

*Farm Machinery*

him in trying to take it off. He will go to great lengths to get his crop off in order to pay his bills and provide himself and his family with a living. I see very little help in this legislation with respect to meeting the needs of the average farmer or small farmer, or in particular the large farmer in western Canada.

The minister stated in his speech last evening that I had spoken twice on the bill already and had suggested no improvements. He stated I had been extremely critical but that he could find nothing in my remarks that could be taken as a positive suggestion with respect to lowering the high cost of machinery. I suggested at one point in my remarks that he could lower the cost of machinery by lowering the tariffs on a great many items used by farmers which are imported into Canada. Apparently he thought he should let that go by because it comes under another department, and though he is the Minister of Agriculture and supposedly the spokesman for the farmers in the cabinet, this still is not within his jurisdiction. He talked much about machinery and about the hot air which he attributed to me. I said that if this bill were in some way successful it would destroy some of the independence which the farmer treasures, and last evening the minister admitted this. He said the farmer would have to give up some of his independence.

Then the minister talked on about the family farm and made reference to an article in the *Family Herald*. In fact he advised us to read that article about the Knight family, but I had read the article myself. Now I have read it again, and it shows that this is a family enterprise. The minister quoted sentences from the article to show that a machinery pool was the answer to machinery costs, but he did not quote sentences from it to show that the Knights are not worried about who puts up their hay, because it is all in the family. He did not quote that part where they said they did not really mind who bought machinery because they exchanged it around and it was all in the family.

A family farm is altogether different from a syndicated farm. Members of a syndicate may have no blood relationship. They are strictly in it for the dollar, and they watch their dollars a whole lot closer.

**Mr. Cashin:** Would the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Horner (Acadia):** No, I am sorry, I will not. The minister did not permit me one last evening as he said he had not much time. I don't think I have much time left, either.

The minister said he envisaged this bill as an answer to all machinery problems on farms today, but I have here an article written by two members of the Saskatchewan department of agriculture entitled, "What about machinery co-ops?" This article says how successful they are, but it points out quite clearly that the only machines on which farmers can co-operate are those that have no specific time use, no specific time at which farmers must use them in the cycle of their work, which is the very thing I said two weeks ago at the resolution stage.

It goes on to point out that some of the co-ops are not successful where members share the crops harvested. If you pool the harvest in a co-op, then it really does not matter whether your own crop is taken off first or your neighbour's down the road. The machinery will take off the best crop first. This article, however, does not point out the need for legislation such as this. I shall read just one sentence from it:

One of the major drawbacks to many machine sharing arrangements is to get agreement on seeding and harvesting dates on the various members' farms.

This is one of the great bones of contention, and points out the folly of the minister's remarks about three families joining together to share machinery.

The minister also said we had offered no suggestions for improvements. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) spoke on this legislation, and he too thought it would help farmers buy their harvesting equipment. How will it? At present a small farmer can borrow \$15,000 at 5 per cent interest under the Farm Improvement Loans Act. If he does that he can buy his own tractor, his own combine or his own threshing machine, which will take off his own crop, and it is reasonable to say that if the machine is used only on his own crop it will last much longer and require fewer repairs. Certainly the example which the minister gave had many holes in it.

Corporations can now borrow money under the Farm Improvement Loans Act if they are engaged solely in agriculture. Each corporation can borrow \$15,000 at 5 per cent interest, and if the minister wanted to enlarge these corporations he could have done so by amending that act to allow each member of a farm corporation to borrow \$15,000