

very popular, although it was expensive. But it did not last long and was succeeded by the single disk, which distributed the grain in a wider area. It became popular and was widely used.

Not long ago I was chatting with a farmer who did his seeding by means of a horse-drawn drill. He told me that with the double disk, for the first few months after seeding, a crop looked very good, but that in dry weather the seeds became compressed in very sharp little grooves in the soil, and much of the grain would dry out, whereas the single disk drill would produce a better crop, although in the beginning stages it did not look as good.

Now farmers have gone back to the hoe drill they used 70 years ago—a series of pipes with holes, now motivated by power. The farmers feel that they now have the answer, because by this means the drill makes a nice, moist groove in which to scatter the seed.

Conditions are constantly changing on the farm, and farmers have to keep up with changing conditions. The same applies with regard to the plough. We used to think that the farmer simply had to use an ordinary plough to turn the land over. Now they use diskers. I know of a piece of land that has not been ploughed for 15 years, where the ploughs are gathering rust—and they cost a lot of money. Farmers now use the heavy diskers.

The same thing could be said of many pieces of equipment in the farming industry. We see the old threshing machine going out and giving way to the combine. It has always seemed to me that the farmer wishing to expand can do so whether he gets the benefit of a loan or not. It depends upon the ability of the farmer himself and whether he likes to have men around him and run a big business or whether he likes to run a small business. There is also the danger that if he loses money that he has borrowed he will be very uncomfortable instead of being happy. The farmer who wants to get ahead will find some way to get more land and more machinery.

However, this is the modern way of doing things; it means more profitable business for the banks, and I do not wish to oppose the bill. Furthermore, having heard the excellent explanation given by the Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Connolly, Ottawa West), I do not consider there is any necessity to send it to committee.

Hon. J. Wesley Stambaugh: Honourable senators, I think perhaps I can answer one of

the questions raised by Senator O'Leary (Carleton). The district I come from consists generally of small farms, the average being less than half a section. These loans have been a godsend to the farmers of that area in helping them to buy stock and equipment, and in helping them to modernize their houses and put in electrical machinery. Within the last few years electricity has reached that area and the farmer can now buy a refrigerator for his house or equipment such as a milker for his barn. Furthermore, we have just ordinary country banks making loans to the small farmers in my district, and in my view such loans have been of great benefit to the small farmers.

Hon. Arthur M. Pearson: Honourable senators, at the outset I wish to congratulate the sponsor of the bill on the very fine explanation he gave. Although it is a simple bill, he has given a concise history of the act since it was introduced in 1945. The act has been renewed every three years and a further amount added to the total available for borrowing by the farmers.

I have one criticism of the total amount available to be borrowed. I notice that in 1960 the loans totalled over \$101 million. In 1962 they reached \$118 million and in 1963, \$135 million. To me this indicates that \$100 million is not sufficient, because it appears that at the current rate of growth the amount required in 1964 will be something like \$150 million.

As the honourable senator from Blaine Lake (Hon. Mr. Horner) has said, there are so many changes going on in farming, and so many improvements in machinery, that the people in the west, where the big farming is carried on, are constantly changing their machinery to keep up with the times. That is the reason for the tremendous increase in the number and size of loans in those areas. I think the Government would be well advised to increase the amount not to \$700 million but possibly to \$850 million or \$900 million.

We are getting into big money in this matter, but we must remember that farming is a tremendous industry and it needs all the encouragement we can give it. These loans have been a tremendous boon to the farmers.

The other point I want to criticize is that of the total loans for the purchase of farm machinery. I have drawn up some figures, taking the years 1958, 1960, 1962 and 1963. For those years I have set out the loans for new implements by provinces, and they are as follows: