

Farm Machinery

ready participated in this debate and under our rules cannot speak a second time unless there is unanimous agreement that the hon. member be allowed to participate in the debate for a second time.

Mr. Baldwin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. A point of order has been raised by inference as to the quality of the amendment which has been moved, and I think on this aspect of the matter the hon. member should be permitted to speak, as well as under the other heading.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Before an hon. member can speak a second time he must obtain the unanimous consent of the house. Has the hon. member the unanimous agreement of the house to speak a second time?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, before unanimous consent is considered in respect of the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Nugent) speaking a second time, I think we must very carefully consider the implications and ramifications of carrying the amendment. It seems to me it would have the effect of killing the bill.

I think there is some useful purpose to be served by referring Bill C-121 to the standing committee on agriculture and colonization for further study and report. However at the same time, if this bill continues through its normal course in parliament it will be considered by the committee of the whole house, at which time much of the discussion which would take place at meetings of the standing committee could take place. If it was desirable and possible to call expert witnesses in respect of the provisions of this bill, which certainly is the intent of sending it to a standing committee, that might be appropriate.

We all know there is provision for witnesses to be called before a standing committee of parliament and that it is not possible to call witnesses before a committee of the whole house. We must realize that the provisions of this bill to provide financing for farm machinery syndicates represent a complete and new departure from usual financing, and therefore as far as I am concerned, there are no experts as to how this could be applied. So who could testify before such a standing committee? Who could be called as an expert witness in this regard? Individuals could be called only for the purpose of obtaining their opinions of what might happen. This particular

method of financing has not been used in the past, and no one could therefore have any idea of how it would operate.

Rather than accepting this amendment, and in effect killing the bill, I think it desirable that this house accept the principles of the bill, go into committee of the whole and take advantage of the opportunity afforded at that stage to cross-examine the minister on the various aspects of the clauses, following which it should be passed and allowed to enjoy a trial run of a few months or a year.

Many questions exist in my mind in respect of the usefulness of the proposed legislation, and I can anticipate many problems. There is no way in which we can obtain satisfactory answers to those questions, both in my mind and those raised by other hon. members, by calling witnesses before a standing committee.

We have heard a great deal of discussion as to whether farmers can obtain loans and purchase certain pieces of equipment to be used on more than one farm. I suggest this is something which must be decided by experience. Certain implements used for the harvesting of crops are of sufficient capacity that they can be used by different farmers during different periods of time, provided the harvesting period is of sufficient length. However, I admit that when crops are ripe for harvest it is difficult for a farmer, who may have a joint interest in a piece of harvesting equipment, to stand aside and watch his neighbour use that piece of equipment at a time when climatic conditions are favourable.

Many other pieces of equipment, such as heavy motor trucks, can be used without difficulty for short periods of time on different farms by co-operation. I think that sort of co-operation in the use of machinery could be very effective toward meeting the needs and demands of farmers holding an interest in the equipment.

At this time we are not aware of the kind of corporate structure these syndicates or co-operatives are going to have, and I do not believe we are going to know after calling witnesses before a standing committee. We are aware of provincial laws which provide for setting up small corporations or co-operatives, and while this proposed legislation may be sufficient to meet the needs of incorporation, so that such an entity could take advantage of the credit proposed in this bill, I personally think that those provincial laws are of such a nature they will require amendment. Perhaps the provisions contained in this bill, in light of provincial legislation, would require too complex a structure, and