

*Prairie Grain Stabilization Act*

Canada and named in a permit book issued for the 1970-71 crop year before March 1, 1971;

Furthermore, there is in the same bill another problem which complicates the situation even more, and this is the definition given by the government for grain sale proceeds. This is why we have now an imbroglio in the House and we must participate in this debate in order to clarify the problem.

The expression "grain sale proceeds" is mentioned in section 2 (1)(c) and I will quote what follows:

—means the amount of the purchase price of grain produced on land described in a permit book and sold by a producer to a licensee, after the deduction from the purchase price of the grain of the lawful charges that are applicable to the grain on its sale to the licensee by the producer;

• (5:30 p.m.)

That is a definition grasping for accuracy. Now what the opposition and western wheat producers seek is a clear definition of "grain sales proceeds."

My colleague the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) made a speech yesterday which drew much attention and in which he defined the word "production." I believe that all hon. members will benefit from listening to it again, and I quote:

—the expression "costs of production" comprises many things which, of necessity, are involved in a production cycle; it includes not only seed grain, fertilizers and labour costs, but also capital investment, interest, depreciation on equipment and that resulting from weather conditions on the land being used. All these things must be taken into consideration if justice is to be done to the producer who devotes himself to agriculture, tilling the soil to extract from it what is required to feed mankind.

The government, by introducing Bill C-244, aims at legislation justifying grants to producers. Producers, however, rightly claim, as attested by the thousands of letters they have sent to the minister in charge, to my colleagues and to many hon. members, that the bill is unfair to them, depriving them of a stable and regular income and that the definition of what is to be supported is so vague that they are prejudiced thereby.

Mr. Speaker, that is why the amendment brought forward by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) contains the following words:

"and after the deduction of the increased costs of production, and including stabilization payments, if any;"

The amendment makes clear the wording of the bill so that producers may be sure to get justice. In order to illustrate what producers want, here is an extract of a letter sent to hon. members, and I quote:

As a member of the Committee on Agriculture or as a member of Parliament I ask you to take the following positions on Bill C-244.

Separate the payment of the \$100 million from the rest of the legislation and refuse to consider Bill C-244 until the government has made such payment.

They are also asking that the meaning of that expression clarified.

Therefore, it is the duty of each hon. member to take part in the debate in order to legitimate the request of producers and make it known to the government.

Mr. Speaker, something in the recommendation accompanying the bill proves that the government is not very logical in its legislation and statements. I quote:

[Mr. Fortin.]

—the present measure respecting the stabilization of prairie grain sale proceeds; to provide for the calculation, authorization and rate of stabilization payments—

Mr. Speaker, millions of dollars, not five or ten, are involved. We must find out how and to whom we shall distribute those \$100 million, and what will be the basis for calculation. The recommendation is very definite. It deals with production and determination of sales proceeds.

With regard to calculating sales proceeds, it is clearly indicated that the production cycle must be included. And as my colleague from Bellechasse said, it is necessary to define what we mean by production.

If the minister responsible awards grants without taking into account the depreciation of machinery, interests on investments, bad weather—so many factors that make up the production costs—it could happen that the producer will receive less than what it has cost him. Therefore, at the end of the year, what would happen to him is what the eastern milk producers are experiencing, that is a loss.

For instance, in the province of Quebec, manufactured milk or fluid milk producers have to work, but they are hit with a surtax on their production if they produce more than their quota. They are penalized, why? Merely because the law is not clear, it does not give a clear definition of production and does not make any connection between a grant or assistance given by the government, the Canadian Dairy Commission or the Canadian Wheat Board and the real production cost.

In my view, this is not a political question, but an administrative one. However simple it may be, it could become very serious if the government is not willing to revise its positions and to accept the proposed amendment.

I do not want to take more of the time of the House, Mr. Speaker, but I felt that it was my duty to invite the government to revise its positions so that the difficulties faced by the milk producers in Quebec or in eastern Canada do not become the lot of the wheat producer in the West and that the government in its dealings with producers, be they from the East or from the West, be finally motivated by business-like principles and not by sentiment or politics.

**Mr. Marcel Roy (Laval):** Mr. Speaker, before taking part in this debate on a very important piece of farm legislation for western Canada, I have listened to the remarks of all the members on the government side as well as of the opposition and I have tried particularly to understand the position of the members opposite who since yesterday are strenuously objecting to the passage of the bill.

As for myself, I have been a member and vice-chairman of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and the same situation which exists today occurred last year at all the sittings of the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

It seems that each time we consider a farm bill, the same thing happens. When we try to help our farmers, those who claim to help agriculture constantly object to the government's bills.

I noticed earlier that the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) stood and voted against the motion proposed by