Province	Number of Loans	Total Amount
British Columbia	1,258	\$ 2,209,439
Alberta	15,246	26,835,245
Saskatchewan	18,913	34,991,183
Manitoba	7,397	12,784,073
Ontario	9,369	16,016,360
Quebec New Brunswick	2,223	3,934,604
Nova Scotia	392	617,718
Prince Edward	445	687,855
Island	764	1,063,354
Newfoundland	21	38,679

Hon. Mr. Brooks: The loans become fewer as one goes east.

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): The largest number of loans and the largest amount lent was in the Province of Saskatchewan. The other provinces follow in this order: Alberta, Ontario, Manitoba, Quebec, British Columbia, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Newfoundland.

That is the history of the lending operations in 1963 in respect of implement loans. There were 8,130 building loans, totalling more than \$18 million. Some 1,456 new farmhouses were covered in this operation.

There were loans for the construction of utility buildings and for the repair and alteration of existing buildings. Those for repair and alteration covered 2,833 units, and totalled over \$4 million.

There were 8,835 loans for the purchase of livestock, amounting to over \$13 million. There were 4,380 loans for other improvements, totalling more than \$4 million. These other items covered such undertakings as the clearing and breaking of land, irrigation work, fencing and drainage, fixed equipment and farm electric systems, sewage disposal systems, wells and water supply systems.

Hon. Mr. Molson: Would the honourable Leader give once more the total amount for the year?

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): Yes. The total number of loans for the year 1963 was 77,373 and the total amount loaned in that year was \$135,954,564.

It is obvious to honourable senators that the technological advances characteristic of the development of the agricultural industry in this country have featured largely in the work which has been done under the provisions of this legislation. The increased mechanization of farms and the requirements for more complex and more expensive farm machinery have been the main areas in which this legislation has been invoked. Between 70 and 75 per cent of all the lending of this past year has been for the purpose of facilitating the buying of equipment.

I should add that the Porter Commission considered the provisions and the history and operation of the legislation before us and recommended that an increase should be made in the amount of individual loans. They found that the credit facilities available under this act to individual farmers should have a revision upwards, and it is precisely this step that is now proposed in this legislation.

I should add, too, to make the story complete, that the Porter Commission recommended that the maximum for an individual loan be \$10,000. The bill goes farther than that, and proposes that the maximum should be \$15,000.

Now, honourable senators, with that as general background to the legislation before us, may I outline briefly the amendments that are proposed to the existing legislation by this bill. First, the bill proposes that the maximum individual loan amount should be increased from \$7,500 to \$15,000; in other words, it should be double. It is also proposed that the aggregate amount available for lending under this legislation for the period ending June 30, 1965, should be increased from \$400 million to \$500 million.

The bill also proposes that the lending period be extended from June 30, 1965 to June 30, 1968. It is also proposed that in the new three-year period the maximum aggregate amount available for lending under this legislation shall be increased from \$500 million to \$700 million.

Honourable senators, this, I think, is a complete explanation of the bill before us. It was my intention that if the bill received second reading tonight—and when I say tonight I hope no honourable senator will think I am suggesting any pressure—and if it is the desire of any honourable senator that it should go to committee, I will certainly be happy to move that it be referred to the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce. It is a bill from the Department of Finance.

If honourable senators have any questions in mind that I might be able to answer tonight, I will certainly attempt to do so.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Would the honourable leader be good enough to tell us whether the rate is still 5 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa Wesi): I am sorry, I thought I had mentioned that. It is still 5 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Walker: What rate is the Government paying now to borrow for this fund? It is more than 5 per cent, is it not?

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): I cannot answer that question categorically. I will get the information for the honourable senator.