

*Farm Machinery*

to me, but for the sake of those who either cannot or, for their own, I think, rather childish political purpose, will not see these advantages to the family farm in this legislation. I want to spell them out.

To be perfectly frank, Mr. Speaker, I can't help but think that the hon. member for Acadia, and others on the Tory benches, cannot quite decide what to do about this legislation, whether to support it in the obvious interests of the farmers, or to attack it for whatever partisan political mileage might be made. As I will show later on, in his first speech on the resolution, even while being critical as he thought it was politically safe to be, the hon. member for Acadia himself mentioned several beneficial uses to which this legislation can be put by farmers in his own area. In what I can only interpret as the cheapest kind of two-bit partisan politics he described this as one more example of the millionaire's approach to our farm problems. Then in his second speech he turned around completely, and suggested that this is a kind of communist approach to farm problems.

Mr. Speaker, I wish he would make up his mind. In his second speech, he suggested this legislation would not only undermine our farmers' independence, but would lead to a communist type of collective farming. What surprises me about this kind of attitude is that I know the hon. member personally, and find him usually a reasonable and fairly well informed person outside this house. As I listen to him make this kind of an attack in here, on legislation I know will be most useful to farmers in every part of the country, I can't help but think that sometimes there is more political chinook wind blowing in this chamber from that hon. member's place than we ever get, even in southern Alberta.

This legislation will substantially reduce the investment small farmers have to make in necessary equipment. It will enable them to farm more efficiently and profitably, at a lower investment in machinery than ever before, if they take proper advantage of this legislation and are not misled and confused about it by the partisan politicking of certain hon. members opposite.

I found a very similar pattern in the two contributions made by the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Nasserden). Although he was critical of the measure at the resolution stage he did say, as recorded in *Hansard* on the top of page 8064, that he did not intend to indicate this is a useless measure, and further on listed specific items of machinery

[Mr. Hays.]

he thought could usefully come under this legislation.

But then we heard the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) who, of course, is a lawyer and not a farmer, and probably cannot be expected to understand these things. We heard him describe this, as recorded at page 8302 of *Hansard*, second column, as "ill-digested, ill-considered and completely insufficient".

Then we heard the hon. member for Rosthern sing a different tune. Then he decided this would be useless and not worth voting for, and that it is "foolhardy" legislation. Well, I am perfectly willing to let the farmers in his constituency decide where the foolhardy name really belongs.

As I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, some hon. members have raised some questions about this legislation, about the way it will operate and its possible results. I want to answer those questions and remove whatever honest concern members really feel about this legislation.

Let me emphasize again that this bill was designed primarily to assist the family farmer to cope with the new problems he faces in modern agriculture, and in particular the mounting cost of the machinery he needs to make a decent living. The federal government, as informed hon. members know very well, does not have the power to control prices, except in wartime. So we could not try to control farm machinery prices directly, even if that were considered desirable, which I am sure most hon. members would agree it is not. Short of price controls, this legislation can have as beneficial an impact on farm machinery costs for individual farmers as any other action the government could take.

This legislation was developed from the experience of farm machinery syndicates operating in Britain. It has been designed to meet the needs of Canadian farmers, but I think some points from a study of the operations and advantages of farm machinery syndicates in Britain, prepared by the department of agricultural economics at the University of Reading, England, are worth putting on the record.

To the question: "What happens when everyone wants the machine at the same time?" the report has this answer: From a technical point of view, the problem of arranging a machine's program to cover several fields on several farms is not different from that of arranging a similar program covering several fields on only one farm. The distance between fields is likely to be greater when