

The man who is capable of running machines is going to get them, and he cannot be stopped from getting them. He will have them, and he will know how to run them.

With all the availability of facilities for borrowing that the honourable Leader of the Government has mentioned, it seems to me that our trouble in the future will be in selling what we produce. What is the sense in encouraging syndicates to buy machinery in order to produce more without knowing whether we can sell it? This is not the way to make people happy. We seem to have gone all out on this thing called money. Young people are told: You must make a lot of money. Honourable senators, that is not what makes people happy, and it is not the way to raise a family, and yet our people are being taught that the whole thing is to grab what money they can. There is a way of life, but it certainly cannot be found by joining up in a syndicate and signing a promise to pay \$100,000.

It is rather too bad, now that the banks have been made into very nice places. If a farmer joins one of these syndicates he will then have no more occasion to go into a bank. He is all through there.

Honourable senators, I would like to see several amendments made to this bill. The whole measure, in my opinion, is entirely unnecessary. It is the purest kind of farce, and it could be very dangerous. It might even be, as I said, the cause of loss of life. I have seen quarrels occur in connection with machines that are jointly owned, and they have been the bitterest quarrels I have ever known. I am convinced they will take place.

I would suggest that this "joint and several" provision be taken out of this legislation. It is unnecessary in any event because each one of the members of the syndicate would be worth the whole amount. However, having regard to all the other kinds of loans that are available, the legislation is unnecessary. I am opposed to it. It is very bad, and it can be very dangerous for the reasons I have stated.

Hon. Arthur W. Roebuck: Honourable senators, I enter this debate with some trepidation because I am another lawyer talking on an agricultural topic. However, do not forget that many a farmer goes to a lawyer and asks him for his advice. For the most part my practice has not been to get people into trouble in order that I might get them out of it, but rather to keep them out of trouble in the first place. Were a farmer to come to me and ask for my advice with respect to the signing of a joint and several note, I would tell him not to do it except under very exceptional circumstances.

My friends who have been criticizing the bill have done so from the point of view of the possibility of the farmer getting himself into trouble by signing a note of this kind, but is not that the function of the farmer himself? Somebody has said that this will not be a cure for all the farmers' troubles and problems. Of course it will not be. Rome was not built in a day, and neither is a successful farming community constructed in a day or the legislation in regard to it. It is a step-by-step operation. One of the Opposition speakers—I think it was Senator Pearson—said it was a flea bite. He said that he was going to vote for it because he thought it might be of some value. Well, that is some concession. I think it may be of some value, but I do not overestimate its value at all.

My friend, who is smiling at me, the former Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Aseltine), said it would benefit the machinery makers and not the farmers. If it benefits the machinery makers then that must be because the farmers think it is of some value to them, because it is only when they act that the machinery makers come into the picture at all.

I have been speaking so far as a lawyer, but my most vivid recollections are of the days when I lived on a farm. It is a long long time ago since I was farming with the desperate necessity of making a living. My father went on a farm when I was 10 years of age and we came off when I was 16 years of age in 1894. The recollections I have of the farming of those days are still very vivid in my mind. I have been interested in farmers and farming ever since and I have seen changes that have taken place in farming.

I can remember my father going out with a team of horses and a single blade and plowing all day long, perhaps seven or eight hours or something of that kind; and finally coming home at night with the horses lathered with sweat, dragging their feet behind them, and he tired out. The horses had travelled, I suppose, two miles an hour or something of that kind. As the land there was fairly heavy, if he had plowed an acre of land he had done fairly well.

At the present moment I have a farm. I am not a big farmer like my friend across the way (Hon. Mr. Willis) but I have a farm and I have a tractor, a fine big diesel tractor. It drags not one blade but three; so on that ground alone it accomplishes at least three times as much as did my father on the farm prior to 1894. Not only that, while he travelled at perhaps two or three miles an hour this tractor may travel at eight miles an hour or thereabouts. That would be about three times as fast as the horses. So if you take first the three blades doing three times as much work and travelling three times as fast,