

so sure that I can see the matter in just that light, because I think the farmer is choosing the lesser of two evils.

Let us illustrate the point in this way. Give the farmer a chance to-day to choose between absolute free trade, free trade in what he has to buy and what he has to sell, and the situation we have now, and the farmer will hold up his hands for free trade; there is no doubt about that. But he says that the parliament of Canada will not give him that; it will not permit him to buy his goods in the cheapest market. Therefore, he says: when I have to suffer all the injustices of the tariff in what I have to buy, surely I am not going to have free trade imposed upon me entirely on what I have to sell. It would seem to me to be just as logical to argue that because a farmer did not agree with a certain clause in the criminal code, when it came to a point where that particular clause would be of some protection to him, the officers entrusted with the enforcement of the law should say: Now, you do not believe in this particular clause in the criminal code, therefore we will not give you the protection of it. That is the way I think the average farmer looks at the matter. Whether the farmer is right or wrong, we are to-day facing facts and not theories. This is something we must recognize and any government must meet the situation as it exists. Indeed, the fact that the government realizes that was exemplified by its action a few days ago when it accepted a motion of the opposition to cancel the agreement with New Zealand. I say "accepted" because that in substance and effect was exactly what the government did.

Several members on the government benches, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm) for one, seemed to argue that protection was of no use to the farmer. I am prepared to admit that protection can be of no use to the farmer where there is an exportable surplus. We must admit that. When there is an exportable surplus, the world market sets the price, but the Minister of Trade and Commerce and other men who take a protectionist stand would not admit that protection of industry does not benefit industry, and certainly as regards any farm product where there is not an exportable surplus, the tariff, whatever tariff there may be, must apply and must give those in that industry some protection.

Mr. MILLAR: Would that be a lasting benefit?

[Mr. Campbell.]

Mr. CAMPBELL: My hon. friend knows there is nothing lasting. Even the very sphere we are living in to-day is not lasting. We have to deal with things as they come up day by day.

Mr. MILLAR: That is hardly an answer. Would the benefit last even a few years? Would it not immediately be wiped out by increased production and reduced consumption?

Mr. CAMPBELL: It might or it might not, but my point is this—and I am trying to give the farmers' viewpoint, because I am talking with those men all the time; if it applies to industry, if those engaged in industry get any advantage from the tariff, surely it must apply to the products of agriculture so far as there is no exportable surplus. Of course I realize what my hon. friend says. If a tariff increases production and that production gets beyond the needs of the consuming ability of the country, then of course the price will immediately drop to the export basis. There is no argument about that, but at the present time we are a long way off from that situation in the case of butter.

My hon. and genial friend from Weyburn (Mr. Young) had a good deal to say as to principles as applied to members in this corner of the house. I cannot see that there is any principle involved in this question at all. As the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) said a few years ago, I think it is rather a geographical question. The farmer, I say without equivocation, would be prepared to accept absolute free trade to-morrow if he were permitted to buy in the open market. What he objects to is the discrimination that free trade is applied to him simply because he has accepted that philosophy. The result is that he has to buy in a protected market and sell in the open market.

There should be considerable satisfaction to those engaged in the dairy industry at the attention and consideration which that industry has received in the debates in this house. Away back in 1867 we chose the beaver as our national emblem because, I suppose, it was symbolical of industry. The beaver is an industrious little worker, always active. But in choosing the beaver, I think, regard was also had to the material side. The beaver at that time was very valuable. About 1867 we were carrying on a valuable fur trade in Canada. But the beaver, I think, has been supplanted by the dairy cow, and I suggest that we substitute the homely and prosaic dairy cow for the beaver as the national em-