

*Farm Machinery*

not let it be examined, after hearing witnesses, by members of this party and of his own party? I am prepared to support the withdrawal of this amendment if the minister will make it clear that he has faith in this legislation and is convinced it will stand up to close scrutiny in the agriculture committee. That is all we are asking. I have said this bill will benefit only the large farmers. Let the minister announce that this measure will go before the agriculture committee where witnesses can be heard and these matters cleared up. What is he trying to hide? What is he trying to ram through the house by saying continually: You have held this measure up too long already. What is he afraid of? Is it the interest rates? Is it the definition of farm machinery? Is he afraid of the clause which provides for these promissory notes? Is he ashamed of that clause? Why should that clause be in the bill at all? Under the Farm Improvement Loans Act farmers have had the best record of all with regard to the repayment of loans; the loss has been less than one tenth of 1 per cent. Why does this particular provision have to be in the bill at all? Is the minister trying to muddy the good name of farmers, though most lending institutions respect that good name which farmers have built up over the years by keeping their word?

What is the justification for this provision that every farmer who enters a syndicate must become liable for the total amount of the obligation incurred? How many farmers would sign promissory notes to pay back possibly \$50,000, while their own interest may be only one tenth of that sum? Let us take this measure before the agriculture committee so that we may find out what the experience of the industrial development bank has been with regard to loans to farmers. Let the farm unions come in and tell us what they think with regard to this proposal. These are organizations which have offered valuable suggestions in the past. Why is the minister trying to rush this legislation through? He has said himself that this is experimental legislation. Yet we are not supposed to say a word on it; we are supposed to pass it without question. To do so would be a poor discharge of our responsibility. The very fact that this is new and experimental legislation is good reason for referring it to the committee on agriculture for further perusal.

This whole business of corporations and partnerships could have been arranged, as I suggested earlier, under the terms of the Farm Improvement Loans Act which this

house has lately revised. All that is offered in this measure could have been dealt with then and the whole matter could have been decided at the same time. The advantage would have been a 5 per cent interest rate on all machinery loans. The machinery would have been taken as the primary security, not a promissory note signing away a farmer's land, homestead and everything else against the total loss which might occur within a syndicate. Some hon. members have expressed the view that signing such a note would seriously impair a farmer's credit rating. What is more necessary to a farmer today than a good credit rating?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I regret to have to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired. I may say the Chair has taken into account the three minutes or so which were taken up with points of order.

**Mr. Horner (Acadia):** I am sure the house would give me unanimous consent to continue.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Otto:** On a question of privilege. The hon. member for Acadia in the course of his remarks and in the heat of the moment made a statement which is of concern not only to members of this house but to farmers as a class. Comparing farmers who had formed themselves into a syndicate, with the Knight family, he said they would have no respect for co-operation with each other, but only for the almighty dollar. I am sure the hon. member did not mean that, and that he would not like such a suggestion to remain on the record.

**Mr. Horner (Acadia):** I will speak on that question of privilege for just a minute or so. I was trying to establish the difference between a family operation and a purely business operation, one in which a group of farmers had joined together. I said that a family operation, one where the father was watching over the son, was held together by a blood relationship and would be far different from one in which five or six businessmen were in business together. Their primary interest would be in seeing that the syndicate made a dollar. I know, of course, that if a company—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. The hon. member has made an explanation of the statement which was drawn to his attention. I think that was necessary, but there is no question of privilege.