

States and Canada is one and a half pounds. In the August-September issue of the *Farmers' Digest*, Dr. T. J. Cunah, head of the animal science department of the University of Florida, provided the following pertinent information:

It is also interesting that the medical profession has been using DES against certain forms of cancer in men and women for many years, yet in spite of this evidence the use of DES in cattle feed was eliminated because half to 2 per cent of the liver showed a slight trace of DES, about two parts per billion. The reason given for it was that DES might cause cancer in humans, yet shortly after DES was disapproved for cattle, the use of DES as a morning-after birth control pill for women was still allowed. The level of DES used in 50 milligrams, is equivalent to a girl consuming 50,000 pounds of liver with two parts per billion of DES or 2½ million pounds of liver in which only 2 per cent of it has DES. A girl would need to live 33,333 years to get that much DES from consuming liver, but she gets that much in a five-day period via the pill.

Was this action against the beef producer common sense, Mr. Speaker, or one more example of emotional reaction or lack of ministerial leadership?

Another area that is equally important—I am afraid time permits me to mention it only briefly—is the need for more co-operation by ministers of departments allied to the agricultural industry. I mean that the agricultural industry, including farm dealers, must have some better means for attracting competent labour. This means that the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras) and the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) must try to co-operate with the Minister of Agriculture rather than play one against the other as it appears they must be doing now. Last summer we had an episode in western Ontario of criticism of farm labour conditions. The Minister of Manpower and Immigration kept saying, "give me definite cases". Mr. Speaker, I think we can give him a definite case that was pretty minor.

The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Gray) must also try to help instead of hinder, as was indicated earlier this session when the Canadian Consumers Association was granted another \$100,000 to investigate marketing boards. Their president emphatically denies this allegation but at the same time publicly talks down the national marketing board concept by saying marketing boards should only be provincial. Whom does she think she is kidding?

● (1710)

Canadian agriculture, as is recognized, has the possibility of finally coming into its own. To emphasize this further let me say that for several years previous to 1970 only 4 per cent of the degree student graduates from the University of Guelph want back to farms. In 1970 the figure rose to 10 per cent and in May, 1973, 18 per cent of such degree graduates went back to some form of active farming. I do not mean they were just allied to farming; they were in fact engaged in active farming.

What I have tried to emphasize is that the government must begin to take a long-term approach to our agricultural problems. The Canadian agricultural community has the expertise and enthusiasm to produce much more than we have already witnessed provided they have the opportunity of managing their own production at a profitable level. If this is accomplished, the Canadian consumer as

Agriculture

well as world demand will ultimately be supplied with sufficient quantities of good food at reasonable prices.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, from time to time the opposition finds that it can no longer avoid discussing the subject of agriculture on an opposition day. Today the opposition motion concerns agriculture. Their difficulty, as evidenced by the last several opposition motions, has been finding a topic which makes any kind of sense as they try to criticize the government.

Today's motion asks for long-term programs and policies and criticizes ad hoc measures. At least two or three spokesmen on behalf of the Official Opposition have asked for at least one additional ad hoc measure immediately to solve a particular problem of the moment. I am talking, of course, about the serious situation regarding the production of beef. We must ensure that beef continues to be produced in this country and that more meat continues to be produced, as the Minister of Agriculture has emphasized many times. We must see to it that over any long period of time this country produces more meat rather than less. It is therefore our clear desire to maintain the agricultural industry in a viable state.

The motion before the House suggests that one of the spokesmen of the Official Opposition may have reversed his direction. May I remind Your Honour that the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner), who also moved the motion concerning agriculture that was debated on the opposition day on June 21, encountered the same difficulty that hon. members participating in the present debate have encountered inasmuch as he, on the one hand, asked for less interference and at the same time asked for more government interference with respect to the Canadian Wheat Board.

It might be worth the while of hon. members to look back at that debate if they think they are capable of predicting and analyzing and saying where they think we should be going. May I suggest such an examination also to those hon. members who believe it is worth while to misstate facts and who go on making political allegations with regard to the marketing of grain. They make predictions that work to the great disadvantage of the producers of this country because they mislead them into thinking that the situation is different from that actually existing.

In the debate previously alluded to the motion moved by the hon. member for Crowfoot criticized the government for allegedly failing to take advantage of what he termed top world prices. The hon. member referred to wheat prices as being a little better than \$3 per bushel. Another colleague of his referred to prices in the order of \$3.45. The motion suggested that the Wheat Board should be at that moment selling wheat at top world prices, that it should be out there selling to the limit, and what a good thing that would be.

Today the hon. member for Crowfoot noted that the price is over \$5. Yet only a few months ago he was referring to a top world price of a little better than \$3 per bushel and he criticized us for not selling wheat. What he was suggesting, of course, was an uncalled for interference with the Canadian Wheat Board, which was doing its usual superb job of knowing exactly what should be sold