

Farm Machinery

matter. This legislation illustrates the same kind of carelessness that typified the introduction of the flag resolution by the Prime Minister himself.

Sir, I must ask you and the members of this house why our Prime Minister has let the minister bring this measure before us in such a thoughtless, careless way; careless of the time of parliament, careless of the benefits that could accrue to farmers, careless of the long term significance the encouragement of this type of legislation is going to give to a type of farming that many farmers in this country do not want to see develop. It is just another one of those acts of carelessness by the present Prime Minister. We had it first of all in the budget. Do you know, Mr. Chairman, why we had that budget? The Minister of Finance wrote a book, and he had to bring in the kind of budget that he brought in, abortive though it was. The Minister of Agriculture made a speech, and he had to bring in a bill such as this, regardless of the needs, wishes and desires of farm people. If we look at this bill, it says that the "minister" will be the Minister of Agriculture. Well, I hope he will be. Then it says:

Where an individual has two or more major occupations, one of which is farming, the corporation may determine which of such occupations is his principal occupation for the purposes of this act.

Then clause 3 deals with the promissory note and other security required for the purposes of obtaining a loan. This security is almost identical with that required by the banks in regard to farm improvement loans at the present time.

I do not wish to take up any more time at the moment, Mr. Chairman, but I would ask the minister to tell us why the provisions of this legislation were not enacted by way of amendment to the Farm Improvement Loans Act. Also why does he think a higher interest rate is preferable? Why does he think the Farm Credit Corporation should be saddled with this additional load? Why does he think the banks cannot provide this service? If the minister answers some of these questions it will give us a better idea of what he has in mind. I have another question in regard to clause 9. We cannot help but ask the minister why we in parliament are not to be given the opportunity to deal with the regulations that will govern the ability of a farmer to secure assistance under this type of legislation. Why should that be left to the privy council, to someone else—I should not say "outside this parliament" because we

[Mr. Nasserden.]

hope they are in this parliament; but certainly they are outside the reach of the ordinary member of the House of Commons. I would certainly like an answer to some of these questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say just a few words with regard to this bill now before us in committee. I might say at the outset of my remarks that it is too bad that certain amendments that will be put forward in committee of the whole could not have been put forward in the agriculture committee, where I think a better atmosphere exists. I think once you are in a committee partisanship seems to fall away.

Mr. Fisher: What a dreamer.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): You hear evidence from various witnesses who support proposed amendments, for example, or are opposed to proposed amendments. The question is simplified and ironed out much more quickly in the agriculture committee than is the case in committee of the whole house. I feel somewhat regretful that the government voted against—

Mr. Macaluso: Speak for yourself.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I am sure the hon. member for Acadia would not want to make reference to a vote which has already been taken in the house. I could refer him to standing order 35 at pages 22 and 23 of the standing orders, which states that it is not the practice in the house to comment on an issue which has been decided in the house.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, if I ran contrary to the rules. I had no intention of doing so but I did want to point out that in the agriculture committee various witnesses are called to present briefs relating to a given subject, amendments are put forward and substantiated by many interested parties attending the committee, and in this way a lot of the partisanship evident in the house, particularly of the kind apparent when the minister spoke last evening, disappears in the proceedings and the committee can get down to business in a much friendlier atmosphere, and proceed along legislative lines which will bring about the most beneficial results for the country as a whole.

It is evident from some of the remarks which have been made that some hon. members are concerned about this legislation. Even the title "Farm Machinery Syndicates Credit Act" is frowned upon by many farmers because they do not like the word "syndicates". Farmers value their independence