance companies.
375.	Is all the money we get from banks domestic? Probably not.
376.	This seems like a possible loophole... foreign investors from have one previous immigrant who recently became a Canadian citizen funding his efforts in buying farmland. Then he has grounds to import workers, or provide jobs for foreign workers with outside investments. Regardless, that money does not stay in Saskatchewan. That doesn't seem like a good strategy at all.

377.	There is no need for that, Canadian owned financial institutions have enough capital to provide financing to Canadian residents to purchase farmland and would profit off the lending immensely.
378.	Foreign investors expect return on investment which means money leaving the province!
379.	Allowing foreigners to have any control over land ownership in our province is a very bad idea unless they are willing to come and live and work on the land. We are opening our province up to be taken over by individuals with communist beliefs, terrorists and other generally "bad" people that don't have good intentions for our country. We must fight to keep our province a safe, good place to live and raise a family and to make sure it is affordable, viable and safe for our children to take over our family farms.
380.	There are enough local financing options for Canadian residents to purchase farmland in Saskatchewan.
381.	This is the thin edge of the wedge where a domestic front allows foreign control of a local resource. Foreign ownership is the ultimate combination of removing profits from the local economy while making it impossible to enter or grow a farming operation.
382.	Although you may try to regulate these dollars, the lawyers will figure out a way to get around this.
383.	Yes it is my opinion it is already happening with Alberta farmers and although it increases the price of land it is still a business decision that needs a risk management plan.
384.	It doesn't matter, where the money is coming as long the profit is not taken aboard and is reinvested in Canada and payed tax here.
385.	I believe that there are adequate financing opportunities within our borders. When and if things go poorly who then becomes the owner, the foreign investor could through lease costs force this issue to gain outright ownership.
386.	A loophole is made.
387.	Already is happening and rest cannot compete. Is good for selling as they drove up the price to unsustainable levels. Have seen the result as one large is in receivership with many locals out their money.
388.	This is occurring presently and is skewing the farmland market.
389.	Foreign investors would indirectly influence and control practices, procedures and market decisions.
390.	How is this different from lending money from an international bank?
391.	Investors control what we do. They will be making the money!
392.	If I don't agree with them owning then I don't want their money.
393.	If the farmer defaulted on the loan a foreign owned corporation would own the land unless legislation was in place to limit the time length of ownership by a foreign owned financial

	corporation.
394.	It would depend on the requirements and security arrangements and the intent of the Canadians involved.
395.	What are their motives in the first place to investing in farmland? To bypass the markets and make a direct chain of supply from Canada instead of buying the grain commodities through the Canadian market??
396.	Why do we need this? Financing is cheap and readily available for financially sound farms. The only reason somebody would need it is if they couldn't get credit from Canadian institutions. If they can't then they aren't financially sound and they shouldn't get credit.
397.	Financing or banking is one thing and ownership or control is another.
398.	FCC and local banks have provided us with all financing options we needed
399.	I would need to know more details about this proposal. It sounds acceptable on the surface, just not sure what the fine print would say--or imply.
400.	Why would a government want to allow this scenario? It would mean the loss of millions of dollars to outside entities. That is money gone from our economy to support a foreign one. Surely there is sufficient financing within Canada or Saskatchewan that at least would keep the interest here at home.
401.	Money still kept in local economy.
402.	Because if the farmer defaults the land would go to the foreign investors.
403.	There's plenty here.
404.	No because if someone defaults who owns the land?
405.	Why not? It is these unique business opportunities that will allow people to take their business in a different, less risky manner. LET THOSE PEOPLE DECIDE HOW THEY WANT TO RUN THEIR BUSINESS.
406.	Ultimately the end user responsible for the land is physically here.
407.	It happens now with investment funds.
408.	Only if they operated like a bank borrowing the money for a reasonable interest rate.
409.	Keep it in Canada.
410.	Just another way to allow foreign investments to take over and control our industry!
411.	How do you police this?
412.	Then one person will move here, and buy everything on behalf of foreigners. Pure evil.
413.	Again same reason - companies with deep pockets bidding on farmland against local young farmers wanting to start out.
414.	As long as they can't take the land in forfeit if not paid.
415.	Foreign ownership would drive prices up and ensure that land would NOT be affordable for the average Saskatchewan farmer or anyone who may want to farm. The regulations surrounding

	foreign companies would be too difficult to enforce, as we currently now see in the oil and gas industry, where most facilities are out of compliance and the government cannot enforce and the public is suffering. The same would happen with the farmers and land rules.
416.	Saskatchewan farmers should be the only ones who own farm land.
417.	Apply banking and security rules and then sure.
418.	With caps.
419.	If the Canadian resident defaulted on the debt, who would own the land?
420.	This would hurt local institutions such as credit unions that contribute to local communities and have supported farmers for decades.
421.	The law should be tightened up here - I think it is already happening and there are too many loopholes. Investors and purchases must demonstrate where they get the money to buy the land.
422.	That would be another way for people to funnel money into our country putting local farmers at a disadvantage.
423.	Financial control is too much power. Sovereignty is lost. That is the essence of colony operation.
424.	We could potentially lose control over our own land. Canadians have to maintain certain standards but foreign ownership could threaten those standards.
425.	Why wouldn't Canadian residents borrow money locally to finance their purchases? I don't like money being owed to foreigners.
426.	Debt can go to equity and that is difficult to control.
427.	Do it the traditional way, go to bank or FCC and buy your land. Why allow this, it's just another way to get foreigners to own the land when the farmer can't pay they foreclose and then they own the land!! No different.
428.	How does outside money increase the economy in the long run?
429.	Provided that they cannot assume ownership and control of the farmland through a foreclosure process. They're interest would have to be limited to financial instruments; the implementation of such a scheme seems complicated.
430.	Investing is just like buying in my mind.
431.	Loan to Saskatchewan residence.
432.	When you sell a house in the city it goes to the highest bidder nationality unrestricted.
433.	Who regulates foreign investment and financing???
434.	No. Would still result in absentee landlords. Money would only be funneled through a Canadian citizen.
435.	Money is global product and as we globalized should have access to money at a global

competitive rate.
436. All investment here in this province is good.
437. I don't know enough about this to comment.
438. Not sure this is needed; we are not short of lending agencies here.
439. No.
440. This would represent a mechanism to circumvent the spirit of local ownership.
441. I feel this is one of the cases I'm facing. I'm up against large mega farms backed by investors (>30,000 acres) that are increasingly buying up and raising the cost of land. One of the greatest stresses I face is wondering which piece of land that I'm farming will be bought out by one of these farms.
442. But the total acres purchased must be limited.
443. No, it is just the same as them buying the land using a Canadian citizen to write the cheque.
444. Same not fair. My grandfather did not come to this land and community to work hard to have the rich business take over. End up like oilfield where there are takeovers and restructuring when economies change.
445. It is no different.
446. They do already when they buy into bank shares, stocks that are Canadian owned.
447. I believe that present risk-management assessment in the Banking Industry leaves much to be desired in their attitudes towards agriculture on a small scale. They think in terms of large scale ventures, with large risks, with large capital returns, so it looks good on their year ends. The small farm makes up the majority of all agricultural products, and, should be supported more by the large domestic Banking System. The development of marketing products from small farms and co-operating by means of Co-Operatives could mean small farmers might directly sell their crops to Buyers in other lands, for a better price, for the support of "Fair Trade" practices, for the maintenance of farm ownership. The buyer would maintain the shipping costs incurred., as is the present model of Export.
448. Yes financing can be difficult and the more options the better.
449. Are foreign investors regulated by Canadian banking rules?
450. Same as the above response.
451. Just a loophole to get around the rules.
452. They try to get in through the back door.
453. At this time there is no reason why this would be accepted unless there is some sort of intention to gain equity from the land through some business other than agriculture (which would unfortunately inflate the market).
454. Keep our internal financing Canadian!
455. No they would foreclose on them pulling Canadian in foreign ownership.

456.	Skew the.
457.	Not sure how this could work as land would be the security on the debt, allowing freeing investors to ultimately own the land in the event of a default. Furthermore, Canadian banks have been very accommodating in farmland purchasing.
458.	Financing by foreigners seems unworkable as any loan secured by land could ultimately become the property of the foreign investor in the event of a default on the loan. Canadian banks have been very accommodating in providing financing for farmland purchases.
459.	Same as above.
460.	Perhaps in a roundabout way, but there should be no way for foreigners to gain control of the land should the borrower default.
461.	the foreign investors would hold title to the land eventually driving the farmer off the land and keeping it for themselves so that would not work
462.	Makes our Canadian lending institution to be competitive.
463.	We need innovation to allow farmers different financing methods. Farming is very capital intensive and new methods of financing need to be allowed to advance.
464.	Farm Credit Canada makes plenty of profits to lend more money to farmers and they are doing a good job at it!
465.	I am confident that there would be fall out and this would be a way for them to get the government to allow foreign investors.
466.	<p>Why is there such a disparate attitude towards this kind of financing? We allow foreign entities to lend us money to buy other assets, happily, but somehow farmland is different? This is a matter of 'cognitive dissonance', furthermore, most of the food, feed, and fuel generated from lands in Saskatchewan are exported... it makes zero sense to prohibit external financing whether from another province or another country.</p> <p>The question that should be asked concurrent with this one is simply:</p> <p>"Should there be legislation to ensure foreign investors and banks are registered within Saskatchewan to provide financing?"</p>
467.	This is just a back door to control. There is no lack of financing available from existing conventional sources.
468.	In 1936 my grandfather lost a section of land to a US mortgage company due to exchange rates not poor crops. We can see right now how that effect Saskatchewan agriculture US made farm equipment has become unaffordable.
469.	I would need more information as to what this would entail. I don't know how an investor could provide financing without having control and therefore I would likely disagree
470.	If the financing goes to the people who will actively farm the land could be an option.
471.	Another back door way of full ownership (i.e. farmer can't make payments, no investor walks away from their money).
472.	With FCC and major banks there is no need for foreign financing in Saskatchewan.

473.	Difficult to follow the money trail Who is truly the financier?
474.	Foreign investors are not interested in farming sustainability and stewardship of the land. Too risky for Saskatchewan.
475.	It would be difficult to monitor if investment income would stay in Saskatchewan. I would suspect that income would flow out of Saskatchewan and I would not support this.
476.	So long as they can't take land as collateral.
477.	Leave the farmers to farm and own the land.
478.	Increased lending options are always a good thing.
479.	Farmers of the province would be competing with a pit-less pot of money to buy land
480.	No because then they will slowly take over control.
481.	I have worked in Eastern Europe and seen what these corporations do in action. Not pretty!
482.	This is just a way around current land ownership laws, it is a front for certain countries or people from out of country to legally get into our land market
483.	Only if the farmer has complete control over the farm and products produced from the farm. Otherwise, NO. Conflict of interest.
484.	Outsiders and arm's length people see the broader picture and not the local situation and as someone who also taught for 34 years as well as farming for 38 years I could provide many examples of those seeing the Big picture cost classroom teachers time and poorer quality teaching as result of their of the world.
485.	As long as all farm gross revenue stays in Canada.
486.	As long as they could never own the land even in the event of a default on loan. Just straight financing would seem acceptable. Have to better understand question.
487.	I suppose that depends on the details of financing, and it's ultimately up to each farmer to decide for themselves if the agreement works for them or not.
488.	Same as above.
489.	Would only artificially inflate prices.
490.	Keep it all in house. Canadian banking system is one of the strongest in the world. Why use outside financing that could implicate problems during market corrections.
491.	Would depend on legislature made on it and potential loopholes to challenge to get around legislature.
492.	Best interest would be served by Canadians investing in Canada. Not obligated to foreign interests.
493.	I can see how this may benefit farmers needing to raise capital. But.... I could also envision it becoming a loophole for foreign investors to sneak around ownership restrictions, by having Canadian residents invest on their behalf.

494.	Don't need foreign money. Lot's available here.
495.	We need to limit funding and purchases by foreign investors otherwise we may lose control of our land, money and way of life. Look south of the border.
496.	Default results in finances going external to province.
497.	There are banks etc. for closing loopholes.
498.	As long as it's competitive.
499.	It is happening too much already.
500.	Canada already has good financial institutions that support agriculture.
501.	Depends on stipulations
502.	Decisions may become driven by short term return on investment rather than a long term view of what is best for the land, local communities and farmers.
503.	I would prefer the interest of loan payments to stay as in the Canadian economy.
504.	How such a loan would be secured.
505.	But they could not realize on their security of loan.
506.	Do not lose control.
507.	Canadian does not mean interest in stewardship. You may get more stewardship out of a Japanese owner. No means no with one being greedy and the other does not know
508.	First maybe attractive repayment terms then in a disaster as we had two or three times in the past 125 years it gets repossessed.
509.	There are enough financial resources within Canada to purchase farmland for a viable farmer to purchase land. We don't need loan sharks coming in to facilitate high risk purchases or foreigners using resident puppets to end run around the rules.
510.	Seems fishy, what's in it for them. Better read the fine print with a few lawyers.
511.	Response to all the above would be no because what I have saw is they only want money back they don't care about the land or the farmer.
512.	This would be a back door way to ownership by foreign ownership.
513.	If it makes it more competitive and a farmer has an opportunity to get better financing rates....why not?
514.	This is a good solution since it keeps the control in the hands of the Canadians and pump new resources to the farms.
515.	If there is a foreclosure, the land goes to the financing company. The foreign country gets the land by default.
516.	We have lots of money available through our own sources. Foreign money is not needed.
517.	Only if the Land is NOT used as collateral.
518.	There would need to be some strict rules to prevent foreign investors from having too much

	control over the land.
519.	Not needed.
520.	Possibly I guess, but how would this be different from our current lending options? Like FCC or any bank?
521.	The Canadian residents are then controlled by these foreign investors. Keep our land in the hands of those who care about this province and the land.
522.	This would be an OPEN DOOR FOR FRAUD!
523.	That's just one step away from foreign ownership.
524.	Nothing comes for free. Foreign investors want returns (as does any investor) but down the road (decades) foreign investors/owners will export the agricultural output directly to their homelands.
525.	Today a federal crown corporation provides virtually all the financing to farmers for land purchases. If foreign banks can compete with an entity like that, all the power to them.
526.	Puppet strings.
527.	We have lending institutions in place here in Saskatchewan to provide financing.
528.	Why would we need foreign investors to provide financing to Canadian residents?
529.	It seems to me that if the purchaser defaults on the loan then the title would revert to the lender.
530.	That takes opportunity away from hard working young Saskatchewan farmers trying to make a living and growing the farm that they grew up on.
531.	Foreign investors can't be expected to maintain credit and capital with the province's long-term interests in mind. The recent Iceland and Ireland financial collapses provide ample evidence of this in practice.
532.	Yes if the interest rate was an acceptable level and the ownership stayed local.
533.	It would still be controlled by foreigners.
534.	We should get local financing.
535.	This is a little trickier, but it is still outside foreign money buying the land at potentially absurd prices that local banking institutions including FCC wouldn't be willing to lend to a young farmer.
536.	Not if they are able to possess or control the land through a default on the debt of Canadian resident.
537.	I'm all for keeping ownership, assets and monies
538.	As long as they have no right to take over the land.
539.	we have our own FI's that will support agriculture I know the federal government has decided to with draw from land loans through FCC (afraid of defaults in bad years) but agriculture is cyclical like anything else The bad years and good

	years balance out.
540.	It would just take control out of the province.
541.	Once again... who would police a system such as this? Too many cracks and loopholes. In the end the foreigners will gain CONTROL of the farmlands. Saskatchewan land should not even be available for ANY Canadian to own... only Saskatchewan residents.
542.	This is already happening. What happens when the greedy foreign investor whose initial agenda is to own the property.... they get it. Too many loopholes and impossible to police.
543.	No comment.
544.	Do we not do that already, or do Farm Credit Canada and other institutions not borrow from world banks.
545.	Same as above.
546.	It's hard without knowing who these foreign investors are. Some would probably be fine but some should not be allowed. There are foreign companies out there with less than stellar human rights records. True, not many, but how do you make it so that these companies are not allowed?
547.	Farmland should be owned by either Saskatchewan residents, or by those working the land themselves.
548.	Residents or farmers?
549.	Foreign backed Canadian companies = capitalist backed fiefdom.
550.	Depends on the level of control that comes with the money, or is foreclosure a way to get ownership?
551.	Who would own the land if there is default in payments? Still leading to foreign ownership which in the future will hinder Saskatchewan.
552.	Yes, I don't know how we could stop that as it would be impossible to police all the lending that happens and how those funds are used. The land could not be held by the foreign lender as security or they might as well be able to own it outright.
553.	Again, this can be simply a wolf in sheep's clothing if not properly structured. There would have to be absolutely no way for foreigners to take ownership of land when the borrower is in default. I can see where foreigners will give money to anyone to buy land thus driving prices higher, but more importantly, doing so in the hopes that the borrower can't meet their commitments just so they can take over the land. It would be just another way for foreigners to figure out how to get ownership of the land.
554.	It is just a trick. What happens when the borrower defaults? Can the Canadian "owner" really be arm's length from the lender when making land management decisions? Of course not. He is a puppet, a money manager, not an owner.

555.	Foreign investors would either obviously expect their money paid back, or solid interest rate charged or both. Isn't that what FCC is for?
556.	Farm Credit Canada is a good resource for funds. Canadians need to invest in their own country.
557.	Are the Canadian residents going to be farming the land?
558.	As stated above with regards to becoming a nation of peasants, but also why are we giving control of our food to foreign countries? We have that scenario in my location. They arrived with a stack of money and took over whatever they wanted because no one else could match their offers.
559.	Foreign ownership would increase prices and make land purchases very difficult for young farmers.
560.	Financing is important.
561.	Another work around. Ulterior motives at play.
562.	What then happens to the Canadian people and business trying to business in this country? In default of payment you would then be allowing the foreign owner to take back that farmland if it was used as security.
563.	It's not Canadian ownership then!
564.	If it allows more Canadian ownership of the land then that would help out. As long as the land can be paid off.
565.	The foreigners still have a hand in local land.
566.	If you default then they get in
567.	Any form of money leaving Saskatchewan or Canada with no value return is beneficial.
568.	If a Canadian needs money to buy the land they should borrow within Canada and not through foreign investors.
569.	That is what FCC and Canadian banks are for.
570.	A connection to the province through residency should correlate with land ownership. Why would a foreign owner care about the environmental impacts of their operation, or be invested in providing tax dollars for things the local education system?
571.	That might lead to foreign investors having a majority share and therefore bigger say in what happens on Canadian soil. I'm not xenophobic, I promise.
572.	The owners and operators should be local people. However we make that happen, it should be so.
573.	Depends on the terms.
574.	Saskatchewan land should be owned by Saskatchewan residents, not Canadian residents. We should continue to limit the acreage owned by Canadian residents.
575.	FARMLAND COULD NOT BE USED AS SECURITY BY A FOREIGN CREDITOR, SO IT'S NOT LIKELY TO HAPPEN. IF IMPOSING THE LIMITS TO SASKATCHEWAN ONLY RESIDENTS THIS WOULD NOT

	LIKELY HAPPEN.
576.	Because then the prices will just go up. The price of houses only went up when interest rates went down and people foolishly bid each other up.
577.	This would simply be a way of owning the Saskatchewan land via financing.....no difference than actually owning the land.
578.	There are many local sources of capital (FCC, Credit Unions, and Banks) and foreign capital is not needed. If these sources were not available then yes I would support it.
579.	Do not trust the motives of foreign investors and what may happen after the Canadian resident buys the land.
580.	Saskatchewan owners. Saskatchewan money. Not foreign owners or foreign money.
581.	Financing yes. Ownership no. They can make some interest money on financing as long as the Saskatchewan resident owns the land the interest rates are reasonable.
582.	I believe in being creative to find cash!
583.	Another country owning any part of the land base will influence to the betterment of the foreigners and not Canadians. - National security - Back door manipulation
584.	This only opens the door for other things. Canada is not for Sale!
585.	If the farmer fails the foreign investor would then own the title.
586.	Never.
587.	If you are aware of history this has occurred many times and in every case the large foreign investors have eventually left this province and folded up the operation to the detriment of the residents living here.
588.	Until recently financing from foreign residents was available to Canadian residents to purchase farmland and the world did not stop as a result. Arbitrarily that position seems to have been reversed. What policy does that represent?
589.	Same as above. I don't want a government holding back my equity.
590.	There are already fronts of this kind.
591.	Neighbor has foreign investors backing him. They buy all in site, even small business in town...
592.	I think the money should still come from Canadian financial institutions. I wouldn't want to see foreign money being laundered through land purchases from a country outside of our control; I think FINTRAC does an ok job of following money in Canada.
593.	But only if foreign investors are prevented from taking ownership of land in case of payment default.
594.	FCC does a great job of ensuring capital is available to producers. The system is already in place and lack of capital is not a current restriction of the Saskatchewan Agricultural Sector.

595.	I do not believe there is a shortage of Canadian FI's and Credit Unions that could not support the financing of farmland. FCC has an open cheque-book that does not have to play by same rules that Credit Unions and FI's have to play by. No need for foreign financing.
596.	They only care about the profit and couldn't care less about the land. If that means implementing significant agronomic and environmental damages, they won't think twice and then Saskatchewan farmers are going to be left to clean up the ashes.
597.	Unfortunately this has allowed tricks to be played to evade farm ownership rules.
598.	Farming is precarious, and, thus, a farmer may default on land payments. Should this situation inevitably happen on occasion, foreign investors would acquire Saskatchewan land? This loophole in the farm ownership regulations could easily be (and probably will be) exploited.
599.	We would still be serfs.
600.	We already do, look at the banks!
601.	You need to live here to own any other way is foreign owned.
602.	same
603.	If the farmer defaults on the loan does the foreign investor now owns the land?
604.	Again, if the money is coming from legitimate sources, yes.
605.	We have enough bankers in the picture already... why would we give the interest and proceeds of borrowing to those from other lands... better off lending from our own.
606.	This is wrong and should be classed as fraud.
607.	Not sure how this is different that right now. Foreigners can buy FFC bonds.
608.	That would mean the fair values would increase exponentially and we would never be able to afford to purchase or lease.
609.	Same as above.
610.	Another way around the system
611.	It's Canada's use Canada's money.
612.	Foreign ownership is contrary to Saskatchewan interests.
613.	As long as the foreign investors would not be able to take-over the ownership.
614.	Still controlled by outside and they don't support local. Purchase their supplies from other large corporations.
615.	You may lose your interest on the investment but all the revenue stays local.
616.	There are lots of places to borrow money from, but sure financing is financing.
617.	If farmland value is affordable, there is enough money to finance it locally.
618.	Farmers will lose control of their lives by doing this.
619.	I will only support this scenario of foreign investors providing financing to Canadian residents to purchase farmland in Saskatchewan under these conditions. Title is in the farmers' name. If

	the land is foreclosed on it has to be sold to another legitimate buyer. The investor cannot capitalize on the asset they have to sell it.
620.	N/A
621.	This is already happening despite our land laws.
622.	Who will ultimately be controlling the land and how much say will the financier have?
623.	We must keep our freedom. Especially from foreign interests!
624.	No.
625.	I have seen this happen in a small town of Saskatchewan, a person from the US fronted money to a Canadian resident to buy land, bought out every small farmer around, now the town is turning into a retirement town instead of farming community, the sad thing is, the Saskatchewan government knew about the problem and did nothing,
626.	Just move here and farm.
627.	I don't see a problem with Canadians borrowing from whomever they choose to.
628.	Allows for some foreign control.
629.	It's a hoax as explained in previous question.
630.	Yes, again investment is always needed.
631.	All my life I have dealt with Canadian owned financial companies...why should farmers have to deal with foreign owned financial business?
632.	I will not allow anything from foreign people in this country.
633.	The land couldn't be the collateral or a 'note calling' end run would defeat an foreign ownership rules
634.	<p>Here again allowing such investor financing, may very well lead to the imaginative and sophisticated agreements which looked at in reality would just be another way for foreign investors to actually have defacto ownership..</p> <p>In addition if the financing payments are in default can the financial end up as the owner?</p> <p>Unfortunately I am advised that there are situations where foreign financiers are providing the purchase capital for Saskatchewan farmland, but there security documents and agreements are maintained in a foreign jurisdiction and are not registered in the Saskatchewan land titles system. I understand that these financiers are the actual beneficial owners.</p> <p>Our legislation needs to give the power and authority to investigate these situations.</p>
635.	You give me the money to purchase land but then I become your puppet. Again they have no real life stake in what happens to the land
636.	This is another slippery slope with long term dire consequences.
637.	Land prices are good. If you have the means to buy more land, you can likely find a bank in the province willing to lend to you.
638.	Foreign ownership and foreign financing creates a large "grey area" where foreign corporations

	lend money and manipulate terms in order to obtain ownership. I don't like it.
639.	NEVER if we have another severe drought then all our land would end up in the hands of foreigners due to default on the loans and we would be slaves to outside control don't you remember the 30's the banksters took over the land.
640.	This may help existing farmer purchase land to expand.
641.	Because that basically puts them "in control" of that farmland should the borrow fail.
642.	This may already be happening. I don't like the large investment farms already developing. They have an unfair edge and make it very difficult for smaller operations to compete, and almost impossible for young farmers to own land. They may benefit those farmers who are being supported by the financing/investment, but as soon as the investors are not receiving the returns they desire, then what? Also, these types of farms seem to need to increase their land base to thrive.
643.	If foreign investors are lending money to farmers to buy land money is leaving the province and the country. Keep the money in Saskatchewan.
644.	If they can provide cheaper money why not. The problem comes if there is a default.
645.	Same, farmer is in control.
646.	Only in instances where ownership of the land can never go to non-farming foreign or domestic entities.
647.	What happens if the owner defaults and the land is foreclosed on at which point it would be owned by a foreign entity.
648.	If they provide financing, upon default, they can become owners. They will not provide this financing without an equity stake. Our banks seem to have lots of money to borrow to Canadian Agriculture and if they have default land they soon sell it back into the local producer pool.
649.	That's what we have credit unions, FCC and Canadian banking institutions for.
650.	Cause the wording in the financial agreement is usually in the favor of the financier not the borrower.
651.	Let's use our banks, they have to stay open.
652.	That is just a way for foreign investors to bypass the rules ,
653.	They will use the land as collateral for the loans and will end up owning it due to recalling loans.
654.	Not if it gives them ultimate control of said land.
655.	Where does the land title go when the "Canadian" dies? We already have banks who will loan money to legitimate Canadian/Saskatchewan farmers to purchase farmland.
656.	Foreign loans mean any default the land would go back to the institute loaning money.
657.	Banks provide financing based on their investments in all sorts of foreign and domestic markets. Let the banks do their jobs and let the farmers do their jobs.

658.	The financing should remain within Canada to make sure the economic benefits stay within Canada.
659.	I don't know what that means.
660.	As soon as these scenarios are entertained we will create loopholes for foreigners to purchase farmland.
661.	No foreigners.
662.	Said investors can access the underlying collateralized farmland if the mortgagee fails to make agreed payments. Of course this also means that transactions can be rigged and performed on the intention of later default, as a loophole for foreign investors to acquire Saskatchewan farmland.
663.	This may be beneficial; however it opens doors ownership by foreign investors.
664.	This only drives up land values.
665.	It's already happening under the government's nose. It just drives land values up
666.	That may lead to good competition for the finance companies; however I would think that it would be a minor percentage of the overall financing.
667.	Because they hold the mortgage, just as bad. It still selling off our assets, and our heritage. Canada doesn't need foreign ownership, what the hell is wrong with Canadians. Foreign investors are not interested in helping us they are just exploiting us. Think about our future under foreign control and ownership,
668.	Canadian producers have all the options they need for land purchase through our existing credit system. Allowing foreign investors is begging for someone to abuse the system.
669.	Who is really making the purchase is my question. Currently land companies are buying land at market value then flipping it to purchasers, at 1.5 to 2x purchase price. This is artificially driving up price. But to the outside purchasers the chance to buy land looks like deal. Some more review of realtor, lender and investment company practices should occur.
670.	There are plenty of options available through regular financial institutions to obtain financing to purchase farmland. Foreign investors are not required to provide financing.
671.	That is what banks and FCC are for.
672.	Tricky question. He who pays the piper calls the tune...
673.	Again one is unsure if these Canadian residents would really care about the farm land they purchased if they are backed by a foreign investors. It is my feeling that foreign investors would find a person with dual citizenship and then it would really be the same thing as having a foreign investor. All they have done is find a way around the system.
674.	I believe the financial support needs to stay in Canada, so that Canadian companies can benefit from the transactions.
675.	THAT IS THE SAME AS ALLOWING THEM TO BUY.
676.	I think that could be a loophole for foreign people to eventually get the land.

677.	Free movement of capital and direct external investment are proven successful concepts. As Canadians may buy properties elsewhere there is no justification for denying reciprocity.
678.	Only if the Canadian residents were those who would be doing the actual farming.
679.	As long as there are no strings attached to the funds outside of the normal paying interest and capital.
680.	It still allows for control and management which impedes the Saskatchewan economy.
681.	I would support foreign investor to provide financing to SASKATCHEWAN FARMER THAT FARM THAT LAND. This will be needed with the vast amount of land that is now held in foreign or out of province hands i.e. timed selling over X years. This will help to alleviate a huge financial loss to the investors. I am in such a deal right now with a group of investors from Vancouver/ India. [I was the tenant with a cheap long term lease, if they wanted out they had to take a loss, or sell it back to me over time.] I have now done this 4 times with both local people I have known, and out of province people I haven't known. It seems to work very well.
682.	Local management and ownership of lands is essential.
683.	This is a way around the issue.
684.	Doesn't that happen in the financing system already
685.	I would agree with allowing Saskatchewan residents access to other monies, but any Canadian may just open up for more absentee landlords situations.
686.	The merits of the free movement of capital as a long term economic principle are well established. There seems to be no worthwhile distinction to be made between foreign individuals and foreign funds, which are, after all, merely collections of individuals.
687.	What would be the difference? The foreign investors would still be in charge of the purse strings!
688.	That would allow any defaults to be under the control of foreigners. If Saskatchewan farmers cannot get financing here they probably won't make a go of farming.
689.	"Yes" with caveats: land foreclosed upon in case of default would have to be sold back to Canadians or Canadian corporations.
690.	If the Canadian investor cannot repay the loan, who owns the property then? Besides the lender owns the land until every dime is repaid. Is this not direct "foreign ownership" The same could be said for federal and provincial debt.
691.	See previous answer.
692.	If we ultimately lose control of the product the impact could be severe.
693.	I thought farm credit filled that need.
694.	Why should other countries make money from our country if they don't want to live here?
695.	The Canadian residents should be farmers themselves if they are going to be financed by a foreign investor.
696.	Farming in Saskatchewan should be reserved for Saskatchewan investors. The economy in

	Saskatchewan should benefit from the farmland used for the agriculture industry.
697.	As long as the stipulation was that the land is sold to another Canadian resident within a reasonable amount of time if financial obligations were not met between the two parties.
698.	I am a YOUNG FARMER. I work hard enough for myself. I can't afford to stretch myself thin in order to compete against foreign investment
699.	Just masking true ownership and another way to circumvent regulations.
700.	Foreign investors providing financing for non-Saskatchewan Canadian owners is the same as outright foreign ownership. Any non-Saskatchewan ownership can be labeled as FOREIGN.
701.	Canadian banks can hold the mortgage, not foreign lenders.
702.	It is just a first step in gaining ownership.
703.	If foreign investors wish to do business here I see no problem allowing that.
704.	We have FCC which is very willing to lend to farmers.
705.	That's happening right now. Foreign money is being funneled to fund land purchases by recently new Canadian citizens already.
706.	Whole different ball game with many variables.
707.	How many banks now are foreign owned?
708.	There are Canadian owned banks and borrowing corporations that provide money for possible farmland owners without the need for foreign backing.
709.	Only if terms did not gouge or put the farmer at risk of losing property to foreign entity.
710.	I would prefer to have Canadian farmer funded by Canada.
711.	The people of Saskatchewan need to remain in control ultimately.
712.	Canadian investors already provide financing to Saskatchewan farmers.
713.	If the financing was fair maybe, but FCC should cover most farmers financing needs
714.	I don't believe foreign investors providing money to individuals or Saskatchewan numbered companies is good for our province. There is just no net benefit to our Province in the long term. I welcome anyone from anywhere who chooses to own land here to move here and farm alongside me. I'll have the coffee on in the shop and stop by.
715.	There are multiple options for Saskatchewan financing within our own economy
716.	Not the same level of farming afraid of wrong direction future farming will lead to
717.	Yes If it is Canadian farmers that end up owning the land. Foreign investment agencies should just be able to give Canadians loans not use Canadians as front for them to buy land.
718.	This also has the possibility of an inexperienced person endeavoring to farm which results in lower profits. That foreign investor could then decide to ask to be repaid his investment. Perhaps land which has been poorly managed comes back on the market at a lower price,

	increasing future costs to the new potential owner. This increases instability in the land prices.
719.	Comes with strings attached most likely and honestly I don't think having outside investors owning me because they helped me buy land is a good idea. That's just a facade. Canadian dressing while everything behind the scenes is foreign controlled.
720.	It is not easy to deal across borders. These investors have probably a lot more lawyers and experience the farmers here and they may well end up with the land they initially financed.
721.	He who has the gold makes the rules.
722.	Charter banks would already meet these criteria?
723.	It's not good for long term health of the Province.
724.	It's just Arm's length ownership
725.	ABSOLUTELY NOT! Again this is just a slippery slope for foreign and institutional investors to be worming their way around the regulations we are already seeing that now it will only get worse. Corporations, countries and large funds would drive land ownership in Saskatchewan, not a good scenario. I wonder if this isn't already happening (). I don't think this question needed to be asked!
726.	We have Canadian banks, Credit Unions and Farm Credit Corporation. Let's do it the old way.
727.	Any benefits from interest should be minimal end stay within the community. Only if there was a lack of financial competition should this be considered.
728.	On a purely financing basis, perhaps. When the management of the operation is dictated by investors, then we are on a slippery slope.
729.	Anyone with a brain would realize that buyers who have to borrow money can't compete with interest free money.
730.	Control through financing is still control.
731.	We have numerous financing options within our own province.
732.	WE will only have a serfdom hewer of wood and drawers of water.
733.	Don't we have enough going for us that we can control our own country?
734.	If implemented this would be one way for foreign investors to legally own land in Saskatchewan.
735.	I think it is already happening, and our government doesn't know, or is looking the other way. We need to keep it local.
736.	Foreign investors would ultimately have the control.
737.	This seems like a grey area. Is it a lending facility? Or a controlling investor?
738.	You then would still have an owner giving a manage direction on how to maximize short term profits at all costs without the problem that a conscious brings to destroying a environment which supports wildlife and a community.
739.	One citizen that is funded by a foreign corporation? No.

740.	If they had to foreclose on said loan they would then own the land. Another back door way of buying our land.
741.	This is just a loophole to buy land by foreigners.
742.	If the terms are like a banks yes. If the terms are similar to angel investors who want control and to make as much as they can NO. The farmers need less middle men and more of the profit to purchase the newer equipment and to keep up with market changes.
743.	If they default do the outside investors determine the fate of the land? Not good. So if they borrow from foreign investors - no. If they achieved their own funds from away - no problem.
744.	I think this would just make for too many foreigners abusing the system.
745.	How is it guaranteed that these investment firms aren't using Canadian residents as a front and retain ownership?
746.	I don't understand the concern in differentiation of outside investors. Either we are progressive and growing with all, or regressively trying to artificially restrict free trade.
747.	Free markets in Banking land and everything would move SK forward a half century in a decade.
748.	I never thought about that before...it is one way to get it call in the loan break the farmer then bye-bye Saskatchewan farmland.
749.	Rather than needing foreign investments land prices need a correction. This can in part be achieved by only allowing Saskatchewan residents to purchase land vs people from overseas and BC come in and purchase all of our land driving up prices.
750.	Not sure if it is relinquishing control. Would need control and follow the money
751.	Banks do this already, foreign and domestic. Dumb question.
752.	Again, where is the benefit to Saskatchewan producers???
753.	As long as the Canadian residents are the ones owning the land in the end I'm all for it.
754.	Wolf in sheep's clothing.
755.	No we already have enough lending institutions, and FCC does a superior job of that.
756.	We lose control. Would allow us to buy up their land?
757.	There are more than enough Canadian lending institutions here that SHOULD be MORE farmer-friendly. Why must we keep letting our country become more and more someone else's country?
758.	We are always searching for operating funds in Saskatchewan and I feel it will be a carefully constructed business decision.
759.	That is just a big loop hole that will be taken advantage of. It isn't going to legitimately help any current SK farmers.
760.	Once again, it is a vote of confidence in my business.
761.	Foreigners should not be allowed to get leverage via agricultural land or any land for that

matter.
762. Why would they do that? I need to know more before making a decision.
763. If it was a reliable company to deal with, and the interest rate was bearable.
764. Only in certain circumstances. Where the financing would be at a better rate for our young farmers to be able to make a living and not be driven to declare bankruptcy
765. With a significantly less than 50% ownership not permitted to go further.
766. We don't want their money.
767. Nice trick but really there are lots of domestic lenders and investors.
768. Canadians need to invest in their own people.
769. I would worry that foreign investors may place dangerous conditions on their provision of financing to Canadian residents to purchase farmland.
770. At least they wouldn't own the land.
771. We have enough Canadian financial institutions to loan money in Canada.
772. Investment money can be found at FCC and local banks.
773. This will likely provide them with legal loopholes to own the farmland should the resident default.
774. Keep it in Canada at least.
775. I would need to study the implications of this.
776. It's not right.
777. We are destroying our right to farm by allowing this.
778. I would think this is not required but when the ag economy drops if it becomes so severe that financing cannot be obtained at local levels then such an option may be needed to prevent total collapse of operations.
779. That depends on whose name the land is registered in and what the terms and conditions of the financing are.
780. The land could not revert to the foreign owner.
781. Depends on the agreement in the event Canadian resident neglected on payments. Who would then become the owner?
782. Land then will be foreign owned until paid off.
783. Our banking system is in place.
784. Possibility of foreign ownership through foreclosure. Banks can make a big enough mess without allowing loan sharks.
785. Although they would not own the land directly, they would have influence on the owners on how the land was used. I think that this would not be much different from allowing foreign ownership directly.

786.	Again. This takes the small farmers chance at ever expanding impossible. Best scenario would then be to sell the family farm to an investor and go from owning to being an employee with no assets
787.	As long as the Canadian lenders cannot jack the interest rates to kill the economy.
788.	Result is the same as foreign ownership; the only difference is a front man to make the purchase legal. This is simply a way to get around the law.
789.	My father came to Canada from Scotland 40 years ago to have a better life and has done very well for himself but he started small and built up to what we have now and calls Canada home because it gave him a chance as a small operator with no foreign help (including family) now foreign investor want large land base which takes away from young home grown farmers to have a chance to stay on the family farm.
790.	But I'm sure they already do.
791.	Just a back door into owning Saskatchewan farm land.
792.	Just another kind of outside control. We need to strengthen the ability of our Credit Unions to finance...
793.	It would depend on the structure of the deal. Yes if the land doesn't become owned by foreigners if defaulted on, then it is simply a bank, but the land would have to be sold to Canadians if defaulted on.
794.	The whole point is to keep land affordable for our residents, allowing outside funds would defeat the purpose of this.
795.	What is the point in that? We already have sufficient lending institutions in place such as FCC, banks and Credit Unions. As it now stands today: if one has sufficient security and ability to repay: then one will probably get the financing their looking for. If one cannot get financing through todays traditional lenders: are we going to turn to these foreign investors for financing and on what terms? Are these foreign investors going to be providing funding through "Loan Shark" terms? What happens if the Canadian resident fails to re-pay the foreigner? Does the foreigner now own the land?
796.	Default of loans could result in foreclosure to the foreign investor.... Rules could change to force sale... A slippery slope in my opinion.
797.	I think the problem with foreign financing is that, in case of any default, ultimate ownership would vest in that foreign investor.
798.	At what cost could you stop or even police this?
799.	Foreign financing allows out of country through the backdoor.
800.	As long as interest rates are comparable to other lending options and there are no interest rate adjustments which pass along the ownership benefit to the mortgage holder.
801.	The decision making would be the financier.
802.	We need to keep the businesses in our economy flowing.
803.	Would they be "custom farming" for these investors? Or paid a wage? Is there truth to the Chinese investors buying land, and cattle, and paying the farmers to look after them? And then

	loading up the grain to ship to their country? Without actually paying for it through International grain trades?
804.	Too much of this happens already. Once this practice becomes big enough and these farmers bypass our markets and ship direct to consumers in their own country we will begin to see how absolutely stupid these ideas are. Only short sighted politicians can be so stupid.
805.	No! Any foreign investing to provide financing translates into the same thing, they, the foreign investors still have the same rights as a financial institution here in Saskatchewan, default on the payments and the farmland becomes foreign owned.
806.	So thing, the foreign investor in not a domestic bank or financial institution. It has to be Canadian money.
807.	This isn't necessary. It is better that this be left to our Saskatchewan financial institutions to do this.
808.	You are playing with dynamite borrowing money from someone or some company outside of Canada. It has too many complications.
809.	Canadian Banks and FCC not enough?
810.	We need Canadian government helping the young farmer to purchase land for guaranteed ownership
811.	NO, foreign investors should not be involved in any way. Competition for land in our area is already fierce, without bringing in foreign investment or other investors.
812.	This could allow for some foreign investment while retaining Canadian control.
813.	Yes if it's in a Canadian farmers hand that is active farmer
814.	There is an abundant amount of Canadian controlled institutions (Banks, FCC, etc.) that are suitable avenues for financing. A viable arm operation can find financing from one of these sources.
815.	Would a foreign investor lend \$ if the land cannot be "ceased" by them as collateral? If they cannot actually take ownership in case of default, are they in the lending game?
816.	If they are providing financing to existing Canadian farmers fine, but if they are providing financing to some guy who just immigrated and it's a front for something else then no
817.	Creating some sort of investment shell?
818.	Just another way in the door. I believe this is happening already and needs to be investigated and stopped.
819.	This should not be required in that there are perfectly functional financing providers in place such as FCC & chartered banks.
820.	It would depend upon the amount of financing and the restrictions to the resident by the borrowing. Potential scenario where investor ends up owning the land if resident doesn't meet payments
821.	Allowing Canadian farmers access to the lowest interest rates, whether foreign or local, allows more money for inputs and profits.

822.	This is already happening in my home area, with those foreign nationals dictating how the land can be farmed. The effect is the same as direct foreign ownership.
823.	No.
824.	I think it's happening already with some of the foreigners immigrating here and setting up farms with financing from where they came from.
825.	Money talks. The investors would have influence regarding decisions made on that land.
826.	Enough Canadians to farm the land.
827.	We have people here wanting to support local banks, credit unions and so on, which employ people in our small towns and cities. Policies established in "Head Office" don't cut it at the local level and that is what needs to be able to respond to the market here, and be able to do it quickly.
828.	They control things...feudal system...dark ages.
829.	Farmers who farm the land should have access to financing from Canadian sources!
830.	As seen in Vancouver real estate, this is a great opportunity for money laundering.
831.	If crops failed or for any reason the farmer was no longer able to repay according to the terms, the foreign investor would take over the land.
832.	Yes, but there would need to be a cap on the number of acres.
833.	Again that puts them in major ownership of Canadian property. Why? For purpose of immigration? Don't sell off our land, out resource!
834.	Where someone gets the money to purchase land is up to them. No difference between a bank financing them or someone else. As long as ownership stays with the resident.
835.	Again, I do not trust that Canadian residents would have Saskatchewan rural social, economic, and environmental best interests in mind if they were provided financing from foreign investors.
836.	There is already enough competition.
837.	This would give them financial control.
838.	"Allowing foreign investors to provide financing to Canadian residents to purchase farmland" has the same net effect as allowing foreign ownership. "Canadian residents" could be someone from Toronto who doesn't care anything about good agricultural or environmental practices. Who would be the "foreign investors"? Would we have mechanisms for vetting what countries they come from? Would they be taking profits out of Canada to foreign investors who could support what kind of political or other purposes?
839.	This seems a slippery slope towards a fuller situation of foreign farmland ownership. I would accept foreign financing if said financing was for a resident who would become the owner-operator of a Saskatchewan farm. Of course, such limits or allowances are very difficult to assess and enforce from a regulatory perspective.
840.	This would simply provide a back door method for foreign ownership.

841.	I support family owned and operated.
842.	This is already common business practice as many Canadian resident farmers receive loans for the purpose of purchasing Saskatchewan farmland from BMO, RBC and other Canadian banks who are publicly traded and have foreign investors. If capital were to become unavailable from these sources there would be very few lenders remaining to finance farmers.
843.	If the financing is fair and regulated.
844.	If a foreign investor provides financing, that would mean they would have the ability to own that land in the event that the farmer cannot pay back the loan. I don't support foreign ownership in any way.
845.	This is a current loophole in my opinion that gets around existing foreign ownership rules.
846.	This already takes place informally, and seems to be a default, but many of the people who take over the land under these situations are not farmers, and don't know how to take care of the land either. Really, we need people who actually know how to farm in control of our land and our potential food supply.
847.	One needs to know to value - foreign investors don't "know."
848.	This could lead to pressure and speculation.
849.	Is an alternative and provides another source of financing.
850.	The investors foreclose and then the land goes to the investor for 5 years while he looks for somebody else to finance. In the meantime he can do what he wants with it.
851.	I am sure that is already taking place and no I would not support it.
852.	Only financial aid to Saskatchewan farmers.
853.	Why?
854.	Only to active Canadian farmers.
855.	We can finance our own purchase of farmland without involving foreign investors. As is the cost of farmland is not out of reach by productive farmers.
856.	Need to keep farmland ownership in Saskatchewan farmers hands
857.	This is again an erosion of the financial feasibility for our farmers.
858.	Loop holes i.e. the Saskatchewan farmer defaults and ownership transfers to financier.
859.	Don't need to be in debt to for foreigners.
860.	As long as they never control the land.
861.	Tomato, tomato.
862.	No, if a farmer defaults, the foreign investor takes possession? Unworkable.
863.	Needs to stay with Saskatchewan residents.
864.	Have some serious reservations on this, from the standpoint of potential money laundering.
865.	Depends on why they want to make that investment.

12) Would you support allowing investors such as Canadian pension plans or larger Canadian investment trusts (of 10 or more beneficiaries)...?

#	Response
1.	I think there should be quotas or maximums in place for this
2.	Hard enough competing with farms over 20,000 acres in size, land investors from Canada, and heaven forbid pension boards, I would never be able to farm and would have to end up selling what land we do have to them. That's a lose lose right there.
3.	Within limits (up to a maximum maybe and not in just prime farming areas etc.)
4.	It might be acceptable to a degree, but it would be all but impossible to open the door 'just that much'. Pressure would mount to open it more and more, from a practical point of view total restrictions would be much easier to manage.
5.	The people farming it should be the ones who own it.
6.	Yes I definitely support Canadian investors being allowed to own and/or finance Canadian farmland anywhere in Canada and also in Saskatchewan.
7.	Same again
8.	100% no.
9.	Where is the farmer in this?
10.	Negative long term impacts
11.	No because there is a good chance it will be farmed by a investment based farming group or friends and family of the purchasers
12.	In most cases, producers would have a stake in these companies and therefore would be competing against there own money to buy farmland
13.	they wanna own farmland then move here and farm
14.	What good is them owning the land vrs me?
15.	This would only increase farmland prices.
16.	why I think we sold off too much of Saskatchewan
17.	I really believe that there is nothing wrong with promoting an agricultural lifestyle in our province. In order to succeed, i believe that farmers need to OWN their land not just lease from an investor whose bottom line is the dollar.
18.	It does not matter who owns the land.
19.	Same as above.
20.	Definitely not! Pension funds are the worst option due to there holding period. They

	will never have to sell the land. An investor may have to sell, but a pension plan that is funded by the people of Canada will never run out of money and never have to sell.
21.	This completely goes against land ownership rules already in place and is a great way too majorly upset the farm land market and the pension funds
22.	Pension plans should stay out of the land business. They drive up the prices of both purchasing and leasing land.
23.	They have no sense of commitment to the land.
24.	Even if they are Canadian, they are still commercial scale investors. No thank you!
25.	They have other vehicles to invest in.
26.	<p>No, this creates a lease situation for farmers, with leases increasing to create a profit margin for a non-farming entity. Farmers are the ones who take all the risk and trying to farm and plan your next year is difficult if you suddenly find your lease owner is wanting more money. Especially if you have one or more consecutive poor years. Farmer takes risk, guaranteed money for Pension Plan Holders. Farmers either give up their land base or go under! Never good for the Province!</p> <p>What happens when Saskatchewan goes into a cyclical crop failure due to drought, etc.? If these Pension Plan land holders and other non-farming corporate entities, etc. don't have anyone farming their land holdings, what happens to the land? Does the Government plan on setting a regulation stating the land must be sold back to the Province?</p>
27.	Drives up price.
28.	Only to a minimum
29.	Possible as long as you don't end up with corporate farms. And keep the small farmers alive.
30.	Farmers should get first shot at all land
31.	No, especially as Canadian pension funds will likely have a large loss when they buy the farmland at a high price and end up selling it at a low price. No one wants to see their pension significantly cut down in size. They should invest somewhere more stable.
32.	This WILL lead to corporate farms.
33.	These are Canadian entities - with interests residing with Saskatchewan residents - why shouldn't they have the opportunity to invest in this province.
34.	the land is for the people of SK
35.	Not direct investment on land. Invest in the companies farming the land
36.	They own some land by me and its land that will never be able to be bought again
37.	Hutterite colonies are larger than 10 people and they can so why not others? Family

	trusts can be larger than 10 so why not?
38.	No what does that have do with me or how will that help me. And I would not like my pension being used.
39.	farmers would be competing for land with government funds.
40.	We absolutely should not be opposed to allowing Canadian capital to invest in our province. In Australia, the ag sector is crying out for Australian institutional investors to pay attention to domestic opportunities. It should get us excited that finally someone wants to invest in a key sector in our economy here in our province. We were fly-over country for too long under the NDP, and we don't want to go back to that.
41.	ONLY if they are and remain 100% Canadian ownership.
42.	This makes the land unaffordable for local farmers/ranchers to compete. It is simply a mechanism that facilitates the pricing out of young people who want to farm.
43.	No, Government has missed these funds and this is no way to try and replenish
44.	Would be impossible to bid on land against that kind of money plus they will expect a set amount of return every year so if I was to rent it from them the rental values would be too high. Plus they likely have no idea what farming the land is like compared to renting from a neighbour who used to farm it and knows what his land is like, a neighbour would be easier to and better understanding to negotiate with.
45.	Need to think about our farmers first. This makes it difficult for them to purchase land.
46.	As long as the owners are under Canadian laws who cares? And the CPP has been a good landlord, better than some small-town landlords who make decisions based on petty rivalries.
47.	go buy on the stock market, do we really want to see the idiocy of stock market mentality on saskatchewan land?
48.	To keep food at a reasonable price no investors in farmland is a good thing. They should be investing into finishing the product instead.
49.	Don't know what to think of this situation
50.	No because they are just playing with cash money trying to turn a quick dollar at the expense of its own people that are paying into the pension plan.
51.	Again, employees have no vested interest and shareholders only care about quarterly increases. Farming is an industry that requires a more holistic approach and a family centred business model for success. The change required is to make it an accessible career choice to anyone who would like to take it on.
52.	Just inflates the price

53.	This would be state owned land like they tried in Russia and China.
54.	Just like any other large corp. looking for an investment . This takes control out of the hands of the farmers
55.	Yes but they must farm it
56.	It is a form of speculation which adds no value to the economy but only takes. It splits the already small margins farmers receive and adds risk.
57.	Local farmers can't compete with investor groups for interest rates.
58.	repeating question again.
59.	While I have no issue with this concept, my concern would lie with the stewardship of the land owned by individuals/corporations/trusts/investors outside of the province.
60.	see above
61.	We can't opt out of CPP and they are using before tax money to purchase the land. Unfair competition for a very precious resource.
62.	Again, where is the MONEY coming from?
63.	As long as they are purely Canadian and do not have a head office or other ownership outside of Canada. And there were limits on what they could do, as well as being heavily regulated.
64.	That would just make to problem worse. High land prices does not benefit Saskatchewan farmers who don't own the land.
65.	We as private farmers cannot compete with public money to buy land. We ourselves have been squeezed out of purchases recently by the CPP.
66.	profits do not stay here
67.	They are long term investors and the money comes back to Canadians in their retirement. Can't beat that!
68.	Yes as long as Canadian Money stays in Canada i will support it
69.	as long as it is Canadian owned. I believe land value in Saskatchewan should be at open market value. Pension funds wouldn't invest if there is no return.....neither should a farmer.
70.	If it had to happen then It is keeping it within the country at least.
71.	As stated before I believe the farm land should stay with the farmer who is the one working hard everyday to feed the world and make a living. I think the government should butt out and not be thinking of driving prices higher and make land harder to get than it already is.
72.	every farmer can compete with their neighbours. we deal with same weather etc. we just watched the implosion of Broadacres and one earth who came in and raised rents

	etc to unsustainable levels to make money for their investors and then were done and now the areas they were active in, have local farmers picking up the pieces, probably stuck paying higher rents to keep some of their land that they had before these "investment companies" came in to show how it should be done
73.	If the trust or fund is 100% Canadian owned, they should be allowed to purchase Sask. farmland.
74.	The price that the investment funds pay will not be tied to land productivity.
75.	no!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
76.	Unfair to local farmers having to compete with government money
77.	Outside the industry money will distort the marketplace.
78.	Land is a great solid investment that will help everyone in the long run
79.	Remains Canadian owned. Capping the amount of land might be a worthy consideration.
80.	This would be a step up from foreign investment but I still don't agree with it. Unfair advantage to farm families & individuals
81.	THIS WOULD TAKE LAND OUT OF CIRCULATION FOR MANY YEARS IF NOT FOREVER. YOUNG FARMERS WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO BUY LAND AND HAVE THEIR EQUITY GROW OVER THEIR LIFE TIME.
82.	As above - they want to own land so they can rent it out at high rates and get maximum returns for their shareholders. This will increase the cost of production for farmers and make it harder to earn a living. They will be able to out-bid farmers who want to buy land and lead to a return to feudalism where landlords call the shots.
83.	Its not fair to the farmers who have made Saskatchewan agriculture what it is today
84.	They will drive prices up, then rent/lease to the local producer, creating even more overhead costs on an already small profit margin
85.	Land prices can be manipulated to inflate book values. The end loser is anyone trying to buy land after that
86.	Allowing these Canadian pension funds etc to own land doesn't bother me so much as the potential that they could own the land in perpetuity.
87.	Funds and trusts should not be allowed to own land unless the shareholders physically farm it, in person.
88.	These large institutions have very deep pockets that farmers cannot compete with. They also distort the value of the land, turning it into an investment instrument for speculators as opposed to a food production commodity for farmers. This could have a very negative influence on agriculture in this province by pushing more farmers and their families off the land. Where will the next generation of farmers

	come from?
89.	See above
90.	Again, it is not a level playing field. They have millions if not billions of tax free dollars to compete against farmers after tax dollars. Farmland is for Farmers. When they retire, they sell or rent to other farmers. One of the reasons the number of farmers has declined is the cost of land.
91.	The difficulty with this is that the investors don't know what is happening on the land. They are too far removed. The fund managers only care about the dollar figures and the hired land managers also only care about how much profit can be squeezed out of the land in the short term. This is not how nature functions. People living with families on the land have much more intimate contact with what is happening and tend to care more about sustainability.
92.	maybe they should get into real estate in Regina or Saskatoon
93.	Most of us lived rural and trust in it
94.	Again it is not being owned by Saskatchewan farmers.
95.	As long as the business is Canadian, I have no issue. The funds and land are "staying" in Canadian hands. We need to keep our resources to ourselves for our future generations.
96.	I don't support these entities owning farmland in our province at all. Most after tax money earned from the land by farmers here is reinvested here. Most money earned by outside entities leaves the province.
97.	I appreciate the restrictions that are in place.
98.	I think it's too risky as once again they are looking for profits. I'd be worried about investors looking to find more profitable used for the land than farming, or not renewing leases to long term farmers in order to make more money or huge lease hikes that farmers won't be able to afford. Once again I have experienced the result of living on a property owned by an out of province company. Huge rent increases, profits go out of province and property not maintained.
99.	Large funds and companies are unhealthy when competing with small owners.
100.	The farm operator needs to own the land.
101.	Too much money to throw around - it has already happened in our community and they have sent the price of land through the roof. Now every retiring farmer expects that and more for their land.

102.	You are supporting Canadian citizens.
103.	Again. How do we compete ?
104.	good solid canadian investment
105.	This is just absentee corporate ownership. Without intense regulation, which your government seems incapable of valuing in a useful way, this would extremely detrimental. Farmland cannot be directly subjected to quarterly profit expectations from a management group with no understanding of biology.
106.	Still creating tenant farmers and annual dollars leaving.
107.	Economics will dictate investment.
108.	By doing this it just creates maker inflation
109.	mmmmm
110.	Pension plans in particular should be allowed because they are a long-term investor. Allowing Canadian workers to share in Saskatchewan farmland is something we should be proud about - not afraid.
111.	open market...all for it
112.	if they think it is a good investment.. then it would be a good investment for anyone.. locals included
113.	The problem is not who the owner is it's that farmers have to use tax payed money to purchase where as the pension funds use before tax money. That is the inconsistency.
114.	---- NO!
115.	As long as the investors are Canadian and there is a process where local farmers can have first right of refusal to purchase.
116.	Market driven decisions. This will price land at true value.
117.	These fund managers have large amounts of long term capital that they will invest into a standardize income producing model and have a level of security in investing in farmland. But again they are'nt farmers and they will need a of team skilled managers to structure and manage data that shows a dashboard of information with the touch of a finger. The same as a sole farmer owned business would need to know, a platform of data anlysis, cash flows. These types of invetment firms will create a whole new dynamics on the farm. That is good to see.
118.	Pushes the local farmers out.
119.	They end up competing with farmers for land - thus raising the price for Sask farmers, often making it unaffordable.

120.	What is the benefit to the local economy or the province of Saskatchewan? None that I can think of.
121.	Unless farmers can start purchasing land with non taxable dollars, or write it off as a business expense. We cannot compete with corporations paying top dollar with non taxable money
122.	These are Canadian owned and control and are under great investor scrutiny as far as not over paying or distorting the market. These types of investors are good capital as it is Canadian money investing in Canadian Agriculture.
123.	There is nothing wrong with Canadian Pension Funds owning land in Saskatchewan.
124.	I beleive there is a net benefit to all Canadians if Canadian funds invest in such a coveted resource as farmland.
125.	See above
126.	Once again. Investors can buy land but who is going to farm it? Not many farmers are going to sell out and keep farming for an investor.
127.	I believe such funds and trusts would act in the same destructive manner as corporations and foreign entities. Investors would fuel speculation on farmland leading to the wild price swings and commodity bubbles we have seen globaly in recent years.
128.	corporate dictates will influence farming
129.	Destroys the chance of young farmers being able to compete.
130.	The work around by the Canada Pension Plan Investment board, which was allowed by the Farm Land Security Board, stinks to high heaven. In theory, with the rule interpretation, other pension plans should qualify. hard to compete against your own money someone else is spending.
131.	land would not be managed as farm land it would just become a stock on the exchange. you will go back to a lord and serf society hurting the middle class.
132.	Driving our cost up
133.	As long as the land has been put up for fair tender and advertised.
134.	If they can help me stay ranching Yes. If no then no way.
135.	I would think this would be fine provided that the pension funds are 100% Canadian and benefit Canadians such as the CPP board. Some caps or limits should be placed on this type of ownership though.
136.	read above answers !!!!
137.	Same as before. They have access to more funds than a lone farmer
138.	Only with severe restrictions on size of portfolio owned. They must be 100% Canadian

	owned and controlled.
139.	Would benefit canadian citizens
140.	Allowing investment institutions to buy farmland makes it very difficult for farmers to compete. Farmers have limits to what banks will lend when it comes to financing farmland. Investment and pension funds have significant financial resources.
141.	The investors are not owning the land to make money producing food, they are only in it for the investment income.
142.	Not control but a minority position..
143.	They simply don't have the capacity and compassion to steward the land responsibly. And make sure it's being leased correctly and efficiently. They are 100% profit driven and should keep thier money in the stock markets and other forms of investments. Not Saskatchewan land !!!
144.	Because one year of drought and they will dump it anywhere they can!
145.	No because then farmers involved in the funds and trusts are bidding for land agains their own savings if they are looking to expand.
146.	dto
147.	Rather a fully owned Canadian company than that of foreign ownership. Just look at Africa - the biggest welfare state in the world.
148.	They would become just another owner of farmland assets. Their motivation for investing in land includes the rental revenues that can be generated. Rental rates will be set, as they have always been set in the past, by normal arms-length market conditions irregardless whether the rented farmland is owned by a corporation of some sort or by a locally retired farmer.
149.	Case by case basis, dependant upon care and control of both the Pension fund and the purchase farmland.
150.	We need actual farmers owning the land. They are the only ones who truly understand the 'business' of farming.
151.	No. They are only out there to extract the highest possible rent, even if it means putting their tenants at financial risk in a bad year. Local owners that lease land back to farmers usually understand what could happen in a bad year and will work with you.
152.	No Ag focus
153.	not a level playing field
154.	individuals or couples only
155.	Letting pension plans make money off farm land and driving up land prices for their gain in my opinion is unethical.

156.	If they are owned by Canadians
157.	This just drives up the price of land with no regard as to how farming conditions are. It also doesn't encourage local investment, if pension plans own the land they're not supporting the local grocery store or the local school or the local minor sports. If local investment is encouraged then rural Saskatchewan wins, and all of Saskatchewan wins as more residents live and work here and pay taxes.
158.	No pride in ownership just out to make money
159.	Allowing investors such as Canadian pension funds or larger Canadian investment trusts (of 10 or more beneficiaries) to purchase farmland in Saskatchewan reduces local control
160.	They don't farm so they should not own land.
161.	No, they would always have the purchasing power to squeeze out smaller farmers, making it impossible for farmers to own their own land.
162.	There is a world of investment opportunities available to these entities. They don't need to own farmland, but farmers do!
163.	market in favor of large financial entities.
164.	let market work
165.	The deal that CPI made to purchase over 100 000 acres in Saskatchewan should never been allowed through in the first place. There was blatant favouritism occurring because several members involved in Assiniboine Land Corp. were strongly associated with the Saskatchewan Party. This deal was very negative for Saskatchewan producers as this land was never even on the market in smaller parcels. This transaction should be rescinded with the land being broken into smaller parcels that would be affordable for Saskatchewan producers.
166.	They do anyway don't they? isn't CPP one of the largest land holders in the west?
167.	Same answer as above.
168.	They say there is no hope for the CCP why let them invest, it will be another lost cause.
169.	If it could be guaranteed that the land was farmed and produce marketed by / in Saskatchewan
170.	best opportunity with this for young farmers to be able to farm
171.	Canadian Companies with shareholders that are Canadian citizens should not be restricted at all. Why would you not want Canadian Pension Plans to invest locally. That money is going to go somewhere. Might as well be right here so we can benefit from the economic spinoff.
172.	How do we know they aren't foreign owned?

173.	They are putting money into our pockets.
174.	we need investors and new ideas to help keep ag competitive and ahead of our competitors.
175.	Individual farmers cannot compete with large groups who pool their money. What will happen when times turn tough, and they will, and nobody can pay to rent the land? These corporations are not farmers. Will the land go into weeds?
176.	How are the large land owners going to sell their land? The people bitching and moaning to gov sure as hell aren't going to pay fairly for it.
177.	All corporate entities that are in Canada is good.
178.	Over the years millions of dollars of farmland rent have been paid to pensioners. Families grew up on the farm, generally the oldest son ended up farming and the balance of the siblings moved off the farm. Eventually the parents died and the non-farm siblings ended up with some portion of the land. The farming sibling wrote rent cheques to sisters or aunts who lived in far away places. That cycle no longer happens. My children will likely never own farmland directly but I see no reason why their pension plans should be precluded from owning farmland.
179.	They don't see the day to day economics and reality of rural life. They aren't here working, but want to skim of the cream.
180.	Depends upon whether the beneficiaries are Canadian citizens.
181.	See above. This is simply a source of investment money. Having access to leased land could actually help some farmers who are being squeezed out by larger farmers who can already outbid the smaller farmers.
182.	I don't think we need big investment from funds and trust to buy our farmland and thus benefit when other farmers would like to own that property
183.	Let the farmers own the land they work so hard to produce food on.
184.	All this does is open the market to inflate prices....
185.	This would open a door that should not be opened.
186.	I see the CPP as unique because we are all mandatorily members as Canadians, but I don't support other Canadian investment trusts - they don't have my best interests at heart
187.	It has been proven in the area that they rent to large scale farm operations that tend the land poorly.
188.	If they were 100% Canadian, no foreign ownership of finances.
189.	There Canadian what is wrong with a pension fund buying and the land belongs to a

Canadian and they should be allowed to sell to anyone they want
190. I don't want to sell off Saskatchewan.
191. The next thing would be having big money telling us how and when to farm.
192. As a farmer I cannot compete with them .It is an unfair playing field. They are using cash on hand and I would have to borrow the money.
193. I'd vote PC first.
194. Need sask farmers to own sask farm land for sask to never run into trouble.
195. There would have to be a limit on how much land the trust / fund can own, and the land would have to be kept under active farming regimes (not just held on speculation or sold to developers for residential / commercial development), ideally through leasing to SK farmers.
196. There have some notable examples of the failure of such do to a good job at this point!
197. My father came from Europe to own his land as many others did. Our sons should not have to leave Sask to own their land
198. State owned land has never worked.
199. same problems as any investor
200. That is simply bs when I have to compete against my pension fund to buy land.
201. That would be the better option , but one sentence is pretty vague, considering the rules put in place protects the land , and the leasee's .
202. test
203. test
204. Farmers can't compete with large investment funds.
205. Again no!
206. financing entails ROI = wrong focus
207. They have no incentive to think about the farming operation itself, only ROI. This could lead to unpayable interest rates or rents.
208. As long as the lease was at a reasonable rate.
209. This takes away from the Saskatchewan economy and makes it very hard for young farmers to get started farming and purchasing farmland. To come up with the capital needed to purchase farmland and compete with large investment trusts is extremely difficult for a young person trying to get started.

210.	This will make us like Russia.
211.	test
212.	It would allow all Canadians to benefit,
213.	refer to my comments earlier
214.	I am very comfortable with CPP. The issue for me would be could other Canadian Pension Funds be purchased and/or controlled by foreigners through acquisition or merger. If they could I would be against them owning land
215.	Its demented that a pension fund can own land. A farm needs a farmer, not a retired farmer, and especially not an entity built around providing the ability to retire to others owning it. The next generation has to make a living before a pension plan does, who else pays for infrastructure, its not a retiree.
216.	the more land that moves into the hands of large scale investors the more farmers move to the ranks of peasants and surfs. In order for farmers to provide the kind of time and energy for the return that they currently receive they need to feel that they are being rewarded even if that reward comes in the way of the land being paid for. If you are simply leasing the land, given mother nature and the volatility losses can occur for many years in a row, and without land as a natural holder of equity the farmers can end up with nothing (a greater likelihood if they do not own land versus if they do)
217.	I'd like the same tax advantages, I paid for land with after tax dollars they paid with before tax dollars, big advantage.
218.	Owners of land should farm it, unless they are too old.
219.	This would probably drive up the price, fine for the seller not good for the farmer wanting to buy.
220.	As long as it is a 100 % Canadian owned.
221.	That is absolutely ridiculous!!! Now how can anyone compete with those prices! And again, are they going to attend our schools? get involved on our committees? Get involved on our sport teams? Again, it's killing our small communities!
222.	no worse than large foreign corps
223.	Farmers are still needed to farm it.
224.	Farms should stay in private ownership.
225.	Locals are the best ones to own/operate the farms because nobody cares more than us. This is our home.
226.	only in a different area from me
227.	I am not a fan of investment funds purchasing land. But pension funds should be treated no differently than other investment funds. Same result from a farmer's

perspective.
228. No-one can be held responsible due to limited liability.
229. It will choke out the multigenerational farmer.
230. Not local resident.
231. Keep it here!
232. It's our money that we farmers are competing against!!! Not fair.
233. only allow if the funds or trusts don't interfere with farmers operations and keep the land in production and not let conservation easements remove productive land. Also if they choose to sell the land, the funds or trust must sell to those who will actively farm the land.
234. unfair competition to grass roots farmers.
235. It is taking away from saskatchewan farmers
236. Saskatchewan's best interests will not be guarded.
237. Size is a factor. All depends what the governments view of what they would like to see in the future for rural communities. I see it detrimental for rural communities. Farming has always been a business, but I see less capital brought back into local communities. The times are always changing, there has been a population shift from rural to urban centers for over half a century. I feel investment ownership would accelerate it further.
238. Maybe with some restrictions
239. We need local people who pay school tax. Send their kids to school. Buy in the local stores and have a stake in the community
240. only if you limit the rent they can charge to the current rate set by government crown land rate for farm land or pasture land
241. I do not think this would be a good idea. You then have investors involved that do not have an understanding of agriculture.
242. It's still taking away from the local farmers.
243. There would need to be very clear rules of the ownership with caveats on the development, use, and stewardship of the land. The land and its care is the most important thing! Not the ROI.
244. Being able to buy and own our own land and work the land is our retirement. It takes years to build a farm and maintain it. We go through losses and gains and put not only our land but family's at risk farming just to make sure the country can eat. Why threaten to take our retirement away from us so others won't even use the land properly.

245.	as long as they are Canadian
246.	Talk about double dipping!!!
247.	Same as last response.
248.	That's better than the Chinese buying like they have, but it still isn't in the long term best interests of the Sask Farming Sector. Someday In the not too distant future I will be of the age to sell, but I still believe that the best scenario for the active farming Sask farmers is to resist the pressure from outside people that are looking for a piece of the pie.
249.	young farmers cannot compete with absent investors
250.	I am 26 years old, and trying to make a living grain farming. I bought my first quarter off my grandfather, I am looking to buy another at the end of the year. the land prices in this province are so inflated it sickens me. my land is in, where the going price for a section (640 acres) of land is in excess of 1.2 million. I ask the sask party how am I to make a living with land payments at that price? the sask party is killing the small family operated farms one by one. When I approach the old couples in my area to inquire about purchasing land they all tell me the same thing why do you want to get into farm? there is no money to be made, and you cant pay top dollar like the potash companies nor the out of country buyers. why would you take ownership away from the ones working the land I feel you guys want to make us serfs. these companies or out of country owners don't care for the land nor do guys that lease the land, people who own and live on the land are the best for the stewardship of the land, they care for it, how cant you see this? the sask party needs to look to Europe and learn how their farming operations are where the little guys are supported and encouraged. these family operated farms in sask that are 10000+ acres are not a family farm they are corporations. also I am an electrician I work 21days straight, this job alone is over six figures. I would give it up in a heart beat to be on the land 24/7, but unfortunately I don't see this ever happening with land prices like this. I would love to hear back from a sask party,
251.	They would only buy it to speculate
252.	Prosperity
253.	Again I see no benefit to Saskatchewan farming.
254.	Pension funds are playing with other people's money. And have no risk if they fail and then the workers are out their pension also that is big business getting involved in agriculture Let them play on the stock market Also what is big business such as STOMP FARMS which is a publicly traded company being involved in agristability which is for our farmers. Not big business
255.	No outside investment.

256.	drive up prices
257.	We don't need them.
258.	I think they would have to operate over the long term as a business, and would be unlikely to be any more successful than the average farmer.
259.	The identifying factor is "Canadian" Farmers can rent from these entities as a means of achieving optimum size.
260.	There is enough competition in the marketplace without the aforementioned to provide a robust return for present farmland owners. Excluding them would increase the possibility that actual farmers would actually be able to own farmland.
261.	I believe in owner operators
262.	I believe when investments are better else where the land will come back up for sale
263.	Possibly, I still have concerns about the inflationary impacts of uninformed investment buyers on farmland values. I am more comfortable with Canadian funds or trusts but what's to stop foreign interests from putting their money in these and manipulating this loophole?
264.	The huge majority of pension fund recipients are not farmers.
265.	I believe that this land will become impossible for saskatchewan farmers to ever obtain again
266.	Replied above
267.	Farmers should own farm land.
268.	Discussed earlier
269.	This will make the land market more like the stock market where there can be huge moves up and down which is bad for farmers that use land to secure financing for their operation.
270.	As long as they are all Canadian people ! They should have Canadian citizenship and the money they make off of our land must stay within the province .
271.	canadian is ok
272.	Locals can compete with these large firms and they have the leverage to control the market. If smaller local innovators lose access to land you will lose control, diversity and long term economic benefit.
273.	No. No. No. We need young farmers ..how are they going to start farming or ever own their land????
274.	It is interesting that it took investment interest by Canadian pension funds to spur the provincial government to take action on this file. Why was there no action when out of province wealthy individuals purchased large blocks of land solely for investment

	purposes?
275.	No because pension funds are looking for a very small return(3 percent). They will be paying tax in another province. The sask government will miss out on taxes and the sask farm families will be forced into operating at a lower margin (lower profit)
276.	Not a good idea to let in investors in farm land ownership. Thier money is not from the land a true farmer makes his living from the land. Is not a level playing field
277.	We want young farmers to own land not big pension funds
278.	The problem is that decisions around land ownership would be made with profits taking priority over land management and farmers' livelihoods.
279.	Access to great amounts of money would allow them to own lots of land.
280.	As previously stated, pension funds have to pay retirement money to their beneficiaries. They have to collect rent or sell land in order to pay their beneficiaries. As the amount of money they pay to beneficiaries increases, the amount of money they charge as rent must increase. Also, pension funds have hundreds of millions if not billions of dollars at their disposal. No large or small farmer in Saskatchewan can compete with that kind of investment money. The inevitable change in farmland ownership would creep into Agricultural policy to the point where these large corporations would influence and probably dictate provincial laws and agricultural programs.
281.	What's the difference? Large corporation or pension funds? They are all bad long term for local people and future generations of Saskatchewan. Great for short term and people trying to get out on a high. But your killing rural Sask.
282.	Pension funds are speculating that farmland prices and land rents are going up. Will they promptly dump the land when things go bad?
283.	Again investment is always good.
284.	Not needed
285.	I do not believe pension funds should be buying farmland. At all.
286.	surely we dont want farms to turn into the toronto maple leafs, run with a view to maximizing profits for those who have no connection to the actual land. the vested interest of the farmer is the best way to motivate profit and maximum returns from farmland
287.	i DONT TRUST THIS GOVERNMENT
288.	why should my own tax dollars interfere with my own ability to own farmland
289.	Just a bad idea and it will make farmland a privilege of the elite.
290.	We tried renting some land this winter from the teacher's pension fund that bought Assiniboia Capital out. Ended up not being able to come to a deal due to the fact that

they just would not come up with a reasonable rental rate because they had bought at the high price of land. How is that our problem? We offered them the going rate for rent in our area (\$30/acre). It isn't our fault that they overpaid for the land. In the end, we rented more land from a neighbor for the same value with no hassle. The pension fund ended up crawling back to the previous renter for the \$20/acre that he was paying prior to his lease expiring this year. Now, they shorted themselves \$10/acre and we are driving extra miles to get to this other land. Who wins here?

291. Canadian owned pension funds, etc. could invest in farmland but it would need close monitoring by well-considered oversight.

292. Is there a lack of places that actually produce something to invest in ?

This whole survey process is likely to fail because the opinions of the four remaining farmers

will be overshadowed by the thousands / millions trying to protect their pension funds

Pension funds investment have failed before - a consequence of acting without enough information I suppose.. now trying a hand at farming seems suddenly a good idea .

I hope the four remaining farmers get a good price to sell their land to the investors and secure

their pension fund. They spent a lifetime re-investing any income into the land , and learning from the failures. Now that food has become a popular topic- it might be a good time for the last four to "retire" .

293. If they are limited to how much they can buy

294. farmers will be forced to compete with their own tax dollars... absolutely wrong. remember the land bank. it was bad experiment.. and it seems we have forgotten this

295. If the restrictions are tight enough, especially on future transfers.

296. I don't see the point of investing in canadian farm land with the all ready very narrow margins, and the potential narrowing under new legislation.

