

*Government Orders*

There is a growing mood of defeat and negativity toward farming by farmers that was illustrated in this particular article. I am happy to stand here today as an urban member of Parliament to support my colleagues from Algoma and Prince Edward—Hastings on this motion.

**Mr. Lyle Vanclief (Prince Edward—Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, I also want to make just a few brief comments on these motions before the House right now.

The first one is that the Farm Credit Corporation money be made available within the meaning of the Income Tax Act to Canadian citizens or bodies, et cetera.

I share the view of my colleague from Glengarry—Prescott—Russell that it would be nice to be able to have sufficient funding to help finance people who want to get involved in farm businesses, farms or the agrifood community. In reality however, as he stated, we just do not have an endless supply of money.

The Farm Credit Corporation is backed by the Canadian taxpayer and unfortunately in the past has had to be funded to quite an extent by the Canadian taxpayer. I think therefore the moneys it makes available should be made available to Canadian taxpayers, Canadian citizens and landed immigrants as long as they meet the accepted criteria, legal aspects, et cetera.

I know that the intention of this bill and the Farm Credit Corporation is to balance the books so there are no losses. There are lots of us out there in businesses and it has been our intention to balance the books. The government claims it has been its intention to balance the books. It is another subject, but I do not think it has done a very good job of it.

This is probably the fairest distribution of this money and availability of money by the Farm Credit Corporation, to make it available to those who fall within the meaning of the Income Tax Act. I would ask the government to consider that and approve of that amendment.

• (1150)

The other motion before us, Motion No. 10, stipulates that a committee to review any decisions made by the corporation be put in place. At the present time there is an appeal board at the Farm Credit Corporation. Some people may feel they have not had their cases heard properly or for some personal reason they have not been treated as they felt they should have been. Perhaps they

have not been able to explain their situations to representatives of the Farm Credit Corporation. They can presently have a second group of people take a look at the situation. I think that is very worth while.

• With this bill we are changing the make-up of the board of directors at the Farm Credit Corporation. I have no problem with the number. We will discuss the distribution, background or make-up of the board of directors in a later motion.

If the bill continues the way it is at the present time, there is no avenue for an individual applicant to raise the question other than to write to the complete board of directors or the chairman of FCC to say he or she would like the case to be reconsidered.

We must all realize that even though that has not happened a lot in the past, it has happened. In many cases when there has been a request for a review, it has not been passed. The decision is made the same way, but it has given that extra avenue and level of comfort to the applicant that was there for assurance to make sure he or she could be heard.

I would ask the government as well to consider this. There is nothing wrong with it. It is not asking that someone be placed on a fancy salary or a long-term thing. My understanding is when these have worked before they were on a per diem basis. They can put two or three people in different places in different parts of Canada. If there is a request for a review they can be called together or go to visit the applicant. They can sit down with the applicant in the farm office or in someone else's facility and go over the issue to determine whether the problem is personality, et cetera. It is a safety valve and I do not think it is too much to ask to give a high level of comfort. Quite frankly I think it would cost very little.

**Hon. Ralph Ferguson (Lambton—Middlesex):** Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on the amendments at report stage of Bill C-95 and particularly to Motions Nos. 4, 10 and 12.

I am going to zero in on Motion No. 4, which is designed to ensure these loans are made to Canadian persons or corporations. In June 1985 we heard a lot from the government opposite about Canada being open for business. In the next few years between 1985 and 1991, approximately 4,100 corporations in Canada were taken over mainly by other interests to the south of us in the United States. Those takeovers were largely fi-