

I suggest it may be because they are eating food that does not have the proper nutrition to overcome their fatigue. Mr. Speaker, I will give a few more figures on the high standard of living in Sweden. Incidentally, considering the cost of Scotch there, I could easily become a prohibitionist if it cost that much in Canada. Another report reads:

The rising taxes to support all this, however, have most Swedes wobbling. For example, the value-added tax, which is piled on top of all other taxes, was recently increased by four percentage points to 17.65 per cent. Partly because of this cost prices of most goods and services are soaring. Some cigarettes cost \$1.40 a pack, eggs \$1.20 a dozen, hamburger \$0.99 per pound and filet mignon \$5 per pound. Increasingly Swedes are making do with items at the lowest end of the price scale: potatoes, carrots, cabbage and spaghetti.

I could read further from this article, but it seems clear that the price of affluence in Sweden is too expensive for many people. More and more of them are filling mental institutions.

Let us compare food costs in Canada with costs elsewhere. I have made comparisons with other countries. Many people say they would like the standard of living they have in Sweden, but just compare the prices quoted in that article, Mr. Speaker. You can see that Canadian consumers are the luckiest in the world, and I say this with full knowledge of the cost of food in the United States which is slightly below ours. But it must not be forgotten that the United States treasury in many cases contributes to producers over 25 per cent of what they receive for their produce. This comes out of the tax dollar. Add all that up and it is clear that consumers in the United States are not getting as good a break as consumers in Canada. Our producers are producing without as much aid.

Canadian producers are among the most efficient in the world; they are more efficient than any other part of our society no matter what kind of production they are involved in, be it government administration, automobile production or whatever else you want to mention. No group has become more efficient and productive than the group which is producing food for human and animal consumption in Canada.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, as a Canadian of Swedish ancestry it gives me a great deal of pleasure to follow the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Whelan), the twice-a-month man who was concerned about sex and whisky in that country. I remind the House that the Swedes still have by far the highest standard of living for the working man of any country in the world.

Mr. Olson: That is not right.

Mr. Nystrom: In rising to participate in this debate I support wholeheartedly the motion of the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) dealing with the high cost of food and the excessive profits being made by chain stores. I note with a great deal of concern, but not surprise, the apologetic speech of the minister from Calgary. He apologized for the chain stores with crocodile

Increasing Food Prices

tears in his eyes, saying that their profits were by no means excessive, that they were indeed small, that we should not attack these people in our society but should leave them as they are.

I shall spend a few minutes speaking about the interests of other people. I will let government members talk about their friends, the corporations and the chain store people. I want to talk about the consumers and farmers because they are on the short end of the stick. I grew up on a farm. I remember wondering, as a small child, why the farmer received such a low price for his product, whether it was bacon, eggs or wheat, and why he had to pay such a high price when he bought the same product in a store. Despite the fact that food prices have been rising, it is not the farmer who has been getting more money. Indeed, over the last number of years the farmer has been receiving less while the price of food has increased.

• (1740)

I should like to put on the record some statistics to illustrate my point. According to the Department of Agriculture, in 1949 \$1.5 billion was spent by consumers on food; of that the farmer received 57 per cent and the marketing share was 43 per cent. Twenty years later, in 1969, the consumer spent \$6.2 billion on food and the farmers' share was 45 per cent. I am told by agricultural economists that in 1971 the farmers' share was probably closer to 40 per cent of the consumer dollar. So it is certainly not the farmer who is getting the money. It is obviously going to the middleman and the food companies for advertising, promotion and profit.

I should like to give a few specific examples of what the farmer receives for certain products. For the wheat that goes into bread, from 1950 to 1959 the farmer received 15 per cent and the marketing companies 85 per cent. From 1960 to 1969 the farmer received only 13 per cent. In other words, if the consumer paid 30 cents for a loaf of bread the farmer received 3.9 cents. For fluid milk, from 1950 to 1959 the farmer received 55 per cent of the consumer food dollar, and from 1960 to 1969 his share had decreased to 52 per cent. For potatoes, from 1950 to 1959 the farmer's share was 52 per cent and for 1960-69 it had decreased to 41 per cent. For canned tomatoes, for 1950-59 his share was 20 per cent and for 1960-69 it decreased to 19 per cent. In 1971 farmers received 25 per cent of the money spent on fruits and vegetables. For bakery and cereal goods his share was 21 per cent of what the consumer paid.

In the May, 1972, edition of *Reader's Digest* some figures were published which had been compiled from the consumer price index, the Ontario region of the National Farmers Union and farm marketing boards. They show that in 1971, if a customer paid 21 cents for a 16-ounce loaf of bread the farmer's share was two cents, the remaining 19 cents going to the food company, the food processors or manufacturers. For a pound of pork which sold in the supermarket for 59 cents to 65 cents, the farmer received 22 cents. For a dozen eggs sold at 47 cents a dozen, his share was 25 cents. On a 48-ounce can of apple juice selling for 40 cents, the farmer's share was seven cents. For a quart of milk sold at 35 cents, the farmer's share was 17 cents. You can see, Mr. Speaker, that it is certainly not the farmer who is benefiting from the sharp increase in the price of food.