297. Their interest would strictly be on generating returns of investment not on the production of the crop. Still creating a more competitive environment by driving up the leases and weaken agricultural economy.

298. I would support investors such as Canadian pension funds if there were strictly enforced rules governing their ownership of farm land. An example would be that only a small percentage of their investment assets could be placed in Sask farmland. Another example would be that they would not be permitted to sell their entire holdings at once, but only a small percentage each calendar year.

As for Canadian trusts, I think it's dangerous to put a limit on the number of beneficiaries. There is potential for a family trust, that traces its roots back to Saskatchewan settlers, to own land in Sask, especially if all beneficiaries are Canadian citizens, where the number of descendants of the original settlers could exceed 10. Does that description make sense to you? I hope my thoughts came across clearly there.

So under clear rules around family ownership within a trust, especially a testamentary trust of a Sask settler with beneficiaries who are Cdn citizens, I think should be acceptable. The type of trust that feeds "trust fund babies" from non-Sask roots should have stringent rules, or even be prohibited.

299. This again creates an unfair advantage that local and especially new/young farmers can not compete with.

300. AGAIN WHAT HAPPENS IF VALUE FROM OTHER INVESTMENTS IS MORE THAN RETURNS FROM FARM LAND.

301. Same as above.

302. If they want to purchase farmland to spread their risk then go ahead

303. Farmers would be competing against non tax dollars.

304. why would i want to fight my own money.

305. Farmers who actually farm the land should own it.

306. I believe I have clearly stated right through this survey how wrong that process is.

307. Pension funds are no different than any other company. Investing in companies is a lot different than investing in land .companies can be created every day but there is not any more land being made. In fact there is less so why not keep it the hands of family farms who care and take a personal interest compared to some large company that doesn't even live on the land or take a personal interest

308. If there's a limit to this then I'd consider it

309. why do they need it?? Farmers should own their land.

310. You have already done it and now you are trying to justify it! CPPIB is not a corporation!

311. Will force all smaller farms out and lead to large corporate farms

312. It is unwise to hand over control of farm land to non-rural entities.

313. while this will also likely drive up prices and demand, at least the increased costs circulate within the domestic market.

314. I hate that CPP owns SK land - in spite of being both a pensioner and a baby boomer. I doubt any fat cat bureaucrat sitting down east could tell a bad farming practice or a poor crop from good ones if it smacked him upside the head. Already I am seeing land

	damage from chancy corporate farming practices. How much worse would it be if there are more pension funds hedging on land values?
315.	Canada Pension Funds blow, they are already short of money and NEED to be looking at riskier investments that CAN actually meet there fiduciary duty of supplying retirees with money. Start a new business with fresh intelligent graduates from the U of S / U of R.
316.	pension funds want the best return for their investment that could distort the farm market economy
317.	If any pension fund or investment trust is establish for benefits of Canadians, we can't discriminate them according to federal constitution.
318.	There needs to be a limitation of size land ownership and individual size of operation. It may not be beneficial to have one large block versus smaller individual operation to maintain local economy and infrastructure.
319.	This is much more difficult to decide, as there are more risks from these big investment groups. However again I believe we have to be on a level playing field whereby if it is good for one it is good for all. We cannot have the situation where CPPIB can buy yet other Pension Funds Cannot. Maybe in these cases it has to be done through exemption and based on a model whereby the investors are taking some of the risk of farming along with the farmer. The cash rent system is just getting to high risk for many farmers.
320.	Same as above
321.	Farmers should own the land they farm.
322.	Any such purchase must be followed by a later sale in a long term scenario. This in/out is also thus a distortion to land values.
323.	It would still create too much pressure for families and individuals to finance land they will farm. There is still the disconnect from the understanding of the health of the land, and could lead to decreased rural population. I feel these groups would make decisions based on what is financially best for the investors, not the land or surrounding community. These groups could also sell the land at any time, leaving the individuals who have been leasing the land with high levels of debt and no land to farm.
324.	I disagree with CPP owning any farmland. All they have done is force me to compete with them for land, prices have gone up considerably.
325.	Federal entities (CPP, PRFA for example) are able to make their own rules regarding their actions in SK without encouragement from Govt SK. How will Govt SK hold

	investment trusts of 10+ beneficiaries accountable?
326.	Investors without direct ties to farming and marinating the land leads to poorly maintained and inappropriate land use to maximize immediate profit. For example, growing Canola many years in succession to optimize profit, causing permanent damage to the soil (such as club root)
327.	Yes, if the pension funds are not run by crappy private corporations and are run by the state for the benefit of citizenry.
328.	Again, there driven to put dollars ahead of managing land properly, false money driving land prices higher yet.
329.	Investors get richer and the poor get poorer, there's only so much money in circulation
330.	Farmland is similar to other REIT type investments. The land carries largely the same risk. Values move in relation to demand and market rents. If farm economics deteriorate (such as they currently are) you can expect to see a drop in rents and land values. We are due for a major correction. However, allowing foreign ownership will drive price up at this point, regardless of corrections. The market does, however, tend to stabilize over an extended period of time.
331.	As long as it's Canadian controlled, I don't have a problem with it.
332.	if there is a mechanism in place for stable tenure
333.	Don't want to compete against my own money
334.	same as above
335.	Keep Canadians in control, we are tired of all the foreign politics that some way always corrupt our legal system!
336.	dito
337.	Kills active Farmers. Out money would be breaking ourselves financially. Big mistake.
338.	This does not allow for level playing field for competition, as they have beneficial tax options, or in some cases no tax costs which means they will have more available cash flow and allow them an unfair advantage over others who are trying to purchase the land.
339.	still not convinced that its a business plan i would participate in.
340.	Individual ownership only!
341.	No need for Pension funds to dally in farmland.
342.	It is concerning as it would leave control and management with folks that are only looking at land appreciation and not productivity.
343.	They are not interested in farming.

344.	Canadian should benefit from that
345.	For many of the same reasons as stated before how are land costs affected and who reaps the profit from farm operations therefore effecting control over farm operation and production.
346.	Let the farmer receive the benefit of increased value Keep increase in value in line
347.	Pension funds and/or investment trusts would have little or no interest in good farm practices or the health of a community (rural Sask.) outside of returning a profit in the immediate and short term. They must make their decisions for the benefit of their pensioners and/or Trust beneficiaries.
348.	As the mega farms go broke or retire, large pools of capital are required to make the ownership transfer. Management is different than ownership. My children will probably make a more secure living working as managers for the large corporations than being owner/operators on smaller land holdings. The difference will be that their RRSP will be a monetary rather than physical soil like mine.
349.	Investors control what we do. They will be making the money! Why work then.
350.	Why do they need to get involved in farming?? I think the government is wanting more control over the farmers/ranchers. Do they want to own us all??
351.	it would provide stable long term lease land to farmers
352.	its not helpful to move farther and farther away from farmers owning their farmland.
353.	I would be concerned about the impact that could be caused on the local community structures is the control for the local assets are in a large corporate office elsewhere.
354.	NO!
355.	It might provide more security to pension fund but don't like them competing with me as farmer to purchase farmland
356.	Depends on the same variables as already mentioned. I am MOST concerned about farming practices. It's not really about money. Investment and profit are never good if they cause suffering to any person, any animal, or any land. By suffering I mean anything less than a respected, caring, and appreciated life. This goes for the prairie land and crops too.
357.	Money still in Canada.
358.	Farmers should own land
359.	this will only drive up the cost and we end up having serf farmers.
360.	No there is already too many investors cashing in. Less and less land is available.
361.	yes

362.	canadian companies under Canadian law - yes.
363.	why not would be the question
364.	With restrictions on the amount
365.	I'm not sure because I don't know the details of who the actual investors are the term 10 or more beneficiaries is what concerns me. Pension funds I understand but the beneficiares I don't
366.	Don't think corporations should own land.
367.	Absolutely not .There is no benefit to agriculture to having large investors owning farmland
368.	They don't know about farming. All They worry about is there margins! Farming isn't about always making a buck! We provide food to Feed the world!
369.	Competing with Non-Ag \$\$ makes it impossible to pay for land by farming it! They need a lower ROI to make it a feasible investment vs a primary producer.
370.	There are plenty of places for pension funds or investment groups to put their money, they don't need to pillage Saskatchewan farmers. Things would be better if they weren't allowed to own land.
371.	No definitely not. When CPP has to take out full page ads in local papers stating why it was such a good thing they invested in farmland in Saskatchewan that just shows that they know there are many people opposed to it. Those full page articles are a waste of time and did not convince anyone that it was beneficial to local farmers to have CPP involved in farmland.
372.	up to a certain percentage, ie 10%
373.	Foreign ownership would drive prices up and ensure that land would NOT be affordable for the average Saskatchewan farmer or anyone who may want to farm. The regulations surrounding foreign companies would be too difficult to enforce, as we currently now see in the oil and gas industry, where most facilities are out of compliance and the government cannot enforce and the public is suffering. The same would happen with the farmers and land rules.
374.	Saskatchewan farmers should be the only ones who own farm land.
375.	A significant portion of profitability within primary production can be tied to owning your land base. We need to make sure we are doing everyone possible to secure that land base for Saskatchewan farmers.
376.	What is a Colony? A large investment trust with religious and lifestyle guidelines. They are not a single family are they.
377.	With caps.

378.	I would support this, with a fairly small limit on the number of acres any one fund could own, and an overall limit on how many acres would be available for this type of ownership.
379.	Maybe in small packages, but they should pay a royalty fee of some sort, so should all outside purchasers. I don't know why we would single out pension funds, all outside investors should pay a royalty or transfer tax of some sort. (They get a huge break on education taxes too, which isn't right for our rural school divisions.)
380.	When they buy it becomes unrealistic for farmers to pay the required ROI that these investment firms would want.
381.	I would want to know that it is a simple land ownership venture, and that a trust such as this doesn't not have any means to influence land use policy or zoning etc. simply to get land prices to go up, or to increase land lease rates. This possible influence concerns me because large corporations (or investors) do not need to take local impacts into their decisions/outcome of wanting land prices to go up, but local people have no choice but to live with local fallout.
382.	Financial markets can overwhelm the farmers in terms of competing in a market economy. The value of farmland lies in its ability to produce food. As the finance takes control access to food will become a privilege for the wealthy as has been shown in the past including the mass starvation in Ireland and in the Ukraine.
383.	Being able to produce food and make a profit doing so is not a concern for these investors. All that matters to them is that the price of the land increases. We need farmers to feed our world and you won't have many if they can't make a decent living.
384.	Tough for young farmers to compete with that large of wealth.
385.	This goes back to consolidation, control, manipulation of market forces and social tensions.
386.	I should not have to compete against my pension plan to purchase land and nor should our children. Thhats !!
387.	It's Canadian owned but the small family farm will never compete with corporations
388.	Highest bidder wins
389.	need more info on this.
390.	They are only market takers
391.	What is more "Canadian" then the Canadian Pension Plan. Farmland is a good long term asset for them to own, it's Canadian, and for Farmers looking for a stable partner to lease land from would benefit from a long term partner like the Canadian Pension Plan.
392.	absolutely not

393.	This would have the effect of driving up prices for young farmers.
394.	As above.
395.	You must actually be a farmer or have your land passed down through the family in order to hold land.
396.	There is already land that I can't purchase because of these large trusts
397.	Yes with the caveats: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Total ownership volume of Saskatchewan would be legally capped - Ownership would be limited to pension funds of Saskatchewan, Western Canada and Canadian organizations who are 100% Canadian owned by their mandate. Example - Coop Pension Fund or Teachers Credit Union of Saskatchewan. - Investment funds would be excluded.
398.	I answered not sure because maybe a limit to their purchasing could be a reasonable offer. But if they still have unrestricted access to buying up as much land as they want, then It really doesn't matter if they are Canadian or not because they are taking away any chance that I may have to purchase land.
399.	But the total acres purchased must be limited
400.	it will quickly make it uneconomic for farmers to own the land.
401.	they don't care except the mighty dollar
402.	Money does not trump the pride of Family Farm Ownership.. Instead it destroys Family Farms to allow such a practice..
403.	Yes Pension funds can take a long term view and in some cases can see that the land is well cared for, Of course if it is not they do not make money either
404.	as a business owner competing against people one at a time is hard enough, but how would farmers be able to take the risks involved in farming when groups with millions of dollars are satisfied with a low percentage return on investment.
405.	If Canadian pension funds or larger Canadian investment trusts want to own SK farmland they should only be able to purchase it with tax paid dollars, just like local SK residents.
406.	My money competing against me for my business ownership. I pay twice again.
407.	farms for sask farmers
408.	They are not stewards of the land but only speculators that would or would not depending on market conditions remove capital from farming operations.
409.	No they will drive up land prices for Saskatchewan farmers.
410.	Any of these options would continue to drive prices up and make farmland

	unattainable for the average farmer.
411.	similar to foreign investment, it's about the production of the land and not about the increase in land value. think national food production security
412.	pension funds are just in it for the return on investment they will not be giving anything back to the local communities
413.	There is basically vast Canadian ownership in the CPP.
414.	They are 100% Canadian. We need to be cognizant of what our neighboring provinces do and be competitive.
415.	I don't feel they would support the local economy as a local farmer would.
416.	Again investors do not know about work - just making money to fatten their wallet!
417.	Absolutely, you allow them to invest in Malls in your province, airports, hospitals, residential and industrial real estate, casinos, etc... why not farmland? Again, cognitive dissonance.
418.	This would infuse billions of dollars into our land markets with no obvious positive purpose. The huge base of land created would not be operated for the benefit of local farmers but to benefit the investors and the commercial agencies managing the land.
419.	I deal with one now and they are one of the worst landlords I have and I have 8 other landlords
420.	This is a possibility but there should be limits as to size and perhaps other restrictions
421.	Too big a disconnect to the land.
422.	No net benefit to rural saskatchewan
423.	There is no better option than having a vested interest. Pension funds fall into the same category as any other speculative investor.
424.	Investment income would not necessarily stay in Saskatchewan.
425.	Leave the farmers to own and farm the land
426.	Investment companies need stable and secure assests.
427.	An endless supply of money that the young farmer has to compete with
428.	This still raises prices and takes the potential for farm ownership away from SK farmers
429.	Their large amount of money means that farmers and residents can't compete
430.	Canadians buying Canadian land..... Rhetorical question.

431.	Same answer as above question.
432.	No room for fat cats
433.	We should not have our own money being used to drive the price of land higher so that we ourselves cannot buy it.
434.	Still no personal ownership or pride to take care of the land. Land stewardship is one very important thing local land owners care about that outside investors don't seem to be as worried about
435.	the people that farm it should own it....as explained in previous comments.
436.	Do you guys realize you have asked the same question a bunch of times over. Read above answers
437.	A fund or trust are not concerned with the overall health of the soil or ecosystem. Its direct incentive is to produce a profit for its investors. To feed eight billion people all land production will require management in preserving the land, to improve output. Producers and fund managers have two completely different directives.
438.	again, would depend on legislature made on it and potential loopholes to challenge to get around legislature.
439.	They already have and the concern is with how the land is managed and how well those that manage it are compensated. How well the important farming decisions are made. Almost seems like we are going backwards to the turn of the previous century with big absentee owners.
440.	You have allowed greed to cloud the thought process around the sovereignty of our food industry.
441.	Pension plans use pretax money, I can't
442.	Any investment purchases must show a return. Farmers do not get paid enough for the work they put into their crops and livestock as it is. Land owned by non-farming interests will need a profit on their investment putting the farmer at further risk.
443.	Absolutely not, it's a conflict of interest.
444.	The more land you control the stronger your opinion becomes.
445.	They are kind of the nail in the coffin to this land ownership problem because once these large groups of investors amass these large treks of land the only outfit that can afford these huge packages of land is the pension funds
446.	The above has happened in this area with purchase of Redlands farms and it sickens me that cpp has driven up the price of land
447.	decisions may become driven by short term return on investment rather than a long term view of what is best for the land, local communities and farmers

448.	This takes away the opportunity for local farmers to expand their operations.
449.	As above
450.	every Canadian is an investor in CP fund
451.	Again depends on type
452.	Given before administrators do not understand farming.
453.	may be as bad as foriegn ownership
454.	Farmers need to be able to compete with other farmers for land ownership, not funds or absentee landlords. If you are not a resident of Saskatchewan, your ownership of the land does not benefit the province as profits are funneled away. Foreign ownership of farmland is no different than selling our potash resource in a one time deal to a foreign owner never to see any royalties from it again. The purchase of farmland is not like a foreign business setting up shop in one of our cities. It will not create employment, build infrastructure or have any net value to the people of Saskatchewan.
455.	I believe there is enough of us trying to buy the land without investors driving up the price so we can no longer afford to buy.
456.	They are buying land to make money for retirement??? Why not leave that to the farmer that worked his whole life on the land?
457.	Although it may not be accurate, I was under the impression CPP pension funds use before tax dollars to purchase farmland whereas investors/farmers are using after tax dollars.
458.	they are only out to make money to ,so the land being able to produce food for many many years is not thought of.
459.	As long as we let foreign investment to purchase land in Sask
460.	this would drive up land prices for small medium and beginning farmers
461.	Absolutely Not! They should be forced to sell it off again. If an individual purchased it illegally we would be forced to sell, guaranteed. How does anyone compete with billions of dollars to play with???
462.	this is great. larger investments bring efficiencies to the operations and it is owned by Canadians and working for Canadians.
463.	no corp.
464.	This sounds too much like goverment competing with private sector but I may not understand
465.	Don't know if that's such a good idea. When they want to sell, they are most concerned about getting top dollar regardless of who the buyer is. They probably

	would give a second thought to selling to a foreign country.
466.	CPP or Saskatchewan based pension funds not controlled by outside Saskatchewan Unions same for investment trusts if they are Saskatchewan Controlled.
467.	They all want to extract the maximum cash they can from the land. Leased land will be operated for short term gain rather than long term good soil practices because the leasee may not have the land in the next year or two. The rent money will leave the province.
468.	kick them out
469.	This doesn't really differ from foreign ownership. Same things apply. Higher land prices both to purchase and rent will occur.
470.	they do not have a vested interest in how the land is managed just a return on investment
471.	Farm families would be driven off their land because schools, communities, health care would be much further away than it already is.
472.	To some limited extent
473.	Land ownership does not affect the concept of a family farm.
474.	How do I as a young farmer possibly compete with that?
475.	I have no problem with the Canada Pension Plan owning land. I am concerned about investment trusts in general owning land.
476.	Investment dollars belong on Wall Street on the stock market.
477.	These funds are intimately connected to long-term interests.
478.	Only farmers should own the land
479.	we need land ownership competing with our tax dollars
480.	See above.
481.	Again, are they living and working off this land?
482.	As long as the land remains farmed by Sask residents.
483.	just would take control away from the provincial residents
484.	They want to purchase as an investment. What about Stewardship issues? To them the almighty dollar will be most important regardless of other issues. If everyone in Agriculture in the last 10 years only seen land as an INVESTMENT... there wouldn't be half the operations there is. We've struggled. Farmers should not manage pension funds and Pension funds (and the like - trusts) should not manage farmland (even as an investment!)
485.	No. I don't know many farmers who manage and control pension funds or trusts so

	why should the reverse be allowed to happen. Urbanites are too far removed from agriculture to understand the risks associated with Ag. Loss of control to the producers when 'leasing' and 'renting'
486.	no comment
487.	With these type of investors, long term leases for Sk farmers will be available, and will have to follow market price.
488.	Yes but in a way of lending to local farmers so they can buy more land or if a pension buys the land the lease it back to a local farmer for the purpose of farming the land at a reasonable return and not a money grab.
489.	Cap the amount
490.	My opposition to this comes from my deep distrust of unions and anything that benefits those parasites.
491.	Farmland should be owned by either Saskatchewan residents, or by those working the land themselves.
492.	Again see above, people, or investment bankers don't give money to anything without expecting return better than they could get elsewhere
493.	I am 28 years old and I cannot afford to purchase land in our area I cannot compete with big corporations that buy land investor groups are killing the family farm and forcing young people that want to farm to do other things if farmland prices do not decrease I will be forced to quit farming and do something in a different industry I am a fourth generation farmer
494.	If they decide to put the land back on the market will drive prices down.
495.	Why not have a pension fund for Canadians invest in something that helps stimulate our economy so that it will increase our GDP. Buying land doesn't increase our GDP because it doesn't help the farming industry innovate or expand, it merely creates a short term gain for the seller and a long term loss of control.
496.	Corporate controlled land can have virtually the same pitfalls as foreign ownership. Look at what happened to Broadacre. In spite of the news, I think I know what truly happened here. For any them to say that allowing pension funds, etc would have saved their business! Hogwash! It essentially was being operated as a ponzi scheme. Read between the lines to see anyone's true intentions.
497.	They are "investing " with money they don't pay taxes on. I have to pay taxes to buy land. They will be anti land development in order to be "environmentally " "responsible ". In other words they will ruin their neighbours land with beaver dams and think they are doing something good when the water backs up and floods other people.

498.	Usually such organizations have no knowledge of agriculture.
499.	I think that land ownership should remain in the hands of people working the land and not a corporation or trust with no understanding of agriculture or stewardship.
500.	Farmers have enough expenses without adding having to pay additional rent for another hand in the trough.
501.	Young farmers can't compete with this. Tell me ... what does the government truly gain from this? Honestly? The landowner does but what do you gain? This won't put the province on the course of your growth plan. It jeopardizes this provinces future in 75 years and 4 year terms shouldn't bet on 75+ year outcomes. I didn't elect you to decide on my grandkids future.
502.	Pension funds should not own farmland they are not farmers. The general population should not have to compete against their own money to purchase farmland.
503.	Just an example but the Ontario teachers pension fund as no business owning sask farm land.
504.	It still takes the land away from the locals. Also it makes a (large) middleman when renting or buying the lease of the land from these, which may cost more for the farmers in the long run.
505.	Why would a pension fund need land? Buy bank stocks.
506.	The pension funds just drive up land prices making it impossible to compete in a bidding war
507.	It is killing the small farmer/rancher.
508.	If this occurs the landowners will not have control of the land they are investing in.
509.	That is what farm Credit and banks are for.
510.	absolutely not. CPP can take loses no other entity can take since they are back by the govt of Canada. creates a artificial market and takes the land out of the market place forever.
511.	Not sure I know what this means,
512.	It would make less land available to Saskatchewan farmers.
513.	The last sale to CPP was totally over priced for the land and the total farming capability of it and as well they are buying land and competing with us using the money that we gave them... does that make sense?.
514.	THEY DON'T FARM IT OR LIVE ON IT. TELL THEM TO BUY SOME VANCOUVER CONDOS AND TORONTO HIGHRISES.
515.	Again, it will inflate prices
516.	These funds have massive war chests and could significantly drive up the price in a

localized area if so allowed.
517. Same as above.
518. Restrict ownership to Sask. residents.
519. Only if the playing field is the same for farmers and investors and no one has an advantage
520. Keep large corporations out
521. We can't close to province completely off
522. Farm land should remain in a farming environment, once land becomes an investment vehicle, its original purpose will become neglectable, and completely unprofitable.
523. We must maintain realistic values according to production and not speculation
524. See the response from two questions prior.
525. they have already stolen land out from under me too many times
526. Canadians are buying Canadian land.
527. Once again, the corporation whether it is a pension fund or any other company is interested in profits. Should the chance for a "windfall" profit occur, there would be no consideration for the effect on the community or other people in this province.
528. If there is to be a free market let it be free without arbitrary exceptions
529. As long as they are not allowed to pick and choose. If , on behalf of taxpayers all farmers willing to sell their land should have the option to sell to cppib.
530. same as above
531. Same as above.
532. CCPIB (or any Canadian pension fund) should be allowed to continue to purchase our land if they see it as a investment with a reasonable R.O.I.
533. Yes, if caps are put in place regarding the amount of land an investor could own.
534. Treating land as a commodity does not ensure the long term viability of the Ag Sector in Saskatchewan.
535. Not sure of the ramifications - I cannot see how they would be much different than other corporate farms - No "on the ground ownership or management"
536. They only care about the profit and couldn't care less about the land. If that means implementing significant agronomic and environmental damages, they won't think twice and than Saskatchewan farmers are going to be left to clean up the ashes.

537.	There is already sufficient competition for farm land. What happens when these big funds decide to dump farm land? Will they flood the market? Will they then demand the ownership rules be opened to foreign buyers?
538.	Again, Saskatchewan farmland should be readily available and affordable to Saskatchewan's farmers.
539.	if they have to much money ,they should give it to charity.
540.	They only want the land and food to go up so this would make it too expensive for the people.
541.	Teachers pension plans are looking for profit every year and it will come off the back of a hard working farmer. Maybe they should work until they are 65 not full pension after 25 years.
542.	Again the owners are disconnected from the ag industry. And how does our young farmers acquire land surrounded by pension fund or trusts. Land owners with no intention to sell only if market value falls.
543.	show me the money
544.	Perhaps as a co-operative, but there would need to be strict governance so they don't get too big for their britches
545.	Separation of the owner and user of ag land will always lead to decreased production.
546.	Keep it small, nobody wants bankers
547.	Just another way to deplete local land ownership.
548.	I shouldn't be out bid by my own government
549.	Farmland is the means to agriculture. Its profit should not be for sale for outside interests.
550.	with limitations as noted previously
551.	It seems like every time you turn around you have someone new trying to put there hands in the farmers cookie jar
552.	large investment organizations are not looking at the longer term or sustainability
553.	Yes but limited in size to maximum Provincial holding of 10,000 acres
554.	I think it would be ideal to have more active involvement in the farm.
555.	They can outbid farmers on land prices..lit is not a level playing field.
556.	No I will not support investors such as Canadian pension funds or trusts to purchase farmland in Saskatchewan. If we do that the Saskatchewan farmers have to bid against our own governments for land.

557.	As long is it is by and for CANADIANS.
558.	This will drive up land prices and support the mega farms. A pension fund or corporation would rather deal with one or few farm managers rather than many small farmers.
559.	With inflation taken into consideration has farmland really increased that much over the last fifty years or even longer? It has had its highs and lows but on average has it really been a good investment when compared to other sectors? The last time there was a high in land values was in the early eighties, when interest rates rose much land was defaulted on becoming the property of the bank. I fear we are getting back to a high like this again and when I hear about pension funds investing money in something like this right before the bubble bursts I cringe. They may be able to purchase the land but who will be able to afford to farm it? Not a good investment. A farmer on the other hand has to pencil out whether or not the land will pay for itself and make his decision accordingly, they are not only buying it as an investment but as a means to make a living and once it is paid off it is one less expense for them to worry about should hard times arise.
560.	We regress if we go down such a road.
561.	Farm land is not a commodity to be on the stock market
562.	That just leads to artificial and speculation-based increases in perceived value. As has already happened thanks to the pension fund purchase.
563.	Invest in something else - say the stock market.
564.	I don't see a problem with this
565.	I don't want my pension contributions, or investments to damage my business or make it harder for other young farmers.
566.	Pension funds can take a longer term view Maybe we need different tax treatments for real estate investment
567.	If you don't allow them to compete for land you are controlling the true value of the land .
568.	Drives up costs
569.	They have access to Hugh amounts of money and smaller farmers can not compete with that.
570.	Farmland should only be us farmers and nobody else
571.	Again, profit driven lack of custodianship of the land itself would destroy the land. This would only be beneficial if custodianship legislation was in place.
572.	I believe I have given an answer to previously..

	Saskatchewan farmers should not have to compete with government created entities for the purchase of farmland.
573.	They are only interested in a return on their investment. They have no particular interest in what is happening at the community level and no real personal investment to themselves so why would they care what is happening?
574.	This would have no positive benefits except short term for those who wish to sell.
575.	See responses above.
576.	Ideally farmland should be owned by the individual who is farming the land. That creates an environment where the land is cared for and the agriculture economy in general is more profitable.
577.	NEVER..... keep it in the hands of our farmers/ranchers
578.	I don't think that will help anyone other than retiring farmers
579.	As I said before, the agriculture land base is finite. Why should we take the land out of the producer's hands?
580.	If I were selling land I doubt I would sell to them unless there was a large gap in price
581.	Investment is acceptable; but ownership should never become a stockmarket commodity
582.	They are absentee landlords who don't support local communities.
583.	They are driving the prices up just as much as foreign or other investment companies.
584.	Would you allow Canadian Pension fund to take your income to boost their portfolio? When farming is good like the last six years, do you know how many people want their finger in the pie? It would be too bad if we had to go back to barely making a living to ward off the vultures!!
585.	that is the same as big corporations , a traditional farmer cannot compete with big business
586.	As already stated, you might as well sell farmland to China. Farmland should be for farmers who reside in and contribute to the community.
587.	pensions should not compete with citizens
588.	Pension funds should have the ability to find investments that will meet their needs in the money markets. Pension fund underwriters should be looking for far more stable investments than farmland if they are attempting to secure the future of a pension plan.
589.	What just happened...??

590.	No one can compete against a multi million dollar pension fund when it comes to buying land. The pay big dollars to buy said land then expect to get a certain return on investment in the form of rent that is unreasonable.
591.	I don't want my investment funds to be used to purchase farmland. They have no other interest in it than to generate income to the detriment of farmers.
592.	Farmers need to be the ones owning the land.
593.	Who would farm this land ,would it Saskatchewan people
594.	Saskatchewan farmland should be most beneficial to Saskatchewan residents. These type of funds and trusts make it easier for people outside Saskatchewan to buy farmland and that is not something our province should encourage.
595.	Land is a food source not a place for a pension plan to try and make a profit. That's what the stock market is for
596.	That's even worse than foreign individuals holding SK farmland.
597.	Fund buying of farmland will push prices up exponentially with the decrease of risk of these large groups. I also feel it will increase the volatility of the land market
598.	Same answer. We can't compete!!!
599.	I believe that they would have to purchase land with an annual return in mind and may provide long term rental agreements
600.	It is still a sell off, it is still exploitation of a different kind.
601.	Why should producers compete against their own money invested in a pension plan. On top of that they are buying land with tax free dollars. Let me buy land with tax free dollars and then MAYBE.
602.	Let the farmers take the risk in farming. Let the investors take the risk in food manufacturing etc if the return in ag is supposed to be so good.
603.	Doesn't help farmers at all.
604.	Demand for farmland in Saskatchewan is significant enough that outside investors are not needed to ensure there is a good market. Land is a strategic resource that should be owned locally to keep the wealth in rural Saskatchewan.
605.	That is what banks are for.
606.	Good for us, good for Canada, good for investors.
607.	No they should use a bank. That is what the rest of us do.
608.	They ask ridiculous rent payments because they themselves over payed for the land
609.	Makes land unaffordable
610.	DON'T NEED THE GOV.T BLOWING MY PENSION FUND'S THAT I HAVE PAID INTO FOR

	MY RETIREMENT.THAT MONEY IS MINE LEAVE IT ALONE.
611.	I am more favorable to this than allowing foreign investors, but I still think the Saskatchewan agriculture industry would suffer in the end. There is pride in ownership. With that pride comes a drive and desire to work hard and produce the best product you can. When you don't own what you are working at, there is less drive to make it successful.
612.	that is no place to be putting trust dollars.
613.	Similar to earlier answers - Simply stated, prosperity invariably follows investment Also rental values are determined by profit potential not the price of the land.
614.	More interested in pension plans owning the farmland as this represents a large base of Canadian people owning farmland. Investment trusts I am not interested in seeing. This has the feel of going back to feudalism in a different form.
615.	These are profit driven entities and do not value proper farm practices or the betterment of Sask. farmland and communities.
616.	Pension funds or trusts are no different than foreign investors, they don't look after local cemeteries, support the local rinks or help keep a community alive.
617.	If you own farm land you should live in the province.
618.	Back to the tax differences of paying for the land, leaves the farmer at a disadvantage
619.	Need more information as to how this would work.
620.	Why doesn't the province try supporting the local smaller farming and ranching families. Try keeping our young people in the province!!
621.	Their purchases take the land out of the market for ever.
622.	Yes because to disallow such ownership is to distort free trade and indeed to contravene Constitutional rights.
623.	This would inflate land prices to levels such that would limit beginning or struggling farmers.
624.	That does nothing for anybody but the funds. It is just wrong on so many levels.
625.	This would probably work if regulations ensure Canadian ownership is secure.
626.	These types of groups do not have the ability to make good decisions about the land use. ie; trying to crop riparian areas and areas that should be left in permanent cover (grass)
627.	Canadian ownership. The right to purchase for investment.
628.	if they are wholly canadian.

629.	I have made it clear that I would not support any compromise.
630.	they are just in they business of making money not taking care of the land for the future
631.	This does allow for the increase in economic value of the farmland, which is required to a certain degree.
632.	I am a YOUNG FARMER. I work hard enough for myself. I can't afford to stretch myself thin in order to compete against foreign investment
633.	Pension funds keep getting larger and eventually would "swollow up" all farmland if allowed. Every non farmer is "messaging" with a farmers livelihood.
634.	That type of investment plays with the price of land and does not let the farming marketplace set the price
635.	just make financing more available thru the Canadian financial banks and or F.C.C
636.	Why would you like for me to compete for your job...
637.	Pension funds are not farmers. We need farmers farming our land.
638.	Local ownership means control of our own markets.
639.	That could make land unaffordable to the average local resident.
640.	They just drive the price up. What do they need the land for. Help out the farmers who actually farm it.
641.	See above
642.	Same as above
643.	Because of tax rules, that places the local purchaser in an unfair situation.
644.	why not allow them to provide financing to local residents?
645.	Once again only interested in profits and recent economic gains and not concerned or understanding of the connected rural economy.
646.	Keep Saskatchewan's prosperity and its rewards at home to benefit its own people.
647.	It is not fair for farmers who are trying to make their living by farming to have to compete with Canada Pension funds to buy farm land. I do not want to be renting land from a government organization. I want to own it myself and make improvements on the land for myself.
648.	I believe what is located in Saharan Saskatchewan should be owned in Saskatchewan only.
649.	Definitely not. Farmers in our area are wanting to own land and not compete with CPP

	who purchase land at outrageous prices. We cannot compete with that.
650.	As long as Canadian land remains in the hands of Canadians, yes.
651.	Canadian farmers should be the people who own the land
652.	Again, it will to over inflation of the land past the economic threshold of the land.
653.	this is skyrocket the price of land
654.	The simple fact is farming is a very unique business which has numerous uncontrollable factors (weather, uncontrollable world markets, insects, diseases etc.) we don't need any other entities taking profits from an already fluctuating business
655.	Already have this happening in our area Very hard to compete very difficult to include our family, operation to expand, to keep our sons into farming. We feel our children should advanced e to other areas evening though farming is an excellent lifestyle
656.	These type of investors still make it difficult for farmers to purchase land. These have investors have so much buying power thy we can not compete with them.
657.	More inclined to see sask investment trusts.
658.	5000 [unintelligible] Canadian
659.	Same reasons as previously stated. Group ownership of land is a bad idea. Better to have individual farmer who care for the land.
660.	What will they eventually do with the land? Also these large organizations do not want to deal with a number of smaller operators so we get the same results, large farm corporations operating the land at arms length from the community .A large corporate farm has farmed next to me for over ten years. I have never seen the owner or had any contact with his help. Recently sold before any local people knew it was for sale
661.	Agriculture has some ups and some very severe downs. These funds cannot stay in the game for long term loses so stability in the marketplace would be questionable.
662.	Because the failure of pension funds becomes politicized when they have a shortfall and public servants such as teachers and nurses start to whine. Governments would bale out the fund but the poor guy who tried buying the land 15 years before is still working off-farm to make ends meet.
663.	It's a back door and could potentially drive up real estate prices well beyond productive capacity.
664.	To farm properly (and yes this doesn't always happen with bigger and bigger corporate farms) you need to live on the land you are farming
665.	This is just a slippery slope for institutional investors to be working their way around the regulations we are already seeing that now it will only get worse. You need to be clear when formulating the regulations no grey areas or as few as possible so you can

enforce them.
666. Local ownership is the best hope that the land will be treated with respect.
667. That's what this whole discussion is about--NO!
668. Prefer this to Sask Corporate Farms
669. My pension investment should not be bidding against me when purchasing land.
670. There is a big difference in holding land for a long period of time, and leasing it to Saskatchewan producers, and using land as part of an investment portfolio, only to divest of it at some future point. This puts the operator in a precarious position.
671. This is getting very repetitive!!!
672. If our environment is really important then control should remain with farmers
673. Save the farm land for the young farmers who are not able to compete against corporations.
674. Who benefits in the long run not us
675. Individual farmers do not get to buy farmland with RRSPs. Investor groups and pension funds result in discrimination against Saskatchewan farmers.
676. This is just corporate control of farmland. The result is no different than if it is foreign owned.
677. It would drive up the price to a point where young people could not survive.
678. Farmland tends to become traded in successively larger blocks which would be impossible for farm families to finance.
679. Only because they are Canadian firms and benefit Canadians.
680. Set up the HQ in Sask and pay sask taxes
681. my kids shouldn't have to compete with unions and pensions
682. Investor driven so no long term vision. Quick in for good times and quick out in tough economic times
683. farming is cyclical, local ownership supports communities in good and bad times
684. my own money bidding against me ?
685. There needs to be a limit on the number of acres they can own.
686. Why should I have to compete with them to buy farmland with before tax dollars
687. pension funds are not farmers
688. If the benefits, benefit the farmers or they had shares. Then maybe.
689. Depends on policies put in place. If this were some sort of incentive for responsible

	land use, perhaps.
690.	yes but only up to 20 percent of any rural municipality
691.	How can it be guarantee these investment firms are Canadian?
692.	I don't understand the concern in differentiation of outside investors. either we are progressive and growing with all, or regressively trying to artificially restrict free trade.
693.	Why 10 is this to excludes family Corps
694.	farmland should be just that..... to be farmed NOT an investment lets grow food and fuel not pension and investment dollars jeez
695.	What's the differance from other companies (maxcrop)
696.	Still, NO!
697.	Producers should not be forced to compete with these entities.
698.	Land is not widgets. Dividends are not a given. The investment portfolio mentality doesn't relate back to realistic economics that are sustainable for future generations.
699.	Keep it agricultural.
700.	These are well run organizations that can be very beneficial to any farming community
701.	farmland is for SK farmers.
702.	Doesn't everyone want to own land?
703.	They are totally shareholder driven so farm the farmer
704.	Maybe... I need to know more before I can say for sure
705.	With some restrictions. I would not like to see them flipping land or dumping land causing a drop in prices by flooding the market.
706.	Once again it is all about making money off the backs of hard working people. We must give the middle and lower class citizens a chance to make a decent living and not be pushed below the poverty line.
707.	Same as above
708.	I worry about any corporations (other than those made up of family members or groups of farmers living on the land) controlling farmland - absentee owners are less likely to care about good stewardship of the land, and more likely to place profit-making ahead of environmental sustainability or stewardship issues.
709.	farmers should own the land they farm
710.	Their only goal would be to make a profit with it regardless of the farming economy.
711.	They are Canadian.very easy to approve

712.	No because long they will have a monopoly on our land and the smaller farmer has no say on anything.
713.	Absolutely not
714.	As long as it's Canadian
715.	This kind of investment once again is hard on communities and local farms
716.	These types of purchasers would eventually 'force' the family farms to sell out to them.
717.	With some solid restrictions about quantities.
718.	Not at all
719.	Purchasing farmland is already out of reach. You cannot begin to pay for the land with what your productivity from the land will earn.
720.	I see no benefit of this over the long term. Or short sighted possible gains with possible long term repercussions.
721.	I do not support them owning the land, but would support them investing in companies that are ag related
722.	Pension plans do not contribute to the economy as private ownership through taxes and leased land land is usually not as productive as privately owned.
723.	Again, I believe our own farmers or resident should purchase the land
724.	Too many pitfalls.
725.	Takes away family Farm.
726.	If everyone of those beneficiaries wants to come out here farm and be a farmer. I have no problem.
727.	Corporations and investment funds have a legal obligation to maximize profits for their shareholders. Their primary concern must be profit and not the health of the land or what is best for the province of Saskatchewan and its residents.
728.	because that's my tax money bidding against myself and farmers that are already established. giving it the unfair advantage of being tax free money.
729.	Why invite sources who don't understand the first thing about agriculture in? Nobody in the world knows more about agriculture than the ones who built it, and those are the guys on farm now. You bring in big companies like that and all younger generations lose interest in farming, and gain interest in money. Then you won't be finding people to lease the land. Just people who want to own it.
730.	smaller operations cannot compete
731.	They drive the farmland in areas too high for what the land can produce and when they lease they know what they make and the farmer takes all the risk100% if the

	farmer goes broke they will just move onto the next farmer
732.	Same as above
733.	They are buying land to make a profit keep the profit in Sask.
734.	Never
735.	Local farmers can't compete
736.	Again, they are only looking for profits
737.	we need to support our own residents and businesses, allowing outside investments would eliminate this and severely affect our economy as a whole.
738.	ABSOLUTELY NOT! Why would anyone want our farmers competing against that type of entity with such huge buying/investment power? There is not that much of a profit margin in farming now! CPP funds are partly owned by farmers. so now allowing CPP to buy farmland is having farmers compete against their own money!
739.	Again it becomes a control issue. The larger players would benefit and the smaller farmers would not be on a level playing field. For investors the primary goal is to create continued dividends and wealth for the corporation without viewing the social and environmental issues as someone who lives here. Not in my backyard is not a great way to live.
740.	Any entity that is not a human or a group of humans who actively farm should be severely restricted in ownership. No more than 10 acres. The problem is that the land is, effectively, taken off the market.
741.	Farming for a company that expects x return on investment in times of varying commodity prices and yields is difficult for an operator
742.	they have no stake in looking after the land or local communities.
743.	Sacrifice long term growth with short term goals of large funds.
744.	I said no because I'm not sure this is necessary. And I wish to know why they feel the need to do this? Why can't the farmer invest in farmland for his own retirement?
745.	No! This will surely increase the price of land that will make it impossible for the next generation of farmers to acquire land.
746.	Canadian pension funds or other Canadian investment trusts have no right to purchase farmland. Farmland is to be used to grow and raise food not for investors to drive the price
747.	Land is for producing food to feed a growing global population, not an asset to appreciate.
748.	Land should be farmed by the owners for robust rural communities. Food security is best provided by family farms.

749.	Foreign investors and pension funds provide no contribution to the rural economy. Allowing these types of investors to invest in Saskatchewan farmland would be a huge mistake.
750.	Why should the money that is supposed to be in a pension fund for our seniors, or investment for the citizens of this country be spent on land? the ONLY way I would ever support something like this, is if the revenue generated from it is put back into the funds for our seniors, or the citizens, not into the governments pocket for somewhere else.
751.	My land is my pension plan
752.	I view these organizations as entities so far removed from farming that their land ownership would include practices that would cripple any farm operation just to keep their overly GREEN (and kooky) stakeholders happy.
753.	investors out side of Saskatchewan does nothing for community as they would drive up prices making ownership unaffordable
754.	No. Same reasons as above. Only Saskatchewan farmers should own the land in Saskatchewan without loopholes, etc. for investment companies.
755.	They will always be willing to give a start to some that has a case to buy the land from them
756.	Pension plans have no vested interest in land except for a return on their investment. If anything was to happen to make their returns dwindle to near 0 or even negative, selling off land in large tracts could decrease the value substantially and put the stability of other owners equity in jeopardy.
757.	How can actual local farmers compete with a pension fund?
758.	They also do not care about the local communities and seeing them grow and flourish. They want to rent lands to a couple large operators and small farmers suffer.
759.	At this point only public plans: CPP or Sask. Pension but could these ever be privatized?
760.	Again, corporate investment decision-making is based on different values & less ability to adapt to change than those people involved in day-to-day agriculture.
761.	Farmers can't compete with the deep pockets of pension funds.
762.	HOW DOES A FARMER COMPETE WITH CPP
763.	This drives land costs up. Land is vital to our livelihoods, and any increase in costs to farmland lowers our ability to maximize our efficiencies.
764.	They bring no benefit to active farmers and simply increase the cost of farming for active farmers. The selling land owner can just as easily rent it out or sell at market rates. Existing land owners have benefitted from tremendous appreciation since 2004 - how much do they really need to retire on?

765.	NO NO NO
766.	Competition and nobody living in rural areas
767.	How about we focus on small business at the local level that already supports business and the communities by hiring and investing where we live? I have four children, many neighbours with children wanting to farm, and cannot see the opportunity due to lack of control of input costs and selling / pricing our grain with any stability to meet the lenders expectation. If the lenders aren't happy, they aren't loaning money.
768.	If it was truly Canadian and pension funds and leasing only to residents who are citizens.
769.	No! Farmers who farm the land should own the land!
770.	Pricing out the locals.
771.	They could not be committed stewards of the land as would the family farmer.
772.	We don't need anymore absent landlords. Leave farm ownership with the farmers
773.	They are not in the business of Agriculture therefore should not be allowed to purchase farmland as an investment.
774.	Again, if the goal is to have farmer employees vs farm owners, then this is the long game to run. Pension plans have deep pockets. They can afford to make minimal cash flow for the long term land value gains compared to a new/young farmer. I hear a lot about the fact there are no young farmers going back into agriculture, but I do not believe that it has to be that way. When farming was profitable and had cash flow in 2010-2014, quite a few young families moved back to the farm. But these families need cash flow each year to keep going. They often have other jobs to start off, but it's not very attractive to work 2 full time jobs and farm full time for your whole career. I'm not sure why society would ask farmers to do this but by the very nature of our food system, this seems to be what is happening. We honestly do it because we love the rural lifestyle and are hopeful that farming will be profitable in the long run. However, I have also seen young farm families give up farming because juggling everything was too much for an extended period of time and with minimal returns.
775.	already too much competition
776.	What control do we then have over what they do with the land? They are not about to farm it.
777.	Farm land should not be owned by pension funds - it should be owned by farmers who plan to farm the land.
778.	Although it was the January 2014 purchase of a large portfolio by the CPPIB that captured considerable public attention, such portfolio was first assembled by an investment trust. Depending on their structure, some trusts may enjoy considerable tax advantages while also having significantly more economic power, resulting in them

	outbidding or bidding more quickly on land relative to individual investors or farmers.
779.	I support family owned and operated only
780.	For some farmers expanding their operations by leasing additional land fits well within their overall business strategy. For these farmers, ownership of farmland by pension funds and large investment trusts may create longer-term leasing opportunities for them that would not otherwise exist. However, many farmers may prefer to grow their operations by increasing their land ownership and Skyline can help them to achieve this goal. Skyline could use capital sourced from various investment groups to the benefit of Saskatchewan resident farmers by financing the farmer to purchase and operate the optimal number of acres.
781.	So I can't opt out of CPP and they get to use before tax money not a fair playing field.
782.	Leads to land speculation and more competing buyers of farmland.
783.	See above
784.	Interests are too narrowly focused on profits not sustainability nor local quality of life values.
785.	If current guidelines are not violated.
786.	I'm Ok with it if they have a local representative.
787.	The profits would not be spent here so it is essentially a blood line pumping money out of our economy.
788.	farmland land owned only by saskatchewan residents
789.	When farm operations are operated by hired people and not by the owners themselves the farm quite often has loss of productivity.
790.	Need to keep farmland ownership in Saskatchewan farmers hands
791.	We recognize that retiring farmers find it financially in their favor and would in some cases look to their short term needs, but when you think of the Sask. agricultural industry, investors from non-farming funds, etc. just make farming more difficult. The loss of the wheat board and the multi nationals providing our fertilizer, chemicals and fertilizers at their prices never allow the margin of profit for the farmer to increase.
792.	Keep their hands outta it
793.	I am not certain that a Canadian pension fund is more or less a problem for purchasing farmland than a Canadian corporation. I object to both owning SK farmland.
794.	They would have too much buying power over a farmer.
795.	Only a "maybe" here.
796.	Same argument of allowing an absentee land owner that does not have a direct connection to the land (and see the land only as a source of short-term speculative

investment)

13) Would you support allowing investors such as Canadian pension plans or larger Canadian investment trusts (of 10 or more beneficiaries) to purchase if land caps...?

#	Response
1.	even with caps that would still tens of thousands of acres that would be lost or tied up for generations.
2.	Maybe, but at the same time if the cap is 10 quarters, you and your buddies get together and all 10 of you buy 10 quarters all of a sudden 25 sections of land are gone out of Saskatchewan resident's hands.
3.	And location - they can't just get dibs on all the prime locations.
4.	As per the last comment made, this could be extremely difficult to control/monitor. What if such a trust simply opens up a second, yet distinct fund? Would that open them up to 'accessing' the cap again?
5.	No because a head guy from one investor company can start another one and buy more
6.	Yes I definitely support Canadian investors being allowed to own and/or finance Canadian farmland anywhere in Canada and also in Saskatchewan. There will need to be a good reason for the caps -- one should be allowed to appeal (i.e., should be assessed on a case by case basis)
7.	Depends on the cap.
8.	But it would have to be small enough not to squeeze out the local guy
9.	I feel it's headed in the same direction with or without the cap
10.	Same as the previous question, in most cases, producers would have a stake in these companies and therefore would be competing against there own money to buy farmland
11.	farmers should own the land not investors
12.	Why do they need to own land?!
13.	This would only increase farmland prices.
14.	why I think we sold off too much of Saskatchewan
15.	Too vague to make a confident answer to the question.
16.	see above
17.	Trick question! There should be no caps in place.
18.	That would be a bit better. Just worried about loopholes that will be used.
19.	see above

20.	It would have to be a reasonable cap (
21.	Only extremely limited say 1 quarter section
22.	Possibly...
23.	No, see above response! They don't farm, don't have sweat equity involved, just their bottom line! The same as willing farm land to a charity. The Charity can't farm it, it has to be sold to be used as a financial gain.
24.	Why should pension funds be allowed to purchase farmland when I can't tax free. My land is my own pension fund, yet I can't use it as an rrsp, why should an investment company be able to.
25.	Free enterprise will sort through all these things. Poor ownership will soon have this land back on the market. If foreigners want to lose their shirts let them leave their money here. My grandfather told me what happened to his ----- farmer friends when the govt. stepped in to protect them from market forces. I don't think I need to explain why I don't want the SFLSB to even exist.
26.	Depending on the amount
27.	I would like just farmers to own the land, otherwise how can we encourage young people to farm if they are unable to own and control their business?
28.	Depends on all the conditions
29.	Farmers should get first shot at all land
30.	I really don't think they should own farmland, they fact that the farmland value can fall and have to sell it for a loss is not good for a pension plan. They should know better.
31.	There should be no caps - for the reasons and response given in the prior question
32.	who gains ?
33.	Can not support the cap idea. Where is Ducks Unlimited in this discussion? They are the biggest and keep getting more?
34.	Investors is the problem so why. We sask. People want to purchase and invest yourselves.
35.	Caps put in place now places an elevated value on the land once the cap is reached .. which then opens the door to extending the cap number. This is a slippery slope, do not fix what isn't broken.
36.	I am not in favour of caps, but caps are better than the alternative of not allowing Canadian pension plans to invest in Saskatchewan farmland at all.
37.	See prior question. Processes and audits must be in place to ensure that this is monitored and managed and REPORTED to the Saskatchewan people in an open and transparent means.
38.	It is impossible for a young farmer/rancher to compete with the capital of investment funds. There is no chance. How can a local person expand or start, when there is no guarantee of land to farm?
39.	what possible reason could we have for wanting our land, our greatest asset to become

	another commodity speculated upon and traded blindly for profit?
40.	Don't like government involvement. If the NDP get back into power in the province, they are know for severe disruptions in agriculture so it's best to avoid starting down that path.
41.	I think this would set up a loophole that would show an increase in pensions plans popping up to buy land.
42.	The principal is the same as above.
43.	Keep ownership in hands of individual sask residents
44.	No caps
45.	It is a loophole that could still be exploited. If people want to come here and live here and purchase land and farm it, it will be a good thing. Absentee landlords and outside land companies are only a drain on the sk economy.
46.	When the super rich or the Hutterites get a cap then the pensions could too but it isn't fair to signal them out
47.	Limit them to ten quarters
48.	Land needs care. It is not a commodity.
49.	That way the investors could be controlled.
50.	While I have no issue with this concept, my concern would lie with the stewardship of the land owned by individuals/corporations/trusts/investors outside of the province.
51.	This option depends on the details.
52.	Same reason as above. These all become first steps on a slippery slope.
53.	As long as they are purely Canadian and do not have a head office or other ownership outside of Canada.
54.	This scenario is much more appealing than a completely uncapped system.
55.	Farm land belongs to the farmers of Saskatchewan
56.	They should be able to buy as much as they like.
57.	This question is poorly worded because Yes means you support limits, while No implies you do not support pension plans being allowed to purchase farmland. There is no possible answer here that states Yes I support plans to buy land and no I do not want limits.
58.	Yes as long as Canadian Money stays in Canada i will support it
59.	Same response
60.	I still am not in support of this. Farmers have a hard enough time without trying to fight our own government for land.
61.	they have ways of getting around the rules
62.	To easy to make multiple pension plans or investment trusts with the same controlling interests to get around any land caps.

63.	The price that the investment funds pay will not be tied to land productivity. I would be wary of loopholes. And regardless of the size they purchase if they are paying more than it is "worth" ie what it produces than it is just creating an unfeasible market.
64.	No pension plans!!!!!!!
65.	No only farmers who actually have to live off of farming should be allowed.
66.	Outside the industry money will distort the marketplace.
67.	No need for caps
68.	As a young farmer with corporations and pension funds purchasing land I cannot compete with what they are paying. And with restrictions through banks on borrowing it is very in affordable to buy land already. Due to the inability to purchase land and expand our family farm me and my sibling are forced to work off the farm driving us away from the lifestyle in which we grew up.
69.	Possibly, however they could just keep branching off into other corps which in the end could own the same amount of land as intended
70.	The investors would get around these caps by incorporating several entities so that each one could maximize its investment. Even with caps they would still be able to outbid the local farmers and young farmers on any given peice of land.
71.	Attempt by government to control what should be a free market.
72.	same reason
73.	the same result comes from one investor with 1000 acres or 10 investors with 100 acres
74.	Allowing these Canadian pension funds etc to own land doesn't bother me so much as the potential that they could own the land in perpetuity.
75.	The actual question should be would you require a cap and I would say NO. But if I say no to the cap in this question you could construe it as a no for pension plans which I support.
76.	there should be no caps
77.	It becomes a slippery slope. At first there are limits, then one day they are gone.
78.	Corporations will find ways around the caps. Why did Assiniboia Land and Agcapita apply multiple times with I, II, III, IV, etc. It creates more loopholes.
79.	The land would always be better in the hands of the end user!
80.	Possibly. I am most interested in restrictions to be put on the use of the land, not so much the size of the allotments in this case. Eg. Pesticide use will be partly controlled then banned as soon as people realize how sick they are getting from the residues in what they eat and in their well water. Organic has to be widespread in the future.
81.	Make it fair to a certain point
82.	Pension funds and investment companies have no place in land ownership when it is vital to the sustainability of the economy and food security in Canada
83.	As long as the cap was reasonable and there were no loopholes for basically the 'same'

	companies to continue buying more land under different corporate names even though the majority shareholders are the same.
84.	Again it is not being owned by Saskatchewan farmers.
85.	We don't need that sort of ownership of our farmland. The expectations of that sort of owner could be ridiculous because of their need to only make profits from their investment. With the ups and downs of farming which they could easily not understand, many farmers leasing this land could find themselves having unrealistic prices being demanded to lease the land.
86.	Same as above
87.	Too many ways to acquire more land.
88.	This again sounds like trouble but I would need to see more details on the limits and controls on them.
89.	Ditto.
90.	I have heard that these investors will be looking for foreign buyers that have the money to purchase huge tracts of land at once, and that is why they are buying up so much. It will not go back to the local farmer/operators and the minute the renters can't afford to pay them a fixed rate of return (5+%), it will be sold to the highest bidder.
91.	What is the purpose of caps.
92.	I understand that the seller wants all he can get. As a buyer how do we compete with what your asking It can't be done.
93.	If the only regulation is a cap, it would have to be very low. Maximum of 49% shared out. Individual shares 10%. This should apply to all out of province corporations, with reasonable exceptions for operator owned corporations that engage in actual farming on neighbouring land in neighbouring provinces.
94.	same as pervious comments
95.	No boudy that is not a farmer should be able to buy land
96.	mmmm
97.	As long as the cap is not to low.
98.	good for economy
99.	Why cap anything? If a land owner wants to sell and this is the best buyer, let it happen, regardless of transaction size.
100.	No cap should be put in place
101.	This question assumes that nobody supports investor owned land.
102.	-----!
103.	The land in Saskatchewan should be mostly owned and operated by Sask farmers.
104.	Try to leave the land to the stewards of the land that work it in most cases we try to do what is best for the land for generations to come.

105.	that may be a good idea.
106.	Market driven
107.	Again it is how many can carry the spread of risk, diversifying risk will carry in difficult times. Only a few will be under more risk.
108.	Even if there was a cap as to how much they could purchase, they would just form more groups to purchase more, once again pushing the locals out.
109.	Still not sure of any benefits to the local economy or province.
110.	The amount of land needs to be regulated.
111.	I don't see a need for a cap. Why cap pensions and trust when individual investors own significantly more than they do. What is the difference.
112.	A limit may encourage a healthy balance of farmland distribution.
113.	See above
114.	Investors would not be satisfied with such caps and seek to increase the amount of land they could purchase or look for loopholes to exploit.
115.	I favour unrestricted ownership, We are all from the planet earth. I would support limited Martian or Greek Gods purchasing Saskatchewan farmland.
116.	corporate dictates will influence farming
117.	How is a 20 year old kid going to compete against that?
118.	Can own 1/4 section
119.	The cap would climb inexorably upwards due to lobbying.
120.	I'm fine with Canadian pension plans owning land but not Investment trusts.
121.	I think this could be a consideration
122.	I think as long as they don't own more than the average farmer it would be ok
123.	!!!!
124.	Takes away from keeping it local. Farmers would have to lease from these people and never be able to own on their own.
125.	See answer above.
126.	need more details ?
127.	This would allow ownership by pension funds. But would limit the amount so not everything is owned by them.
128.	partner with a farmer in a minority position.
129.	They simply don't have the capacity and compassion to steward the land responsibly. And make sure it's being leased correctly and efficiently. They are 100% profit driven and should keep their money in the stock markets and other forms of investments. Not Saskatchewan land

!!!
130. I don't think any amount of small print could ensure that that land would ever come back to the hand of a small family farm owner once it's taken out of the hands of farmers! Least not in affordable way! Same thing! Just because farming has had a good run in the past seven years! Think of the sixties and the eighties all you would be investors!! Not sure u all have the stomach for it quite frankly! And history will repeat itself! That's the one thing we can all count on! Weather patterns change, cost of input / output goes up and down, and the human race consistently skews up by trying to fix what's working! Sure everyone wants a price of the action in the good times! Who's willing to stick it out in the bad? Better not be investors or they won't be investors very long! When you buy a farm U buy a life style. When you work in the oil patch u buy into a life style! Farming is a life style it's not a "good" investment!
131. It would still drive up prices
132. i
133. Why does that need a cap.
134. If a cap is in place they may use subsidiary of a different name to keep purchasing land.
135. More favourable than -----
136. I would support the purchase with no cap in place. Have we forgotten when CP rail owned all that Sask land? All the land was leased to local farmers at local market driven rental rates. And eventually the holdings were liquidated by sale to the local farmers.
137. Again regardless of size of acquisition, care and control is key, especially with reference to stewardship/sustainability concerns.
138. No. they will always manipulate the system eventually. Proven over and over again.
139. There should be no caps.
140. No Ag focus
141. They probably be only interested the best land leave the rest of poorer land untouched because of less of a return.
142. Saskatchewan residents only!
143. once you open the door a crack it will only get pushed wide open later on.
144. Don't cap it.
145. See above comments.
146. Depends on the cap and other conditions, ie. How and to whom is it rented to, what are the terms of ownership, is there any incentive to the RM or local community that must be paid, etc.
147. Keep the farms run responsibly not with the bottom dollar ruling all decisions. This will return us to the feudal system if land is held by big corporations within or outside of Canada and saskatchewan. There will just be labourers working the land.
148. Allowing investors such as Canadian pension plans or larger Canadian investment trusts (of 10 or more beneficiaries) to purchase land if caps were put in place on the amount of land a given

investor could own reduces local control
149. They do not farm either.
150. They should not own any farm land.
151. possible with strick limits. Lawyers always find a way around these rules it seems.
152. our fore fathers left this idea behind in Europe 150 years ago to come to Saskatchewan so they would no longer have to be serfs of the land!
153. No restrictions
154. There should be no investments allowed from pension funds. Especially if farmers have contributed to them, such as CPI, because this means that they are essentially competing against their own money which makes little sense.
155. I'm against investing in land and leasing it back to the farmer
156. No. It would lead to more Gov't waste. We have lots of that already! Why not let the new sask farmers borrow interest free money from the Bank of Canada. From 1933 to 1973 the Provinces of Ca. Borrowed money interest free for The Trans Ca highway, hospitals and schools and more at interest free.
157. Same response as previous
158. I would be open to that idea.
159. Canadian Companies with shareholders that are Canadian citizens should not be restricted at all. Why would you not want Canadian Pension Plans to invest locally. That money is going to go somewhere. Might as well be right here so we can benefit from the economic spinoff.
160. No interference from government
161. Keep this out....they are not interested in the welfare of farmers!
162. Why limit this
163. No - there's no need to sugar coat the ownership with caps or other complications. If there's a strategic interest in preventing non-resident ownership then it should prevail. If there is no such compelling reason then farmland ownership should be wide open to anyone who can write the cheque.
164. Ask any lawyer or accountant that question. As their mind is racing to find the loop hook, they open up a myriad more shell companies. Smart move.
165. sask farmland should stay in care and control of sask farmers because they are the ownly people give a crap about what happens to it as it is there only way of making a living. as corp become owners if they dont get there rent the land will sit idle which is no good for anybody.
166. I don't see a need for caps.
167. cut out the caps
168. No. I don't like them being able to own farmland at all
169. Land should be owned by farmers and Saskatchewan residents .

170.	they would just split into many funds until the purchases were done then merge.
171.	It still takes away opportunities from the actual farmers.
172.	This is the typical "thin edge of the wedge" approach...
173.	If for farmland or water purposes, then no.
174.	Canadian Investments needs clear definition. This survey does not establish what this means. I have witnessed many Canadian companies become foreign companies over my years in Saskatchewan. And personally experienced foreign ownership of a company.
175.	There should not be any restrictions on selling farmland
176.	who would set the caps ? Government? Seems to me enough things are mishandled now.
177.	There are lots of companies on the TSE that they can invest in
178.	The caps would just keep increasing.
179.	They always find a loop hole
180.	See all answers above, depends on the rules.
181.	All this will mean is that they will have to get creative to skirt the cap.
182.	same problem as any investor
183.	I grew up on a small family farm and am raising my family on a small farm. I support farming as a way of life and would like to see that opportunity available to my children.
184.	Again the specific rules would need to be negotiated with farmers.
185.	test
186.	test
187.	They are still competing unfairly against local farmers.
188.	No caps
189.	Once the door is open I fear we will lose control.
190.	There are enough investments available that don't endanger the food supply. The returns here are not high enough for them to be clamouring for this opportunity unless they feel they can change the industry and raise food prices in the long run.
191.	no more than 2 quarters
192.	No more than 10%
193.	test
194.	This is silly as I stated before the farmer owns the land , if he doesn't want to sell to a non farmer than don't, I think farmers are smart enough to make this decision, they don't need the government telling them who they have to sell their land to.
195.	The pessimist in me feels that if there are some rules like that in place, it will only be a matter

	of time before lawyers get creative and find a way around them.
196.	Caps on the amount of land is not the issue.....who owns and controls the fund is the issue
197.	No grey areas, its not fair to the farmer next to the them.
198.	Possibly, depends on the size of the cap.
199.	This should make a more equal playing field for the local farmer wishing to purchase.
200.	Everything and everybody needs a purchase cap.
201.	Canadian Pension plans should keep out of farmland! The same goes for Canadian investment trust! It's just not good for anyone, especially our small communities!
202.	A very small cap. 10 acres. It would keep the land value high.
203.	depending on the size of caps
204.	1150,000 acres is too much. Allowing that transaction to take place was a mistake. However, a limit of 1,000 acres then starts to create a more even playing field as you have more healthy competition opposed to no competition.
205.	No-one can be held responsible due to limited liability.
206.	It gives them wiggle room. They would just start up another company with a different name. We don't need their money. They starve the local and provincial communities.
207.	Still room for misuse.
208.	See previous response!
209.	how do determine the cap?
210.	no multiple entities that are all owned buy one trust or plan. keep it open and transparent.
211.	Very tough to regulate.
212.	Cap the spending power and the amount. Make it a fair chance for the farmer
213.	depending on what the cap amount is, and as long as the cap is on the rent portion too, as in previous question above
214.	Caps and rules are just loopholes for crafty lawyers
215.	Once again I do not think that these investors would have an understanding of the business of Agriculture and would perhaps panic at every adverse situation.
216.	Limits need to be placed otherwise the general population runs the risk of being held hostage by the corporation through the use of the food supply. Individual Ownership diversity is key
217.	Leave it for the real farmers.
218.	shouldn't be any caps
219.	Leave the land available for those who live in the area and make a living with it. The sale of one quarter of land in the middle of a municipality will set the price for the whole municipality. And farmers cant compete with large investors.

220.	They would find a way around that.
221.	I am 26 years old, and trying to make a living grain farming. I bought my first quarter off my grandfather, I am looking to buy another at the end of the year. the land prices in this province are so inflated it sickens me. my land is in RM 128, where the going price for a section (640 acres) of land is in excess of 1.2 million. I ask the sask party how am I to make a living with land payments at that price? the sask party is killing the small family operated farms one by one. When I approach the old couples in my area to inquire about purchasing land they all tell me the same thing why do you want to get into farm? there is no money to be made, and you cant pay top dollar like the potash companies nor the out of country buyers. why would you take ownership away from the ones working the land I feel you guys want to make us serfs. these companies or out of country owners don't care for the land nor do guys that lease the land, people who own and live on the land are the best for the stewardship of the land, they care for it, how cant you see this? the sask party needs to look to Europe and learn how there farming operations are where the little guys are supported and encouraged. theses family operated farms in sask that are 10000+ acres are not a family farm they are corporations. also I am an electrician I work 21days straight, this job alone is over six figures. I would give it up in a heart beat to be on the land 24/7, but unfortunately I don't see this ever happening with land prices like this. I would love to hear back from a sask party, -----.
222.	?
223.	Again I see no benefits except to the investor and to the seller who is already selling for close to 20 times his purchase price with no capital gains tax and can only claim greed as a reason.
224.	Let young farmers make money on land not investors in Toronto.
225.	Because once they get their foot in the door the government can change the percentage of ownership to allow an influence in election platforms if needed. Once in government the mla seems to forget the people that elected him
226.	This is getting repetitive, no outside investment!
227.	might depend on the size of the cap restrictions.The guiding principle is that we do not want to drive land price prohibitively high so that young farmers or farmers wanting to expand can not acquire the land base they need to succeed.
228.	the caps will just change in the future because of pressure from funds etc .
229.	Farm land needs to be owned and farmed by farmers.
230.	If they have to operate as a successful business they are unlikely to significantly impact local or regional agricultural economy.
231.	But I see no need for caps unless they apply to everyone.
232.	How naive are you guys? You currently have an investor group challenging the Sask Farmland Security Board, the CPPIB pulled a fast one on you, and you have people who want to buy millions of dollars of farmland here and you think you will keep ahead of their shenanigans?
233.	I believe in owner operators
234.	no but I would support it for a personal investment say if my sister or friend wanted to buy a few quarters but it would need to be capped at 4 or so

235.	These caps could be effective but would have minimal which would likely stave off any interest by these funds in any event. 1 or 2 thousand acres max.
236.	They will want the cap raised in time as well as form subsidiary company's so that each can buy the capped amount
237.	Same s above
238.	Caps can be changed.
239.	Discussed earlier
240.	same as above
241.	canadian is ok
242.	We don't want investors coming in buying every piece of land.
243.	They shouldn't be allowed to own period.
244.	Answer is still NO. Leave it alone
245.	That would be another limiting factor on what will be my retirement package - the sale of my farmland.
246.	Depends what the cap is! And how easily politicians could change it in the future.
247.	Caps should be in place not only for each corporation but also for Saskatchewan farmland as a whole.
248.	What would stop those 10 beneficiaries from starting multiple corporations, all of whom would purchase Saskatchewan farmland. The beneficiaries would potentially be numbered companies all owned by the same person. You would get the same result as if you had no caps in place. Opening the doors to foreign ownership or large Canadian pensions/trusts is a slippery slope - once the decision is in place, these well-heeled entities would continue to lobby for changes in their favour.
249.	Need more info? What are the caps?
250.	No means no.
251.	If that was done Hutterite brethren and large farms would also have to be capped.
252.	Not needed
253.	difficult to answer with no cap numbers.
254.	Farm land should be owned by the people who look after and keep the land clean and farmable.
255.	There is no need for farmers to own the land, but they must have security of tenure such as the had through the original Land Bank program..
256.	I would support the implementation of caps on the amount of land that could be held by any given investor as long as these caps were accompanied by strict regulations governing rental agreements to prevent the abuse of these agreements by the wealthier and more powerful investment groups at the expense of individual farmers and the environment.

257.	it would depend on the cap, and if there was a total cap that all investors must be below, and if there were rules concerning totals for related investors so shell companies could not scoop up more land
258.	Don't trust you to not sell out my Saskatchewan
259.	no investment firms or tax shelters or oil companies etc. using tax shelters to buy land should be allowed to own farmland
260.	Thin edge of the wedge and an opening for the erosion of the restrictions on ownership of farmland.
261.	See the comment below about the Farm Land Security Board. That should be enough said.
262.	<p>I do not understand how caps can be put on a share offering ?</p> <p>Will all the land be classed as one large investment ?</p> <p>Was nothing learned from the " land bank " experiment ?</p> <p>That was where a family (farmers) had the chance to make an intergenerational transfer by one (retiree) selling the land-(pension secured) and the next generation leasing it back till they could buy it (accumulated credit experience) .</p> <p>There was a recent case where a small increase in the lease rate initiated the next generation (now nearing retirement) to refuse to pay the increased amount.</p> <p>Will there be enough farmland to secure the next generations ' pension fund ?</p> <p>If they have two children and the last generation has not yet released the need for security, it will take more acres to achieve the goal.</p>
263.	Farmland is a trust for farmers to Stewart.
264.	Caps i dont like. Were farmers. Free market!
265.	If the restrictions are tight enough, especially on future transfers.
266.	There would be lots of opportunity to skirt rules by simply looking at titles of companies.
267.	Why do we want to sell our identity?
268.	as per comments in the previous question.
269.	The caps are a joke, they and their lawyers find ways to circumvent the "cap"!
270.	It matters not where the investment money comes from. It is speculative money and the consequential impact on the fellow trying to make his living farming is that his chances off success are dramatically reduced. Only a few years back, an investor bought land in RM 467 and is now offering to sell it for about three times his cost. If he sells for what he is asking, the buyer will likely lose it to his banker as the net return from farming may be negative.
271.	WOULD YOU PUT A CAP ON TERM OF OWNERSHIP? LONG OR SHORT BUT NOT TO DUMP WHEN THEY SEE FIT ? WHAT WOULD HAPPEN TO SASK. ECONOMY IF ALL INVESTORS DECIDED TO GET OUT AT SAME TIME?

272.	Ditto.
273.	Its time the farmland security board relaxed its regulations maybe look outside the country for other examples.
274.	why would i want to fight my own money.
275.	Farmers who actually farm the land should own it.
276.	just a way to wiggle in the door
277.	Depends on the cap size.
278.	Farmers will sell out to anyone for cash, they need to retire on their investment as pension too!
279.	There is no need. Producer owned land will be the best way to keep our agriculture industry strong in the future.
280.	This question is so poorly worded that any response would be meaningless. I do not think there should be a cap. I support the ability of investors to purchase land without any cap. If a legislated cap is in place, then of course I support the ability of investors to purchase land, up to the cap.
281.	It is very difficult to control these corporate entities they simply form subsidiaries to buy more land. I am familiar with how the Irving family gets around Prince Edward Island's corporate land ownership rules. In that example, family members also own companies.
282.	Ditto previous answer.
283.	No. Eventually the cap would be reformed and displaced, don't trickle the flood gate to blow it open down the road.
284.	nor again this would distort the farm market economy
285.	Long term investment by Canadian pension funds will provided more benefits to Saskatchewan farmers andgovernment eventually.
286.	See above
287.	Again this is the same as above. However along with the amount they can own it would be good to have a lease model whereby the investors are taking some of the risk of farming. There are several models out there that can be used.
288.	It's the same idea, they would outbid local investors on the land they are purchasing, even if there is a cap on it.
289.	Why do they need land? Isn't there enough other investments. You want farm land then move to the country and farm it!
290.	as above
291.	Only if the caps were very low, such as 1 or 2 sections per R.M. or some other designated region(ex. 36 sections in each of the SW,SE,WC,EC and Northern regions)

292.	Do not allow them to own land
293.	\What did Govt SK learn the from dealings with CPPIB? What has Govt SK learned from the massive cumulative land purchases of USA financed Ducks Unlimited???
294.	We do NOT want investors we want real farmers.
295.	It would be easy to evade restrictions by forming multiple companies or corporations to purchase farm land under various aliases.
296.	Know,this is false ownership as stated before.
297.	There's no need for investors, there's plenty of young people that want the land already, these investors are just one more hand in the cookie jar
298.	This may be an acceptable option.
299.	No . what good will a cap do? We all know that Saskatchewan farmland is a hot commodity. As landowners we already face pressure from wealthy people in our own province buying it as an investment and being able to outbid young farmers and old farmers!!
300.	Might make a concession to the CPP because it is for the benefit of Canadians not foreigners. I think that it is vital for farm land to remain in the hands of Saskatchewan people especially farmers. We cannot sell such an important asset to outsiders. I just don't think that there is enough benefit from increased outside investment. We would be giving away the rights to the land in our province and sending the rent out of the province. A lot of times the money from the sale doesn't even stay in the province. Many buy a house in the Southern U.S. And move to B.C. If outsiders want to profit from agriculture let them invest in our Agri Business. We need more processing capability for our production, better equipment, better inputs and better technology. There are plenty of opportunities for investment.
301.	Make a decision either yes or no and get out of the way don't straddle the fence. There is nothing wrong with simple.
302.	Keep Canadians in control, we are tired of all the foreign politices that some way always corrupt our legal system!
303.	dito
304.	Same reason above, regardless of the amount of land they will still have an unfair advantage.
305.	Not sure how you would do it but I like the cap idea.
306.	It would depend if the caps were fair and realistic - a cap would be useless if the number was extensively high. The term "cap" is very vague when not put into context or defined.
307.	because investors could divide there investments into smaller trusts to gain access to more land
308.	I would only agree if caps were kept very low, about 320 acres.
309.	Same deal, the lawyers find the loopholes-give an inch take a mile. Is a beneficiary a single person or group?
310.	As above

311.	they only want to keep their money save. Pension should be payed by premiums lifelong and they can use other investments.
312.	Again farm operators should own the land to maximize their opportunities through appreciation and production.
313.	see above
314.	It would be too easy for the large investment trusts to bend the rules, make slight changes to their structure or adjust in innumerable ways to own and hence control farmland and practices. Could and investment trust be created and owned by one of the multi-national farm chemical and supply giants?
315.	No farm land should be owned by anyone other than Saskatchewan resident farmers because they will take the best care of land that they own. This insures that our farm land will be productive for future generations.
316.	If we were able to tax them different on a local level the playing field would be skewed towards owner/operator ownership.
317.	Investors control what we do. They will be making the money! Why work then.
318.	See above
319.	as long as a realistic limit was in place. eg 100,000 acres
320.	It could be a slippery slope.
321.	The best long term model is to let the business owners that are actually farming set the price of land by bidding accordingly to what profitability can be achieved at. Any other model introduces speculation and possibilities of severe price fluctuations and crashes from market bubbles. Stability and steady growth should be the goal.
322.	NO!
323.	No caps
324.	Once again, we should be talking quality, not simply quantity.
325.	"Caps" would easily be worked around. There would suddenly be multiple "entities" (ie. subsidiaries) to purchase the land. It only takes registration of a new name as a company to provide for another block of land to be purchased.
326.	If an investor buys land, it should be sold to the farmer who looks after it within ten years of the date of purchase. A young farmer could then lease for ten years without worry that he's going to lose the land to another farmer
327.	I support with no caps in place. So if I answer YES to the above question, i shouldn't be able to answer this question, it will give a result that is not true and can be mislead.
328.	too much land in one pocket is not a good thing. what if a big portion of the financial markets crashed and companies walked away from farmland like people from the USA walked away from homes? it would be a very bad situation.

