

*Farm Credit Act*

Land Act under which the maximum one may borrow is \$40,000. The Veterans' Land Act requires assets as security. I ask the government why it is increasing the borrowing capacity under the Farm Credit Act and is not doing the same thing in respect of the Veterans' Land Act.

**Mr. Korchinski:** And the credit union.

**Mr. Benjamin:** And why is the credit union not doing all the lending? The Minister of Agriculture, of course, will answer that a veteran who has reached the maximum of \$40,000 under the Veterans' Land Act can transfer it to the Farm Credit Act and borrow up to \$100,000. That is perfectly true. But surely the veteran should have some special, built-in privilege. May I correct that and say he should have some special, built-in "right". Under the Veterans' Land Act it takes too long to have a loan processed. The process is too long and the land gets away; someone else buys the land in the time it takes a veteran to transfer his application from the Veterans' Land Act to the Farm Credit Act. Why should there not be equivalent amendments to the Veterans' Land Act? Surely the veteran should be given a special right and privilege in this regard.

Other groups can increase their holdings and assets under the Farm Credit Act. Unless the government brings in equivalent or even better changes under the Veterans' Land Act, the veteran will have no choice but to transfer his borrowing power to the Farm Credit Corporation. This would take some time. Some of these veterans have been established since the end of the Second World War. They are being left out of the deal. Surely there should be an amendment in respect of their legislation which would be equivalent to or better than the amendments to the Farm Credit Act. I ask the minister or someone speaking on his behalf to reply to this matter in the House, or at least to do so before the committee.

Despite what the Minister of Agriculture said, any amendment to the Farm Credit Act will not be sufficient unless we have a national government which will do something about farm income and costs in order that farmers will be able to obtain and repay the kind of loan the minister proposes for them.

**Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak to the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Knight). I assure the House that I shall not be long. I shall not delay the passage of this bill to any extent. I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that there is some meaning to the words "where young farmers meet performance standards". We see a number of programs brought forward by the government from time to time. I refer to programs such as the Opportunities for Youth program in respect of which I believe most prairie members and Conservative members feel there are not enough criteria which must be met. It has been said that this really does not matter, that the programs have met certain standards and have passed certain boards.

• (2150)

We believe that the government is handing out bonuses to industry, and I call them just that. Last night, in the budget, big and small manufacturing industries received a reduction in income tax, which will do nothing other

[Mr. Benjamin.]

than encourage big business and big industry to modernize their plants, put in one more machine and lay off two men. That is all it will do. We do not see all kinds of government bonuses being handed out to people in the agricultural industry.

Because of the high average age of farmers, only 2 per cent of loans made to date under the Farm Credit Act have been made to farmers aged 25 and less. I see some members shaking their head. I suggest they check the evidence and they will see that what I am saying is true. Let them look at the Dominion Bureau of Statistics farm credit analysis publication, where they will see that 2 per cent of the loans made by the Farm Credit Corporation are to farmers aged 25 years or less.

We must make special provisions to encourage young people to return to agriculture, because the average age of the farmer at present is 58. The small farm development program is ineffective, yet the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) says he will go ahead with it. A detrimental measure was proposed in Saskatchewan which in essence would nationalize farms in that province. As reported in the *Winnipeg Free Press*, Mr. Messer, the minister of agriculture of the Saskatchewan government, said he wants to socialize Saskatchewan farms. He does not beat about the bush.

**Mr. Mazankowski:** That is what the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) wants to do.

**Mr. Horner:** The hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) and the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) said they will not support our amendment. They want to socialize farms in the whole of Canada, not only in Saskatchewan.

**Some hon. Members:** Shame.

**Mr. Horner:** I quote from the *Winnipeg Free Press*:

Mr. Messer said flatly he looked on the program as a revival of the Regina manifesto of 1933. And he said he was satisfied the present Saskatchewan government wants to socialize Saskatchewan farms.

Mr. Speaker, I hear some nattering behind me from the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar. As the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre said, the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar sold his farm, so why should he worry now? I have reason to believe that he is living in the penthouse of one of the better apartment buildings in Ottawa, so why should he worry?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. Is the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre rising on a point of order?

**Mr. Benjamin:** It is a double point of order, Mr. Speaker. First, I wish to correct the record. The hon. member for Crowfoot was not right when he quoted me; he was incorrect. The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar did not sell his farm; he sold his tractor. My second point of order is to ask you to rule now whether the point of order which the hon. member for Crowfoot raised would not be in order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I respectfully suggest that the first was not a point of order. As to the second one, I think the hon. members are equal.