

only instrument of financial aid to the farmers. In one or two years in the past the Government experienced rather heavy losses on potatoes as a result of a marketing agreement, and the benefit of these losses went to the potato growers of the provinces mainly concerned. So it is not possible to assess exactly the cost of price support or price aid procedures by simply taking this one fraction of the price support cost.

Senator POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, I have been listening with great attention to the interesting questions put by my learned colleagues and to the able answers given by Dr. Taggart. Now, there is a question mark in my mind about the term "processed products of agriculture".

I have three questions to put to Dr. Taggart: in clause 2, paragraph 1, subparagraph (a) "agricultural commodity" means "any other natural or processed product of agriculture designated by the Governor in Council..." I understand that it does not apply to rice, tea and coffee because they are not produced in this country.

The CHAIRMAN: We were going to come to that point, Senator Pouliot. If you will read clause 2, paragraph (1), subparagraph (a) (i), it says that "agricultural commodity" is limited to Canada, but the processed articles are not limited to Canada.

Senator POULIOT: Yes, exactly. And now I would like to know if pulp wood is included in that, and the produce of sawmills, shingles and so forth. This is my first question.

My second question is whether hides, leather and boots are also included in processed products of agriculture.

Senator ROEBUCK: You mean political hides?

Senator POULIOT: No. Dry hides, leather and boots, that kind of hides.

And I would like to know if woollens, all sorts of woollens, cloth, etc., wool cloth and clothes are included in processed products.

If those commodities are not included I wonder if the bill should not be amended by adding the word "edible" before "product", making it read: "agricultural commodity means any other natural or processed edible product of agriculture."

The CHAIRMAN: You could say "processed food products."

Senator POULIOT: Yes, exactly. Because otherwise there will be confusion. Will you please answer, Dr. Taggart?

Dr. TAGGART: Mr. Chairman, I think probably the thing to do with that suggestion is to refer it to the law officers who drafted the bill. If it seems expedient to the committee to recommend that the word "edible" be included that would seem to be right. I would think probably from reading the bill that it may be susceptible to being stretched to cover leather and wool, but I do not think it would be the intention of the board to do so.

Senator PEARSON: Wouldn't you refer to paragraph (2) of clause 10 where it reads, "For the purpose of stabilizing the price of an agricultural commodity, the board may exercise all or any of its powers under this section in relation to any food product thereof...?"

The CHAIRMAN: But, Senator Pearson, what is there in clause 10 paragraph (2) that in any way cuts down the meaning of processed product of agriculture in clause 2? There is nothing. Section 10 paragraph (2) deals with only one kind of thing, it deals with a food product that is an agricultural commodity but they do not relate that back to the definition. The definition is broader and therefore it is the definition that controls.

Senator POULIOT: Clause 10 makes no reference to processed products.

The CHAIRMAN: Except that a food product may be a processed product.

Senator POULIOT: Therefore clause 2 should confine it to food products.