329.	hard to set the caps
330.	But only if we know who they are not a numbered company
331.	I don't want the Canada Pension Plan owning land under any circumstances They have no business competing with farmers for land
332.	Again why allow funds to Try run or control our industry and province. There is plenty of land in other provinces they can buy.
333.	Depends on the caps I guess!
334.	They would start as many "seperate" fund companies as required to keep buying land. Awful suggestion.
335.	Same reason as above. They can find other things to invest in that will allow our children to own farmland and farm it for the next 50 years.
336.	as above
337.	Saskatchewan farmers should be the only ones who own farm land.
338.	Govt will likely to this option to save face over corrupt CPP deal. Oh yeah everyone knows how corrupt that deal was!
339.	I would support it even without Caps. How do you want us to answer this to express our feeling about land ownership caps. What is a person buys more than the pension acre cap. Then what do you do? Did those who are soiling themselves about this actually think through these questions?
340.	See above.
341.	see above
342.	Same as above.
343.	Where ever they are allowed to purchase land it will artificially cause increased land values which negatively affects the local farmers.
344.	Land should be owned by people who actually farm and care for the land.
345.	Why cap it? Scale drives expertise and efficiency.
346.	Leave the farming to the experts, FARMERS. They do not need out side interference.
347.	Again, just some more crap, Totally unfair to be competing against them to purchase land. Let those funds invest in stock markets where they can screw up those instead.
348.	Even if tighter securities are enforced there will always be loop holes for those who really want to buy to find.
349.	A cap would be good I think but who's to decide what the cap should be
350.	Money talks
351.	need more info on this

352.	If land caps are reasonable and there aren't loopholes in which they can purchase more than should be permitted.
353.	the same
354.	I Don't support caps on the amount of land given investors can own, I do support investors such as the Canadian Pension Plan buying farmland
355.	They will just abuse to loop holes and create more companies
356.	Yes with the caveats: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Total ownership volume of Saskatchewan would be legally capped - Ownership would be limited to pension funds of Saskatchewan, Western Canada and Canadian organizations who are 100% Canadian owned by their mandate. Example - Coop Pension Fund Teachers Credit Union of Saskatchewan. - Investment funds would be excluded.
357.	I feel the amount of land owned by the Canadian Pension Plan Investment Board is extremely high. My answer would be no if MUCH lower limits were not in place.
358.	Would not support it but it is a compromise if we're forced
359.	no, because they will try their best to skirt the rules however they can.
360.	investor are investors. they still want there profit just trying to avoid laws and use subclass.
361.	why should there be a cap
362.	If you must put in caps then do so,I would prefer no restrictions.
363.	they would not take long to split into several groups controlled by one corp. to get around the rules.
364.	If Canadian pension funds or larger Canadian investment trusts want to own SK farmland they should only be able to purchase it with tax paid dollars, just like local SK residents.
365.	same
366.	They would find a way around the cap
367.	farms for sask farmers
368.	Let's let the market regulate itself.
369.	Would increase volatility on the market for land.
370.	What does the cap mean - 100 acres or 1,000,000 acres?
371.	maybe, but caps would have to be low.
372.	There are numerous financial instruments that these institutions can purchase to increase value and market share. Why would they want the headache of owning farmland, when they can just buy a bond. Maybe they are coming to the realization that their paper instruments are worthless and pointless and are now searching for assets that have value. Why should Saskatchewan give up the most precious asset we have, farmland that makes food, because of

	corruption in the financial markets? I will never support this.
373.	no because they will get around this once they own some land they will start more funds and amalgamate more plans into owning as much land as they want
374.	To much Government regulations which is not required.
375.	What's the cap? That may influence our answer.
376.	1 benificery could be a part of more than 1 investment trust and could be pumping tons of assests (cash) into it and offer way more than any local farmer ever could! Those investors could find a way around those caps.
377.	Same as above!
378.	No cap, if you are going to create a free market, with open borders, then putting a cap or a limit allowed would put you in the same position you are now, individuals and corporations will find a way to circumvent the law, and your legislation will have to be tested in order to comply. this will not end well for the province or the government.
379.	There is no sound reason to have them owning our farmland at any level.
380.	Probably. But I think there should also be some restrictions as to the kind of investment trust.
381.	A cap would only work if the total area remains small(max 75,000 across Canada)
382.	To many ways to bend the rules(i.e. maybe have a saskatchewan resident in the fund)
383.	I don't believe it's wise to allow corporations to hold large blocks of land, small parcels could be acceptable.
384.	There are always loopholes so the cpp reaches their cap then they start a new company and buy more
385.	Depends on the cap. If it goes back to one quarter then I don't think that is realistic
386.	Refer previous response
387.	Investment income would not necessarily stay in Saskatchewan.
388.	It would have to be less than the average farm size. So small farms can still compete.
389.	Would allow more investment companies in.
390.	There should be no ownership by pension funds or the like
391.	Depends on the intent of the investor.
392.	Answer as above
393.	Because that will only stay in place until the next election
394.	Funds could still buy large tracks of land this way.
395.	Investors should not be buying farmland. Period.
396.	same as previous comments.
397.	but it would still depend on legislature made on it and potential loopholes to challenge to get

around legislature.
398. It is still a fund.
399. possibly. We already have Hutterites buying large tracts of land that will never be available to individuals again.
400. there would find a loop hole some where and control more than is let on.
401. Could be a discussion point
402. They shouldn't be allowed to own land and push prices up with our own money.
403. Minimal amounts tracked provincial wide. Same should apply to corporate farms as well.
404. I think a cap would be a good idea if they are allowed to invest
405. As above
406. Can't be a little bit pregnant
407. Again do not open door, they can invest in Saskatoon farmers instead through loans etc.
408. may fall in category of what a tangled web we weave to those we try to deceive
409. This would just lead to a larger corporation setting up several land holding entities to do an end run on the rules.
410. Current restrictions are not enforced. Relaxing them by putting 'caps' in place would only open it up for more abuse of purchased land.
411. There are some really big farms who can't sell and therefore would benefit from a cap, AS LONG AS IT IS CANADIAN OWNED!
412. If we do not let foreign investment to purchase land in Sask. our farmers will not get fair prices for their land. All of our farmers that are ready for retirement want the highest prices possible for their land, as I said, we in Sask are still under valued with our land values!
413. this would soon be challenged in court or overturned if any discrimination was shown
414. They would cheat the system and find loopholes like they have already done
415. caps need to be in place.
416. There would have to be a condition that the owner could only sell to a Canadian as well as a land base cap.
417. Caps should be placed but still on only those listed above to qualify. The reason that I give for qualification is that all Saskatchewan residence should be able to purchase farmland with their investment money if they wish to have that opportunity.
418. They will always find loopholes.
419. max 10 acres
420. large investors have too much buying power compared to regular farmers
421. as above

422.	These larger corporations would always find some way around all the red tape by having subsidiary companies. If it is no, it is no to all!
423.	These entities can hide information, it would be open to fraud.
424.	As long as the Canadian pension fund or Canadian investment trust would never enter the hands of foreign (out of Canada) investors...perhaps some consideration may be given to this.
425.	I'm not sure how caps really change things...it just means more investment groups...that may be either good from a competition standpoint, or bad from an efficiency standpoint. It might be interesting if the government forced corporate investors to have a significant Sask operational or head office presence to allow ownership of more than 10,000 acres.
426.	There is too much gray area and I think it will be taken advantage of. Loop holes will be found and farmers will take the hit for it
427.	They have no business buying farm land.
428.	I want to see the people that farm the land own the land
429.	bring ten families out with land ownership is only about investments /////
430.	See above
431.	Any amount is too much.
432.	benefits more than a single individual investor.. I need more information. but I see the pension plan benefitting many Canadians who have worked their entire lives here
433.	It's just a way to take the land out of the hands of local ranchers and farmers.
434.	Again... SK Agriculture producers are struggling to compete in the local land markets. CPP or investment trusts only drive prices higher. They as many URBANITES are too far removed from agriculture to understand the concepts of productivity and land value.
435.	They are too far removed from agriculture to understand the risks. How many pension plans and investment trusts would have survived the last 15 years of low prices in agriculture. Yet they would expect top dollar for rent wouldn't they. They'd want xxx dollars return of investment. Doesn't work like that. Its like making bread without flour!!
436.	no comment
437.	There are ways around the rules, it's already happening. Either open it up or don't.
438.	But with this they should have to only farm it themselves or lease it back to ONLY LOCAL FARMERS AND A REASONABLE RETURN
439.	Maybe - that might be better than the above.
440.	don't think in a free country anyone should be limited (when they are a citizen)
441.	Allowing pension plans or investment trusts to purchase land would make an already expensive business even harder to make a living off of by driving up land prices.
442.	I can see loop holes causing problems.
443.	Non farming organizations should not be using Canadian pensions to invest in farmland. They

are competing against farmers.
444. The cap doesn't really change anything if there are multiple investors.
445. Same problems and issues. Just sets the stage to open the door even further down the road.
446. They have millions of dollars to get around those rules too.
447. once you allow them ownership, then increasing the limit is far too easy.
448. same reason
449. I think that land ownership should remain in the hands of people working the land and not a corporation or trust with no understanding of agriculture or stewardship.
450. Once again the profits leave the province so no.
451. I think a cap in place is a good idea, I would just hate to see a decision like this be detrimental to the farming industry in Saskatchewan.
452. lawyers in corporations are paid very well to find loopholes. The only way to correct what is wrong with the current land ownership is to limit land ownership to active farmers only. You would still bring in investment money from new farmers, as well as bring in new farmers to our province.
453. There always seems to be loop holes available. Whomever can afford the best/biggest law firm.
454. No caps, let the market dictate as with any other real estate property
455. Needs to be clean cut
456. Placing caps that aren't too large would keep a lot of land still in the locals hands.
457. I'll be honest little fish me here can not compete with investor groups or corporations. Doing so will again increase land values on marginal land.
458. It's still driving up land prices....only ones who can afford to buy are corporations
459. Family owned farms are the ones that are the best taken care of. Allowing others to purchase land will result in poorly managed and taken care of land.
460. They have no business in agriculture unless they live on and farm the land.
461. They should have a limit similar to the non-Saskatchewan residents. And if the investor was not investing in land under the name of more than one corporation.
462. LIVE ON IT OR FARM IT, OTHERWISE YOU DON'T OWN IT.
463. They are looking for their investment to increase in value in a speculative manner.
464. This would depend on the caps, not being to buy out an entire farm would be good. Also maybe only so many quarter sections in a township etc.
465. Same as above. rules can be changed. large investors will lobby to make changes to rules.
466. This is gettin closer but would still not like to see foriegners own land and not support

	provincial economy
467.	Farmland cannot be allowed to be an investment vehicle of any kind, it could become a commodity regardless if it is used for food, possibly becoming a hedge fund, and may sit idle awaiting appreciation. Do you really want to risk food production in a global climate warming scenario. Think forward two to three generations, what will the world look like, and what will your children will be doing.
468.	Just don't believe that there is any place for investments such as these.
469.	Investors with large amounts of money can afford to manipulate the ownership of titles and make it very difficult to figure out who actually owns the land.
470.	The caps would have to be of a realistic magnitude otherwise the only effect of a cap would be to exclude a sector of investors who are not interested in small holdings.
471.	They are destroying farming in Saskatchewan. Corporate farms are getting larger and rural areas will disappear. We will buy bread from China
472.	same as above
473.	Maybe a limit of 100,000 acres.
474.	Too many ways of finding loopholes and getting around regulations.
475.	No caps you can always turn down the offer
476.	Treating land as a commodity does not ensure the long term viability of the Ag Sector in Saskatchewan.
477.	See above
478.	They only care about the profit and couldn't care less about the land. If that means implementing significant agronomic and environmental damages, they won't think twice and than Saskatchewan farmers are going to be left to clean up the ashes.
479.	Sufficient competition for farm and exists.
480.	<p>The population density of rural areas will likely dwindle further in comparison to that in urban settings, due to farmers chasing the elusive "economies of scale" (i.e., increasing the size of their farming operations), as input costs increase. Therefore, there will always be a greater number of potential urban, as compared to rural, investors that believe they know what's best for farmers and their families, but will never understand the complexities of the operations, due to their distance from them. I fear that land caps may not be enough to prevent the acquisition of the limited land resources by "Canadian" investors, due to the difference in population densities between rural and urban areas and the greater potential interest in farmland by Canadians in urban settings.</p> <p>I also fear that land acquisition by investors (foreign or Canadian) would inevitably drive up land prices for Saskatchewan farmers, even if capped. (It is reasonable to assume that rather large portions of Saskatchewan farmland would need to be offered/sold to investors in order to entice them. Thus, land prices would inevitably increase under this scenario as well, unless land ownership restrictions are very carefully put in place and enforced.)</p>
481.	there is no government that could do that resonably

482.	The govt ----- us out of the Wheat board and the prairie Pools
483.	might feel a bit better about this.. but cautious as we tend to exploited..
484.	Only Saskatchewan residents should be allowed to own more than 160 acres.
485.	It is still a bad idea. Even small purchases will disrupt supply demand balances.
486.	We want farmers not just investors, they are two different playing fields
487.	It depends on the cap.
488.	Same as above.
489.	Caps can be changed. It is better to not engage agriculture as a means to another end at all.
490.	I believe that the most beneficial option would be to insist anyone (not any company) purchasing Sask land needs to be a Sask resident
491.	Wide open or nothing- too cloudy in the middle
492.	Cap at 10,000 acres
493.	
494.	These parties are going to kill it for farmers.
495.	Maybe
496.	No I will not support allowing this even if there are caps in place on how much land could be owned by a pension plan or investment trusts. All this will do is create more trusts and funds to stay under the caps.
497.	N/A
498.	See above responses.
499.	Saskatchewan farmers/farm children can not compete with these conditions and we shall loose the core of what has fashioned our province.
500.	Once you open the door in one area , that gives them a in so they can screw with the system to get it opened right up.
501.	Caps would make sense.
502.	Make the cap 10 acres.
503.	I'm not sure about putting on caps, probably better to look at some special taxation rules if it becomes a problem,
504.	explained in previous question
505.	Depends on how much land will be allowed and where this land is located...in a depressed area and isolated may be okay?
506.	Like I said land should only be for saskatchewan resident only
507.	With only safeguard custodianship legislation.
508.	I do not support this proposition. However if it has to be then certainly there should be limits. I

<p>would further suggest that there be limits placed on the amount that individual Canadians could own as well.</p> <p>One of the problems that I see regarding allowing non Saskatchewan individuals and Canadian pension plan and investment trust to purchase farmland is that they appear to concentrate there purchases in there areas of the province that have the more productive land.</p> <p>I would suggest that this is causing localized concerns for active farmers in those area regarding purchase competition and affordability for those wishing to expand ownership .</p>
509. They still have no personal care for the land itself, or the neighbours quality of life.
510. I'm not sure if a cap makes any difference. We would think it is too high, and they would think it is too low.
511. Once you give them a cap they will eventually negotiate and lobby to have the cap increased. If you believe otherwise then I would disagree with you.
512. Why are we trying to "---- out" our farmland in Saskatchewan? Saskatchewan farmers are excellent stewards of the land, and when we own it, it is good hands. If pension funds want to invest in agriculture, they can do so by investing in any number of publicly traded companies that are involved in agriculture.
513. NEVER... again how would some dumb smuchk in toronto know a single thing about farming/ranching in saskatchewan?? they only know profits and the bottomline.; they do not love the land like we do & what is best for the land. remember how the rich came from england with all their money to show us poor farmers how to do things by the book, many lost their shirt through the tough years, but we stuck it , we had the pioneer spirit that is what makes us so unique that is what makes us saskatchewan!!!
514. This may help both retiring and current farmers out
515. It may be possible to regulate this, but it must be transparent, so investors can't get around the regulations.
516. Basically I don't agree with pension plans owning land
517. Non-farming owners should never be allowed.
518. There are lots of local local farmers that will purchase the land but with these prices that are being offered doesn't make it viable to own.
519. Lets leave farming up to farmers. They're here for good, they won't hurt this province, don't hurt them. They are a good asset.
520. If investors are being allowed to purchase farmland, I would prefer it to remain within Canada. The difficulty still lies in the reduced long-term profit margins for farmers of leased land. I don't know the answer in terms of percentages to allow for purchase by investment corporations, but preferably no investment companies would be best for the farmer in the end.
521. There has to be realistic policies surrounding this
522. depends on the cap , i doubt this would work they would try to find loop holes in the rules
523. No as there would not be enough farmland around to satisfy the webs lawyers would spin

around this.
524. same as above
525. You would have to prove to me that the rules are ironclad BEFORE they came into play.
526. Such investments could be supported as long as the caps on the ownership were extremely low (20 acres or less). In the past, foreign investors were only able to own very small acreages of land. This should still be the case.
527. Loopholes will be found and these companies will buy more than the rules intended to allow.
528. No cuz they would just make more companies, provide a loop hole
529. Why do that, the effects would point towards the same direction
530. This is a better model, however it would lead to a volatile market
531. For me to support this the cap would be lower than they would even consider bothering with.
532. Families should own and farm the land. Its how you keep rural sask alive.
533. WHY, it just creates unfair completion
534. No. give and inch and some lawyer will take a mile citing the Charter.
535. Caps are arbitrary, what are you trying to solve here?
536. They shouldn't ever be aloud. Why would you ever want to push farmers out?
537. Demand for farmland in Saskatchewan is significant enough that outside investors are not needed to ensure there is a good market. Land is a strategic resource that should be owned locally to keep the wealth in rural Saskatchewan.
538. Banks are for lending money not groups of investors we know nothing about.
539. Absolutely necessary.
540. SAME As above /they can't be trusted;;;
541. I'd rather a limit on total land that non farming owners can control.
542. Only if the cap was quite small.
543. Owners of pension funds will not work the land nor care for it. Owners should have direct responsibility for the welfare of the land by living on the land.
544. under no circumstances should Canadian pension plans or investment trusts be allowed to own Saskatchewan land!
545. With respect, this question is similar to "Have you stopped beating your wife? - answer Yes or No" Pension funds have access to "pre-tax" funds whereas farmers have only access to their own "after-tax" funds. It follows that land purchases by Pension Funds should be considered within the context of the tax code. However until the concept of equity is considered regarding taxation a free market should also apply for those funds. In summary and to answer the

	question Protectionism is an outdated concept and has no place in a modern free economy.
546.	Depends on the cap
547.	Again, as above, I think, if used trusts should be very limited in the amount of land that they can purchase.
548.	For same reasons already listed.
549.	It may seem a little drastic, but the simplest rule would be that if you own the land you farm it, unless you or your immediate family have been farming the oldest purchase of land for 25 years, then you can rent it out, if their primary residence is in Saskatchewan, and no more land can be added to this package unless those family members farm the new land.
550.	Still, must have local control despite a minority position. Land is not an asset that can be bought and sold like other assets, and is FAR more valuable to survival of our society.
551.	If you own farm land you should reside in the province.
552.	Same disadvantage as before, only now it could get area specific.
553.	The cap would have to be very small in my opinion. 160 acres or less. So small that such parties would not likely be interested.
554.	why ?
555.	Already answered previously.
556.	Again it does nothing for Sk or it,s farmers.
557.	As long as 70% and controlling share is owned by Canadians.
558.	they should not own all the land.
559.	MAYBE
560.	NO compromise!
561.	they will just want more. you have to draw the line somewhere
562.	This does allow for the increase in economic value of the farmland, which is required to a certain degree.
563.	I am a YOUNG FARMER. I work hard enough for myself. I can't afford to stretch myself thin in order to compete against foreign investment
564.	Opening the door even a small crack eventually could result in uncontrolled scenarios.
565.	I see no value in that either
566.	Once again a foot in the door A first step to bigger and bigger
567.	See above
568.	Give an inch they will take a mile.

569.	Because they would find a loop hole around the rules and still end up buying as much as they wanted
570.	it is a better idea to allow them to provide financing to local residents.
571.	Once again only interested in profits and recent economic gains and not concerned or understanding of the connected rural economy.
572.	I would support foreign ownership only of a) the owners were strictly Canadian b) there was a cap on land owned by a foreign entity
573.	A cap on land ownership would encourage small farmers to continue farming. Large farming operations aren't affected nearly as bad as a small farm is when prices are low, which is probably the number one reason why the small farmer sells out. If farming wasn't such an expensive financial gamble more people would be willing to do it.
574.	The legislation to be workable must be kept simple. An outright ban on land that is zoned agricultural by the local Rural Municipality!
575.	same as above
576.	A cap on amount of land one owns could give an opportunity for locals to advance
577.	There are enough of these type of investors that we cannot compete with them.
578.	5000 Canadian nation 5 thousand
579.	Same as above.
580.	These organizations have strictly a economic interest in the land they generally contribute little to that community and speed up the depopulation of the area.
581.	Just adding a level of bureaucracy which costs all taxpayers
582.	Same as above.
583.	Slippery slope
584.	Again this is just a slippery slope for institutional investors to be worming their way around the regulations we are already seeing that now it will only get worse. You need to be clear when formulating the regulations no grey areas or as few as possible so you can enforce them.
585.	With a relatively small cap
586.	No! No! No!
587.	No none at all.
588.	No investors!
589.	I would rather see more families moving home to farm. Our small towns are dying
590.	For exactly the same reason that urban dwellers do not wish to rent their home all their life.
591.	Possibly, I would have to have more information on the potential effects of this pursuit.
592.	I know it's getting harder and harder to maintain family farms already. Foreign ownership and

	large non farm investments are just going to speed up the demise of these working family units.
593.	This only opens the door for people to abuse the program
594.	lawyers would soon find a way around the caps
595.	Once a policy is in place it can be adjusted .
596.	The water is getting very murky.
597.	loop holes will be found
598.	Impossible to make policy that is not enforced.
599.	any amount of foreign ownership will not be in the best interests of local communities
600.	Depends on the size of the caps
601.	This still doesn't fix the problem
602.	If we have extra land nobody wants but that is not the case, to my knowledge.
603.	I would like to see strong management controls on investment in farmland, where return on investment was not the highest good, and who would want to invest in that.
604.	How can it be guarantee these investment firms are Canadian?
605.	half measure, stop creating artificial confusions for people willing to invest in the core industry of the province
606.	No caps should be place on any owners.
607.	see above
608.	NO!
609.	Same
610.	These investors should be allowed to purchase as much as they want
611.	We will be outbid in all cases. Rent will be far too high.
612.	Opens the door.
613.	The farmland market should be left to free enterprise guidelines. Land is only purchased if it makes good business sense.
614.	Against any amount of land.
615.	Good business controls itself.
616.	Maybe
617.	Possibly
618.	Slippery Slope...
619.	It would depend on the amount of the "cap"
620.	Big pension plans have no business in farming. Let us do our thing for our living.

621.	farmers should own the land they farm
622.	Dont need more competition to raise prices.
623.	Again they are Canadian
624.	Leave our land up to the person who wants to farm it or live on the land whereas these investors don't farm it themselves only buy it as a investment.
625.	Pension plans defently are not in the business to farm the land and I think if you are going to allow that then let forener come i to, that way we will get the most out of our land instead of a teachers pension found being substized by farmers
626.	Having just seen our dad sell all but the home quarter, it would be hypocrritical to not want the same high price benefit for others who are ready to or have to get out. But it's impossible to get into farming now starting from scratch and that worries me.
627.	Limiting them would allow new and existing family farms to compete in land purchases and restrict the amount of land we see being leased.
628.	No it's not right
629.	They do not need to be investing in land
630.	Again, such investors will be there when the ag sector is strong but will pull out when the sector is in a downturn - that is precisely what their directive is. When they pull out the downturn will be more severe and the impact more wide spread than if such investor types did not own land to begin with.
631.	I think if this happens, pressure will be put on the government of the day to reverse the decision and we will be back where we started.
632.	Keep it simple.
633.	Keep it simple, do not allow, that way no one can find grey areas
634.	As long as the limit is below 1 quarter section.
635.	Again. Their legal obligation is not to the people of Saskatchewan but to their shareholders. Our needs and theirs may be at odds with each other and we would lose out.
636.	Put caps on the price of leasing
637.	we do not want to go back to the feudal system
638.	Too easy to make sub companies/investment groups
639.	Again, opening the flood gates
640.	This would become a loophole where funds could control a million companies to control large tracts of land
641.	same as above
642.	It is too easy to set up additional trusts to again control our home province.
643.	I would limit the amount of land owned to 10 acres.

644.	See above. I would be more partial to this than no restrictions
645.	pension funds should invest in stock markets.
646.	it.would.artificially inflate.the.value.of.farmland.and this would.leave sk farmers out.of.being able to.expand their operations
647.	No I think caps are a bit of the problem too, if they are legit and sask residents let the productivity of their land decide the proper size and structure, for economic stability.
648.	all these questions are the same less hands on interest but in the future the government will have to regulate how farming can be done because these corporations etc will ravage and plunder our land for the almighty dollar which is their only concern and if you don't believe me tell me why was there no interest from them 10 years ago when farming was not as profitable as it is now
649.	No, it takes away the opportunity for new farmers to enter the business regardless of cap. Eventually the pension plan will influence the government to make the caps larger and larger as more and more our Saskatchewan government is serving the interest of large corporations, pension plans rather than individual citizens. A citizen should have the opportunity to purchase land on his/her own, not this ridiculous reasoning of allowing citizens to own land through a pension plan. That is not ownership. And the fact that most citizens are already not capable of purchasing land, we are already to far in the wrong direction. Allowing the pension plans and investment trusts to purchase land worsens this situation>
650.	If they want to invest then they should have no choice but to farm the said land, not sit in an office thinking that farming is a profitable by the millions that they want.
651.	Land is for producing food to feed a growing global population, not an asset to appreciate.
652.	Cost of food world wide
653.	See above, these folks should not have a say in real farming. Buy a shopping mall.
654.	once you open the door to investments out side there will always someone will try to increase the limits allowed
655.	No. Same reason as above. Terrible idea - foreign investment, CPP and other million/billion dollar companies should stay out of farmland in Saskatchewan.
656.	Can't have one investment group owning it all
657.	The cap would need to be low enough to not have an effect on local farmers, I would suggest a limit similar to what the average farmer currently owns.
658.	If it was a very low cap
659.	Who is going to track this over the years? An investor can be in an investment trust under different names, companies etc. Also - see the statement below.
660.	The limits would be constantly tested; how could you determine whether a given investor is involved in more than one form

661.	A cap could be placed but inevitably a savvy investment group would find a loophole.
662.	Large groups can easily manipulate the rules.
663.	Outside investment only gives a temporary surge of money into Saskatchewan. after that it will be flowing back out.
664.	Caps are simply the start of a slippery slope, where there will be more lobbying in the future to open it up. There are lots of opportunities world wide for those pension funds and investment trusts to pursue. Once they buy up land, no farmer will ever be able to afford to buy it from them as those Plans and Trusts.
665.	NO
666.	Let the market stabilize without outside money
667.	If we make this the law the corporations will just cap out their acres and start a second company to buy more
668.	Start with the local market. We have heard ad nauseum, the need to have farmers retire with adequate returns from their land. I could sell today to neighbours and would entertain an agreement for sale at market price, and 30 years from now predict my land would be worth more than it is today. With the ability to move grain and product to market at prices of grain that leave me a profit, I will expand. Start improving conditions for those of us already in the game before changing the rules.
669.	Very low caps and not investment corps.
670.	No! Farmers who farm the land should own the land!
671.	Say, the average farm size.
672.	Farmers want to own their land and not lease it from million/billion dollar companies. Competing with them is impossible. Small towns will die, rural Saskatchewan will be barren except for a few mega farms.
673.	Outside money too often pushes prices higher than local people can viably afford.
674.	If they are not involved in Agriculture in some way should not be able to purchase as an Investment.
675.	Maybe.
676.	Farm land should not be owned by pension funds - it doesn't matter how much - they would find a way to get around the rules and link together ownership of small plots into a conglomerate. Farmland should be owned by farmers who plan to farm the land.
677.	Perhaps if the cap was sufficiently low (although it would likely need to be so low that it would make for an unattractive investment).
678.	I am fearful of farm ownership becoming corporate which goes against traditional Saskatchewan values.
679.	The only group who is invested in agriculture is the one who is on the ground, doing the work and paying for the seed going into the ground. No one but the farmer understands how tight margins are on their farm and it is getting more difficult for farmers to make any money in the

	current conditions. Land prices are too high as a result of outside/foreign/corporate investment. Those groups are only in it to profit from their investment and will do whatever it takes to make that happen. It is creating a hostile environment for those trying to make a living in agriculture.
680.	same as above
681.	Still problematic. See above.
682.	Depends if it is disruptive to free enterprise that we endear.
683.	Same response as above.
684.	I'd support this but it would really depend on the cap whether or not purchasing farmland would be a viable investment from these entities. It could be quote easy to "allow" this but to make the cap low enough that it isn't worth the time to actually purchase land in the first place.
685.	i dont care about caps
686.	Again there is loss of productivity in hired operated farmland.
687.	Need to keep farmland ownership in Saskatchewan farmers hands
688.	same reasons I've already given.
689.	Minimize speculation
690.	Some how the government would allow em to buy more
691.	Why restrict the size, unless the cap were lets say 200,000 -300,000 acres
692.	It is a matter of principle for with pension plan or corporation, but presumably a small level of cap would make it less likely either of the entities would consider ownership, and if they did, it would keep the out-of-province ownership lower.
693.	They would have too much buying power over a farmer.
694.	This would make more sense to me, as a way of preventing too much acreage being owned by such entities versus SK resident owner-operators.
695.	Same argument of allowing an absentee land owner that does not have a direct connection to the land (and see the land only as a source of short-tern speculative investment)
696.	This allows for outside investment in Saskatchewan, while limiting the amounts
697.	Two questions here don't understand where you are going with this!!

14) Would you support the government of Saskatchewan (through the Farmland Security Board) taking a more active role in ensuring compliance...?

#	Response
1.	In my area there are several large tracts of land that have been purchased by foreigners and even though they have been reported, nothing has been done.

2.	If they can't follow the rules than they can't have the land.
3.	This is exactly why I'm hesitant about supporting "Canadian" corporations - complex (impossible to decipher) corporate structures!
4.	As noted, the FLSB has faced challenges here in the past. The Government taking a more active role, through the Board, would better ensure such activities are caught, and when they are caught, that immediate, effective action can be taken, without such purchasers dragging things out indefinitely in the courts.
5.	Yes, regulation are useless unless there is follow through by the government to ensure that the rules and regulations are fully complied with.
6.	I am very much against cheating.
7.	Those who do not comply would have to sell, or lease at cost. Harsh yes, but I am ardent in the fact we must protect our province. There must be proof in writing and with inspections of land and finances.
8.	Yes if it is already a known problem why would it be left to carry on? I see firsthand the effects of it as a young farmer with investor groups buying land around driving prices thru the roof. If this continues the future will be investor owned and a investor farmed Saskatchewan, the Saskatchewan farmer will be no more. There was a 10 year gap where every farmers children were leaving the farm on the first bus out, now they want to stay in our province why push them out?
9.	Rural Saskatchewan is important to the success of the province; the government needs to ensure that ownership rules are followed.
10.	It should be done whether someone is buying 80 acres or 8000 acres.
11.	The government should be able to enforce the provincial regulations at any moment.
12.	Why I think we sold off too much of Saskatchewan.
13.	Respecting the integrity of the restrictions is very important. When people take advantage of the system, they ruin it for everyone else.
14.	I also believe that should violations be discovered, there are immediate actions against the fraud including steep financial penalties and the loss of land title. Actions do not change without consequences.
15.	This needs to be heavily regulated.
16.	Role and function of such a Board needs to represent the interest of landowners as well as buyers.
17.	I have been approached by foreign buyers. I am in ag commodities and have been told they are buying land already.
18.	Keep it honest and transparent.
19.	I agree that it should be more active but it should be a private entity and not government influenced.

20.	A 'guilty until proven innocent' path should be taken in this issue: make the purchasers prove to the Sask. Farm Land Security Board that they are compliant, and until it can be proven to a reasonable standard, they cannot own the land. Of course spot audits should be undertaken and there should be serious enough penalties in case they were found to be lying about their compliance.
21.	No more back room pension deals. Be honest and transparent
22.	They need to.
23.	<p>Yes. Although Farming is already over regulated, despite the farmer being the one to take all the risks, too many outside interests think they know better, in this case the Government should be regulating ownership where outside interests may create future problems with Saskatchewan farming residents and communities.</p> <p>The problem is you've let them in, now how do you chase them out? Regulations should definitely state, that unless you are an actively farming resident of the Prov. Of Saskatchewan, (for e.g. 5 years) and ownership of land has been seceded through family or family corporations under a set acreage (e.g.: under 10,000 acres), or purchased outright not through a corporation, under a set acreage (e.g.: under 10,000 acres); Farming Corporations and/or farmland holdings through non-farming entities must file annual documentation showing financial statements, particularly those financials showing incoming and outgoing monies and shares and their initial origins and all benefactors and addresses. All transactions with foreign investment of any kind can be flagged, followed up, tracked and land maps made to show where ownership is being taken place and if an agenda is being pursued. This could also include hiring practices listing foreign or local employees etc. to watch for immigration concerns. This practice should also be done with Farm Factories who have land ownership of over 10,000 acres or whose land holdings is more than 35% of any single R.M.</p>
24.	Corporations as institutions need strong controls. They have far too much ability to dictate politics, environment, people, etc.
25.	Get rid of the board.
26.	These rules are for the benefit of all Saskatchewan residents. Ensuring compliance and closing loopholes to foreign ownership is critical.
27.	If you have a board of biased people with open minds!
28.	Born here you get to buy! Canadian citizen you can buy! Company investors if Canadian get last shot at buying land!
29.	Everyone needs to follow the rules and there should be no exceptions. This needs to be monitored better as they can find loopholes and this is unacceptable. I know that it is tough, but we really need to protect our farmland.
30.	I believe they have sufficient authority and resources to do the job already.
31.	By your statement above with complex corporate structures, lawyers, etc. once there in, they will soon be making or changing the rules to suit their best interests
32.	If you are not provided enough information, decline it. CPP got an ruling and now they are halted? Being more active in What?

33.	As long as the Saskatchewan Gov. Does their job. They like making stupid rules where they benefit and not the people.
34.	Isn't that what their mandate is now?
35.	If you don't allow corporate purchases, you don't need more investment in place. Keep it simple.
36.	Are we some kind of socialist state or a free market economy? If the government of Saskatchewan is truly free market oriented, it will allow the market to operate freely in all sectors of our economy.
37.	And reporting it in a very public and transparent nature to the Saskatchewan people. I think in many cases that there has not been the due diligence by the government to ensure that this is effectively monitored, managed, and where situations have occurred resulting in effectively "foreign ownership" that there has been no rectification of the situation.
38.	Of course the government should be investigating compliance. Making rules to look good on paper doesn't help if they aren't followed. Government is supposed to be there to govern, hence the name.
39.	Why are you trying so desperately to sell off our province to the rest of the world? I can honestly say i will never see another case of a bunch of complete and total in action. Money is not everything Mr. government, you are selling off our children and our pride!!!!!!
40.	There has to be someone who watches more closely what is going on.
41.	More strict guidelines need to be enforced.
42.	Yes they need better security. Why should people that don't even live on the land control it?
43.	Protect our future.
44.	The province needs to maintain control over its land.
45.	Same answer as above. Can't risk government interference if there is any possibility of a return of the NDP!
46.	I believe us as farmers need some help to ensure farmland stays with the farmers at an affordable rate.
47.	But no corporations. Farms will succeed as family run businesses. This will be the death of an industry that built our province.
48.	Why have rules or laws if they are not enforced.
49.	I sure there is already foreign money being filtered through some of these mega farms. There is no way a farmer farming 3,000-4,000 acres can go to 50,000 acres in a matter of 10 years or less without some mega funny money.
50.	Simple low cost legislation,
51.	In order to make sure the intent of the rules is being carried out it is necessary.
52.	I feel Saskatchewan's government needs to keep a close eye on land ownership
53.	We already have evidence of noncompliance. If I can see it there must be some high paid

	bureaucrat that can see the same thing!!!!
54.	We have good example locally. Farmers were trying to negotiate lease agreements with a fellow from Ireland. What gives?
55.	There are some dirty people out there who would pay others to get them to buy the land for them.
56.	I believe that this would be a necessity to ensure compliance regardless of whether the current regulations were relaxed or not - the type of compliance being ensured may just change.
57.	The present legislative process is not helpful for our province, our economy and society. It benefits potential future landholders over existing land owners. The effect it has in reducing price will not give enough of an advantage to make a real difference and will only give certain large enough enterprises an advantage while affecting the rest of the landowners in the a negative way.
58.	What purpose do rules and guidelines serve if they are not enforced?
59.	If the control is taken away from politicians and given to an independent board.
60.	We should take care of our land and our farmers. They support us.
61.	Yes, someone needs to enforce these measures in the interest of Saskatchewan people.
62.	It is the role of Government to provide these services and as I do not think these regulations are necessary I feel this will save the government a lot of cost by not needing to be regulators and increase tax revenue for the province.
63.	It should need to make sure those genuine investors are only trying to own the farmland.
64.	Just really not sure.
65.	Depends on their level of oversight and what the compliance guidelines are.
66.	I feel I do not understand enough to give a good response.
67.	I am 99% sure that some of these so called Canadian companies are not real. I know I am not smart enough to find their loopholes, but I hope someone else is
68.	It is important that if a Canadian individual or corporation is purchasing numerous parcels of farmland, that the Govt. of Sask. ensures that the funding for that purchase is not coming from outside countries, and is NOT being hidden by putting the title in the name of a Canadian individual or corporation.
69.	Catch the land grabbers.
70.	We must ensure that people are following the rules, not just the intent, but also the letter. Remember, in law, you cannot do indirectly what you cannot do directly.
71.	Government should not be interfering in that.
72.	The board though must be impartial and representative of agricultural stakeholders not just politically appointed party faithful representatives. Otherwise, it has a built in political bias and amounts to a government rubber stamp. It should be supported by the provincial ministries involved in agriculture and land ownership but not run by them.

73.	Definitely.
74.	Farmland ownership is extremely important. It is worth putting the necessary resources in place to make sure that enforcement is effective.
75.	My personal feeling is I feel the government interferes too much as it is .
76.	We do not need to change the current rules, neither weakening nor strengthening them, except to close any current loopholes allowing foreign ownership. Foreign ownership should not be allowed in any form, and it is simply a matter of supporting the enforcement of these rules (and not allowing politically motivated exceptions).
77.	<p>This government has a history of deregulation to the detriment of our province. We strip away inspectors and hope that companies will police themselves. What a joke! Why would a criminal turn himself in for punishment?</p> <p>Many foreign investors try every trick in the book to avoid rules and fees. Many of them LAUGH at how trusting we are and take advantage of every opportunity to advance themselves over others, even if it is illegal.</p> <p>WE NEED MORE REGULATION!! NOT LESS.</p>
78.	Usually bureaucracy screws most things up.
79.	Make everyone prove they are residents of Saskatchewan the government has the power to do so.
80.	This needs to be policed very closely as foreign investors will not have the best interest of the province in mind once they gain possession of land.
81.	Governments should always assign the resources needed to enforce their regulations. The cost of enforcement is something you should think about when creating or changing any regulation.
82.	Should be disbanded if it is going to keep trying to screw around with the rules and bogus survey questions like these.
83.	Farmers know the land is valuable. Other people are starting to see this too, and devise devious schemes to get the land for themselves.
84.	If we keep the same rules which I don't feel should be in place.
85.	If compliance is not verified then there is no point in having rules and regulations. Institutions will do whatever it takes to hide their activities and control of agriculture by this province will be lost.
86.	If the government would be diligent in ensuring compliance, I would say yes. But it's clear to me that won't happen. Perhaps if there were representatives from the government AND the opposition (all parties elected) and several other farming organizations like SARM and APAS all with equal input.
87.	I believe that once regulations are in place that they should be enforceable, with few "loopholes" that sophisticated investors can exploit.
88.	Not sure the Board would be trustworthy. Since Harper I do not trust any even pseudo government connected organization to behave ethically.

89.	Someone's got to shut the tap off before all the land is gone!
90.	Maybe it would help give people bigger fines in trespassing and destroying farmland. Considering your hardly allowed to protect your land besides paying for insurance and that's not protection at all.
91.	This is a big job and an important role.
92.	If government doesn't enforce it who will? It would be nice to live in a province that takes a long term view and makes their decisions for the best interest of the province not just today, but 50,100+ years from now. I feel this government has the potential to do this.
93.	Absolutely!
94.	Exactly as stated, they use complex corporate structures to get what they want. Regulations need to have stricter enforcement. There needs to be more transparency of ownership.
95.	Play by our rules or go back from where you came from, is my sentiment.
96.	The regulation's value is nullified if it isn't enforced.
97.	People will always look for loopholes. Just as the Pension Plan investment arm has done.
98.	Once again, why is farming any different than the other resource or business?
99.	Land is being bought up that individual farmers don't have an opportunity to compete for because we are judged by our financial institutions on the current situation in agriculture. We don't have deeper pockets so policing is required.
100.	The government tends to produce exceptions rather than roles of order.
101.	Foreign ownership is still foreign ownership regardless of how it is hidden. Again dollars leaving the province annually. Long term, food and water will become more valuable than oil. We already give enough resources away without any value added involved.
102.	The government should step in and make sure people are following the rules and regulate who actually owns and buys land
103.	ggggg
104.	The FLSB was a bad idea from the start.
105.	Should have open market.
106.	Of course buyers are creating more 'creative' structures. That's what happens in an interventionist economy...government makes a rule, private sector finds a way around and then government makes another rule and the private sector finds a way around it. Don't bother fighting it, just open up the market.
107.	Open it right up and then there is no need.
108.	Again are you really Canadian if your living in China 9 months and Canada June, July, and August. Or are you vacationing here every summer.
109.	All depends on the actual outcome, If you're going to grow some and do something sure, but if you're just going to foot it, I've got better things to do.

110.	We see an example of this right now. A landed Canadian owns land beside us, does not live here but maintains a residence so that he qualifies. This needs to be stopped.
111.	In the past five years a Chinese investment type co. bought a lot of land in this area, what is not so bad about it is they bought mostly poor land some had not been farmed for a few years, no one wanted to rent it, this land if sold locally brought very poor prices, investors paid good prices win-win!
112.	Whatever the law is, we need compliance to the law.
113.	As long as they have a clear perspective on what is taking place, a low level of board knowledge will put businesses at risk, I've seen this before, older delegates don't always see the picture clearly and can uphold progress.
114.	There is always someone out there that will try to circumvent the regulations so it is very important that compliance is maintained.
115.	I think it is important to understand who is buying land and their motivations.
116.	The government should not get involved.
117.	If we draft legislation it must be adhered to or there is no point in drafting it.
118.	No, I do not support anti-free market rules and enforcement. You will never get ahead of the structures that can be conceived. If the land values are depressed well below market, there will always be structures put in place to profit from the "spread".
119.	There should be more checks and balances on who owns our province.
120.	To prevent foreigner from buying land through shell companies.
121.	We need to ensure that the people buying it want to farm it.
122.	Could be fun ensuring compliance. For every new regulation there will be a 100 lawyers or financial shysters trying a work around.
123.	Yes and penalizing the people who try to abuse the system.
124.	Our farmland should be here for our kids and grandkids to own.
125.	Investors and realtors drive up prices without consideration of the big picture impacts to our province. It's short term greed with long term detriment to Saskatchewan. The next generation of farmers are being saddled with more debt. Is that a win for Saskatchewan?
126.	Am concerned about red tape, and possibly damaging to rightful heirs who may not always be in Saskatchewan.
127.	There is already so much land out of Saskatchewan farmer's hands; someone needs to do something before it is too late!
128.	Isn't that the role of the FLSB?
129.	Provided that this oversight is aimed at excluding foreign ownership of our land.
130.	What's the point of rules if you don't enforce them? Every loophole needs to be closed as soon

	as it's noticed.
131.	Strictly administer ownership to guarantee purchasers are compliant with all regulations. Any non-compliant purchasers should be stripped of all ownership and barred from future participation. Deal with a very firm hand! Keep the rules simple and straight forward to minimize challenges.
132.	Need to enforce the rules as they were intended, don't want corporations, foreign investors presenting themselves as something they are not. Is this why Reality doesn't want a change to the rules, because of complex arrangements as to the identity and country of origin of the owner and which could allow land prices to drop?
133.	There has been some suspicious buying.
134.	It's their job, so they should take it seriously and enforce the law as it is written.
135.	To the full extent of the law. It's rumoured that foreign investors are using Yukon/NWT registered companies to buy farm land and therefore own it while the person is not even Canadian.
136.	Compliance is used broadly here? I would support the Saskatchewan Gov't to support their local constituents who voted them in to look out for those people's best interests! If farming is their livelihood and they are law bidding citizens doing a good job of farming and land management which I turn is investing in this provinces future then I say let them do their job! Go fix what's not working like our health care system!!! More people die of disease contracted in the hospital itself from dirty floors and bacterial infested rubber gloves of our so called health practitioners than on our Saskatchewan highways! Now that's serious, as the Saskatchewan highways are completely and utterly dangerous and embarrassing!
137.	Open the market and there will be no compliance cost!
138.	Why do we need this regulating body? Waste of resources. Let the market handle the coordination.
139.	Yes. Loop holes need to be closed; people will always find ways around things.
140.	Canadian culture is important - who lives here makes up that culture.
141.	Farmland should not be treated any differently than any other asset class. As an example, why would government impede arms-length sale of farm assets by a retiring farmer but at the same time expect him to compete with all classes of buyers when he wants to buy his retirement home in the city?
142.	I think there is a lot of foreign ownership now because the rules as they stand are not being followed. More needs to be done to investigate and prosecute rule abusers.
143.	I am relying on the government of Saskatchewan to operate in and work on behalf of the best interests of the residents of the Province of Saskatchewan. Of course an active monitoring role is critical.
144.	The government needs to be more vigilant and less cozy with big business.
145.	The FLSB used to do that.
146.	Make sure the Saskatchewan way of is preserved for generations to come!

147.	I totally support this board to keep farmland transactions legal.
148.	severe penalties and fines for misrepresentation
149.	My example of _____ of Triple Drop Tine Farms at Maryfield. Do a search for him on the internet. You will find he is a very rich resident of the US. He purchased a farm at _____ Sask. He does not live in Canada. This land was purchased when several young farmers in the immediate area are trying to get established. The rules say he can own no more than 10 acres but he has purchased several quarter sections. Take a look at the land the _____ have purchased. The 10 acre rule is a rule without enforcement or teeth.
150.	It would have to be a board with knowledgeable members that are from Saskatchewan and have a farm back ground and have nothing to gain or lose so they can make an intelligent nonjudgmental decision.
151.	It would help make sure the rules are being followed.
152.	As long as they are ensuring only Saskatchewan residents are buying and owning the land.
153.	Taking a more active role in ensuring compliance on farmland transactions would improve the possible retention of local control of farming.
154.	Yes, the laws should be clear and concise and upheld at all costs. Only Saskatchewan farmers should own Saskatchewan farmland.
155.	YES, YES, YES!!! This is your job, and it needs to be done!
156.	Clever investors find back doors to white wash their exterior appearance, done for their own profit potential, not Saskatchewan's benefit.
157.	Always good to have watchdog.
158.	If regulations are in place they should be strictly enforced, with non-compliers being strictly punished to set a precedent for others to not try the same thing.
159.	Yes I think more proof and protocol to purchase land.
160.	If they go through such great lengths to buy up our land... They see future value in it!! It is imperative that loop holes be eliminated and legislation be put in place to have all farm land protected for the security of the AG industry.
161.	As long as it is transparent.
162.	If the board can't enforce it now we never will have the chance in the future.
163.	Fewer restrictions would be better for our economy.

164.	Get rid of the loopholes.....the changes were made with good intentions; there have been abuses through loopholes.
165.	Absolutely not, are we going back to the land bank days.
166.	Foreign ownership is an issue and I would want us to ensure this is upheld.
167.	No. There should be no restrictions whatsoever on ownership and then there will be no need for the Farm Land Security Board.
168.	Ruthless and sneaky people always try to get around the rules. Keep on them.
169.	If the Board is to remain in place, it should be supported in forcing compliance.
170.	We always need governing agents to have control as there are always entities trying to weasel around the rules.
171.	People always try to find loopholes. Have to be vigilant!
172.	More government interference.
173.	The government just have to change 2 things = offshore ownership and pension fund ownerships.
174.	Why not? I've also heard people say there are currently ways around "provincial ownership"....
175.	I believe non-compliant transactions should be revoked and made available for true Saskatchewan farmers to buy and care for.
176.	Once government gets involved with "enforcement" it becomes a bureaucratic nightmare.
177.	Yes, you do what it takes to toe the line and make it right.
178.	It would be nice if the letter of the law reflected the spirit of the law.
179.	I am aware of the foreign ownership moving through a front in Saskatchewan. In fact a friend has done this, I let him know I did not agree nor support his actions. Money is his simple interest and no regard for the future of Saskatchewan. He has acted this way his whole life.
180.	Government has no place in the market place.
181.	If we have laws to protect the land transactions then someone should also check for compliance.
182.	Yes someone is always trying to bend the rules we need to make the ownership laws more black and white with no gray areas.
183.	Yes, please do This is the body that enforces the policy. I've bought land recently and had to deal with the board and do not mind be checked out.
184.	If it just makes things harder and more expensive for farmers, no. Cause in the end all rules seem to cost the farmer more, not the investors, etc.
185.	There's no point in having rules / regulations if they are not enforced! It's also unfair to those who do play by the rules.
186.	Only way to stop farmland from being eventually owned by investors not the farmer working on his or her farm.

187.	test
188.	test
189.	The Farm Land Security Board must have the resources to enforce these restrictions.
190.	The future of farming in our province relies on tighter farmland ownership rules; the average age of farmers in Saskatchewan is rising at an alarming rate due to the difficulty for young farmers to enter into the business.
191.	The regulations wouldn't be required if there were no restrictions. Government can't claim to embrace free market ideas and then restrict ownership of land.
192.	Recent numerous purchases cannot satisfy me that their government/corporate industry is not involved. I have no problem with people from other countries who come here to actually farm but looking for high rents and a turnaround to sell it for a profit does not sit well for our local industry.
193.	If you want to simplify it, make it so that land is registered to social insurance numbers. Corporations and other legal structures can lease the land, but not have ownership interest. Probably can't make it retroactive, but if the CRA can deregister charities and corporations if you do not provide the SIN of directors and majority shareholders, it can be done.
194.	Strong investigative powers will discourage.
195.	If we do not track this it is possible for some corporations to amass an enormous amount of Saskatchewan farmland and go unnoticed.
196.	test
197.	I think the board has a role to play the same as it does now.
198.	Again referring to above comments, but as long as there are some small loopholes, lawyers will turn them into floodways. Legal battles will go on indefinitely in trying to enforce any kind of compliance or fines for offenders. That's not a good use of our tax dollars. I think we'd be better off simplifying the rules so that these loopholes won't exist.
199.	The Board has investigative powers to request information from purchasers. These could be used to garner more information from purchasers. Also, employing a corporate lawyer to review structures may assist in detecting non-compliance.
200.	The government needs to dictate the type of corporation that can own land and what the corporate structure must be. It should not be dictated by accountants and lawyers.
201.	Yes, how else can rules be followed unless someone is enforcing them.
202.	Corps will always look for loopholes. Regulation and enforcement is key to stop cheating.
203.	Government has to get control before it is too late.
204.	Unfortunately people are people today.... and somebody (the Saskatchewan Gov.) are going to have to "police" these measures.
205.	It's high time someone does something before we become an extinct breed!
206.	The law is the law. Whatever law we decide on has to be enforced.

207.	Just another board going to meetings and probably not doing much.
208.	If government is having trouble enforcing it that is a good indicator they should not be involved or need a better rule set.
209.	I think that the government needs to be more involved with this and needs to put rules in place before it is too late.
210.	The Saskatchewan government has to insure Saskatchewan farmers can survive, this generation, the next generation, the next generation.....
211.	Have rules implemented and follow those guidelines and it will work.
212.	As long as it doesn't cost more tax dollars!
213.	it sounds good but would it work or tied up in paper work or people working that have no idea what dirt actually is
214.	Compliance enforcement is very important.
215.	Yes, all transactions should be reviewed. The transaction should not be held up by the review process, but within a 5 year timeframe it should be reviewed and addressed if there are infractions. It would be way easier if only persons or partnerships could own property.
216.	If you don't go after them, they have nothing to lose. They are slowly choking out or multigenerational farms that have supports our local and provincial governments for decades. Anybody who can see foreign ownership as a good thing doesn't understand what drives our provincial, and Canada's, economy.
217.	It is the Government of Saskatchewan's duty to enforce provincial legislation?
218.	We need someone to ensure that loop holes aren't manipulated!
219.	we need someone to insure rules are followed
220.	If the will of the people of the province is that the FLSB should remain and that restrictions on ownership of farmland should continue to exist, then the FLSB should have the resources to policy ownership and take action against those that do not comply. To my knowledge, that has never been done and the FLSB is currently only an impediment to those who actually wish to comply with the rules. Outside investors have already found ways (such as indirect ownership through a Saskatchewan corporation) to own farmland in contravention of the Act. There are also many land banks operating in Saskatchewan right now that no one seems to be doing anything about.
221.	If they don't stand up for this - who will????????? It is my expectation that this is done.
222.	Only to increase ownership by Saskatchewan residents again.
223.	But it better be in the interest of Saskatchewan farmers.
224.	The simpler and clearer the act, the easier and less costly it is to enforce. A complicated act opens doors for loop holes.
225.	I work also in financial industry and CRM changes ensure we know exactly who are clients and

	beneficial owners are. This can be replicated
226.	If restrictions are put in place someone has to oversee the transactions.
227.	The rules must be upheld.
228.	of course how else would you enforce or check the investors out, this could be impossible as each investor would have to be checked out and they may not allow or end up in court costing more the it would be worth
229.	This becomes pretty difficult. Make simple rules. See previous comments.
230.	It has to be regulated and patrolled to ensure the rules in place are followed.
231.	ABSOLUTELY!! We know of situations where compliancy regulations are not being met because of complex and complicated relationships and business arrangements.
232.	Seems obvious. Trust needs to be built through open, honest, and respectful encounters.
233.	Should audit a % to ensure compliance or audit large sales.
234.	I do not trust the government in charge of land.
235.	It would help to make sure the rules in place would be followed. Only someone with something to hide would be against this.
236.	The rules need to be strictly enforced.
237.	Leave the land controlled be the farmers. They know the best for rural Sask. and sustainability of farmland.
238.	I am 26 years old, and trying to make living grain farming. I bought my first quarter off my grandfather; I am looking to buy another at the end of the year. The land prices in this province are so inflated it sickens me. My land is in RM 128, where the going price for a section (640 acres) of land is in excess of 1.2 million. I ask the Saskatchewan Party how am I to make a living with land payments at that price? The Saskatchewan Party is killing the small family operated farms one by one. When I approach the old couples in my area to inquire about purchasing land they all tell me the same thing why do you want to get into farm? There is no money to be made, and you can't pay top dollar like the potash companies nor the out of country buyers. why would you take ownership away from the ones working the land I feel you guys want to make us serfs. these companies or out of country owners don't care for the land nor do guys that lease the land, people who own and live on the land are the best for the stewardship of the land, they care for it, how can't you see this? The Saskatchewan Party needs to look to Europe and learn how there farming operations are where the little guys are supported and encouraged. These family operated farms in Saskatchewan that are 10000+ acres are not a family farm they are corporations. Also I am an electrician I work 21 days straight, this job alone is over six figures. I would give it up in a heartbeat to be on the land 24/7, but unfortunately I don't see this ever happening with land prices like this. I would love to hear back from a Saskatchewan Party representative,
239.	People are people and greed promotes searching for loop holes to make gains. We all need a bit of supervision from time to time.
240.	Not the land bank all over again.

241.	Why should the government tell me who I can buy or sell my assets to?
242.	If it us the rule or he law. Enforce it
243.	You should do everything you can to minimize outside investors in the Saskatchewan land market!
244.	But not reverting to the practices of the "land bank" days!!
245.	Because of the complex corporate structures.
246.	As long as trust worthy people were ensuring compliance.
247.	What good are rules if you can't enforce them?
248.	Why should they hide their structure or identity?
249.	I'm not sure that they are ineffective at the moment.
250.	You need to be there and you need to be able to investigate transactions thoroughly.
251.	Just go ask the locals who have been there for generations which farms/ farmers are not legit then investigate them.....why do I have an American down the road from me that purchased an entire farming operation but only stays up here for the summers (and hunting time).
252.	Regulations are worthless if they are not enforced.
253.	I already sit on RM council that's probably enough.
254.	Keep the table level for us.
255.	I would definitely approve of ensuring at all measures that corporations and investment funds and foreign buyers are kept away from farmland.
256.	Answered in survey.
257.	If they do not actively enforce the rules, then rules are meaningless.
258.	It is the government's role to make sure that the rules are followed.
259.	Make sure there is no more foreign ownership and owners such as maxcrop should be kicked out.
260.	I don't know enough about it
261.	This question is geared to make government interference more attractive. Governments needed to be more involved back when we had small and medium sized family farms and neighbours supported one another as well as their local communities. Instead, governments promoted the move to large farms run as corporations under the catch phrase siting "economies of scale" as the rationale and our small, vibrant communities all but disappeared. Why do these large farming operations require government intervention when none was made available to smaller farmers in the past?
262.	When it comes to foreign buyers or pension groups yes. No to controlling Canadian residents.
263.	Yes if they keep Saskatchewan land for the farmers of Saskatchewan.
264.	The role of the Government of Saskatchewan is to ensure that provincial resources are being managed in the best interests of the citizens of the province and as such they should have

	more ability to ensure that transactions are being made according to regulations.
265.	If they could really dig on each sale and find the root of everything to be sure that the land is at least Canadian owned.
266.	Yes and they could start by taking a more focused look at the MLA's that farm. Particularly the on in my riding. I have a feeling that he is one of the reasons I'm taking this survey.
267.	The determination of some entities to circumvent laws is a big headache for all Saskatchewan residents as it ultimately the taxpayer who pays the bill. There are probably a few happy lawyers. What do these entities gain by their actions? Is it possible to reduce/eliminate the gain? Do they get away with unpaid taxes (undeclared income)?
268.	Should have been done a long time ago. Severe penalties for people who have been found non-compliant. Severe. As they have not only avoided the red tape but ruined others livelihood in the process. I think corporate structures and agreements are more clever than the amount of due diligence the government will look into it, so it will stay status quo.
269.	Let's look at board structure. Like the idea of an elected board instead of appointed.
270.	If it is opened up we may not need a farmland security board as much, just for home quarter provisions etc. No other business go through as much scrutiny to be bought and sold..
271.	Protect the farms.
272.	Land bank. What a joke. In our area only NDP members got land or those that had pull.
273.	If the government would institute the previous Land Bank Program – Yes.
274.	I believe it is the case that foreign investors are already using these loopholes. I support increased power for the Saskatchewan Farm Land Security Board to prevent fraudulent purchasing of Saskatchewan farmland.
275.	I would like to know cost of compliance versus cost to non-compliance. Is it worth the hassle?
276.	If the government of Saskatchewan employees involved actively farmed themselves maybe.
277.	They have been failing at this currently.
278.	Don't trust this government at all.
279.	As long gone as they don't allow non-Saskatchewan at chewable people to buy land.
280.	The government has the power to check up on questionable deals and to rescind purchases not in compliance.
281.	We need vigilance to avoid legal loopholes by which we are pushed in a direction we do not want to go. The gov't needs to act to protect residents, not investors and foreigners.
282.	With all of the loopholes that these companies' legal departments manage to find, we need to have someone from the other end stepping in and saying no to some of these deals.
283.	That's the problem - corporate structures and agreements have become a jungle and so very competent, wise heads will need to be involved. Canada appears rife with underhand dealings and greed out of all proportion to what's good for us as a country or for individual investors.

	See what's been uncovered in the Senate and who knows where else. I don't support individuals needing billions when we still have homelessness and child poverty out of all proportion to what we should expect from a country as wealthy as ours.
284.	I am not aware of the role of the Board, it's scope or tools it employs to ensure compliance. Damn it- I just found a pasture of toxic plant that may kill my livestock- I cannot research everything in a timely manner.
285.	As long as they are not allowing foreign ownership of land.
286.	Free market! CWB?
287.	I add a "strongly agree" Yes reply about this.
288.	By maintaining the restrictions it will limit the ownership to provide more ability to effectively ensure that the compliance is maintained.
289.	YES, YES, YES! As a former banker, Anti-Money Laundering rules always required that we determine "the source of funds" involved in any transaction. I cannot believe that there could be so many nationals in Canada with Canadian permanent residency and who cannot speak a word of English yet suddenly set up a CCPC and invest millions in Saskatchewan farmland! The FLSB needs more horsepower so they can properly audit these transactions to ensure not only compliance in ownership, but also to determine the "source of funds" used in purchasing Saskatchewan farmland. Does the government have indirect ownership in tens-of-thousands of acres of Saskatchewan farmland by providing funds to these "permanent residents" to set up a CCPC and buy Saskatchewan farm land "within the rules?" I would think all levels of government would be quite unhappy about this if it was the case, but since the FLSB is understaffed and overwhelmed, how would we even know?
290.	Not sure what compliance means (in compliance with what?)
291.	Yes or even an independent watch group run by family farmers that have a vested interest in not selling off our province.
292.	Yes by all means there should be sound governance and policy to monitor and ensure compliance to any foreign investments or transaction of Saskatchewan farm land!
293.	Sadly, sometimes even 'honest' people need someone to keep them honest.
294.	SOMEONE HAS TO LOOK OUT FOR SASKATCHEWAN'S FUTURE
295.	Free your citizens by eliminating one more useless, meddlesome bunch of bureaucrats that only cause more drag on the economy. Kick them out on their butts and make them go work in the real world for a change. A dose of reality is character-building, and we could use the savings to pay down the provincial debt.
296.	Again I do not agree with too much control freak type of government.
297.	I feel they have been lack luster in the last 7 or 8 years.
298.	This is exactly why I replied no to the foreign investment questions. There are always ways to

	"look" like you are complying with the rules. Preservation of Saskatchewan farming should be a very big concern for all Saskatchewan (and Canadian) residents.
299.	There is no point to this question, since you have already made exceptions for the Assiniboine land Co, which has ripped off the Citizens of Canada through the CPPIB, which states that the land purchased will take 100 years to provide returns to the fund. You let it happen!
300.	Yes, yes, yes!
301.	Self-explanatory...The Saskatchewan Farm Land Security Board has faced challenges in the past ensuring that purchasers are compliant with the regulations. Complex corporate structures and agreements can make it possible for purchasers to present themselves as being compliant when they may not be.
302.	That should be the role already!
303.	the government should be able to close loopholes so this doesn't happen and ensure full disclosure of all investors
304.	If any foreign investors try to pursuit for short term trading gain through derivative structuring with bad intention, FLSB can take more active action against these kinds of foreign investors.
305.	Again, what will the powers of the Government of Saskatchewan be in light of TTIP, CETA and other such "Free Trade" deals? Do these agreements negate the whole discussion?
306.	Yes Had they done this in the first place then some of these issues may not have arisen. Had they made the exemption process a little less daunting and allowed some non-resident ownership, then they would still be in control. Yet they failed to do that and lost opportunities for finding investors who wanted to invest in Saskatchewan farmers as well as Saskatchewan Farmland. And I believe we need to find people to Invest in Saskatchewan farmers as well as the land. Maybe that is a role for likes of CPPIB and our own tax dollars,
307.	If there are rules in place, they need to be enforced. The rules need to be for all, not just the few.
308.	These rules need to be enforced and currently they are not. Therefore its Saskatchewan young farmers and farm families looking to expand that lose out.
309.	Depends on how much power they have and where their true interests lie.
310.	of course a regulatory body needs to be active to ensure compliance with the regulations.
311.	There is no point in having the rules and laws in place if the transactions are not reviewed and properly enforced.
312.	I cannot believe that these requirements are not being completely followed now?!?!
313.	FLSB should have more investigative capacity to determine veracity of some investors, particularly foreign interests and foreign/local joint ventures. What due diligence did FLSB exercise in granting a Chinese potash speculator approval for 60,000 acres of farmland?

314.	Despite existing regulations and laws corporations and foreign investors have found an exploit loop holes in the system. Extensive review and alteration are minimalistic ally required to correct present laws and regulations.
315.	Very funny the government cannot enforce its regulations. Are you guys listening to yourselves?? You need the intestinal fortitude to do it and unfortunately this government does not have it because it might affect its friend.
316.	If it is spelled out black and white ahead of time I would support it -this is often not the case though.
317.	Not sure how significant an issue this really is.
318.	If the law on this was written that if they do not comply and have tried to hide their non-compliance, then the land would be vested back to the province who could then re-sell it. This would be a big stick to make sure that purchasers were compliant. Make it really strict and actually do it, and I think this would work.
319.	Yes anyone can own land no they can't, then there is no over sight required
320.	Keep Canadians in control, we are tired of all the foreign politics that some way always corrupt our legal system!
321.	They should have been doing so all along as that is why we pay them.
322.	For sure they should be more active. That is the government's role to protect its assets and residents and make sure that laws are upheld. The statement above is exactly why we need very restrictive laws on the ownership, because otherwise large corporate structures or funds will find loop holes and spend endless funds to gain access and make it very complicated and expensive for local residents for regulators (Government of Saskatchewan) to try and enforce.
323.	It's either a hard line or no line.
324.	Providing the government of the day was interested in Saskatchewan as a whole and not the interests of foreign investments that may or may not change Saskatchewan for the better, both economically as well as socially.
325.	You mean they have not been doing so?!?!? Are you stupid?!?!? So what you're saying is the Government of Saskatchewan has no idea for certain as to how many purchases were not compliant. So we cannot trust the government at all when it comes to policing and regulating ownership of Saskatchewan farmland. I find it appalling the Saskatchewan government doesn't even know who owns its farmland.
326.	Somebody needs to police this. Government doesn't always make the best decisions but it's all we have.
327.	Yes someone has to step in and help us protect our Province!
328.	I would insist that full vetting of purchases be implemented, and white/ black lists for finance institutions be maintained.
329.	Keep the rules simple. Err on the restrictive side.
330.	A lawyer boasted to me about working around current rules...not sure how to ensure compliance when it is blatantly ignored.

331.	A more active role for any board has inherit risk unless their mandates are strongly spelled out as anybody that has regulation enforcement powers tend to lend personal bias and emotion to decisions.
332.	If there is a good bid from a farmer close by, no other investors should have a chance to invest
333.	Individuals cannot determine ownership of entities or are limited in their knowledge in this field so assistance through a transparent board of enquiry would be beneficial to monitor ownership
334.	Please let the board do their job on compliance and not allow the lawyers to fuzzy up the intent of proper land ownership transactions.
335.	As with any law it's only good if there is enforcement.
336.	Otherwise for example the Chinese will own our land.
337.	We know that large corporations competing for profit cannot be trusted to police themselves or each other. They will make rules and interpret them to their own advantage only.
338.	My legal loopholes will be found and creative ownership structures to create the facade of being compliant when they actually aren't.
339.	Somebody needs to regulate this
340.	Let's get back to the basic principles of why we farm. It's not about an asset or equity as the foreign people think.
341.	it only makes sense for this to be closely watched.
342.	The role and responsibility of government is to provide infrastructure, and maintain it. Farmland, is strategic infrastructure, culture, taxation, etc.
343.	It's up to our government to set the rules to insure our rural communities thrive.
344.	The statement above is undeniably true. And yes, compliance is crucial. Sadly, even compliance cannot ensure that technical ways and loopholes cannot always be found.
345.	I don't want to see more layers of government, but compliance needs to be enforced. If that involves more financial support, that could well be money well spent.
346.	That depends on what the FLSB rules are. There is no difference between a foreign owner from China or a non-resident out of Saskatchewan (e.g. BC or ONT).
347.	It is common sense.
348.	Do the right thing. And give it teeth.
349.	But only if they follow up on the transactions. I mention previously in this survey of a personal situation when I sold my farm and how an individual entered into Canada in my opinion fraudulently and when I reported this to Farmland Security Board they did not follow up or think it was a big deal.
350.	Except I am not sure government values the land in the same way farmers do. What happened to the tree distribution to farms for shelterbelts? Pasture lands? Protection of ground water when intensive livestock are raised in huge numbers or rural companies that use vast amounts

	of water and don't protect us from pollution? Fortune Minerals, etc.
351.	We need to show power and control and make this clear; we want farmers or Saskatchewan residents to help our province become economically profitable for the future.
352.	If these rules are not policed well, why would anyone want to comply with them!
353.	Yes definitely these things need to be investigated and enforced so that these companies aren't finding loopholes in which to purchase land.
354.	Absolutely! A legitimate company should have nothing to hide. Saskatchewan farmland is as precious and whoever has the privilege of owning land should be put through a better screening process.
355.	FSB certainly does not need to grow its empire, it should shrink as technology in all other areas improves efficiency. Define the challenges is it that they are restricted externally or at a process and individual theology level?
356.	Any rule is only as good as its enforcement. The Province needs to devote a reasonable amount of resources to this area to ensure a good rate of compliance. Requiring clear proof at the time of sale is one way to help with that.
357.	This is absolutely necessary. FLSB must have the tools it needs to ensure compliance!
358.	Increasing resources to such a low-priority and outdated compliance measure is irresponsible.
359.	Whatever the legal regime may be, the FLSB should be active in enforcing it to ensure that everyone's operating on an equal playing field under the law.
360.	I don't just support it, I expect it. It should be happening now. If we have rules in place, but no will (or people) to enforce them - what's the point of the rules.
361.	That us what they are there for!
362.	I support the controls I just don't support the current policy and think we need to create an agriculture based approach to farm land value and use as opposed to a market driven financial capital control approach.
363.	You actually have someone follow the rules what a novel idea, should have that about that before the CPP purchase.
364.	If laws aren't enforced they are meaningless.
365.	Everyone should be accountable and held to the same regulations whether they are Canadian, foreigners, corporations, or individuals.
366.	Someone needs to control what's happening with land purchases/ ownership.
367.	Yes, but you must start with reasonable regulations at the outset.
368.	There needs to be regulations in place to ensure that farmland remains accessible and in the hands of Saskatchewan people. As "old school" as it sounds - it's not always about the "almighty dollar", it's about making sure this way of life is accessible for future generations.
369.	Farming should be left to the farmers who are experts in the nurturing of the land. Any outside interference will only hurt local people be contra productive in the long term.

370.	But don't screw it up.
371.	Not necessarily looking for governments to dictate every incident. Govern means to govern the country not dictate or own.
372.	The long-term viability of agriculture in Saskatchewan is of paramount importance. The agricultural activities in the province should benefit the residents of the province and we should support the Farm Land Security Board's mission to ensure that our laws are being followed. Harsh penalties, including steep fines and appropriation, should be in place for those people or entities that attempt to circumvent the law.
373.	It is pointless to have rules if they aren't being followed.
374.	If there was someone to regulate and check up on people purchasing the rules would be followed
375.	As long as the Board is representative of the agricultural producer (e.g., geographic, gender, small producer, etc.)
376.	Should be free enterprise.
377.	Need to know what a more active role means.
378.	I would support this if there was a feasible way to do it without adding too much additional work or money needed. Shouldn't be wasteful use of resources, there needs to be a good strategy in place for enforcing compliance with regulations.
379.	Seems like an issue that needs to be policed in some fashion. Business structures will only become more complex to appear complaint.
380.	Regulations without enforcement are ineffective.
381.	Someone must look after the long term benefits for the generations yet to come, only Government can and has the power to do that.
382.	The regulatory body must be the Province
383.	Where is enforcement?
384.	Regulations are of no use if they are not enforced.
385.	I am sure that a lot of these off-shore land deals are actually funded from abroad. To fix this simply limit the amount of land that can be owned.
386.	There is land that already has foreign money supporting it, just ask a crooked real estate broker.
387.	Must also have the authority to act on non-compliance and be able to investigate as a result of information provided by concerned citizens.
388.	Stand up and do you job as a facility to provide rules that level the playing field. You can seek laws and control how land is sold. You can investigate if the purchaser is legit.
389.	Land should be first offered to local farmers at a fair price.
390.	The signature and witnessing of such affidavits should also be backed up with stiff fines and the powers, by the Agricultural Ministry, to seize and maintain farmlands until auction of those

	lands to properly accredited Farmers only.
391.	Do not make anything more restrictive than it needs to be.
392.	Everyone should have to play by the same rules.
393.	Land is a strategic asset and I would think the province should be as mindful of this asset as it is with potash, uranium or oil.
394.	Someone has to enforce the rules.
395.	Someone has to oversee that regulations are honoured
396.	No more investors or foreign farmers let the kill them.
397.	Let's govern the province and not the market for farmland.
398.	The government should have the means to support its own policy and in special circumstances provide information to the courts to decide required action.
399.	Why did you change the farmers' regulations?? The banks are encouraging these transactions, it is a money racket.
400.	I agree the rules are being exploited and much foreign ownership has already occurred.
401.	I support the government in taking a more active role in ensuring that corporations are in fact compliant with the current rules.
402.	Never trust government to look after a farmer. Industry will always trump it.
403.	Make the rules simple. Government can never figure out why people don't follow their rules. They are too complex for nothing. The law should be simple; No non-Canadian residents can own any Canadian farmland. Any caught breaking this rule will receive swift and severe punishment. It doesn't need to be an encyclopedia.....
404.	they have to make sure that all transactions follow the rules and no foreign money is used
405.	The governances of the Act need to be enforced.
406.	Thought they were already overly active.
407.	It will make the future better for producers and consumers when the Government takes this on. My tax money should be used for this.
408.	I am of the opinion that the government of Saskatchewan has artificially lowered the value of extremely valuable farm lands in Saskatchewan, and that if the 'Farm Land Security Board' started taking individuals and corporations and pension plans to task, they would find the people of farming descent in the province would likely have something to say about the legality and constitutionality of the act itself... This would not end well for the Province or the Government. I would propose an outcome far worse than the "Spudco" legal fiasco.
409.	Please make them follow the laws. We see them being broken all the time. Small elderly farmers are being conned out of their land and then being sold to the . Some Mennonite farmers in an area close by are apparently abusing the law. This has to stop.

