

—but I know that in Quebec we have a provincial farm loan system which has been taking an increasing proportion of the loans required by the farmers. They carry a very low rate of interest, something like 3 per cent. It seems to me that the probable reason for the decline in the figures in the Province of Quebec will be found in the fact that that province has substituted its services for those of the federal Government.

Honourable senators, in this chamber in 1960, when discussing Government expenditures I suggested that if the Government was paying the shot, it would not seem unreasonable to suggest that the purchases made with the money so provided should be of goods made in Canada. This money is not being provided by the Government but by the banks. However, \$99 million for farm equipment is an impressive figure. If that machinery were made in Canada it would provide a large number of jobs. Unemployment is a problem we have with us daily. It is not a problem that the western farmers or farmers in general should be asked to solve. It is not their problem. I would not for a moment suggest that any restriction be imposed on the farmer in order to solve that problem. However, one of our great national problems is that of providing employment and it seems to me that, in much of the legislation we have here, provided it does not work to the disadvantage of the person for whom the legislation is designed, some provision should be made to favour the purchase of goods made in Canada. I know that this is done in other countries. If such a provision were made also in regard to other fields of activity, not just in regard to this legislation, it would make a considerable difference in the employment opportunities in Canada.

I do not suggest that anything be done in this bill at the moment, but I suggest that in future legislation of this type, where the Government is providing facilities for the individual, we should try to ensure that at least some other individual in Canada will be provided with a job as a result of the legislation. That is really the main point I wanted to make with regard to this bill. I feel that this is one of the number of bills where, if some thought were given to this problem, considerable advantage could be given to employment opportunities in Canada without in any way detracting from the advantage of the individual in the legislation, and I would like to think that the Government would give some consideration to that in some of the measures we have to deal with.

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): Honourable senators—

The Hon. the Speaker: I must inform honourable senators that if Hon. Mr. Connolly

(Ottawa West) speaks now it will have the effect of closing the debate.

Hon. John J. Connolly: Honourable senators, I must, of course, thank all honourable senators who have taken part in this discussion tonight. I should add that on such short notice it is all the more remarkable that we should have had such an interesting and far-ranging discussion.

May I first refer to the remarks of honourable Senator Horner, who is the senior senator and who always, I am happy to say, takes a very active interest in the measures that come before us respecting the agricultural community of this country. We welcome his contributions and are always very glad indeed to have him express this interest. We are happy that his health continues to be as good as it is.

We have heard, of course, from expert western farmers like Senator Stambaugh and Senator Pearson, and from gentlemen farmers like Senator Willis from the east, and Senator Molson from a little bit farther east, and Senator Cameron, who lives in a province that is a great agricultural area of this country, indeed of the world. We have heard too from the Leader of the Opposition, Senator Brooks, who also comes from an agricultural province. I do not know which of our provinces are not agricultural in a very large measure.

I do not know just how to categorize Senator Walker. I know that he has an interest in the country; I do not know that he is precisely a farmer, but certainly he has an interest in farm problems and has shown this on several occasions in this chamber.

Now may I speak to the point raised by Senator O'Leary (Carleton). It might help if I said that the average loans made under this act since it was initiated in 1945 ranged from a low of \$738 in 1946 to a high of \$1,757 in 1963. For example, in 1950 the average loan was \$1,075; in 1955 it was \$1,137; in 1960 it was \$1,497. That may answer in part the question that Senator O'Leary raised.

I think, too, the experience to which Senator Stambaugh referred, and the explanations given by Senator Brooks will help a good deal to satisfy the concern that all honourable senators would feel, that perhaps the farmers who need this kind of help most do not get it. I think, perhaps, on analysis of cases it will be found that they do.

Senator O'Leary spoke particularly about the small farmer in the Province of Quebec. Senator Molson has already informed the house that in the year 1961 there was passed by the Province of Quebec the Quebec Farm Improvement Act. Senator Pearson's question about the great drop in the figures shortly