

*Farm Machinery*

**Mr. Nasserden:** On the point of order, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** A point of order was raised and—would the hon. member kindly resume his seat—it seems to me it would be conducive to the good order of the house if the hon. member for Acadia were allowed to continue his speech.

**Mr. Horner (Acadia):** Thank you. I hope the timekeepers have duly noted the length of the interruptions. I was dealing with the manner in which we should receive the bill. The minister has an optimistic nature which we must bear in mind whenever he speaks on a particular piece of legislation. I pointed to the optimism he expressed in his Chicago speech as an example of the optimism that is characteristic of him, and we must bear this in mind in viewing this legislation and the principle of the legislation. He went on to say in his Chicago speech:

—talk about the job at city hall being a tough one, this one is a lot worse. There are only about four agriculturalists in the whole Liberal party but they are all agriculturalists on the opposition side. So I get a good overhaul every day.

I am not going to quote further from his Chicago speech. It was a good one, but it provided very little leadership for the farmers of our country. I seem to have lost another speech by the minister to which I was going to refer, in which he dealt with the Department of Agriculture and the principles behind it. He felt he should not be called Minister of Agriculture but the food minister of Canada. He said farmers should not be called farmers, that they led a hard, lonely life and should not be known by such a poor name as "farmer". He would have them called food producers or grocery growers. That was what he thought in his Toronto speech, in which he expressed great concern about the image of the department and the minister and farmers generally.

I suppose this bill is meant to build up his image, because he has been raving about this legislation for some time. He told the farmers of the Lethbridge area early this year that they must wait for it, but that it would change the agricultural economy vastly. He was greatly concerned about it at that time. He claimed last evening that it was badly needed. He claimed that farmers needed it urgently.

When one looks at the Farm Credit Corporation report to see how much money they lent for the purchase of equipment, one finds that only 1.2 per cent of the total amount was lent for that purpose. The industrial

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

development bank has also lent quite a sum of money to agriculture since 1960, when the agricultural industry became eligible for loans from that source. Last year they lent nearly \$5 million to the industry. Many corporations applied for and received loans from the industrial development bank at 7 per cent for the operation of farm syndicates.

With regard to the need for this legislation I have before me the *Country Guide* for September, 1964, which contains an article entitled "What About Machinery Co-ops?". The article is written by two members of the Saskatchewan department of agriculture. They say that legislation to enable farmers to set up machinery co-operatives has been available in Saskatchewan over the past 20 years and only one a year has been formed. That shows that the urgency is not too great. I will quote further from this magazine as I proceed.

We on this side of the house must ask ourselves by whom is the legislation needed so badly, and for what purpose? We on this side have tried to find out what the minister has in mind with regard to the definition of farm machinery. Many members on this side have offered suggestions as to machines that could qualify. Last evening in his speech the minister said these would all qualify, but did he offer any suggestions of his own? Did he tell us how he envisages that the bill will apply? Not one machine did he suggest in his speech last evening. He O.K.'d some I had suggested and some that other members had suggested, but did not give us a glimpse of what he envisaged that the bill would do.

He did talk about combines, of how small farmers in Ontario could benefit from the purchase of an eight foot combine and how small farmers in Saskatchewan could benefit from a \$5,000 combine. I am sure the farmers of the west, particularly since this fall has been so wet, would be very wise indeed to pay little heed to what the minister said with regard to pooling their efforts in order to purchase a bigger combine. I should like to see the minister as a member of a syndicate trying to get a combine out of a farmer's field when the farmer was half finished and the sun was shining and the crop was ready to cut. I think that farmer would be prepared to buy out the other members of the syndicate very quickly, because there is tremendous urgency for a piece of machinery like a combine when a man's labour for a whole year is bound up in that crop and the weather and the elements are against