410.	There is no point having regulations in force without effective compliance mechanisms.
411.	Just like every other industry their needs to be a watchdog.
412.	I think this is vital.
413.	Live in Saskatchewan as your primary residence for more than 2 year or can't buy land.
414.	The rules need to be more black and white so the rules aren't so easy to bend.
415.	That may increase cost and complexity of all transactions negatively affecting the 99 percent of compliant ones.
416.	Yes. I have been out bid for farmland by foreign investors who are bending the rules to buy Saskatchewan farmland.
417.	I have firsthand experience of an family approved by the board to buy land for them to farm. They didn't farm at all rented for 2 years and sold it. So they made a profit. Where was the profit spent? It wasn't here in Saskatchewan.
418.	I do believe people have been taking advantage of regulations but if the regulations are practical then maybe there won't have to be Security watch Dog
419.	Legal and corporate structures are constantly evolving and becoming more complex. Compliance and regulation will be more difficult due to the sophisticated nature of these structures.
420.	Trust is always an issue.
421.	Canadian citizenship alone does not necessarily guarantee that there is no foreign investment
422.	An investment company can create whatever image it wants. Proper oversight is important. It limits fraud and corruption when handled correctly. No crony capitalism.
423.	I know of 36? Quarters that owned by an investor from . He is in his 70s or early 80s. Why is he allowed to own land in Saskatchewan??? He is the money behind a Canadian made corporation and all they need is a representative in Canada to manage it. The land is rented out so he can make a % of the investment. My son would like to farm some of this land that is beside us but can't afford the rent or the purchase price if it came for sale. This investor should never have been allowed in and the issue should be dealt with.
424.	To ensure our resource is kept in Saskatchewan hands, there must be proper oversight of all sales that are deemed suspicious.
425.	It's not your land to be telling people what they can and can't do with it. Piss off.
426.	My elected government is my only hope in protecting the citizens of the province. So, I depend on them to protect our lives here.
427.	Accountability is number one.
428.	We need some teeth in the enforcement side of things as well. Real penalties for false declarations.
429.	Not only is there great complexity in dealing with compliance in farmland transactions in regards to corporations, there is even great complexity in dealing with local farmer to local

	farmer transactions as much of it is still done by word of mouth and behind closed doors.
430.	Because the problem with investors or foreign ownership is the ability to find loopholes to get around and to challenge in court.
431.	It is your obligation to do so
432.	Saskatchewan residents should be favoured since they have paid provincial taxes.
433.	Someone needs to because I am sure there are far more case right now that are not complying than are. Saskatchewan has kind of been pushed over because of our lack of enforcement
434.	as long as government of Saskatchewan does so with another regulatory board, like the Farm land Security Board) and with complete transparency of what they are doing. The current government tends to do things in their own best interests, not that of the people of the province, so as long as all was done with no "hidden agenda" and the government was also monitored, it would be better.
435.	I'd support this only if the rules stand as is.
436.	Mind your own business, stay out of the way of my business operations. You will stifle investment and limit my ability to maximize my returns. Perhaps you should regulate the farm machinery suppliers and grain companies who extract the maximum margins from farmers. The current government supports grain transportation and marketing deregulation but you want to control who I sell my land too, hypocritical to say the least. Try to be consistent and quit picking winners and losers, you always get it wrong.
437.	That is only IF, AND A BIG IF, the Board would do so. In many cases, rules and regulations are put in place and compliance is not followed up in a proper manner at all!
438.	As above regarding sales to buyers.
439.	If you're not going to do the job completely then what's the point of doing it at all. It's not just about who's buying land now, it's if that land falls into the wrong hands, your grandchildren may not have a chance to ever buy that land
440.	Then the Government of Saskatchewan should bring in rent control on rents in the cities.
441.	Why have regulations if you don't enforce them?
442.	The laws are put in place for a reason lets obey the law by supporting their intent. Is that not democracy?
443.	Same as the answer above.
444.	Yes this due diligence should be done in an aggressive manner prior to land sale approvals. If the Land Security Board does not uphold its own laws then they are not worth the paper they are written on.
445.	Need to make sure other countries are not getting other people from over here to invest for them.
446.	Land ownership should be transparent. You either are or you are not Canadian. If you need a bunch of lawyers to explain your corporation then it should be a definite no.
447.	Rules need to be enforced or they will be ignored.

448.	It needs to be monitored as the large corporations and wealthy know how to beat the rules.
449.	Any foreign activities on our land must be compliant to very strict rules and regulations. We as land owners in the area of potential or current foreign activities (mining, refining, intensive livestock operations etc.) must have a say on the impact of said activities.
450.	Our Farm Land security Board has to assure Saskatchewan farm land stays Canadian Owned.
451.	Effective enforcement is critical.
452.	No. Too restrictive. Current laws for ownership are way too restrictive. As long a foreign ownership is legit it should be allowed.
453.	Keep the land in farmers' and ranchers' hands.
454.	I Support an open market but I agree to limitations on the farmland market. Where I live farmland is extremely expensive but the demand is high. We have regulations too, that support farmers over non farmers.
455.	Stop these companies from breaking the rules. We have an example of that in our area and it makes me sick thinking that because of how they have broken the rules but have not been charged. The financial backing they have, makes the price out of reach for local people to purchase land.
456.	That is their job, DO IT!
457.	The Government is the voice of the people so should be involved.
458.	Absolutely, the Government must dig as deep as it must dig to ensure compliance with farm land ownership rules. Any entity caught cheating should be banned from future purchases PERIOD!
459.	There needs to be teeth to enforce regulations...we don't need a situation as exists with PCS where there is still just a "pretend" office in Saskatoon.
460.	Even if this creates more work for farmers when purchasing farmland, I would support the Security Board taking a more active role.
461.	I am sure foreign entities (mostly China) have been buying farm land through individuals living here. This practice must be stopped and purchases that have already been made should be made to sell back to Saskatchewan residents.
462.	The Gov. of Saskatchewan should be given the powers to investigate and do a thorough job of ensuring compliance.
463.	Ban foreign ownership and investment. Any land bought should have to be farmed by the purchaser. Land should be bought to farm for a profit. It should not be purchased solely as an investment. People who want an investment can go on the stock market.
464.	This is their job.
465.	If it's done in a manner that would allow farmers land owner.
466.	One way to do this would be to make all corporations ineligible to buy farmland. In my opinion the ability for farms to incorporate in order to pay less tax is when things started to get screwed up. Legitimate farmers were already getting breaks when it comes to fuel tax, vehicle

	<p>registration and capital gains. If any current farming corporations, with farm income as their primary income source want to remain as corporations in order to retain their low income taxes, they should be allowed to buy land, but they should also have to run their companies like a non-farming corporation, which means corporate plates, no fuel tax discounts and no capital gains exemption. And only current farming corporations would be afforded this opportunity to still buy farmland. All other land sales would have to be to farmers or new farmers intending to farm their land themselves.</p>
467.	There should not be loopholes. The Saskatchewan government should be able to police this.
468.	I am sure the provincial government is already aware of foreign ownership under the guise of `local `ownership. Stop the insanity NOW.
469.	Not sure I understand the question.
470.	1st the rules for ownership need to be tightened up to Saskatchewan residents only. We ourselves have seen many land transactions where the principles of transferring lease land have been denied. An example of this is subdividing a wee plot of 10 acres of deeded land to sell with sections of government lease land. Such a farce. The intent of the law is being crossed.
471.	Already too many transactions happen that cross the intent of the current laws. Subdividing wee parcels of 20 acres of deeded land to sell with Saskatchewan Lease Land. Bogus! Government employees looking the other way. Lease land is illegal to sell. Yet it is being sold just like deeded land. There is already no enforcement!
472.	No comment.
473.	Yes, whatever the rules are, someone should be keeping the answers in check.
474.	Yes, the government with a board made up of local farmers.
475.	This is part of the reason why I don't support foreign purchases or purchases by large corporations with many backers. How can anyone possibly know exactly who they are in bed with? It's very complex and very difficult.
476.	The Saskatchewan Government as headed by _____ and the Saskatchewan Party have proven in the past that they have the provinces best interests at heart. I believe that they would use any additional power given to them to ensure the compliance of individuals in the sale and purchase of farmland in the best possible manner.
477.	Let's keep Saskatchewan land in the hands of Saskatchewan residents. If others want to own land, become a Canadian citizen and take up a real residency HERE, in Saskatchewan!
478.	To protect from large operations driving up prices then going into receivership and hurting the local product suppliers. From foreign ownership doing the same thing and stripping the land of value and to protect all Saskatchewan residents.
479.	See previous responses.
480.	Absolutely! It is extremely loosey goosey the way it is. A proper set of rules and regulations must be put in place with the power of the governing body to act accordingly. I'm not for a lot of rules and regulations, but some are obviously necessary. It must be well thought out and very comprehensive. I strongly believe that the SPIRIT of the law must be paramount and allowed to have precedence and not be allowed to be exploited by technicalities and the

	LETTER of the law.
481.	I don't trust unelected lawyers to do the right thing for the people of Saskatchewan. Only government can do that.
482.	I don't enjoy seeing everything regulated, however on this topic, I believe the government plays a huge role in insuring people aren't finding loop holes
483.	Who else will do it?? And have the authority/control to do so?
484.	Simply looking at the ISC report on businesses will display the addresses of directors. Its not hard to do, but no one does it. The government should take a more active role in ensuring transactions meet the Act.
485.	This is very important that they do and strong penalties should be put in place to detour this from happening.
486.	Lots of cash transactions being done by permanent residents, et cetera, need to be thoroughly vetted before approval. Source of cash should be verified and traced for much longer than 90 days.
487.	Laws are in place to protect the people involved and need to be enforced
488.	Everyone is trying to find workarounds. Your team needs to up its game big time and shut all such attempts down.
489.	People use all kinds of ploys to get around issues in all aspects of business; this should not be any different.
490.	I've seen workarounds and toothless legislation throughout my legal career.
491.	No point in making rules if you can't enforce them.
492.	it needs to be monitored.
493.	This would be greatly beneficial to farmers.
494.	Regulate the land for farmers if you want the best return. Besides the complex structure of a farmer is to create a return to feed his family. It won't be that difficult to manage.
495.	They have not been in the past and it needs to change.
496.	If you put the land back in farmers hands it won't be a problem.
497.	The government of Saskatchewan should monitor all sales of Saskatchewan lands in assurance that the regulations are obeyed.
498.	Non-farmers should not be able to own farmland.
499.	They are greedy and have since gotten all the PFRA lands for free and now want to sell them for a profit when they should go back to the municipalities who gave it to the Federal gov't in the first place. You can't trust the Government of Saskatchewan with land. All they want is the money.
500.	Compliance is important for any government structure.
501.	I'm not experienced enough to know what an impact this would have.

502.	There is no point to have regulations without enforcement...
503.	The Farm Land Security board should ensure purchasers comply. Placing further limits on ownership & caps on acres owned may help prevent future challenges.
504.	They should look closely who the people or company is, and where they are from.
505.	EVERY TIME YOU MAKE A RULE SOMEONE LOOKS FOR A WAY TO GET AROUND IT. GIVING GOVERNMENT MORE CLOUT WOULDN'T HURT OUR "RIGHTS".
506.	I hope you expand your powers; there are already many numbered companies in the province.
507.	Simply needs to be done. Too easy to hide who owns the land.
508.	Protect your soil at all costs, that's why we have borders. Wars were started for land accumulation why on earth would you sell it to a potential enemy.
509.	I believe that there are many hiding behind these corporate style structures.
510.	Another example of government telling me what to do.
511.	There is no evidence that the Board has been of any particular benefit to any class of land owner (and if that is an incorrect statement the evidence to refute it should be produced and published as an aid to the current consultation process).
512.	Governments should be in the business of providing services (health care, roads, policing, etc.) not in the business of dictating who someone has to sell their property to. They don't do it with apartments so what is the difference in farmland?
513.	The government must enforce its laws.
514.	I believe they are doing a fine job.
515.	Too many ways of finding loopholes and getting around regulations.
516.	The amount of effort to ensure compliance must match the effort that is being made to obscure the organizations compliance.
517.	We are already over-regulated in all aspects of the economy. You would be setting up another governmental bureaucracy (people getting paid good salaries and benefits, doing and accomplishing nothing) that would have to be funded by tax payers.
518.	Yes the Government of Saskatchewan should more publically state its support for the law as it stands.
519.	Definitely.
520.	Somebody has to monitor this , but in a timely way .years after the fact does no good .
521.	The Farm Land Security Board should monitor compliance on farmland transactions without favoritism or exceptions. Exceptions already made to purchase land in Saskatchewan should be revoked.
522.	I lost land to a BC livestock investor how rents government lease land. By using several small corps to acquire the lease. Now the land was sold to this farm which is many times larger than my farm.

523.	See previous responses.
524.	Yes, but need transparency and accountability. Too much lip service these days.
525.	Absolutely. The government must enforce the rules so people follow the rules. They must prosecute violators. We do not want foreign countries like China owning our farm land.
526.	Enforcement is key, or productive value of the land will quickly be eclipsed by appreciated asset value of the land.
527.	The government needs to implement and put a stop to this. For many the rules were very tight in order to allow Saskatchewan family farms have a succession plan, now there is nothing. Once the dollar is spent it is gone. There is no annuity for the farm or the successors.
528.	We need it!
529.	Yes, please take a more active role and deter this sort of action in the future.
530.	In so agreeing, I am placing faith in a system in which I have little, but it is the only choice of body for regulation available. I prefer that the Government of Saskatchewan repeal the current Act and follow the 1974 incarnation, and then follow that act. I do NOT support the Gov't of Sask. initiating legislation which allows any land purchases that takes land out of the hands of farmers, either for the purposes of foreign or Canadian (so far, pension) investment. Rather, farm land needs to be farmed by farmers for farmers, not as a pawn for investors to make money.
531.	The whole Maxcrop structure is very suspicious. The Farm Land Security Board should have stepped in immediately and stopped what was happening.
532.	If the transactions are not transparent they should not be allowed
533.	It would have to be front heavy structures; otherwise the cost of compliance testing would escalate to be too much.
534.	There needs to be accountability.
535.	Yes I do support the role of the farmland security board having a more active role. Give them the authority to dig deeper into these corporate structures.
536.	You are fools, you silly, stupid . The own much land in the southwest because of the situation you describe. Wake the up.
537.	There are operations already running under these circumstances. They offer and pay extremely high land purchase and rental prices driving up expectations of other land owners in the area. I'm a firm believer in Canadians producing crops, products etc. and selling them to other countries.
538.	Unsure of how much control they already have.
539.	Cheaters need to be severely and publicly punished.
540.	I believe this is what the FLSB is mandated to do, so get at it. Close the loopholes that have been recently exposed, and go back and reassess the transactions that were allowed to proceed.
541.	Just do the job properly.

542.	I have grave misgivings about any board scrutinizing the sale of private land. Is our land a private asset, or not?
543.	if there is a loop hole to get through it should be closed
544.	Money managers will always look for loopholes to exploit and the public must watch very closely.
545.	The security board is doing their job. They don't need any new powers
546.	The government should be taking more active role and stop brining these foreign people into the country and taking our farmland away from us. They do not belong here or have ever been raised here.
547.	Immediate legislation on destructive drainage practices and soil sterilizing spray practices are desperately needed.
548.	As I've already mentioned it appears that there are already abuses taking place. The tools to enforce and investigate compliance are essential.
549.	Do what you have to do.
550.	Absolutely, they have a responsibility to the people of Saskatchewan to be sure that all transactions comply with the laws in place.
551.	Lawyers are paid to find loopholes and thwart the intent of sound legislation.
552.	Dissecting complex corporate structures requires a lot of intelligence and manpower. The farmland security board needs as many resources to dissect the corporate structures, as the corporations need to create the corporate structures.
553.	That is why the rules are on the books, if you don't enforce them, then what is the use of having them? Put in a shot gun clause that if they in any way make a false disclosure take the land away from them or hold it in escrow till it is settled. Get tough.
554.	I believe any structure and regulation regarding land purchase ought to be clear and transparent, so that entities must comply. It is the government's duty to ensure compliance.
555.	Sounds to me like more of the NDP days and government and Wheat Pool knows best
556.	Is there a future plan?
557.	If not monitored we will have a result that will negatively affect Canada as well as Saskatchewan.
558.	The government should also tighten the rules so that ensuring compliance is less complicated.
559.	There needs to be more strict regulations.
560.	Companies have their lawyers looking for loop holes no matter what your rules are. If you open the province up, that never stops. The down side is endless.
561.	There needs to be more work done in this area. There is no way some of these investors that have purchased in our area are in compliance.
562.	Ducks Unlimited should be near the top of the list.

563.	The regulations must be actively enforced by the FLSB. Through enforcement the FLSB will be familiar with the latest scheme in use by foreign owners to control Saskatchewan farmland. The schemes will change but the FLSB will be better able to thwart those breaking the law.
564.	There is no sense having any rules if you do not vigorously enforce them. I believe the current situation is already out of control if the mailing addresses at crop insurance in Melville are accurate.
565.	Someone needs to protect the family farm and who owns Saskatchewan farm land.
566.	All farmland purchases should be scrutinized where ownership is concerned. Since farmland ownership transactions are currently tracked for sale value and various other components, there would be little work to determine the ownership structure. It is extremely evident that many of the current supposed "Canadian-controlled corporations" that have purchased land are not held by Canadian citizens and investors and this is very problematic. In our area, many of the "Canadian" owners of farmland spend the grand majority of their time in China and most have not taken the opportunity to learn the English language. This makes one believe these people are not very Canadian and are not very dedicated to the agricultural way of life.
567.	Somebody has to be vigilant before we are stolen blind.
568.	Do what you have to do to make sure they comply.
569.	We need to protect this valuable resource and allow it to contribute to the economy as significantly as possible. If the government does not protect it who will?
570.	There's already too much land owned by foreigners and corporations, homesteads tore down to make a couple hundred dollars more a year. Decades of tree rows torn out and wild life habitat destroyed so they can get an extra acre. There not about sustainable farming, there about profits.
571.	If we have laws they must be aggressively enforced.
572.	We have a local corporate farm that is taking every piece of land they can buy for any price. They are using foreign and investor money. They must be stopped.
573.	Land ownership should be transparent so any foreign or illegally gained money does not affect our values.
574.	Get at it, it is long overdue.
575.	The Board needs the tools to protect our industry. Walk softly and carry a big stick. They need a much bigger stick.
576.	If you want to own Saskatchewan farm land be a Canadian and finance it through Canadian institutions, just as I have too. A level as possible playing field would be nice.
577.	The Farm Land Security Board needs to be diligent, and continually review their status, and values. Corporate entities have legal authorities who can out-wit Directors of most Boards. Be careful!
578.	Yes is what they are supposed to do.
579.	What other vehicle does the Province have at its disposal?

580.	The Government of Saskatchewan should take a more active role and be checking to see who is investing in our land. I question if why some of the foreigners who have bought land in our area have followed the regulations involved. Are they Canadian citizens? Or have they found a way around the system.
581.	I think there is not enough control and policing of regulations at present.
582.	FARM LAND SECURITY BOARD TOLD ME I HAD NOTHING TO WORRY ABOUT IN THE 1980'S WHEN THING'S WERE TOUGH.
583.	Definitely they will be called to do more. Have buyers provide accurate information. If they don't comply then deny their request. Give them the teeth they need to enforce the rules.
584.	I believe we experienced this when we sold some land a few years ago. A Canadian bought our land, we had closed the deal but before they paid us people straight from (not Canadian citizens) kept showing up at our place being toured around by the person who had bought our land. Apparently the people who bought our place were somewhat of a broker and were trying to resell our land to before they paid us. I don't know how they got around regulations and laws. We would not have sold to them if we knew that was what was going on. We really felt like we were used and not told the truth.
585.	Protectionism is a failed concept and has no place in a modern free and open economy however a case could be made for applying protectionism to ensuring that farmland is not wasted by poor husbandry or disease build-up. This has been neglected particularly in the instance of utterly inadequate rotations for Canola production which is prejudicial to the sustainability of a vital part of the Saskatchewan Agricultural economy.
586.	Having regulations without enforcement is equivalent to no regulations. Possibly these approvals should have to be given prior to the sale of the farmland and if it is not transparent where the money is coming the sale should be rejected.
587.	Government should not get involved.
588.	A firm stance has to be taken to cover any loopholes!
589.	Yes, because right now there is way too many beating the rules, though loopholes.
590.	Absolutely! It starts with ownership living in the province.
591.	Sales need to be monitored.
592.	I agree that land purchases have taken place which do not follow the current laws - for the reasons you mention.
593.	We have a company that came into our community and bought up land all around us and they are not compliant.
594.	If rules are in place, they should be followed.
595.	Any further powers would simply amount to further interference in rights of ownership.
596.	If left unregulated, land owners can operate at will.
597.	We need to make sure everyone is compliant and all ownership structures are transparent. It is critical to keep farming going for Saskatchewan farmers.

598.	Disappointed that this doesn't already happen
599.	It's similar to disallowing BHP from purchasing Potash Corp. Albeit a smaller scale, foreign investment is supposed to bring money in...to stay!
600.	The law must be followed.
601.	Their job should be easy if there was no equivocating.
602.	if you don't follow the law then go to jail
603.	We cannot make more farm land so let's keep the land in the hands of those who know how to look after it, farmers of Saskatchewan.
604.	I am a YOUNG FARMER. I work hard enough for myself. I can't afford to stretch myself thin in order to compete against foreign investment
605.	But even with set rules there are always "cheats" that will bypass laws. Close the door and lock it from the start...PERIOD
606.	Obvious. Do their job!
607.	Keep Canadian farms and really all resources for Canadians .We already see the huge amounts of money oil and potash co. take out of the country. I know foreign money is needed to develop some industries but farming is not one of them
608.	Unless the government is going to oversee all business transactions I see this as restricting farm land value.
609.	We do not want people in Saskatchewan who fudge the rules. Many countries have different rules for different groups of people. In Canada, we have been successful in building a country where the rules are for everyone. Definitely the Farm Land Security Board should ensure compliance with the rules. It is the law.
610.	We do not understand what would be required by the Farm Land Security Board; however the ownership laws need to be more restricted to Saskatchewan residents. The Saskatchewan Farm Securities Act needs to be enforced under the law.
611.	The rules are in place so they should have the tools at their disposal to enforce them.
612.	Being able to keep a closer eye on farmland purchases and making sure that they are purchased by farmers who are invested in their local economy to not be bumped by corporate investments.
613.	Foreign ownership should not be allowed under any investment structure.
614.	Any law that is right and just should be followed. If this Security Board aids in operating within the law, it should be as active as possible.
615.	Absolutely. I think that foreign investors are skirting and bending the rules.
616.	Yes, the potential negative effects to our province are absolutely overwhelming and the investment must be made to protect the fabric of our Province.
617.	I am skeptical with my answer because the Saskatchewan economy including the Ag sector does not need an increase in bureaucratic red tape. Keep the regulations simple and enforce

	the common sense laws and rules.
618.	If farmland security is provincial based. May benefit locals especially in our own benefit to expand even somewhat.
619.	Regulations are made to be enforced.
620.	Help Canadian workers/farmers/retires to safe, solid Canadian investments.
621.	I am not familiar with the current regulations of the Farm Land Security Board.
622.	As long as they actually did their jobs instead of pissing away the money like you bureaucrats are so good at.
623.	Only the government has the legal resources to investigate, set up regulations and force compliance. The main concern is who will be on the Security Board? It needs to be comprised of individuals that do not have vested interests in encouraging many of the scenarios we have just discussed.
624.	The question answers my concerns.
625.	Put the onus on the corporation, if unclear don't allow. If they are that sophisticated they should be able to think of options other than buying a quarter of land
626.	Saskatchewan government makes laws for a reason and they should have the means to make sure that they are in compliance.
627.	Yes it should be more active I believe there is more foreign owned farmland than the current statistics report; I might consider making the FLSB somewhat larger to ensure it can enforce the regulations; perhaps look at a non-partisan/non-political board; perhaps a retroactive review of current ownership of certain parcels of land.
628.	Yes. Why have regulations if they are not enforced? We are paying the price for turning a blind eye to illegal drainage channels on farmland over the last many years.
629.	All farmland transactions should be looked into when selling or buying the farmland by the Farmland Security Board to make should all regulations are followed. That means No foreign investment and complex corporate structures and such.
630.	By all means necessary You can't get the land back once it is gone.
631.	I want tough compliance and I don't want the 'buddy system' with elected politicians to enter into land sales in this province - like the 115,000 acre sale to the pension fund!!!
632.	Regulations should be very clear, precise & with no loopholes.
633.	Back the laws put some teeth in them.
634.	Close the loopholes in the rules and enforce them.
635.	We certainly need to stop foreign buyers from buying up all our farm land.
636.	It would be amazing to find out that the government actually cares what is happening to farmland ownership. To date it has been an absolute farce. This government stands up for the potash industry but not farmers.
637.	What are rules for if you can't investigate or ensure compliance?

638.	As long as the enforcement is effective, if they are as ineffective as other government agencies (for example the inability of water shed to stop illegal drainage), them don't waste my tax dollars (water shed example again).
639.	Why the have a government if they aren't going to act on behalf of us?
640.	Investors have access to professionals who make a living lobbying so they can invest in profitable ventures. Farmers do not have this ability so need government to assist before even more damage is done to rural Saskatchewan.
641.	Put regulations in place and ENFORCE them.
642.	close the loop holes and review all deals that have foreign investment
643.	There has to be someone who can force compliance of corporate structures.
644.	If the government does not step in soon the farmland will be all owned by 50 or so corporations. Will certainly get rid of support groups like crop insurance though.
645.	Complexity is always aimed at avoiding or hiding compliance to a law or tax.
646.	No sense in having a law with no ability for enforcement.
647.	And I'd like to see sustainability initiatives on this.
648.	Feel the following is more the norm and most likely: "Complex corporate structures and agreements can make it possible for purchasers to present themselves as being compliant when they may not be."
649.	Make these big companies and investors accountable for the wasteland they leave us with here
650.	There needs to be less regulation and thus less need for regulators
651.	I don't understand the concern in differentiation of outside investors. either we are progressive and growing with all, or regressively trying to artificially restrict free trade.
652.	It simply is not possible to plug all the loopholes
653.	Somebody has to police it as it won't police itself.
654.	It would be about time.
655.	There is no point having rules if they can't be enforced.
656.	Farmers need help in this matter. The government of SK has more reach than
657.	There are many ways to skin a cat. Catch crooks by hiring ex-crooks and give them guns and a license to kill. Corporate lawyers can run circles around government hacks so make sure you have appropriate controls, policies, enforcements, transparencies, and people in place to keep the wolves out.
658.	Every transaction should be put under the FLSB microscope.
659.	I think we have enough business rules now for the market to operate.
660.	We need to make sure it doesn't get worse, and to show our government is serious about this

issue.
661. Free enterprise is an excellent regulator.
662. I think rules can be beneficial, but also restrict progress. If it's a danger then it should be regulated, but if no physical harm comes to anyone then it should not be.
663. The government is responsible to make sure all rules are followed when it comes to things like this. Not turn a blind eye on these things and pretend that it is not happening at all. We all know it is, government should realize that people are aware of that.
664. Yeah don't let other countries come in and buy our land, ever!
665. It is of utmost importance that the regulations be enforced.
666. Absolutely! The complexity of corporate structures can make it possible for foreign ownership to masquerade as Canadian. FLSB needs powers and resources to enable it to guard against this fraud.
667. Somebody should police it.
668. As long as the cost to do so does not impact provincial tax payers or producers.
669. Protect us please
670. Absolutely. There should be no loop holes and mistakes.
671. Restricting and monitoring corporate, trusts, and foreign land investments should be monitored closely by the government.
672. Absolutely.
673. Harder for young farmers to buy if you have huge corporations coming in
674. As long as the government is not owning land, such as the Land Bank.
675. They set the rules, who else if not them are going to enforce them?
676. This is a role that Farmland Security Board should be actively involved in. Is this not their purpose....to ensure compliance in the sale of farmland or using farmland to acquire financing?
677. They would act as policing the regulations.
678. It is the job of the government to vet transactions. And to void ones where rules have been broken.
679. As long as it keeps our family farm.
680. If they personally come and farm. If they present themselves as a corporation, they probably won't stay the same structure long enough for the ink to dry.
681. If the Farm Land Security Board needs to take a more active role to make them compliant, they should be given that authority and the means to enforce it.
682. Lots of deals are going on underhanded. FCC has known of this problem and does nothing about it
683. The land should remain available for farmers to buy.

684.	They need to get more involved.
685.	Absolutely, any rule or law is meaningless without enforcement.
686.	Absolutely yes. Tighten up the rules and regulations and NOT cave in to the interests outside of Rural Saskatchewan!
687.	Money well spent, in my opinion.
688.	Basically, only humans, or groups of humans actively engaged in the business of farming can own land. True, this would mean that the land my brother, sister, and I own, as joint tenants, would be affected. Perhaps a grandfather provision is possible, so save the cost of transfer fees. But in our situation, we rent to the third brother, so if these rules had been in place 30 years ago, we could have formed an entity that allowed our brother to continue paying us rent in order to farm that quarter section.
689.	Compliance is key. We need to safe guard our land and then our operators/ lessees of these lands against dishonesty.
690.	I don't need someone telling me who I can sell my land to. I basically had someone telling me who to sell my grain to and how much they would give me all my life, and now I have someone to tell me who I have to sell my land to? I DONT THINK SO!!!!!!
691.	Outside corporations are complex by their nature. They do this so it is hard to tell who actually runs or owns them.
692.	Protect the most important resource - food producing land.
693.	As long as loop holes are not left for them to go through!!
694.	Sooner or later somebody has to keep these large corporations accountable just look at the oil industry and imagine what it would be like with no regulations about spills and all the other environmental issues is that what the government want to do for farmers there is no better steward of the land than the owner operator.
695.	This is very important and we need to be much more thorough in who actually owns the land. This is already happening in way to many places.
696.	Yes I would definitely support the Government of Saskatchewan through the farmland security board taking a very active role to ensure that all farmland transactions comply. Farmland in this province needs to be owned by people whom live here not thousands of miles away.
697.	I would, that is the appropriate governing body that is trained to manage and enforce these regulations.
698.	Yes, we need a transparent and accountable public body to watch over our precious land.
699.	I want full compliance and responsibility when it comes to owning land in Saskatchewan. There has been too much land purchased by people and companies who have done it in a way to look legal, but is not legal at all. Land here in my own area was bought in such a manor. They bought it under the name of a company, and they are not citizens, not even residents. The money has left our country.
700.	If working to support farmers.

701.	An agency that looks out for the interest of current farmers.
702.	This must be monitored very closely and not using loopholes and having this happen behind the radar with no one knowing. That seems to be what happens. FLSB needs to police this and farmers need to be made aware of companies trying this.
703.	I think that the Government of Saskatchewan should be allowed to investigate every purchase as need be as long as it is legit.
704.	If the government does not regulate the ownership laws initially, then the land will be purchased by non-compliant parties and once the transaction is completed there is no going back. Better to fix the problem before it arises.
705.	A government that cannot enforce its own rules in the interest of the citizens has no legitimate existence.
706.	I want to see land prices drop so young guys my age can come home from the oilfield and start farming. Because right now we are looking at a real problem in the future as our average age of farmers increases. When these operations go up for sale they tend to be large and unaffordable for anyone but foreign investment or pension plans. There are guys like myself who are in the market for 4000 plus acres but can't afford it. I want this to be my family's future but it's hard to compete. Leasing land is difficult with cattle as you don't know if the owner will decide to break the land up the next year or if a larger producer will move in under you with more money and push you out.
707.	Governments can really change the economic playing field within the time of their mandate. This is a trust issue.
708.	Absolutely - land has been sold and is illegally owned in Saskatchewan currently - needs to be stopped. Land needs to be taken back.
709.	If this is the policing tool the Government of Saskatchewan chooses to use. At the end of the day, there will need to be a body to ensure compliance
710.	It is one thing to compete against your neighbour for land but how do you compete against pension plans and big investors. How does a young farmer start up or expand?
711.	Foreign ownership occurred near Spiritwood many years ago, illegally, and it was easily achieved through a local farmers cooperation with an American investor.
712.	Even though there are rules and regulations in place many of these very large scale farmers have found loop holes, allowing them to be funded by foreign investors. These large farms are "weeding-out" the little guys because no one can afford to pay what they are paying for land prices. Those large farms also loose the morals behind caring for the land and replace crop rotations with additional fertilizer and in several cases I have seen whole quarter sections be not seeded only because a big farmer forgot about it.... I think you have too much land if you forgot to seed a quarter....
713.	There are a number of examples back home where land has been bought up and is controlled by outside parties through either a Saskatchewan resident (who has no farming background) acting as land lord, or someone with no farming background starting out farming and being

	supported by deep pockets outside the Ag industry. I will not give specific examples here.
714.	This back door method has been unsupervised for far TOO LONG ALREADY!
715.	The Gov't needs to make sure large corporation or conservation groups are not purchasing large amounts of land.
716.	Enforcement is key.
717.	I have been approached by agents looking for land to buy for "interested parties" that eventually we found out was Chinese investment. Fair is fair.
718.	As long as the local farmers and residents are supported.
719.	We need to protect our province and our people!
720.	Yes, everyone has heard stories about people finding loopholes and gaming the system!
721.	It takes government oversight, and as you say, great expertise, to protect land from being grabbed.
722.	It is simple - if you own it you better be getting your hands dirty by living and working on your farmland.
723.	Yes! Absolutely! We are in a unique time where full disclosure on all land deals will help us ensure a vibrant rural Saskatchewan community moving forward. Unless the goal is to have several large cities and the odd Co-op store scattered across the province, it is so important to ensure that SK land is retained by people interested in building companies, communities and protecting the environment.
724.	The provincial government should spend more resources on enforcing regulation on farm ownership and other regulations such as those preventing ploughing up of native prairie, inappropriate drainage of water from farm land and so forth. Incentives should be provided for good agricultural practices.
725.	The FLSB has coped admirably with rapid farmland appreciation, broader changes in the provincial land market, and accompanying processes of financial innovation. Nonetheless, a regulation is nothing without the teeth provided by careful monitoring and enforcement.
726.	Enforcing regulations gives existing regulations some teeth. You would have my support if the Board is very active in guaranteeing compliance.
727.	<p>Skyline has always intended that its business model be fully compliant and aligned with both the goals and spirit of the ownership rules in the province. Skyline is confident it has achieved this and supports the government in taking an active role in ensuring compliance.</p> <p>The Farm Land Security Board outlines two main objectives of the legislation:</p> <p>a. To maintain opportunities for Saskatchewan residents to acquire farm land in Saskatchewan for agricultural purposes;</p> <p>Skyline is very well aligned with this objective in that Skyline's business model offers the next generation of Saskatchewan farmers with new opportunities to own farmland in the province to use for agricultural purposes.</p> <p>b. To support the development of strong rural communities in Saskatchewan.</p>

In Skyline's consultations with farmers it became evident that retiring farmers would prefer to sell their land to those within their community, perhaps to a son or daughter, nephew or niece or young neighbor. This can be challenging in that the younger generation often does not have the necessary capital to purchase the land. As a result, retiring farmers have to look at other options to liquidate their land such as selling it to large corporate farms, limited partnership funds, pension funds or wealthy Canadian investors. Skyline's business model creates opportunities for young farmers to acquire land from retiring farmers, thereby transitioning the land within the community which helps to maintain and develop strong rural communities in the province.

Unfortunately the Farm Land Security Board has taken a different view of Skyline's business model and has mischaracterized it as trying to circumvent the legislation. This is not true. Farmers utilizing Skyline's financial services to acquire land retain full ownership and control over 100% of the farmland acquired. This is accomplished while at the same time bringing much need capital to the agricultural sector as the large intergenerational land transfer unfolds over the coming decade.

728. Rules are worth nothing unless enforced.

729. Absolutely!!!

730. Com promised compliance is a good reason not to sell to them in the first place.

731. Being diligent is important.

732. The rules should be followed and the onus should be on the purchaser to prove the source of the funds and to prove compliance before a sale is allowed to anyone, even Saskatchewan residents.

733. Necessary to ensure land purchases and owners abide by the rules. This is important and should be monitored.

734. Provincial governments should take an active role in controlling corporations.

735. I believe that financing can come from anywhere and still appear as if it is Canadian.

736. Most of the farm community that I've talked to are tired of non-farming interests looking at Sask. land as a way to enhance their own profitability. Rural communities lose when large corporate farms own large tracts of land but don't live in the area.

737. Compliance and accountability is very important.

738. Some investors are pretty good at hiding where their funding originates.

739. Make sure the investors aren't thieves

740. If there are going to be rules, they should be enforced and FLSB seems like the logical agency to do. They should be given the power and resources to ensure compliance.

741. A stringent government regulation is required to prevent speculative investment in farmland for short-term benefit of absentee landowners

742. Enforcement is key

743. OR is there a choice? i.e. Legislation

15) Is there anything else you would like to share about farmland ownership in Saskatchewan?

#	Response
1.	I would like to see the property transaction data be made more available to the public.
2.	<p>Farmers are price takers. Farmers have no influence over grain prices, no influence on the price of crop inputs, no influence on the price of equipment. The one thing farmers had control of was the land and what they did with it. Allowing outside investment, once again make farmers price takers in terms of the lease rates they need to pay to farm the land. Opening up farmland ownership to residents and companies outside of Canada, as done in 2002 and now the consideration for foreign ownership and large investors, once again strips farmers of any control they once had. This is a highly sensitive topic, not to be taken lightly by the Sask Party government.</p> <p>As expressed to the Ministry of Agriculture, the people of Saskatchewan need to be "heard". This online survey is doing this whole process injustice. The older individuals in rural areas likely won't even hear about his consultation process let alone participate. Mail out surveys should be sent to all residents of Saskatchewan. If all the Government of Saskatchewan does is this online survey and concludes the findings at that, there will be unrest amount rural residents.</p>
3.	I hope that we are able to keep our farmland in this province own and worked by the farmers that live in this province. This is a very slippery slope to wander down. Investors from other countries do not care about the land here as long as they have black in the bottom line every year. The tradition of family farms will become extinct if we allow foreign investment in our Saskatchewan farmland. This tradition needs to be protected for our people to make sure that we have enough food to feed the people for the future. Farming is what built the prairie provinces why do we think we need to sell it off to the highest bidder? Keep farmland local for the people of this province so they can prosper instead of letting foreign investors push out the people trying to start farming or continue to farm. As someone who has been trying to enter farming as a career but already cannot afford farmland this topic is very concerning to me. I do applaud the current government for not allowing foreign investment thus far and do hope that they continue with that. Please keep Saskatchewan farmland for Saskatchewan farmers and not for investment companies.
4.	As a young farmer starting out, I want to expand my farm enough so I can make a full living on it and not require off farm income. I am already having trouble competing with larger farms who can spread out their costs over 20,000+ acres. I cannot do what I love if I have even more competition from out of province and country. I've been lucky to be born on a farm so have a small base to work off but it is proving next to impossible to compete. The bank would give me the money, but I couldn't pay off what the land would cost and still be able to pay bills at home.

As well, when farms are owned by not local owners, there are less families, less people around to buy and build in small towns. This drives away services and business to the cities making a hard life tougher when the closest groceries is over an hour way, more for doctors, prescription drugs, and parts to keep our business going. We can't lose a full day driving if we break down in a busy season.

Keep land local, keep our towns alive. Dont sell our future to someone who isn't going to be part of our great province.

5. All regions are unique, especially in a country as vast as Canada. I see farmland ownership being primarily controlled by 'like-minded people' as very important to a province. The more local the control (ie: ownership), the more values are shared. Hypothetical: what if a fund, controlled out of Toronto, decides they like the idea of eliminating glyphosate? The farmer on that land would have no choice but to do so, or lose the ability to farm it - a potentially serious thing given most farmers owe hundreds of thousands of dollars on equipment, and need enough land to make it pay.

Saskatchewan is a wonderful place to live, and I am proud to raise my kids here. If people want to move here, buy land, and farm - by all means, do so. But if you cannot be bothered to live here, you should not expect to be able to own the land.

6. It is very hard for young people to start farming. Many traditional family farms are being lost, need to make starting up for young farmers more accessible.

7. We need innovative solution and business models to help finance Saskatchewan farmers so that there is a win-win for both the farmer and the investor -- this works best in the long run. We cannot maintain Saskatchewan as an island -- farmers need to be able to find long-term solutions to ensure they can continue to farm and allowing Canadian pension plans to invest in Saskatchewan farmland is part of the solution in my view.

8. Whatever the rules are or become they need to be enforced. There is enough land in our area that has been owned by offshore investors for 30+ years that have never lived in or had family live in Canada. all that income they have made here leaves the country and is never reinvested back into our Saskatchewan economy.

9. Please ensure that farmers can continue to own the farmland and not have to compete with outside buyers. To ensure that our family farms survive from generation to generation we need to own the land not rent it from outside buyers. Farmers do A very good job in their own overpaying for farm land with out the help of other parties.

10. Call me and we can talk more about this subject. You are pushing young farmers out of agriculture. The average age of a Canadian farmer is 54 years old. In 20 years they will be gone. If no young farmers are willing to step up and play the game our agriculture sector will be diminished to nill. We are essentially losing a war right now and our government is letting it happen. At this rate, the majority of our farmland will be owned by foreign investors in less then 20 years.

By the way, I am writing this from the tractor seat!!!

11. Give the local guy a chance to make the difference.

12.	Do not look at a short term gain scenario, the health of rural Saskatchewan is dependant on Saskatchewan residents owning land in rural Saskatchewan.
13.	The interest of young farmers in Saskatchewan is thriving something that hasn't been seen in years , but slowly slipping away with rising land / lease prices forced up by investor based land company's . As a young farmer who has to carry a full time job as well as farm 3000 ac FAMILY farm just to keep up with the going land rates , nearing 30 how many more years can I physically do both before its to much . The choice is ours, prevent it or grab onto the rug and help pull it from under the farmer a feet . Some one has to farm it , why not farm it our selfs .
14.	If the government allows the CPP or foreign investors to buy up Saskatchewan farmland it will drive up land prices and have a harmful effect on farmers and it will insure less young people become farmers in the future. this is wrong for the province and wrong for our economy.
15.	find investors buying land is going to kill rural saskatchewan making it almost impossible for young farmers like myself to make a living I also think the environment will suffer with draining and other impacts they create, whats going to happen when grain prices fall will the investors sell and create a panic or will they keep rents high and farmers go under. we are in some very uncertain times in agriculture these days and its scary
16.	My family farm is 103 years old. We've never had over 2000 acres because help had always been scarce. I am a 4th generation farmer trying to farm with my brother and father. My brother and I both have schooling at siast. He is a journeyman heavy duty and I am a millwright. Even with our high paying jobs it's still hardly affordable to be buying land and equipment and anything that comes available is picked up by 15000+ acre farms that have investors. My dad has got to the point where he doesn't enjoy farming anymore as it is so competitive. It's nothing but a big passing match to see who can borrow more money and hire more workers
17.	I did not respond in a lot of the boxes. I do not believe in foreign ownership of our land or ownership by investment firms. I have already been in contact with security board regarding a foreign land owner. Have no problem with new farmers coming in and farming the land. But leave the investors out.
18.	Like said before. Keep sask land in the hands of sask farmers.
19.	Farmland should never have any foreign entity involvement. Control could easily be lost. Saskatchewan farmland should not benefit others outside the province.
20.	Stop the investors before it's too late
21.	Unless you and your family operated a farm since the mid 1850's in Saskatchewan you will never understand the barriers faced and the joy of having the freedom to call home.
22.	I have no choice but to place my faith in the leaders that make these decisions. I intend to purchase farmland in the next ten years and begin to bless the land with wise agricultural practices and build a future for those yet to come. However, I fear that this is swiftly becoming a pipedream and the agricultural industry is headed in a very different direction that betrays the future of the province and it's residents in the name of business and "feeding the world" which at first seem like a noble cause, but in actuality does not hold much valuable meaning.

23.	Non farming owners of land increase the risk the farmers take on to farm that land and we are already taking on more risk than many industries. Higher risk means more farmers go broke in tough years.
24.	Government needs to get out of controlling who I choose to sell my land to.
25.	Desperately hoping for changes to safeguard our farms. Please keep Sask in Sask. Hands.
26.	High farmland prices make it harder for younger farmers to start or grow a business. Especially when they have to compete with foreign and domestic investors. I think it is in the best interest of the young people of Saskatchewan to keep the land ownership within the residents of Saskatchewan and western Canada.
27.	In the not too distant future.... I would like to farm 10 acres of land... if I can find it... I want to dry land grow crops that can be rotated and grown three times a year.... I am just learning about this now and ways of preserving the rainfall etc. Digging in earth makes me feel good... and I have no great plans to organize more than a little plot of land. Perhaps I am a dreamer... sobeit... I shall dream.
28.	This is not a question of competition. I have no problem competing with any investor. This is a question of economics. Renters will not survive multiple tuff years. Which will happen in saskatchewan. Farmers must be able to buy the land they farm, it is the only way to insure the long term viability of agriculture in saskatchewan. Our grandparents got on boats and left countries where they were not allowed to own the land. Lets not make the same mistake here.
29.	I'm a 23 year old Sask farmer and have been farming for five years. I've luckily purchased some land and it will take most of my lifetime to pay for. I think without the farm security act in place it would of been much more difficult too purchase
30.	Farm Ownership is going to large Corp Farms, but these are operator based companies, the best alternative.
31.	It would break my heart if Saskatchewan gave control to foreign ownership of land. Saskatchewan is unique because it created a wonderful province through hard work and dedication of its residence. The foundation of a strong province is the land, controlled by the people for the people who chose to live in this province. Government needs to find ways to support new and younger farmers or farmers that want to move here to make a life. Government can't just throw its hands up in the air and say we are driven by a new global economy and we have no control. Saskatchewan is what it is because it has always taken a different path. I often ask the question if we are still progressing as a society. Will are children have as good or better life than the present society enjoys or are we sliding and will we look like other societies that are slipping, I would use Mexico as an example.
32.	You need to get a handle on this. You probably should have started on this 6 years ago.

33.	<p>It is obvious that putting Saskatchewan farmland into the hands of Non-Sweat Equity owners is and will always be a cascading problem. From the farm door where lack of land base or too high of prices for land base, purchased or leased creates numerous problems; to the ownership of land by entities that are only looking for a profit margin and not investing in the day to day problems of putting in, caring for, taking off and eventually selling the actual crop. Nor are these entities investing in the communities other than providing a tax base which is the same tax base as the local farming family which invests time and equity in their communities; to large corporate Factory Farms monopolizing the roads, the dealerships lots, the Ag. Supply depots, the shipping terminals, and the markets. If you want to kill the history of this once proud farming province and it's wealth of farmable land, then "You " allow investors who don't care about people only profit.</p> <p>Worst case scenario: CEO's or Managers of Multi National Corps sit on RM's, WaterBoards, as MLA's and then who will own the Province of Saskatchewan? The people or the Corporations?</p> <p>Worst case scenario: Farmland is owned by Multi National Corp. or Large Foreign Investment groups who control the crops, the land base and how it is used (drained, burned, overfarmed, natural resources depleted) the markets, and we are all serfs, because we can't afford to farm and fight them too! If you look around the world you can see where this is already happening. Profits before people! aka Investment is Good for the Province!</p> <p>Thanks for letting us have a say! We hope you listen and protect our beautiful farming heritage our Province!</p>
34.	Worked 2 years as a farmhand in Saskatchewan.
35.	<p>I am glad I am the age I am as I will soon not have to be the one worrying about my loved way of life being taken away by circumstance out of my control and sorry my son will not have the enjoyable life on the farm in rural Saskatchewan as the ways of the modern world will surely be the ruination of the farm life that me and my ancestors loved and still love. My son started farming this year as I showed him how great this life on the farm is, but I don't think he will have the enjoyable life I have had, especially if investors and foreign ownership is allowed. The farm economy never turned around when the rules were changed 15-20 years ago, it changed when the world economy changed and the world realized they needed fed.</p>
36.	<p>You need a fifth option on residence- some of us went to other countries to get a job and were forced back in part by land ownership rules.</p>
37.	<p>Who exactly is going to work on all these foreign owned farms if farmers are being pushed out.</p>
38.	<p>Please do not let this happen it will ruin the futures of young farmers who's family does not own a lot of land to start with but want to expand</p>
39.	<p>letting foreign investors buy up land takes it away from the small local farmers and future generations of farmers. These farmers had families in small towns that kept schools running and businesses operational. Without them small town Saskatchewan will be a thing of the past.</p>
40.	<p>Determining who can own Saskatchewan farmland should not just be about who benefits</p>

	<p>financially in the short term. Preserving the farmland in Saskatchewan, which is some of the best in the world, for the farmers and residents of the Province for generations to come should be one of the government's highest priorities. Allowing foreign investors, like those from , or out of province investment trusts may increase the value of the farmland and benefit current owners in the short term, but in the long term it robs the residents of this province of a valuable resource and relinquishes control to outside interests. In addition, these rules must be enforced and exceptions not allowed.</p>
41.	Have to much to say lol
42.	It is hard to make a living farming and allowing investors to buy more land will only decrease profits for farmers and discourage young people to take up the profession.
43.	Keep it to local farmers at an affordable price
44.	Prices of marginal land have almost tripled in my area because investors that have no clue what the land can produce. I am a cattle operation and with beef prices where they are I still cannot compete to buy the land and use for grazing. I have lived my entire life on the farm and plan to stay. I have a problem with pension plans and foreign investment buying land.
45.	I would like to see the government try to keep the small farms alive and save rural Saskatchewan. This province was founded by those rural communities and family farms. When they are gone what do you think will happen. I have to work of the farm to make a living and that should not have to happen.
46.	<p>I feel that farmland ownership should stay to Canadian residents only and no foreign ownership. But as I mentioned before, when the price of land comes down and it levels off, the pressure of foreign ownership will decrease. It will happen, it has happened in the past and history has this funny way of repeating itself.</p> <p>These young farmers who are borrowing heavily to purchase farmland, could be a disaster waiting to happen as 1 bad year could put them in a very bad situation and bad years do happen, they just need to experience a few. Talk to the older generation and they have lots to share about the price of farmland.</p>
47.	trust funds and foreign investors should not be allowed to buy land in SK
48.	If a foreign/non local entity owns the land then it must be required to be open to public for hunting
49.	Let outside investment into the farms. Leave out non farming land investment. This should keep land prices at a level sustainable for primary agriculture
50.	The amount of non farm orientated land owners is frightening as a young farmer starting from scratch I am doomed if the current status quo is maintained
51.	Please feel free to contact me at or to discuss this topic further.
52.	farmland needs to be what it is, land that produces a product which has a value which implies a value back to the land. It needs to stop being a political tool to get back a specific people or other motives.

53.	My wish is that farmland can only be purchased with the intention to farm it. Not for investment purchases. Buyers would have to be able to show that they are farming it. Or if they choose to rent out the land they can't make full use of the increase in value over that time period.
54.	Let the farmers of Saskatchewan farm their land. We love it and we just want to make a living. We don't want to end up being employees of large corporations who can hire and fire us off our own soil. Keep the tradition alive. Saskatchewan is farming. We bleed green and yellow for this province and we give our blood sweat and tears every single day to this land of ours and to feeding our people.
55.	I would like to purchase some
56.	Investment is good. But there are plenty of young ambitious producers who are being held back due to inability to compete with large investment funds. Allow some investment, but building opportunities for young Canadians to become successful is more critical for the long term prosperity of Canada.
57.	Saskatchewan farmland should be owned and controlled by Saskatchewan residents.
58.	My son and his family are farming with us and eventually will take over the farm. He has missed two opportunities to purchase land in our immediate vicinity, in both instances was the high bidder. Its pretty tough for a 30 year old to compete with the largest land owner in the province.
59.	Saskatchewan has the potential to be an agricultural powerhouse if we don't shut off investment and shut out the world. Let's make that our objective.
60.	I believe agriculture is important and we need to encourage more young farmers but at the rate land is going all we are doing is discouraging the young farmer as it gets harder and harder to compete with foreign investors and corporate farms from out of province moving in. Just can't compete paying or renting land for that kind of money they are losing before they start. There will be no more family farm and all that sask was built o will be list
61.	Governments should stay out of this- we need capital and all this is doing is preventing capital from coming to the province and hurting farmers. Stay out of this!!
62.	Please stop enabling selling our key assets to foreign owners.
63.	already said what needs to be said
64.	Help for young farmers just starting out to purchase land. With all the large established farms it's hard to compete and get a chance to grow the farm. I've always believed a small farm with, say 2000ac using same farming practices as a large farm, say 10000ac will always be more profitable per acre. Why, because chances are the work on the small farm is all being done by family members who all own part of the farm and they all will give their best effort all the time because if the farm does well then they do well. The large farm typically will need to hire full time or seasonal employees who may not have proper training/experience and being on a hourly wage or salary, they might not overly care if they do a good job all the time because whether the farm does good or bad they still get paid. For example, I provide custom harvesting, since I don't have the acres to support land and combine payments and I worked

	for a large farm in the area last year, they had a custom swather come in to cut canola. We harvested a field that the farmer swathed himself then moved to a piece the custom guy did and you could sure tell a difference. The custom guy did a terrible job, went too fast, cut too low, and packed the canola swath too much. He charged per acre and clearly all he cared about was covering as much ground as fast as possible without worrying about the quality of work. When it comes to hiring whether it be employees or custom operators, there's always a better chance of a mistake or poor quality of work as compared to a family member who is also relying on the final product, a good crop.
65.	The government needs to act fast on stopping investors of all kinds before sask. Becomes empty. The rural life and people will be gone. So sad to see this happen.
66.	Farmland needs to stay in farmers hands to ensure the the stability of the industry.
67.	Shake your heads you sillies
68.	This is a solution in search of a problem. Should just leave the legislation the way it was before the changes this spring.
69.	No more investor farms. They don't work.
70.	Saskatchewan land should be Saskatchewan owned
71.	We need to encourage new farm families.
72.	It's important that the present government make it clear to the public that the situation of investors owning Sask. farmland was brought on by a change in legislation by the NDP. Radical left groups like the farmers union are trying to make the present government look like to bad guys.
73.	I think if the rules are relaxed we will be selling our soul for all the wrong reasons
74.	Please make farming an accessible career choice for Saskatchewan residents before you sell us out to foreign interests and bank pension funds. Interest free loans and free education and training are the keys to making Saskatchewan farms more profitable. NOT selling us out to the highest foreign bidder.
75.	Do a tour of land owned by big investment groups and rented out to farmers, often involving 10's of thousands of acres and see how it is farmed compared to owner operator farms. Productivity, sustainability and environmental stewardship are pretty much out the window. The outside investor - large scale renter scenario only works when grain prices are very high.
76.	I hope and pray that the Saskatchewan government will clamp down on this issue and keep Saskatchewan farm land in the hands of the Saskatchewan people otherwise there won't be any young people left to carry on the rich tradition of Saskatchewan agriculture.
77.	Please make the results of this survey public. It would be very beneficial to have some public consultations as well. You do not know who is filling this survey out. A company could quite easily hire someone to fill out many of these surveys to scue the results. In public you have a face to put to it.
78.	It is very important to keep farms in the family and affordable to ordinary people if the very existence of the family farm and rural Saskatchewan with its numerous small communities are to continue to exist. Without community large farms become faceless corporations. Similar to

	oil company's, which are generally hated throughout the world. Do you want the Saskatchewan farm to become like that?
79.	I feel that a lot of small communities would have another nail in their coffins with large groups buying land. These groups would most likely buy their inputs elsewhere which leads to crop input companies pulling out of smaller centres.
80.	Please be very careful about the direction you are heading. Governments have always wanted cheap food at the expense of the farmer. If you continue in this direction you will have neither, There are examples of large corporate farms that have failed....one being “ “.
81.	Please for our sake and our future generations do not allow any more outside investors to own our land. We could take the greedy road and we would have more money in our pockets but we all need to think deeper than that.
82.	I think only true farmers should own land to make a long story short.
83.	It would make sense for foreign investment in the finishing of our farmed goods such as Flour Mills, Locker Plants etc, just like they do purchasing oil from our refineries.
84.	<p>Trying to picking winners and losers in this game, while tempting, ultimately will cost the many to the benefit of a more limited few. By limiting farmland ownership, the government effectively benefits future purchasers of farmland at the expense of existing owners/sellers. There are a few "traditional" family farms that will benefit, but the big beneficiaries are going to be larger, non traditional farms and communal religious organizations who can access large scale capital. Not allowing diversified farm ownership is a recipe for long term disaster.</p> <p>If the people who push for farmland restrictions to ensure the viability of the traditional family farm really want their goal you would have to limit "corporate farms" (including family farms that are "too" large) and communal religious organizations too. These are not traditional farms. My guess is that the reaction from many who propose these limits would not be good if you limited their ability to buy land. For example, if ownership of all farmland, whether owned by Canadians or non-Canadians, or those associated in a communal religious organization or a given family, was limited to a set hard "traditional sized" family farm limit, say 10 sections to be generous, you'll see a reaction in a hurry as it will no longer be to the personal benefit of most of the people who want to maintain or increase the barriers to farmland ownership in Saskatchewan.</p> <p>The government picking winners and losers in business is a generally a bad idea. Farming is no different. The government should get out of it.</p> <p>If you want to make a difference and encourage owner operators, improve access to capital for small operator farmers together with providing business support to allow them to compete in a dynamic market for land. Restricting farm land ownership is wrong headed and not the cure to the problem.</p>

85.	We need to get control of this situations. This Province is built on family farming operations and is once again balancing the books this year. Why would we mess with that and give away our best asset to foreign corporations and pension plans. Let farmers own land and farm the land they own.
86.	Our farmers and the land support everyday life. We need to protect what we have.
87.	I live in and work at the . I'd like to take over the family farm land as my parents are retiring. I cannot afford to buy the land, and my parents cannot afford not to sell the land to someone else. Saskatchewan is losing prospective farmers because of the outside ownership of land.
88.	We need to create an environment that encourages young farmers to start, not one that encourages farmers to sell out and quit.
89.	I grew up on a farm and have operated a farm beside by credit union career. We know that land can produce as certain amount of revenue and super high rent would leave good land idle and that is not in the best interest in agriculture.
90.	Plan to move back to my home province, Saskatchewan, make it my residency and invest in farmland.
91.	As a child, I went to a country school where there about 15 families attending the school. Now, there only 4 families in that area and the farms are larger. Land values are a part of the problem as those who have can acquire more with less problems than those who are struggling or just starting out. And another factor is that many young people do not want to do manual labour for a living anymore. Rules have to be put in place to encourage the youth to continue farming with possible incentives to encourage them.
92.	We need to keep investment places and pension funds out. The price of land is already not affordable for the farmers especially with the current state of commodity prices versus input prices
93.	I believe in the freedom to buy and sell land on my own to who ever I want to. I believe in a system of competition and nothing being freely given to me to benefit myself.
94.	I think it is very important for farmland and commercial ownership to stay in Saskatchewan, we have the best province and I feel that if we have non-Saskatchewan residents wanting to invest in our natural resources etc. We should be investing in our own natural resources. Why would we want to give the profits to outsiders?
95.	Thanks for asking.
96.	it seems almost impossible to start a small farm
97.	Close family are still involved in agriculture.
98.	I would like you to ask the FARMERS. Hold town hall meetings, allow the farmers who are still farming their own land to give you feedback. and then, listen to them.
99.	I feel our society it extremely removed from agriculture in general. I believe keeping farming/ranching a family based business is important to our future.
100.	people say this outside investment is helping the young farmers. I guess I don't believe it. I actually think it is hurting them and benefiting the real estate agents who have investors in

their back pocket. Even a retiring farmer who has multiple children, one farms, rest don't, and trying to straighten out an estate has to get the farmer to cough up an unsustainable rent or buyout to satisfy the non farming siblings who have heard about the farmland boom. the farming one gets fed up, says I cant make money at this and quits. another young farmer gone .

101. Investors are NOT artificially driving up the price of Sask. farmland under current ownership regulations. If the major concern for changing legislation is that Sask. land values are rising too fast, this is NOT true and no changes should be made. As a farmland real estate broker, I see that the market is already correcting itself due to softer commodity prices and crop yields being closer to average in 2014. I have NEVER experienced an investor outbidding a local farmer for the purchase of farmland. What an investor will pay for a parcel of land is mostly based on rate of return, which is lease rate. The lease rate that a farmer will pay is based on commodity prices, recent yield averages, and ultimately their rate of return. Therefore, farmland values fluctuate based on these factors, not because of investors purchasing farmland. Current regulations are working effectively and no changes should be made to the Saskatchewan Farm Security Act.

102. Keep Saskatchewan farm land in the hands of the people who actually work the land, and depend on the land to make a living. Foreign investors that are simply looking for a place to store a monetary value are not a good alternative. Also, restrict urban municipalities and rural municipalities from developing good, arable cultivated acres. Too much farm land is being lost to expansion of cities.

103. The value of a piece of land should be tied to its productivity. It shouldn't be based upon what a desk jockey on Bay Street thinks he can buy in for and sell for later on. The ROI these investors are looking for is unfeasible given the price they are willing to pay.

104. if u let foreign ownership or pension plans own farm land u are only hurting the young farmers trying to do what their ancestors did! Let's help the residents and the caretakers of the land own it and it will always be looked after and cared for! Pension programs don't care about land, they care about profit!

105. Farm land needs to be available for farmers to purchase. With investors buying land it is becoming, and will continue to get harder to purchase land as a farmer.

106. Outside investment makes competition very unfair for young or local farmers who rely on this land to feed their families and to have something to pass on to their children. Their needs to be no outside investment by both foreign or government investment! Period!!!

107. Although I am a strong believer in the free market the topic of foreign land investment concerns me as not only a farmer but also as a resident of rural Saskatchewan. As farms grow larger and consolidate acres around less farm businesses when the time comes to exit the industry these are not single 1/4 sales. These are 3000-4000 ac sales which if a foreign investor purchases that farm it removes all of that local equity from the area. No longer do local farmers have the ability to leverage that land equity into purchases of equipment, inputs, buildings etc. This will effect other local industry as farmers find it harder and harder to secure financing to support our arms length industries like manufacturing and retail. These outside investors also don't live and work in the area and participate in local improvement efforts. Although the acres would still get farmed, I have no doubt of that, I am greatly concerned about the removal of wealth from our finally reinvigorated rural landscape.

108.	Open market is the best system and will always be. It will provide better efficiencies improved technology and investment across the board not to mention improved productivity. Family farms are not going to meet the challenges of future food demand
109.	By allowing foreign investors to purchase land it is killing a way of life. by making it harder to purchase land you are driving the younger generation elsewhere to look for jobs. Or stay here and work for the pension fund farms making less money then is needed to survive. I would love to see this government allow young farmers or small farmers have the chance to expand. We all have to pay our taxes so we our still making the government money. And make it easier to sell our crops and cattle internationally to bring more money into our province.
110.	This is a definite heritage concern. Money is darn sure not everything. If this was to proceed, we will find out in 30,40,50 years what a huge mistake it was and it is too late to revert back to how farming/ranching used to be. Kids who were not raised in that lifestyle would rarely if ever pick it as an occupation let alone be successful at it.
111.	We must take a stand to protect our farmland. It is fundamental to sovereignty. If foreign owners and investment companies make the decisions about farmland, they control our food supply. They could also decide to bring in foreign workers to operate the farms and we as Canadians and Saskatchewan people could end up having very little say about what happens within our territory. Protecting our farmland from foreign ownership is of the utmost importance!
112.	I feel owing pension plans and foreign investment can help increase our industry better .
113.	<p>We need to preserve the remaining native prairie AT ALL COSTS. Once it is gone, it's gone forever.</p> <p>It is a farmer's responsibility to have stewardship for the land for future generations. It is the government's job to make sure that they have all the tools, and gentle oversight, to make this possible.</p> <p>DRAINAGE in Saskatchewan is a huge issue in Saskatchewan. We need to preserve wetlands on every farm so the birds and animals have somewhere to survive in the huge mass of monoculture. Draining all the water away in a semi-arid environment (becoming more and more arid as time passes) is NOT a good idea.</p>
114.	<p>Ensuring compliance with whatever program is in place or put in place is absolutely key.</p> <p>Ensuring viability of local farmers to purchase land and make a living, maintaining Saskatchewan's farming economy is key.</p>
115.	Alberta should be a great example of how a lot of land is owned by foreign or Canadian investors out of province. Their sole purpose for the purchase of the land is to sell it at a higher price. Our farmland cannot be like the NYSE and be bought and sold freely. We need restrictions and we need more Saskatchewan small farmers owning land. The more small farms, the more people to contribute to rural Saskatchewan economy, the less people moving to urban areas congesting the cities. Large farms should also have caps. Think about it, if Smith Farms inc owned and farmed all the land around a small town, they would employ at most 15 workers and usually part time. If the farmland was divided among 40 farmers all

	having 2-3 family members working for the farm, that keeps 80 + people in the small town compared to 15.
116.	How does a young farmer have a chance of starting up in farming with the cost of land these days? No different than all the gouging the fertilizer companies do. They know every year what is out there for money and squeeze every last feasible penny out of a guy ..
117.	Why is this even a question?? What is wrong with the current system.
118.	<p>The best landlord is one who understands the industry and is committed to having a long-term stable, flexible and transparent relationship with their farmer. If both parties are trustworthy and capable people, and neither side gets greedy, this is a beneficial arrangement for all parties. It doesn't matter if the landlord is a Canadian pension fund as long as they have this kind of philosophy.</p> <p>There are a lot of new Saskatchewan farmland owners who have no experience with farming and, those who bought after 2007, have no sense for how a major crop failure can impact their renter, or land and rent values. I believe that eventually they will learn some hard lessons and many will find other places to invest their money.</p>
119.	Allow free market work. Sask Party - get on with being fiscal conservative capitalists. Progressive Conservatives - act like your name and if you have a petty axe to grind have the courage to come out and say it.
120.	Saskatchewan residents should have first right of refusal and a say to who owns the land
121.	The farming economy is getting to the point where farmers are working as servants of the corporations, instead of of corporations providing services to the farmers. Plant Breeders' Rights is an example of this. Allowing foreign land ownership would just exacerbate this problem.
122.	there should be no barriers to Canadian ownership including pensions and trusts. If we continue with the rules as they are sk land should regulate if there is a concern over Canadian ownership. Please note the wealth effect that was created since 2002 when the rules where changed and how that wealth has benefited all Saskatchewan residents. i would suggest that the wealth effect would continue if we lifted the Canadian residency rule as well.
123.	<p>If farmland ownership is allowed to be taken over by foreigners and institutional investors, then control of the agriculture industry in this province will also be passed to them. Keep control of the industry in the province.</p> <p>Uncontrolled speculation in the USA financial industry led to the colapse in 2008. That did not happen in Canada because of our strong rules and regulations in the banking industry. Don't let speculators take over the agriculture industry in this province. Their interest are strictly monetary with no regard to what happens to the social and financial structures of this province.</p> <p>Only strong rules and regulations will keep agriculture strong and prosperous in this province.</p>
124.	We moved here from Alberta because the are taking over and making it impossible for

	young people to farm. Don't let that happen here!
125.	Farming is no longer a small family way of life, it is a business. Sask has made strides in becoming a place to invest and to restrict ownership will send a negative message. It should be a free enterprise as to whom an owner is allowed to sell his/her asset to. To do otherwise would be communist in nature. Perhaps as he only has his personal well being in mind. Lets not get happy feet and move forward not backward such as the PC and NDP would have us do.
126.	This online survey should only be one part of the process. I have a University Degree, and there were questions I am not sure I interpreted correctly. There should be public meetings and a more transparent process. At the very least, you should have the entire survey in a printable PDF can be mailed to your office. My Mom would like to have a say, but can't since she can't use a computer. But I could print it for her to complete and mail in. Are you afraid to meet the public?
127.	I appreciate the opportunity to weigh in on this issue, and trust that a decision will be made which is in the best interests of the Saskatchewan people as a whole, rather than that of any particular vocal minority group. I should note that along with discussing market values, stewardship of the land is also important to me (minimizing soil erosion, etc.), and would support a system which provides the best incentives for farmers to take care of the land for future generations.
128.	I've watched farmers with small operations forced out of farming due to higher land, inputs and machinery costs and skyrocketing inflation. My family and I are landowners of 2080 acres in central SK, but I would happily sacrifice any increase in land prices for the tradition of the family farm to continue. This used to be Saskatchewan, but has changed drastically in the last 25 years for reasons never discussed, debated or voted on.
129.	I came to Canada as a small child so basically I have always been a Canadian. I have seen too much good land disappear under 'development', a huge reduction in wildlife and beneficial insect life in fields, reduction in bees even in the city, have seen people die because of mass spraying in the countryside. I know of people whose land lost value and whose production has been affected because the neighbours sold to CAFO's polluting the air, land and the water. Who owns the land makes a huge difference ultimately to all Canadians, not just the one's with title. Under Harper's proposed trade agreements Canadians would lose all control over who does what with the land and Canadian laws will not apply to be used against foreign corporate owners. I was dismayed to see that there are already provinces which have no restriction on foreign ownership. Sask. must not join them. The countries in the world that do not permit foreign ownership are the ones that are prospering.
130.	I believe it should stay farm land. I find it extremely terrible when farms and acreages are being forced to sell Due to urban growth
131.	Keep our Breadbasket CANADIAN, make it affordable to younger people wanting to farm.
132.	Most other businesses or property owners do not have restrictions on who they sell to, I believe land owners should have the same option
133.	I work at small town Credit Union and can see the effects that inflated values have on

	farmers, it is getting more difficult to purchase land for beginning farmers and for operations looking to grow. I wouldn't want pension plans to be given any more opportunity to buy more land because it would exacerbate the problem.
134.	I would like to see crown lease land to be able to be used for security by lending institutions similar to Alberta system.
135.	Changes can have drastic effects in the future, such as what happened when non-Sask residents were allowed to own Saskatchewan land. It is critically important to me that farmland be owned by Saskatchewan farmers. My next vote in a provincial election will depend on each party's platform on this issue.
136.	The individual in this area whose name is dumped 13 million buying land here in the last 3 years. How can this be allowed. His rent income is \$400,000 a year. He wants to buy more and has to be stopped. this new legislation needs to put a 800 to 1000 acre buying cap on these individuals that are buying land to rent it back to farmers otherwise a third world country is coming sooner than later for us.
137.	This province was built by farmers blood, sweat and tears over many generations. Do we really want to sell that piece of our identity that most of us who farm hold so dear, just so that one set of land owners can realize good profit? I don't see any other benefits to opening up land sales to foreigners, investors, speculators or funds. It would be a great disrespect to our forefathers incredible amount of sacrifice and hard work, while at the same time taking away the opportunity of both current and future generations ability to live the same farming livelihood we've been afforded. We obviously have something that everyone else wants. Why do they want it: Food security? Capital gain? What are the ramifications of funds, speculators, investors and foreigners owning the land not only today but in 50+ yrs. How are future generations going to be affected? How are current farmers going to be affected? How are rural communities going to be affected? How much money will be gained/lost from the provincial coffers over all this time? We can not make a short sided and narrow minded decision. These questions must be answered. Once we change the rules and open the door to anyone who wants to but farmland the damage, if there is any, cannot be undone. We should be thinking more about selling what we produce on the land than selling the land itself. I am confident the government will make the right decision for the long term economic health of this province while fostering the sustainability of a livelihood that has been the heart and soul of Saskatchewan from the very beginning.
138.	I grew up in rural Saskatchewan, my family has been here for several generations running family farms. I still have many family members operating family farms in this province. Our province is very valuable to all of the world. I hope our government sees how very important it is to keep things Saskatchewan/Canadian owned.
139.	Thanks for the opportunity to raise my voice.
140.	Grew up on farm. Dad recently retired and sold the land to local neighbor farm.
141.	It's Very frustrating.
142.	We need to keep Saskatchewan farmland in the hands of Saskatchewan farmers. The more removed owners are, the less accountable they are, the less taxes they pay, the less business they do in the province etc. This is a sure fire way to kill our Agriculture industry and in the

	end, we will be the 'serfs' doing the work for subsistence living.
143.	If someone or corporations want to purchase land they should have to farm it for a minimum 5 years. This would stop the overpaying on land as they have to worry about cost of production and now take on real risk.
144.	I would have been a 4th generation farmer but due to some hard decisions and Chinese investors offering good money, my father made the choice to sell
145.	Farmers have been under serviced and over legislated. Farmers have had poor roads, late access the utilities, including the internet and subject to market increases for inputs. Why should we should we subsidize future farmers while we have to pay market value for housing, food, services like assisted living, medical and dental care, and other commodities as we retire. We NEED to get good value for our land. The small farm is extinct. Most of our children are not interested in farming and no other industry worker is expected to subsidize future employees. Farmers are merely foot soldiers in the battle of food production and it is a shame to expect them to continue to be serfs.
146.	Usually these survey don't do anything but cost money prove me wrong !!!
147.	We want to help our children farm and attain ownership in this industry. Large funds are making this near impossible to do
148.	I have farmed since 1999 I have Been active in buying land when times were good and bad, but now I can not compete with outside bidders on land for sale, I am a mixed farm who is raising a family on the family farm.
149.	The most important issue is environmental stewardship of the land. As more land is owned by investors and auctioned off the the highest bidders every 2-4 years with no long term stable leases it becomes very hard for farmers to justify financially taking care of the land with a long term perspective. The best example is Phosphorous fertilization. When a farmer has an unstable lease on a Phosphorous deficient soil (which is 85%+ of farmland in the province) a farmer cannot afford to build phosphorous levels to optimism levels. This is one of the most serious issues agriculture in Sask faces today. With stable rents and owned land farmers can maintain and build fertile, productive soils.
150.	Some argued that we needed to open Saskatchewan land control to other Canadians so we could borrow more. It is a weak argument, to say we want the banks to have more control and ultimate control of the farming operations and food production in our country.
151.	We need to be cautious as keeping land local keeps our costs as civilians reasonable and our ag economy strong. As foreign countries grow in population it becomes more viable to purchase land here, farm it, then sship the production back overseas cutting down on our economic potential.
152.	Farmers should own farmland. If u don't farm don't buy farmland. Keep the family farms and towns and communities stay alive. The bigger the farms the less people in our towns and schools. This is why small communities are dying.
153.	I am a very strong supporter of the Saskatchewan Party and a lifelong conservative and free-

	<p>enterprise thinker. I am very, very concerned about the Government's approach that seems to be pandering to left-wing thinking or at the very least to the narrow interests of farm owners. This is very bad public policy and the Government needs to really be careful. I am was very surprised that Regulations were passed before this review.</p> <p>Be very careful of how this is managed so you do not lose touch with the political values of the Sask Party.</p>
154.	its crazy to have restrictions on one segment of assets... a step back in time
155.	<p>restrictions always lead to other Bigger issues..</p> <p>the owner should be the only person who should decide who buys his/her land..</p>
156.	The farmer in Saskatchewan is a dying breed. It is basically impossibility for a young person to start farming without huge financial backing. A good portion of that would be because they cant afford or never get a chance to buy land.
157.	Farmers who own their land instead of renting will always win in Saskatchewan Agriculture. Renters are just squatters who come and go. and are two examples.
158.	When I was buying land I had to bid against the NDP land bank.It has never been easy to buy a farm and start farming.think the government should stay out of things like this and let a true market value of things take its own coarse.
159.	Land purchases by institutional investors has resulted in the market value of land being significantly above economic value. This is not sustainable in the long run. Institutional investors also by large tracts, making it impossible for local farmers to purchase smaller portions of a unit being sold. There is no long run future in leasing land. A young farmer is far better off purchasing land as soon as possible rather than leasing. Leasing land just wears out equipment and men in the long run. At the end you have nothing. Some foreign investors are just buying farmland to get their money out of their country. They may fully anticipate asset depreciation. 25 cents in Canada may be better than a \$1 in China.
160.	Farming is now a business like all of the things that are part of farming. Machinery, inputs, marketing, mechanical are all businesses and farming is the same. So keeping the land value low because of restricted investment without restrictions to keep the entire operation low I can't support.
161.	Keep Saskatchewan farmland in the hands of the Saskatchewan farmer.
162.	I am pleased that Government has provided a survey. I am hoping that the survey results do inform the decision.
163.	I just really think once we open the door to other investors we have hurt our own people in this province I know a family that does not even know who they sold to 3 years ago. But for the people left on the land beside them it makes it hard. Who fixes fences can you still drive across part of their field to put your crop in on the other side?? Also out small communities suffer taking people away. All I can say is help your own people out please and stop worrying about the outsider. Listen to us that want to be hear for many more generations. Our family ranch has been in our hands since 1883 we have won awards foe how well we have taken care of it such as the Stewardship award so help us keep it going do not cripple us and so many other families in the same place. If you force the price of land up you are hurting the land. People will crop it and stock it to the max and future generations may not have the

	same opportunity.
164.	Why would the farm owner category of the SINP continue given the current climate? It's a waste of government resources. It serves no economic or demographic benefit. Anecdotally I understand it has little success and retention is poor. It also competes with Saskatchewan residents wishing to purchase land. Think about the New York Times comment on the role of sask in the future of the worlds food supply.
165.	we need more farmers not less,restrictions are only make less,do we really want a 1000 farmers owning all the land in Sask.???
166.	I grew up and went to University in Sask, acquired land and invested heavily in Saskatchewan for the last 25 years. We have a cottage there and I travel to the ranch every month. We employ people who would not otherwise be living the lifestyle they enjoy and it has been a good investment for my family. I believe any Canadian should have the right to buy and own land in any province.
167.	From me and other Dutch immigrants it is a lonely province, so spread out, it takes a special type of people to live in the prairies. But we are all a part of Canada and this is my nationality and very proud of it, we are here to protect the Canadian culture.
168.	It is so hard to make a living as a farmer. Everything is so expensive. Land, machinery, inputs. Lower prices when its time to sell your crop. And by the end you are never guaranteed a crop. The family farms care. We care about he hard work we put in, the family life we are providing for our family. The people we are providing food for. If foreign investors and big corporations take over the land who knows where things will lead. Families will be forced to leave the farms because there will be no land to purchase to be able to farm. Please keep the land in the hands of the local farmers that care and just want to make an honest living.
169.	It is VITAL that the farmland of Saskatchewan remains in the hands of farmer-majority owned and operated operations for the well being and security of this province's future in regards to the economics, food production, families, and culture. The current system in place is working well- no need to change this. Canadian citizen owned ONLY, and no pension ownership. Saskatchewan is on a positive growth path in terms of its economy particularly over the last 10 years and securing this issue is key to continue its success, family values and culture.
170.	The more we allow outside ownership of Sask land to others, the more we erode our way of life. Farmers become the workers, and as such do not have the stake they once had in food production. Decisions about how the land is farmed is in the hands of outsiders. once we lose ownership we may never it back.
171.	We're not for sale!!!!
172.	I think as long as farmers can afford to farm the land and increase their land holdings without too much outside influence it is a good thing. I realize the dynamics of farming and the size of the farms is changing and there are enough challenges facing the farming community these days without causing undue hardship through land ownership issues. Sure, there are millions of acres of good agriculture land in this province, however, by opening up land to absentee ownership to trusts, out of province or country interests it will cause more problems to farmers down the road. It is a tough issue to find a balance but the interests of famers and the

province as a whole should be considered as the most important factor before "selling out the farm". Farming is what opened up this province and helped make it the province it is today through all the previous hardships and success of the farming community over the years. Farming is now more of a business than it ever was and with some of the best farm managers you will see anywhere in the world it would a negative factor to have farm ownership opened up that would hinder their current plans for expansion or even the possibility of having to compete with the deep pockets of outside investors.

