

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member for Edmonton Centre rising on a point of order?

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, I have requested a number of times more copies of Bill C-7. We have experienced difficulty in obtaining this bill from the distribution office. I wonder whether it would be possible to get a few extra copies?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member knows that that question ought to be asked in a different way, by communicating either with the Clerk's office or with officials of the House. The hon. member's request has been noted.

Mr. Rynard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if it would be out of order for me to ask a question of the Minister of National Health and Welfare in order to clear the air. In view of rumours—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member seeks to ask a question by raising a point of order. Again, I suggest to hon. members that if the hon. member for Simcoe North is given that opportunity by the House a number of hon. members who have not even had an opportunity to ask a first question today should be given the same opportunity and privilege. I will inquire whether the House agrees to the hon. member asking a supplementary question.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Rynard: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the House. It has just come to my attention that there is a rumour circulating to the effect that Director General Craig of the non-medical use of drugs directorate has resigned. I wonder if the minister could make a statement to clear the air.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I inquired whether there was unanimous consent to pursue the question period more than ten minutes after it had expired and there is not consent. Is the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville rising on a point of order?

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I rise to seek your guidance. The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion will not be here tomorrow and, as you know, we are trying to get him to appear before the Standing Committee on Regional Economic Expansion. I wonder if he will appear today, on Monday or Tuesday, or as soon as possible?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before calling orders of the day may I, as suggested by the government House leader, inquire whether an order shall be made for the consideration of the budget business at eight o'clock next Monday. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered. Orders of the day.

Farm Credit Act
GOVERNMENT ORDERS

FARM CREDIT ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING LOANS AND POWERS AND
CAPITAL OF CORPORATION

The House resumed, from Wednesday, May 3, consideration of the motion of Mr. Olson that Bill C-5, to amend the Farm Credit Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture and the amendment of Mr. Korchinski (p. 1872).

• (1530)

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I rise to continue my remarks on Bill C-5. Clause 1 of the bill gives the Farm Credit Corporation carte blanche to carry out every wish of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) by order in council. This has to do with the implementation of the so-called small farm adjustment program.

I stated last evening that I read an article in the May 8, 1971 edition of the *Calgary Herald* headed "Olson seeks to reduce the number of small farms". This is the whole aim of this program. Under this legislation, the Farm Credit Corporation will be handed the job of proceeding with the eradication of many of the small farms. The minister shakes his head in a negative manner. I wish to quote from the article briefly:

Agriculture minister Bud Olson is trying to sell to farm organizations and the provinces a sweeping plan to reduce the number of farms in Canada.

I underline the word "reduce". There is nothing clearer than that. The article continues:

Already, the plan has run into opposition from the provinces and farm organizations.

The plan has been in existence for over a year, and no province has accepted this legislation. The Standing Committee on Agriculture has not held up the plan. Why has it not been accepted? It is basically because farmers do not like a plan that will eradicate many of them. The article continues:

It would also leave the country with a more efficient agriculture industry, something Ottawa wants badly.

There have been some denials of that interpretation. We wonder how far this is going. It is interesting to note that the minister in charge of this program is a former member of the social credit party. His parliamentary secretary, who spoke yesterday, is also a former social creditor. He said yesterday, as recorded at page 1880 of *Hansard*, and I quote:

We cannot expect drastic changes because too many production units are involved in farming.

There it is. He, too, thinks there should be a reduction in the number of farmers. When looking at the arrears on loans made by the Farm Credit Corporation, I asked the manager of that corporation if he could relate those people who are in arrears to the size of their operation. I asked if most of them fell within a particular segment of the industry and whether he could categorize them. He said there were people in arrears with large, small and middle size farms, and that no pattern was evolving. If there is no pattern evolving in the arrears on loans made