

Farm Machinery

I would not want anybody to think I had any idea that all farmers would be able to borrow that amount, but let us suppose that one farmer was able to borrow up to \$85,000. If he paid only 5 per cent interest he would pay over \$4,000 each year in interest quite apart from what he needed to live on. I do not think many farmers will be able to handle loans of that size, and each farmer must realize that he has no hope of being able to borrow himself rich.

The hon. member for Norfolk, who has just spoken, said in the course of his remarks that someone on this side of the house had said that farmers could not co-operate, that these loans could not possibly be of any use, and that if they did borrow they were communists. In the first place, I am sure no one over on this side of the house ever said that farmers could not or would not co-operate. We who come from the west know very well that the farmers are unable to co-operate in owning machinery no matter how much they would like to, because their operations are controlled by the weather, not by themselves. In the area in which I live the farmers have had pretty well four weeks of steady drizzle; I do not mean heavy rain like we had in Ottawa yesterday, but the sort of drizzle that makes harvesting impossible. The crops out there are swathed and lying in the fields, and no one can tell me that three, four or five farmers who owned one combine would be happy with that sort of arrangement instead of each being able to use the machine to harvest whenever the sun shone. I think there has to be a combine for each unit.

With regard to the allegation that they are communists, a communal farm is not composed of individual owners. Farmers on communal farms work for the good of the community. Those farmers do not own anything, so the hon. member is away off beam when he says that we on this side are calling people communists who would borrow under this kind of legislation. The only real communal farms in western Canada are those operated by the Hutterites. They are very hard working people, but none of them owns a thing and would not be eligible for a loan under this farm machinery syndicate credits act.

To my mind the only people who could really benefit from this measure—and here I am speaking entirely of the west, not of someone who grows five acres of tomatoes or potatoes in Ontario or eastern Canada—would be, say, a father who has two or three

sons, each of whom could borrow provided he owned land. They could borrow money under this legislation for the purchase of farm machinery provided they worked together as a unit rather than as individuals. If they worked as individuals they would be faced with the old problem of doing certain things on their farms only when weather permitted.

It seems to me the only thing that could be satisfactorily purchased under the provisions of this legislation is heavy equipment such as a portable feed mill. If groups of farmers purchased portable feed mills and learned to operate them efficiently they would only succeed in putting another industry out of business. Surely it is obvious that local feed mill operators can do a better and more efficient job than can be done by farmers with portable mills. In the district of Canada where I live there is only one farmer operating a portable feed mill. With the exception of one report from that man's brother to the effect that this was a success, I have heard nothing wonderful about his operation. Nor have I heard of any farmer in the district other than the operator making use of that portable feed mill. This, incidentally, is not a syndicated operation.

At this time I should like to read into the record an editorial which is to be found in the Canadian milling and feed publication of August, 1964. This publication is the voice of the milling and feed industry in Canada. The editorial is signed by Robert Mercer, the editor, who says:

A news item on the back page of the *Financial Times* of Canada states that the Minister of Agriculture plans to finance collective purchases of farm machinery. Only certain more expensive items of machinery are to be included, among which is the mobile feed mill. A large sum of money is being put aside for the financing of these purchases, and it is to be made available through the Farm Credit Corporation.

We understand that the reason for including the mobile feed mill is in order to lower the cost of feed to the farmer. How a co-operative of local farmers, who should be within 30 miles of each other, hope to compete with an established mill, we do not understand.

We suggest that if the minister wishes to aid the livestock feeder in the east or in the west that a more direct approach be taken. In our estimation the present course of action that is proposed, will give the greatest benefit to the machinery manufacturers. The progressive farmer has more to do than learn the complex workings of the feed trade. The organizing, operating, upkeep and financing of a mobile feed mill is no small problem. The knowledge required to use the mill to maximum efficiency, the knowledge required to mix uniform feeds for effective purposes and the knowledge