I realize that if I was a farmer in a position to retire and was selling my land I might express a different opinion. In my personal experience I have seen farmers more than willing to sell to outside investors because they can receive more than the neighbor across the road can pay. Good for them if it puts them in a decent retirement position after years of hard work. On the flipside, I have seen farmers sell to relatives, local interested parties or neighbors at a fair market price and they are quite content with knowing that the buyers will be around to support the local communities. These farmers are more concerned with the long term viability of the local community, as well as the provincial one. Money is not everything to them and they are more likely more financially set that they can afford to do so.

Overall, I personally prefer control by the FLSB as to land ownership and good luck in trying to find a balance in this issue.

173. Keep ownership local. The farmers need to own the land. This will keep farming strong, and encourage young people to start farming. We all need to think about the young people who are trying and want to farm. We need to keep things affordable for them, or there won't be agriculture as we know it in the future.
174. i believe this province needs to focus on the young rural residents. Keep the local family farms going in the province. Don't get greedy by seeing the foreign \$\$\$!!!! The young men and women can prosper in the future, only if outside investors are kept away.
175. The pioneers of this province would not be happy if they knew that multi-national companies and pension plans were buying land driving the price up of the cost of land when the grandchildren and great grandchildren are having to compete with them.
176. Farmers should be the only people who own farmland.
177. Agriculture is big business. Farms are a business. the government made a concerned effort to reduce agricultural support, and as that support has been reduced the health of Canadian agriculture has continued to grow. Farmland is just another step to a healthy and open agricultural sector.
178. Leave it alone. It is not a broken system so don't try to fix it. I think we have bigger fish to fry.
179. I would never invest or advise anyone else to invest in the province of Saskatchewan.
I have lost millions of dollars because of the archaic land laws in Saskatchewan. Just because a foreign investor were to buy land in Saskatchewan, would that land be lost to a local forever? No, of course not. Is a foreign investor going to pack the land up and take it away?? No, of course not. If it were sold to a what do you think? Would it ever be on the market

	again?? No. Look at Southern Alberta.
180.	Sask farmland remains undervalued. The producers who wanted a free market and the elimination of the of the Canadian Wheat Board's monopoly should not now be asking for legislation to shield themselves from an open market in farmland transactions. If you want to play free enterprise then don't expect protectionist legislation if it doesn't suit your own exploitive desires. If you want to buy my farmland I want full price.
181.	Farmers must have the capacity to make a living. Outside investment occurs for the purpose of making a profit for the investor REGARDLESS of the capacity of the farmer to make a living. When we get a succession of drought years, the truth about outside investment will be revealed.
182.	I'm glad this is being looked into but I hope that the process protects the farmer and not favour big corporations who have the money to buy what or who they want. Thank you.
183.	keep it local there is plenty of local owners willing to buy the land we do not need foreign investments
184.	If you let foreign money come into Canada which it already has somehow to buy land the Sask family farm will not exist big corporate farms will try to farm it which doesn't work ie: one earth, wig more, broadacre the only ones that can is family farms cause they care about land and are passionate about the Ag industry and it succeeding. The only reason people can afford to pay the 1000 ac plus is because interest rates are at an all time low if they rise that land will be for sale again.
185.	Saskatchewan land for Saskatchewan people. Sharecropping is not an option
186.	It scares me that farmers have to compete with massive pension funds. Even if there is a cap, a young farmer has to secure financing, etc and a big fund just writes a cheque. Most farmers that are selling obviously want to maximize their profit but most farmers want it to stay as farm land and help out the young ones. Even if it means less money.
187.	I don't think wall will listen to anything the people have to say anyway he will do what he wants
188.	are purchasing land, who next, the ? Soon they will be requesting work visas to let the or whoever come over and work the land, command their own box cars and load their own trains and ship their own grain overseas? This is wholesale selling of Canada to foreigners. First be a Canadian, then follow the route all others have to be farmers or own land, finance through our local institutions or Govt. programs. Its just greed and the possibility of higher prices through foreign sales that is behind all this. Money is always the underlying issue and man's inevitable greed to get it. Please do not sell Sask. down the tube, you will regret it years from now.
189.	1) We do not need foreign ownership of farmland in Saskatchewan. 2) No to foreign governments or foreign government backed companies owning anything Canadian. 3) I have no problem with a non-resident of Canada inheriting farmland from a Canadian. This would be a small drop in the bucket.
190.	please no foreign ownership of they want to move to Canada and get a citizenship here and

	<p>buy land ,like my grandparent that's fine. However selling direct to some government to start a potash mine and not have no business plan or intention in place is wrong. Hope it turns out CANADIAN LAND FOR CANADIAN CITIEZENS THANKS</p>
191.	<p>If we keep going the way we are today there will be no farmers left in Saskatchewan. All the land will be swallowed up by who ever (lets just say the Chinese) we will be working for them and we all know where that grain would end up going as well. Not a bad thing it would go over there if we sold it to them but that's not going to be the case.</p>
192.	<p>I am very pleased to see the Sk govt listening to farmers and residents of Sask about this issue. Land is valuable but having prices jump by 3 to 4 the assessed price is not a sustainable model. Farm land should primarily be owned by active farmers with limited amount of v ownership to non Sask and Canadian residents.</p> <p>Cash purchases esp from China need to be investigated fir money laundry.</p> <p>I am also pleased about the govt halting the purchase by large Pension funds.</p> <p>As one old farmer I heard say "our fore father's came hear from Europe because land was owned by the very rich (similar to corporations today) which did not allow average people to own land, and now with in 100 years farm land ownership has gone from the farmer back to the corporation. It's just liked the European feudal system.</p>
193.	<p>This is one area where I believe it should only belong to those that get their fingers dirty working it.</p> <p>We farmers know what the land is worth and what we will pay to own it.</p> <p>I don't need to be competing with someone with pockets full of cash, only to go broke after trying to match or beat their bids.</p> <p>If you want the best farmers to survive out here, and guarantee our own food supply, you better keep us on the land for our country's best interests.</p>
194.	<p>We bought here in 2009 our land we paid \$53,000 a quarter</p> <p>2015 land sold in our area like less then one mile from us for 126,000 quarter buy a guy that has declared bankruptcy and Chinese have helped him buy it. It was 36 quarters. How can we get land here we can't we are again old wives lake and it will never make more healthy land as that's salt water and nasty land.</p>
195.	<p>A free market does non exist if it involves some billionaire who has lobbied "bribed" some politicians to write the rules in his favour such that he pays none of the taxes the rest of us pay. That's the "free" market participants who will eventually own the land and spend NONE of their profits here. It's all about black money to politicians.</p>
196.	<p>It is in the peoples of Saskatchewan best interest ownership of this resource remains as close to Saskatchewan as possible</p>
197.	<p>I moved back to Saskatchewan from the US because of the opportunity to purchase land in Saskatchewan at a value that was more affordable than Montana, however some of the large operations I have experienced in the US and in Canada that are owned by outside investors</p>

	also present opportunity for specialized employment and but reduce the opportunity for an individual starting out to build to any size. However, at half of our current size or double our current size, identifying profitable opportunities is the key to encouraging the next generation especially with access to low/stable interest loans.
198.	All the farmers I know and whom I work and associate with are growing old. We need to ensure that there is a program in place to ensure that the next generation of farmers are able to come into agriculture and that they are Saskatchewan residents. If this needs to be a government guarantee to the banks and credit unions for the first few years that the new farmer is involved in the industry that would be worthwhile. Some of the farmers I know are in their 70's and they can't keep doing this forever. I also think it would be most favourable for farmers if we had a restriction on the individual size of farms. This way more people can get involved in farming and it may restrict the sheer size of corporate farms that is detrimental to the ability of young and expanding farmers trying to buy land.
199.	This review seems to me to be about caving in to the demands of very large farmers who wish to dominate the landscape, the small to moderate size farms are expected to take less for their land so that these mega farmers can gobble up some more land. Completely unacceptable socialist idea. What would urban people say if they were not allowed to sell their house to the highest bidder ? It is discriminatory and ridiculous.
200.	Without the ownership of farmland in the future there will be no farmers, only agricultural businesses.
201.	the and the Canada pension plan is the big ones it should be Sask citizens only and that are farmers own land only
202.	I feel the land should be owner by Saskatchewan people that have a direct connection to the land. Either by farming it themselves, family , inheritance, some connection . I also believe are are enjoying an upswing in the agricultural economy . An adjustment is coming . Nature has a way of dealing with us to keep us humble. Right now i am sitting in a tractor seeding at a rate of 40 acres per hour, we have about 3000 acres left to seed. My son and his family

	<p>moved from a job as an Engineer in Saskatoon, his wife has her Phd, they moved here to farm because of the way life and the personal rewards you don't get working for someone else. Leasing and corporate farms can't provide that! He was able to do this because several years ago the land prices were more reasonable. Today? I don't know.</p>
203.	The sale of my farmland is my retirement package, and I don't want it controlled. I feel that most other industries or businesses are not controlled.
204.	We have taken over the family farm and have struggled for many years. Things are getting better now (fair prices) and the lease payments are going up a lot. The price of the land has risen to the point we probably will not be able to buy. We will probably continue to lease and throw money away. Making those payments to a fairly priced land purchase would make more sense. lease keep farming in Canada. Give us (farmers) a chance.
205.	Support Canadian ownership but not foreign
206.	Please be very firm to maintain Canadian ownership of land. Once we lose control, there is a substantial risk to negative results.
207.	Increasing foreign ownership for purely the economic benefit of the province is going to force local farmers out of the picture. I don't mean 3000 acre local farmers that won't survive anyway I mean 10,000 acre local farmers that want to continue to expand over time to cover the rising costs of inputs and equipment.
208.	I should not be restricted to whoever wants to buy my land.
209.	I think there should be limits of farm size operated (4000 acres per operator would make for a healthier rural economy!!!
210.	<p>Why would the government want to sell the heart and soul of Saskatchewan " Prairie Farmland " to others with interests tied only to money ? Don't do as BC and Ontario has done and have no restrictions ! Once the land is lost it will never be available to lower or middle class Saskatchewan farmers wanting to farm . Most I spoke with do not want foreign investors owning large amounts of SK land. It is interesting Lane Reality is not in favor of changing the rules. However ,Is the government proposing to make the ownership rules tougher on corporations, trust funds and investors with or without foreign interests? if yes I agree.</p>
211.	I don't think drawing the line at pension funds makes sense. At least if these funds buy land we as farmers get the option to lease it back. There are many other large buyers of farmland

that will out compete local producers that will take control of the land and farm it themselves using cheap labour. Some examples would be Hutterite colonies (this being the biggest and the largest threat in saskatchewan) these colonies have masses of people and money and have been expanding here like crazy. They do not support local communities the same way traditional farming operations would. Ex. Don't go to schools, don't participate in local sports and activities, compete with local grocery stores, etc. The next are very large farms using cheap foreign workers some examples are , Alberta farmers expanding into sask. Some very large established sask family farming companies at 20000 acres plus. And then there are many large individual investors buying here ex. . Point is shutting down the pension funds will make no difference to farmland values and it might even make it easier for some of these others buyers to get it, who are not local family farms. If the government wants to limit investment in farmland here they need to limit it for all these investors ESPECIALLY . Or leave the rules alone and let business carry on here. I don't think anyone will disagree with keeping foreigners out of sask farm land

212. I believe any individual Canadian citizen or landed immigrant should be able to buy farmland as long as they are not doing this on behalf of an investment company. Corporations that are actively involved in farming should be allowed to purchase farmland.

I don't believe foreign individuals should be allowed. I also do not believe non farm corporations should be allowed to buy farmland. This would include investment and pension funds regardless of how they are structured.

213. Saskatchewan farmland is permanent resource, and should be protected in the most absolute way possible. It is the only resource that will be here forever if we protect it and treat it properly. all other resources in the province are finite, except for wind and sun (and that is not a joke)!

214. Please do not allow foreign interests to buy up our province.

Please do not allow corporations or pension plans etc. from within Canada buy up our province. We have something great, save it for us. Agriculture will thrive and our province will thrive will new farmers with pride of ownership in their land and their own success at heart.

215. The are the biggest threat to our operation and expansion. If the government wants to limit purchases this is where they should start. There are well over 70 colonies in sask and at an avg of say 15000 acres that's well over a million acres. They have a huge pool of money and labour to draw from. We have tried to expand and bid on 2 different farms both of which were sold to at what was deemed to be uneconomical values to the local farmers. The government needs to stop this expansion if they want to preserve the tradition of sask farm families owning and farming the land.

216. Personally i think foreign buying should be put to a halt. Its to the point where us young farmers cant even get a head start due to ridiculous rent/acre. I'm a young farmer trying to get a hard start and am starting to second guess it. At 40.00/acre its extremely hard to get a head start on things to build up some money to purchase equipment, chemical, fertilizer, pay off loans etc. I strongly believe there enough young farmers with the knowledge to start up their own farm once our current generation is gone. It would be nice to see some steps being taken towards benefiting us Saskatchewan farmers first before letting foreign come over in which they ask ridiculous amount for.

217.	Spring, Summer and Fall living part time on the farm so the above question needs to be understood that my mail is in the city.
218.	We need more farmers, not investors. The last generation of farmers has left a huge gap (not enough farmers). And that's why this land debate is occurring. The answer to the entire situation is to have more and more youth start farming. Then in a few generations there will still be farmers. This will keep ownership local and sustainable for a better Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan is not for sale, but our produce is. More farmers and farm owners, less investors.
219.	Sure wish the rules would have never changed and I could have afforded to invest in my future of farming/ranching. Same goes for many other younger guys in my area.
220.	<p>Farmed all my life, my Grandpa, Dad and now my sons are farming. Finished seeding yesterday.</p> <p>With some of the hardships that go with farming which are mostly weather related, too wet, too dry, too cold, too hot, too much wind, or not enough wind, there is great satisfaction seeing the land turn green with newly emerging crops. Young people need a chance to buy land or rent land.</p> <p>So I guess, if someone wants to purchase Sask farmland they should live in Canada, all shareholders of the company, and no fund buying</p>
221.	Farm land ownership should remain owned by farming families that were born and raised in Saskatchewan. We have to keep tradition so that younger generations (such as myself) can take over the family farm without financially hurting. Farming is a lifestyle for our family.
222.	Think I've pretty much said it! I'm not in favour of too much red tape and Weighty Gov't! I think we need to trim the fat re administration by about 90 % and get people back to work in active life styles. May we should reward people who clock in a two mile walk a day! That would revolutionize the health care system but cutting its costs by at least 75%! Sure would tick off the pharmaceutical companies! There u go! Take a shot at those guys! Now there's a money making venture for u! All protected by gov't and lies! Just what the Dr.' S are trained to order'!
223.	I live here, pay all taxes here, and would really appreciate the opportunity to grow my farm here.
224.	<p>Let's not get romantic about this. I grew up on a farm and I own farmland. But this is an investment like any other.</p> <p>A free and open market for farmland will be in the best interests of Saskatchewan. Costs for farmers to purchase or lease will be determined by supply and demand not government intervention and regulation.</p>
225.	the size of farms in this province have been increasing from the time of homesteading on . this in my opinion is the biggest contributing factor in the death of small town sask. The cities seem to increase in size at a great rate while the small towns shrink . I feel that the only way to keep the province as strong as we can is by not allowing a few farmers and investors grow so huge that the community is hurt or dies only for the benefit of the few or people that are not from here.one could say that right now the increase of cash land values is propionate to the

	number of farmers that are not farming anymore. we need as a province to get more people on the farm restricting the amount of land one entity can own and keeping the loop holes closed is the only way i can see this happen. The government has the responsibility to protect all the people in the province from the greed of the well to do or the few that think size matters
226.	Keep Saskatchewan owned by Saskatchewan people.
227.	I think the young farmers coming up need a change. So does agriculture. It's going to be extremely important one day and to sell our land to foreign investors if a food shortage ever happened we wouldn't have rights to that food grown on Canadian soil. We need to protect ourselves.
228.	Outside investment is good for growth, rural sask, will continue to grow please do not restrict farmland.
229.	There are many more investors that own farmland in Saskatchewan that are from outside of Canada then the government of Saskatchewan knows
230.	Our farm is located within a town - the council has designate the land as FARM LAND within the town. I assume it is an attempt to encourage environmental gains and URBAN appreciation of farming ??
231.	Good government does not usually focus on a specific asset class in an otherwise free marketplace. Any restrictions most certainly impact the normal arms-length transfer of assets and unfairly impacts a certain group who have legitimately acquired assets. Transfer of wealth by limiting potential competition and price of the asset just seems to be philosophically wrong in a normally strong and vibrant democratic jurisdiction.
232.	The price of farmland has grown too quickly because of all the loop holes. We Canadians have to be afforded an opportunity to be able to keep the family farms. With all this big ownership it is growing beyond our means to continue, therefore we will have no option other than sell for a big price and get out of the province as the conglomerates take control of everything and sell our crops back to their homelands when we need the option to be able to feed ourselves first.
233.	I started farming when I was 18 I am now 32 worked full time at various jobs till now, I am taking over more of the farm as my parents wanna slow down. If farm land was valued of what it is now when I first started farming I probably wouldn't have got into it. I know land was under valued then. I can handle paying double of what it was 10 years ago but not 3-4 times as it is now. It is hard to buy equipment to farm mostly rented land because you never know what is going to be happening in a few years when the contract is up on the leased land, are they wanting to sell it to someone else, or lease it to someone else that offered them a dollar more. What if you loose the land lease and you have sell the machinery off and exit farming because the land you were renting is gone. Investors only care about making money they aren't out there to help others out and don't care about loyalty. There money only helps the people wanting to sell out and possibly leave rural community's, when the land owners live out of province or out of country the rental money leaves this province. The money should stay in this province and it benefits everyone who lives here.
234.	As in all things, we must strike the right balance between allowing for competition and the free market to operate with a particular oversight over a natural resource with a monetary

	<p>value in the tens of billions, but more importantly, with a social and profitable industry driver value that cannot truly be estimated. Private local farmland ownership opportunities drive the profit motive in a part of the economy that cannot be underestimated. This is especially true as we observe current economic drivers, (low oil and gas prices), and juxtapose that with the reliable predictable economic driver that is primary agriculture, I would estimate that primary producers have put an \$8B investment into the 2015 SK crop thus far, and importantly, done it as the good stewards that only owner/operators who have a balanced profit motive approach can truly do, year in year out, regardless of whether it is too hot, too cold, too wet or too dry. That is the part of the equation we cannot allow to be messed up by getting farmland ownership changes wrong. In summary, the reason the folks who currently own / work the land are successful is partly because they actually live here, and have skin in the game, we should encourage a new crop of owner / operators to step up and share in that opportunity, as long as they come here to be a part of it. That is the formula for success and one we are well advised to continue following.</p>
235.	<p>Local ownership means profits from the land will stay within the province, get spent here and go towards future generations of Saskatchewan residents.</p> <p>Foreign ownership would mean profits would leave the province, and foreign owners have no care for being stewards of the land or being good rural community citizens and supporters of rural communities.</p>
236.	<p>If you want to have a healthy younger generation, be involved in agriculture, you have to give them the chance to get started. The best way is for them to have the chance to invest in the land. When you own land, you have better farm management and land stewardship of the land.</p> <p>I was asked years ago. ARE YOU A FARMER OR A MINER???? A farmer cares for the land and ensures its viability for the next generations to come. A "MINER" strips the land for all that it is worth, leaving a barren waste land. Only looking for the profit for the day. That would be "foreign" or "corporate" ownership!!!!</p>
237.	<p>Farm land is important to Saskatchewan farmers. Foreign ownership has a disconnect to the meaning and history of the land. A reminder as what I said earlier, Land and Water are the future of this province and Western Canada. We need to maintain control. We have sold off enough of our country to foreigners without restrictions.</p>
238.	<p>Our Family is very large, and not all who wanted to farm, had the option or chance to farm. Although I mostly just "hobby" farm now, the goal is to one day be able to farm full time.</p>
239.	<p>Grew up on farm and live in Swift Current now but drive home to Lancer/Portreeve to farm with my brother dad and uncle. Prices make it impossible to only farm and left for different job opportunities but want to expand into ownership of land eventually</p>
240.	<p>As stated before, Saskatchewan farm land needs to be owned by Saskatchewan farmers! No one else is better for the land and better for Saskatchewan. The more control you take away from the farmer the more you destabilize farming and the harder it will be for young families, and the future of farming!</p>
241.	<p>Farming for young generations is almost lost already!</p>

242.	As I stated in an earlier comment. I am against all foreign ownership in our province. I believe that we have enough capable farmers and ranchers in this province to look after the land we have. I strongly believe that foreign investors are wanting to invest here to make a profit and do not contribute to communities, schools etc. Please leave things alone and keep the land in Saskatchewan hands. Thank you for asking our opinions.
243.	I'm from Nokomis Saskatchewan but there's no way to verify where any ones from, same as current ownership rules, tighten them up
244.	We do not want to turn the history clock back and make the farmers of Saskatchewan just farm labourers. One just has to look at history to see why this country was settled. It was so they could own their own land and not have to work for rich landlords. We have seen vast improvements in farming methods and innovations because one can own their own land and make these improvements in order to provide themselves with personal benefits. Ownership by local landowners let them make decisions that benefit themselves, the community, the province and the country they live in. We will not see this if the landowners live in the US, China or some other country.
245.	Rules need to be in place for ownership or else it may become unsustainable for farmers to continue to purchase land. This could also lead to lease increases which would hurt farmers bottom lines significantly.
246.	It is important that Saskatchewan farmers and it's people stay in Control of our land and decisions about them and there uses.
247.	Farmland ownership is a key part of succession planning for any farm in the province. In allowing outside investors to purchase land, this removes potential equity opportunities for existing and growing farm businesses. Farming is a long term business, and the risks and rewards are high. Meaningful equity cannot be built in the equipment, so it needs to be built in the land. If the farmer cannot access and own the land he/she farms, their potential to build equity and long term sustainability is greatly diminished.
248.	I am interested in the return of small scale farmers...not so concerned about newcomers who have become Saskatchewan residents but concerned about large corporations taking over farming in SK, especially foreign ownership.
249.	Don't sell out because of the \$. Have some pride in being from Saskatchewan, and having a rich farming, and small community life. Even selling out to the Albertans isn't a great idea. There is something about being from Saskatchewan and that changes as you go west. Don't make our province like Vancouver, where the average person can't even buy land or a house. That's where we are headed if we let non Canadians, and non Saskatchewan residence buy us out. Thx Good idea to do a survey. Hope you get lots of response.
250.	As well as preserving the traditions of the farm and of Saskatchewan, i strongly believe that going forward we need to preserve and invest in Rural Saskatchewan as this government has done. Allowing foreign investment reduces local ownership and therefore could reduce interest in the local communities, which are somewhat already struggling to survive.
251.	Current legislation has already facilitated a great reduction in the number of people involved in farming as primary producers. Any relaxation of regulations will only further reduce the

	number of people involved in agriculture as decision making, primary producers and further reduce the general population's connection to the land.
252.	biggest problem foreign money buying land paying ridiculous amount of money a farmer would never in their life time make back by farming. Another problem government giving the natives endless money to buy land that they have no intention of farming and all rented out or goes back to weeds. Large corporate farms are a night mare absolutely destroy the roads with over weight trucks pay no taxes because farming reserve land, have no respect for local neighbours land.
253.	Please do not make farm ownership laws any more relaxed. I think land values have increased enough and should not go any higher. If they went down a small percentage it would be fine with me.
254.	Farm prices have gotten out of control and should not be traded as investment tools by non-Canadians or corporations/pension funds. Saskatchewan farmland should be owned and farmed by Saskatchewan farmers.
255.	The value
256.	Farm land ownership laws have benefited Sask residents I believe. Opening it up and or allowing large interests such as pension funds to invest will eventually reduce the potential of ownership for local people. The ownership of land is why our forefathers came here, fatigued by working for absentee land owners themselves.
257.	Without personal ownership we will lose a significant number of our top young farmers because without ownership there is very little incentive to remain in this industry!
258.	DO NOT impose to many restrictions
259.	In all the talk about farmland ownership, we are forgetting that rural people (like anyone) need community to thrive. When farm land is owned by people not living or part of the local community it makes farmers more and more sparse. Farmers benefit from having neighbours, allowing for partnerships, friendships and other working relationships. When more and more farmland is bought up by people not wishing to live in the community it breaks the local community down, resulting in smaller and smaller communities with poorer and poorer services.
260.	I have always believed that farmland should be owned by farmers only whether they actively farm or rent to other farmers. Currently, farmer's ability to pass farms to their children has been severely compromised by allowing other people to drive up the price of farmland to levels that young people can no longer afford, forcing sales to people who have no association or commitment to the land. A country or province that gives up ownership of its land to those who see it as nothing more than a vehicle for making money other than its value as a productive unit to someone who has a feel for the land is playing a dangerous game with the future of its residents.
261.	In general the farmland ownership laws need to be restricted more allowing only Saskatchewan residents to buy Saskatchewan farmland. If this does not occur our great farming tradition runs the risk of being lost, of Saskatchewan farm families being replaced by corporate farms. This would truly spell the end of the rural communities residents take great pride in.

262.	Please help keep the tradition of farmers owning the land and keep owning land a realistic hope for young farmers.
263.	<p>Farm land ownership has more to it than just the name on the title. By relaxing the rules of ownership farmland values have doubled in my area. Land is no longer affordable. But that is not the only impact, by removing ownership, rules you have also put another nail in the coffin for rural Saskatchewan. Pension funds, foreign investors do not care about local rinks, schools, churches etc. the only thing that they care about it ROI.</p> <p>Writing the cheque is the easy part of farming. The hard part is the work. In this area some land that I farm has changed hands 4 times in less than 10 years. This does not provide any continuity to a farming operation.</p>
264.	<p>there is a bright and strong future for our young farmers in this province and it is imperative hat action be taken by government NOW!</p> <p>Hundreds of thousands of acres of farm land has been sold off in this province that may never be locally owned ! The future of SK Agriculture depends on the outcome of the decisions made in the near future!</p> <p>PLEASE DONT LET US DOWN!!</p>
265.	Leave the farm land to the Saskatchewan residents!
266.	I hope you receive lots of submissions in support of strengthening the security board's power. There is only so much land. If we loose control now we will never get it back to true Saskatchewan farmers.
267.	As a young farmer trying to grow my farming operation Its very hard to compete with pension plans and so on. The investors have driven the price of farm land up so high It is unaffordable for the Farmer. They are killing rural Saskatchewan. I hope the government wakes up and makes some changes before Saskatchewan is the new China. We cant make more farm land so let the people of Saskatchewan own it.
268.	In my case a mortgage that equals \$1,200.00 is my breaking point for me to afford land.
269.	<p>This survey does not address the economic impact that investment in Saskatchewan has on the entire economy. The average citizen or average farmer does not have the knowledge and this survey has not addressed the positive impact investment in Saskatchewan has. Their instinct will be that lower land prices would benefit Saskatchewan farmers more. However they will miss the benefit that an open market would mean to the equity of current farmers and in turn the economic spin off that comes with it. RESTRICTING THE BUYERS OF FARMLAND IN SASKATCHEWAN WILL ONLY BENEFIT THE SMALL FARMERS. The small farmers that struggle to buy a quarter or two likely will not survive long term anyway in the ag industry with increasing costs of inputs, machinery, etc... AN OPEN MARKET INCREASES THE EQUITY OF OUR CURRENT LANDOWNERS. Those retiring farmer will have the ability to sell at a higher price and will turn around and buy more expensive houses in town, cars, recreational property, etc...</p>
270.	Remember this: The government was given the responsibility to ensure our lands/resources are not destroyed by any means including chemical. They are in breach of office and breach of oath to allow the destruction of our lands/resources. Criminal acts under the criminal code.

271.	Please don't sell the goose that gave us the gold.....we have nearly half the farmable land in the country let's guard that resource for future generations.
272.	It is time to change things up. We should let some of these investors buy up the community/PFRA pasture land first, BUT they may not with all the restrictions placed on that pasture land. Life changes you either adapt or are run over by father time and his old 4 wheel drive. Technology has done way more for allowing farmers to farm more land and I expect these technological changes will continue. Can we stop technology? No can we stop changes in land ownership NO Not sure we would remain competitive in the world market if we did stop these changes.
273.	Time for the govt to stop controlling the free market. Socialist ideology is a thing of the past, agriculture has advanced, the farmers have changed and the market should dictate price. No need for a political appointed farm security board and less regulations. Seriously, is this the Blakeney Govt and the days of the land bank!
274.	Quit being a bunch of and do the right thing.
275.	Let the market decide what land is worth. Only the foreign ownership should be of concern. No issue with farmers renting if non-farmers buy. Not sure why we would limit the buyer and who that would benefit other than the farmer. That is not an open market.
276.	This is a very emotional issue. I think the most compelling argument is the one I outlined above - namely that current generations of youth who grow up in the city (the majority of our youth) are being precluded from owning farmland because of the pension plan restriction.
277.	I saw 80% of the kids I went to school with move away from the farm because Canadian farmers couldn't compete with the Treasuries of the US and Europe with their price war. We can compete with the world's other farmers but it is unrealistic to think that the strength of Investment Companies or Pension funds are on the same level as us. When they are allowed to dictate the new "fair" investment prices of land, more owners will be given the "privilege" to become tenants or leave the industry and rural life.
278.	Ownership has a direct impact on land stewardship and on control of production supply.
279.	As a young farmer I cannot compete with foreign money or investment money. I cant make long term projections with leased land.
280.	Keep young farmers or you wont have any. with land prices being what they are you will not have any
281.	Alberta resident farming in sask
282.	Ownership should be with the producer. I know that is not always possible but should be the first consideration.
283.	We need to ensure that young farmers are able to purchase farmland at an affordable price. It is important to keep young people and increase the population in the rural areas in order to provide a tax base for schools, municipalities, etc. Most Saskatchewanians' emigrated to Canada in order to escape the poverty and restrictions of tenant farming. We must avoid replicating this situation in Saskatchewan and ensure that Saskatchewan people own Saskatchewan farmland. I have no issue with people wanting to buy farmland in the province, but I do have a problem with absentee landlords. If people want to own farmland here, move

	to the province and contribute to SK economically and socially.
284.	We need to make rules that help keep rural Saskatchewan strong, with people living here. Keep the farms in the hands of Saskatchewan farmers and residents.
285.	The price of farmland has risen because of farmers expanding. There is no need for farmers to compete with pension corporations who have unlimited amounts of other people's money, and if things do go bad the fund managers just walk away with no PERSONAL risk at all. this is the farmers livelihood we're talking about.
286.	let the market place work. govt doesn't control inputs etc and they shouldn't interfere with this real estate transaction
287.	The majority of my farm is in a limited company and hope to put it in a family trust, and eventually rent it to neighbours.
288.	Saskatchewan has a good thing going in the Ag Industry.... It should remain a Saskatchewan industry operated by Saskatchewan people... (And I don't mean renting or leasing land back from any outsiders or foreigners)...
289.	As a 27 year old farmer trying to make a living at something I truly love, it's very disheartening to see lands you've worked your whole life ripped from your hands by somebody/group with far deeper pockets than you just because they can make a quick buck
290.	There are many uncontrolled factors in farming, such as weather conditions, fluctuating markets, etc. I would be glad if there were more reliable transport to enable the farmers to get their grain to port.
291.	Locally owned farm operations contribute to a healthy rural economy. Where family operations are involved the rural town does better as well
292.	I have made my thoughts apparent within this survey. The last part of a front (Canadian) creating ownership for a foreign interest is a major immediate concern. Rules and intent are circumvented this way and are doing harm. The funds they present move land values up and the true market value is not realized. This needs to be addressed immediately.
293.	Farmers should have the chance to afford to buy land and not have to compete with companies that are just after more money and no interest in looking after the land
294.	The owner of farmland should have the same right to sell there land to anyone they want to. Or people owning houses in town and city's should also not be allowed to sell to anyone other then other Saskatchewan residents
295.	I am the largest land owner in RM
296.	Many of our resources have been developed by foreign funds Eg.Oil,Potash etc. we DO NOT NEED THE SAME THING HAPPENING WITH FARM LAND.
297.	I appreciate being able to express my views and please try to keep FARMERS owning the land.
298.	Keep Saskatchewan Saskatchewan owned for our children and our children's children.
299.	I have no problem with some foreign ownership. They must live here!

300.	My 2 Great-Grandfathers came to Canada from Europe (Germany then Poland then Russia) because no matter where they went they could only be peasant farmers for wealthy land owners who took all the profits. Why would I want this to happen again to our young people!
301.	We are blessed with rich land in a beautiful province / country, let's do our best to manage it properly so it stays that way or even improves for the coming generations of Canadians. Let's also make sure we remain owners of our own land ! Thank you for taking the time to consult with the people who are / will be the most affected by those decisions - definitely a good Canadian approach.
302.	I believe farmland is one of our provinces greatest treasures and should be protected and persevered for the people and families who depend on this dirt to support ourselves and our families. it should be put up for auction for highest bidder who may not have the best intentions in mind for our province
303.	One of the things we learn from history is that we don't learn from history. Large tract ownership was practiced, often by absentee landlords, in many areas of Europe - - - it didn't really work. When the lands in Western Canada and those in Montana, North and South Dakotas (with some other states) were opened there were also developed a notable number of very large farms, some of which were even larger than 25 000 acres. It is fascinating to me that none of those large farms in the Northern Plains in North America which were operated in the time from the 1880's til the 19teens survived.. Today we have again developed farms where that 25 000 acre line has been crossed. Looking at these operations one might think that things go quite well, often because of size efficiencies. What is not so obvious is that once one passes a threshold, in my opinion somewhere between 2 and 5 thousand acres, depending upon the location and type and skill of the operator, the ability to truly work with the land disappears. Large acreages tend to be homogenized in their usage. Somehow the land just isn't homogenized and so results decline. (Labor also starts to become an issue - - - but then we do want to import serfs - - - don't we?)
304.	Go to google and put in farms . I am that type of farmer I enjoy healthy food that has a taste Most people have lost there trust in Corporate Canada or U.S.A
305.	Our young people are interested in agriculture .. farm ownership is nb. we should not take that opportunity away from future generations Once pension plans own land and or foreign investors. Our children will never get it back. Sask will be a have not province once again!
306.	Allowing investors to own land instead of farmers is a bad thing in many ways. It is surprising to me that an asset such as land is ever sold. There is no better long term security than land. It seems most people have forgotten why there ancestors came to Saskatchewan in the first place. Farmers should have taught there kids some family history.
307.	please stop the loss of smaller individual farms
308.	That Globe and Mail article I pasted in earlier was informative, sorry if it was kinda long, but it backs up what I've experienced in selling land . MaxCrop should be investigated in-depth ,

	knowing what I know now , I would not have done it .
309.	I think that only sask residents should be allowed to own the land. If it keeps going the way it is young farmers will be crop shares like in the 30's in the states will all the profits going to a few very rich people while the farmer remains trapped. Also non amortized loans shouldn't be allowed because it allows for the renter to be a slave to the bank indefinitely.
310.	Large investment funds or other large enterprises with unlimited resources see a sector where they can make large capital gains . Local farmers can't compete.
311.	Foreign and corporate investment has screwed up the whole land value in Sask for the family farm a and made it very difficult for local young farmers to farm
312.	I have been very frustrated in the last several years as I have been trying to expand my farm. In the last 10 to 15 the value of land here has easily tripled. How am I supposed to compete with Alberta oil millionaires in a bidding war? If any land can be found for sale, I have to offer much more than it should be worth to even have a chance. And now, I am faced with having to bid against the CPP, essentially being forced to finance my competition!?!?! The situation has gone from frustrating to infuriating. Sask land should be owned by Sask residents. Period.
313.	Again, as I stated in previous comments. To own land in Saskatchewan, you should have to be a Saskatchewan resident like it used to be. Land has already inflated to the point that it will no longer pay for itself. If it was not for the fact that we run a generation ranch and purchased land before the insanely over inflated land prices, we would not be in business today.
314.	As a farmer and farmland owner I believe no other resident in Saskatchewan or Canada has the right to add to this survey. Thanks for your opinion but as the primary stakeholder in this argument it should be left to each individual farmer and farmland owner to decide.
315.	The land I own was homesteaded before 1900 by my late husband's family. I would prefer that it stay in the family but, of course, it soon won't be my decision. On the whole I feel that the interests of Sask. rural people are best served by the land remaining in the ownership of Sask. residents.
316.	When investors or corporations purchase farmland, the communities will suffer as population decreases in the rural areas. Depopulation of rural areas is having an effect on communities for the last 25 years and its effects are very visible now, further depopulation will make this problem larger.
317.	If the young farmers are to have a future, the land changing hands must be purchased by people that will be actively farming it.
318.	I believe Huterites are at an unfair advantage over other farmers. Level the playing field give all farmers the same advantages they enjoy. We also don't benefit from plant breeders rights. We don't need to buy seed every year buy chemical and pay royalties on the grain we would produce.
319.	Current land owners have seen a significant increase on their land values over the past

	<p>decade under the current rules, and most current landowners have received a considerable return on their land investment. This is with the current ownership rules. To open up the land ownership restrictions further will certainly result in more foreign investment, and fewer Saskatchewan residents owning land to the detriment of the next generation of farmers.</p> <p>Young farmers do not need additional groups of investors bidding up farmland values in this province on the basis of speculation to the point where it's just not economical for farmers to purchase and cash flow land.</p> <p>Existing landowners have done very well in recent years, even under the current land ownership rules, and I don't see any valid reason to open up the market to foreign investors or pension plans, other than to boost land values to the benefit of current landowners.</p>
320.	<p>Future land purchases must be allowable only for those Canadian citizens who will be actively farming the land. The future of our young farmers depends on it.</p>
321.	<p>You need a residency category for Canadian, living in Canada, and who has lived in other countries.</p> <p>Farming is treated as a unique business by many international organizations and governments through tax laws, trade agreements and other economic measurements. This isn't about producing the cheapest t shirt to maximize shareholder value, it is about food.</p>
322.	<p>if the government doesn't start taking responsibility for our farmland. The future is doomed.</p>
323.	<p>Keep farmland in the hands of farmers</p>
324.	<p>Farmland ownership is key to keeping a direct connection to the land a being a good steward of the land. Being a good steward of the land is part of making agriculture sustainable. Sustainable agriculture is good for the Saskatchewan economy. If the Saskatchewan economy is strong that is good for everyone who lives here. Renting or leasing farmland is no different than renting or leasing a car and no-one treats a rented car the same as a car they own themselves.</p>
325.	<p>I have many more thoughts on this issue that I would like to share personally with someone one on one, but what it comes down to it is my land and if I find a buyer whom I am happy to sell to why should the government dictate who this is. ITS MY LAND DO WE NOT LIVE IN A DEMOCRATIC COUNTRY</p>
326.	<p>Farming is a risky business. Historically, I feel some of the stability has been provided in land ownership for individual farmers. I'm not saying that cannot change, but again in conversations with my accountant, the current business models of many farms are heavily leveraged and exposed to more risk than years ago. The ag industry in SK will not benefit from multiple operations folding in a short period of time should a drop in profitability occur that cannot be weathered short term.</p>
327.	<p>Resident farmers owning their own moderately sized farms have been key to the strength of</p>

	Saskatchewan society and economic well-being since 1905. Regulation preventing non-resident and non farmers from owning land is crucial to maintaining the vitality and health of rural communities.
328.	We also have concerns regarding absentee owners and their impact on rural communities. Further, we have concerns that absentee owners may not monitor those who lease their land and that negative environmental and aesthetic matters may arise.
329.	This survey is a scam - an imprecise tool the Sask Party will use to justify any desired act. Why not ask the people the Government is meant to serve, the people of Saskatchewan?instead of a survey any global citizen (or machine) can take.
330.	If you do not reverse the changes made to farmland ownership, the government will go down as the government that killed Rural farming and brought back tithe farming. (And I voted for Wayne Elhard, still would) but please hear what the farmers and ranchers are saying. We do what we do for the love of it, but we need it possible for us to do it.
331.	<p>Cities often require that neighborhoods be mixed with high end housing and rental accommodations to ensure that their is a lower chance of a "slum" area developing where large numbers of low income families are located resulting in numerous negative social effects.</p> <p>By allow easy access to Saskatchewan land by non farm operators in essence is the same thing. The wealth will over time accrue to the land owners and the operators will be the low income recipients which will result in many social issues that cannot yet be foreseen.</p> <p>It is hard to understand when taking a longer term perspective why we would as a province wish to allow the equity and fundamental core of the province to be owned by those who live elsewhere.</p> <p>For once please look a the longer term view and do not look at the short term political gains to rule the day. This is one of those issues that can be looked back upon in history as a decision that allowed Saskatchewan to continue to flourish or one that flushed Saskatchewan away.</p>
332.	As a young farmer starting out I am discouraged as to how I can compete with corporations and foreign owners to purchase farm land. I worry about the ability to raise a family on a farm and to make a living from the farm.
333.	<p>I have land homesteaded by my grandfather. I have the land my father was able to accumulate in very hard times. Except for one small piece of pasture that i wish now i had not sold.</p> <p>Land owners are good stewards. Land ownership provides stability.</p> <p>Land prices born of speculation is not beneficial to the ag industry. I would love to see the</p>

	huge investors get their fingers badly burned by a bubble burst in prices. It would teach them to stay out of where they don't belong.
334.	I think the family farm is a very important to try and preserve! Young farmers trying to start up to day are facing a number of problems such as price of land, machinery ,insurance as well as trying to provide for their families. In 1974 I bought a new car Chev Monti carlo (spelling) It cost me around \$5000.00 in 1974 that was about 1000 bushels of Spring Wheat. Same car today would be about 6 to 8000 bushels of Wht.so has farming progressed in the last 40yrs.You people preparing this survey in 1974 what the salary for your job compared to today's salary? see what a young farmer is up against.
335.	I grew up knowing my entire family's history.... and how hard Saskatchewan farmers have always worked to make a life for themselves, their families and their communities. It would be a shame to have foreign investments come in and scoop everything up. What the Sask. government needs to do is keep our young farmers interested in keeping it 100% Saskatchewan/Canadian owned and operated.
336.	keep gov't small and let the private sector take care of business.
337.	We have to fight for our rights, otherwise we will become all foreign owned, and farmers do not grow on trees nor in the cities! You have to live on the farm to learn to love the lifestyle, to take the ups and downs of working the farm land. You need the passion! It's not just a job. And if you kill this generation's passion, you're not going to find it overnight! It's takes many generations to grow the skills and the know how of farming!
338.	If you want to head us back to the NDP idea of a farmer on every section, the province will return to the dark ages and prosperity will be gone.
339.	It will be a difficult task. rural Saskatchewan is changing Farms are getting larger Small towns and villages are disappearing non resident ownership only speeds it up
340.	I feel it is important to retain local ownership and stewardship of our land. I believe that the current issues with land drainage are partly caused by a disregard for "the land" and for other farmers who are no longer neighbours and friends. Corporate or non resident ownership will promote this attitude. It may also make it more difficult for government agencies to act.
341.	Our land is our life and if anybody thinks we don't need and want to own it they are wrong
342.	I would like to see rural Saskatchewan stay where you know who your neighbours are, you know the next generation has a chance to farm if they choose to.
343.	A seller should be able to sell to the highest bidder. Our economy is based on the capitalist system. Farmers wanted and supported marketing freedom for their grain, why would the same belief not be followed with land sales? I want the most I can get for ANYTHING I'm selling.
344.	Let the farmers of the province venture in expansions not outsiders who only see interest in Sask farmland because their interest in financial institutions were not paying enough revenue with low interest rates.
345.	Saskatchewan farmland should be owned by Saskatchewan farmers/residents and foreign and Canadian ownership should be abolished. There are lots of businesses that have being sold to outside parties in this province already and quite a few of these business owners have moved

	away along with their money. I don't want to 'sell out our province'.
346.	I think you need people on a board to help decide ,people that have a background of land and the impact it has on sask. and the people of this prov. We come from a diverse background of immigrants that came here to form this prov. not to work their backs of just to give to the highest bidder with no care for the well being of the land.my grandparents came from Ukraine to start a new life ,one that gave them freedom from where they came from. We don't have to be the same as the rest of the world. I plan on living my life in this province , to be buried here , not to give this up to companies or groups that just have a dollar value.
347.	Canadian, keep it Canadian. The thought of walking through a field and the dirt underneath my feet is owned by a foreign entity is a very scary thought.
348.	Non-Resident (absentee landlord) ownership is counter-productive to sustainability. Land is a wealth generator and under no circumstance, should be owned by a corporation (or similar structure, due to limited liability) or by a non-resident. This stance may not be favorable to international trade agreements, but it is environmentally and socially responsible. It is not in the province's interest to deal away control of wealth.
349.	These investors have already done severe damage to our communities. Land has been driven up to the point that it is no longer affordable to buy. They demand steep/long term rents that protect their investments that hold farmers hostage. We farmers have to expand our land base on an ongoing basis to stay competitive. The rising fuel, fertilizer and input costs have already bled us dry. Add to the mix outrageously expensive rents, with no future for ownership by the tenants, makes the next generation's farming future look bleak. We need to stop these investors now. They do nothing for the local, or provincial economies. Without our generational farms Saskatchewan will become a foreign investment farm run by foreign hired help and we will lose the kind of people that Saskatchewan is known for, and the kind of people that fuel our economy. Imagine the health of agriculture if it is driven by a fast-food type clerk working our land. Once we lose our most precious commodity-our land and our people- their is no going back. Farming is too expensive and demanding for people to get a second chance and start over. Once we are broke its game over for Saskatchewan.
350.	Sask. farm land should not be available to speculators and foreign buyers.
351.	Foreign investors will buy huge farms and they will export commodities over seas and bypass packing plants , elevators and by there inputs abroad. What will that cost Saskatchewan residence in the long run ?
352.	I just want the sask government to sit back and realize that there may be a huge economic benefit which might well be the primary effect. But think long term. They want a safe haven for their money. They want title And don't care about caring for the land. Once the world is owned by big business there will no longer be Sask family farms nor their families and then there will be supply man ageing and rest of world is held ransom.
353.	This increase in the price of land comes at a bad time for me personally. It is very tough. I personally had land I farmed sell to someone out of province for an inflated price. Real estate people are crooks. If these buyers would have done some homework on their own, they would have been able to buy the land at much less. (30-40% less). Now my lease went way up. I was in a bad position and had to pay them or loose farm land I've farmed since I started.

354.	my blood pressure medication will not allow me to comment fully on this subject
355.	The home quarter protection requirements are also an archaic and paternalistic carry over from days gone by. Those restrictions and the requirement to obtain SFLOB approval to pledge or mortgage the home quarter as security for a loan should be removed as they are an unnecessary impediment to "farmers" obtaining financing.
356.	As a young potential farmer who has the technical skills - it is near impossible to get a comfortable start in the industry with a young family. The competition is unfair and is killing our small towns. The towns rely on the industry to put back dollars to the area and this is not happening. Farmers from 200 to 300 km's away are farming in the area now and not spending 1 dollar in the community. Is there any wonder why our schools are closing. Our local economy crucially relies on this industry. It ends up costing the government more to deal with these small towns shrinking that if they are maintaining or increasing.
357.	Letting investors buy land is killing the family farm and the people who love to farm. I have see it in other places and let me say it's not good. For once let's hope the government does the right thing
358.	I would like more transparency on the numbered companies that own/buy land. Who the CEOs and management are. When land is bought and sold between the public(local farmers) there is usually the person's name, or farm corporation when searched on the farmland security boards website. (Contacts, Company Headquarter address, phone) I'm proud to be born and raised here in Saskatchewan.
359.	The govt. should not be involved in regulating farmland transactions in Saskatchewan. Investors (farmers) purchased the property, paid the mortgages, took the risk associated with ownership and should be able to sell or rent without interference from government.
360.	Another thing that is currently hurting farmers is huge Hutterite colonies. In my area they continue to drive out smaller farmers and push land prices (owned and leased) way up. As long as they are allowed to have their "church" own all the land and they run everything thought that to save on taxes, it's a completely unfair system that is hurting normal farmers in SK.
361.	I do think that the total ban on outside Canadian investment was too restrictive at the amount it was but it should not have been changed to a wide open amount either. I don't think we should allow outside of Canada investment to more than 40 acres without board exceptions. I think also that we should have a limit on the amount that individual non Saskatchewan resident Canadian investors can own . I think maybe 15 sections (9600) would be a good number. At current rental rates that would still be close to \$1,000,000 leaving the province. Pension funds and investment groups should not be allowed to own Saskatchewan farmland. Keep ownership in as knowledgeable hands as possible that have a stake in the community in which they live. Every family that leaves the farm means less people to buy local, volunteer or donate money to local projects. There is a natural decline in farms due to increases in efficiency that will continue without outside investors but we do not need to accelerate it and leave our communities empty in exchange for short term profit. Long term the lease money is leaving the province and control of our RM's and local government may go

	with it.
362.	The lands act needs to clamp down. Sure it's great for the guys on there way out that cash in but that's not the answer. You can let everything go to investors. With the price of commodities in my opinion they should have to farm and face the challenges we do. When inputs are up like they are and prices are as appetizing as they are there ends up being more red ink in my book than black.
363.	I believe it is important to attract investment to Sk, and in particular that we stay competitive in Western Canada. The fact of the matter is that most farmers are now in a position to compete for land that they may want to purchase. The argument that the young farmer doesn't have a chance is old . Unless a buyer has significant assets / equity ,regardless of land purchase rules, they will not be able to play the game. That is reality.
364.	How long would it take if Saskatchewan farm land was mostly owned by foreign ownership for that/those countries to divert grains and produce away from Canada and into their own countries? Food and water are the number source of keeping humans alive, yet we care so little for making sure Canada will continue to have access to this. We place more value on technology, white collar jobs, military etc than we do to make sure we can feed ourselves.
365.	We need local people to benefit from the resource. Spend government resources to develop trade agreements with other countries.
366.	keep all land investors out of province or place onto them a increase in land taxes of 1000% so if a quarter had taxes of \$500.00 per year land investor would pay 5000.00 per year this money could go to local RMs to be paid out to community rinks, pools ,parks etc
367.	WE SHOULD KEEP FARMLAND FOR THE FARMERS OF SASKATCHEWAN. IT HAS BECOME SO COSTLY TO GET STARTED FARMING, SO IF YOU ARE NOT "WILLED" A FARM IN A FAMILY DEATH, THE CHANCE OF STARTING FARMING IS SLIM. WE NEED TRADITIONAL FARMERS HERE, MORE CATTLE FARMERS. IT IS NEARLY IMPOSSIBLE FOR CATTLE FARMERS TO MAKE IT WITH LESS THAN 300 HEAD. THAT IS JUST RIDICULUS. WE NEED TO SUPPORT OUR FARMERS AND KEEP THESE ROOTS TO THE LAND IN OUR SASKATCHEWAN FARMER'S HANDS.
368.	Farming is a largely family based business according to fcc. If our government is willing to remove protection of this and other industries in this province to make the playing field out of reach for the average Saskatchewan family, it will be a sad day for this province. and an expensive journey for food consumers who have enjoyed low food prices for generations.
369.	Farmland should always be in the hands of farmers. This gives security in the future for the farm family, allows the farmer to make long term investments in the land as he knows he will always have the land, and is better for the land and the environment as the farmer wants to ensure that the land remains productive and healthy and will know that he will be using the land for more than a year or two. Allowing non farmers or foreigners to own land will in effect reduce famers to mere peasants and serfs. One doesn't have to look far back in history to see what happens when farmers don't own the land, from chronic poverty to revolutions and uprisings. History shows that farmer ownership of land leads to better and stronger societies, economies, and democracies. Many of the farmers of Western Canada came here from the old country with the promise of owning their own land. It would be a shame if what we escaped there happened to us here.

370.	<p>It becomes very difficult to try to purchase or lease land as an individual when you are competing against an oil company or a pension fund. These outfits have millions of dollars to spend. I don't feel these companies are investing as a sign they see a bright future in agriculture, but more so to make a quick buck.</p> <p>Thanks</p>
371.	<p>There seems to be a lot of interest in companies owning farmland solely for the purpose of speculating. My concerns now are what is best for the land owners that are on the land now. Average farmers age is 54, the young farmers who are starting out and don't have farmer Dads to back them up won't have a chance to own land unless some form of a fee levied on farmers and the big pension funds and corporations who buy farmland help create a fund to be used by the government to help young farmers access funds to help them get started in owning land and the emphasis is on young starting out farmers, otherwise the farm as we know it will be gone forever, and that is not a legacy I would want to leave behind.</p>
372.	<p>Farming owned land is almost always best. I see farmland differently to other property. The other aspect of off farm ownership is that it adds to the decimation of rural communities - not mentioned in this survey. The absentee land owner only takes money out. He doesn't have kids in the rural school, doesn't support the community medical clinic/hospital, doesn't coach the kids soccer or hockey team. The government takes a lot of money out of the rural community, but does put some back. I very seldom do surveys, especially government surveys, because often the course of action is pre-decided, and the survey is just ass covering. Obviously this is a topic close to my heart. And yes, I am a Sask Party supporter.</p>
373.	<p>I believe I have addressed my concerns in the comment sections. I do not have a problem with people emigrating to Canada, buying land, renting land and actually farming that land but I am very concerned by uninvolved and uneducated investors having interests in our livelihoods.</p>
374.	<p>Residence is split between farm residence and small town home.</p>
375.	<p>I would not like to see the people of this province lose control of the land which is what happens</p> <p>when corporations and big money have control</p>
376.	<p>I am saddened that I am not able to truly make a living doing something that I love and brings increased health to others. More people motivated by the greater good are needed with a government that supports them and initiatives that improve the health of the land. Less concern needs to be given towards corporation and unsustainable economic growth. We need to stop thinking about the economy as a living thing and start thinking about the land as a living organism and something that truly matters.</p>
377.	<p>If you sell the country out then you are just putting a band aid on the debt. It will only become worse with poverty. Quit paying the Indians and our debt would be fixed in no time</p>
378.	<p>Farmers often retire to the city but return to help with the harvest or with the planting in the spring. The connection with the land is strong, involves several generations, and makes living in Saskatchewan quite bearable despite the cold winters. Ownership of the land passing to family or to another Saskatchewan owner - not to a foreign corporation is what makes life in Saskatchewan very special.</p>

379.	Let the free market decide who owns land as long as they are Canadian
380.	save the land for the young farmers
381.	If we want our rural youth to be able to carry on in agriculture we need to support them both financially and also with legislation that will make it possible for them to purchase land at a price that reflects its productivity.
382.	We must consider the long term sustainability of our farmland. Farmers who own the land that they farm are going to always be the best stewards of the land. A pension fund doesn't really care about what the land will look like in 100 years from now but a farmer who's great grandchildren will be farming in 100 years cares very deeply about what the land will look. The best stewards of our farmland will always be family farmers that own the land they farm. It's not that they don't care about their leased land but if the foreign owners demand a high return on their investment then farmers will be forced to try and extract more from the land than it can sustainably produce.
383.	For the sake of Rural sask as we know it (a great place to live and make a living) please make sure measures are taken to keep foreign and large investment firms from being able to purchase sask farm land.
384.	The only ones that would benefit from relaxing the rules would be large existing farmers looking to cash out. At the detriment of young farmers and future generations. Let's keep the saskatchewan family farms intact and keep rural saskatchewan healthy and vibrant. We do not need more outsourcing we need more value adding.
385.	no
386.	Food security, food safety, animal welfare, environmental management, and driving rural economies are all positive economic externalities that saskatchewan resident farm owner/operators provide and will likely not be replaced by foreign owned structures with employee/custom farmers. The value of saskatchewan resident farm owner/operators is far much more than the equivalent bushels of grain produced by a non resident.
387.	<p>Please don't Allow foreign ownership!! I want to be able to buy farmland at the price that our farm economy sets, not the price that foreign speculators set. With the way that mega farms have demonstrated their viability and the funds that currently own land, please ask the question- what will happen to our Net Worth via the price of farmland, when these current investment holders find a better investment and a lack lustre future in Ag? They will bail on their land much much faster than we farmers can absorb it, if returns erode like they are.</p> <p>I know that's not what you are wanting to see, so please keep that in mind when making your decision.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important issue!</p>
388.	Foreign and big company ownership, will only hasten the exit and exodus in rural Saskatchewan that is already occurring. Why this would be a good idea is beyond me. Giant farms are not good for rural Canada, and rural Canadian towns and life.
389.	My grandfathers came here in 1906 to be able to own their own land. With allowing outside investment and corporate farming we are moving back to the feudal system. I want my descendants to be able to own their land and farm it.

390.	sask farm families first
391.	<p>I am 26 years old, and trying to make a living grain farming. I bought my first quarter off my grandfather, I am looking to buy another at the end of the year. the land prices in this province are so inflated it sickens me. my land is in RM , where the going price for a section (640 acres) of land is in excess of 1.2 million. I ask the sask party how am I to make a living with land payments at that price? the sask party is killing the small family operated farms one by one. When I approach the old couples in my area to inquire about purchasing land they all tell me the same thing why do you want to get into farm? there is no money to be made, and you cant pay top dollar like the potash companies nor the out of country buyers. why would you take ownership away from the ones working the land I feel you guys want to make us serfs. these companies or out of country owners don't care for the land nor do guys that lease the land, people who own and live on the land are the best for the stewardship of the land, they care for it, how cant you see this? the sask party needs to look to Europe and learn how there farming operations are where the little guys are supported and encouraged. These family operated farms in sask that are 10000+ acres are not a family farm they are corporations. Also I am an electrician I work 21days straight, this job alone is over six figures. I would give it up in a heartbeat to be on the land 24/7, but unfortunately I don't see this ever happening with land prices like this. I would love to hear back from a sask party.</p>
392.	Thank you for this opportunity to share my opinions.
393.	<p>Land values in our area have increased to a point that it is nearly impossible to purchase land with the intent of having the product produced on that land cover the purchase. This was the standard on which land purchases were based.</p> <p>Retiring farmers who sold to foreigners were very happy. They got more money that they had hoped and knew that it would be a failure to the foreigners. Now these same purchasers would like to sell that land, as they have lost huge amounts of money. None of the remaining farmers are willing to pay the asking price. It doesn't make sense.</p>
394.	FARMLAND SHOULD BE OWNED SOLELY BY PEOPLE ACTIVELY FARMING .
395.	My son is just getting started in farming and the increase in competition from non farming entities is not something my son or my family wants to see we are a 5th gen farm and it would be a shame to see my son and his family digress into some sort of share cropper working for someone or thing that looks at farming strictly as an investment and is ready to run when the going gets tough that's not what farming is all about
396.	Regina and Saskatoon have enough people. We need more young people coming to work and live in rural areas. Land is value. It is also open to speculators in Toronto. Let land benefit the local people and the local way of life. We need to move forward and strongly restrict investment from outside source and let young farm families own land. We need strong rural communities.
397.	why should farmland be any different then a business or cottage or condo.
398.	Quit trying to kill rural sask. sask was built on small towns. Small business in agriculture Take a trip thru the mid west USA and see how they are investing in small towns to keep local

	economies going Small towns have less social problems. More rounded youth. What business does not want a child from a sask farm working for them We small town folks grow responsible adults with a positive affect in our communities
399.	Think I have made my opinions clear. Keep all foreign and non saskatchewan residents as well as investment firms out! Saskatchewan farmland should be owned by Saskatchewan people!
400.	just use common sense .we don't need to be farm peasants for other countries which would cause our rural communities to disappear forever
401.	My wife and I answered this survey together and are in agreement with the answers provided. We appreciate the Sask Government currently in power for providing us with an opportunity to participate in this important survey and express our views...thanks and good job.
402.	Already the price of farm land and inputs etc plus the limited profit margins makes it impossible for most to farm as it is now . I would guess farmer debt is at a all-time high ? Also what able the next generation wanting to farm ?
403.	I believe I have made it quite clear that farm land should remain in the hands of Sask farmers.
404.	Best describes you above does not contain an applicable choice. I grew up in Canada but spent 7 years in the US before returning 42 years ago.
405.	Closing the doors to economic activity (outside investment) within the province has never been an effective means to prosperity at any time in the past and is not the road to riches in the future either.
406.	We should try to preserve the farm model we have traditionally had in Saskatchewan - farmland owners who predominantly own the land they farm. This has provided both farming security and retirement security for Saskatchewan farmers. Moving to other ownership models as contemplated will result in the loss of both.
407.	Would like to pass my farm on to my kids. Would like to increase the size of the farm so that it could support two families when the are ready to take over. Would like to see more families on farms rather than an investor driven corporation. the corporation doesn't put more kids in our school, I haven't seen them support anything local.
408.	When we started out, we had to pay top market value for our farmland. For farmers getting to retirement age and with the cost of living, we don't feel that prices should now be regulated. Young farmers will pay millions for equipment costs but want the land regulated. The government wants free market on many other commodities and ownership is not so much a question. Hopefully the government has not already made their mind up already like they have done on

	previous farm related surveys.
409.	I don't want government foreign or local purchasing land or giving funds to organizations to purchase or hold easements to control land in this province. We should have a willing buyer willing seller perspective on this but foreign buyers are hard to find out who is doing the funding.
410.	There are many people and organizations that own private land in rural areas in Saskatchewan including recreational users, communities, conservation organizations, churches and service clubs. These decisions significantly affect all of these stakeholders and Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Justice are encouraged to get their input into this matter. Private rural land ownership is an issue for all Saskatchewan residents.
411.	A farmer landowner should reside in Saskatchewan, educate their kids here, contribute to the community they reside in and keep the incomes earned from farm land in Saskatchewan.
412.	I would be nice if all investors would butt out of this business. I guys are going belly up and need and investor to pull them up, TO BAD. Let someone else who knows what there doing have a shot at the land. Good job to all those who have cashed out and made big money. However for the smaller family farm, such as mine, it makes it really tough to purchase new land. I keep telling my kids to run don't walk from the farm, because the price of everything keeps going up and what you make keeps going down. There is no way I can support the next generation without expanding. All these foreign investors and trusts, that pay way to much for crap land, is making good land unattainable. Why should I have to basically give up my first born to guaranty some heartless corporation, or foreigner, a guaranteed percentage on a business that is never guaranteed a crop to pay them!
413.	Thank you for allowing for my voice to be heard.
414.	I am very concerned about external control of farmland in Saskatchewan.
415.	Listen to the farmers whose livelihood is at risk. We need control of the land in the form of land ownership or have a personal relationship with a neighbour who is retired from farming and is renting us the land.
416.	Do not allow foreigners to purchase farm land in Saskatchewan. We only have so much land and we should keep the investment dollars in our province.
417.	I think our true farmers need to be supported in every way to preserve our food quality. As soon as we lose control of our productive farm land ,we lose control of our food. Very important, I think. We must invest in our own province.
418.	Leasing at times is the only option for people starting out. It's not a divine right to be a farmer. If I sell my land my grand children shouldn't have less, to provide cheap land for someone else to farm
419.	Proud owner through several generations worked hard to keep within family would not want that to change due to regulations/ taxes.. Thanks for the opportunity to comment- only in Canada/ Saskatchewan would we have this opportunity Proud to be Canadian
420.	KEEP YOUR LAND OUR RESIDENTS NOT FORIEGN MONIES!!!!

421.	Land is to a farmer what water is to a fisherman. Without water there are no fish. Without land ownership a farmer is an employee not a famer.
422.	Don't expect this review by the government to change anything. In the near future it's 100000 acre farms with laborers from wherever they can be found for the least dollars, eg mostly foreign part time. If the government were serious about agriculture first thing would be to include farm laborers under the Health and Safety regulations and hours of work rules all other Sask employers must follow. I don't care much whether the hundred thousand acre farms are owned by Canadians or not as though it really matters to most, and urban people think ma and pa farms are still the norm anyway and don't know what the situation really is.
423.	<p>If the rules allow more investment by outside owners and groups, the Ag industry in our province will decline, and profits will leave our province and country.</p> <p>The land will be farmed, but leased land is NEVER farmed as well as farmer owned land. The risk of losing the land when the lease term is over, results in very short term plans and practices that tend to milk the land. Proper crop rotations and pesticide rotations are ignored, in favor of the short term gain of extra profits for the moment. Protective practices to reduce erosion and to protect riparian areas tend to be ignored by lease operators.</p> <p>Large corporate farms are likely to eventually replace the farming units that predominantly exist today. Encouraging Sask ownership will maintain a higher level of stewardship of the land because of the connection local people have to their home province.</p> <p>Owner-Operators of farms and farmland tend to be more personally invested, better stewards, and more efficient and productive than farming arrangements without ownership of land.</p>
424.	There is no logical or economic reason to: (1) turn your farmers into tenant farmers (2) turn farmland into an investment commodity subject to herd mentality (3) cater to the wants and needs of national and international investment organizations (4) forward farm profits to Toronto, Vancouver, Hong Kong, Moscow and anywhere else outside the province (5) have young farmers subject to the risk of weather and markets (6) promote further the transfer of wealth from the younger generation to wealthy seniors.
425.	Example: 3L Cattle Company. Nobody is taking care of the land, now out of business he thinks.
426.	<p>1) Many farmers use their ownership to help their family members start their farming operations. And rely on their land value for their retirement. Governments must not lower their land values with regulations which limit retirement opportunities.</p> <p>2) Access to capital can be a very important item when starting a viable farm enterprise and in many instances the capital for the purchase of land is at a preferred interest rate, compared to equipment and/or crop input rates if the young operator is going to concentrate on "best-practices" and "profitability". Governments would be wise to tread very carefully on limiting land values which could be negative for either the start-up farmers or the retirement farmers.</p>
	Thank you.

427.	Investors are great for retiring farmers but terrible for young or starting farmers.
428.	Foreign ownership and absentee ownership of Saskatchewan farmland will only lead to decreased services provided to rural residents which in turn will lead to the de-population of rural Saskatchewan much like what has occurred in the Northern Plains states south of us.
429.	<p>I grew up in Saskatchewan and my parents own farmland, but I now live in London, UK. The housing market here is a mess and completely unaffordable to locals because it is such an attractive opportunity for foreign investors, which drives up the prices. Though it's a very different situation, I wonder if similar results would be seen if Saskatchewan farmland were open to foreign investors and pension funds.</p> <p>Living in Europe has made me realize how important tradition and culture is, and how little culture Saskatchewan has that is unique to it. Farming is immensely important to the Saskatchewan identity and should be protected.</p>
430.	The government needs to be cautious with stimulating investment. Slower but steady long term sustainable growth needs to be the plan. Fast growing, over heated markets can be difficult to manage and government generally is not able to respond to economic changes as quickly as private corporations so we are generally left holding the bag when the inevitable downturns come.
431.	People in sask should have the right to own what we have worked to build. When we allow foreign people to take it we lose everything. People outside this prov have come and bought huge amounts of waterfront property here. The own people who live and work here cannot get lakefront property...we who pay the bills get to go camp in a trailer, so the rich from afar can reap the riches. sask people should be the only ones who can own lakefront lots, and our farm land we are selling our future for a buck...next generation will have a chance at what...
432.	Please consider all your options before you make any decisions
433.	ownership of all saskatchewan farm land should remain with saskatchewan farmers should be no investor owned farmland should go back and tax those Albertans who bought up sask land to resell to investors
434.	As a young farmer working my way into the business its tough there is lots of variables in agriculture. I have recently bought more land competing against a investor was very evident. They made my ability to make a deal with the retiring farmer extremely difficult. I have slowly built up my operation money is not free flowing. The investor is has not made their money from the land like I have. It's seems tough to compete with people investors that have made their money from non-agriculture sources. Their access to capital is a lot different source than local farmers are. Investors that buy the land also do not care about the local communities and business that are around them. It makes local rural business hard to operate and employ people. Witch hurts small towns. I like agriculture way of life I think foreign investment truly hurts our province their is many issues we face they add many more issues.
435.	It is a Pandora's box to go down this path. Saskatchewan government's issues with compliance of the Sk Farm Security Act will only become more difficult. Do not follow BC and Ontario into "no restriction" territory.
436.	Thanks for taking the time to consult the public on this very important issue.

437.	As a young male growing up on family farm I find it is going to be difficult to take over the family farm due to high land price and operating cost
438.	As a Saskatchewan resident having seen the destruction that just one corporation has done to the province I feel it is up to us to protect for the future generations the family farm where it is possible for an individual to make a living, raise their family and still have a community to be part of. We have witnessed first hand what happens when people who are running the operations do not live or belong to the communities. Laws were repeatedly broken, small fines were given out which didn't seem to affect them as they would continue to do what they wanted there was no respect for neighbors, all these big business cared about was the dollar that they could make.
439.	As a young farmer, I see very little chance of purchasing my own land if I have to compete with the seemingly unlimited funds of large investment groups, both foreign and domestic. I also cannot afford to rent their land at the exorbitant prices they ask. This is particularly upsetting when these groups simply want to turn a profit and could care less about the tradition of farming.
440.	Driving up the value of farmland could be good for investors etc but not for the farmers.
441.	Large Canadian investors have moving into our area and drove the land rental prices and purchases prices so high that hardly anyone can afford them. Now we are talking about allowing Foreign investors to add fuel to the fire. Our province was built on the traditional farms and that might sound old school but it will still work as long as our elected representatives allow it to continue that way. I am not just referring to our government restricting land ownership. Elected officials that farm need to take the farmer's response to this and represent us and not just themselves
442.	A person living on the land he farms which his forefathers farmed before him takes pride in accomplishing all the facets of becoming a farm land owner. Farm ownership makes for good stewardship of the land. I welcome new foreigners to come to our country and invest themselves in farm land agriculture. Compete for the best price. I totally disagree with investors who have never seen a farm but feel they should have a piece of the pie. Please make the laws more stringent so we don't have a hand full of people in a board room trying to figure a way to buy farm land
443.	I have little hope this will be rectified. I saw this coming years ago. After trying to have discussion with elected officials and Farmland security board. I always received the generic responses and the lack of willingness to admit their was a problem or willingness to do something about it.
	This survey says 80% of farmland is from farmer to farmer. Well three months isn't a statistic. In my RM, I would bet non farmers own close to 50% of it. Alberta has relaxed rules, as pointed out. Look what happened their. The family farms got sold to larger corporations for excessive amounts of money and they come here and buy more and do it all over again. On Saskatchewan people's back.
	Case in point was in our area. The year after Alberta investor bought BHP started doing seismic in the area. Insider knowledge? It was an awfully timely and lucrative decision. The

investor captured all of these profits, not Saskatchewan people. The money went out of province. To top it off, they sold part to BHP just recently, for 4X what they initially paid.

Do you have any idea how disheartening it is to have a non local business person make forever lasting decision on the area and landscape of 4th generation homesteads? As from farmland security board said when questioned about the dissatisfaction locals having BHP come into the area to yet forever change the landscape. "If they aren't wanted there then I suppose locals wont sell to them". Theoretically this would be true, but not when you have an investor owning a large portion of land. Part of the tract of land BHP wanted was over a homesteaded yard site where all 3 boys actively farm. When they refused BHP, BHP went to the Alberta investor (majority owned parcel) and moved a half mile over. Their landscape is lost, their expansion dreams are lost, the esthetics of their land is lost and they and everyone else around will have to put up with noise, light and environmental pollution. All because of the decision of someone in another province.

I'm sure the government could give to two rips about a person's live hood, their generational farm or their backyard. The thing they do care about is where the votes are...and they're not outside of Saskatchewan.

444. Should be Canadian to own land in saskatchewan and involved with the land decisions. Preferably sask resident paying taxes in sask.

445. Think the consultation process is flawed. Why is open to non-Sask residents in the first place. As a Sask farm owner I am offended by this process. If giving people's names is voluntary then how would you know where the person doing the survey is from. Why are non-residents allowed to determine the future of Sask farmers?

446. I realize this is a contentious issue. There are many things that can be done to encourage young farmers and other business people as well with putting more restrictions on farmland ownership I have purchased when Canadians could not purchase and under the present day rules and did not see much difference. Please remember that low land prices do make for a strong industry

447. Keep it for sask farmers

448. I cannot stress enough how important ownership of farmland is to Saskatchewan farms. If we lose control our farms and communities will suffer. Ownership provides long term health of current farms but most important is integral to the success of future generations.

449. Hope changes come so Saskatchewan farmers can improve quality of life and farm business. Hope investors and pension groups stay out!

450. I think inflation would be bad economically by allowing Pension Plan and corporation to compete with families for farms.

451. Stop trying to be like Alberta. All or some of the old ways are not all bad. Small farmers are the heart of our country. Our commodities have fluctuated so bad we can't compete against big corporations and money hungry foreigners. Govt can't be controlled now how can we

	expect you to control farm land purchases
452.	Farm land should be owned by those who provide for the land as much as it provides for them.
453.	young people don't have a chance to start farming the price of farmland is high young farmers cannot compete with foreign investment money to buy farmland
454.	Most of these questions are ambiguous. There is no need for farmers to own the land, but they must have security of tenure such as they had through the original Land Bank program. Under this program, there were limitations on how much land the lessee could own. Also at one time foreign owners (Non-residents of Sask.) could not own more than 10 acres. That should be reinstated!!
455.	I would not support a government that let's a government such as pension plan agency own land, After all that to me is no different than the old NDP Land Bank!!
456.	Keep Sask owned by Sask people.
457.	When I think of a young farmer wanting to purchase land in Saskatchewan it isn't necessarily foreign money that is making it difficult. Hutterites and large Sask owned corporate farms are also making it difficult. Once 1 group of investors owns 50,000+ acres it is generally out of the purchasing cycle and a farmer will not be able to expand his operation.
458.	Farming was a way of life for most rural people. As the elderly retire from farming the younger farmers cannot afford to take over the family farm. Therefore big businesses come in to the picture.
459.	Farmland should be saved for Saskatchewan farmers. Rangeland should be saved for Saskatchewan Ranchers. We DO NOT want or need Non-Farmers or Non-Ranchers owning land in Saskatchewan! Saskatchewan is NUMBER 1
460.	Farmers need land equity to get them through times when cash returns are low. If people want to own land here, they can come here to live
461.	I am very happy that the Saskatchewan Government is taking this issue seriously and is involving SK farmers and the broader SK public in this very important decision. The Wall government has proved it has the best interests of SK residents at heart when making policy decisions (as exhibited by Premier Wall standing up against the takeover of Potash Corp.) I am confident that Premier Wall will also stand up for SK residents against the threat of foreign and corporate investment undercutting the traditional SK farm family lifestyle and the associated values of strong rural families and communities.
462.	I am a young farmer myself trying to farm my own land and eventually take over my parent's farm. I am starting out on a very small basis and working my way up. With the increase of farm land, it is a challenge to buy land and operate. Having investors/corporations coming into our area and buying up land, it only drives the price tag up. Let's help our local farmers and make it easier to do their job and work for the future. I plan to farm, it is my passion and I want to raise my family on our farm that we own and operate.
463.	Bring back the Farmland ownership of 1974 which prohibited non Saskatchewan residents to own our land.

