

Looking at the amount of funds available, the parliamentary secretary was talking about how the government has always made money available to the FCC. The question is as to what interest rates are charged. If we look closely at what has happened to the FCC even since 1987, it is pretty dramatic. The number of loans out there has dropped from 72,000 to 59,000. That just about parallels exactly the number of farmers we have lost during that period which is some 13,000.

• (1115)

I suggest that the government's tight-fisted approach to FCC, especially coming through farm debt review boards, really results from that tight-fisted, hard-nosed approach this government has taken with literally thousands and thousands of producers.

The parliamentary secretary says that the government has made funds available. In fact, if we just look at that period from 1987 to 1992 the amount of loans this government has with Canadian farmers has decreased from \$4.7 billion to \$3.5 billion. That is \$1.2 billion taken out of the farm financial situation across the country.

During that same period of time the amount of loans, the amount of farm debt, has increased from some \$22 billion to, I believe, almost \$24 billion. The amount of money the government is making available for farm loans is certainly not increasing. It is in fact decreasing.

The only thing that is increasing is the number of properties which the government has seized. In 1987 it held 911 properties across the country. At the end of fiscal year 1991-92 which is almost a year ago, it owned 2,609 properties. There are hundreds of thousands, millions of acres of land which the government has seized.

The parliamentary secretary suggests there are lots of funds available but the amount of funds is rapidly decreasing. The parliamentary secretary suggested that the Farm Credit Corporation would be able to go to the market any time to secure additional funding. That is true, but every acquisition of funding has to be approved by the Minister of Finance. Therefore, the funding is only available if the Minister of Finance approves it.

It seems to me that this amendment to clause 4, suggesting that persons resident in Canada within the meaning of the Income Tax Act or Canadian citizens or bodies would be eligible for the funding is a good

### *Government Orders*

amendment. If there are limited funds available, surely we want to reserve them for Canadian citizens. That, of course, does not preclude groups putting together funding from other sources that are outside the country, but certainly we should have an approach to provide funding for Canadian farmers whenever that is possible.

We have three motions grouped for debate. This debate also includes Motion No. 10, standing in my name. This amendment of clause 8, by striking out line 23 on page 5 and substituting therefor "committee", gives the board of directors the powers to establish committees. They talk about the executive committee, the audit committee. We are proposing that there would be a committee to review any decision made by the corporation under paragraph 4(2)(a), or any other committees involved.

Essentially what we are trying to put in place is a review procedure, an appeal body. I put a similar motion before the legislative committee because I think it is important that in legislation there be a provision for an appeal procedure. The Tories, of course, voted that amendment down.

Fortunately we have been able to bring forward a new amendment before the House. However, I do not know why legislators want to remove the right for an appeal. I appealed to the members on the government side at the committee that the basic right with any government body or corporation such as this is that there be an appeal procedure.

We are talking about a very serious thing here. We are talking about farmers who have applied for a loan from an agency of the Crown. The loan should be available to them. If there is an official at the headquarters in Guelph, Regina or wherever it is across the country who dislikes that farmer for whatever personal reasons or incidents which have occurred during the negotiations and that request is being turned down, there should be the basic right to appeal.

• (1120)

An appeal procedure has been put in place by regulation or under this new arrangement it will be by a by-law. However, it seems to me that it should be right in the statute. Therefore, regardless of who the chairman of the Farm Credit Corporation is or who the chief executive officer is or who are the board of directors, it is in the legislation that there will be an appeal procedure.