

Canada have sufficient income to maintain a viable industry with an adequate working capital. The figures I have quoted today and which the minister himself quoted in his statement last October tell anyone who reads them that we face a situation in western Canada in which farm capitalization and the farming structure generally will no longer be viable. The minister will not have to worry about helping people to get out of farming; they will be going. The sad fact is that they will be going out broke. It is fine to say they can be retrained, but I do not know where the government intends to send people from the farms when there are at present 700,000 unemployed in Canada, many of them with skills and training. I do not know if he intends to do anything about it. I do not know what advice he got from farm organizations, but at least one press release from the National Farmers Union suggested it did not have undiluted enthusiasm for this bill.

The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool indicated on March 16 that the board of directors contended that 2 per cent of gross receipts from producers as a contribution is too high in relation to the plan's benefits. The board also suggested the plan should include features to take care of steadily rising costs of production. Within the last month we have experienced an increase in the price of fuel. This apparently is being ignored. The government must think that a farmer is some kind of a magician who can pull dollars out of a hat and continue to live and function on the income figure the minister has quoted. Surely the minister should pay some attention to these facts pointed out by the directors of the wheat pool.

The assessment of 2 per cent of the gross income of farmers is perhaps the worst way to collect money. It is in effect a total production tax. It does not amount to a contribution; it is a production tax of 2 per cent. This is like a property tax on your farm; you pay it whether you make money or not. Why did the minister not relate the tax, or the contribution, to income? Apparently there would not be sufficient return if it were based on net income so the minister decided to base it on gross income.

**Mr. Lang:** How do you figure it?

**Mr. Gleave:** That is not difficult. A contribution of 2 per cent on gross income is 2 per cent on the gross. If there is another way of putting it, I would be glad to listen to another interjection from the minister.

**Mr. Lang:** I should be delighted to ask the hon. member a question, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. For what reason is the hon. minister rising?

**Mr. Lang:** I am rising to ask the hon. member a question, Mr. Speaker. Since the hon. member seems to know how this can be done, calculated on the basis of net income, I should like to ask him how we are to distinguish between appropriate premiums in respect of well operated farms and poorly operated farms? How do we distinguish between different types of land and operations and a thousand and one other things I could list?

#### *Prairie Grain Stabilization Act*

**Mr. Gleave:** I tell the minister that if I were going to devise a method to help out people in an industry which was known to be in serious economic difficulty, I would not start off by taking money away from them. That is my first point of departure.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his allotted time has expired.

**Some hon. Members:** Carry on.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Chair has some observations about the procedural aspect of the motion of the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave). If there is consent that the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar should continue, I will recognize him.

**Some hon. Members:** Continue.

**Mr. Gleave:** I express appreciation to hon. members for extending my time. I do not want to say a great deal more. I will wind up my remarks very quickly. If I wanted to take 2 per cent of someone's net income, or the net income of a group of people, I expect I would do the same as the minister has done; I would say to some of the boys in the back room, "Figure out a way to make this assessment based on net income. Tell me how to do it".

**Mr. Lang:** They said it was impossible.

**Mr. Gleave:** I suggest in all sincerity that it is wrong in the first place to make a deduction.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Get some new back room boys.

**Mr. Gleave:** All I can suggest is that the minister has ignored the major problem outlined by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. I have in mind the increase in production costs. This over-all program ignores that fact; nothing is mentioned about production costs. There is nothing envisaged in this bill to meet the short fall which now exists in the farming economy or the increase in production costs which exists throughout Canada and which in all likelihood will continue. That is all I can say to the minister.

In closing, let me tell a story about a chap who delivered grain to an elevator. The farmer hauled his grain to the elevator and the agent made up a little ticket. The farmer asked what an item on the ticket was for and the agent replied that it covered dockage. The farmer asked what the next little item was and the agent told him it was to cover shrinkage. The farmer said, "I do not understand dockage and I do not understand shrinkage but I know there is too much 'takeage'". That is your problem, Mr. Minister.

**An hon. Member:** Ho, ho, ho!

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. Before the Chair recognizes another hon. member perhaps I should make some comments in respect of the procedural aspect of the motion of the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar. I