

Farm Machinery

operate in the purchase and use of a forage harvester and self-unloading wagons, a hay baler and possibly a large power unit. Their savings in machinery costs could be very substantial. They would have efficient machinery with the capacity to do their work in good time and thus would save labour.

Another possible use which farmers might make of a machinery syndicate in concentrated cattle areas in eastern Canada could be with feed mixing equipment. A farmer milking 40 cows would probably need to feed about 42 tons of grain, with added concentrate, a year. Most of this grain is home grown and the farmer now has to make arrangements to have it ground and the concentrate added. If 20 such farmers went together in a syndicate, the capital cost of a portable mill for the purpose would be in the order of \$1,100 per farmer which, amortized over 10 years, would be \$110 per year or 13 cents per hundred pounds as the capital cost of grinding and mixing the grain and concentrates for a 40 cow herd. To this, of course, would have to be added interest and operating charges. I think these examples should show just how wrong any member is who suggests that this legislation will not help eastern farmers or that it will help western farmers more than eastern farmers. The kind of co-operation envisaged under this legislation can be extended to farm operations in every part of this country. It can be used for the purchase of potato planters, sprayers and diggers in the Atlantic provinces, for corn pickers and sugar beet equipment in the central provinces and elsewhere.

In summary, let me say that I believe very sincerely that this is good legislation for all our farmers from coast to coast. It can be especially useful to the family farmer by putting him in a stronger economic position than he has ever enjoyed before in his competition to survive against the large farm or the corporation farm.

Some hon. members have suggested this measure will encourage vertical integration and threaten the independence of the family farm. This is nonsense. It will have just the opposite effect. It will provide a new buttress to support the independence of our family farmer by reducing the amount of money he has to spend on machinery. It can encourage better farming management through the conditions that will be required for qualification for one of these loans, and this can improve the income of our farmers. It can help to relieve some of the farm labour problems our

farmers now face, including a shortage of farm labour in some areas, by making it possible for farmers to help each other.

The use of the latest machines can lead to work being done more efficiently from a technical point of view, more quickly and with greater timeliness. As a result, the risks of crop losses and damage can be diminished and the quality of such products as hay and silage can be improved. By being able to have the use of new and better equipment co-operatively that they could not afford on their own, individual syndicate members should be able to increase production of their crops or, as in the case of one farmer with a share in a potato harvester, to sell their products in a earlier and better market. The examples I have cited indicate the very real reduction in machinery costs this legislation can mean for individual farmers. I think it should be obvious by now that it will be of more benefit to the small farmer who cannot afford to buy all the machinery he needs on his own than to the big operators who can.

This is something brand new in Canadian agriculture. It is an experimental type of legislation and we will be ready to make whatever changes in its operation experience indicates. We may need more than the initial \$25 million fund to keep it operating and if that is the case this government will not hesitate to bring forward the necessary amendments.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I listened with sympathy to the valiant efforts of the minister in the fight which his natural modesty and humility waged with political partisanship of the highest order in his desire to construct a political halo around his head. Alas, we must confess that that humility and modesty, earlier evident at the beginning of his speech, soon disappeared. There are one or two comments I think I must make about what was said by the minister. He indicated that in his view too much time had been taken on this debate.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Baldwin: I hear hon. members applauding, which only indicates that in their view the members of the opposition are not entitled to exercise their proper function of critically analysing legislation brought before the house. I would point out that on September 21 this bill was brought down for second reading. At that time the parliamentary secretary spoke, and I would judge that some 35 to 40 minutes was devoted to the second