

War Appropriation—Agriculture

be necessary for some farm products. "To that end," he continued, "we may have to join with others in recognizing that some form of co-operative production may be required."

In viewing the vast perspective which now opens up before us in this new era of peaceful development which we believe will be possible after the war, two things stand out in my mind most clearly. First of all, food production must be increased according to this country's ability to produce certain types of food more cheaply than other countries can produce them, in the first place for the immediate purpose of present war needs and for relief schemes; and secondly, food increases must be maintained and absorbed to a far greater degree than before by our own population through gradually achieving higher standards of living.

Canada's farm requirements, we must recognize, have depended in the past upon the income of her people, but food requirements are not like other things. They are a basic necessity for the life and health of the nation, and we should not judge food by the ability of the people to pay for it; we should judge the quantity of food needed by the accepted standard necessary for health. In 1940 the average consumption of food in Canada was roughly 1,038 pounds per year per person. That was a fairly high average, taking into consideration the food consumption of other peoples of the world. But without doubt we must realize that numbers of our own people could to their great advantage increase the amount and quality of the food they eat.

In certain surveys made in Canada just prior to the war, I think we can find evidence enough to prove that a larger consumption of food in this country is still a desirable thing. Studies made just before the war among numbers of families in the country show that when the average income was anywhere from \$1,000 to \$2,000 per annum, these families used an appreciably larger amount of protective foods than did those families whose income was below \$1,000 per annum. Those who received from \$1,000 to \$2,000 used on an average 12 per cent more meat, 10 per cent more milk, 10 per cent more eggs, 7 per cent more fish and a larger amount of vegetables, fruit and butter than those who received less than \$1,000 a year. These same studies would indicate that the more well-to-do families whose income was anywhere above \$4,000 a year ate far more of the nutritionally important foods which give the human body a greater fighting chance to resist infection and disease. This income group, receiving over \$4,000 a year, ate 50 per cent more fish, 34 per cent more meat, 38 per cent more

[Mrs. Nielsen.]

milk, 15 per cent more eggs and a proportionately larger amount of fruit, vegetables and butter than families earning less than \$1,000 a year.

The point is that if the people of Canada were able to procure the amount of food which it is necessary for them to have for their health, we should need more food than we were having prior to the war for our own home market. The same Canadian council on nutrition stated, that in order to bring the adequate level of nutrition of all Canadian families up to the desired point, we would need roughly 1,500,000,000 pounds of food a year in the form of milk, eggs, meat, vegetables, dried beans, small fruits and things of that kind.

It is all very well to speak of Canada, and Canada of course is of greatest importance to us when it comes to the welfare of our people. But we must recognize that our own standards are very much better than those of many others in the world. If you come to consider the question as it affects some of the other nations, you realize what scope there is for the increase of food production if we are to implement those clauses of the Atlantic charter which declare that no people should suffer from want. The report from the mixed committee of the League of Nations before the war showed that in the countries with the largest surplus of food, such as Canada and the United States, there was still a considerable amount of malnutrition, but it was nothing in comparison with the conditions that prevailed in India and China. Take one food product, such as milk. In Canada there are three or four people dependent on the milk of one cow, whereas in China there are roughly fifty thousand people to every cow. This will give some indication of the need for an increase in live stock if we are to supply the needs of the people of the world to give them the health conditions to which they are entitled.

In normal times it is estimated that in China about 8,000,000 people die of malnutrition every year, and in India the condition is similar. Diet deficiencies are causing infant mortality, blindness, crippling of children, and this condition is widely prevalent among India's 400,000,000. In the last disastrous famine in India, roughly 1,000,000 people died from malnutrition. In Africa, Mexico, South America, Egypt, and in other parts of the world you find malnutrition and diseases resulting from diet deficiencies. Estimates made by the same committee of the League of Nations show that of the 2,100,000,000 people of the world, roughly two-thirds, or 1,400,000,000, have always eaten diets consisting of