

they are going to snoop long before they get on the trail. That sort of thing will not work.

I picked up a very interesting article this evening in *Farm and Country* for Tuesday, September 18, by Gordon Hill, president of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, in which he refers to a number of naïveties on the part of the Food Prices Review Board. He says:

When one of the chains has been charged in a court because of pricing shenanigans, it is hard to find the board's naïveté palatable.

He was referring to stickers on cans. He went on:

It is just as naïve to wait for voluntary restraint in other sectors of the market place. When banks are licensed for usury, their profits cannot help but skyrocket. Our economy today is ready-made for opportunists. Food processors have reported profits on investments up 50 per cent to 80 per cent over last year. Commodity futures trading has yielded fantastic profits.

There are people who do know what is happening. We in this party absolutely refuse, and will continue to refuse, to accept the idea that nothing can be done about food prices. We refuse to accept the idea that because of the world market it is absolutely impossible to feed Canadians adequately with good food at a price they can afford. If we were talking about exotic foods that have to be imported, perhaps it would be different; but we are not. We have everything in Canada needed to provide a healthfully nutritious diet. We have the grains needed for bread, pasta, and so on. We have dairy foods such as milk and cheese. We have poultry products, eggs, meat, fish, vegetables and fruits of many kinds. It is absurd and untenable for this government or anybody else to say that we cannot feed our people properly. The people on the street will not accept this. Women in the home will not accept it.

If the government keeps the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs looking like a dignified and indignant pharaoh unwilling to take steps to free the people from this tyranny, then he is going to get the plagues and those plagues will come upon all of us—increased misery, insecurity and malnutrition. One of these days he is going to have armies of women besieging his office and other places on the Hill unable to take any more of this business of having the wool pulled over their eyes.

It is absurd to believe we cannot feed our people. There must be something taking place between the producer and the consumer, something that is taking increasingly heavy tolls. If the marketplace cannot provide the kind of diet our people need and can afford, changes in the marketplace must be made.

● (2100)

In the time I have available I intend to deal with one protein food. Nothing is more necessary for a good diet than protein. In underdeveloped countries, dietary malnutrition diseases develop on a huge scale because of the lack of protein. Even in our big cities in Canada there is evidence of malnutrition among newborn children and older children as a result of the lack of protein.

In British Columbia we have always had an abundance of fish and until very recently it was sold at a reasonable price. What has happened in this regard? Let me give you an example of what has happened to the price of sockeye salmon in British Columbia. Up until the beginning of

Food Prices

1972, a 7¼ ounce can of salmon—and I do not know why they do not make it eight ounces—sold for 69 cents. In early 1973, the same sized can sold for 89 cents, and in the summer of this year the cost went up to \$1.15. On September 15 this year, the Vancouver *Sun* ran an article that suggested that callers were complaining that the same 7¼ ounce can of salmon was being sold for \$1.31.

Whole pink salmon, which is one of the lower grades, was selling in British Columbia supermarkets this summer for \$2.49 a pound. Some people will say that the villains are those who demand increased wages. The fishermen's contract for 1973 in respect of sockeye salmon, which is about the second best grade, calls for 50 cents a pound this year, plus some slight production bonuses, and 52 cents a pound for next year. The contract in respect of coho and steelhead calls for 40 cents a pound this year and 42 cents a pound next year, and for pinks it is 20 cents a pound this year and 22 cents a pound next year.

So the pink salmon for which the consumer had to pay \$2.49 a pound this summer in Vancouver netted the fisherman 20 cents a pound when he caught it. There is a \$2.29 spread between what the fisherman got and what the consumer paid in the store. Who gets that \$2.29? Let me point out that, as an additional factor, the labour force in the fishing industry has been reduced by nearly 50 per cent in the last five to ten years because of automation, with the cost in respect of wages consequently going down significantly.

What is the reason for this huge spread? I suggest that it arises because two companies control 85 per cent to 90 per cent of the canned salmon in all of British Columbia and Alaska. Those two companies are B.C. Packers Limited and Canadian Fishing. As far as I can learn anything about Canadian Fishing, eight shares of 15,000 are owned by eight Canadian employees of Canadian Fishing, some 14,900 are owned by Americans, and no one I have been able to contact knows who owns the other three. You might call this a dominant position if you do not like to call it monopoly control, but that is what I call it. I think this more than any other single reason is why we have these prices in respect of salmon today.

Let me refer to some of the reasons we have been given for these prices. On August 4 the Vancouver *Province* ran an interview with the president of B.C. Packers, Mr. Richard Nelson, to this effect:

Prices paid here by consumers of B.C. sockeye salmon will rise sharply in the next several weeks due to an unprecedented strong international demand for the product.

The upward price spiral was blamed Friday by spokesmen for both government and industry on the almost total failure of the Bristol Bay runs to Alaska, largest sockeye fishery in the world.

British Columbia supplies about 20 per cent of that international market, but this year it will supply about 50 per cent because of that Alaska failure. Most of the pressure is coming from Japan and Great Britain. This is the interesting thing about the article:

Nelson said the retail price here will not be known until sockeye runs have ended. His firm withdrew its price offer to local wholesalers a week ago until the market settled down.

I suggest that means all the fish they can get hold of will be sold to Japan and Britain at the highest prices they can get, and everything that is held back here will be held