

Business of Supply

ince of Ontario is doing the right thing in trying to rectify the situation that exists.

We talked about brucellosis and some of the other diseases. I could go back to what the hon. member for Timiskaming mentioned about making sure that we get rid of the skim milk powder in our own nation because many people need more protein and more of the minerals that milk contains. There is not denial of that. However, the provinces can do that. Society as a whole can do it. Do not ask the farmers of Canada to do it, because they own that product. We might go to Nova Scotia, that little province on the eastern seaboard.

Every child in school in Nova Scotia gets milk at five cents for eight ounces. That is under a good government down there. I will tell you that their dairy farmers are the highest paid in the world. Plus the subsidy that we pay them, the province pays them \$1.50 a hundred on top of that. They have not increased their production too high. They are not self-sufficient in respect of milk supplies. They bring in milk from Quebec. I could show you a very successful farm co-operative in Nova Scotia which has some of the most modern dairy equipment in Canada which, plus that, paid them \$1 a hundred dividend on the milk that they put in their area and they supplied the people in the area with some of the lowest priced dairy products in Canada.

If they can do that, and they are doing it, then surely we can solve some of the problems that confront our dairy people. Do not forget, also, that we are subsidizing skim milk powder to the tune of 34 cents a pound for consumption by people from any part of our society. That means that one can buy a pound of skim milk powder for approximately 72 cents. There have been some sales at which it has been sold as a loss-leader for much less. One can make four quarts of skim milk powder, according to our nutritionists, from a pound of skim milk. That works out to 18½ cents a quart. Mr. Chairman, I do not think one can even buy distilled water for that amount of money. That is the cheapest and most nutritious drink we have in this country. Our social services in this country are second to none in the world. So there is no reason that anyone in our society who has to spend nearly \$1 for a package of cigarettes cannot spend 70 cents a day for four quarts of milk.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the minister, but the time allotted to him has expired. He may continue with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Whelan: I will not take up very much more time. I think there is a great misconception when we hear talk about our getting rid of skim milk powder on the markets of the world. I was happy to hear the member from the New Democratic Party say what he did. He could go right to the city of Windsor, that little old labour town of mine, and say the same thing that he said here about those farmers and what they should get for their milk, and so on. Those are good things to say.

I can tell you that many members of the media are not saying that. They think that because a farmer has a nice dairy farm, and so on, he is among the richest people in

[Mr. Whelan.]

society. They must learn that this is a seven-day a week job, that the children work and, as the hon. member for Elgin pointed out, there is also the matter of the treatment of the wives. I should like to touch on that later, if I may. The denatured skim milk powder that we are selling on the world market for animal feed, which cannot be used for human consumption, is a product that deteriorates. Some people think when we talk about skim milk powder that we are talking about grain that can be stored in a farmer's bin on the prairies even without a roof over it. That is not true.

We should be honest about that when we are talking about skim milk powder. We should make sure we know what we are talking about and that we know how it is distributed on the world markets. The skim milk that is distributed on the world markets is not instantized. It is not ready for human consumption. Canadians would not drink it in that form. There is no doubt it is true that it can be used in the baking process, but it cannot be used in the home. There is a cost of about 30 cents a pound just to instantize it. So if you see it sold on the world market at 13 cents or 14 cents, add 30 cents on top of that right away before you talk about using it for human consumption.

The hon. member for Elgin talked about farmers' wives, the taxing problem, and so on. I think we should be realistic. When we changed the tax laws about three or four years ago we allowed a farmer to turn over his farm to his son or daughter without any capital gains tax. They had worked all their lives at building the thing. This was approved by the House. By the way, no other country in the world does this. The Secretary of Agriculture in the United States, when I told him about it, asked me what we are doing. I said that we want to make sure that our farmers remain in agriculture. He said that he would not have a snowball's chance in hell of getting that through the United States Congress. He said he would never know how we ever got that through the parliament in Ottawa. There is not another country doing what we are doing.

The hon. member for Elgin mentioned the forming of a corporation. He said that they could issue shares, and so on, and do this in a very fair manner in the same way it is done by business. The farmers' wife, in that way, could share in the income in a fair fashion. I do not see anything wrong with that, but so far as I am concerned we can only go so far. Agriculture is so different from small business, and so on, that I would find it difficult to promote that kind of a thing, much as I do promote agriculture, because I would have every small businessman in Canada being kind of mad, and I think they would have a legitimate reason.

Other things were said here about the amount of the supply of milk, the eradication of brucellosis in Canada, and the number of cattle we have. In 1950, approximately 9 per cent of our cattle in Canada were infected with brucellosis. In 1956, 4.5 per cent were infected. In 1966, the figure was 2 per cent. That is one of the lowest rates. It is practically the same, but we are not too happy about it.

● (1710)

We maintain that much of the brucellosis problem in Canada today is due to poor housekeeping. Farmers have a certain responsibility in this respect, and they know it.