

Farm Credit Act

Mr. Olson: Do you not want an explanation of why clause 4 is there and what it means?

Mr. Horner: Yes, but do not bother to read your amendment.

Mr. Olson: There was some misunderstanding by the hon. member for Kamloops-Cariboo about whether or not clause 4 limited to \$100,000 that could be lent to the entire band. It certainly does not. I do not know how many, but there could be five, ten or 20 partnerships, corporations or co-operatives, or indeed individuals, within the same band. That clause is there simply to provide that the money is to be lent to the band in the name of the band. It is necessary that it be there because it is not clear yet whether a band itself could be considered to be a corporation, co-operative or partnership. That is the reason it was included.

Mr. Gleave: Why limit the amount to \$100,000? There are reserves of various sizes. In my constituency I have two reserves. One is large and the people there are fairly well advanced in farming operations. The other is small and the people there are not advanced in farming operations. I cannot understand why it is limited to an amount of \$100,000. There might be a reserve which would need \$500,000 for its development.

Mr. Olson: If there were a number of individual farmers on that reservation who made application for an aggregate \$500,000 and if that was approved by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, they could be granted \$500,000 in total.

Mr. Gleave: I think that is questionable.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Chairman, I should like to support the amendment to subsection 4 of new section 17A. I do so because of what the minister said at the commencement of the debate. He said that the intention of the government is that our Indian citizens will be placed in exactly the same position as other Canadians who are engaged in the farming industry in Canada. If this is the intent of the minister and the government, I submit that under the terms of the clause as it now stands we are not achieving the desired objective.

I believe the government is in trouble with our Indian friends, first, because of its reputation as expressed by the saying that the white man speaks with forked tongue, second, because of our tendency to treat our first citizens as second class citizens and, finally, because of the lack of consultation. I

support the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Crowfoot because I think the clause speaks with a forked tongue, if I may use that expression.

I cannot refer to the amendment put forward by the minister, but he speaks of corporations and co-operatives. The fact is that on most reservations there are very few co-operatives. The co-operative movement is just beginning on reservations. There are very few corporations. The band council is the main agency for transacting business on the reservation. So in actual fact the \$100,000 would be the maximum limit. I believe that if the committee and the minister would approve of this amendment we would be able to get over this obstacle and no ceiling would be placed on the activities of the band council in this regard. If it is the desire of the minister to place the Indian bands on the same basis as other farmers in Canada, this is one simple way to carry out that objective.

Mr. Olson: If the hon. member, who has had long experience in this connection, would read the bill carefully and particularly clause 6 he would find that it puts Indian farmers on exactly the same basis as every other farmer in this country. This is spelled out in great detail. Even if a co-operative should have 1,000 members who are other than Indians it could not get more than \$100,000 from the corporation. That is clear. We are applying the regulations to Indians as individuals, as partnerships and as corporations exactly the same as everyone else in this country.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Chairman, on this point the minister has suggested that in fact this clause means all loans made by one band and not all loans within one band. This, in essence, is what he is saying. Therefore I suggest that this clause is redundant because subsection (1) says:

—farmers who are Indians on reserves and to bands engaged in farming operations on reserves.

It says "and to bands". Let us look at subsection 5 where it says:

The provisions of this Act, in so far as practicable, shall apply to all loans made or to be made to farmers and bands referred to in subsection (1)—

If we interpret subsection 5, which is difficult to interpret, in the way the minister interprets it, namely, that it is not all loans made within one band but loans made to one single band as a legal entity, then the clause is redundant. It does not have to be there because subsections 1 and 5 specifically spell out that bands can borrow money. In answer