

intention in the bill. What the bill says, as plainly as it can be said, is that the government is prepared to pay a price that no one else will pay—a price so high that no one else will pay it. That is what the bill says. And that is the only thing it says. It says if no one else will pay a price at a certain level, the government itself will pay it and take the loss. That is what the bill intends to say, and that is all it does say. It stands to reason that the only time the government will get products is when they are going to take a loss. They are not going to get products when a profit can be made. And that is all the more true if the products are of such a class as to require to be marketed within the year they are produced.

Mr. WRIGHT: That is a different thing.

Mr. GARDINER: It is different only with regard to such products as oats and barley; it is not different in regard to anything else.

Mr. WRIGHT: What about alfalfa?

Mr. GARDINER: Any other products we are likely to handle will be products which are perishable within a very short time. I have in mind meat products, dairy products, fruits, vegetables and other products of that kind. There are only two products which have been placed in a position where this does not apply, and those are oats and barley, with the possible exception of a few beans and possibly alfalfa—and they are not produced to such a great extent. But so far as the others are concerned—

An hon. MEMBER: Cheese.

Mr. GARDINER: We will get cheese when no one can make a profit out of it, at the price indicated, whether it be through a co-operative organization or some other. We shall have no profit, because no one else will take it at the price we are paying. So that to say that we are going to set a floor which will lower the ceiling, when no one can get more for the product, is to say what is not so. We are not doing that at all. We are saying to the farmer, "Go ahead and get all you can for your product. You sell it for what you like, and make all the profit you can out of it. But when it gets to the point where you are not being dealt with properly in the light of past and present experiences, the government will take your product at a floor price which has been prescribed." The only sense in which that can be termed a ceiling is that the government has offered a higher price than any other will pay.

Mr. SENN: Would the minister say at what stage in the marketing of any particular product that floor price may be set by the board?

Mr. GARDINER: If the price is being forced down on any farm product to a point below reasonable level—when you compare the post-war conditions with the period through which we are comparing prices—then the government will take action through this board, and we will take that product at a price.

Mr. SENN: That is very important.

Mr. GARDINER: And when we have done that we will take the product as long as no one will pay more. But the minute someone else can pay more, and someone else will buy on the market at a higher price, it will be marketed in the usual way. In other words, it is almost impossible for us to make a profit out of these products. If it did so happen that we had \$10, \$15, \$100 or \$1,000 of a profit at the end of our period of transactions under this bill, that would go into the consolidated revenue fund. There is no question about what happens to the losses. We would have already paid them and we would have to collect them from someone, and that would be the people of Canada.

Mr. PERLEY: I think the discussion has shown plainly that as far as grain is concerned we understand the situation and agree that there is no difficulty. As to coarse grains, the minister has stated exactly what he proposes to do. Saturday night I was looking for a section to which I could move an amendment to provide for participation certificates, but I was not sure with just what section I should deal. It would appear that a new paragraph (k) should have been added to subsection 1 of section 9. However, I am going to make a suggestion to the minister. Instead of saying, "with respect to the purchasing and marketing of any one commodity" change "any one commodity" to "any product designated." If those words were changed I think it would cover what I intended to deal with.

Mr. GARDINER: It would not make any difference where the amendment was placed; it would just make the bill unworkable. The amendment suggested is that with respect to the purchasing and marketing of each product in any one year the board shall in that year distribute said profit by means of participation certificates. The amendment would have to be worded much more particularly than that if we were even to contemplate accepting the principle of providing participation