

and it is all they can afford to pay. Well then, we say that we pay the difference between 15 cents and 20 cents. That would make it impossible for any other country which produces cheese to put cheese in here at any higher price than 15 cents. I think the same principle would apply in connection with any other product.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Does the minister think that that would apply in the case of processed or cured fish? I wondered about that. We are not the only producers, and if a floor is placed under Canadian production, suppose some country contiguous to Canada which is a very large producer of that type of food product were to say, "That price is good for us; we are satisfied with it," a difficult situation would arise. This suggestion is just an indication of a number of difficulties which will arise. Yet, as I have indicated, I do not wish to see the theory frustrated on that account, because I want something done. I am afraid of the post-war period—not necessarily the immediate post-war period but the period of deflation which in my view is bound to come. As I indicated the other day I do not think that any human being can devise a plan or formula which will take care of the position. I am not sure that this is the true way to do it, because in substance, after all, this is a bonus or subsidy.

Mr. SENN: I could give a very good illustration, it seems to me—

The CHAIRMAN: May I be allowed to point out that we are on section 11, and the discussion has to deal with the regulations, so that I think that as regards the last two sections it is out of order.

Mr. KINLEY: I assumed that there would be some regulations, and I thought that I was perfectly in order.

The CHAIRMAN: In these matters I am in the hands of the committee.

Mr. SENN: Take the case of fruit, of early asparagus and other early vegetables coming in from other countries and which, because they arrive at the first of the season, command high prices. By the time our goods are on the market—and this applies especially to berries—we are met with the clean-up of the fields of some other country, which is dumped in here at any price that can be got. How is the minister going to deal with a case of that kind? Is he going to protect our producers under such circumstances?

Mr. GARDINER: We are setting up a board to advise us how to do that. That is what the bill is doing.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That, I suppose, is an unfortunate admission. There is only one way to deal with that situation, and it is to prevent the stuff from being dumped on this market. I do not know whether the minister is prepared to go that far. Anti-dumping legislation has a place in the economy of a country, under extreme conditions. You may say what you like, but it is the only method by which you can handle this kind of thing.

Mr. GARDINER: That is what I mean by saying that it is not a question I can deal with. It is not a question that the minister of agriculture, whoever he is, can deal with. It is a question which must be studied by the different departments and a report made as to what it is advisable to do under certain circumstances. The question whether what is spoken of is dumping or is not dumping is one I should not like to enter into this morning.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): You have to make some decision.

Mr. GARDINER: It is something which we have been discussing for twenty years or longer, and I do not know that we can get anywhere by discussing it under this bill.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I think the discussion this morning arose chiefly out of the desire of hon. members to see that the producer gets a fair share of the selling price of his products.

Mr. GARDINER: That is the principle of the bill. It is not something which hon. members this morning have brought up.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I said that the members have been discussing that this morning, and it appears to me that the matter might be settled to the satisfaction of everyone if, in determining floor prices for this measure the board used parity prices; there could then be no objection from producers. I thought that was the purpose of the whole bill. With a parity price I think the difficulty would be overcome, otherwise the floor price might possibly be set low because of prevailing conditions in the country at one particular time and if, while the government had the commodity in their control or in storage, the price did go up and profit accrued, the producer would then feel he had had his proper share of the selling price taken away from him. On the other hand, if the parity price were set as a floor price I do not think anyone would have any cause for complaint.

Mr. GARDINER: What period would you base parity on?