

*Farm Machinery*

qualified still to appraise a new industry or a new invention on behalf of, say, 20 different farmers. He might be better able than the Farm Credit Corporation to appraise the worthiness of making a loan. Therefore while the hon. member may be right when he says that the Farm Credit Corporation is a better institution for this purpose than the industrial development bank, it still may not be as good as the opinion of a bank manager making loans under the Farm Improvement Loans Act.

To get back to my trend of thinking with regard to the word "farming" and its definition in the bill, we see it includes livestock raising. Does that include the raising of horses? Some members on the other side say yes, it does. They know the answers.

One could perhaps go further and ask whether the raising of pleasure horses could be included in the definition of farming under this legislation. I refer to horses of the saddle or pleasure variety. Is the definition of farming wide enough to include the raising of race horses? Would race horses be considered as livestock under this legislation? If I or my constituents commenced to raise race horses could we apply for a loan under the provisions of this legislation?

One might also ask whether fur farming could be included within the definition of farming for the purposes of this legislation. Fur farming is considered to be farming, under the provisions of other legislative measures. Perhaps one might ask whether beekeeping could be considered farming for the purpose of this legislation. Perhaps bees could not be considered to be livestock, but the keeping of bees is considered to be farming for the purpose of certain legislative measures. One could go very far in projecting his thoughts along this line.

The Minister of Transport is an avid spokesman in support of the fishermen and I am sure that he would like to have fish farming included in this definition. Will these loans be available to fishermen? I am in a quandary as to exactly what kind of farming will be included within the category of farming as defined in this bill. We must remember that this legislation will be interpreted by the officials of the corporation, and a great deal of thought should be given to this question.

Last evening the minister pointed out that only individuals whose basic income is derived from farming will be eligible for membership in a syndicate for the purpose of obtaining a loan under the provisions of

[Mr. Horner (Acadia).]

this legislation. If I am wrong in interpreting the minister's remarks in that regard I hope he will correct me before I proceed much further. The clause of the bill itself suggests that it is the majority of the syndicate whose principal occupation must be farming. However, last evening the minister said that all of the members of the syndicate must be farmers, and that the majority of them had to derive their basic income from farming. I hope I am interpreting his remarks correctly in that regard.

Those are some of the thoughts which entered my mind as I read this bill, and I think the time to raise these doubts is during the consideration of clause 1, when the minister and his officials are present to consider these questions, and perhaps provide answers when we deal with the bill clause by clause.

I am sure a number of members will have a great deal to say in respect of clause 3 which states that each member must undertake jointly and severally to sign a promissory note for the total amount of the loan. The thing about that provision which is of concern is that the loan is to be primarily secured by the promissory note, and second, by a mortgage on the machinery. I suggest that this is a departure from the principles contained in the farm improvement loans legislation, in respect of which the loan is secured primarily by a mortgage on the machine. Under that legislation, if a farmer defaults the bank can actually and physically seize his machinery, whether it be a combine or any other piece of equipment which is urgently needed. The farmer does not have to sign a promissory note under the provisions of the Farm Improvement Loans Act, yet, as stated by the minister last evening, under the provisions of this legislation loans will be secured by a promissory note signed by each member of the syndicate, and second, by an attachment on the equipment purchased. I suggest this is a vast departure from the principles contained in the Farm Improvement Loans Act. As a farmer and a legislator I do not like that provision and do not understand why it is necessary.

Is it the experience of the government in respect of loans to farmers that farmers are poor credit risks? Is that the experience of the Farm Credit Corporation? I do not think that is the case. Has that been the government's experience in respect of the Farm Improvement Loans Act? I suggest the facts indicate directly the opposite. Less than one tenth of 1 per cent has been lost by virtue