

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

in hiring the required manpower, thus suffering considerable losses, can the minister say whether he has received representations from the directors of the Coopérative des producteurs des produits de l'érable requesting that changes be brought to regulations under the Unemployment Insurance Act so as to allow recipients to work a few days during the maple sugar season without any prejudice concerning their entitlement to benefits?

[English]

**Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, the law as it is presently written permits people in that situation to supplement their unemployment insurance by 25 per cent which is more than ample for the sugaring season. I shall be glad to draw that particular section to the hon. member's attention so that he can send it to his constituents.

\* \* \*

**AIR TRANSPORT****RESPONSE TO REQUESTS BY FRANCE AND GREAT BRITAIN FOR SUPERSONIC FLIGHT CORRIDORS OVER CANADA**

**Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque):** Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Transport I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. What response has Canada made to requests from France and Great Britain that in future their airlines be permitted to fly SST aircraft through certain corridors over Canada at supersonic speeds?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I shall consult with my colleague the Minister of Transport and ask him to answer the hon. gentleman.

**Mr. Speaker:** Orders of the day.

**Mr. McGrath:** Mr. Speaker, a point of order, since Thursday last when the government was questioned on government business a new order has appeared on the order paper, namely, government order 25 which concerns educational rights for the Pentacostal Assemblies of Newfoundland under the British North America Act and consequential amendments thereto. Since the same order appeared on the order paper last session, may I ask the government House leader whether he can inform the House when this order will be brought forward, bearing in mind the limited duration of the present session of parliament?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. President of the Privy Council will be allowed to reply, but that is not a point of order, it is a question which might properly be asked during the question period. Having said this, and the question having been asked, the President of the Privy Council might reply.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, I will be meeting with the House leaders tomorrow, I hope. It should be possible for us to consider this and other items to which the House might wish to give priority.

[Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse).]

• (1500)

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS****FARM CREDIT ACT****AMENDMENTS RESPECTING LOANS AND POWERS AND CAPITAL OF CORPORATION**

The House resumed, from Thursday, May 5, consideration of the motion of Mr. Olson that Bill C-5, to amend the Farm Credit Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture and the amendment of Mr. Korchinski (p.1872) and the amendment to the amendment (Mr. Knight) (p. 1903).

**Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley):** Mr. Speaker, the other day when I was speaking on this bill I suggested that, while my impression of the Farm Credit Corporation had been quite favourable and that while I felt it had performed a useful service, I also had the impression that upon occasion it became a little overenthusiastic about lending money to buy land at inflated prices. In the years 1968 and 1969, the Russians and Chinese were buying a lot of grain so farmers in the prairie provinces sometimes got a little carried away and paid too much money for farm land in expectation of continuing high prices for their products. It seems to me that officials of the Farm Credit Corporation got a little carried away too, and were prepared to lend too much money for the purchase of these farm lands. This is to be regretted because many farmers now find themselves saddled with a debt out of proportion to the productive value of the land at the present time. I think the corporation should be careful not to extend credit to the point where farmers will get in trouble.

The \$100,000 limitation proposed in this bill may help inflate the price of farmland. This might be an advantage to those who wish to sell land but the Farm Credit Corporation, when lending money, should consider the productive capacity of that land in relation to the projected crop price. I am somewhat concerned about the possible duplication of services in respect of that portion of the bill concerned with the small farm adjustment program. At the moment, some provinces are providing advice and counselling to farmers on management questions and it seems to me that this bill will bring the Farm Credit Corporation into this area as well. It seems to me there is also some duplication with regard to the possible establishment of a land bank for the assembly of land. I do not think this would be useful, and in addition it would mean that the federal and provincial governments would be doing practically the same thing. I suggest that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), who is not in the chamber, and the parliamentary secretary look carefully at this aspect of the bill. Instead of going ahead on its own, I suggest that the government should continue to press for an agreement between the provinces and the federal government.

The problem of land ownership, land tenure, mortgages and absentee landlords has plagued many countries for centuries. Those problems have been the cause of much political unrest, especially in older countries where there was not enough good land to go around. The result was