

*The Budget—Mr. Hamilton*

with the Chinese. I also said that they should realize that the Americans and the Chinese had a great deal in common and had one common enemy, and Kennedy agreed. All this is on the Congressional record of the United States.

My point is that the farmers and producers of Canada have a tremendous opportunity to market all over the world. If we market all the products which we can produce in the United States and Canada, we do not have to worry much about the Keynesian types who try to run any type of industry. That is my answer. We will survive this. If the Americans do not give the Russians the same deal as they give the Third World countries, the Russians buy from us. We signed an agreement approximately two months ago for up to 350 million bushels per year to one country, and the Americans would have liked to obtain that market. It is the same situation with China and all other countries with which we deal. We deal with them on the basis of mutual advantage to both sides. We live up to our word and have expanded into all sorts of markets by using that principle. We are getting into South America now. There is good co-operation. For any farmer who has hope for the future, it will not be based upon what the Americans do price-wise. It will be based upon whether we can sell all the grain we produce and help Americans to sell all the grain they produce, and the world needs it. Then we are both better off. That is the only way to go ahead.

**Mr. Orlikow:** Mr. Speaker, is the Hon. Member not aware that Canada's customers for grain, which it had for probably close to 100 years in western Europe, are now no longer our customers and are in fact our competitors for the sale of wheat because the countries in the European Common Market have established very substantial subsidies for their farmers? If the United States Government, in its new agricultural policy, is to subsidize the export of grain by \$3.50 per bushel, as was indicated in its new program, how will the Canadian farmer be able to compete? Surely that is not fair market competition.

**Mr. Hamilton:** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be harsh but that type of nonsense is really beneath the dignity of this place. The French subsidize their farmers by \$9 per bushel and they are exporting; the British do not subsidize their farmers and they are exporting. I simply point out that we are just as smart as the British. If they can raise their productivity up to 148 bushels per acre, so can we.

**Mr. Orlikow:** By subsidy.

**Mr. Hamilton:** We can take on the British, the French and the Americans any day of the week and we can whip them any time.

**Mr. Benjamin:** We cannot, and you know it, Alvin.

**Mr. Hamilton:** I am not talking to the labour man over there. I am talking about the facts of life. We object very strenuously to the fact that we tie ourselves up to the American price. We do not deal with these other countries purely on price. In the case of grain to China, the Chinese buy our grain because they know that they make more money from buying

our grain than they do buying from anybody else. Why is that? It is because we help them sell their products around the world. If the Hon. Member wants to look at this from the Chinese point of view, I would be glad to provide it to him. The Chinese calculate that for every dollar which we made out of the sale of wheat to China over the last 25 years, they have made double as much my selling their food products in world markets. The Hon. Member asks how we can compete against these subsidies. We do it by showing how we sell grain. We sell around 1,200 million bushels per year. When I first started, it was 300 million. The point I am trying to make is that all this nonsense is unworthy of a literate person in the House.

● (1530)

**Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for recognizing me. I am willing to take part in the budget debate, but perhaps depressed about it. I want to say to my friend, the Hon. Member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton), that I will have a word or two to say about what he has just finished saying in a few minutes. I also want to say that I am glad I did not send a memo around telling Hon. Members on all sides that I was speaking today, otherwise there would be nobody here but you and me.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Benjamin:** This Budget and the previous one reminded me of some of the Liberal ones I have had to suffer through since 1968. I have concluded that what the French philosopher had to say is sort of reinforced, believed in and supported by these last two Tory Budgets, that is that a rich man has as much right to beg on the streets and sleep under a bridge as a poor man.

I have looked under a few bridges and looked in the line-ups at food banks and at those who panhandle for loose change outside of stores on the streets of Ottawa and I could not find a single rich man. I have looked at the Government's attempts to deindex old age pensions and at its successful attempt to deindex family allowances and whatnot. It reminded me of another old adage of the Conservative bent, "that old age pension just destroys the incentive to work".

I listened carefully today to my friend, the Minister of State for the Wheat Board (Mr. Mayer). He asked us to give him, his Party and his Government some credit for what is in the Budget and for some of the things they have done. He even cried and pleaded for some credit.

I am a magnanimous fellow. I will give the Government some credit. For instance, that drop in unemployment is nice. I will give the Government credit for that drop, although there has not really been a net increase of 580,000 jobs. There might have been an increase of 580,000 jobs in certain areas of the economy but when you subtract that from the over-all figures there may have been a net increase in jobs of maybe 150,000—let us say 200,000. That is good. I will give the Government credit for that.

I agree with the Minister responsible for the Wheat Board that if unemployment had gone up, his Government would