

*Farm Credit Act*

get out of this fantastic error the Liberals have been making for years in describing the income of farmers. The hon. member outlined today the various factors that make up the cash income of farmers, the supplementary grants from the government and income in kind, adding up to a total cash income. When you take off the costs of operating and depreciation you get an operating, net figure that is the cash in the farmer's pocket.

The dominion bureau of statistics have a bookkeeper's item called realized income and inventory. When the farmer is growing grain beyond the amount he can sell, has a surplus and is filling up the granaries on his farm, the bookkeepers of the dominion bureau of statistics say this is income in his pocket. Therefore when the farmers across Canada make say \$1½ billion, they add on the \$3½ million surplus that he did not get paid for and say that is on the farm. That is why the Liberals went up and down the country in the thirties and forties and said, "Look how prosperous is the farmer in Canada. He has this money; his income is at a very high level". They added on all the wheat he did not sell.

Oddly enough, Mr. Chairman, in 1961 the only figure the hon. member quoted was the lowest income the farmers have ever received except for one year. Let me tell the committee that for last year the bookkeepers in the d.b.s. had added on wheat that had not been sold back in the period of the Liberal regime, and they had to take it off when we sold it. So that last year, if hon. members will look at the figures across Canada they will see the figure of \$397 million as realized cash income, the farmer's real income, which brought it down to this low figure. But actually the farmer had not had this money taken out of his pocket at all. It had been added on previously. Therefore to get the real figure for last year one has to take the realized income plus the inventory, because the income the farmer receives is when he is paid for his products, not the bookkeeping entry previously; so really the figure the Liberals are quoting as income is roughly \$800 million out.

That is all I am going to say, Mr. Chairman, about that remark in the speech of the hon. member. The mere fact that he repeated all I said must have indicated to the members of this committee how much truth there was in what I said, because they never bother answering things that are not important. The hon. member answered point by point what I said yesterday and put it all back on the record, because he knows he carries the weight of sin and guilt that must fall on the

[Mr. Hamilton.]

shoulders of the Liberal party for what they did not do for agriculture for 22 years.

Certain hon. members of this committee made remarks today upon which I think I should comment. I should like to make a suggestion at the end of these comments, and I hope I can complete this argument before five o'clock. One hon. member mentioned—I think it was the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes—that the farmers of his province did not know about this legislation. I agree; this is absolutely correct. We have one part of our country where the farmers do not even know the legislation that exists and what is available to them. I think I am a failure as Minister of Agriculture for not having been able to get down there and tell them what this government has made available to them in the last four years. So to the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes and other hon. members of the Social Credit party who have been telling this committee about the real needs of their constituents I would say that I welcome invitations to visit their counties, see their farmers and talk with them face to face.

I should be glad to talk with those farmers and tell them what assistance is available to them in the hope that they will take advantage of this great confederation—the tremendous tools which the taxpayers in all parts of the country have put into the hands of agricultural producers. I am thinking of such measures as crop insurance, conservation, rehabilitation and so on. I would like invitations, preferably at week ends, when I do not have to be here in the house, to tell the farmers in more detail the possibilities which are open to them, because by so doing I think they would be encouraged to take advantage of legislation which is already on the books as well as of measures which are due for enactment shortly.

Mr. Chairman, I know that a large number of members have indicated their intention to speak on this subject, and I would ask as a favour not only to myself but also to many thousands of farmers, whether we could not get this resolution through today. On second reading, of course, every member can speak again if he so wishes, and when we move into committee after second reading, every member can speak as many times as he pleases. Moreover, on second reading hon. members would have the bill in their hands and, being in possession of the entire facts they could probably direct their remarks more closely to the subject matter in accordance with the rules of the house. If we get the resolution stage through today, the bill could be printed and put into the hands of hon. members on Monday and we could get off to a good start next week, moving forward to