464.	farmers should be allowed to sell to the highest bidder as it is their retirement fund
465.	Mother nature and the market place are the ultimate control of farmland ownership. Food security concerns should be the primary objective. Access to responsible credit sources is key to efficient transfer of farmland. The bank will let you know soon enough if you paid too much if you are not a profitable operation. Land is always too expensive to buy, the trick is can you hold it. Good luck on your decision.
466.	<p>A lot of the hyped interest in farm land in the last 7 years is related to the good returns we have been able to make grain farming during this period. This boom cycle appears to be over now. The ability to pay high rents will diminish. The outside interest may subside somewhat.</p> <p>It is very important to us to own the land we farm. It is why people were attracted to Saskatchewan in the first place. Even though many other things have changed over time, this principle of independence is still important to the long term success of family farms. Family farms, both big and small, are still the best economic model for prairie agriculture. Time has shown that.</p>
467.	Strong farming background. Ownership is important. Keep Saskatchewan farms Saskatchewan owned
468.	I have neighbours here that I know are financed out of province possibly out of country and it angers me because I would like to expand as I have three boys all with the itch to farm. I simply can't compete with the money they put on the table.
469.	Farmland is easy to sell at a high price to local farmers. We don't need or want to sell to outsiders. I will sell to a local even if it means getting less money than selling to a foreign investor.
470.	Farmers and ranchers should reside with others who will oversee the care and longevity of the land use. The farmers and ranchers who own land in a community benefit the community and surrounding towns and cities. Their children attend local schools, and keep the communities vibrant. If there are no young people in a community with a stake in the area; those communities will die. The pride of ownership and the time put into caring for the land will also be lost.
471.	Please do not allow foreign/corporate/pension fund ownership of SK farmland. Look to countries who act to preserve their future such as Norway and understand the positives for future generations in keeping SK farmland ownership local.
472.	Well, I do not understand why a non-farmer or non-land owner has a say about this. I do not have a say in who owns the local restaurants or hotels.... And Since I am not directly involved in those industries nor do I have a working knowledge of them, I do not expect to have any influence in their future.
473.	I work for an ag inputs retail and used to work at a grain elevator and am married to a 3600 acre farmer and originally from a 7500 acre farm, which I am still a part of. When I see some of these foreign outfits coming to our area to farm, we are not seeing that business come through our door anymore. The farmers that previously owned the land did, but they have since sold and retired. Inputs are being bought and shipped from a head office somewhere that isn't near here and now they are wanting to load their own grain into shipping containers

	and railing it to port without hitting our grain handling system. If this is the future, then where is my job in 10 years? There won't be a need for people like me if this is the case. So much for economic stimulus.
474.	I am a younger rancher looking to get started in owning a piece of Saskatchewan land. If I have to compete against foreign investors with bigger check books, I can not do that and make my ranch viable. If some corporation or pension plan owns land. That land might not get cared for as well as a farmer in Saskatchewan who owns it, they would lease it to the highest bidder no matter what kind of stewardship practices they have. Also if foreign investment buys land, would they contribute to that small community or keep buying land, allowing families to move away and spell the end of that town. Farms are getting bigger some towns are getting smaller let's not keep that trend by letting foreign investors in. If you want to own land in this great province, then live here.
475.	At 3 Am- I believe a rest from farming would be a good thing. I wish those that view farming as a restful investment - the best of luck. I rented my first 80 acres (calculator used here) 44 years ago. The neighbor needed the rocks picked. The bins I used needed cleaning out. The fuel I used was paid by working another job. I had family help most of my farming "career". Unpaid / bartered (slave) labour from grandfather, spouse, father, mother, my spouse and offsprings ---and neighbors. The things I did not enjoy, included watching the hail tonight destroy my spouses newly emerging garden - and the thought of cleaning up after yet another ill wind tomorrow. I hope you share my comments "in context" with those pensioners and investors in favor of investing the rest of their life in farmland- and wish them luck. I hope they all can amass enough information to make an informed decision. Every action has the potential for consequences.
476.	Farms should be owned by Saskatchewan farmers. Farming is not just a job, it is a bigger commitment. You don't own land you just take care of it for the next person. Big investors will only make farmland unattainable to the people who know how to farm. It will be like the oil industry where money talks and the land comes second.
477.	Owning your own land is great, but for most of us to get bigger, we need to be able to lease land. The ownership of that land, while great if it is someone from Saskatchewan, can be anyone from Canada or pension fund or trust that is representing real Canadians.
478.	I don't want foreign invest if it makes it impossible for young farmers to buy and own land
479.	Keeping the rules in places makes it hard to change the integrity of the province. After all the oil and potash gone ,interest in the province will decline and the farmers of Saskatchewan will still be here. And we will deal with all the aftermath. Please make it hard for outside investors to purchase land in this province.
480.	I think this is stupid and I cant believe the government is even considering it. Use your heads
481.	No but I have lots to comment on about this survey. In case my comment below are missed for the next question:

<p>OPTIONAL - If interested, please provide your name.</p> <p>Names will not be publicly shared with the results of the survey.</p> <p>My comment is: "To have names optional is useless for a survey. That is why we write letters or sign petitions. Surveys do not ask names unless there is a reason or incentive to do so. I saw none."</p>
<p>482. Having outside ownership of farmland opens the door for people with noble ideals to tell farming tenants how they think land should be farmed, and what types of crops they will allow to be grown on land that they own. Farmers are the best stewards of the land, and 99.9% would never do anything to hurt their most valuable asset- the land itself. Without it they have nothing.</p>
<p>483. As a young farmer in Canada I have never felt more of a sense of abandonment by my government after the quiet passing of bill c68 and the less than fair sale of the CWB. The government of Saskatchewan and Canada should be protecting the few farmers left in this country not selling us out to chemical companies and foreign investors.</p>
<p>484. With the dynamic nature of agriculture, I feel there should exist a competitive marketplace for farmland which will provide current producers with opportunities to exit as they retire and provide current producers to expand or enter the market.</p>
<p>485. Saskatchewan farmers are looking for a fair market value for their land compared to other farmland in other provinces. This is what they have worked for and plan to retire with.</p>
<p>486. I live in the city only because my wife is urban to her core. My heart is, and always will be, rural.</p> <p>I was (am) a 4th generation farmer. I shiver right to my soul to think that we could return to the land ownership environment that my great-grandfather left Europe to get away from. We must be smart enough to not repeat history. The self-serving greed of those who want a truly open market in Sask farmland are not looking at the situation with any long term view. The promise of Saskatchewan was virtually crushed in the 1930's, and now that we've got our swagger back, we must protect the promise of Saskatchewan and not sell out in this age of "instant gratification."</p> <p>I am not promoting a socialist approach to farm land ownership in Saskatchewan. But I believe there needs to be, and can be, a healthy dose of market influence within carefully constructed rules that establish clear and fair parameters around controlling and owning what supports all life: the soil.</p> <p>I would be thrilled, and honored, to have the opportunity to provide further feedback to this process, should it be extended to me.</p>
<p>487. I strongly urge the sask govt to change farmland ownership laws to the 1974-2002 time periods. Sask farmers need to own the land they farm. My forefathers came here in 1905 from France for the opportunity to own their farmland and not to be a peasant. I want</p>

	people to come to sask and have that same chance, we need this for a strong economy.
488.	The government has made some positive changes to the Saskatchewan agricultural landscape and I hope and trust that Mr. Wall will do the right thing in terms of restriction/preventing foreign and outside investment including corporate ownership of Saskatchewan farmland. Give the young residents who want to pursue farming, an opportunity to continue with traditional land ownership without having to compete or contend with the deep pockets of foreign investors injecting dollars and ownership of our heritage. This will be a huge influencing factor in my vote and many others in the spring election.
489.	If investment company groups & other non-farm groups continue to grab up land the young future farmers will not be here.
490.	I am a young farmer struggling to increase my family farm to a size where it can support my family without an off farm income. I believe that if you farm the land you own you are much more likely to take care of it and insure it will continue to produce food for future generations than a large corporate operation owned by someone in another country. Agriculture is as huge part of our local economy in Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan farmers are much more likely to reinvest money made in agriculture here at home than a land owner from somewhere else.
491.	Farmland prices are already surely high enough to provide adequate retirement funds for anyone leaving the farm. It is not fair to the next generation of farmers to force them to carry backbreaking debt to satisfy the greed of the retiring generation or the non-farming speculator. I think that local banks and credit unions must have enough funds to finance land transfers in Saskatchewan. Thanks for the opportunity to have my say.
492.	LOOK TO THE FUTURE NOT THE NEXT 4 OR 8 YEARS. BE THE GOVT. WHO CAN SAY WE CARE ABOUT THIS PROVINCE.
493.	I want to see the results of the survey.
494.	Know of some land backed by foreign investment, all crop shipped out, no community benefits. If open up would get approximately 13 billion from our country alone.
495.	Don't sell us out
496.	It's time for the province to consider changes that will allow even more outside ownership though not necessarily foreign
497.	No.
498.	Without local farmers and people around to the rural areas, there would be no towns or services. If we open our doors to absentee land owners than there would not be a rural Saskatchewan. It would just be empty roads and dead towns.
499.	Farmers who actually farm the land should own it.
500.	I believe this issue is a major one and the government of Saskatchewan needs to go on the

	road across Saskatchewan to hear the people and put on the line what they plan on doing. by doing this survey on line during the busy growing season it is showing a complete lack of leadership by our Premier and his MLA's on such a major issue.
501.	We live near where is currently trying to set up a Potash mine. I can see the economic benefits to this business venture for Saskatchewan, but there is a huge downside as well. Environmentally our immediate area will suffer greatly as will the water supply in a larger area. Also the social landscape of our area will be changed forever. If we wanted to live in an area like this we would have stayed in Lloydminster. Ownership of land by non-farmers in our area has done nothing positive. It is extremely hard to police what is being done on that land. Neighbors are accountable to neighbors. Take that away and what will happen??
502.	Yes, build some decent roads that farmers can access their land more readily, the current roads are not built to take the weight strain of modern agricultural equipment! What has happened to the grasslands that the Feds put into your care?
503.	As it sits now I currently own land and lease land from locals as well as investors that live outside the province. It really frustrates me when I have send my hard earned dollars out of province rather than they stay in the community that we live in.
504.	Only Sask. residents should be able to own Sask. farmland. Our ancestors came here so they could own their own land and now we are selling off that dream for short term profit. The security of our food should be in the hands of Sask. residents. Thank you.
505.	There is still room for the "family farm", and that needs to be protected. We are feeding the world and should not have to compete with the world to own our land. Leasing land is hard enough to do when you're dealing with a neighbour, it's much less fun with someone who couldn't find it on a map.
506.	Don't see China selling land to Canadians so we can tear up there country and unemploy their people. Just saying we need to look after our own....including farmers!
507.	If a foreign owner is willing to move here and actively farm the land I am okay with that but not if they live outside of Saskatchewan.
508.	Ducks Unlimited is overpricing farmland. It is in their constitution (Canada DU's) to get money from DU USA, only if they take AG land out of production forever. If we lose control of our land, the people here will become transients.
509.	THE SASKATCHEWAN GOVERNMENT MADE A BIG MISTAKE, ALLOWING THE C.P.P. TO BUY ANY FARMLAND, OUR FOREFATHERS, WENT THROUGH GREAT HARDSHIPS IN ORDER TO OWN THEIR OWN PIECE OF FARMLAND NOW YOU ARE ALLOWING THESE LARGE CORPORATIONS TO TAKE OVER THE LAND AGAIN - BIG MISTAKE.
510.	I feel we are facing great challenges and pray you will be able to make the right decisions. Thank you.
511.	As the world population grows and 3rd world countries economic situations improve, commodity prices are only going to increase because global food requirements will increase. Farmers will be able to fund their land purchases in the future due to stronger markets, and land values will stay up because of competition between producers. We do not need any

	<p>corporate investment in our agriculture land, please keep the tradition of producer ownership. This will keep our agriculture sector competitive and viable and it is the best thing for environmental sustainability.</p>
512.	<p>In my opinion agricultural land should not really be treated as commodity to be invested in. Rather it should be a resource to be developed and cared for.</p> <p>I wouldn't mind seeing a stewardship program where farm groups are granted care-taking rights of government owned farmland for term periods of time (granted through bidding or application)</p>
513.	<p>I would like to see land caps on the amount of land that could be leased by private farming corporations. (Farmers who own their own land and lease others' farm land. Some of them are no longer land stewards by any stretch of its definition.)</p>
514.	<p>It's critical that farmland remains in the hands of persons who have farmed their land throughout their life or are actively farming.</p>
515.	<p>Keep it in Saskatchewan, find an innovative way to finance the young farmers, encourage new ones to start and transfer the wealth internally. I don't see a purpose to transfer money out of the province, do you?</p>
516.	<p>Need more programs for young farmers starting out!</p>
517.	<p>Selling our farmland to foreign people is not a good idea. It is best to keep our farm families on the farm as they will do a good job of maintaining the land.</p>
518.	<p>there have been investment groups and corporations that have bought up large chunks of farmland and due to weather and market conditions that have failed before.... let the farm oriented community continue to farm</p>
519.	<p>Foreign National should be given a chance to enter Saskatchewan. People/Farmer from around the world should exchange knowledge of expertise in terms of farming.</p>
520.	<p>If any Canadian pension fund or Canadian investment trust is established for benefits of Canadians, best revision of farmland ownership rule is that provincial government allow that Canadian pension fund or Canadian investment trust to buy Saskatchewan farmland given maintaining major rule frame. I think it will be benefit for provincial government, old farmers and young farmers eventually.</p>
521.	<p>As stated above, I can see limited long term foreign ownership as a mutual benefit. Large scale investments bear the risks of rapid changes to the provincial economy and may not be beneficial to the infrastructure in rural areas; the question of legal constructs come to mind where most of the profit is occurring outside the province hence fewer taxes collectible.</p>
522.	<p>We certainly do not go back to a system where we are chasing investors and people away from Saskatchewan. We have a much more positive outlook on the Province than there was some 20 years ago when we Immigrated here.</p> <p>However it is inevitable that farm sizes are going to grow, and the amount of family farms is going to decrease, but that is what comes with progress and technology.</p> <p>However farmers will need to create or generate new capital to support their expansion, this</p>

	<p>may well needed to be done through capital from outside sources.</p> <p>I do believe however that we must retain some control on who buys here, especially with the amount of so called dirty monies in the world.</p> <p>I also believe that we do not want to see other governments (foreign) purchasing the land through unauthorized methods.</p> <p>Yes we need to have FLSB overseeing but we need to be creative in our approach to doing business, and helping maintain the farming industry in Saskatchewan.</p> <p>Along with this investment in Farmland, there is a huge opportunity for investment in the value added industries which again will benefit the farmers in the long run.</p>
523.	<p>Keeping farmland affordable for young farmers and farm families in Saskatchewan is not about tradition and certainly not about sequestering the free market economy. It's about providing those who have the ambition and knowledge to farm the land, be good stewards of that land and support their rural communities. We saw the erosion of rural Saskatchewan under previous governments and now it is coming back as young people see a future in farming. However, negative changes to farmland ownership rules and the lack of enforcement of existing rules will make this more difficult in the future. If Saskatchewan wants to produce more food, expand our economy and provide more jobs, we need a strong, prosperous rural Saskatchewan with local farm ownership and management. Therefore, the only way to do this is to keep land affordable so young Saskatchewan farmers can get into the business or expand their operations without having to compete with companies that can easily outbid them.</p>
524.	<p>If you want organic land to purchase or lease, both will be hard to attain under foreign or large corporate ownership.</p>
525.	<p>If we lose ownership of the land we will lose control of our economy and our way of life. Don't let this happen</p>
526.	<p>I believe increased investment group ownership is making it more and more difficult for young farmers to start farming and build the equity needed to have a successful operation. It is very rare for a family or individual to start their own operation without help from a relative (parent(s), grandparent(s), etc.) There are many young people who grew up on farms that are discouraged or their families do not have the means to support them to take over, join or start their own farming operations.</p>
527.	<p>Please restrict foreign ownership of land. Allow farmers to farm, and make a living at it. The world is hungry, we have the resources, why shouldn't we be able to profit from it? At this rate, in 50 years, all of the land will be foreign owned and factory farmed. It will be a terrible waste. My family has been scratching in the dirt for 107 years in the same place, and I would like to keep doing it! Forget the foreigners, let's remain a "HAVE" province, let's keep the long view in mind!</p>
528.	<p>I think it is very important for the residents of sask to own and control the land.</p>
529.	<p>Agriculture is the backbone of the Canadian economy. It allows us to be a strong exporting</p>

	<p>nation, and maintain a high GDP; thus, a high standard of living for Canadians. As a Professional Agrologist, I have seen first-hand, the losses in efficiency and production when Saskatchewan land is purchased by outside investors/investment groups instead of local farmers, or even local farmers backed by third-party investors (whether or not, they intend to farm it, or lease the land to local farmers). The farmland needs to stay in the hands of farmers if we want to see our economy continue to grow, take a look at world history if you think otherwise.</p>
530.	<p>I heard someone say at the farm progress show this past week that 1/2 the land in Alberta south of the number 1 highway is owned by Hutterites. At the rate there buying up land is foreign ownership the biggest challenge facing family farms or is it colonies?? With foreign ownership there is still the chance to rent or lease land back and expand the farm operation that way.... Now if Hutterites start to farm it what does that do to the local communities, we all know there not sending there kids to the local school or shopping at the local store. At the rate colonies and splitting and expanding its scary they're not worried about competing for land with local farmers there worried about foreign ownership as you rarely hear about local farmers out bidding for land.</p> <p>This I see being the biggest challenge to local small farms.</p>
531.	<p>Present laws and regulations need to be reviewed to prevent the already epidemic of foreign investment into farmland in Saskatchewan.</p> <p>In summary: The average farmer can't purchase the land by relying on income generated from same. External income sources are ALREADY needed.</p>
532.	<p>If you want to own Saskatchewan farmland you must be a Saskatchewan Farmer or resident of Saskatchewan.</p>
533.	<p>Keep land owned by the people of Saskatchewan..</p>
534.	<p>Look after your land and your land will look after you- very few manage with this philosophy and it is showing it ugly head every day. The land is taking a beating and with some dry years there will be irreparable damage. I'm sorry but the large corporate farms, colonies , have been and will continue to be harmful to the environment ,negatively affect stability of land values, a stewardship way of life and land , and the surrounding settlements and communities will be sacrificed .Any way we can reduce these negative effects will always be welcome. Might not hurt to throw in some rules such as land turnover rates(some way to reduce land gathering for obvious large dispersal's to an organization or entity). Thank you in advance for putting out the survey, maybe saving some of Saskatchewan's precious land from damage.</p>
535.	<p>People came to homestead on the parries so that they could get out from under land lords, let's not take a step back wards</p>
536.	<p>Farming is a way life of for Saskatchewan. We have the resources locally to improve the economy and grow as a province without selling our soul to foreign ownership. Let's keep on the same road that we are on, conservative but amendable to new ideas that benefit our population, not the pockets of rich people overseas.</p>

537.	<p>I think there should be some basic parameters around farmland ownership (only residents or Canadian controlled companies can buy) but the idea that we need to subsidize someone else's kid to get into farming is abhorrent to me. For every other vendor, they don't have restrictions on selling their capital to another Canadian resident - why should I have that restriction.</p> <p>Land prices were so utterly devastated under the previous communist (NDP) government that when the restrictions were finally lifted, everything changed and farms FINALLY became worth something. If you look at the provinces on either side of us, their prices have been market driven with the restriction that only residents could buy farmland. Why can't we have that right also.</p>
538.	<p>Please try bring the family farm back. Around the world rural communities and healthy ways of life have died with the corporatization of agriculture</p>
539.	<p>I feel very strongly about foreign and corporate ownership of our province's farmland solely as an investment. We need to preserve the family farm for the integrity and way of life that it provides or we will all be pee-ons working for big money and then it is just a job, not something you invest your whole life in.</p>
540.	<p>Keep ownership Saskatchewan and Canadian based. That is why our ancestors came here and there is no good argument (except short term greed) to change it.</p>
541.	<p>It would be easy to give in to the demands of others and let the free market take us where it will but I hope you will consider other options. Farmers are the most efficient operators and I find it amazing how much we can do with so little while others would never consider taking on the risks that we do for so little reward. We care about our land and our communities and their future as well. I think that the allowing our farmers and the people of our country, and our province to act as the stewards of the land is the best option for the future of our province. It is the best way to keep our money in our local and provincial economies. Thank you for taking the time to consider my opinions.</p>
542.	<p>Let people who not only are going to farm the land, but also care for it and treat it with respect be the ones to own it.</p>
543.	<p>Why are we talking about differentiating farmland from other CN land? If CN land should be open only to CN nationals, there would not be the development we have. Philosophy is very expensive.</p>
544.	<p>I do not think we need foreign ownership of land in Saskatchewan. If people want to own land here they need to move here and farm.</p>
545.	<p>Keep Canadians in control, we are tired of all the foreign politics that some way always corrupt our legal system!</p>
546.	<p>Land and buildings, both urban and rural, should not be treated like other capital assets as they pay tax on their value yearly.</p> <p>Only municipal governments should be able to levy tax on buildings and land.</p>
547.	<p>It is our greatest asset. Don't let people who abuse their land buy ours. Saskatchewan farmers love their land.</p>

548.	For the various reasons stated throughout the survey, I think it is very important that we restrict the ownership to Sk residents to ensure that we can continue to have the great province that we live in for future generations. Short sightedness on trying to gain value in farmland and inflows of cashflow will not stimulate the economy. A retired individual who is looking for the highest price is not going to reinvest the money to be active in the economy, but rather become an active assets sitting in bonds or GIC's, so having foreign cashflow coming into our province might seem like a good idea initially. It is going to do nothing to stimulate the economy in the future and actually be a drain on our cashflow in the future as rent and potential future purchases by SK residents back from foreigners will cause cashflow to be flowing out of our province. We have seen already where land was purchased by outside the province investors and now they are selling at higher prices and have not invested a dime into this province while they owned it.
549.	Solidly have my feet on both sides of the fence. I really believe that owner operator is by far the best business structure ... but who am I to say
550.	Saskatchewan farmland should be owned and farmed by people from Saskatchewan, with money going back into our economy, not foreign investors. Foreign investment is only good for a short term cash out. It isn't good for future generations and will eventually lead to a bust.
551.	Saskatchewan is the most preserved and wholesome province in Canada. Everything from the land to the people that live here. Our resources and natural habitat are threatened by chemical toxicity and foreign investors who don't want to live here but just see dollars signs. Who are we if we don't own our own country?
552.	The move towards farmers leasing more land than they own will have disturbing effects years down the road as no farmer is going to invest into caring for land that could be sold off from year to year. There will be more taking from the land and less putting back into it.
553.	While rural depopulation is an unintended consequence of some policies , allowing foreign ownership as well as investment fund ownership of farmland would definitely contribute to rural depopulation. An very undesirable position for Saskatchewan to find itself in.
554.	I come from a family with four generations of farmers before me in this province and the farm I own has been passed down from generation to generation. I am highly educated in the area of agriculture and business with a masters and bachelor degree from the University of Saskatchewan. I have life, work and educational experience/knowledge that is pertinent and relevant to this survey. Changing or broadening foreign ownership laws surrounding Saskatchewan farmland would be a huge mistake in all aspects (financially, socially, environmentally, etc.) that CANNOT be undone. It would be detrimental to the very people who built this province. Please DO NOT allow foreign ownership of Saskatchewan farmland outside of the 10 acres that is currently permitted. Thank you.
555.	Individual ownership only! Saskatchewan farmland for Saskatchewan people!
556.	We have struggled to get the acres we have do to out of province investors buying neighboring land. I can't imagine what it will be like for my kids if they want to start with me

	and progress. Next to impossible if we have to compete with large scale buyers who don't need the same percentage of a return than we do!
557.	I would hate to see us come to the serf and peasant situation. Farming is a very cycle driven operation with so many things out of a producers control. Foreign investment has made it very difficult for the younger generation to acquire land. Why should we have to compete with oil money from a foreign country? The ones who control the land ownership are the ones who control the economy of the province. Do we want to be serfs in our own province?
558.	Even mature farmers are making it difficult to enter the market, as are large collective farming operations.
559.	Land is a valuable resource to Saskatchewan and its residents don't allow people from out of province to control a lot of that land. They don't contribute to the health of our province and its communities
560.	Our Alberta company has purchased deeded & lease land in Sask. We would be interested in expanding our operation, which could be made possible if there was a change to your commerce act to allow leveraging of Saskatchewan lease land.
561.	Owning Saskatchewan farmland has offered us opportunity to achieve our dreams and goals. We own and lease property, and by far, the ownership option has worked best with us who raise cattle. This may be due to the additional infrastructure needed for cattle-fences, water and access during all seasons, even winter and spring. Pressure from outside investments would certainly be most difficult for anyone starting up their own enterprise. We are always glad when land is resold to farmers.
562.	<p>As an Alberta resident that also owns land in Saskatchewan I would like to say we bought the land from a long term friend and business client. The land wasn't less than we could have done in Alberta but is only four miles inside Saskatchewan and its proximity to other operations in Alberta made it viable.</p> <p>Also we are long term licensed livestock dealers in Saskatchewan and Medicine Hat, Maple Creek, Mankota, Burstall etc is what we consider to be home.</p> <p>The decisions made here are very important to our family and to a large number of farm families in our area that already own land in both provinces and look forward to growing in Saskatchewan. Lastly our neighbors in both provinces are fantastic people and we always need to get along and treat them as we would want to be treated.</p> <p>We hear that some people believe if you don't live in a province you are there to drive up the price of land but one just needs to look at the competition for land in Alberta and it is our choice to compete for land with any farmer as his risks are the same as ours.</p> <p>Agricultural land has historically always been over priced and goes through boom and bust cycles.</p> <p>This is not likely to change and the people that are focused and committed will survive and grow.</p>
563.	We are coming from Germany. Most land there is leased . It helps retired farmers as additional

	retiring income, but it is taxable. There is a list with all land transitions and the prices and if an other person or company want to buy farmland, an interested farmer has the first bid. If the bid is lower than the average, other persons can buy. But the seller has not to sell..
564.	I would prefer That we own the land benefit from it ourselves then selling to foreign company who takes all the Benefit. Look at all the innovation for farming in sask that we created, seed master bourgault degelman morris leon rite way flexicoil seed hawk conservapack honey bee just off the top of my head. These were all created by farmers who wanted to innovate and do better. If we sell out to china or Saudi Arabia I can't think off anything they created that helps us in farming. That all happened in the last fifty years can you imagine what could happen fifty years from now.
565.	Through modern technology we have already relinquished control of profitability to large corporations providing terminated seed and chemically controlled production methods so any further loss of management control in farming will only add to uncertainty and the risk to profitable continuation." Once the cow is milked who will keep feeding her for nothing." Once the system is changed and profits taken who will stay in a system that offers limited potential. How do we then rebuild?
566.	Try to keep the people who farm the land also own the land. You will have a better system of food production for Canad. The end result is a more sustainable system with the owners of the land having a direct action on the land . This all leads to a better society.
567.	As a small farmer looking to expand, it is tough enough to compete with the neighbors and large farms to buy/rent land let alone if we had foreign money coming in. I would like to see the family farms be prevalent in sask. and see less corporate/mega farms, they drive the price of land up and make it nearly impossible for the rest of us to compete. We are blessed to have the fertile land that we do in sask, it would be a shame to give it away to somebody who doesn't care about it like we do!!
568.	Allowing out of province ownership of land removes the profit of the land to those investors leaving the residents of the province with nothing for the future.
569.	As a young farmer I am worried that the rising cost of farmland will affect my ability to run a stable farm. I currently lease approximately 80% of the land I farm. The cost to lease land can change quickly, It is difficult to buy equipment etc for the farm with the uncertainty of if you are going to be able to continue leasing the land and at what cost. I would prefer to own most of the land I farmed. In my opinion current land values are close to or over the price where a farmer on an average year would be able to cover the land payments with the profit from the crop grown on the piece of land being purchased. I think large farms that can pool profits from land already owned to buy a new piece of land as well as investor speculating on land is the reason for the current higher land prices. I have no problem with competition between farmers of all sizes and investors with connections to agriculture but I'm against investors/companies with no agricultural connection speculating on land. I don't want pension plans, large land investment companies and non Canadian residents buying Saskatchewan farm land.
570.	The government of Saskatchewan has an absolute responsibility to govern for the benefit of Saskatchewan people within the larger Canadian milieu. I believe it to be beneficial to the

	Province and its people to retain farm ownership in the hands of Saskatchewan people and preferably farm owner/operators.
571.	I highly disagree with investor owned farm land. The past few years investors have bought up thousands of acres in my area. It's made it extremely difficult to expand our farm. This land was then farmed by corporate farms (max crop and broad acres). The land was farmed poorly and now is a mess. It worries me that this could happen to more a more land and there will be nothing for the next generation of young farmers.
572.	Farmland is not the same as a stock market investment to be traded by people with no connection or concern for Saskatchewan's land. The best chance for a sustainable future for food production for all of Saskatchewan, Canada and the world is to have farmland owned and farmed by small to medium sized local farmers living on and taking care of the land. The less restriction there is on land ownership the less farmers there will be on the land and the faster our land and environment will deteriorate.
573.	I am strongly against First Nations purchasing land and converting that land to reserve land tax free. As wards of the state then the Federal Government should be liable for the local taxes on the original property. If we don't address this situation the local tax burden on other owners will become too onerous in the near future. As the population of aboriginals grows exponentially this problem will only get worse.
574.	i think this is a very important issue as I know of several young people who would like to start farming but cannot because the price of land is too high. As a province do we not want young people to farm and uphold our rural communities? I think it is very important that we do everything we can as a province to make it a favorable environment for our young people to enter farming. I feel very strongly that we as a province need to put land ownership restrictions into place ASAP to ensure our future young farmers.
575.	Our agricultural land is one of our most valuable natural resources. Those who live on the land have the most to lose if it is not protected and carefully managed ('husbanded'). It cannot be treated like many other commodities as it is a 'living organism' requiring constant monitoring and adjustment in its care.
576.	People came to Canada to get away from working for other people farming and OWNING their own land. The rules seem to be in favor of returning to that system where the poor provide for the rich. Owning farmland is just important to modern farmers as it was in year's past. There is still foreign investment going to happen with farmers from around the world coming here to farm because it makes financial sense here for them. That part I agree with if they come here and live and farm themselves. The more the cost of land goes up the less financially sound farms become particularly new farms.
577.	Is the ownership threat foreign or domestic. Foreign includes all foreign companies or governments Domestic includes , other companies in other provinces, pension funds etc
578.	My goal was to work in Alberta and buy some land in sask and eventually farm but high prices have slowed that process down
579.	Farmland is for farming. Not investors.

580.	Would like to see government support traditional family farm. Those who work the land should have priority to be owners
581.	SK is in the unique position of resisting the draw of foreign ownership longer than the other provinces. We cannot give in now for the sake of quick, temporary, limited financial gains. We need to keep in mind the long-term consequences. We are already losing much of our land base to mineral prospects. We need to keep hold of the land that we still have that will ultimately be our saving grace in the years to come. When we have no land to feed ourselves then we will really be at a loss.
582.	We do not have the financial base in Saskatchewan to support the farm and the farmer. We need outside money to keep the cash flow going.
583.	sask has a lands branch- use it to buy land and rent it back to farmers- at a fairprice-the farmer gets paid out when he sells and the govt gets there money back in time
584.	Let's not turn this into a third world country by letting people other than Canadian farmers gain wealth from Canadian farm land
585.	I believe that agriculture in Saskatchewan is doing very well. It is driven by the need for good quality food that comes from good farming practices and land management decision that helps our environment in which we live and I believe this can only happen as long as farming stays in the hands of the Saskatchewan farmers who continue to live and work on that land and to improve its productivity.
586.	All Governments constantly change policies. They don't necessarily go by surveys.
587.	I have a 1/4 section of land for sale for a year and I still have not sold it yet. Farmers complain about who wants the land outside of Canada and Pension plans. But never about the price of equipment. The Farm Progress Show is happy to host over 800 International guests and representing over 57 countries. Why should these people not be interested in Saskatchewan farm land as well?
588.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The bigger issue here is protecting food security for our province and country. 2. Ownership results in sustainable crop rotations and better long term stewardship of the land and protection of the ground and surface water supply. 3. Our ancestors left Europe with the hope of owning land - not to be serfs. 4. Our area has buyers working recreational property as well as oil industry demand for local housing which also drives up the price of land.
589.	<p>This survey is misleading at times. You should explain that the increase of market values is directly related to investment.</p> <p>Farm land should be owned and farmed by Saskatchewan residents.</p>
590.	Right now, we have several foreign buyers willing to buy a million (1,000,000) acres each of Saskatchewan land. Their job, right now, is to search for loop-holes in ways of obtaining Saskatchewan-Canadian farmland.
591.	Farmland ownership/leasing must be bonafide farmers residing in the province. We also must return to the original Land Bank system for young and beginning farmers. Limit non resident

	ownership to 10 acres. Pretty tough for a young person to compete with big money especially when the Federal Government confiscated that amounted to billions of dollars of the Wheat Board with Wheat Board Payments of which amounted to billions of dollars of which hurt the farmers bad.
592.	Lets get back to normal and quit changing the face of our rural communities by foreign investors and big dollars and changing the face of our topography and ruining rural life. JWH
593.	See attached letter.
594.	Land for value added purposes need not exceed 10 acres (usually). Raw materials should be provided by farmers - not corporations.
595.	I cannot afford to own all my land. I rent half my farm. The people I rent from will be selling their land sometime in the next 5-10 years. If I am unable or unwilling to buy that land (don't want to take on that much debt, could put me in a bad situation if interest rates go up or have successive poor years), I could loose half my acres. I am set up with equipment to farm it all. Having larger funds/groups in place that can take the land purchase risk and I take the farming risk will allow me to keep doing what I do best.
596.	Immigrated more than 20 years ago.
597.	I grew up on the farm, and my family still farms. Regardless, I still believe that increased regulation in the guise of "protecting our way of life" ultimately hurts us by denying owners options in using their land to its full potential, which includes selling it or transforming it to other uses. I reject the notion that the government will always know better than every single farmer how to best use that land.
598.	lived rural until 18. parents still live rural.
599.	Keeping things more locally owned will benefit our economy in long tun
600.	I think I covered all I have to say. I would welcome a call.
601.	My family has been on the same land for four generations. I care about how it's handled and have pride in owning it. I want the best not only for the land but also for the communities surrounding it. I don't feel that foreign or large company investors have that same idea in mind.
602.	I have a grandson and I would love it if he had a place to come where the land is good and he could experience farm life. His grandparents have had the land in their family for 100 years. Let's not sell it to be used, depleted and abandoned.
603.	As mentioned; we have farmed for over 100 yrs in the province. 6 generations have worked out land; we take a lot of pride and value in this. By changing these laws; you will cripple an industry that is built on honesty; hard work and dedication even in the bad years. Farmers are and will always be the back bone of any civilization; it's a culture that can't be explained; your born into it; it flows in your veins. Do not make the mistakes other provinces have by allowing foreign investments into our great provincial investment. A lot of Farmers stayed and worked hard; fighting to make ends meet when greener pastures were all

	<p>around. And now that an industry is thriving; you want to take that away from All those people. Canada is a big country; let foreign investment go else where and keep Saskatchewan as it is.</p>
604.	<p>Why would we want to allow foreign ownership of one of our most precious resources?? When in history has it been a good idea to allow foreign ownership of farmland?? When in history has leasing land been more profitable then owning land? Why did Premier Wall stop the BHP Billiton takeover of PCS? In one word, control! Why do we want to lose control??</p>
605.	<p>Farmland should be owned by farmers. Get rid of foreign investment. It's going to cripple our province in the end.</p>
606.	<p>I just hope the government does not allow all this outside investment in farmland. There have been some good years but there will be difficult ones again and that makes it very hard for our children to get a start in farming in our small rural community. We want to keep our young people (farmers) in the area and the only way to do that is to allow them to purchase farmland. I am not talking about the ones whose parents already own 5,000 to 10,000 acres or more, but the small farms like ours need to be able to expand and keep our children around. We cannot compete with CPP.</p>
607.	<p>Saskatchewan land MUST remain with the residents of Saskatchewan. Period.</p>
608.	<p>Saskatchewan farmers should be the only ones who own farm land.</p>
609.	<p>I would like to strongly urge to whoever is reading this to pass my name and contact info along to the powers above. I believe that as a young primary producer looking at taking over and expanding a grain operation, my insight and experience is invaluable and imperative to a decision as big as changing the ownership regulations surrounding saskatchewan farmland.</p>
610.	<p>Typically, I favour less government intervention in the economy. In this case however, I see the positive in restricting foreign investment in farmland. Personally, I would gain the most from allowing foreign investment in farmland, as I do not plan on farming, but will one day own land. I do however have many young friends starting out in farming and hope to one day own land. I see no problem with Canadian ownership in farmland. I think Canadian-owned investment funds should be allowed to own farmland (if it is proven that they have no foreign investors).</p> <p>As farming is becoming more and more commercial, it may one day be worthwhile to consider allowing foreign investment on farmland, but have the government charge royalties on production.</p>
611.	<p>Farming is already an activity of large land barons in Saskatchewan. The small family farm is a thing of the past. You'd need a section of land at least to earn a modest, risky living and a lot of costly machinery. Protectionist actions of government will simply allow large land holders to acquire more land before markets are eventually opened.</p>
612.	<p>Restrictions on Saskatchewan farmland ownership should be removed to allow outside investment. The reason for this is that other provinces have no restrictions on farmland ownership. Farmland should be the same as other assets, such as office buildings, urban property or Industrial property.</p>
613.	<p>I am very much against foreign ownership of land and also against corporations owning large tracts of land and renting it back to farmers! Keep farmland owned and operated by Canadian</p>

	farmers or owned by retired farmers and rented back to Canadian farmers.
614.	Yes. Seems like the big farms are buying all the land. There are smaller farms that would like to buy. But the big guys seem to get it . We don't have the money like they do. They pay the big price.
615.	Wants farmland to be owned by local farmers only - they care about the land and roads and community!
616.	An Alberta based company realized a near doubling of SK land value held between 2006 and the 2013 winding up of the farmland fund. That is speculative capital, not productive - who pays the price? This same company launched a fourth farmland investment fund dealing exclusively in SK cropland in 2013. The fund is RRSP eligible and is open to investors in six provinces providing a stated hedge against inflation and to give risk adverse investors an opportunity to diversify their holdings without assuming operational risks faced by farmers. Does this need or deserve comment? Crop Farm Canada Inc will not seed or harvest crop of its own this year. Speculative capital at its best! Further an admission that some of the funds originated offshore - tax evasion money. The Provincial Investigator will never be able to follow the money to the source without cooperating Governments.
617.	Farmland is readily available for purchase in other provinces and the world didn't end. The price of that land rose considerable and their economies grew accordingly. Thank you to the Government of Saskatchewan for considering such an open consultation on the matter.
618.	Keep the farmland in the hands of the people that best know what it takes to make a living off of the land.
619.	Under the current rules it looks like there is some concern within government that we are not really on top of who owns what (e.g., when the investment/owner scheme is really complex), hence the question about us supporting some tougher scrutiny on land ownership. With this in mind - what makes the government think if we open rules up more, they will be easier to track? It will just move the bar for these clever investors to find new ways to hide inappropriate land purchases. Regardless of the outcome of who owns the land, it is, in my opinion, just as important to address the issue of who gets to decide what land is used for (i.e., land use policy). For instance - if a company large enough to buy a large part of the farm land in a small RM, did in fact buy it - what happens to the infrastructure needs of the RM (and maybe even the tax base etc.). The few remaining people living in the area (not just leasing it) may be affected by a large out of province ownership outcome. I would want to see strong laws/policy in place that ensures we don't start giving away the benefits of owning our own land. This policy must be in place before anything happens - not developed in response to a crisis or oversight encountered after the fact.
620.	I started our farm 10 years ago at the age of 22 in a post-BSE financially challenging time. I have felt the severe impact of external investment and inflated land prices first hand and feel that if things don't change and land prices don't become more stable for the growers actually responsible for producing food, my three young children will never be able to pursue a life on the faint if they so choose.
621.	Farmland as a commodity is really bad public policy. Financial capital is an issue that creates a virtual serfdom for farmers. However, foreign ownership will result in a lack of sovereignty and for me this is the key issue.

622.	Keep it local
623.	Ultimately ownership provides more stability for generational transfers. Unless farmers regain market power to earn a sufficient share of their production value land ownership will be irrelevant.
624.	Land prices need to be kept within reason in order for farmers to make a living. Local ownership of our land means it is treated with respect and not abused. Saskatchewan depends on its agriculture and its resources. We need to maintain control of our land and continue to produce quality products that feed Canadians and the rest of the world. Big corporate farms do not have the same vested interest in producing quality product or maintaining the integrity of the land. Employees are not the same as owners when it comes to motivation and farming is not a 9-5 job.
625.	Farm land ownership needs some controls in place. They don't make any more land. This isn't like other businesses. Too many investors can cause long term hardships in Agriculture and it could lead to the demise of it.
626.	my family has farmed this land for 107 years my son is trying to farm but the cost of the land and foreign owners and huge farmers make it very difficult
627.	We do not want to repeat history of the rest of the old world which with time led to the few owning and controlling the many. Revolutions started for food that the powerful controlled and manipulated the price of the food. Farm land consolidation here will have NO escape clause since there is NO new world to emigrate to and start a quarter section for a mere \$10.00. They just do not make any more farm land, in fact, lots of land is disappearing due to urban sprawl and control by the few and powerful.
628.	Would like to see this settled and not allow these big corporations to buy the land, All they do is go bankrupt when they try to farm and then that hurts all the suppliers in the area that trusted them to pay their bills. I do not want to compete against big corporations or pension funds for land. Its not fair
629.	I would sooner have farmland values fluctuate with profitability of the land than the land being purchased as an investment vehicle.
630.	I think the owner ship rules are restrictive for farm land development. Saskatchewan land has a lot of potential but lack of corporate financing and ownership will keep production low.
631.	I am a young man with a small 3 person family. Both my spouse and I want to farm but can't make enough to get started. We want to raise our children on a working farm and have them learn the value of hard work. Making land limited to Saskatchewan residents would hopefully allow people like us to make a dream happen and live comfortably doing what they love.
632.	Please ensure that the traditions of Saskatchewan farming is preserved. Thank you
633.	Since we are ALL 'settlers' (having stolen the land from its rightful owners in the first place), we need accountable, just and enforceable government regulations which protect the stability and co-operation between true 'farmer' landowners without exploitation,

	<p>interference and lobbying from corporations, foreign or otherwise!</p> <p>That includes doing what's necessary to re-instate the CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD - the stable and fair marketing capabilities, global reputation and physical assets of which were also stolen by BIG AG!</p>
634.	A man or women work there whole life in the city and sell to the highest bidder. In the country they sell to a restricted crowd.
635.	I purchased land in Saskatchewan in 2003. I work together with local operators to operate the livestock operation both on crop share and custom work sharing risk. This allows the operator to grow to economy of scale and a faster pace. It has been a very positive experience and profitable. Allowing us to work together complimenting each other with time, machinery, land, and finances has made it possible for all of us.
636.	Saskatchewan residents should be the first and only land owners.
637.	The decisions I have made regarding land purchases towards my future are mine alone. The risks involved have been ours. Knowing that land ownership defines our existence , know that the owners of that land have to produce and participate in Agribusiness here. Also the owners of these lands need to be recognized of their return of investment. Will I have a say on Urban sales??? or Cabin/recreation sale ? They are all on Sask. lands..
638.	My Great, Great Grandfathers on both sides of my family homesteaded in Saskatchewan and I have had relatives farming in Saskatchewan for more than 100 years. My family owns 50+ quarter sections of farmland currently and we will buy another 20 quarter sections this fall if the ownership rules become broader or stay the same. If ownership rules become tighter, as investors we will view this as negative, we will look to invest outside of Saskatchewan for the near future. One of the main drivers for us to begin investing in Saskatchewan were the relaxed ownership rules in 2002.
639.	Any financial gain that people like want to preach about being a benefit to this generation is not worth the generations of farmers who will struggle if Saskatchewan chooses to sell its land away to other countries. The world is going to . Let's keep the food we grow in control of our Saskatchewan people. Keep the land in the hands of the descendants who broke it for the first time.The ones who know how to farm it efficiently, and keep the moral and social and environmental values that Saskatchewan needs that keep agriculture viable.
640.	Stop letting foreign investors buy our land and big corporations Government is selling smaller farmers out.
641.	<p>I am very passionate about being a farmer as you may have deducted.When I was young I worked off the farm in order to fund my farm and feed my family it wasn't easy to do.</p> <p>My grandfather in the 20ies would go to Detroit and work at the Ford factory to similarly feed his family.</p> <p>I am annoyed that after all the hard work and personal sacrifices me and my family endured I cant afford land today because of all these foreigners coming into Sask</p> <p>Just because some degree of prosperity exists, buying land only to flip it and profit beside my farm gate.</p>

642.	Don't make me be forced out of the area that my family has settled and been a mainstay in for 5 generations of farming. All the land I have I currently rent, if it goes to market today, I can't afford it and I will be pushed out as there is not enough with dads farm to support my family also.
643.	<p>We have seen huge impacts both positive and negative brought about by technology. The majority of the negative issues have been created by three factors.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A rush to implement change 2. A lack of time and will to slow the process down in order to develop a foresight into the implications. 3. A aggressive mindset to exploit the lack of foresight by those who wish to capitalize on gaps and situations. <p>Please slow the process down, examine what has happened in other countries and take an objective look of both the benefits and long term implications before making change.</p> <p>Those who with to pressure for quick change may not be working for the long term benefit of the Saskatchewan farmers, people and future generations.</p>
644.	I feel that with the current situation farm land is becoming more and more difficult for a young farmer like myself to get established. I own some land (140 acres) but my family owns more (2000 acres) that one I will be able to be a part owner of. I'd like to increase the land that I own but the biggest challenge that I face are large mega farms buying up anything that comes available. These farms are backed by investors. It really doesn't matter if those investors are foreign or even Canadian because it still prevents me from establishing myself. If competition increases even more then I'm not sure if would be able to continue. When more and more young people leave their communities it will have an impact on rural Saskatchewan and our way of life.
645.	We need to keep ownership of Saskatchewan. We don't need foreigners owning us and telling us what is best for us. Foreign ownership will only bring on more corporate farms that do not help the small towns and communities.
646.	If we want young farmers in Sask don't expect them to compete against large investors.
647.	I know for a fact the in my area there is foreign ownership of land in Saskatchewan and is financially backed by foreign government.
648.	<p>Be fair and provide laws to keep foreign investment, pension plans etc.</p> <p>If someone wants to invest then come live here and contribute. We all came here to start. Whether our ancestors or current immigrants. a living person counts more than a dollar amount</p>
649.	I should have the same rights as any other Canadian real estate owner to sell my property. Which I paid for to whomever I wish. Our governments do, urban residential and business do. So should I since I should have the same rights and freedoms as any other Canadian/sask

	resident.
650.	Nothing prepares a young person to become a farmer as having grown up as one. It is a passion you can't acquire elsewhere. Also to keep our small communities alive we need people living here.
651.	<p>For the most part investors have been positive for the industry. In our area an investor came in and purchased 28 quarters, they were leased, new fences put in ,old yard sites cleaned up etc</p> <p>They were sold this spring to 4 young farmers, Yes the investor made money on the sale but if that had went to hutterite brethren it would be gone forever. The brethren are good farmers and good neighbours in most cases but if your goal is to bring new farmers into the business ,Investors will allow that to happen. The land will be rented and may be sold at some time. If it is sold to the brethren it is gone forever. To not allow investors particularly Canadian investors, and still allow the brethren would be unfair and possibly harmful. Investors are still bidding but are bidding lower than area farmers It is a myth that investors drive up the price of land, Sometimes in rare cases they just get it to where it should be</p>
652.	Farmland should be owned by farmers period.
653.	Our farm is over 100 yrs old, and it will not see another 100 if land rules do not change and give its local residents a improved chance of owning farm land.
654.	Thank you for this opportunity to express my opinion. I may not have attended a public hearing to express my feelings.
655.	Stop selling land to foreign owners your ruining the small family farms that were here!!
656.	Government should be very careful to protect its agriculture industry. It is the oldest industry in existence and special attention should be used to make sure that policy changes have the desired results long term.
657.	I would like to see more capital come to the industry as long as it is capped in a way that won't create an industry of Tennant Farmers.
658.	Sask. farmland should be owned only by Canadians.
659.	I believe that Canadian Corporations with minority foreign investor should be allowed to buy no more than 4,000 acres. With a minority foreign investor allowed an interest in only one Canadian Corporation. Any new foreign owner should only be allowed to retain ownership as long as they reside in Canada for 10 months of the year.
660.	I don't trust the government since they change the farmer regulations. Five company buying grain - multi-national buying oil companies. Ownership of overseas owning our companies. What advantage. Farmers are there to farm - let them farm - young farmers want to farm.
661.	<p>The Act which restricts non-Canadians and non-Canadian corporations from owning more than 10 acres of farmland in Saskatchewan should be retained as it is.</p> <p>Farmland is a renewable resource, one of which is responsible for a great portion of the country's wealth; producing huge amounts of products such as wheat, oats, barley, oilseeds,</p>

peas, lentils, corn, etc. for use at home and for export to other countries.

To sell our farmland to foreigners is to lose a large part of the country's wealth; to allow others to impose conditions of growing, selling, and exporting farm products is unthinkable.

Once any resource is sold, someone else controls the land and resulting produce. Sell it, the money from the sale will soon be gone, they will own the resource and you will become a poor country, someone else will gain the riches from your resource.

We have brilliant young people in Agriculture courses at The University of Saskatchewan and children from farm families who will be equipped with the knowledge and drive to take over Saskatchewan farms when we older farmers retire. We do not need to import farmers.

Corporations only drive farmland prices up so that local can't afford the price of the farm. They are no asset to the farming community or to rural living.

Saskatchewan farmers have become the innovators in Agriculture in whom other nations are envious. Foreign investment is not needed here. New and better machinery is designed and made here.

Please do not change Saskatchewan's Farm Ownership rules!

662. There can not be unlimited foreign investment into Saskatchewan or Canada otherwise China would buy Canada and we would become a Chinese province. Therefore Saskatchewan's foreign ownership policy will have to be governed by the federal government's policy.

Farming as we have known it prior to the second world war is a thing of the past. Most of the small mixed farming farms are now hobby farms as the sustainable income comes from full time jobs away from the farm.

To be successful today farming has to be specialized and on a large scale. This means farming is a risky and expensive venture so those who back farming have to have deep pockets. To my knowledge there are very few wholly Canadian companies willing to undertake this risk. Therefore I feel like we should allow foreign investment into farming to make it a viable business.

663. Should have Health card, post office box and driver's license for Saskatchewan.

664. There should be a cap of maybe 2,000 - 4,000 acres that foreign investors or Trusts or Pension Funds could buy.

665. The prairie provinces are the conscience of the nation. Therefore greed cannot rule the regs

	<p>here on land ownership. We must consider balance in leasing land to our localities. We must always use social objectives to further our lives and communities in the long term not just feather our personal masts!</p>
666.	<p>Keep farmland locally owned so our young farmers (my son) can afford to own farmland. Locally owned and operated farms usually better operated or managed than those owned by outsiders and just rented to people who have less to lose by not operating or managing them well. Owners take more pride in the farms.</p>
667.	<p>I strongly believe only Saskatchewan residents should be able to purchase or own Saskatchewan farmland, no foreign ownership or corporations Canadian or not should be allowed to purchase Saskatchewan farmland.</p>
668.	<p>We are not interested in speculators owning farmland here. If they wish to do the farming themselves that a different story. They would need to be permanent residents. Also I am not so sure we could go and buy farmland in China or some other countries. The same should apply here.</p>
669.	<p>I am the son of a man that fought in the first World War. The war that we fought to end all wars. When my Dad returned home he was given the chance to purchase land known as school land. In every township the section 29 was set aside to finance the building of schools. It was raw prairie. I am so proud that this land is still in our family. If we allow large corporations or foreign money to take control our sons and daughters will not have the chance to carry on the farming life that we treasure. Canadian land is there for Canadians regardless of nationality. We are fortunate to have abundant food at a reasonable prices. We want to keep it that way. We are seniors now but we treasure our land and the early settlers that came and made it easier for us. Let's think about them.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
670.	<p>Things are good with the current rules in place. Please don't give away control of our province in the interest of a short term gain.</p>
671.	<p>The results of this survey have a huge impact on how my career will be. Like I said before I work a full time job while living in the city so that me and my family can someday soon move to the farm and farm full time. If farmland keeps going up in price the reality of us moving to the family farm will be gone. To pay 200,000, 300,000 for a quarter of land is unbelievable and will surely put land out of reach for farmers like myself who are just starting out.</p>
672.	<p>We need to value our farmland as highly as we value the food that we eat. Without food, we die, ipso facto, without farmland we die. This is the most precious resource we own, it needs to stay under Canadian control. People need to stop serving their self interests (lawyers, realtors, bankers) and start serving their country, and stop selling out their countrymen to anyone that will give them a dollar. Have some pride.</p>
673.	<p>to provide a strong future for Saskatchewan farmers I hope the government does not allow foreign ownership or non Canadian resident ownership or pension fund ownership. if they do the future generations of farmers will eventually become extinct .</p>

674.	The farmland ownership act is old out dated governances that provided no benefits and directly results in the artificial suppression of Saskatchewan farmland values.
675.	Even though I am 65 years old and am turning our 105 year old farm over to the 4th generation I hope they never sell it to a large outside corporation
676.	We need to be innovative in allowing new financing methods to assist farms to be more viable in the future. This will require "out of the sandbox" thinking
677.	Saskatchewan is the greatest place to live on earth! I'm very thankful to live here and Farm with my Dad. My hope is that our tradition of Farming would continue and thrive into the next generation as it did in previous generations. I guarantee Saskatchewan Farmers care about and support their communities like no one else! My hope that there is a reexamination into the impact and effects of foreign investment and pension fund investment into buying farmland on the Saskatchewan Farmers.
678.	You have smart people who farm. Listen to them. I may live in the city since I work in agriculture, however I am at the farm all the time. I know what happens in other countries since part of my family has a farm in California. I see what happens and the consequences when dealing with investors instead of listening to those who are active in farming
679.	Cheapest land on earth, only fair to increase the value
680.	<p>I was born in Saskatchewan and my family moved to Alberta when I was but a wee baby. I have lived in Saskatchewan in the past, my father was born in Manitoba but raised in Beechy, Saskatchewan, his closest and best friends are born and bred Saskatchewanites, currently managing growing concerns on farms in the region of the province, our family had farmed in Saskatchewan for generations, but left for greener pastures strictly due to corruption in the Saskatchewan provincial government.</p> <p>This farmland act, as it exists today, is an archaic form of poorly thought out, emotional, and likely unconstitutional piece of legislation that absolutely requires liberalization.</p> <p>In no means am I recommending that this issue be completely free of regulation, but the way the 'act' stands now is doing harm to the province and the farmers in the province. I have seen the children of my generation leave the family tradition because it is too hard to make a buck in this day and age on a small farm. Opening the borders to more financing and ownership options will allow everyday farmers to farm more land, raise more capital, with less risk to themselves and their families. Owning land is a privilege-- not a right. If you can not afford to buy the land, or to pay the interest on a loan to buy the land, you ought not be able to do it... however, if you are able to spread the risk of land ownership to another, say a corporation, or foreign entity which allows you to farm more land, perhaps in conjunction with another, or others, thus utilizing your machinery and equipment more efficiently, perhaps you have the ability to earn a much larger income, which in turn can be used to secure lands in the future.</p> <p>This is exactly what the 'Saskatchewan Farmland Securities Act' prohibits today, and what a</p>

free and open market that is adequately regulated can provide to this province.

There is an opportunity for investors to place capital into an under-utilized, and undervalued asset that is not correlated to any other kind of asset that exists in the world today, this should not be overlooked by the current Government, as this idea can create a very large and consistent boon for both the people of the province as well as for the tax collectors in the province.

I would suggest that there will likely be pushback, very loud pushback from certain farmers and even urban dwellers in your province whom believe it their right, not only that they be the only people whom can own and sell lands in Saskatchewan, but also be the ones to dictate to the masses how it ought to be done... I would urge you to drown out this loud but very likely minority group in favor of the good of all of the folks whom are voting and paying taxes in Saskatchewan.

At first it may be an unpopular decision to open the market further, but the voices of descent will fade away as the province prospers.

The latest changes in the 'act' back in '02 certainly have helped raise the profile of the province, but any change made by a corrupt and deceitful, disgraced government is not a powerful one.

This current government has done many great things since gaining power in 2007, liberalization of this legislation will certainly be another.

Thank you

681. Please protect our land!!!! We have gone to war in the past to do that why can we not do it now?? Regulate our grain so we will have food for future generations. Bottom line is it can't just be about money. If so we are sell ourselves out way to cheap .

682. Our farm land ownership mechanisms in the three prairie provinces are almost unique in the world. Most of the world's farmers would like to have opportunities to own and operate their own land, but are increasingly being denied that privilege. It would be irresponsible to diminish the current legislation. It should be aggressively adapted to new challenges.

683. a strong and vibrant rural population should mean a strong and vibrant ag industry.
I have had a large amount of exposure to the investor/ institutional farmland owners and I find in dealing with them they are only interested in their bottom line not in the community in which they have bought land as only an investment nor are they interested in the success of the tenant .

Our ancestors left Europe to come here so they could own land why would we repeat history here and create a generation of tenant farmers who are subject to the whim of land owners

	who are only interested in a return on investment not the society they have invaded
684.	Keep Canadian land in the hands of Canadian Residents!
685.	Farmland is a non-renewable resource. Sell it to foreign investors and you sell Saskatchewan. Foreign and /or Corporate owners will do nothing to ensure the success of communities.
686.	If the government allows foreign investment firms to buy other Saskatchewan farms, potash, oil etc., why can't they be allowed to buy farmland. As being one who work at farming all his life why shouldn't we allowed to get as much as we can to retire from farming.
687.	I don't agree with having absentee landlords. I know of several that have bought land in this area over the last few years and then they lease it out not be best solution. Also, there have been tracts of land sold to people from Germany and China that do not live here. I don't even know how this land was bought as they do not live here. Not a good thing for farmers in Saskatchewan. Before I retired I lived on the farm. Son-in-law farms land now.
688.	Outside investment in farmland would not benefit Saskatchewan as a whole all it would do is give foreign people another to hold on food supply and a place to invest money. A lower price on farmland would be better for farms communities and the rural population. Smaller farms such as about 4000 acres would also benefit rural Saskatchewan and all the small towns that be sustainable here.
689.	Other provinces and states allow foreign investment and they have not imploded. Free markets work.
690.	if the province wants to keep a healthy rural economy you have to have people living here all the time with jobs and families that can make a living. If large tracts of land are owned by outside investors this can't happen. You will have a bunch of old retired farmers with big bank accounts living in cities and huge corporate farms with no interest in being a part of community. Also nobody with skills to actually do the farming
691.	<p>I feel that there is no future for the next generation if they are unable to buy their farms. If they have to work where the best wages are it may not necessarily be in the agricultural industry.</p> <p>In other countries where there are no restrictions on farmland ownership the lending institutions do whatever they can to expropriate their customers land. Once acquired, they retain it as an investment and rent it out to the highest bidder.</p> <p>Once investors own the farmland, it is not maintained in the best interest of the land but what is best for the investor's bottom-line. The investor will do what is necessary to make the most return on their money. The condition of the land deteriorates and may take generations to clean up.</p>
692.	I am glad the government is inviting this dialogue. It would be good to publicize it even more and encourage people to have input. This is a crucially important issue. If ownership rules are expanded, it is unlikely one can restrict them again later and I fear a lot of damage could occur very quickly. I would strongly support tighter control by government on ownership and strongly reject opening ownership to foreign investment!

	Thank you
693.	Keep ownership in the hands of people who want to live and work here....
694.	Since the CPP has taken over Assinibioa Farmland there is a lot more rules and regulations to the lease agreements. I feel that this will only become worse if they can continue purchasing more land. My lease is up next year and if they want the same conditions I will not be resigning. I had to increase my liability insurance(extra cost to me) to meet one of their requirements. Someone in an office making a decision that is not suited to how rural lifestyle is.
695.	We would love to be full-time farmers, but that will never happen if the current out of control outside investments continue.
696.	Farmland security needs to crack down on realtors and lawyers helping foreign investors bend the foreign ownership rules
697.	I m a young farmer and a proud Saskatchewan resident my family and I live in rural Saskatchewan. We can already see the negative impact out of province owners are having on rural life. We are basically shipping money out of Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan is the greatest place in the world to live. So if you want to be part of the economic gain of Saskatchewan you should live here.
698.	Sask farm land values are finally catching up to other areas of the world. People have moved into our area from Alberta, Manitoba , Ontario and Europe. At the time they were selling their high priced land to come and buy cheap Sask land. It was so cheap because of the NDP polices to restrict foreign ownership not because it was poor land. If the government is going to try to control farmland value for young farmers then maybe the same thoughts should go into controlling prices of housing in the cities. Young people have trouble buying houses in the city but government does not step in to restrict houses prices, they should not for farmland also.
699.	Impossible for young farmers to purchase land competing with large investment funds. High priced leasing by these funds also decreases stability of assets for young farmers. In a bad year being stuck in a high priced lease is much worse then if you owned the land. I would also much prefer leasing from a retired farmer for they will understand the challenges of farming. Perhaps young farmers should consider lease to own strategies.
700.	I have previously stated that the best operators are those with a vested interest. I truly believe that Saskatchewan farmers are the best in the world, bar none. If we want to continue this tradition, then the way to do it, is to provide a future for our children and their children. If the successive generations of farmers cannot afford to purchase farmland, then they will become slaves to the investor master. This is a recipe for failure. Help us keep farmland for farmers. Our industry and livelihoods depend upon it.
701.	Farmland prices should reflect the productive value of the land over time, rather than speculative investment opportunities by foreign investors or other investors.
702.	I have no problem with people coming to canada(sk) buying land and farming it. Then they will know all the ups and down in the farming industry, the risks and rewards and price land accordingly.
703.	I want to see a population increase in Saskatchewan. If we could allow outside capital in; with a demand that offices and people follow those dollars that would help. Saskatchewan needs

	<p>people and dollars to stay relevant and sustainable. Hopefully we can see a increase in locally grown and consumed commodities. We are land locked here. The more value we add and consume at home, the more dollars we have for improvement.</p>
704.	<p>Fix this issue or all this land will be owned by investors or foreigners and the young farmers of this province will be gone and the province will suffer. Keep our young here that want to be s part of agriculture. It's a good life give them that chance.</p>
705.	<p>land values can no longer be paid back in ones life time because you will only make so much profit off the land and the profit is less every year due to increase in seed fertilizer chemical fuel equipment.</p> <p>the government needs to stop buying the natives even more land because they do nothing with the land and it goes back to weeds or they rent it out</p> <p>all the land that has been bought in my area which has been 10 of thousands of acres are bought by new canadian citizens that get all the money from out of country and they brag that its none of there money</p>
706.	<p>I believe that foreign entities masquerading as Canadian companies or individuals are buying land with the intention of never selling the land, or keeping it in trust for foreign countries or individuals. These Canadian companies likely are financed by out of country money, it's unfair to local farmers and Canadians as a whole.</p>
707.	<p>Farmland in Saskatchewan should be owned by farmers. Ag more than ever.</p>
708.	<p>There is already to much underhanded land purchases that have been bought and not monitored correctly. By the time the layers of the purchases that have been done, too much is already going to be in the hands of foreign investors. The land should have been better look after long before now. The true ownership of land is so covered up its a crying shame, one day we will be the foreigners in our own province. Too late,????</p>
709.	<p>Start focusing on making farming more affordable. Don't waste your time on the land. There is lots of land to go around. Make the consumables and equipment costs not outweigh the profits and LOTS of farmers will farm more and new prospecting farmers will start farming.</p>
710.	<p>Saskatchewan farmland is a natural resource of people of Saskatchewan and should be preserved for generations to come.</p>
711.	<p>I am a citizen of Canada and have lived in Saskatchewan all of my life. I have helped farm 14 quarters of land for my 38 years and taught for 34. I was in charge of our advanced program for many years. I value new citizens to Canada because they enrich our cultural and work lives and I live my country. We need to be very careful that we protect what we have for the children of Canada who are our future.</p>
712.	<p>In order for long term viability, over inflation caused by pensions and huge foreign investment can't happen. When money is shifted to something else agriculture is toast then who will pay when the cash and the equity has left the country.</p>
713.	<p>Saskatchewan should be owned by Saskatchewan people - not the Saudi's or the Americans or the Chinese!! I have no problem with land being owned by descendants of Saskatchewan farmers</p>
714.	<p>Local farmland ownership is very important to keeping the land clean and productive. You</p>

	can't take care of something you don't see or touch often. Unless your out working in the dirt it's hard to understand the connection a farmer has to his land. Personally owned land will always be taken better care of than land owned by some foreign entity
715.	We need to support the good old family farms.
716.	Farm land should be sold in the same manner as government lease for pasture is decided. It should be open to young farmers trying to expand before it is sold to someone that is only looking for an investment. Investors target farm land because of the stability of the value. I target farmland because it is my life.
717.	To enforce rules in a free market system artificially affects the how an efficient market functions. To instill onerous rules and regulations will create a market that will not function properly in the future and long term.
718.	As i said before....ownership of land by those that farm it will leave you with better land, better environment, etc. and a safer food source.
719.	Ask Alberta residents who overbid on land then once give it back refinance with first right if refusal. To see if corporate should play farmer or ranchers.
720.	We need to be extremely careful that our land which is our most important resource does not become owned by non residents. I understand it may give higher and prices I think in theonv term it is not beneficial to our province
721.	I hope the Government does not take the view that anyone who does not support relaxed farm ownership rules is Negative. New comers who wish to join our communities should be welcomed.
722.	GIVE SPECIAL HUNTING RIGHTS TO FARMLAND OWNERS
723.	Is it possible to have Saskatchewan owned land that is available to small or new farmers with reasonable lease rates? That way they can start farming, grow their operation. Once established they can pay market price for their own land. Small town Saskatchewan has seen their population dwindle. At one time, schools were full, there was huge community involvement. Was this a bad thing? Now one large farmer farms 10-15 times what one farmer used to. One farmer replaces 10-15 families that were the back bone of the community.
724.	I am old enough to remember when those elected were fondly referred to as civil servants. They represented the best interest of those who depended on them to voice the opinions of their region. Somehow we allowed the servant to become the master. I implore you to keep Saskatchewan, Saskatchewan.
725.	Canada should not sell or concede land nor natural resources for the benefit of non-Canadians.
726.	In the 70's I purchased my first quarter worked off the farm and bought two more then bid on two more was high bid but at auction was out bid by sask land bank money (my own tax dollars) many years later the same half came for sale and I verbally agreed to purchase it Enter Assiniboia land company the only way they would buy the other eight quarters from the neighbour was if they got it all once again I lost it now Canadian pension plan owns the land that fits perfectly in our adjoining land. Is it possible to get a printed copy of this survey and

	my answers?
727.	Rural communities are finally starting to grow, let's keep the momentum going by drafting rules that protect the voters, not the investors. It is your obligation to do so.
728.	Our grandparents came to this country to farm so they wouldn't be peasants working the land for someone else. There is no shortage of young people who would like to buy land in this area but outside investment has driven the price very high.
729.	I would like to see large and foreign investors still NOT have the ability to purchase farmland. It is difficult enough to compete with people who are buying the land either to live on or just own. We have seen in our area land values triple and just about quadruple in the last ten years making it very difficult to purchase any land that does come up. Myself being a young farmer just can't afford to pay those prices. I would also like to state that our farm has been in the family for 111 years and when some family land does come available I would like to be able to purchase it without having to compete with companies that have millions to invest. Lets keep it in the Family.
730.	In previous responses
731.	I'm proud of the pioneers and their decedents for the respect they have shown towards the land.
732.	please get control of who buys the land so my children can have a future in farming
733.	Foreign ownership is not a good idea for the people of Saskatchewan, and the country as a whole. We need to keep our people here employed and financially secure, instead of lining the pockets of rich foreign investors. it is NOT wise to sell of a resource that is invaluable that will ALWAYS be needed, land to grow crops and livestock to feed people.
734.	depopulation of rural areas has already drastically changed Saskatchewan's small towns and cities.
735.	we should have the right to sell what we have acquired and worked for to the highest bidder
736.	All land owned in Saskatchewan by corporation and foreigners must be put up for auction for residents only. The Canadian pension plan board of directors must be stripped of all their ability to buy farm land .young farmers cannot compete with pension plans and foreigners.
737.	If you allow another country to keep buying up land, will it ever make it back into the hands of a Canadian? Too much control is being given to those who have no interest in farming. Farming is in your heart, not just your pocketbook and it would do well to let all levels of government officials know that. No one should look at a farm and just see \$\$\$. If that's all they see, then they have no interest in the future of farmland or the future of their groceries as well. Increased land prices because of foreigners will mean increased prices on the table. It may take a while to get there but it will. And, when it does, those who allowed it to happen will be wondering what the heck happened. I suggest office workers go visit a farmer and see what we're up against instead of just looking at numbers
738.	There should be more incentives to keep farming a viable resource to keep food production at its maximum level to ensure food costs are kept at a low cost level to consumers. More initiatives should be employed to entice young farmers to take up farming. There should be incentives and government financing to increase diversity in agriculture, more tax write offs,

	<p>farm loan rebates, farm loan initiatives with low interest rates, promotions, to encourage more farm related businesses. We do not need corporate farmers... We need to bring back families to farm and take care if the land. Specialized in greenhouse farming, vegetable farming etc. to keep our food prices down. We have never experienced a famine in this country and we don't want to... We need to appreciate the food producers and realize their importance to feeding this country. We need to financially support family farming not corporate farming. It would increase our numbers in the rural areas and increase the population in Saskatchewan decreasing the need for big urban centres. Spread the population more evenly through out the provinces.... Give families a place to live and work and raise children in a great environment. Farming is a way of life that creates great values, work ethic and way of life that is being destroyed with big farmers and corporations... More families should have the choice to live this way and they won't with big corporate farms taking over. The government can make a choice to turn this around or not.</p>
739.	<p>I grew up on a farm and it is a way of life that I would like to see my children and grandchildren have the opportunity to have</p>
740.	<p>Farmland and its ownership is a strategic resource which should be owned by farmers and responsible to Canadians to produce quality food. We should not lose any more control of what we eat. The minister of health and minister of agriculture should share the agriculture portfolio. If 40 percent of my tax dollar goes to health care and we are what we eat - why doesn't the minister of health have a larger say in agriculture?</p> <p>If land is owned by corporations whose sole purpose is economic return or worst case security of food supply for another country - what does it matter what it is worth? We must ensure we do not become serfs in our own country!!!!</p> <p>I think we should restrict farm size to 10,000 acres per person as well. Small farms add innovation and encourage true farmers and consumers to get better connected and we should focus on capturing the value of the commodities farmers produce as well as the nutritional density of what is produced.</p>
741.	<p>Why should I subsidize the younger farmers with lower land prices, when nobody cares how much I have pay for a home in town or city. My land is my pension. I need the most I can get so I can retire in dignity. We worked hard on the farm, now the Gov,t should tell me who I can sell to. I am sick of It.</p>
742.	<p>To provide an out direct descendants should be able to inherit land and add to it if they wish, recognizing some left the farm because of financial considerations but their support targets those here now and has stewardship.</p>
743.	<p>keep Canadian land Canadian</p>
744.	<p>Our forefathers came to this country to settle here because their home countries would not allow them to own land and make a sustainable living for themselves. To this day immigrants are trying to come to Canada for a better life. If we can't learn from history and see the value of owning our own land and resources we are doomed to end up like the countries that are been fled from. We need to have the foresight to see that this land ownership rule does not only benefit the people of the province today but all future generations.</p>

745.	<p>I own farmland in MB.....the land on which I was raised.</p> <p>I believe that without the proper control of ownership of our Canadian farmland, our people could starve to death while living in one of the richest food producing countries of the world. This should be taken lightly. There is great responsibility on those in charge of making decisions around what involves sustaining quality of life for all Canadians. And that life quality's foundation is in farmland and the water ways around it.</p>
746.	DO NOT ALLOW FOREIGN BUYERS TO PURCHASE SASKATCHEWAN FARMLAND PLEASE!
747.	Corporations not involved in actively farming the land have no business in buying land, let alone foreigners. Farmers need to be able to buy land and not just the corporate farms.
748.	By allowing foreign entities to purchase and own farmland we are moving away from the proud Saskatchewan farming tradition. This will make family farms a thing of the past and will make large corporate farms that care nothing for the people of Saskatchewan the norm. This will create long term wealth transfers from the people of Saskatchewan to entities outside of the province. Individual residents need to be the owners of production not foreign entities or large corporate trusts. By keeping farmland ownership in the province this will keep the profits in the province and keep the proud Saskatchewan farming tradition alive.
749.	You should have to be a sask. resident to own land Saskatchewan
750.	Let foreign investors purchase as much land as they want, Saskatchewan will thrive with all the investment it will bring to everyone.
751.	Most of my relatives are farmers and have worked farms for generations it would be a travesty if their kids could not work the farm just because we let foreign investors buy the land. I am tired of the government selling Canada bit by bit to people who have no connection to our country
752.	no
753.	It is a tough thing to balance as most farmers rely on the sale of their farms to retire on, and with increased cost of living to afford retirement they need all they can get, but at the same time farming isnt profitable enough for a young farmer to be able to buy a farm and remain profitable. Maybe the best thing is to let the chinese buy it and force them to have to farm it themselves. This would ensure cheap food production to the country and other countries for decades to come as they can work cheaper than Canadians it seems and this country doesn't cherish it's food supply or farmers enough. I think of an old saying from the Roman times and we all know what happened to the Roman empire "While the people were busy in the coliseums the bins ran dry".....Translation "Entertainment is more important than food"
754.	Changing the rules in the middle of the game is rarely fair
755.	We farmed around Yorkton for a few generations before selling the equipment and leasing the land out. We're still involved in the agriculture and food industry however not directly farming the land.
756.	As a Canadian I believe it is our responsibility to allow Canadians the opportunity to own land in Saskatchewan. They must prove they are Canadian or qualify to become a resident. Our producers are resourceful and will continue to produce some of the best food in the world. It is imperative that we keep ownership of our land for Canadians only. Thanks for the

	opportunity to participate in this very important survey.
757.	Local ownership of farm land is very important to the health and well being of the rural economy in Saskatchewan. Increasing non farmer ownership of land has and will have an increasingly negative impact on the viability and stability of the farm sector in Saskatchewan.
758.	<p>If I was forced to lease all my land I would probably be considering another career. I have a university education and could find good work anywhere.</p> <p>I am a rural municipal councilor and I believe that many people in my RM share my point of view.</p>
759.	Very good investment experience as of this date. No problem in leasing out land and maintaining good relations with renters.
760.	I generally believe land values should be reflective of world commodity prices or the potential (speculative) outlook for commodity prices. Farms have been expanded and will continue to succeed based on risk management and competitive production as in any industry. Land ownership is only one part of the equation. I only see foreign ownership posing a threat if done without some restriction and monitoring.
761.	<p>All my life I have had to bid for land against foreign interests.</p> <p>1 the NDP's landbank</p> <p>2 24% interest rate's in the 80's</p> <p>3 first nation's land claims thanks to the federal liberal's in the 90's</p> <p>4 now investor's and hedge funds, with millions of cash</p> <p>enough is enough, give the producer a chance</p>
762.	I believe that in allowing too much foreign ownership of land, be it foreign investors, pension plans etc to buy and own Sask farm land we will end up in a situation that much of the U.S. faces. With absent land owners renting to the highest bidder, and on the rare occasion that land comes up to buy, it will be so high priced that the average farmer will not be able to afford it. How can I pass on my farm to my sons one day when the likelihood of them being able to expand and grow will be far too expensive to make it feasible?
763.	Saskatchewan Farmland will always stay in Sask and be farmed by someone living in Sask who came there 10yrs, 30yrs or a 100yrs ago. My dad bought Farmland in Sask many decades ago and we are proud of our Farmland. The Family that farms our land has a farm about the same size of our land so they Profit of being able to lease the land from us. We Exchange Information and knowledge because I am a farmer over here in Germany and I have worked on farms in France and the USA after studying agriculture at the University of Munich. We just visited our friends in Rouleau and went to the farm Progress Show and we enjoyed ourselves in looking at canadian and german Technology and had a couple of beers to go with it. I am not happy that we have no regular way in increasing our farm size which we would like to do in a moderate amount if there would be land for sale near our farm, which usually is

	necessary for a normal farmer since farms tend to get bigger. But I am a friend of moderate size farms since they provide local Jobs in many ways. Farmland in my area is extremely expensive but the System still works and we farmers find ways to adapt as Long as the Prices for our products are ok. I could imagine a Little bit more of a open Farmland market but I am not a fond of Investment companies buying Farmland that is too much of a concentration.
764.	please keep our land owned by Saskatchewan residents that farm the land and keep large investment companies and foreign investors out.
765.	I have no problem if outside investors buy Sask farmland as long as they live and operate the land themselves . If they choose to live in and support the communities that's great but to own from afar I totally disagree with selling to funds or out of province investors . The government will be making a bad mistake if they don't smarten up and prevent the farmland being just an investment tool .
766.	Investor groups and non Saskatchewan residents have without question have driven land values up which in turn has made it hard for local farmers to compete to expand there operations, Rent has been paid to absentee owners which does not benefit the province or local economy. In many cases Investors are also speculators and have resold the land for a quick profit year or two later. I think in order to own farm land some sort of a " Homestead Act" should be enforced were as the purchaser must a bonified farmer and reside in the province and live on the farm , This in turn would benefit the local economy .
767.	I am very grateful that you are seriously looking at this and what effects this will have on our province as a whole and the small communities that are within it and the impact of selling us to pension plans and outside investors. We are a proud province because of our roots and most of those roots came from rural Saskatchewan. Let us hold onto that and continue to be a proud province and good stewards or OUR land.
768.	At a minimum, keep things in Canadian hands. Foreign ownership is DANGEROUS to the future of all Canadians.
769.	Our grain and livestock producers successfully compete globally for sales of their products. Access to land is only one cost the farmer has in producing...the value of that access is determined by the market and will be based on a combination of the returns that can be made, and the appreciation in land value that can be expected in the future. Allowing more people to invest in land won't necessarily increase the value in the long term, but will allow Sask land values to reach a global norm much quicker. As a former part time Sask farmer/land owner and a long time Sask taxpayer, I would love to be able to invest in Sask farmland through companies and trusts...I can invest in Sask based companies through Sask Works Labour Sponsored funds...why not Sask Works Farmland funds?
770.	Think of all the young farmers when you make your decision. Don't just think about the older farmers wanting to sell. Sure you might get them a good price for their land and buy their votes, but how are you leaving the farm picture for the future generations whose dream of farming like their dad, grandpa, and great grandpa is in jeopardy. I want to farm! I don't want to farm for a foreign controlled/pension fund. I want to farm for me, my family, I want to make my dad and grandpa's proud.
771.	I am older than the average ag producer in Sask. I can see a scenario in which at my retirement there would be three or four neighbours with young guys wanting to start or

	<p>expand their farms. These guys are going to have enough hurtles with inflated fert, chemical,seed,machinery,etc.prices without having to bid against large pension plan and other outside investors for ownership of the land.</p> <p>Yes ; I would probably get a higher bid for my land but for the long term outlook for Ag. in Sask. it would have a very negative effect.</p>
772.	<p>There is significant value in maintaining family-owned farms in the province. The collapse of family owned farms could have significant negative consequences for the province that are hard to measure.</p>
773.	<p>If investors continue to buy farmland it will drive young Saskatchewan farmers away from the farm. It's a tough enough business without competing for land with huge companies with unlimited amounts of money.</p>
774.	<p>I take all the risks in good years and in bad years. All I want is not to be restricted when I do something with my land. The same people that are complaining about the price of land in our small town ,are the ones who have all the brand new equipment in there yard.</p>
775.	<p>With the average age of farmers already being at 54 making land even more expensive for young farmers is going to drastically affect their ability to make a farming operation viable. There will be even more young people leaving the farm as a result</p>
776.	<p>Only the people actively farming should be allowed to purchase farmland. Young farmers are losing control and soon we just be farm managers for large corporations. As a farmer I take pride in doing everything I can to try to grow a good crop. There are many factors that play a part in that and lots we can't control but if we do everything we possibly can to get a good crop it is nice to see the financial benefit of it. It's been a hard last 5 years because we finally got some decent crops and then the railroads have taken all our profits away and large grain companies as well</p>
777.	<p>I hope to see my grandchildren have the opportunity to own land as I do. I believe this will be less possible if rules were relaxed to allow for more foreign ownership of land. My great grandparents came to this country to have to opportunity to own land and moved from countries where land was all owned by estate owners and there was no chance to own land as a small farmer. I have been in third world countries like India where I was told directly by officials of a state trading company which buys Sask pulses that they would like to control Sask farmland as it would provide better food security for their country. I believe this prospect to be bad for farmers in Sask to lose control of their land. We are seeing this scenario happening in Africa and backlash from the affected counties is now noticed.</p>
778.	<p>There should be rules in place that when people are selling land they cannot charge the same amount as owned vs leased (lots of people are doing it). Can only charge improvements.</p> <p>Should be able to get lease land from neighbours that boarder you or within a certain distance without having to buy some owned to get it.</p> <p>I fell that if you don't live in and farm the land yourself you should not be able to own or lease land.</p>

779.	I farmed and purchased land without competition from outside investors and I think my son and other young farmers deserve the same
780.	If young Saskatchewan farmers cannot become Saskatchewan landowners then we are simply labourers. We will take a good paying job anywhere. What keeps young families in Saskatchewan? What keeps rural Saskatchewan alive?
781.	In order to best encourage appropriate environmental stewardship of farmland, as well as consistent access to a quality food supply, it is important for the land to be owned and managed by individuals reliant on that food supply, or private corporations (CCPC's) actively involved in the production of the food.
782.	Farmland in Saskatchewan should be owned and farmed or leased from Saskatchewan farmers. I am not happy with any kind of owner ship outside of Saskatchewan. I don't think China or any other country should be allowed to control this country.
783.	My feeling is that we need to keep Saskatchewan farmland in the hands of Saskatchewan farmers. The more that gets sold to foreign investors the less the people of Saskatchewan will have to say about what happens in our province.
784.	<p>it is getting to the point of having a quasi judicial board review all farm land sales prior to approval that involve investors only. If I relocate to sask and actively own and operate a farm operation, and reside here . Fair enough. If I purchase land as an investor and do not relocate to the province to actively farm,.. Than I am an investor only . Foreign ownership is the same issue. We must maintain rural communities by being an active resident residing in and supporting the community in which we live , work and play..when the gate is open ,it is too late .</p> <p>you may take political heat , but Good decisions make for Good government...do not be Mised</p> <p>stand up for what is right and stand up for the family farm</p>
785.	I feel farm size should be limited so we could get more people back on the land. We need to take a more holistic approach.
786.	It is very difficult for anyone to purchase land right now, even Sask residents because land that is appraised at \$50,000 is being sold for \$400,000. You don't pay \$40,000 for a \$5,000 car, and you shouldn't have to for land
787.	GOV SHOULD NEVER SINGLE OUT ANY TYPE OF REAL ESTATE TO CONTROL IN A FREE COUNTRY.I SPENT ENOUGH YEARS WORKING FOR NOTHING ON THIS FARM. .EVERYONE ELSE EXPECTS TO BE PAID FOR THERE WORK AND GET A RETURN ON INVESTMENT.NOW THAT FARMERS ARE FINALLY IN THAT POSITION WHY WOULD YOU TRY TO CONTROL US AND SEND US BACK TO SCRAPING BY IF YOUR LUCKY.LET THE MARKETS CONTROL LAND PRICES NOT GOV.
788.	Current laws and their enforcement are not enough to protect Saskatchewan land. SK agricultural producers must be supported in being allowed to compete for SK land. The foreign money has never had to 'Wait for Precipitation' to make itself. Imagine every government worker waiting for 'timely precipitation' to get paid their pay-cheque. How many would ENDURE? SK farmers face enough risk and challenges we should not have to have inflated land prices which are out of the realm of possibility to pay for in one lifetime. The

	message is STOP SELLING SASKATCHEWAN OFF!
789.	We need to keep SK in SK. How much success would the SK government have in governing Alberta or BC. NONE... We need to keep SK Land owned by SK resident people ONLY. Selling off Sk land is only a TEMPORARY fix to SK economy. The real long term money is leaving SK in the form of rent and leases. That money is NEVER spent here in SK. SK government needs to keep SK land productive for SK farmers or else SK farmers will end up going broke and the industry will eventually die. SK farmers are the EXPERTS on SK land. No one else. Not even fruit farmers from BC or corn farmers from Alberta!
790.	There are a lot of landowners who will depend on selling land as a retirement fund. People who sell houses for the same purpose can sell to anyone.
791.	I am a Developer and I own a large Mechanical company but I do form one section of land and my brother farm three sections we were born and raised on a farm and we always wanted to keep a part of that tradition. But as a company of mine that has grower across Canada and the U.S. I believe Canada and Saskatchewan is best served KEEPING OUR RESORSE LOCAL.
792.	I would hate to see a day, however far down the road, when Saskatchewan farmers are all surfs just farming land owned by others that are all non-farmers. I also don't like the idea of other countries being able to own land here. I'm not sure what kind of rights that affords them but it seems a little dangerous.
793.	Farming is a family business and people should be in it because they have a passion for it, not because they are getting paid for it. I would like the Saskatchewan government to introduce legislation to limit the amount of land operations are allowed to work. Allowing people who do not have a vested interest in the land itself to own it, drives up land prices and creates a land system that many of the people who immigrated to this province came to Canada to get away from. That system is one where large tracts of land are owned by the rich who have no care for the land, and the land is worked by people who cannot afford to own the land they work.
794.	Look at what has happened elsewhere, millions of acres controlled by Corporations like Agricore or entities like the Chinese Government. Don't get me wrong I sell my grain to Viterra , I just don't want them owning the land I grow it on. Look ahead land and the food it produces will become more and more important as the world population grows. We want to control our own.
795.	if all the family farms and smaller farmers are forced to sell there land because they cant compete with investors and corporate farms there will be no people left to support the farming communities
796.	Please allow local farmers to retain control of saskatchewan's biggest resource.
797.	I would ask that due process be followed and that our government would truly reach out and hear the responses of our province before making a decision.
798.	Need to put a limit on the amount of land Hutterites control. Soon it will be called the Saskatchewan colony. Stopping certain groups from buying here will just make it easier for the large established farms and private investors anyway. If there is going to be a limit put in place it needs to include everyone. Not just pension funds. That's the only way to preserve the tradition of sask farming.

