

*Farm Machinery*

several farms are concerned, but with present day speeds of road travel, the time taken, even when farms are several miles apart, is negligible, and can often be done when the weather is bad or crops are not yet ready. The main requirement is that the total work load of each machine should be well within the capacity of the model chosen.

To ensure that each syndicate member has a fair share of the machine's use, specific provisions for sharing are spelled out in each agreement. But the British experience has shown that the general spirit of good neighbourliness and of give and take has proven a sufficient safeguard in itself.

What about disagreements among members of a syndicate? On this the British experience is that the risk of disagreement can be minimized, by ensuring that only those machines are selected which are able to deal comfortably with the total work load and the whole range of crops and soil conditions likely to occur.

What about loss of independence? The Reading University report says "sharing, by its very nature usually involves some loss of independence." Then it continues:

Whether this constitutes a serious difficulty depends on whether the inconvenience and cost of any independence lost ... outweighs the advantages gained by the sharing.

The report adds:

However, not a single member referred to loss of independence as constituting a difficulty. On the contrary, some who had previously been hiring or borrowing, said that by joining their syndicates, they had achieved greater control and certainty over specific operations.

In some areas—

—the report continues—

—it was claimed that good neighbourliness and co-operation generally had improved as a result of syndicates.

I have every confidence that these and other beneficial experiences of British farmers in the syndicate use of expensive farm machinery will also be the experiences of Canadian farmers who make use of this new legislation we are debating here today. I think the savings from co-operative ownership and use of farm machinery should be obvious to every hon. member.

To make it easier for farmers to co-operate in this way, the bill proposes the formation of syndicates. As the parliamentary secretary (Mr. Beer) indicated when he opened debate on the second reading of the bill, the syndicates as proposed in this legislation are, in effect, partnership agreements

between three or more persons engaged in farming.

Some speakers, and in particular the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Bigg) expressed fears that this would promote corporation farming. If you refer to the definition of syndicate, as contained in the bill, it will be noted that a syndicate is an association, formed by an agreement between three or more individuals who are engaged in farming. Because corporations are not individuals, it is apparent that corporations would not be eligible to be members of a syndicate. Furthermore as loans can only be made to syndicates, a corporation would not itself be eligible for a loan. However, a farmer who has organized his enterprise into a family farm corporation could, as an individual, co-operate with his neighbours, in a farm machinery syndicate.

The syndicate arrangement provides a simple and effective basis upon which three or more persons engaged in farming, in separate farm enterprises, may co-operate in the purchase and use of farm machinery. It does not involve formal incorporation, and it does not encourage or promote vertical integration, as has been suggested by some hon. members. It is a simple method for our individual Canadian farmers to join together in a co-operative venture, and in this way it will help them to compete against corporation farms. In this connection, I might refer any interested hon. member to the latest issue of the *Family Herald* and an article about the Knight family in the Lacombe-Stettler area of Alberta. It tells how a farmer and five of his sons run a very successful co-operative family farming venture and in one paragraph it makes this point:

Such a farming venture has advantages for all partners, the machinery pool being perhaps the biggest one.

It goes on:

The hired help situation has been solved as they pool work. The young Knights have been taught to keep their credit in good order and such security makes financing easier.

At another point the article says:

Since the Knights avoid overlap in machine buying, they can afford some 'frill' machinery that the individual farmer cannot afford.

I would particularly like to recommend this whole article to the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Horner) the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Nasserden) and the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Woolliams) who described this legislation as "absolute non-