

the minister had adjusted the program too often. When he finds that his program has failed to gather support, he brings out another one such as the systems marketing project, or something like that. Perhaps I used the wrong title.

• (1600)

Mr. Olson: Project 75.

Mr. Horner: Project 75. There must be some advertising agency dreaming up these titles. In any event, what does Project 75 or a system marketing project mean? The interpretation I put on this is that a federal government employee will follow the product from the time it is first produced until it gets to the consumer to make sure everybody gets the best deal, a square deal, an up and up deal and everything else.

Mr. Olson: That is a wrong conclusion again.

Mr. Horner: The minister says I have come to a wrong conclusion. I wish he would explain these programs. There is one devious thing I have noticed about the members of this government, and the Minister of Agriculture is no exception in this regard, they all by-pass the normal procedures of Parliament in respect of most of their important legislation.

The government wants clause 1 accepted, so that they will never have to come back to Parliament. They can do things by order in council, designating a farm corporation and handle this thing and that thing in that way. The government will never have to produce a bill again. Perhaps this is necessary because the government has so much trouble drafting bills which meet with approval. The minister in charge of the Wheat Board (Mr. Lang) followed this practice with Operation Lift, and we have seen what it has done in respect of farm credit programs. The Government includes \$1 items in the estimates and the estimates have to be passed by May 30 no matter in what state the examination of them is in the committee. Parliament has to pass them, and the member has to scurry around to find out what are the exact interpretations.

The people of this country, whether they be farmers or otherwise, are deeply concerned, frustrated, angered and annoyed at what is happening. Can you blame them? I do not think you can. We want more information as to what the government intends to do with Project 75, with the small farms adjustment program, with interest rates and now with the Farm Credit Corporation.

Mr. Bill Knight (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner), and I should like to compliment him on some of the issues he brought forward. I do not wish to deviate from the debate, but I was interested to hear the hon. member challenge the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), to a debate in respect of the Farm Income Stabilization Plan and the benefits thereof. He suggested the minister would not win, and I think he is correct. However, I suggest the hon. member would not win either, after the stand his party took in respect of that bill last fall.

Mr. Horner: I make you the same challenge.

Farm Credit Act

Mr. Knight: When one examines the bill and the amendment, one finds it much like the sugar coating on a bitter pill. In dealing with the amendment, I suggest that the question of interest rates is one that is always before the farmer. This is a very important aspect, as the hon. Minister of Agriculture should know, being a former Social Credit member. The amendment refers to providing for partial repayment of interest when a young farmer meets performance standards. It appears that the Tory party, in moving this amendment, intends to introduce a kind of selectivity to the program. This is the very kind of selectivity they attacked last week in respect of the Family Income Security Plan.

What is a performance standard? Is there going to be some kind of bureaucracy set up to go out and examine farms to see who is up to date in performance standards? Who is to make the judgment? Is the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) going to make the judgment as to performance standards? I should hope not. That part of this amendment is selective, and is at variance with statements by members of the Conservative party in this House last week concerning other bills. This amendment to include a performance standard brings in a certain element of selectivity.

If you look at this bill in terms of its different amendments to the Farm Credit Corporation Act, you will see some changes which may possibly bring it up to date, especially those relating to the amount allowed as the borrowing level. If you look at the bill you will see certain changes suggested which, on the surface, do not appear to be of great concern.

I suggest it is the underlying motive behind the changes which is important to the farmers of Canada. I need only refer to part 1, the amendment to Section 11 of the Farm Credit Corporation Act, which gives the corporation all the powers necessary to carry out such duties or functions as may be assigned to it by the governor in council in relation to the administration of any agricultural program, or is assigned to it pursuant to any other act of the Parliament of Canada. What is the significance of that amendment, and what lies behind it? This amendment allows the government to bring in a small farm consolidation plan which it does not have to have approved by the House of Commons. This is what is behind the amendment, and it should be questioned very seriously in committee.

There are other amendments of concern, such as the one in clause 3 which would enable the corporation to make a loan under the act where in its opinion the uses of the proceeds of the loan would facilitate the efficient operation of the farm mortgaged. Under the present act, the corporation must be of the opinion that the loan is necessary for the efficient operation of the farm to be mortgaged. That sounds like nothing more than a play on words by the government. I hope the Minister of Agriculture will take the opportunity of explaining in this House and in the committee the over-all meaning of that clause.

If you carry on with an examination of the clauses you will see there are some changes which may have some merit. Let me refer to clause 2 which proposes to amend the legislation as it relates to corporations. The explanation is that this amendment will provide that loans may be