799.	<p>Always remember that our strength, vitality and future rests in the people of Saskatchewan being the owners (stewards) of Saskatchewan when it comes to our land and our homes. This is absolutely priceless! The SPIRIT of our people, our life-energy and true existence comes from the Land, Nature and each other. We must not be the fools that sell our hearts and souls to the devil. Do not worship money, for it is meaningless, unless used with the intention of serving the Greater Good for All" without compromise. Use True Wisdom as a guide, resist temptation to be popular (to those with self-serving agendas) and do not allow shortsightedness and self-serving agendas to rule the day.</p> <p>Also, when it comes to size of farms, I do not believe in nor promote large scale agriculture or conventional practices because they are truly not sustainable regardless of the empty arguments supporting it. As a government, we must taking a leading role to create our legacy as being principled, dedicated and integrous in all matters, especially on the issue of land ownership, and then step out of the way of our good people. Nothing works in this world if Agriculture is broken. Let's not follow the Interstate Highway to, but be wise to take the scenic route to paradise for there is great value in the journey. What is our Will?</p>
800.	<p>People who don't live in the area form their opinions about land use and ownership from news media, rather than from the reality of first hand experience.</p> <p>The difference between reality and "common knowledge" seems to be getting wider and wider.</p>
801.	<p>I believe the people owning the farmland should be the people farming the land. I'm a 4th generation farmer and hope to give my sons the chance to become 5th generation farmers. To encourage outside of country ownership would be a mistake by the government. The short term benefits for a small group of residents would far be outweighed by the long term negative impacts. Farming finally seems to be profitable and more stable than any decade prior. I commend the government for the role they have played in that. That is the only reason outside investors are so keen to own this land. If we use our foresight, hopefully we can keep it profitable for years to come.</p>
802.	<p>Support of the young operators is important. Through multiple decades we seem nothing but youth leaving the countryside. Now there's interest to return but we're not doing anything to make it more attractive to be in agriculture. We're just sitting still hoping it does something by itself to attract youth.</p>
803.	<p>I am very disappointed that the current government would even consider allowing outside investor to purchase farmland in our province. You can't sell the cow to buy milk. I hope that the people we elect to take care of this provinces long term wellbeing do so.</p>
804.	<p>I just think this is something that could cause a big change in the agriculture industry as we know it today. I am not opposed to change, however, I see many potential issues with opening up the sale of farmland to outside investors. I hope the Government of Saskatchewan is not looking at this as a potential for a cash injection in Saskatchewan and the economy without looking forward to see what backlash it could have once the cash injection runs out.</p>
805.	<p>As stated repeatedly in this survey, land ownership should be limited to active farmers only. Having ownership of land by outside individuals only add excess costs to the farmer, and directly takes money out of the agriculture economy and transfers it to the already wealthy. I say to the already wealthy because as a young farmer, I cannot afford to purchase land at the</p>

	<p>current prices. My crop returns will not cover the loan payments. People who have money already are the only ones who can afford to purchase the land, as well as the large corporate farms who already have a lot of acres to spread the cost over. Why are we giving away control of our future, and our most important resource, our ability to grow food, to outside individuals, corporations and countries? It makes no sense and should be stopped immediately. Please take this seriously and don't sell out our province for a short term gain of cash.</p>
806.	<p>You sell your customer the commodity ... not the resource! Remember that simple little golden rule just as we did when we shot down BHP buying PCS. Once its gone; its gone. You sell the customer what we grow and we grow sustainably in equity and value ourselves, the way we always have and what has served us best for over 100 years. Don't get bigger than your britches claiming you know what the crystal ball looks like.</p>
807.	<p>Farmland should be owned by farmers and ranchers/ The food and products they grow they grow to the best Of their ability. Having numerous players and brains in the industry brings out the best ideas.</p>
808.	<p>Don't fix it if it ain't broke.</p>
809.	<p>I gave benefited from the increase on land values grew increased equity available for my use but if I had not had the opportunities to buy when I did I would not be able to buy land today</p>
810.	<p>Open the market up!</p>
811.	<p>Let's be honest farming is as tough as it gets. Crop insurance always comes up with new rules when they lose money. You sell everything at wholesale buy at retail. The people who farm are people who get up early who won't sleep in just cause they can. They live, eat, breathe, and bleed the soil that they own and tender. Allowing foreign investment or corporations will only break the Saskatchewan farmer. I find it hard as I have to go work a second job to sustain a farm and slowly after many hours away from family. One day I might be self sufficient. But here is what I pull out of this all. The owner of the land who say rents it back to the farmer carries no risk. You think a corporation will cut you a break if it's a tough year and this will break you? I have my opinion you have yours. Why is it so important for foreigners to have land here? And a I would like to say the appreciation from myself and many more farmers for the saskatchewan government for hearing us out! God bless</p>
812.	<p>Saskatchewan land needs to stay with Saskatchewan residents. Land prices need to be fair and affordable to ensure our young people have a future in this province as well. Please don't sell us out to foreign investors!!</p>
813.	<p>Put the land back in the hands of the people who live in Saskatchewan and sit in the tractor seat</p>
814.	<p>The big corporations and foreign buyers buying up all the land through Canadian Proxy at a price that is unaffordable for the small operator. Further the Hutterarian ownership and their sheltering there income within the "church" needs to be controlled. At the very least they should have to pay taxes the same as all other farmers. How they operate is big business.</p>
815.	<p>Corporations and investors follow the \$\$\$\$. They are not as interested in environmental or community sustainability.</p>

A society is only as strong as its food security. Producers are the foundation of the food chain and any society and its economy. Weaken your local producers and you weaken your society and its economy, perhaps not in the short term, but eventually. Let's keep Saskatchewan strong by keeping its producers strong.

The value of investment \$\$\$ fluctuates. The food value of a loaf of bread, an egg, a glass of milk, a roast beef, does not.

With changes in the environment and food costs already rising, do we want to put our land and food security in the hands of foreign investors and corporations!?! If they see the value in our farmland, so should we!!! Rather than weaken residency requirements for farmland ownership, increase government oversight.

Thank you for conducting this public survey.

816. I believe that a Saskatchewan resident should have the first opportunity to buy land in Saskatchewan before anyone else in Canada with the exception of an immediate family member.

817. Keep our land for the people who actually farm. There is land out there that has been bought by investors that has not been farmed and is infested with weeds and disease. What a shame !!!!
This is happening before our eyes so do your job to feed the world.

818. Leave the Greedy Government out of handling land . The farmers have managed on their own for years and will always do a better job of managing it because they actually care.

819. Please don't destroy my children's future in farming

820. Any Canadian citizen should be allowed to own land. Govt should never be allowed to own land, even in the guise of the 'betterment of society'

821. My answers might be out to lunch in the opinions of my farming neighbours. I don't know enough about the role the Sask Gov plays in ownership, to have an accurate view... Simply. I've been frustrated my whole life, wanting to become a farmer but not knowing how I could ever afford to be one. I grew up on a mixed farm, grain and beef. But my father passed when I was young, so the opportunity to just take over was thrown out the window. I know this is my calling, and I will do everything I can to become a farmer. But it would be helpful if there was something in place for people like me, who could use the help getting started. Farming seems to come with huge expenses and I don't want to drown in debt. I have a young family to keep in mind.

822. Please keep Saskatchewan Saskatchewan. A short sighted view is just that, a few will make a bunch of \$\$\$ but the long term ramifications will long offset short term gains. We here in SK don't need to make all the mistakes AB has made...

823. The small to mid-size farmer can barely afford to farm the land they have now on a single farm income, there's little room for expansion. Opening up the ownership rules to allow non-

	Saskatchewan & non-Canadian ownership & investment would limit Saskatchewan farmers even more.
824.	Farm land should be farmed by those who own it. Foreign investor owned land is generally rented back to a Saskatchewan resident farmer who actually does the work. Increased foreign interest in Saskatchewan land has driven up the prices, and in some areas has made it impossible for a farmer to compete to purchase. Don't worry about the retiring farmers. We need to make sure that continuing farmers are viable-they are the ones who are producing food to feed people.
825.	IT IS IMPORTANT THAT WE GET THIS RIGHT. I DON'T FEEL A "SASKATCHEWAN ONLY" RULE IS UNREASONABLE. WE ARE IN THE PROCESS OF LOSING WHAT MAKES US WHO AND WHAT WE ARE. OUR FUTURE WILL LOOK MUCH DIFFERENT IF WE CONTINUE AS WE ARE.
826.	Keep Saskatchewan farmland in the hands of Saskatchewan residents please.
827.	Land ownership in Saskatchewan should be given to saskatchewan residence only.
828.	Some people call land "dirt". Dirts gets on your hands, clothes and blows in the air. A little dirt gets washed of and generally is more of a nuisance. We are talking about land. We build our homes, Plant crops and gardens, raise our children and families on the land. It has value. Not just monetary but social, emotional and is part of our heritage. Many in Sask love the land. I had a friend from the south west of the province and he loved the land. He loved the hills, grass, communities, history and people. He was a man of the Great south west. He great passion and dream in life was to farm and be part of the land. He did just that for a few years and passed away and is now part of that land.He like myself value this land and the land of this province and country as more that a commodity to make cash. It has so many intangible values other than monetary. Yes we use it to grow crops and livestock and make a living but it is much more important than that. To sell it to the highest bidder is not an option. Look at what is happening in Australia. Huge tracts of land are being sold to Chinese investors. The same I am told is being done in New Zealand and Africa. The best land is being sold off and its people displaced. Our grandparents came to this country to own land, they started with nothing and made something of the province. We cannot sell it off.
829.	Concisely: Sask. land should be owned by Sask. residents, and, as much as possible, by farmers. What some call investment can also be seen as divestment: Sask. people selling off our land to non-residents. Do not create government policies that maximize divestment.
830.	I would like the government to protect farmland from foreign ownership but beyond that the market should determine the price of land and leasing. However, there must be no advantage to Canadian investors over farmers in purchasing land. Young farmers will struggle with high land prices but retiring farmers should not be penalized by artificially low prices. More leasing will be done by young farmers and the terms will have to be favourable for them to stay in the "game. Otherwise farms will continue to grow until they find a breaking point, which they will. Canada is not Australia or South America which have months and months of seeding and harvesting time. Government interference always turns out badly in the long run. Trust the free market but make it a true free market where no one has unfair advantage through government law and regulation. No one Canadian, that is.

831.	I believe in a free market for all things but farmland should have some restrictions.
832.	I currently rent land from the pension plan and have had a good relationship with them. I feel that having access to someone who can afford land and rent it back to the producer is important and therefore we do need investment but I think there is enough wealth within our country to accommodate these situations.
833.	Selling your breadbasket will leave you with no bread for ourselves. Does anybody know what the repercussions will be for Canadians living in Canada on land owned by another country? Absolutely insane to sell parts of your country for any reason. Wars and revolutions have been started for less.
834.	Keep it simple and Canadian! No foreign investment groups!! Put a cap on the amount of farmland an individual or Corporation can own! Do not let investment groups hide their intent and or get into land purchases!! Maintain a level playing field for all and keep speculation at a minimum!! Let's keep our Land and our Food Supply Canadian!
835.	All I want is a few more quarters to buy and I will have enough to make enough of a living off farming, but every time I try to buy something some foreign or even local investor rips it out from under me. Investors have done nothing to help the farmers.
836.	Although I do not farm myself, in the form of renting or owing land, I am nevertheless very emotionally attached to the issue surrounding farm ownership regulations in Saskatchewan. My family's operation (4th generation) is located in Saskatchewan, and is a quintessential example of a western-Canadian family operated farm. Nevertheless, my father and two brothers are experiencing first-hand the consequences of inaction by the government on this issue. If the status quo remains, we as a province would open the flood-gates to non-resident speculators, with no attachment to the area, people, or industry, whose only motivation is wealth acquisition, acquiring vast tracts of Saskatchewan farm land. Wealth acquisition is no doubt an essential, worthwhile concept in any productive economic system - one which all businesses and individuals should ascribe to. However when it comes at the expense of the current and future generations, there is something fundamentally asinine with the theory, as it pertains to the agriculture industry. Ask yourself who wants the status quo to remain. It is certainly not the people who give everything - blood, toil, tear, sweat, and all - in striving to better their own operations (often many generations old), station-in-life, family's well-being, communities, province, and country. Rather it is property speculators, hedge-fund managers, investors, and financial charlatans who can barely decipher an R.M. map, let alone physically locate the tracts of land of which they acquire. The double standard of these "investors" between Saskatchewan and foreign jurisdictions is cause for grave concern, and bears repeating. If you think that China, India, Brazil, EU countries, etc, etc would VOLUNTARILY allow foreign prospectors and investors the opportunity to acquire prime agricultural land in their countries, you are entirely misguided and wrong.

I would like to think that I bring a unique and varied perspective to this important and contentious issue. I have spent most of my life in the province, and it truly holds a special place in my heart. Holding degrees in Political Studies and Commerce (both from the U of S), I would like to think that I approach this subject from a practical, economic, unbiased, and rationale perspective. I can say unreservedly that I have supported this government steadfastly since 2007 (first election in which I was eligible to vote), and I trust that it will do the correct thing in this case and put a stamp on this type of outside investment. Failure to do so would be hypocritical on the governments part considering the province's and federal government stance on the BP-Potash Corp take-over bid (a situation in my opinion very analogous to what we are experiencing now). Like myself, many, many people in my area strongly support this government (81% in the 2011 provincial election). However, my advice to the Wall government is be wary, very wary. Loyalty in politics is not unconditional, and farmers have the longest memory of any profession I have ever come across. Once we allow land to be essentially gifted away to foreign (read: three links removed Chinese state-owned corporations), it will be gone forever, with little tangible return for the province of Saskatchewan. Posterity will be the ultimate judge of this governments decision - chose carefully, for when you open this enormous Pandora's Box, there is no putting the lid back on.

Thanks for undertaking this consultation and best regards,

837. My grandpa used to own 2 quarters of land. Then, my uncle took over and had 5 quarters of land. Today, the average farmer has to own Sections of land to be viable. Farm ownership has changed in many ways. If I owned farmland today, I should be able to determine to whom I want to sell it, without government meddling.

838. Local communities are stronger when people own the land. In addition many young people would love to own land and form a connection. Right now many current owners who they themselves had financial difficulty over the years and who either inherited their land or paid very little for it are wanting prices which they themselves would never of been able to pay. New land owners should not be responsible for someone else's retirement. Rising land values not based on what the land can provide is not sustainable. Rising land values based on investors is unearned equity not earned by the current land owners. Land value needs to be driven by its and the farmers inherent ability to drive a profit ONLY!!

839. The FLSB needs to decide on a clear well-enunciated policy, publish that policy, legislate for it (if necessary) and adhere to it in a transparent way. Currently there seems to be an absence of any particular policy and the FLSB merely exhibits reaction to external events.

840. This is something that gets re visited too often.

A non partisan group should make the decisions about this instead of a stupid one sided survey with predetermined outcomes.

The minister should be meeting with farmers in different communities instead of hiding

	<p>behind this survey.</p> <p>When he done politics and makes decisions based on his personal agenda and it impacts future generations ... its incompetent of him to approach this the way he did</p>
841.	<p>I may think differently if I was retiring and selling my land but my farm business must continue and we need to keep our young farmers in the business first. I have never been against growth and progress in this province and have struggled with previous govt. policies that limited this. We have many families in our area that have moved in from other provinces and countries to run intensive operations and this is what we need. To sell land to an investor somewhere else in the world is not the answer unless they will live here to manage the operation</p>
842.	<p>No, I have said all I want to above.</p>
843.	<p>Keep it Saskatchewan owned!</p>
844.	<p>Foreign ownership of land has the potential to increase the cost and reduce the availability of farm land. The effect of this is either farmers must borrow more money to purchase land (which is good for the banks) or they must rent the land from the foreign owner (effectively funneling money out of the province of Saskatchewan). The best way to ensure profitability in the ag sector and for the province of Saskatchewan to remain vibrant and profitable is to ensure the family farm is given the opportunity to grow and prosper.</p>
845.	<p>If trend continues we will lose the family farms.</p>
846.	<p>I am a young farmer and I am concerned the way the industry is heading. I find it hard to expand with outside money driving the price of land and think having corporations own land you will lose your small rural communities and many young farmers.</p>
847.	<p>I am a little disappointed that the review has included the issue of the CPPIB purchase of Assiniboia land corp along with foreign ownership. Two completely different topics that become confusing to people when lumped together.</p>
848.	<p>I would be great to further support and encourage the tradition of the farming and small farms. It is a very nice way of life.</p>
849.	<p>Keep existing laws and regulations. This type of talk of restriction makes me wondering if we are living in a communist state. Let's leave Saskatchewan a free enterprise province.</p>
850.	<p>Considering the high cost of imports and machinery, many farmers would have nothing to retire on if they didn't own their land.</p>
851.	<p>I see no difference between farmland and any other land and the government has no business regulating farmland compared to other kinds of real estate. The trend is for farmers to rent not own their operations as the inflated cost of machinery & inputs are holding them back. I don't see the government setting limits on those items so leave the farm land alone.</p>
852.	<p>Farmland ownership is only a piece of the puzzle. Agriculture in Saskatchewan is facing a larger problem in lack of labour, lack of diversity, and massive dependency on manufactured imports and professional agronomy.</p>

	<p>These problems have arisen under a system of essentially farmer owned land. It may be that we would be better off with a large change of ownership to foreigners who are able to take advantage of the opportunities in Saskatchewan that the present owners are unable to because of age, enthusiasm and generally lack of need to do anything different.</p>
853.	<p>I think non-residents should be prohibited from owning land regardless of how it was acquired: by gift, purchase, or will.</p>
854.	<p>I understand that there is pressure from investment groups to obtain rights to purchase large tracts of land as an investment as there is currently better returns than low interest rates. What will happen if the interest rate rises and land investment is no longer as good of a return? Likely a lot of land "dumped" on the market at sub optimal prices.</p> <p>Is there a location in the province where there are current land owners unable to find a suitable buyer? Is there any group that is looking at this beyond the "short term benefits" of a spike in land prices? Let's keep Agriculture in this province healthy for the long term!</p>
855.	<p>My biggest concern as a southwest farmer is the very rapid increase of religious groups buying up land. In saying this I must also state that I am not a prejudice person, and am friends with many of these people. But the long and the short of it is that they are destroying communities, and repairing the damage is not possible as the land is forever gone from the marketplace.</p>
856.	<p>Being a farmer has meant everything to me. It used to mean a lifestyle that was made up of hardwork, good friends and neighbors and a quality of life that was fulfilled. Now if you're not a Big farmer you are set up for failure. You can't even buy equipment that is sizable for a smaller operation. It feels like I'm being pushed out and the corp farmers are waiting at my driveway waiting for me to drown and throw in the towel.</p>
857.	<p>I realize that farming has changed and will continue to change. I have seen significant changes over the years. Farming is huge-business. In order to be successful, they have to keep up to date on all aspects of the industry.</p> <p>As with any business, succession planning must form part of the overall business plan. We have to prepare for the future and cannot wait until it is too late. As mentioned before, I believe this is still demand from Saskatchewan and Canadian residents to acquire Saskatchewan farmland.</p> <p>We can revisit this in another 5-10 years.</p>
858.	<p>Farmland ownership should stay with farmers. Instead of allowing farmland ownership to those who don't have a clue about what it takes to farm, the government should instead be finding more ways of helping young farmers and keeping them in Saskatchewan.</p>
859.	<p>Many countries around the world wish they had the protection for their farmland that Saskatchewan has.</p>
860.	<p>If Canada (and Saskatchewan) wish to be global leaders in agriculture, they absolutely need to protect the interests and assets of their farmers. Saskatchewan is in a unique situation in</p>

	comparison to most other provinces in Canada in that their farm ownership rules are quite stringent. Stringent farm ownership rules have allowed farmers to thrive in Saskatchewan and support the local and national economies. We should be proud of Saskatchewan's agricultural progress (or perceived lack thereof); the province is in a more powerful and unique economical position because of it.
861.	there is no more land being made . a lot of people envy Saskatchewan .why give it away to someone who has left a pillaged and over populated country to do the same here . we do a good job of feeding the world without someone else dictating.
862.	We need family farms in Saskatchewan.
863.	Farmers should not have to compete against tax free dollars (Pension Plan) or foreign investors who have not paid taxes that keeps our infrastructure maintained!
864.	Grew up on the family farm in rural sw sask. Currently living in se Alberta and are farming with dad on the family farm and eventually taking over.
865.	Don't give away this beautiful land to the world who does not care about our Saskatchewan just the physical land. They will use it, destroy it and then walk away and we are left with the mess.
866.	If you let other than farmers own farm land it will be a mistake. Doctors and lawyers have made it difficult for young farmers to get started. A lot of them, me included worked oilfield or other off farm jobs to make payments. We worked double time to make a little money to buy the essentials. Dont want to see an Ontario teacher or an oil in control.
867.	Under the current government, it is getting increasingly more difficult for small farms (owned by people who actually care about the land and the commodities they produce) to survive. Changing current legislation will make this situation much worse. Please stop trying to sell everything to the highest bidder. This province is a large hollow shell compared to what it once was but "go Riders". Gahhhhh!
868.	times change and farming will change with it. the more government involvement the more skewed the system
869.	I am concerned about allowing too much foreign ownership of Sask farmland. If the trend continues, soon our Sask farmers will be serfs working for the master. The government has already allowed foreign ownership of too many of our natural resources.
870.	Sometimes progress isn't about making the most money. Sometimes it's about preservation, values and maintaining a quality of life.. The direction that has taken our province towards frankly concerns me..
871.	I may not have grown up on a farm but my Great Grandparents immigrated here and were farmers. My grandparents farmed until my Mom & Dad were in Grade 1 and Grade 7 respectively. Our families chose to leave farming due to the small size of their farms and the need to make a better living in towns and cities. The opportunity was not there to continue this important tradition.
872.	I am a capitalist, but restrictions need to exist in markets to ensure the proper functioning of

	our system. The Canadian banks did not fail in the last financial crisis because of oversight. It is equally important that Canadian farms and food production no fail in the event of a crisis. Strength need to be built into the system, and restricting ownership is a good way to do that.
873.	The most important resources we have are land and water. It would be a blessing to them to protect our resources for our future generations
874.	When outsiders own Saskatchewan land they do not pay income tax on the profits from that land here. So Saskatchewan loses.
875.	I believe allowing foreign ownership and or pension funds to own land it will hurt rural agriculture which will in turn go up the agriculture food chain.
876.	Don't sell off this province for possible short term gains, look at the long term impacts on farmers, communities, tax base, etc. If the investors and pension companies think it is so important to own farmland, why wouldn't it be more important for farmers to own the land as they make their living off it? If a foreigner wants to own sask farmland they should move here and contribute to our province and live in our communities.
877.	We need Canada to remain free for ourselves or we may as well rename ourselves China.. Keep it classy, local ownership, we need farmers not investors. Big operations are going to go small as progress develops in agriculture and the need for alternative energy develops. I may be young but I am well educated with a degree in environmental management, my Canadian roots and heritage need to be protected for future generations. This is one of the greatest attacks to see foreigners buy out farmland.
878.	I want to continue farming and not be a serf farming for other people.
879.	make large farm companies ie: hutterite colonies pay wages,canada pension,workers comp for any and all business they perform off colony and on like any other business has too or any other family farm.no more low income subsidies
880.	If you want to buy farm land move here and farm it yourself
881.	Saskatchewan farmers are the only operators that truly care about what happens to the farmland 10, 50, or 100 years from now. If it was solely about the money most farmers would have quit years ago. Saskatchewan is the " bread basket of the world". In order for the farmland to still be truly cared for the bulk of it needs to be owned and operated by farmers.
882.	Farmland ownership needs to be by farmers.
883.	If you want our youth to continue to carry on the family farm foreign and investment ownership must be stopped. I feel that more investment ownership would be the beginning of the end of sustainable food supply for the future.
884.	I'm a small unincorporated farm and it is getting real hard to compete with outside investor and large corporate farms. When you get large farms buying 20 1/4's in one purchase and someone like me who only can budget for 2 maybe 3 1/4's a purchase. The smaller person will always lose out.
885.	It's hard to compete with large farms as it is , little own with foreign investors it would be impossible , I spend 8 years on the rigs just to be able to farm a little and it's hard enough trying to work a fully seasoned job plus farm only to keep the farm going n building

886.	I'd move quite slowly through any changes in regulation. As many farmers work the land, and may not understand policy and how it would effect them, I'd recommend having very simple language being used. I'd also learn as much as I can from the Western Australian farm situation as well.
887.	I think that smaller family farms are as good for the agriculture sector as the large farms and I believe that a balance between the two is good. I don't however believe that if we get a large amount of out of province investors that this balance could be reached. Land prices would soar and small farmers would be shut out from the land market.
888.	As I stated before keep land ownership in the hands of Canadians and those that want to farm it. If our land is sold to corporations and funds or foreign ownership we will have no control over what happens to it. If foreign governments own it they eventually will farm it and the product will go directly to their country bypassing our system. When they own the land they own the food, we work for them. I cannot agree to that.
889.	Keep farmland ownership in Saskatchewan hands - if you stupid can't see fit to do that, then ensure it remains in Canadians hands only.
890.	I would like to see ownership stay in saskatchewan. The benefit would come when people would move here to work or raise their families on a farm. I think this would help boost the economy in many different areas even beyond agriculture. Selling farmland to people outside the province only sends money out of the province and give people a reason not to move here.
891.	not desirable to have farmers be sharecroppers
892.	With more foreign ownership I see it hurting our economy, taking money out of our economy, taking people out of the country(rural). Turning Canadians into workers on the land not owners of their own Canadian soil that they take care of because its their own. I see the farming practices of the large corporate style farms as unsustainable. planting large areas of the same crops together, making it more attractive for pests and disease to take hold. They spray insecticides just in case they have bugs, killing all insect good and bad. As you can tell I'm a supporter of the small family farm. I feel our environment and economy benefit in the long run. We shouldn't be so quick to give up control of our land for a little money.
893.	Canada, in particular the prairie provinces were settled by immigrants looking to come to a place where they could actually own their own land and raise their families, not farm the land of a Lord. In a sense we are coming full circle where soon the land will be controlled by outside investors, corporations, countries, and the farmers will be nothing more than the peasants, hired to look after the land.
894.	Controlling food production controls peoples. Affordably owning and operating farms creates the building blocks of Democracy and allows people to be free. Please look at the horrid conditions farmers endure in other jurisdictions where commoners have no hope to hold title to their plots and must scrounge to survive.
895.	It's all about the power If I own the land I have the power If someone else owns it I become controlled by them. Let's keep ownership in our control Sask first Canada second nothing else period.
896.	If this is opened up the province will suffer from the income lost and it will be the end of the

	family farm
897.	<p>I feel that as property owners we should be allowed to sell, within reason, to anyone we please.</p> <p>As we will leave the farm at some point do to the extremely small town size, with no healthcare</p> <p>or even a grocery store we will have expenses. We will need to replace a lovely home with a much more expensive one in a city. The prices of homes in cities has risen dramatically and those people are allowed to sell there property to the highest bidder!! No restrictions there.</p> <p>Sask already has some of the lowest prices of farmland in the country.</p> <p>We have endured some very difficult economic years on the farm, purchased some land at higher interest rates in the eighties which also contained some very severe drought years!</p> <p>I, the farm wife had to travel 200 km a day to my day job in a city that had work in my professional field. This was not necessarily by choice.</p> <p>Due to some more difficult years retirement funds were allocated to keep the farmland from having to be sold. So the land is a big chunk of our RETIREMENT fund and therefore we will want the best price obviously!!</p> <p>Also what is to say that if the farmland ownership rules change in ie: 10 years all these young farmers that are now buying land cheap won't sell out and reap the financial benefits that we and our children were denied! What makes a young farmer any more valuable to society than our three university educated, employed contributors to the economy and society.</p> <p>I think the word " traditional " has been overused in this survey. I think the traditional family farm has been on its way out for a number of years, and that is just the changing of the times.</p> <p>Farms are getting bigger of course as has ours. "Romanticizing" the family farm has no useful purpose and I personally would not have any problem with European farmers coming in to purchase our land and in fact would welcome it.</p>
898.	<p>I am in area where a large company farmed, and have seen the effects of large companies farming, it's not good, they say Canada's wheat is not the same quality is use to be, I believe this to be true , not because we cannot grow it, its because we don't have farmers growing it, we have companies growing it, thanks</p>
899.	<p>Keep Sask. farmland for Saskatchewan residents. If allowed to be sold the rest of the world will own us. The landscape will change forever. This land was settled by people who came here to farm - not just owned the land from some other country. Don't screw this up!!!!!!</p>
900.	<p>This is a concern of foreign governments buying our farm land and using it to provide themselves with cheap food. Which I turn will be detrimental to our nation survive if we cannot provide ourselves with affordable food.</p>
901.	<p>Prices of farm land are influenced by many factors like commodity prices. Interest rates, exchange rates, weather patterns, other investment opportunities. Housing priced have sky rocketed. Should there be restrictions on house sales to foreigners? If we live in a free country, which I think we do, why do we want excessive control of land sales? I do agree</p>

	though, that Canadians should have equal rights to purchase land in the countries whose citizens want to buy here. And, they would have to be democratic countries, not ones with "state owned land and assets"
902.	A farmer needs equity in land to farm if you run into a disaster for a few years you have equity to pull you through until better times, in good times and bad you need equity in land ,farmers need to own most of there land to be prosperous , if farmers are making money they will buy the land beside them they DO NOT NEED INVESTORS BUYING IT. YOU MUST LIVE IN SASKATCHEWAN TO OWN LAND!!!!
903.	Keep it for us so we can use it and profit from it. Look at how we've increased production over the years through zero tillage fertilizer and such. Even companies like seedmaster bourgault morris degelman all started on farms many years ago. I don't think those companies would have started if the Chinese owned the land.
904.	Don't ruin a provinces sovereignty, and independence for a short term cash infusion.
905.	If we really want farmland ownership to stay local then we will have provide different tax treatment for owners, not only farmers but business owners as well. There is really no retirement income other than selling the farm or business It is asking a lot of farm and business owners to give away farms and business If you don't want open investment then set up a land bank style system. We have that in crown leases It can be abused as we see extremely high transfer rates. We could set up different tax treatments so the farm or business doesn't have to be sold to fund retirement
906.	Harsh restrictions take the value out of land. Saskatchewan farmers are able to compete for ownership through Farm Credit Corp if they desire. As a past farmer and a current farm land owner I should not have to subsidize my neighbours. I would give them a good chance to buy my land but they have to compete.
907.	There is no point to having laws and rules if they can't be enforced. Make the laws very clear so they can more easily be enforced
908.	Had to leave our family farm after high school as only one brother could take over the farm but have kept a keen interest in the farm all my life.
909.	Farmland needs to stay with the farmers that have been raised and grown up in Saskatchewan. We do not need to be giving away our land to foreign people. These people have not grew up here and should not live here and do not deserve our land that we the farmers in Saskatchewan have worked so hard for. My grandparents and their parents did not work so hard to have this land takin away from is by these people. Stop taking our land.
910.	Providing tax dollars to agri bus. for 'chemical inputs' so they can in turn give my tax dollar to the chemical industry complex does two things. Firstly it gives an unfair advantage over organic agriculture which by the way seems to be able to make a profit without the welfare tax deduction, And secondly, is a corporate welfare doling to the chemical industry and their lobbyists. It is time for politicians to quit being gutless lobby sucking dolts, and start making legislation to protect our lands.
911.	There should be enforceable restrictions on religious institutions as well.

912.	I am saddened at the possibility of foreign interests gobbling up our farmland. My family (like many others) immigrated to Canada just so they could farm. My family loves this land and my grandma would be disheartened to know there is a possibility of it being sold to outside interests! Keep the Saskatchewan tradition alive...keep farmland safe from foreign buyers!
913.	open it up like in everything else, there are no rules about outside investment in grain companies, potash, uranium, houses, condos etc.
914.	open the doors wide to investment we need all the investment we can get, communism loves restrictions, socialism does not work ,i thought we got rid of all of that nonsense in sask ,if this open investment on farmland ends the sask party has betrayed us big time, why get rid of ndp, if you close this you are the same!!!!
915.	I believe that it is not necessary to open up farmland ownership rule to such an extent that it creates undo competition with the individuals and families who are doing the actual farming, those who are supporting their rural communities, in various roles, such as local government, volunteering with local facilities, and just proving a population that helps to make these communities viable.
	I further suggest that changes that allow for movement away from the traditional farmland ownership should be taken slowly so that unintended consequences can be avoided or arrested.
	Care needs to be taken so that we don't end up with a situation like the Vancouver housing market, where the people and families who live and work there and who support the community find that they cannot afford to purchase a home.
	I have taken considerable time completing this survey and I would like to print a copy of my responses, in particular my typed responses.
	Is there any way that I would be able to get a copy of my submissions?.
	I have provided my email address below.
916.	If an individual wants to start farming here I have no problem with that. But no foreign governments, no business's and no pension funds.
917.	Urban as in small town under 800 people. Farmed with my husband some years, also had my own permit book.
	I prefer to see our land owned by farm families. It provides stability to a community with people scattered through a farming area. The idea of large farmed areas with a very low people population isolates people and reduces community formation. There is strength in community.
918.	Anytime you have non-local land ownership you have an absentee landlord. They for the most part don't care what happens to the area as long as their investment does not decrease.

	Farmland is a privilege and a responsibility to own. Farmland must be taken care of to ensure it is in at least as good if not better condition each year. Also community is important. Absent landlords don't participate.
919.	The Farmland Security Board must develop a clear philosophy and then fight relentlessly to ensure its implementation. A big danger is political appointees to the Board who are there to promote an agenda contrary to that of the Board
920.	Besides all the increased investment that would occur if outside interests could invest in farmland, our province was built on immigrants who came here for the chance to own land and escape crowded Europe. But the key was that you had to take on the risk of actually farming and making improvements. By all means, move here and become a resident and take up farming!
921.	I see no benefit for rural communities in having large quantities of land owned by pension plans or foreign investors. The common perception around these properties is that they will be farmed by very large farms. I have nothing against these large farms operating in the ag industry. That being said I do not see where the local community needs are served by having outside hired labour operate in the area instead of local community people farming the land. These local people are the same people who volunteer in the community whether it be for the fire department or any other community board.
922.	High priced farmland only helps financial institutions and those wishing to retire. Most retirees only have a short period to help the economy. Young farmers have many years to contribute.
923.	Don't screw this up and give into pressure by outside forces and big money, think this through. slowly carefully and methodically; give the reeves, the rms and the farmers/ranchers a big voice on this. cuz once you jump off the bridge you cant go back and undo the mess 5-25-50 or 100 years from now!!! give the little guy, the young farmers/rancher a fighting chance, they are our future. that is how we started; lets keep it simple and carry the hope for future generations. we love the land we love Saskatchewan... don't ruin it
924.	We have to consider our children and the future generations of Farmers. With current land prices and the amount of foreign interest all land owners could sell and would likely be better off financially. I don't think my Father and Grandfather farmed their whole lives and worked as hard as they did so this generation could sell out to wealthy business owners from a Communist country. Saskatchewan is what it is today because of its people and now that is starting to change and not for the better.
925.	Being a young farmer that has started in the last 6 years, I find the change in ownership regulations would handicap myself in my ability to gain access to purchasing land.
926.	We need to be sure that farming practices are sustainable over the long term.
927.	The economy would benefit from Canadian investment. If the land is producing an expected rate of return then local farmers will purchase the land.
928.	Don't open it up, it would be great for the generation leaving and selling, but destroy the future of this province

929. Even more important that ownership is the use of farmland. Farmland owners should not be allowed to leave land in a neglected state. I am astounded that the Province of Saskatchewan has no policy on weed control for the protection of conscientious farmers from uncaring growers of noxious weeds. Alberta, for instance, has weed inspectors and when a landowner is neglecting a prospering noxious weed population, the farmer is required to control or eliminate it. If he fails to comply, the province takes care of the problem and bills the landowner. The neighboring farmers are not subject to weed infestations from uncaring landowners - actively farming or land laying idle. EVERY FARM IS INSPECTED

930. I strongly urge the government to look ahead and consider the implications of non-residents controlling the decisions regarding the stewardship of a resource as valuable as our agricultural land in Saskatchewan. Although additional investment dollars could be economically beneficial to the agricultural industry, my primary concern is that individuals who have a vested interest in the long-term sustainability of Saskatchewan farmland will no longer be able to obtain ownership of the land and have the authority to make day-to-day agronomic decisions. Relative to foreign investors, local farm owners are inherently more invested in the stewardship of the land because they are the ones who will still be living here and experiencing the consequences of poor agronomic management--such as land degradation and resistant weed issues--so it is in their best interest to prevent this from happening. I would imagine that it would be much easier to choose short-term economic gain over long term agronomic sustainability if your only connection to the farm was its location on a land title compared to the individual whose own shadow has been in that field more times than can be counted, has felt the soil in their hands, and experienced the joy of a successful harvest. My entire career has been spent in the Saskatchewan agriculture industry and I have witnessed countless times that the producers who are actively engaged in improving the health of their soils and maintaining sustainable crop and input rotations are consistently achieving higher yields and returns on investment. These individuals undoubtedly contribute to the provincial economy. Those who believe that farming decisions can be made solely on paper are rarely as successful. Granted there are two sides to this debate, but it is my strongest conviction that a passion in Saskatchewan agriculture is an attribute that cannot be bought.

931. I appreciate the Government of Saskatchewan's desire to consider the opinions of farmers and agriculture land owners. I love this province. I and my family have greatly benefited from the privilege of living on a farm. We wish to see generations to come continue the tradition of the family farm.

932. I'm 22 years old. Born and raised on the farm. Land was given to my grandpa by my great grandpa. He built a home and raised his family on that land. The same land the same house where I was raised. Ever since I can remember I have wanted to farm. Always out helping dad on the farm. Spent nights up all night with a new born calf trying to save its life some we saved and some we just couldn't. Put that calf in the arms of a bog corporation they will tell you to get rid of it. It's not worth the time to save it. Farmers have the passion and the love and patients needed. Without farmers where would we be where will we be when the farmer is gone. I will do what it takes to buy my dad's section of land. he went through some rough times and cant afford to help me out so I will be paying market value. The land prices need to stay affordable.

933. If left alone any commodity including land will find a level that works. To me it is more cost of doing business, (ie machinery and input costs as well as a hap hazard transportation system)

	<p>than land costs that could create problems. If that happens land prices will drop and it may take deep pockets to withstand falling land prices. Overall I expected better from this government</p>
934.	<p>Farmland is becoming much sought-after. Everywhere in the world, corporations are trying to control food production. We need to protect our country's food security.</p>
935.	<p>Keep control in Canada! Ensure we can feed our people, Canadian's first, at a reasonable cost.</p>
936.	<p>Money isn't everything. Strength in our rural communities is essential to the success of Saskatchewan. Absentee landowners don't send their kids to school, the local rink, 4-H club etc. SK was built on the family farm and it should continue that way. Just larger farms is all.</p>
937.	<p>I've been raised on a farm. I have only been farming on my own for 7 years. I bought a half section of land 5 years ago for \$150,000. Now since the foreign investors have come into our area a half section of land now sells for \$500,000. This makes it impossible for me to grow my farm. To help sustain my farm I have taken on custom work for the foreign investors because they don't farm it themselves because they have no idea about farming. This has been a real challenge as they have withheld payment. Communication is difficult with them not knowing anything about farming is the biggest challenge. Also it is uncertain year to year whether I am farming it again because they will not do a 3-5 year contract.</p>
938.	<p>Farming is not small business, is suitable for bigger and stronger corporations and partners to operate, is teamwork.</p>
939.	<p>In my area there is too many investors that have now raised up price of land. In many cases land was not rented out to farmers because they cannot make money at investor's rental prices. I have yet to see any investor have any interest in the problems of road infrastructure within our rural municipalities. Finally young farmers are coming back to the farm by letting foreign investors or pension funds gaining more land will be the demise of many farms. Choose your answer wisely!!</p>
940.	<p>You have a tough decision on what's best for this province. I would like to thank you for letting us have an input. Whatever your decision is, you won't be popular with some, but I'm sure you know that. I guess the big decision is where do you draw the line and not lose control. Think long term it will help back your decision. Thanks again</p>
941.	<p>I support competitive free enterprise and less government involvement in any business particularly agriculture</p> <p>However</p> <p>Foreign investment will negatively impact a lot of areas</p> <p>Of main concern is affordability and opportunity of local farmers to compete fairly to purchase farmland</p> <p>I'd like to point out that ironically foreign investment has minimized local politics surrounding lease agreements</p> <p>But still the average farmer that is under 40 without inter-generational support/wealth</p> <p>Just know there's limited ways locals can and will purchase farmland</p>

942.	The land should be owned by residents only. Opening it to big investment isn't going to benefit anyone in the end, only the people selling right now. The pension firms are only interested in holding to drive the price up then they try to sell it again to build the portfolio it will create a false price for land that ordinary farmers cannot afford
943.	We have already had instances of investment firms buying land and then trying to up the rent rates in the area.
944.	Stop Ducks Unlimited from their back door practices to obtain easements
945.	We rented land before we owned an acre. Our future was in the hands of the landlord; a from Alberta. We now own that land and make all the decisions regarding how it is managed and farmed. We work every year to improve the soil and grow better crops. We drilled a well on the land to provide an alternate water source for the farm and have set aside a parcel for wildlife We include that land in any future plans for the next generation because we own it. Our children can consider farming as a career because we own our land.
946.	We must move quickly to shut down the purchase of farmland or as I've stated we will all be serf's within 30 years, as farmers were in Europe in the 1880's. A good start would be to move immediately giving CPP 5 years to dispose of their Saskatchewan farmland.
	Thanks to the Minister Of Agriculture and the Government of Saskatchewan for undertaking this survey. I only hope it is not already too late to undo the damage.
947.	THIS SURVEY SHOULD HAVE BEEN SENT TO ALL SASK FARMERS
948.	As a fourth generation farmer I feel the roots of many farmers depend on the location of the neighbouring land, developments, the location of oil field activity; the large hog barns; the takeover of Colonies, the government needs to work harder at keeping the family farm viable for the future; larger purchasers do not comprehend the value of the land for the next generation, the overuse of chemicals, the water drainage are non-vital instruments that are going to ruin the production of our food source.
949.	I have a good example for you. In my R.M. some quarters came up for sale. All the local farmers couldn't top the price a oil patch man paid. He only leased to keep the land maintained. His goal was to develop residential, and sit on the rest as an investment for future development. Well, he couldn't cover his debt so his Alberta lawyer and lawyer partners took it off his hands. Spent 3 years flattening it. Two acre lots zoned industrial. No takers. Two other quarters left idle, all weeds. All profit leaves Saskatchewan, three quarters out of production. God ain't makin' no more dirt. WE need to understand that. It's not just us in the now, we have to leave farming land for the people that are 100, 1000 years ahead of us. And it would be MOST beneficial if the person farming the land owned it. Instead of being a serf. Perhaps you should look at leases, like up in lake country, 99 year leases for cabin owners.
950.	Our forefathers left the tenant/farmer feudal system in Europe for freedom in Canada. Unfortunately with the foreign ownership of land, we could be returning to that same scenario!!!
951.	Are we going to become peasants to large corporations? We don't need outside investment, local farms are paying a good price for land.

952.	As a rural municipal administrator, in addition to being a farmer, I encourage issues with absentee farmland owners on a very regular basis. Land is being returned to rural municipalities due to unpaid taxes, land is being left uncultivated, roads cannot be built because the landowners cannot be found in order to acquire easements, local bylaws are being disregarded because the landowners think they can do what they want when they are ready, local farmers are being challenged because foreign farmland owners do not know how to manage the land. These problems have evolved over the past 5 years and create issues for administration in an already challenged profession. Encouraging more foreign ownership in the interest of profit will do nothing but increase these issues and create no long-term good in the province of Saskatchewan.
953.	must.be.canadian.resident.to.own.land.not.pension.plans.or.corporatiions.of.other.counties
954.	Land ownership should stay inside Saskatchewan.
955.	<p>If the current rules aren't changed and more foreign owners or pension funds buy land the rural communities will be lost and small town schools will be empty. The new generation of farmers cannot compete against foreign owners or pensions. These funds offer no benefit to the local community's.</p> <p>When I see someone working the pension fund running the Zamboni maybe I will change my mind. Until then this is my opinion</p>
956.	I think we have many young people that need program to assist them in initial startup as capital cost are unattainable .
957.	Farm owners and operators will be able to do more to protect our soils for generations to come. Absentee landowners will not have the understanding of how to protect this precious resource and improve it for the future. Renters in general must think shorter term with their investments in the land. This fact will be detrimental to our soils.
958.	Please don't allow these people to push me off our 5 generation farm, I've seen to many farms disappear and to many small towns and schools close up (and I'm only 33) because of first Hutterite colonies and now investment corporation farms/foreigners push people out with the all mighty dollar. Seems to be no limit what these people spend even though the price they are paying is impossible to pay back over a 20 year mortgage at today's prices and yields which have been pretty good. What's going to happen when the yields and prices fall? Many many bankrupt farms!
959.	Why are you asking the general public about what to do, which by and large is uneducated in finance, economics and politics, and thus unable to understand the consequences of changes in the subject regulation? Trying to figure out how much resistance you will have to manage during the change? Or what are the most popular concerns so effective counter arguments can be furnished? Because from the type of questions you have, it is obvious that you fully understand what is at stake. If the political system is functional, it will obviously choose to protect the farmers for the collective benefit, as they provide a service to the nation, including your own plate. If it is corrupt and side with the banking system, then the rules will change to favor speculation, and your plate of food will get more expensive and of lesser quality.

960.	Agriculture is one of the main pillars of the Saskatchewan economy - a direct result of the farmers working the land and the agriculture industry that supports them. Let's preserve their way of life and land ownership rights.
961.	If you want rural Sask to survive, the local farmer has to own the land. If you work hard to make a profit, you get to keep your hard earned money. Why send part of the profits out of Sask. to pay a foreign landowner. Seems backwards to me!!
962.	This province was built by farmers. The farmland ownership act was put in place to protect us and no one has the right to take that away from us. Especially for greed and money. My grandfather would roll over in his grave.
963.	I hope that any changes to the ownership laws keep in mind that the benefit of owning land should result in stronger communities both in Sask and Canada
964.	I think there should have been some kind of identification process with this survey. Eg. Drivers license #
965.	<p>I believe this notion that foreign ownership of Sask. land creates economic value, value for whom, value for the foreigners, but not the province or the people. It is nothing but foreign exploitation of the weakness in our system, that is the failure to look after our own affairs, where else in this world can foreigners simply gobble up other nations assets, under devious schemes.</p> <p>Those in southwest Sask. in particular can attest to how large religious farming entities leads to school closure, failure of small business, towns, and displaces local culture by unfair competition. I think it is time the province steps in to protect our heritage, our assets, and the rights of the farming community. Just stop foreign farmland investment Companies, and Institutional Investors. Our farm land is not for sale to outsiders, no more so than selling off our hopes, dreams and RIGHTS, and jobs than in any other sector</p>
966.	Opening the gates on this is a bad idea - period.
967.	Once Canadian farmland is no longer owned by Canadians, it will never be our land again. Land is in limited supply and the ability for a country to feed itself is one of the most important things I can think of. Let it go and we will most definitely regret it as our children and their children try to undo the damage created by a reckless act such as this. If land values go up much more where I live I will likely be forced to quit farming and not allow my children to continue this as it will not be sustainable.
968.	If we keep catering to the old farmers that only want to make as much money as they can off selling land than we are going to run into too much land and not enough people to farm it because farmers will be an extinct breed. Let's put the "farmland" back in the hands of "farmers". Young farmers need a chance at farming too and not just with horrible deals with investors because they control all the money.
969.	<p>Thank you for inviting input into making an important decision about farmland ownership in SK.</p> <p>If we recognize and appreciate the significance of the historical evidence of independent land ownership, it will honour our ancestors who sought to maintain the independence lost in their European homeland. It will also benefit our future generations who take pride in their work and wish to maintain and instill values of independence. Corporate values are not individual</p>

	values.
970.	I am not only interested in my position as a farmer but in the farming future of my son. Young farmers in Saskatchewan need an opportunity to be able to farm without facing competition from large foreign investors. These outside investors do not even support the agribusinesses that are in our province.
971.	Agriculture and food production are critical elements in our future economic well-being. Food will increase in value significantly and consumer prices will rise greatly, as climate changes occur, energy prices fall, and we grow different crops - let's add value to those enterprises and protect our producers and our investment. Our most valuable commodity will be water; so, make the connections. e.g. expend irrigation, enhance water quality - led by the Americans, the world will pay huge prices for access to our water and our food; if we are not ready to deal with and on this, they will take it.
972.	As a retired teacher I am very concerned with the drop in school enrollment in rural Saskatchewan. The rural community offers an ideal education system for our children. Children raised on a farm receive a farming education that exceeds the knowledge of displaced foreign investors. The education that they receive as young children working in a farming environment is next to none. It is something that can't be learnt by a person from a non farming foreign background. However allowing foreign investors to take over our land is going to eliminate our family farms. These family farms have been fundamental in the development of Saskatchewan. Killing small towns and the family farm is not the answer. Reducing the number of children living in the rural area by reducing the number of farms is not the answer. Big is not always better. As a school teacher I know the value of a small town education. We have children raised in our rural communities that are very often sought after by many employees. Why? They know how to work and they have an understanding of many basic principles and values not taught in a urban setting.
973.	Why in the world would we allow foreigners to own our land we will or already have developed an actual connection with it. The foreigners do not care for it and never will. Just the money tied to it. Land going on market should be directed towards the next generation, sustainability is a big current trend in agriculture and having the next generation get land in their hands will be far more sustainable environmentally and economically. So I would ask the government to cut out foreigners and look to put us young farmers on the land.
974.	I do not want to see farmland being owned by huge corporations who swallow up large areas, which leads to further depopulation of the countryside. I feel there should be space for the smaller farmer to still own and live on his farmland.
975.	You get what I am saying I will never be able to afford to buy land if things don't change
976.	As a young individual trying to work my way into more farmland ownership, the cost of cattle, joined with the cost of land is barely feasible as it is. Allowing these groups to purchase more land which drives the price up further would allow traditional family farms and youth wanting to get into farming to be driven away from a great career.
977.	My folks came out from Ontario in the late 1800's to take up homesteads. The smaller farms where part of the fabric that made the prairies a wonderful place to live. Bigger and bigger farms with fewer people have seen the loss of many smaller communities. Allowing foreign ownership will permit the total globalization of farming which in the end will result in a loss of

	control of both economic and environmental issues. Canada is for Canadian just as the prairies should belong to the people who live here. One day we may discover that we can't eat money.
978.	I don't see Saskatchewan remaining as competitive in the Agricultural landscape internationally if we don't at least find some form of middle ground on foreign ownership. Having a closed door policy to it may be a hindrance to export relationships we have or may have in the future. I agree I would like to still see primarily Canadians farming here and realizing the benefit of appreciating land values, but blocking all international investment in this form seems like it will hinder continued growth in our sector over the long term.
979.	I am for Canadian ownership of farmland, Saskatchewan or out of province. Welcome immigrants who want to own land and actively farm it. Relatively few large farms are stable and able to last for an extended period of time. More family owned and operated farms are needed, large or small. This segment has been the most successful and enduring in our province's history. The need to grow the farm in order to be profitable has been over-emphasized, and is erroneous. Many operators who went that way sold out because they burnt out, stressed out, and went into extreme debt. Farming is a very cyclical business, and a family owned and operated model has stood the test of time.
980.	All my thoughts are contained in previous answers. I grew up on a farm and it makes me sad to think that the people who live in the Province may no longer have ownership and control of this precious resource.
981.	Keep the farm land in the hands of those that work the land as much as possible. We don't need to sell off our resources to foreign investors we need to keep our communities alive foreign ownership does nothing for our communities.
982.	Saskatchewan compares poorly with the rest of Canada (except BC) in that farmland ownership is severely restricted. The legislation under which this Protectionism is pursued also appears to offend against the Constitution of Canada. It is likely to be only a matter of time before that proposition is tested with potentially catastrophic consequences for both past and future decisions and actions of the FLSB
983.	Even though I am unable To purchase much land myself I have been made able to farm a large number of acres do to investment companies such as assiniboia capital, HCI and other large firms.
984.	those wishing to buy land will be very opposed to foreign investment as they want cheaper land, while those looking to sell land would like land values to increase so that they can capitalize on their lifetime investment. the province of Saskatchewan must decide whether it is better to have affordable land for those taking the risk by farming that land themselves. or to open up the land ownership regulations to allow more non-farming people to own the land and reap the benefits while shouldering none of the risks associated with farming.
985.	With crops such as lentils getting over 20 dollars a bushel farmers can buy land if they want without needing govt to cause a market drop in land prices. Money is a lot easier to borrow now and interest rates are a lot better when I mortgaged. If people want to farm they can pay the price. I don't see any poor farmers in the area I live and they are still buying land up.
986.	Farming is currently an efficient and productive business. Farmers that own their land are

	<p>very careful to maintain the value of their land, because they are proud to do a good job. Saskatchewan has done well in maintaining farm ownership of the land and agriculture benefits from their attention to detail in their own land. Furthermore, farm families do a good job of passing the land to succeeding generations.</p>
987.	<p>My grandfather and father were both farmers in Sask. I have always farmed and realize the value of farm life and the life lessons I have learned as a farmer. This tradition can only be carried on with the affordability and availability of land for future generations.</p>
988.	<p>I have had 2 70+ year old men, both farmer in the last 6 months tell me that they see in the next couple of generation, that if the non farmer land ownership is not addressed that rural Saskatchewan will start to look like the countries that their grandparents left with only the shirts on their backs. The rich do not look after the land, the rich don't care how you make a living as long as they can live on easy street. These men, retired, live comfortably now in the city. They both have sold a small portion of their farm to buy a house in the city, take regular holidays and enjoy life, with their pensions and the sensible rent they receive off the rest of their land they can't spend it all. They don't need to have huge dollars for the rest of their land. The way it is now if they sell the rest of their land, not only can they retire but their 40 year old children can retire too. I mentioned this problem to [redacted] on a chance meeting in Best Buy in Regina in December of 2012. His comment was that we needed to keep the young people in the community to keep the rinks open, and the small towns alive. A very stringent land ownership law is required to achieve that. FCC's low interest loan of 500,000.00 for young farmers is a joke now. My son had to pay 375,000.00 for 160 acres of hayland with a 1972 1000 sq. ft. bungalow and 3 35 year old 2000 bu. bins. Can't make a living off it, can't rent any more land, but is to live in the country, and support the local community. He can only make a living off of cows, but the provincial govt. policy with are soon to be transitioned PFRA pasture stinks. I think he should move to town, and if he wants to still farm wait till I die.</p>
989.	<p>This is not only a SK problem, but a growing Canadian problem. As environmental change happens, we are at greater risk of environmental fluctuation, so esp. there is great concern about water management (incl. potash development) affecting the water quality. Having too many foreign influences without local knowledge and affecting a sparse land sets up our whole province for wholesale destruction if we are not very careful. It is not a risk I want our province to take.</p>
990.	<p>Foreign ownership through any means degrades the family farm concept and forces Saskatchewan residents to work elsewhere. There has to be a means to enforce the rules. Money and increased value is not the most important thing to rural residents. Profitability drives up the prices of inputs while small farms cannot compete against corporations that make their profit by volume like the big box stores.</p>
991.	<p>Sat on Farmland Security Board once</p>
992.	<p>I am recently retired and now do not live on my farmland. I have family who continue to benefit from my farm land.</p> <p>Maintaining the PFRA pastures as part of an expanded Saskatchewan pasture program is very , very important to me. If they are dismantled - sold, or otherwise closed to grazing patrons - my lifestyle and that of my family will be permanently hurt.</p> <p>I am opposed to foreign ownership of Saskatchewan farmland.</p>

	I am opposed to further sale of any Crown lands in Saskatchewan - they are an insurance policy for our citizens as climate change impacts us.
993.	I believe the provincial government needs to start focusing on our smaller farms and ranches and supporting young people to keep them in our rural communities. At the rate land/lease prices are now and if they go any higher there will be no future for our young people in agricultural.
994.	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Current (or any) restrictive ownership rules prevent a farmer from realizing the full potential value of his/her property and deriving optimal benefit from such ownership. Put another way, (1) not only is the best selling price unavailable but (2) the value of the land for the purpose of securing bank finance is artificially depressed, restricting the farmer's ability to fully exploit the asset and grow his/her enterprise by utilizing what the farm's otherwise full collateral value should have been. Ownership rules simply interfere with property rights in an unconstitutional way.</p> <p>Continuing with restrictions clearly deprives the economy of the benefits of Direct Investment from elsewhere. Not only would Direct Investment introduce new capital but it also follows that income or other gain derived would be taxable and thereby be of benefit to the Saskatchewan & Canadian people.</p>
995.	Keep farm land ownership in the hands of REAL Saskatchewan Farmers. Enough already with "foreign investors" who will "help" grow the economy and are only looking after their own interests which happens to be the bottom line.
996.	Willing seller, willing buyer!
997.	We are a family owned operation that has been continually farmed by our family since 1882. My son and daughter are actively involved and they will be the future of Sk. farming, not investors in land. It is very hard for us to compete for land with the big operations. We have been a mixed farm to spread out risk and have had no help from risk programs because of that. We are not affluent and are quite risk adverse and that is why we have survived as long as we have. We do need to be able to expand affordably as people living on and caring for the land is the only future for Sk.
998.	<p>One subject not part of this survey is continued public ownership of Crown lease land and community pastures. These should never be sold to anyone; they should remain in public ownership and overall management for the long-term public good.</p> <p>This does NOT mean they should be operated by government - private farmers and ranchers can do a perfectly good job of that, within appropriate environmental guidelines.</p>
999.	Farmland should be open to competition to purchase, like anything else in a free society; provided they are taxed on the profits of farmland by investors is a good source of available farmland to lease by starting farmers. Lease rates are always adjusted to economic conditions of farming at the time. Not too many years ago some areas had difficulty renting out farmland, even just for the municipal taxes. Investors bear that risk.
1000.	Prices rise and fall. Be conservative with your finances, work hard, shrewdly invest, and be generous. Failure is a good excuse to keep trying.

1001.	<p>Foreigners have no interest in our way of life. They just want to bring more of their kind to Canada. They make poor neighbors. So many young farmers need to be able to buy land. It hurts to see someone who doesn't care for land and can borrow money from foreign country be able to buy</p> <p>thank you for letting me share my thoughts.</p>
1002.	<p>I am a 6th generation farmer in Southeastern Saskatchewan. Our farm was homesteaded in 1882 so it is very important to me that we be able to keep the farm profitable for many years to come and if land prices are going to keep rising it will be hard to economically do so.</p>
1003.	<p>Please keep and even put more control on ownership of our precious Saskatchewan asset (land).</p>
1004.	<p>Farm numbers dropped 13,000 in a 7 YR period (2004-2011). Were you able to determine why such a large drop, and what are the numbers in 2015. What remedies in place to stop the slide.</p>
1005.	<p>no.</p>
1006.	<p>How do you know if respondents to this survey are really SASK. RESIDENTS. That concerns me.</p>
1007.	<p>Yes I have farmed all my life in Saskatchewan now I would like to sell to the highest price, I have had people outside of Canada wanting to buy some of the land, but they were not allowed to. Its not my job to sell my farm to the local people for less money. Because I need to have money to retire.</p>
1008.	<p>If former Sask person inherit land, maybe they should be allowed to keep it, if they plan to plan to move back to Sask on a permanent basis. Would need a time limit - 10-20 yrs.</p>
1009.	<p>The choice seems easy if we want a rural population for a good place to live and also provide society with human resources with valuable rural values. Farm land has historically produced good people as well as good basic food.</p> <p>Modern day serfdom will eliminate rural way of life.</p>
1010.	<p>why are governments always adjusting to accommodate the immigrants when they didn't like the country they were living in and now want to change this country to make it like the one they just left</p>
1011.	<p>I will not support (vote) the political party that supports this.</p>
1012.	<p>I grew up in a farming community that was taken over by a monopolizing individual who purchased all the surrounding land in the area. Our farm eventually could not keep up with economic change due to the increased value of the farmland and were forced to sell the land. Farmland value has increased immensely over the last 2 decades and has forced out family farms. Aspiring farmers are not able to take farming on as an occupation anymore and reduces the amount of family farms in rural areas.</p>
1013.	<p>Don't sell our farmland to outside investors, keep it for those who know how to produce products that feed the world in our own Province.</p>
1014.	<p>I think you are too late. The damage has been done. Young farmers were finally coming back</p>

	to farm and these huge out of province land sales have already restricted them from competing in today's market. We will just have a few big corporate farms left that lease from outside investors and the money sent out of province not spent here at home. Everyone loses. Especially our province
1015.	For the past 2 to 3 years I have raised this issue with my MLA but nobody foresees a problem. Then when it's too late we will all wonder why something was not done.
1016.	I am a YOUNG FARMER. I work hard enough for myself. I can't afford to stretch myself thin in order to compete against foreign investment. How can you possibly think that I, having no significant capital built up, can compete against foreign investors that have an ungodly amount of money? Then saying that they do purchase the land I was trying to buy rent it out to me. They still have no risk. Doesn't matter if it's a good year or not I either have to pay them or I get the land taken away from me.
1017.	We need to hang on to our land for our children and grandchildren ~ if the government insists in being involved perhaps they should give First Nations their stolen land back first before selling what isn't theirs to foreigners
1018.	It is most important that crown pastures be maintained as provincial or community pastures for the benefit of ranchers and for the benefit of the natural environment. Those crown lands that have been leased should remain available as leased land and not sold.
1019.	R.M.s should be allowed a more aggressive land taxation system towards nonresident owners.
1020.	The outside investor only thinks of one thing and that is return on investment. He could care less who farms it or what happens to future generations. If things don't go well they will dump the land to anyone who comes up with the money no matter what country they may be from.
1021.	Please do not let foreign ownership of land happen. In my opinion we are selling out our future generations if we let this happen, which is just wrong for a short term gain.
1022.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Crack down on illegals who now own Sask farmland and take back the land 2. Ensure only Canadian banks are funding the purchase of land 3. Relators have told me many times of aliens actively looking for farmland. Someone in farmland security is not doing their job
1023.	Farming needs to have a stronger voice. Gov. needs to help sustain it in its ever evolving form. But maintaining it as a Canadian owned and operated resource should a priority. By the people for the people of sask. The best operator is the one who has the most invested financially and emotionally
1024.	Keep farms with farmers
1025.	We have some of the best and most productive agricultural land in the world. I believe it will be in Saskatchewan's advantage to maintain it for Saskatchewan residents forever or as long as possible.
1026.	We believe that a significant majority of acres of Saskatchewan farmland should be family owned.

