

The farmer said that although the druggist was a fine fellow and a good druggist, this was a farming community. He said that a farmer should be elected to Parliament to deal with their problems. He asked the people whether they could imagine a druggist out on the range or himself working as a druggist. The farmer had long hair and was not too clean. He said that if he were a druggist, he might mistakenly give birth control pills to a woman who was looking for saccharine tablets and she would have the sweetest babies this side of heaven. In light of this, I suggest that we should not have professors looking after our farm problems. We should have people who are a little closer to what really goes on in the farm belt and are aware of the problems.

With regard to the income stabilization, I cannot help but associate the horrible conditions that now exist with stabilized poverty. In the 1930's there was almost as big a disaster in the farm belt as under the present reign of the Liberal government. The only difference is that there were compounding features then, such as drought and grasshoppers. What would have happened if in the 1930's someone had had the same foresight as the minister and introduced a program of stabilized farm incomes? With a program such as this, there would not have been any payout for over 20 years. There would not have been any payout during the crucial and critical 1930's. This illustrates what this plan is really all about.

Some provincial representatives think that this bill is all right. I suggest that they are being bribed politically to do so. They see a little of this \$100 million coming their way. They are afraid of what Ottawa might do if they do not subscribe to the stabilization of poverty plan. The farmers of this nation are a very resilient group. They have overcome drought, hail and grasshoppers. I am not sure whether they are going to be able to overcome this present Liberal administration.

Mr. H. A. Moore (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed to appear to do much for the prairie grain producers. What it does initially is impose a 2 per cent levy at the time of sale, in addition to the various other charges already imposed. If, after various complicated calculations, it is determined that 90 per cent of the over-all proceeds from the sale of grain for a particular crop year are down more than 1 per cent from 90 per cent of the average grain sales for the preceding five years, the producer will receive a stabilization payment. Whether a producer receives a stabilization payment will not depend on his need for one in that particular year. In fact, the poorer his crops, the less he will likely receive. The only persons assured of benefits from this scheme are those who produce the calculations and carry out the administration.

I object to one of the conditions imposed by the bill on which transitional payments depend. To be eligible for the transitional payments, acreage payments, or whatever they might be called, the producer must be named in a permit book issued before a specific date. I maintain that as long as a producer is eligible for a permit book, there is no law that states he has to take one out for the

Prairie Grain Stabilization Act

1970-71 crop year. If he wants to sell grain, naturally he must take out a permit book.

If a farmer does not have any grain to sell, I cannot understand why he must take out a permit book. Legally, he could still farm without one. Because of being hailed, dried or frozen out, or any other accident of this nature, he may not feel the need to take out a permit book. Not being a mind reader, he could not guess what the minister or the government will come up with next. We can understand that some method of proving a farmer's planted acres, but what about the prairie farm assistance inspectors? In these types of cases, they inspect the land. They have a record of the crops sown and the number of acres of each. In other words, the farmer is technically in default if he has not taken out a permit book. This is not fair.

A grower who has not taken out a permit book by the required date because something happened to his crop may be in the greatest need of this payment. The minister should announce some alternative method for determining this man's eligibility for an acreage payment or at least allow an appeal. There does not seem to be any such method at the present time. In answer to a question in the House, the minister was adamant in saying that the criterion stated would be the criterion used. I admit that the minister did not have time to consider this question. I realize there are many farmers who would be in this situation and this should be all the more reason for the minister to give this type of consideration. It would certainly not cost the government or the taxpayer much more and it would at least result in impartiality and fairness in a case where a man was hurt through no fault of his own. If this proposal is not accepted it would appear that one more effort is being made to shaft the operator of a small farm.

• (3:40 p.m.)

The clause relating to transitional payments has little relation to the rest of the legislation. There have been other instances of bills covering more than one subject; indeed, this has become a practice. Here, we encounter the same threat; it was expressed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) the other day, and, since then, by the minister in charge of the Wheat Board. In brief, we are asked as parliamentarians to pass the whole of this bill quickly; if we refuse, we are accused of withholding much-needed cash from the hands of western grain producers. However, this kind of threat is no longer effective. Producers read the press and follow these debates very closely. They know the score.

My main criticism of the legislation is that it is not designed to aid those who are most in need. It could be that such people would be helped in particular areas, but the opposite might also be the case. The bill deals with gross income, whereas to an individual producer it is net income that matters, that is income after all expenses have been met. A stabilization fund is established by imposing levies on producers. The government will, or may, make contributions at times. One of my hon. friends who spoke before me drew attention to the fact that