of a huge backlog of other legislation which must be dealt with. Well, Mr. Speaker, other than Bill C-176, the agricultural products marketing bill, three agricultural bills have been introduced and have been before the House for less than one month. Each and every one of us who has constituents engaged in the business of agriculture must have an opportunity to speak on these measures and an opportunity to place our views before this House.

I do not believe any minister of the Crown should deny us the opportunity to express our views. I believe it is fair to say the minister knows very well that any measure introduced which would truly assist the western farm economy would be passed with a minimum of delay. Certainly this government's record in respect of introducing perfect legislation is far from adequate. We have only to look at Bill C-176 to see that only 42 amendments were adopted out of 129 proposed. There are some 30 more amendments to be considered. The grain act had 20 or 30 amendments incorporated, and yet the minister says this is just a senseless waste of time. Here is what the *Free Press* had to say about Bill C-176, the new Canada Grain Act:

> Despite continuing objections from some quarters, the new bill seems to be a step in the right direction, designed to help Canadian wheat secure and hold its fair share of world trade. It is a definite improvement on what was offered at the last session of Parliament in Bill C-196.

So I say much the same feeling has been generated in respect of Bill C-176. Let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, the producers do not see this as a senseless waste of time. This bill undertakes the payment of $100 million, or a reappropriation of the expenditure of funds. Certainly this is welcome. However, over a long period this measure will have very deep and underlying implications for the grains industry. As has been pointed out by previous speakers, the government will withdraw from its responsibility under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act as well as its responsibility in respect of the coverage of losses in pool accounts. In total this amounted to $131 million in the crop year 1968-69. The federal government's share under the PFAA, which resulted in an average payment of $6 million per year since its incorporation, is also being withdrawn.

The future impact, in my opinion, will have a very detrimental effect on the industry, particularly smaller producers and those who are at the lower end of the income scale. Because the $100 million is tied to the legislation, it is also very difficult to examine this legislation objectively and in an accurate manner without any pressure. I say the opposition and farmers of this country are being blackmailed by the $100 million payment which is hanging over our heads. It is difficult to be effective and constructive in attempting to put forward amendments and recommendations to improve the operation of this legislation. Believe me, it needs many. It certainly needs major improvement, as I see it, if it is to provide any effective measures for the welfare of the western grains industry. To do this, of course, will result in a delay in the payment of the much needed $100 million transitional payment.

There are many aspects to consider in conjunction with this bill. For example, we are currently dealing with other important aspects of the grains industry. We know that the Prairie Farm Assistance Act will be withdrawn. We are enacting changes in the advance payments legislation. We have just recently been informed of a new quota policy. A number of reviews are being conducted. The Menzies committee has tabled its final report. There are many changes and redirections of thought in respect of the Canadian Wheat Board's policies.

In dealing with this legislation and a program which will affect the future of the prairie grains industry for many years one must take into consideration all these matters. Certainly, with the attitude of the thin-skinned minister which was displayed in his press release, and his threats, we can only assume he is very touchy and wants to ram through this legislation while attempting to recoup some political gain—I may say, temporarily.

If the minister is sincere and understanding about wanting to assist and help the western grain industry, the payment should have been made in time for seeding operations, at the same time as he announced his intention to withdraw the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act and the coverage in respect of the losses in the grain pool accounts. Then the bill could have been dealt with in a constructive and careful manner, taking into consideration all potential developments and implications which I believe are very serious. They must be considered very carefully because we are dealing not only with an industry and with dollars and cents, but with people, of course, engaged in the industry. Therein lies the problem which must be dealt with. It is not only an economic problem; it is a social problem as well. Instead, we are being blackmailed and coerced into accepting this bill without having an adequate and uninhibited opportunity to study it.

I reiterate that the payment should be made now, without further delay. Farmers are in desperate need of this money. The agricultural industry in western Canada is depressed to the state that it is probably in the worst condition it has been in history. We might take a look at the net income for the western provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. According to figures taken from "Outlook '71", we find that in 1970 Alberta had a net income of $86 million, Saskatchewan had a net income of $56 million and Manitoba had a net income of $32 million, for a total net income in western Canadian agriculture of $174 million.

• (9:00 p.m.)

This is less than $1,000 net income per farmer, Mr. Speaker. While this includes receipts derived from the sale of other products, we have only to subtract the sale of those items to know that the income derived from the sale of grain is considerably less than that. If this is the kind of income the bill is intended to stabilize, I as a member of this House certainly do not want any part of it. When you study these figures it is little wonder that the farmers are having such difficulty meeting their commitments, their bank payments, their Farm Credit Corpo-