<p>1027. Saskatchewan land should be owned by Saskatchewan residents who support their community, town, city and province.</p> <p>Local ownership means local pride.</p>
<p>1028. Good stewardship of the land is important.</p> <p>Affordable land is important to local people.</p> <p>Government control of community pastures is important to preserving biodiversity. Private owners will eventually plough the native growth.</p> <p>Farmers should be able to make a good living from their land.</p>
<p>1029. Please protect our farmland from disappearing from the farming families that have put their sweat blood and tears into this land for years. The government needs to step up and protect Saskatchewan farm land from identities that want to destroy our history and culture.</p>
<p>1030. In my opinion I think we are heading for a disaster. Without farmers owning their land, and if we had a weather disaster such as a drought, Early fall frost, late spring heavy snow fall that killed livestock or wrecked farmland crops and farmers or ranchers have to pay high land rent costs rather than paying land taxes (which in our area are about 1/10 the cost of rent currently) that farmers and ranchers won't be able to make it through the tuff times. Who will bail the farmers and ranchers out if they don't even own their land. Its not fair to the tax payers to have to bail out the farmers. Farm land has been operating the same for decades in good times you would buy land and build equity and bad times you would budget properly and coast threw, but when you're renting in bad years the rent stays the same and pushes producers further and further into debt.</p> <p>In my opinion if we are going to continue with land ownership going the in the same direction that we are currently heading I think pension group's, local investor's, foreign investors and all other land owners that own land and ARE NOT ACTIVELY FARMING should be charged a higher land tax. For example in our R.M. farm land owners are charged 4 x mill rate, commercial land owner are charged 8 x mill rate, oil and mineral owner's are charged 20 x mill rate. Oil and mineral owners fall in the same category as investor's because they are not using the land to provide food for the world and are using the land to make money so maybe they should pay the higher mill rate also. Perhaps when producers are struggling and trying to pay the higher land rent cost this extra money could be used to help them or when these producers retire and have no land to sell and retire off the income from there land sales because they couldn't afford to buy land we could use the money from the higher mill rates for there pension's.</p> <p>I strongly believe in what I have wrote and leave you my name and contact info. in case you have any questions or maybe I have misunderstood something and you would like you would like to correct me on it.</p>
<p>1031. It is crucial to have a strong viable agricultural sector. Too much of our farm revenue is leaving the province. We need to do more of the research, manufacturing, processing, etc. in province! If farmland ownership leaves the province so does a portion of the profits!</p>
<p>1032. Having local landowners result in a stronger more prosperous rural economy. Outside investment decreases community investment and involvement and does not benefit the Saskatchewan economy.</p>

1033.	Farmland in Sask should not be sold to investors whether foreign or domestic. In our municipality thousands of acres have been purchased by one investor from another province. This has driven the price of land to unrealistic values and made it virtually impossible for the young generation to purchase land. We will become have the situation where land will be owned by the investors and speculators and farmed by the lessee. As I recall that is the very reason many of our founders came to this province was the promise of land ownership. Appears to me we will be taking a huge step backwards every time we allow an investor of any form to own the most valuable resource this province has.
1034.	The people and government have lost touch with people in rural areas and farmers.
1035.	Keep Saskatchewan land in the hands of Saskatchewan residents, and money out of the pockets of foreign companies.
1036.	<p>I grew up on a farm and spent my life as a teacher. I inherited farmland from my grandparents and have always and continue to operate it.</p> <p>I love farming.</p> <p>I keep in contact with what is happening in Sask agriculture and want the best for farmers and for the province.</p> <p>I'm passionate about this. I would welcome the opportunity to participate in a consultation or help in any way possible.</p>
1037.	Farmland is the more important resource we have in Sask. You can't eat potash, oil, or gas. To lose control over our farmland is to lose control over our ability to feed ourselves.
1038.	It would be nice if the markets could be stabilized to provide more security and certainty for farmers. Or if there was support from the government during low markets. My family raised cattle but because prices were low a few years back we were forced to sell out. Shortly after we sold, of course, prices went back up. The uncertainty we faced each year was nerve wracking, and both of my parents were forced to have a 'regular' employment just to support our rural lifestyle, on top of being full-time farmers. Even something like a blown tractor tire can be crippling since it's a critical piece of machinery yet it is expensive to fix. Personally, I want to be a farmer myself but it's questionable if I will be able to afford to do it. I think that farming should be affordable for everyone.
1039.	I strongly disagree with foreigners owning our Saskatchewan farmland.
1040.	With investment groups, non-farming corporations and non-resident owners, who will only be concerned with a return on their investment, I feel there could be great risk to our environment and food quality standards we are feeding our nation let's keep it local.
1041.	Farmland in our area has virgin wildlife areas which is impressive to preserve for wildlife etc. We may never will see farming like it used to be knowing this of course one is forced to adapt like in any other business. But strongholds could be put into place to benefit our capabilities to compassionately farm our own lands like someone who is fighting to live or battling an illness who we try to make as comfortable and painless as possible knowing that there future

	is near end
1042.	Saskatchewan has deep heritage of farming and it is a major part of our culture here. Investors such as the type you have mentioned prior jeopardize this lifestyle making it difficult for Saskatchewan farmers to expand or start up farms. Let keep Saskatchewan land inside Saskatchewan.
1043.	Do not disturb what presently works for Canadians/Saskatchewanians and seniors. I oppose super large farms over 20 quarters. Our families left Europe to own reasonable farm operations - not corporate ag farmers. Too much too large. CPP investment good.
1044.	I would like to know that farm land in Saskatchewan and other provinces remains in the hands of Canadians - preferably individuals actively engaged in managing the land. This is OUR land, and I want it safe and healthy for future generations.
1045.	Don't sell out.
1046.	Keep it Canadian. Harper already firesaled so much of our resources. Please just stop with this nonsense.
1047.	From the experience I have had supervising land for foreign land owners and leasing land from them, I believe there are instances when some of the individuals should have special consideration. One land owner \I rent from has owned land in the province for over 50 yrs. He visits the farm every 2 years he phones every 6 months and is aware of all aspects of farming. On his last visit he was concerned that on his death the family would have to sell the land. I think this would be a great loss as they would probably rent the land to a younger neighbour for the next 40 years. The have always set the rent so that everyone can make some money. I think that people like this should be able to appeal on the basis of their exceptional generosity and concern for their rental family.
1048.	I urge the Government to change the laws to keep farmland and pasture ownership in the hands of farmers. If you want to see the future you have to look at the past. Our ancestors came to a place where you could own. Their hard work turned us into a world power all from a dream of land ownership.
1049.	When reached retirement age we need a value for our land to support us in retirement (purchase house in city and maybe care home and who knows what else). Some of these young farmers are living a life of luxury so do I as a retired farmer. Don't want to destroy Sask. but want good value for my land.
1050.	I hope I can buy land around me in the future I would like to buy 2 or 3 more quarters and I might consider leasing.
1051.	Farmland is inherently different from other assets - we grow our food on that land - only Sask farmers should own and care for Sask farm land and certainly not non-Canadians.
1052.	When land becomes a commodity for speculation, the land is in danger, so is our country.
1053.	Farm land should only be owned by people who farm the land themselves or who rent out their land to relatives or neighbours. These people care about the land and will take care of it. It must not be sold to foreign investors who only see dollar bills or want land to grow food for their own population.

1054.	<p>-We as Canadians are selling out to foreigners.</p> <p>-Using pension funds for land purchases are causing farmers to compete against their own money</p> <p>-Foreigners are destroying our way of life (They push down bush and large corporations destroy our communities)</p>
1055.	<p>Would like to see restrictions put in place against institutional investors and foreign ownership.</p>
1056.	<p>when rights to drill are being granted by lease auctions etc, the government should send a letter of notice to the surface land owner so he can begin to study his options for when the sandman walks on the place. It would balance the playing field somewhat from one party in the negotiation involved in the topic on a day to day basis and the other being totally unprepared.</p>
1057.	<p>I urge the government to not allow Pension Funds and Investment Boards to purchase Saskatchewan farmland.</p>
1058.	<p>It is vital to the long term health and sustainability of rural communities, province of Saskatchewan and ultimately our most valuable resource the land, that land ownership remain in the strong hands of the true stewards and custodians, the Saskatchewan farmer and rancher.</p>
1059.	<p>You cannot eat money. Over the years when the economy failed, it was the land resources that pulled us through. To have a sell off to various interests outside of Saskatchewan or investment groups is fundamentally wrong.</p> <p>When money fails, it becomes the reason why land values would go up because it is a secure asset. That speaks for itself which is a greater long term value to have. If Saskatchewan wants to be here for the long term, it has to retain local farms and affordable farm owned assets.</p> <p>On page 3, it asks the question to support the expansion of operation for local farms. While supporting Saskatchewan local farm is the best, bigger is not always better. Smaller and more financially stable locally owned farms is probably the best bet for Saskatchewan and our interests.</p> <p>On page 4, it asks the question preserving the tradition of Saskatchewan owned farmland is important as economic consideration. It is the same question by preserving the tradition of farmland ownership you are also preserving the economy.</p> <p>Clearly at the end of the day, you have to own the ground that you walk on and have a relationship with it; otherwise how far can you sink. It does not make sense to trade lasting value for value that is passing. Saskatchewan farms and farm land owners have pulled Saskatchewan forward in the past and will do so again. If managed properly as a resource not of today's dollars and just today problems, but as an owned resource that will continue to move Saskatchewan forward, regardless of the economy of the day.</p> <p>Strong local business is the backbone of the nation; local spending keeps the economy afloat.</p>
1060.	<p>I gave my son two quarters of good farm land and they changed it to my son with no charge. This was at the prov. office in Yorkton, Sask two years ago. I gave my grandson one quarter</p>

	<p>at the same office, But it had been privatized.</p> <p>They wanted me to pay money to them for the increased value of the land. They wanted 5 times more than I had paid for it. I told them I was not selling it, I was giving it to him for a start in farming at no charge. They brought in 4 more of the staff to say I had to pay more.</p> <p>In the end they said they would do it for \$35 so I said it was not right, but I'll pay it. Then they said they would send it out to him.</p> <p>2 months went by and I asked him if he got it and he said no. So I went back to them and asked for it.</p> <p>The one in the office looked up the titles and said you've got to pay another \$25.00 if you want the title.</p> <p>I didn't want to argue anymore so I gave them another \$25.00 and took the title home with me and gave it to my grandson. I don't think that this is fair to the farmer who is just trying to help the young fellows to get farming.</p>
1061.	Farmland should not be mined. Foreign ownership will surely mine it.
1062.	I would like to see native prairie preserved. Our 20yr old son is farming and cannot afford land.
1063.	I have no issues with out of province investment by individuals but am opposed to investment by large corps, such as pension funds because how can farmers compete against their finances with government money. They can purchase urban property such as large apartment complexes.
1064.	Large land ownerships inputs and profits would not benefit local small town communities.
1065.	Public ownership of land (crown land) should not be further eroded. Community pastures have been well-managed at low cost for the benefit of all - farmers/ranchers, naturalists, wildlife.
1066.	Letting non sask residents own sask farm land WILL decrease our small town with hospitals schools and the rest of our structure that we need to keep farming, whether your farming 3000 acres or 25000 acres people still get hurt ,injuries still will happen and if there is no one around to run the hospitals or ambulance or schools to keep our population of Saskatchewan up ,thus less voting people as well.
1067.	I just want to make sure that Saskatchewan farmland remains in the hands of those that are born here; those Saskatchewan residents that want to purchase land should be able to do so. We do NOT need foreign investors who only care about making money for themselves and their investors and really could care less about the farmland. The Federal and Provincial Governments have already sold and given away enough of Canada and the Provinces--it is a real shame for our country!
1068.	Selling land to large out of country corporations and pension funds provides a onetime gain only for the seller. This land would never be available for private ownership again. And this type of scenario does not keep people in rural Saskatchewan.
1069.	The traditional Family Farm has been replaced by Farmers incorporating in my area. The trend will continue, and I would consider it if any of my family wants to farm. This is a good move to allow Farmers to be more efficient. If most Farmers are incorporating, then I do not

	understand why they need special rules for their corporation. Farmland prices will reflect the potential profit.
1070.	Our land is our homes. You are dealing with multi generations of sweat and sacrifice. The general public should be happy there is food in the grocery stores. If they feel we are making too much they are free to try themselves. Land has become more expensive than what it can produce. Do not let foreign investment destroy our province. The current market place will determine the value of land. Residents of Saskatchewan should not have to compete against foreign interests trying to secure their food source. We will sell them the grain or livestock and keep our profits within the community.
1071.	Land ownership has been a backbone of the agriculture industry in Saskatchewan for generations. Some of the best stewards of the land, and our province's reputation have been farmers who own their land. If ownership restrictions are completely lifted, I feel that foreign investor capital and large multination interests will make land ownership next to impossible for the private individual over the next generation. The trick will be to find a balance of investor capital to grow our industry without losing complete control of a very important capital base.
1072.	It is important for rural saskatchewan to keep the land farmer owned in order to help rural communities survive and prosper. If not we are heading to corporate owned farms, dead small communities, and just workers on farms not proud owners who help each other and enjoy the simpler farm life.
1073.	The only people that should be allowed in this survey are Saskatchewan farmers. I can't believe my eyes that foreigners are even invited to participate. Business people shouldn't be involved either, this isn't their business.
1074.	I think sask residents should only be allowed to purchase land in sask with an exception to the rest of out of province people who still live in Canada may purchase land but with a very small limit. And totally disagree with out of country purchasing of any land in Canada
1075.	Once our land gets sold the control, will be lost. Saskatchewan will be working for another country or pension fund. Our ancestors didn't work this hard to throw it all away.
1076.	Foreign or corporate ownership would ensure the destruction of the family farm and rural communities. We must not allow this to happen.
1077.	I believe local ownership should be able to afford and control the majority of land in Saskatchewan. If we have too much outside investment ...not only can we not afford to buy where will the next generation farms be? We are already losing too many (family) farms!!!
1078.	I would like to preserve the independence yet cooperation of neighbours helping neighbours. It's that independence and cooperation which inspires people to do more for themselves and others. There is more creativity when you have more invested in yourself and your community. I believe foreign ownership and big money investment will not enhance the quality of rural Saskatchewan in the long term. Greed never builds anything worth having, it almost always destroys. Foreign ownership and big investment is really all about greed.
1079.	This opening the door to foreign investment will only provide short gain for long pain
1080.	We are watching all the land around us turned into a factory. There is no stewardship. There will be nothing left for our kids. This is land my ancestors immigrated to over a hundred years

	ago. All around us everyone has sold to the because they are getting 200 000 per quarter. No young farmers starting out can pay that. It's not a fair competition. Chinese corporations have endlessly deep pockets. Farm yards are being abandoned because all the farmers are leaving. It's sad. We're selling our heritage and while the money seems good now, we can never get that heritage back.
1081.	Foreign investors in farmland treat the land as a commodity and will seek to get the highest return from that land at the lands expense eventually. It is just an investment until something better comes along. Resident farmers will also seek a return from the land but not at the lands expense, they will produce the food for the country, and live in and support the community where the land is located.
1082.	It is most important to keep farmland ownership with the people of Saskatchewan. If you release land to foreigners, it will be gone forever. I believe you should look after our most valuable asset, and not treat it like a commodity. If you allow foreigners to own our land, is water next?
1083.	When a farmer has to compete with outside interests that have unlimited funds and purchasing agents with unlimited time an idiot could figure out what will transpire. As farmers, we have to respect the work of our ancestors and so are obliged to not risk everything with every deal.
1084.	The way things are going there will be no young farmers left farming , no chance in purchasing any farm land!
1085.	I am the 3rd generation Canadian citizen. Grandparents emigrated here from the Ukraine, fleeing religious persecution. I've been told that once settled their worries were over, i.e. regardless of how bad a year you've had it still was better than worrying for the safety of yourself and family members, quite literally, (is anybody shooting at you). I'm not exaggerating. Locally there's been farmland bought by chinese companies for very high dollar value, they in turn look for renters to get their % return on investment. It's not happening, thank goodness nobody's paying it. Did they even look at the dirt before they bought it, I think not. And I feel no sympathy for them in doing so. Unfortunately back to the human greed thing, people hear these values and automatically do the math based on their land type and think well if that land sold for x dollars, then my land MUST be worth this amount. it's absolutely stupid, its truly gone off the charts of greed.
1086.	it's a beautiful place to raise kids Don't give it away
1087.	Profit has been moved to a small group of owners in rural Saskatchewan and the wage earners on these farms do not have protection of hours of work, safety, or many other labor standards because these corporations (large farms) are not regulated. Rural towns are dying and it appears the government is more interested in having profit leave Saskatchewan. The serf and tenets way of life is supported by outside investors.
1088.	There are farmers like ourselves who have children who would like to farm with us and expand our operation. However in the last few years where foreign investors and company's have purchased and brought land values up immensely - we can't afford to. Therefore in the long run , the family farm will be lost completely. If left to continue the way it is, there will be no family farms left. The people who have built this province agriculturally by building the

family farms - will no longer be. And that's not right.

And now with the elevated prices - if there ever is land to be sold - the average family farmer can't afford it. And the foreign investor/ large corporation investor isn't going to sell it at a price that is at a loss to him/them therefore again making it impossible for the family farmer to afford.

As we see it , the tightening of foreign investors/ large company purchases rules and regs are coming too little to late. It should have been restricted five years ago.

1089. Heard , on the radio waxing nostalgic about farmers, sort of painted a picture of a mom and pop operation, with a few chickens, a couple of cows ,and a few pigs, and how it was so important to maintaining this lifestyle. Great propaganda for naive urban dwellers, but far from the reality of today's farms. Maybe she would like to forgo say half of her pension to lower tuition to university, so kids could get an education at 1960s prices. Our sons and daughter chose to get an education and not be involved in agriculture, why should their inheritance be reduced to help someone that chose agriculture as an occupation have an easier time. If you want to farm, prepare to work hard, and take your lumps to build something the way we did.

1090. our forefathers emigrated to this country to escape the peasant/landlord trap, if we don't maintain LOCAL land ownership we will be heading down that same road. Only people that live/work/own our local communities will support them so they can survive/grow. Nothing good will come from letting others own/control our biggest asset, our LAND, once control of that is relinquished further decline is inevitable.

1091. have to make it impossible for foreign government to own or control through a few citizens Saskatchewan land going to lose control of one of our biggest if not the most important resources. Future generation farmers will just be serfs to foreign landlords and the local governments will also lose out on tax dollars as a lot of the production will be shipped direct to the other countries without any taxes applied.

1092. As a former farmer and a current farmland owner I think it is vital to keep farmland Saskatchewan owned and economically viable for young farmers.

1093. If you want to keep the next generation farming you better make it possible for them to purchase land. With the current situation it's impossible I just tried to buy land and also my nephew who wants to farm and FCC would not lend us the money for the amount that was offered to grower by an investor. Now my nephew has decided to move away and I am not going to move home to farm with my brother either. Our small town would have benefited by me moving with my kids and my nephew staying at home to farm and start a family a lot more than an investor buying to land. I am not going to move my family on the risk of rented land that could be pulled once the 3 year lease is done.

1094. im afraid it is already too late. money buys the govt, the world is over populated and each govt is making sure they have enough food for their people. Canada has just closed their eyes to the worlds interest in grain and oil shortfalls.

1095. The question comes down to who do you think should control the land that our food is

	produced on? Who do you trust? I do not trust hired hands, employees, of large pension plans or corporations. I trust the individual traditional farmers who live in the communities they farm in and are beholden to their peers and their community.
1096.	Quit selling Saskatchewan off to the highest bidder
1097.	<p>I like the way it is. We are happy to compete with local farmers. Land is at a premium and farmers have to go further all the time to obtain land. Do we really want more ag equipment on the highways of our province? Less farmers in Saskatchewan means more people in the cities looking for jobs. It's already a go big or go home industry and I believe this proposal will force the current young farmers trying to make a go of it to quit by being forced out of their ability to compete.</p> <p>Lending facility could use a restructuring of the law to allow them to be able to compete with the changes in the market for land. To help young farmers purchase land. Banks can lend on a asking price and/or fair market value for a house or somewhere in between but land can only be lent on historical fair market values and assessments. This gives us little to no ability to purchase in a bullish market.</p>
1098.	Reduce mega-farm land holdings, and let more people live on the land.
1099.	Please stop selling our most precious resource to foreigners...put Sask and Canada first before the \$\$!
1100.	Keep it local, \$\$\$ is what will destroy this land we call home and all corporations and investors are in it for \$\$ and will not take accountability or give back to the communities. Big Farms hire out custom seeding, spraying, combining ect from and that does not really help out the local community at all! They say they are feeding the world but at what cost? Sending money back to rich investors and corporations that don't have to live in a desolate chemical laden landscape! Poisoning our own back yards for what?? Plowing down every tree in sask for massive mega equipment! Then complain about flooding and run off taking land! How is this going to help for the future generations?....
1101.	Farm land ownership needs to remain afford for the traditional Saskatchewan family farm. They are the backbone of the rural areas and we need them to survive. Rules need to be in place to support Saskatchewan residents. We have already seen how well corporate farms such as Broadacre and Wigmore have done... put rules in place to support Saskatchewan farmers so that land remains affordable for traditional owners! Keep outside money out of landownership or it will become so unaffordable that there will not be a next generation of family farmers...
1102.	Open up the market, get outside investors to provide much needed capital and ideas into Saskatchewan, this is not only about our Province it is about feeding the world, and we are falling behind the game.
1103.	Yes this Government in its pursuit of political gain doesn't wish to offend anyone so in hiding in the bush regarding drainage issues as well.
1104.	Please Please keep it local we as farmers know what it is worth so dont let capitalists and bankers get involved and artificially inflate values take the profits and leave the ag community in shambles when they go

1105.	we are a young family that grew up farming but cannot afford the current land prices in sk to start farming. the family farm is too small and too old of equipment to take over and the surrounding land is too expensive
1106.	Foreign ownership would put a true value on the value of farmland.
1107.	We can't let corporations operate farms, they don't have the best interests at heart for the environment, health and safety, as well for employees. The cost of food will skyrocket and they would starve people in order to raise prices. They will cut corners in order to pad the pockets of their investors and there'll be even more politicians making little deals in order to get more campaign financing and bribes. This is a disgrace to even think of. As soon as Wall and Harper screwed the farmets out of the CWB I knew this was coming. SHAME ON YOU!
1108.	Would like to actively farm more however, scale of economics is a barrier. How do you know that trusts and foreign controlled corporations are not paying people to enter survey data showing preferences to support trusts or foregone controlled corporations
1109.	Farmland is an asset. Saskatchewan should not be looking for ways to allow others (be they individuals or corporations) to control that asset. For farmers to be profitable they must control their asset base as much as is possible.
1110.	Keep things the way they are!
1111.	Something doesn't sit well with me having more and more farmland constantly getting sold to non residents of Saskatchewan or even Canada for that matter. Keep the land, resources and equities at home with the people who continue the farming tradition in this great province.
1112.	Why can't Canadians own the land they live on? Our ancestors worked hard to clear this land and provide and so did our parents and now how can being greedy benefit our country? Materialism will kill our country and our children will be foreigners in their own country.... We are not selling our land. We are trying to hang on to ownership. Buying at prices today puts a strain on our way of living which we will live with for years to come.
1113.	Pretty sure I've been clear in my support for sustainable family based land ownership rules for our province. It's hard enough to eke out a living on the land without going head to head with a portfolio manager that doesn't care about my grand kids kids' grandchildren each and every day they put their boots on.
1114.	I'm not opposed to anyone from any country or province owning land here, as long as they live here and farm, hands on, no exceptions, like the saying goes, "If you wanna do the crime then do the time." Was that not the whole idea of settling it with \$10.00 homesteads in the first place. The pioneers came and built this wonderful province. Shame on us to sell it off to foreign investors and speculators who are come and gone, as the wind and they a mess in their path. All along make it difficult for us to stayed through thick and thin, to expand and remain profitable for our future generation of kids, in this tough hard industry of farming.
1115.	I have seen how owner ship becomes concentrated in other countries and the masses are left out. Keep land for the average farmers not conglomerates local or foreign.
1116.	More young people would be farmers if the government would step up and give grants to young people starting out or provide affordable ways for us to get going. People are giving up because we can't afford to live like this anymore, people on welfare make more than small

	farmers(1-5 quarters of land). I have seen this substantially in this area.
1117.	My grandfather walked into southeast Sask. on the ox cart trail. from Portage La Prairie. Established a farm and raised a large family successfully. My Dad bought nearby land when he was old enough to start farming. He farmed through the 30's and still kept a love for farmland. When I started school I knew I wanted to farm and own land and I am proud to own land in central Saskatchewan
1118.	I really think government involvement is unwise. I prefer living in a land where free enterprise is valued and sustained.
1119.	We will just do some quick math. A quarter section (160 acres). Leased for 65 dollars an acre. Will be 10, 400 dollars. Now lets do this over a 100 quarters. That is 1.04 million dollars of taxable income that is being taken out of Saskatchewan. 1.04 million dollars at what 25% tax dollars. Which is just over quarter million tax dollars. How much is federal/ provincial I'm not to sure. So keep farm land ownership in Saskatchewan
1120.	If land is owned by a family, it is taken care of for future generations. If the land is owned by a foreign investor, the land could become mined for larger profits and disease would spread throughout the prairies. This is not something to be taken lightly.
1121.	I am feeling the need to look at this question of Farm Land Ownership...not for myself, but more for the Future Generations of Saskatchewan Farmers...let us say 7 generations hence...I want their Saskatchewan to be a thriving land, where there exists strong rural and urban communities...built on shared values and principles...
1122.	as a young farmer I would like to see affordable land prices. Or there will be a major decline of farmers in Sask and more large operations not farming Sask land to potential which would reduce production off the land
1123.	I think that too many controls on anything creates an unfair environment. Being mindful of keeping agriculture feasible and protecting the investment of existing farmers is fair. Personally, I will require some equity in my farmland to sustain my retirement. It is not reasonable to expect huge farm corporations to own all of the land that they farm. So far it seems that these huge corporations operate a a short term situation.
1124.	Would love to have prices that are reasonable for young people getting started. Should not have to have 2 jobs to buy land to farm. Really tough farming and keeping full time jobs as well. Farming alone is a full time job
1125.	Farmland in Saskatchewan should be for the people of Saskatchewan or anyone in Canada who wishes to come here and make a living by farming. We need our small farmer again. The ones that made this province what it is. They should not be "drummed" out of here by corporate farms who just want to make the most they can and take the money elsewhere. We must give our young people who wish to come back to the land the chance to do so. They are the ones who will build our communities, who will contribute to the local economy and help make Saskatchewan a viable place to live.
1126.	You need to focus on how the little guy is getting wiped out. Kids don't even have a chance to buy. The big big farmer that is knee deep in farm credit keeps buying and buying and as well as the Hutterite colonies. We need to cap the huge corps to a maximum in order to keep the

	family farms alive. Very sad to see so many family farms disappear
1127.	Farming in saskatchewan should be about providing a safe and stable food supply for the benefit of Canada predominately. Allowing huge foreign owned corporate farms to operate here increases risk of large tracts of land not being cared for due to financial risks involved. Foreign owned farms could eventually jeopardize local food security by exporting production directly abroad without consideration of local needs. Land speculators and investors make it difficult for young local farmers to grow or sustain a viable farming operation because they are using investment dollars from elsewhere to drive up the price of land to buy and sell at a profit.
1128.	The majority of farmland needs to be owned by smaller farmers. e.g.. five thousand acres or less. Today's competition for farmland prevents our young people from entering farming unless they inherit the land. Corporate farming is one of the major deterrents.
1129.	I am concerned about sale of crown lands; importance of continuing to make grazing leases available and affordable for farmers; and good management of native grasslands, our rapidly vanishing resource.
1130.	Only short sightedness would allow us to tell land to foreigners and non residents. If they want to own land here, allow them to move here and farm it! It's their back breaking labour than, and it keeps the money and ownership in Saskatchewan. Too many houses and cabins sit empty year after year, because the owners live elsewhere, and the economy of the areas suffer! A farmer having to use his own money buys the land he can and sells it when he can't. There is ample opportunity to buy, but not when foreign individuals buy huge amounts of land and get investment backing by other investors. The short term benefit of an increased sale amount will be offset by no new sales, no local benefit, and no addition spending in local economies.
1131.	farmers should own the land they farm
1132.	Good ag policy is more beneficial than low land prices Our ag policy does not always encourage good land stewardship. We used to summer fallow a very destructive process. We don't do that with other natural resources either No one really wants to destroy the soil but everyone still has to make a living.
1133.	As new/young producer in the Ag industry, I feel that I will be at a financial disadvantage to purchase land(s) if I am in direct competition with corporations, trusts or other out-of-province investors with unlimited financial support. Also, I feel that the strong personal connection to the land that local resident producers/ farmers have is critical to the Ag industry, not only in Saskatchewan but across Canada. And by allowing non-local non-resident owners, it will have a negative impact on the industry due to the lack of connection to the land.
1134.	Only thing I have to say that most of your questions are worded so that only a lawyer or a university professor can figure out what they mean - why don't you put in farmers talk so everyone can understand them.
1135.	I spend 8 months at the farm

1136.	More people bidding on my farm land the better
1137.	Why isn't this in the news?
1138.	<p>I have observed how there has been an accelerated increase in corporate ownership including pension fund ownership and that does not sit well with me and many others.</p> <p>The National Farmers Union has done excellent work on these land ownership issues and should be consulted!</p>
1139.	Keep farmland in the farmers hands in the province they live and farm in!!
1140.	We need to stand up for our communities rural population schools. Young people wanting to farm as a carrier. This is important
1141.	Farm land should be sold to farmers, now a day a young farmer has a hard time farming due to the price of land and other people/corporations buying it up.
1142.	This is very important. Please get it right.
1143.	<p>I believe and feel that immigrants or foreign should not be able to just come into our province and buy land. Immigrants or foreign coming from places such as China, Africa and many other places feel that they should be able to come in and buy as much land as they want. This is totally wrong. How can our young people buy land if you have people like this coming and buying our land. If we would go to their country and wanted to buy land they would not let us because they want to keep that land for their people. Well we want to keep the land for our people and not let them come in and buy it from under us. The government needs to wake up and make sure that the land in our province is kept for our young farmers and NOT for foreign ownership.</p>
1144.	Keep rural Saskatchewan alive. Long term if all the land becomes investor or foreign owned where will this province be? At the mercy of someone else.
1145.	<p>I think our grandparents had it right with having the ag economy determined by the people living and working the land and ensuring the local economy remains strong even through a down turn. The more we move away from such an ideal the more we will see a benefit during a strong ag economy which will then result is a more severe decline during a downturn.</p>
1146.	Let's keep a future generation of farmers on the land. Selling off to large corporations and foreign investors will make it impossible for young farmers to gain a foothold to farm. They simply cannot compete with the "big money" guys.
1147.	<p>I think that farmland ownership should lie mostly with those of us actually farming the land. In our area there is land that is owned by investors, and it makes it difficult for the actual farmer to make a living on the land because what they want in rent is not based on what the commodity markets are doing, but on what they paid for the land (which is often an inflated price) and what they expect for a return on their purchase price. I know of land that has been so over priced (rent) that it has sat idle for several years. I really believe that farmland sales should be based on the markets, whether that is grain or livestock. Not on what some corporation, trust or other organization thinks they can get as a return on their investment. Farming is a difficult and stressful enough occupation without adding in people who have no</p>

	<p>understanding of the realities. And I most certainly think that anyone who owns a large amount of farmland should be preferably a Saskatchewan resident and at the very least a Canadian!</p>
1148.	<p>Foreign owners have purchased large parcels of land in our area, paid more than asking price, financed through fcc , same as our lender but different rules. Leased out land at ridiculous price local farmers have no option but pay, but returns not there to pay land is left idle. farmers that sold moved away our local town lost, our family{105 year farm} who wished to continue farming now cannot pay the impossible lease and now land is idle and for sale again at double the original price, this all happened in the past 3 years</p>
1149.	<p>Govt should stay out of farmers business.</p> <p>Government let the CWB go look where we are now it is foreign owned.</p>
1150.	<p>I do not agree with governments bailing out farmers like was done many years ago. I know many farm operations where higher mortgaged land was given up (Farm Debt Review Board) then purchased back for a much lower price by another member of the same family. Other business's did not have that same privilege</p>
1151.	<p>The family farm should be the primary focus for future farming. Not vertically integrated foreign owned agribusinesses.</p>
1152.	<p>I do not want to see land around the farm eaten up by no Canadian ownership. Family farm works.</p>
1153.	<p>They are not making any more land and the value of it in all ways can only increase. The people who live on that land (urban and rural) and those that make a living from it need to have ownership and control of how this resource is used. The health and wellbeing of this generation and those to come will be affected by your decision. Thank you for the opportunity to have my say.</p>
1154.	<p>I have geared my whole life to be educated in and grow in agriculture with the idea/plan of going back to the farm. Every time the land ownership rules or exceptions are made that plan (dream) gets ruined. It breaks my heart to see all our land potentially going into the hands of people that don't care about the people already here and of our environment. I would hope that one sees that it would be mad rush to come in and take over our country, and that the right people stop that from happening. Thank you</p>
1155.	<p>As young farmers trying to get started we have already seen foreign investment in our area. As old farmers retire they sell for over inflated prices to investors willing to pay it as investment. No chance of young farmers getting started to ever grow their operation. Most farms being sold now are sold for big dollars to Albertan investors who don't reside and have no intention of residing in the area. Not only does this hurt the smaller guy it also hurts local rural economy. Instead of new families moving in to support locally owned business, the land is rented out and original owner moves away. Our small towns are dying and will worsen if farmland is sold to outsiders who never reside on the properties they buy. There are a lot of baby boomers retiring and with outside investment the young people interested in agriculture are pushed out and forced to explore other avenues.</p>
1156.	<p>The reason a family has moved off farm to live is to keep a job in order to try and keep what they have left. It is too costly to drive everyday , which in turn a person works a lot of their</p>

	time to balance .
1157.	I have grown up believing in the future of the family farm and the industry has turned into a huge business, which isn't bad but some of the best famer are working in other industries because the cost of farming (land and equipment costs are so high) they can't return to what they are good at. I my opinion you want people doing jobs they are the best at and love. Big farms are getter huge and taking away for people futures because they need less help because of the quality of equipment. I am lucky enough to be able to raise my family in an industry I love and being able to teach my children about the lands, plants , animals and everything the makes this world thrive. I the big picture the roots to life are being lost and it is a shame that people just think that everything is from a store. In closing we need more opportunity for the people that love farming and ranching to be able to continue in it and it will benefit everybody
1158.	It is our hope that this survey is treated with honor and respect to the food producers of this province and not with the big business and government agenda. It is in everyone's best interest to have producers as the farmland owners. Farmers keep the profits within the province making it the most beneficial long-term profitability for the province of Saskatchewan and producers themselves.
1159.	I just want a chance to have the spread I want. But it is very difficult for me to compete with the big operators. I'm not sure if you in parliament even care about my plans but I will do what I've always done, work through it.
1160.	It is hard enough to farm and to pass the farm on to our children without having to compete for buying land against foreign investors or companies and pension plans
1161.	We need to own our land . If we let others ie: own land how will we be able to control our country if they want to own it move here and have residence here and be Canadian .
1162.	Good young farmers out there right now that cannot afford to own land
1163.	Farm land should never be considered as "investment" other than investment for the farm families. Once something becomes "investment" by pension funds, etc., the push is on to "maximize profits". Which puts one on the slippery slope of pressure to use unsafe farming practices to the detriment of the soil and the climate. My husband and I have been Canadians and Saskatchewan residents for over 40 years and watching our neighbours struggle with the current scenario in the province is heartbreaking. Others our age have chosen, when the time came, to sell their land not at "going market rates" or "for development" but rather at a price the young people in their communities who wanted to farm, could afford.
1164.	We must keep foreign investors out of not only Saskatchewan, but Canada as a whole. If foreigners actively farm the land and are compliant to the rules such as draining etc, it's easier to bend a little and welcome them into our communities. It's the Chinese investors that drive the price of land, rent it back for a high price and ultimately control the land from there on to shipping ports. We must be very careful who we let buy our land as it could be very scary one day when we are told what we can grow on our land and when we can ship it.

1165. As a young mixed (beef and grain) farmer with a passion for making healthy, safe food profitably and sustainably, I hope that farmers can forever control the most important asset required for production of food. As the world grows we need to make more food than ever, and I'm seeing multiple cases of foreign and corporate ownership having the opposite effect.

1166. This is our heritage, our tradition and our land, to keep secure and reasonable for future generations to enjoy and harvest a bountiful life from, not to sell for the highest amount to the largest corporation that would not be supporting our small town communities and way of life. I find this offensive and discriminatory that this is even being considered that land should be for sale for large corporations or companies that do not even reside in this place of wonder and beauty. this would be a negative impact of the entire economy in the long run as these large corporations and companies that have tried to conquer land have all failed in the past and the same would happen here, only making the price of land so high that no farmer would be able to purchase land and begin farming in a practical and efficient manner.

1167. The people of Saskatchewan own our parks and waters so why would anyone want to sell out rural Saskatchewan to foreigners???

1168. I would be in favour of setting up requirements for crops and rotation of crops. Our soil, and water are key to our survival and that of future generations. Soil integrity and water security are very important to me. We have 1,000,000 acres of certified organic crops in production now. We are the bread basket of Canada, continued movement towards Certified Organic as well as processing could make our province economically sound and a leader in both sustainability and security for future generations. That is a win-win in my opinion.

1169. Farmland ownership in Sask. must be protected against the greed, corrupt individuals and big multi-national Corp.....who are capable of "TAKE-ALL) and who mismanage, and leave the soil depleted and unproductive.

Farmland is Food and Water ----not a gem or mineral. It Cannot Be Replenished easily or Reproduced. It is Everything We Are.

I can continue.....pages and pages.

My summary is sufficient for now. Thank you for listening!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

1170. The following was also pasted into Section 2, so it can be disregarded if it is legible there:

I think there are 2 issues; how do we maintain the free market, and what is the vision of the future of farming.

Maintaining the Free Market

I think that with institutional investors like CPP, or if maybe a large corporation like Microsoft decided to diversify into farmland, that any land involved is no longer part of the free market. Certainly it is possible that market forces will shift and CPP will sell the land at some point, but if the future of farming is positive, and commodity prices continue to trend up, then, honestly, there is only a small chance that CPP will ever sell. Allowing a large corporation to own lots of land is no different than allowing Government to own all land, whether it be the

Saskatchewan Government, or the New Brunswick Government, or the Chinese Government. The reason all are the same is that neither large businesses nor Governments die in 3-4 generations.

However, I don't mind, as much, a group of individual investors joining up and purchasing a block of land, since in a period of time, market forces may mean they have to sell some or all of it. Since they are all human, they have human issues, such as divorce or health issues, that affect the entity, and so that land will foreseeably come back onto the market.

But either of those scenarios is still not the best: that is when the land is farmed by those who own it.

Sure it may be that, currently, only 1% of total farmland in Saskatchewan is held by large investors, but what amount is appropriate? When all the land around me is owned by CPP, and there is no chance for me to expand without moving my operation, then that is too much owned by one entity. It's different if all the land is owned by one big farmer, since he has been buying land over time, and I can compete with him for it if I want. That is what is happening in my RM; a number of different farming operations are all looking to expand, and so land prices improve, but if only one entity owned all the land then prices would stagnate since if all the land is rented, there is no incentive to improve it.

Buying is always preferable to renting, since then you can improve the operation over time. Renting is not the ideal long-term solution. Renting means there is no Pride of Ownership – just as residential housing properties deteriorate more rapidly than those inhabited by the owner, so too farmland is negatively affected by renters or caretakers.

Renting land forever would be like portions of radio frequencies being bought and sold. Imagine a company had a licence to operate a radio frequency at say, 650 AM, and had various talk shows on it. Yet in the early 1990's, the company was experiencing financial difficulties, and the law allowed it to sell a portion of its frequency. So the talk show host at that time for the 8:30-12:30 slot bought the rights to the timeslot, named it _____, and decided the format to be used as long as he owned the timeslot. Even though he may decide not to be a talk show host and retires, the new, or returning, person at the mike will have to maintain the same format since _____ does not want to sell the rights, at any price. It's easy to see that the new host would soon become frustrated since he, or she, would not be able to make changes to the show that they think appropriate, and either the show might deteriorate, or the listeners would. Yet the talk show host should not be frustrated, since he is still making money at the job, and is generally doing what he loves to do, but the truth is that for him to have any control, he would have to move to a different station, or a different city, since most cities or regions could only handle one talk radio station. Yet, all other time slots in all other cities were sold off to institutional investors, or to large talk show entities, and there are no time slots available, unless one goes to a small town radio station.

So with large entities owning all the land, new or existing farmers can only hope to expand by renting, and the incentive to farm is reduced. May as well move somewhere else that I can

own my own land and have something to pass on to the next generation.

The Future of Farming in Saskatchewan

If you foresee Saskatchewan as one big farm and two cities, then one owner of all 62 million acres is fine, or five entities holding around 15 million acres each, and renting it all out to large operators.

However, I foresee more and more small or even tiny farms. I see the local food movement as only getting larger. More and more young people are asking about the ingredients in our food, and the local food movement encourages small farms. But many small farms can only happen with a vigorous free market.

I have 12 acres, and from research I have done and permaculture principles (ignoring the tree-hugging sect), one can do a lot on small acreages, and I see more and more of that happening. Yet if CPP buys every acre in an RM, why would they want to sell one quarter, or even 10 acres, to me? But even if many large farmers are bidding on local land, I still may be able to buy it since it's too far away from their operations. I can operate in a niche, and then, as my operation becomes successful, by the time I want to expand, one of the large farmers may be retiring, and I can buy some of his land, and other small farmers can too. The point is that I have a hope of buying land if humans own it, since things happen, divorce, death, change of heart. But if an institutional owner has locked it up for all time, then why bother?

So with large entities owning all the land, there is no incentive for small farmers to operate, since they can't own even 10 acres without paying exorbitant prices, while new or existing farmers can only hope to expand by renting, and the incentive to farm is reduced. May as well move somewhere else that I can own my own land and have something to pass on to the next generation.

1171. Environmental stewardship, drainage stewardship, and keeping communities thriving all starts with responsible ownership. It is very difficult to convince foreign ownership or absentee owners of economic swings, infrastructure inputs needed to improve the land, or how weather can really vary production/returns

1172. We have a beautiful country and agriculture is a huge part of our history. We need to protect our country and agriculture is the backbone of our economy. We have something worth protecting for farmers now and years to come. Local farmers who invest in their country, community, and local economy now and years to come Not foreign investors.

1173. At the present value of farm land the majority of people can't afford to buy it even if you could get a loan to buy some land there is no way it will ever produce enough to pay for it your lifetime. at the price it's at its great for a farmer who's looking to retire but impossible for anyone living here to purchase land

1174.	please see earlier comments
1175.	<p>local ownership of farmland is. best for the land, local communities, ask and Canada simply because local farmers have a major interest in. Making sure they all stay strong healthy and growing</p>
1176.	<p>Water and land are the most important resources you can have, especially land that produces food for us and the world. It is critical that the Canadians have complete control of this valuable resource for the benefit of Saskatchewan and the rest of Canada. Don't sell us out; no other country would allow foreign ownership of their land.</p> <p>Thanks for consulting the people!</p>
1177.	<p>I feel it would be a great benefit to our rural country if a law were passed stating that no more native grassland be broken for cultivation anymore. This would ensure the future of our wildlife and potentially stabilise our grain market somewhat. As well I'm not sure I know alot on the topic but I feel it would be important to make a move on restricting the draining of wetlands in the watershed heading to Manitoba.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>
1178.	<p>I am a firm believer that foreign investors, although beneficial because of their seemingly unlimited funds in the purchase of farmland, are detrimental to a rural Saskatchewan setting.</p> <p>We have seen in our area, first hand, the lack of community involvement, by both Korean and Chinese investors, and a disregard of a family farm. They are in it to get as big of a return on their investment, at whatever the cost. This could be a skewed opinion, as I do not know what is happening in other parts of the province, but this is what I have seen.</p> <p>I am not a racist, but I have seen this first hand.</p> <p>The Asian and South African investors, some farming, some not, have brought the big money in and taken away a lot of the land from young local area farmers.</p> <p>Being a young farmer, with a young family, and hopefully taking over the family farm, (which is a Century Family Farm), I would hope the Government puts in very strict laws on the ownership of land, by people outside the province, and limits the acres to which they can own.</p> <p>My father would rather carry on a legacy of farming, and community support and involvement, than to make the decision to sell at a higher profit. But, truly, at how much of a higher profit? I believe with the funding programs in place, these young farmers would be able to buy and farm their own land. But it seems when the time comes to seal the deal, the "big money" comes in and offers a no limit price.</p> <p>I understand a farmer works his life to build his business to eventually sell to make money. With the positive outlook on the agriculture industry, his sons or daughters, local farmers, young farmers, now have the option to be able to afford a fair price for both the seller and the buyer. A lot of farmers have sold and made a lot of money, which is great!! It truly is... But it has also come with a cost, of some young potential farmers, not being being able to afford to get into farming, and are forced to enter another line of work.</p> <p>Let's hope the Government does the right thing.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

1179.	KEEP FOREGHN OWNERSHIP OF ANY KIND OUT
1180.	<p>There should only be two ways to own Sask farm land.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Your primary source of income is farming and can be proven via tax records 2. If you inherit it through the will of a deceased farmer
1181.	<p>We are giving away one of the most important and uniquely Canadian values. Our land. More and more we become like the US. Political decisions determined by big money with little regard for the common citizen. As our income gap widens and our rural communities dry up, our country will weaken. Add in foreign land ownership and we will find ourselves in a Canada we don't even recognize. Unfortunately we will not live long enough to realize the stupidity of our actions. The generations to come will look back in bewilderment of how we selfish and careless our actions where.</p>
1182.	<p>Farmland in Saskatchewan is not to be played with. This land belongs to the people of this province and foreign investment or investors of any sort would change the landscape of who owns this country.</p>
1183.	<p>Agricultural land is for Agricultural land USED for Agricultural production for FARMERS to produce food to feed the world - not for land speculators, funds, or non residents. If they want land, buy some non-Agricultural land or non-forestry land. Then see what value they put on THIS land.</p>
1184.	<p>We have got to be proactive to get more young people involved in farming. Joe public is totally unaware of the risks that farmers take to produce a crop and it all depends on one thing..... Mother Nature.</p> <p>The young people want the high paid jobs with a paycheck every other week and only work up tp 40 hours and get holidays anytime they want them.....does 60-80 hours a week with more bills coming in than paychecks loo appealing. I don't think so.</p>
1185.	<p>Keep our land owned by our own residents and Canadian citizens</p>
1186.	<p>I want to see more of the younger generation have the opportunity to own land in Saskatchewan. Too many of us who are younger are unable to purchase the land because prices have gone unrealistically high, and we cannot afford it. I am glad that the older generation who do not have someone to take over their land, are getting a really great value for their land which gives them something more to retire with, however no one is stopping to think about the younger generation.</p> <p>People are also turning a blind eye when it comes to who own the land, and it will be too late once there is too much foreign ownership, and we no longer have say or control in what it happening around us.</p>
1187.	<p>I love it here and am raising my family here the same way my family has here for the last 127 years why should a wealthy pension plan or a rich doctor be able to have the same farm benefits that my family has had to work their whole lives for</p>
1188.	<p>I do not wish to say anything more about the ownership of land, but more straightforward questions like the last ones in the survey are going to give far better information.</p>
1189.	<p>I would like to see ownership of land remain for Saskatchewan to have an acceptable lifestyle</p>

	encouraging each other
1190.	I would like to see the laws go back to what they were when farmland could only be owned only by individuals and corporations that reside in the province. The NDP removed that restriction several years ago. I think that needs to be put in place again and we wouldn't be having this mess. SO - individuals and corporations that reside within Saskatchewan are the only ones allowed to buy land in Saskatchewan. The Act should still restrict ownership to anyone who does not live in the province to 10 acres or less.
1191.	I think our govt should allow foreign investment so that Saskatchewan keeps moving forward meeting the worlds demand for our product. With out it our transportation and other infrastructure to help promote our products will not be an attractive investment and will start deteriorating. If you are not moving forward we are moving backwards. I farm in a large area in the southwest corner of the province and never had to compete with foreign ownership it is always the local farmers paying the highest price. Foreign ownership or pension plans create a floor for the lower priced land which keeps everyone's balance sheet strong which helps the economy!!! Also foreign ownership or pension funds ownership of land are also good stewarts of the land and take the emotion out of land and make it more economically viable for everyone involved!!
1192.	this is a very important issue. it is hard to compete against the investor who just want a return on their money. if you have family that wants to farm/ranch with their parents it can't always be done because the price is too high and they won't be able to pay for it. We can't sell out our land base to outside investors!!
1193.	I believe it's the Hutterite colonies the gov't of Canada should be taking a long hard look at. I would love to see how much they are getting around paying taxes. It's no longer about them having enough land to support their people it's now about competing with other colonies in the area.
1194.	Agriculture is one of the 3 main drivers of the provincial economy. A prosperous rural farming community provides tax revenue and economic growth that helps keep Saskatchewan a "have" province. Allowing one of our most precious resources, land, to be owned by foreign parties will be a detriment to our local and provincial economy. Foreign owners have no vested interest in our prosperity and will not contribute back to local business as they are looking to maximize their return and export the revenue as soon as possible. Allowing foreign money to flow in for land purchasing also puts the local farmers at a distinct disadvantage in being competitive to purchase land and remain profitable.
1195.	My family would love to be involved in the round tables.
1196.	Free enterprise would allow anyone to own farmland If we were truly free enterprise we would be selling crown lease land. Crown leases are really the old land bank in another form
1197.	Don't make our province available to the global 1%. Our family has made a multi generational contribution to our community as well as our nation. Owners, living in our community have a vested interest in all aspects of life in this province, not just return on

	investment.
1198.	I grew up on a farm in this province and had many chances to leave for employment. I chose to stay in because I love Saskatchewan as a province. Foreign ownership will greatly change the Province. Eventually much will be owned by corporations and wealthy individuals and farmers will only be employees on the land.
1199.	The interest in farmland & the spike in current prices is as much a result of the fairly recent largescale involvement of realtors in the land market. This industry sees huge opportunity to increase its returns on farm sales. Canada was built by people who want to own their farms rather than be tenant farmers. The Achilles Heel in the industry at present is in finding qualified labor. Corporate ownership will intensify rather than alleviate this issue. Sask. should not squander it's resources in general. Once control of farmland is relinquished especially to those with only an economic/investment stake, many intangible facets of farming will be lost forever.
1200.	It would be a Pandora's box - once it's opened up, we can never go back. And land is a resource that we should never be giving up to foreign owners.
1201.	I think it is important to focus on our country and our provinces and the people we have living in them. We should support and invest our own monies into our provinces. The foreign immigrants, that have immigrated to Canada, don't support our country, they send all the money they make here and invest in their countries and families back home. In years to come Canada is going to see the big mistake this costed us and will realize, when it is too late.
1202.	WHEN HUGE COMPANIES START BUYING LAND FARMERS CANNOT COMPETE WITH PRICES OR BUYING HUGE CHUNKS OF LAND FARMERS NEED TO BE ABLE TO BUY ONE OR TWO OR FOUR QUARTERS AT A TIME OTHERWISE THE DEBT BECOMES UNSERVICEABLE
1203.	I strongly believe that farmers will keep this great province economy strong on the agricultural front but we has young producers can't compete against pensions funds or super big non farming land owners,, We need confidence in our government to make the right decision so we feel we can continue to reinvest in our operations without feeling threatened. THANK YOU
1204.	Keep the rules as they are. Farming is a big enough gamble let's keep the land ownership stable and big companies and investors out of it so they don't make prices any worse than they are
1205.	Make sure wildlife lands, pastures are not put up for sale. The long term benefit to biodiversity is far too important
1206.	Ultimately it comes down to what the government wants to see for the Ag industry - whether or not the government is truely interested in supporting agriculture or getting votes. Exiting farmers will of course want outside ownership allowed as that gets them the highest proceeds. But at what cost to the remaining farmers or those wanting to start? Existing farmers do not benefit from competing against foreign investors or those from out of

province for farmland, it simply increases the cost of farming and increases the risk.

From a social aspect, farming communities have been in decline for years and there is little that has or can be done to prevent it. However allowing outside parties to take control of a greater portion of the most critical asset in farming (the land) puts even more risk on those involved in farming and the surrounding communities.

I am well aware of many laws, trade agreements, investment agreements, etc that have a bearing on this decision. Once we start down the slippery slope, we cannot turn back and there will be more pressure to open ownership up. As you are well aware, there are foreign nations such as Saudi Arabia that is actively buying up farmland in other parts of the world.

I am well educated with a Masters of Science in Agricultural Economics, I have been involved in farming all my life, and I work in the banking industry (Ag and commercial lending) so I understand the competing interests in this asset. I am strongly against the sale of farmland to foreign or non-Sask owners (pension funds, income trusts, etc) as this will only increase the cost and risk to active farmers.

It is interesting that few if any foreign or outside parties are wanting to invest working capital in the actual growing of crops and raising of livestock as an investment. The risk vs return equation is too risky for them and instead it is the banks and credit unions that are deeply involved in this aspect.

1207. We have been somewhat fortunate in our area there is only a few parcels of land owned by these land corporations. But they have drove the price of the land up and the price of rent. As far as I am concerned all local farmers should get together and refuse to rent the land and let it grow to weeds. I have told these corporations this while inquiring about renting from them. But there is always some greedy guy that will pay there astronomical rent prices just to have more land even if they hardly break even.

1208. Would like to see our youth getting back into the industry of Agriculture and keeping the smaller communities alive and growing.

1209. I think that with regards to land ,ownership as local as possible is best.

1210. A Saskatchewan farmland owner should live where he farms, support his local economy, and help build his community. The owner of Saskatchewan farmland should NOT be a faceless wealthy, unknown entity, with zero interest in anything outside of their own portfolio.

1211. Saskatchewan farm land needs to be owned by Saskatchewan farmers. Get back to the roots that built this province. Enough investors from other provinces/foreign places hiking up land rates and charging an arm and leg to rent land. These investors don't know the area, don't know the land and nine times out of ten don't even know where the land is located.

1212. Keep it simple if you buy land you should be farming it.

1213. If you don't control the land you have no control over food or it's quality and safety. Foreign ownership of land will result in us growing the grain here, shipping it overseas for process and then we will be importing it back. Doesn't make sense when it's grown in our own back yard.

1214. Banks, Credit Unions, FCC and others consider farm lending a high risk and charge high rates accordingly. My access to capital to compete against an investment company or agency like

Ducks Unlimited isn't even in the same league. Ducks Unlimited can have a fundraising dinner and silent auction and pay cash for the same land I need to pay for 25 years after providing other land, equipment, cash and "enough to satisfy the lending policy" while trying to sell grain into a system that can't take it for the price I need in order to buy the land.

The market determines the rent and lease rates and works well. Trying to manage outside speculation on an influx of investment money will decimate us when they leave with their money.

We need better and realistic lending policies here.

I would not accept outside investment without an overhaul to lending practices that allow me to compete for land purchases if I'm in the same arena with foreign, Corporate, and Pension Plan buyers.

Thank you for inviting our responses.

1215. Community pastures are even more likely to protect the integrity of land,

1216. With the huge buy out Saskatchewan farmland we are losing a precious resource that should be nurtured and passed on generation to generation to generation by Saskatchewan people. We should be thinking about how younger generations can get into affordable, sustainable farming. With huge outside investor buy up of land Saskatchewan will become a wasteland of mono culture and production.

1217. Allowing other people to own farmland will only push more farmers off the land and lead to more environmental degradation, flooding issues, and risks to food safety and security. There are already far too many people who are so far removed from food production that they have no understanding of what is involved/important and we certainly don't need these uninformed people in control of our most precious resource - our land! We need to protect our land resource for the future generations!

1218. Only Saskatchewan residents should be allowed to own farmland.

1219. Open the gates for the big money to flow into this province. Short term there may be a few farmers that need to look for new jobs, but long term there will be more money in this province and more business as a result.

I also look at things from the perspective of a farmer looking to retire right now. He has worked hard his whole life, and should be able to ring the cash register in a major way when he sells his farm. He shouldn't have to worry about selling it for cheap to his local neighbor "Just to keep tradition going". He needs laws changed so he can maximize on the sale of his business. He then takes all that cash and likely flows it right back into our Sask economy.

The demand for food is greater than it ever has been, and Saskatchewan is one of the main providers to the world. We need to be gearing up for Big Business handling this huge export, not worrying about how to cater to a minority of complainers that can't grasp the fact that the world and the economy is changing.

Don't hold Saskatchewan back, move forward with progress by opening up the gates for

	investors. Attract these people, don't repel them.
1220.	Please, please, DO NOT allow Foreign Ownership. As a younger farmer I and many others will have no chance to expand the family farm. It will be big corporate farms taking over. I see this first hand as it happened ten years ago in the Spiritwood area. We are trying to expand but now cannot. My father and I still both work off the farm because we are surrounded by a foreign owner.
1221.	The social fabric strength and health of rural Sask. is dependent on resident ownership of farmland and farm units that may or may not include rented land.
1222.	<p>1) Non Canadian Residents (including Canadian Citizens living outside of Canada) can own no more than 10 acres of farmland in Saskatchewan</p> <p>2) Non Canadian Residents who are Canadian citizens cannot be grandfathered or inherit lease on crown land.</p> <p>3) FLSB cannot grant exemptions</p> <p>4) Pension Plans and investment trusts cannot own farmland in Saskatchewan</p> <p>5) Limit farm size to 1600 acres for individuals and 3200 acres for corporations (including all farm corporations)</p> <p>6) No foreign ownership of farmland.</p> <p>7) No foreign funds eligible to finance farmland purchases.</p> <p>8) Only 100% Canadian owned entities be permitted to own farmland with a cap of 3200 acres.</p> <p>9) All land sales need approval of FLSB to make sure that they are in compliance with the law. Putting onus on purchase that they are in compliance with the law.</p> <p>10) Restrictions on owned farmland, and investments by foreigners, would ensure that Saskatchewan family farms will survive and the people of Saskatchewan wont be in the welfare line. The more family farms you have, the more people you have employed and fed. Foreign ownership and investment will ensure that our young farmers cannot afford to purchase farmland and will be the demise of the family farm.</p>
1223.	If a portion of our land is sold to foreign investors or to large investment corporations this will put a pinch on the Saskatchewan economy. Those dollars that were once made off the land and from the Agriculture industry will then be removed from the Saskatchewan economy and sent out of country/out of province investors.
1224.	Don't let foreign investors in. Land needs to be owned by people who live and work in their community and who don't send money back to their homeland as a young farmer with my two brothers we can barely make ends meet because all the land is owned by big corporations or foreign investors and we may not last long either but this is how we were raised and we'll die before we leave
1225.	Please protect Saskatchewan farmland for the people of Saskatchewan. We need more programs to help existing Saskatchewan first, second and third generations maintain their farms without the hardships they currently face, with agribusiness often putting them in the position of being poorly paid employees to their focus on profit, without concern for people.

Corporations have lost their moral compass, in the service of profit and growth at all costs. Please do not do the same.

1226. We are developing an ethic of good agricultural practice in Saskatchewan, that respects the environment. We are also trying to respect the First Nations from whom the land was taken. We are trying to maintain the rural way of life and rural communities. We want young Saskatchewan people to be able to purchase farm land and take up farming. These things need to be supported by better commodity prices, better rail transportation, more value-added processing close to home, more farmer-to-consumer direct sale of agricultural products, and more funding for monitoring and enforcement of no-break-no-drain and environmental and water management policies. Allowing foreign ownership, or ownership by corporations or pension funds, will raise land prices and bring in owners who will not care about any of the values we are trying to maintain and promote in Saskatchewan.

1227. As the education document notes, changes to the legislation governing farmland ownership must be considered within a broader context. At minimum, the Government of Saskatchewan must also consider issues related to access to financing, farm consolidation, other means of boosting farm productivity and profitability, changing farm structures, and farm succession and intergenerational transfer. In each of these areas the Government must take a long term view, looking back beyond the last 10 (in many ways exceptional) years, and forward to the next generation. Where challenges exist or are foreseen, the Government should not merely accept the solutions that several existing investors purport to offer, but must rather fairly evaluate these against other possible solutions, including those requiring a relatively higher degree of Government intervention.

At present, it seems that deliberation on all of these issues is very much hampered by an absence of even basic data on landownership and land transactions in the province (historically and in recent years). Where limited data may exist, it has not been released to the public for a full and fair evaluation. For example, while the education document states that 80% of the total of farmland sales in March 2014, November 2014 and March 2015 were between farmers, it was neither clear on the methodology used for making such assessment, nor the rationale for picking those dates (which were relatively 'late to the party' from the perspective of known investors). The Government has also faced criticism for scheduling this review during a busy time of the year for farmers, and for limiting public comment to written submission rather than in-person meetings.

In light of these challenges, I urge the Government not to be pressured to constrain itself to a "short decision process" (as the Minister of Agriculture recently indicated), but rather to consider very carefully and thoroughly its next steps. In the interim, the changes to the SFSA that the Government introduced in May 2015 must remain in place.

1228. If all this land sells to investors, you eliminate the farmer he becomes an employee, which is the exact opposite of the tradition of the farming heritage

1229. Need to ensure future generations have the ability to continue family farms to help keep rural communities alive. We don't want to race each other to the bottom.

<p>1230. -Permit the possibility of generational land transfer</p> <p>-Restrictions on ownership of farmland should be in the hands of local farmers. Care of land! It is theirs so they plant shelterbelts and try to prevent crosses through recommended farming practices.</p>
<p>1231. It is very important to leave ownership guidelines as they are. In fact, I would even support only Sask residents owning farmland. I cannot state strongly enough how important it is to have younger farmers both owning and being able to rent land from fellow Canadians. Opening it up to foreign investment only hastens the demise of the family farm and rural communities.</p>
<p>1232. It was extremely difficult for me to start farming because of land availability and the cut-throat nature of all my neighbors. It would be good to see some programs to get more young people started in farming, so it's possible to start farming and start a family. Maybe limit the amount of land for everyone. How can a farm under a corporate tax rate tell another corporation that they can't have any land? Large parcels of land being sold is rarely divided amongst a number of farmers and only getting larger.</p>
<p>1233. Skyline's financial services were created to address the concerns of all Saskatchewan stakeholders – farmers can access the capital necessary to expand their operations, and Saskatchewan resident farmers will own and operate the land as intended by the legislation.</p> <p>Skyline's financing model has been introduced to a significant number of farmers, as well as many important stakeholders in the province of Saskatchewan. The response to the business model has been very positive.</p> <p>More information on Skyline's financial service offering can be found at www.skylineagriculture.com.</p> <p>Skyline's financial services help to ensure Saskatchewan's farmland remains community owned and operated, and provides a solution to transition farmland from the current to the next generation. As such, the needs of all provincial stakeholders are met. It is important to remember that Skyline's financial services were created with the input of local farmers and that Skyline has received significant support from both farmers and farming groups within the province. Skyline would welcome an opportunity to participate more fully in the consultation process and requests that representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture meet with Skyline's management team to better understand Skyline's business model, goals and objectives.</p>
<p>1234. Province did not try to help young farmers, but a whole generation was lost as they were not eligible for most of the programs. Also you need more farmers to help keep the vitality of rural areas. Need more of the money to stay within the communities.</p>
<p>1235. We have dealt with such corporations and they bring the farmer to their knees. The leases are highly demanding on the farming operation, not only with high lease prices but what is in the fine print is like a noose around the neck of the operation. The investor always comes out on top, no matter the outcome for the tenant. It will drive all young farmers to other industries or provinces if this continues. There are well-seasoned farms that can't afford to continue on with the price of land as it stands. There is no motivation to expand a land base with the</p>

	current price of land. How is there any hope or optimism for those who are young and eager if they can't afford to even start?
1236.	I'm really surprised that I have to fill this out with the current government. I thought this would be a no brainer for the powers that be. Why can premier wall say no to the potash take over but can't say no to this. I'm very concerned that my rural perspective is not being represented at the cabinet table.
1237.	I feel that Lyle Stewart should listen to Rick Swenson on this issue. There should be CPP on foreign ownership of farm land. You have created a private land bank that is out of control. This is one of the main resources in Saskatchewan and shouldnt be owned by CPP or foreign investment. Maybe Lyle Stewart should quit being a puppet to Gerry Ritz and stand up for Saskatchewan like Bob Bjornerud did. is a good premier, but needs a new Agriculture Minister. I also belong to the and I see the mess that happened when the federal government turned it back to you. The lease rate is out of this world and the way Lyle Stewart handled this is a joke. You better not do this with the provincial pastures. You should have run the like the provincial pasture system. That is alot better. Dont you even think of selling these pastures to such investors as that will destroy them completely.
1238.	In my observation our province is being sold off. People left Europe to get away from serfdom and came to Canada to freedom and ownership. Pool and United Grain Growers were owned by farmers. Now Vitera is owned by conglomerate in Switzerland. What happened to the money it paid for Vitera on the stock exchange?? Grain prices are a few dollars a bushel. Machinery costs are up in the thousands of dollars. Chinese agents have bought out land for high prices and are asking \$65.00 an acre rent. Young farmers can't compete. Farm Credit Corporation has lent out millions and millions in loans. No wonder so many auction sales! People are tired of working for the chemical and fuel companies. We are going downhill at GREAT SPEED.
1239.	Should be a question above about citizenship as there was earlier in the survey
1240.	Farm (agriculture land) ownership must be kept within Saskatchewan. No out of province or foreign owners or investors.
1241.	I have famed all my life on a farm my great grandfather homesteaded in 1882, which is still currently farmed with by family. I started farming full-time after obtaining a Bachelor of Science in Agriculture in from the University of Saskatchewan. My observations in relation to this survey: 1) I feel we have a very knowledgeable group of young farmers in Saskatchewan with farming backgrounds 2) My experience is that farms owned by the operators are taken care of better and prosper more than rented units 3) I feel that farmlands will be better conserved when owners are involved in daily operations.

	<p>4) I do not believe it serves the role (of feeding a growing world) to allow non-agricultural groups to drive up prices beyond productive values of the land. This results in driving out the new generation of young farmers, instead replacing them with absentee managers as the decision makers.</p> <p>5) My great grandfather came to Canada because he could not own land in England/my grand children may not be able to own land in Saskatchewan.</p>
1242.	Keep ownership in Saskatchewan, lets help our own producers to be successful, and not foreigners!
1243.	Land is a special and integral part of the fabric of Saskatchewan farms. Land investment provides stability and a way for farmers to build an asset base for their retirement and for passing on a business and way of life to future generations.
1244.	I'm interested in increasing the form capacity with my family; however, I don't see us increasing in size if this is the way things are going. Land is considered a very valuable asset in my opinion and it's a little tough to outbid an investor or pension plan that has endless amounts of money behind them.
1245.	It will be a sad day in this country when all the farmland is controlled by foreign owners and not actual farmers.
1246.	Please keep a healthy portion of land in public ownership - no more sale of public land. Such ownership gives the province equity and the government options to influence land-ownership and land-management trends.
1247.	There is enough competition to buy farmland as it is and is making it impossible for young people to start farming! We don't need to be competing with Pension Plans and Foreign ownership! We don't want to become tenants in our own land to foreigners!
1248.	I have 3 boys who want to farm. If they can't own farmland because of too high of price they will move somewhere else. Land is overpriced & doesn't promote the younger generation to farm. Government is turning the province into the same thing people left Europe, because they couldn't own their own land. Inflated land prices cause more debt that the land can't pay for. More investment for retired farmers will end up in Arizona. It is the future generation of farmers that will be contributing to the economy. We need to keep in mind that the average age of farmers is 55 years old, how do we change that? Certainly not by opening up the rules to purchase Sask. farmland to foreigners.
1249.	Farms would be owned by people/corporations who don't reside in the province. They hire managers to run the operation and hire workers to complete farm activities. The workers do NOT have a vested interest in the land. They are just there for a paycheque. The corporation is looking for investment return. They are only interested in the bottom line for their investors. Who will be the Stewards of the Land? Who will look towards future generations farming and taking care of the land and the environment?
1250.	The rules surrounding the ownership of farmland should be such that the net benefit rests with the farmer. Most farmers would agree that relaxing the rules on ownership would not benefit them, maybe only a few retirees, but if retirees still own land, if sold now they would likely retire happily. It seems that the investment groups are pushing the limits because they want things set up so they can see the most benefit. Absentee owners from other countries

	want to own land here but not live here and contribute to our great province. They only want to establish a bloodline to pump money out of here. The ownership rules have likely been opened up too far already and loopholes need to be closed. In fact, I think a cap should be established for Canadian Residents too. I rent land from a guy in Nova Scotia. When I write my rent cheque, and put it in the mailbox, that money is gone from Saskatchewan forever.
1251.	I strongly believe that the sask government should support the young people whose ambition is to farm by making land more affordable through putting an end to foreign ownership
1252.	I think if things don't change there will be a lot of young farmers looking for another occupation. Ultimately we are the ones that feed the world and the world needs more and more food every day.
1253.	Perhaps it should be made easier for young farmers to establish themselves in farming. I don't know how this can be achieved but I know that the wage earner could not possibly afford to start farming without inheriting land.
1254.	Local communities benefit when farmers live in the area and support local businesses and schools etc. This is not exclusively affected by tenure but the further increase in farm size tends to erode the support received i.e. investment funds tend to rent to large corporate farms which are headquartered outside the area.
1255.	Saskatchewan is a wonderful province to farm and raise a family. Things have been working as is so would not want to relax the regulations and open farmland to foreigners who might abuse the land and take it for granted.
1256.	Saskatchewan family farms are the key to prosperous agriculture in Saskatchewan.
1257.	We need you to have long term interests of Sask. residents at heart. Foreign investors and pension funds, etc. will not only make it more difficult for our farmers but also increase the cost of locally grown food. Does the short term return for retiring farmers excuse the lack of long term foresight? I don't think so but for some who are retiring, that is unfortunately the only consideration. No one wants to retire without sufficient funds to live a decent life.
1258.	I am a child of farmers. I inherited most of my land. Even though I chose not to farm, I stay up to date with what is going on in the district. I have many friends still farming and their biggest obstacle to expansion is availability of AFFORDABLE land...to rent or own.
1259.	My family & my husband's family came & homesteaded this land. As we have children who are thinking about coming back, something like this would make it more unlikely for them to come home as they probably would not be able to afford to if bigger companies came in & bought up the land.
1260.	We always hear in the public advertising about young farmers. It is when the high land values make it unaffordable for young individuals to keep going. It pushes some away from farming because the high price is not something a younger person wants to deal with. Depending on what crop you grow that year, the crop success, and the market values, paying off a loan for land can deter some, or cause more worries. Agriculture is at the mercy of Mother Nature, as we have seen this Plant 2015 season. High land prices are a big part of farming accessible and keeping it going amongst the next generation.
1261.	I don't like the idea of foreigners owning our land that we broke and sowed for generations.

	And then charging crazy prices and screwing farmers over
1262.	<p>Land was worth nothing in our area before came to the area. Now all of a sudden everybody is up in arms and the excitement is on. It's a win win for everyone. It's just going to take a few years for everyone to realize how good it was for the area.</p> <p>Hutterites pose more of a risk then the andjelic trust. At the least the land is still available to farm/rent/maybe even buy again at some time Very rare a Hutterite colony sells out. That land is usually gone.</p>
1263.	<p>We need more economic activity in Sask not less. The more investment dollars that flow into Sask the better. Every time a retired farmer sells land they spend some on housing, vehicles etc. and this has a major impact on the economy. We need progressive thinking not regressive. Let's move on from some of the old way of thinking and look ahead to a new day in Ag. in Sask where technology and investors are part of the new landscape that creates a stronger industry. Otherwise the big farmers will get bigger and the Hutterite colonies will eventually own half of Sask! Let leave the ownership rules alone and if any changes please relax them. Thanks</p>
1264.	<p>I would prefer that Saskatchewan land be owned by Saskatchewan residents. They are physically closer to the land and perhaps emotionally closer to the land. The land is a precious resource. As Will Rogers said, "Buy land. They aren't making any more of the stuff." It is finite renewable resource and should be in the hands of those who live on it, as much as possible. I would favour getting back to Saskatchewan-only ownership, and vociferously object to any erosion of the farmland ownership restrictions.</p>
1265.	<p>Stop the investors, they are not good for rural sask.</p>
1266.	<p>As a young farmer I have found it very difficult to compete with Investors at buying local land. Investors buy large chunks and the land that would have been split up with neighbours in the past is now sold again at outrageous prices. Hard enough competing with large farms for farmland let alone MASSIVE investment funds. It would benefit my operation if it went back to a Saskatchewan resident only system.. and if it is opened up to oversea buyers then it's all over for the family farm.....</p>
1267.	<p>Being a young farmer foreign and large pension funds being able to buy land acres me about losing the traditional Saskatchewan farm. With the current state of Ag land prices have continued to go up and they will see this as a good investment and bid very high to make sure they get in on this. This will not allow people like myself and my children to continue to purchase land and farm it themselves. It will take money out of our communities and not allow farm expansions. I think the rules should stay as is and continue the farming tradition.</p>
1268.	<p>What ever happened to Saskatchewan people owning Saskatchewan LAND that are Saskatchewan farmers!</p>
1269.	<p>Foreign investors are taking out the young farm families.</p>
1270.	<p>- I strongly believe we need to protect Saskatchewan farm land from foreign and corporate ownership.</p> <p>- I also believe allowing ownership to persons/corporations , planning to develop farm land</p>

	<p>for more residential, (and some commercial) needs to end soon,</p> <p>-many thousands of acres of agriculture land has been taken out of production, permanently.</p>
1271.	<p>If a foreigner is allowed to buy sask farmland they need to reside in the province and farm it for a minimum period of 5 years</p>
1272.	<p>Have previously lived there; was born and raised on a family farm (homestead) in the R.M. of Three lakes.</p> <p>So would like to see majority farmland ownership remain in the hands of SK-resident farmers.</p>
1273.	<p>Government policies should provide support for land ownership and land stewardship practices that maintain soil health and land's productivity over the long term. Absentee land owners should not be allowed to extract maximum short-term profits at the expense of the health of environment, wildlife habitat, water quality and other environmental benefits. Commitment by family-owned operators to soil health and environmental health in general will secure long-term sustainability of food production, and food sovereignty in the ever unstable world. More diverse smaller farms (as opposed to corporation-owned industrial farms) based on properly developed agro-ecological farming system will help in providing stable and resilient food production in face of the impending climate change</p>
1274.	<p>Important not to sell crown lands! Keep suitable crown land available for leasing or in established, managed pastures.</p>
1275.	<p>I think the big farms are going to have to slow down on buying and leasing all the land because we are losing our young farmers.</p>
1276.	<p>NO to Foreign Investment and Foreign Ownership of Sask farmland, not pension funds or investment trusts</p> <p>YES to a more active role of security board or farmland transactions</p>
1277.	<p>The rules of farmland ownership should be revised so that our Sask farmers come first. If we sell out our country ownership, we as farmers that want to keep local business and towns alive, will disappear. I want to hand my farm to my children, hopefully I can. Land purchases of the last 20 years should be checked out so that the illegal way it was sold to out of county residents could and would be penalized. Thank you.</p>
1278.	<p>I have lived in Sask all my life since 1918 except during WWII. I know that the harvested crop is unpredictable. Farmers are not guaranteed a crop every year. Any farmer hoping for a cash lease may lose a great deal. There is more at risk than planting and reaping a harvest. Companies investing in farm land may be disappointed. I remember 1937 especially which was a very dry year (and we have had several since) the grain buyer at Kindersley was without a job due to no grain to buy. He came to Northern Sask and became a time keeper for a fire crew. My observation.</p>
1279.	<p>By allowing foreign investors into Saskatchewan the price of land is not affordable for young farmers to start out. Instead of foreign investors give the young farmers more incentives to start farming. It is not only the foreign investors that are driving the price up it is also the Alberta and other provinces' residents that are buying land and forcing our young farmers to pay high rent.</p>

1280.	As a young farmer it upsets me when the foreign investors, as well as large investment groups come into my area and buy up land in which I could buy, hence building my equity as a farmer.
1281.	Farmable land is very important to fueling our country and the world. So why would we let somebody else control our land from another country? It is very difficult for young farmers to compete against large investors for land.
1282.	All land should sell for fair market price which the land could maybe pay for but that will never happen. I idea of big public and corporation money inflating the price to protect their money is wrong. In our area it is impossible for a young farmer to buy land without competing with industry money (oil money) without managing his whole life.
1283.	-Sons to own my share in near future -DO think that foreign + pension plans could turn agriculture into a surd-peasant system like my ancestors left Europe for 200 years!
1284.	Farmland is one of the best investments in the world (better than gold, silver, houses, apartments, antiques, dividend yielding stocks) It should be bought and sold on an open market basis, open to purchase by the person or entity who will pay the highest price. PERIOD.
1285.	I think farmland should be owned by Saskatchewan farmers who farm the land. If the owners of the land don't live and work the land. It has a negative impact on the culture and sustainability of the rural communities.
1286.	Land is too high for me to purchase. I would love to have a farm but may never pay for it because of the high prices. You need to bring in support for young farmers who want to start out or they may less and less farms. And only farming corporations. And they take no pride in farming or loving the land. It's just a money making machine. And they definitely don't care about the environment and wild life. They just push the bush and drain their water onto someone else.
1287.	People are very worried about foreign ownership and renting of Saskatchewan land. We are 100 per cent against farmland ownership or renting or wet lands, be sold out outside of Saskatchewan. No foreign company, country, investment companies and pension funds should own this land. Farm land is not commercial real estate. Controlling and keeping this land in the hands of the Saskatchewan farmers will assure our food supply now and in the future, keep economic benefits in Saskatchewan and the people who live there. We must do this for the future generations while keeping the food supply safe.
1288.	1. This survey should be for farmland owners only. 2. If government wants to control the sale of farmland, they should also control other investments, example, mines and forestry sale of Viterra to offshore owners Walmart. Railways. 3. Farm machinery industry. 4. Control fuel pricing etc.
1289.	Our small communities will die if we don't have new, young families owning their land. Just being renters or laborers of farms won't keep them in a community all year long. Our little

towns will die.
1290.
1291.