

could have for nothing. But suppose the market did not improve, suppose it got worse; what would happen? Then other countries would see us bonusing our exports to the British market and by so doing reducing the price of butter on that market. What would they do? They would underbid us and a price war would be started with each country trying to undersell the other. You would demoralize the market, and the last condition would be worse than the first. Somebody has said, "Who will get the benefit of it; who will get this money?" I will tell hon. members this, that the farmer who makes his own butter and sells it himself would not have to contribute to the fund, but would receive the benefit of it. On the other hand the farmer who sends his cream to the creamery would have to contribute to the fund, because his contribution would be taken out of his cream cheque. When the butter was sold for the added price the creamery would say, "The cost of operating a creamery is more than it was; our overhead is more than it was, and we will have to charge a higher price for manufacturing and selling." The creamery would absorb the bulk of the increase.

It would be interesting to know who asked for this legislation—not who asked the minister, but whose fertile brain originated the scheme so that somebody else might ask the minister. We know where the agitation came from against New Zealand butter, or butter coming from the Antipodes. It originated not among the farmers, but among selfish creamery interests who had imported large quantities of New Zealand butter and wanted to shut out further importations. They wanted to corner the market and to make a killing, if I may use the term, on the rising price of butter. It would be interesting to know if some such ingenious body was not behind this scheme in the hope once more of getting a corner on the market.

If we do this in connection with butter, where are we going to stop? Already the member for Bow River is asking that we do the same for cattle, and the hon. member for New Westminster is asking for the same thing in connection with eggs. Then there will be apples, potatoes, fish—

Mr. SPOTTON: Bananas.

Mr. YOUNG:—Lumber—is there anything we produce which would not demand similar treatment? And what would be the result? If this takes effect you would increase the cost of living in Canada by at least five or ten per cent. I ask this question: What nation is going to be the first to recover from

the depression? The nation that can so reduce its production costs that it can undersell its competitors in world markets. Here we have a scheme which can have no other result than to increase costs of living and costs of production. Not only that, but the increase that is added to the cost of production in this country will be subtracted from the cost of production in the country to which we are going to send cheap food and cheap supplies. How can we hope to compete with other countries in the world markets when we tax ourselves in order to pay the board of the working men in those countries? We will not have a ghost of a chance. This step, if taken, will tend to put Canada in the background and put us in a position where we cannot compete with other countries. I have used a quotation in this house before, which I should like to use again; I believe it should be repeated on every possible occasion. Bastiat has said "Study all economic questions from the standpoint of the consumer, for the consumers' interests are the interests of the human race." If the consumer can be satisfied he will keep the producer busy. If goods can be placed on the market at the price the consumer can afford to pay, he will buy the goods, and the producer will have the work of producing them. The legislation passed these days however, not only in this country but—

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): How long does the hon. member for Weyburn think the farmers would continue to produce butter at its present price? If they could not continue to produce it, and ceased production, what would be the effect on the price?

Mr. YOUNG: The minister assumes that this scheme presents the only way of increasing the price of butter. My argument is that it will not increase the price of butter. If he wishes to increase the price of butter he and the government with which he is connected must devote all their energies towards breaking down the barriers which are making it impossible to ship goods back and forth across the world. The tariff barriers which the government opposite and other governments are constructing are making it impossible to sell butter or anything else.

The government cannot in this roundabout way raise the price of butter. As I have said by erecting tariff barriers they make it impossible for us to buy or sell anything. If the consumer can be kept satisfied, and if he can be put in a position to buy, there will be a market for goods. Because of legislation passed in this house within the last two years, and legislation passed in other countries, the