

Farm Loans

But suddenly the barn is not quite complete and FCC demands that it be completed. Now the supplier is in a Catch 22 situation. He either advances more supplies in order to get his money, because FCC will not advance it to the farmer, or he stops the project right there. I know a lumber dealer who advanced materials and \$7,000 is outstanding, but the person who received the FCC loan left the province—he walked away, so to speak. Obviously the FCC has the first mortgage, and in order to protect himself, the lumber dealer took a second mortgage on which I do not think he will ever realize any return. Not only does FCC have a responsibility to farmers, it must modernize its administrative system, particularly concerning the manner in which supplies are received and building materials are purchased by some people with FCC loans.

If there is hope in the country, I believe there is hope because of agriculture. I have been somewhat critical of the minister today because the farmers with whom I have spoken have been extremely critical of the minister over the last few months. What they have been saying is: "Would you tell them in the House of Commons that first there must be a recognition, not in words but in action, that agriculture is extremely important for Canada's future." Perhaps that sounds prosaic, that everyone understands and agrees with it, but this is not so.

Today we hear much about an industrial strategy, which is valid and important, but the development of farming and a method of meeting the problems and challenges of farming should be as much a part of the industrial strategy as rebuilding, for instance, industries in central Canada to make them more competitive. When there is a lay-off in farming, it affects a farmer, his wife and his family and their future and dreams. When someone who works for Massey-Ferguson is laid off, we hear about the numbers. Both are tragic, but there must be a recognition that farming is important. We should not only give it lip service. It must become part of the national strategy. Also we must do a better job of selling. Today I often hear the word "marketing". I am not against marketing boards, but I want to see hard-nosed people out in the marketplace selling Canadian agricultural products. We are not doing an adequate job in that regard.

I should like to refer to the example of the first shipments of canola to Japan. Yes, the Canadian government was interested but it did not know what to do. I know a farmer who said, "Look, I will do it". He filled containers and said that he would clean it in Canada. The Japanese had a certain standard, they thought it could only be done in Japan. When the farmer delivered the canola to Japan, cleaned in Canada, it had a lower dockage rate than the best cleaning facilities in Japan. This is what Canadian farmers are capable of doing. We must get out there and sell.

I should like to refer to another example in the time remaining; that is, the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency. Over 50 per cent of all eggs produced in Manitoba are produced by a number of farmers in my riding. Over the last few weeks I have been trying to obtain, through CEMA, permission to purchase eggs through an international contact in excess of 11,000 cases per week. The average farmer produces 100 cases

per week, so one can imagine how much I am talking about. I cannot obtain that. I have talked with farmers in British Columbia and in Manitoba, and they have said, "Give us the opportunity and we will produce those eggs." When marketing becomes more important than selling, we run into trouble. This is what has happened.

I am for marketing. We need good marketing, but we also need hard-nosed selling. We also must be able to assure Canadian farmers that they will retain their assets. If we do not assure young Canadians who want to become involved in farming that the assets will be theirs first, that they will be their pension plans, that the Government of Canada will not confiscate through capital gains and change the rules in the middle, as we saw with the budget, we will not attract young Canadians into farming.

Those of us who grew up on farms—and perhaps tragically were not able to continue that life—say that farming has a great future, but we must allow farmers to do what they do best—farm. We should not interfere, but we should encourage.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. McMillan)—Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements—Calculation of provincial revenues. (b) Request that Minister review formula; the hon. member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer)—Agriculture—Government aid to producers. (b) Application of lower interest rates. (c) Short-term credit; the hon. member for Halifax West (Mr. Crosby)—The Budget—Provisions affecting pensioners. (b) Taxpayer statistics. (c) Minister's budgetary statements.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

FARM CREDIT ACT FARM LOANS INTEREST REBATE ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND—MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Whelan that Bill C-88, respecting loans to farmers, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Bud Bradley (Haldimand-Norfolk): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak today on Bill C-88, respect-