

*Dairy Industry Act*

had received twenty letters for oleomargarine to every one against, that one against felt more intensely than the other twenty combined. He has, of course, what is called an open mind in the matter. These, however, are matters of political expediency, and great political parties should base their actions on high principles, not on vote-catching expedients.

Let me therefore turn to an examination of the principles of each of the major parties in the house in relation to this ban; and, if I do so unfairly, I shall welcome correction. Let me, first of all, take the Conservative party. One of the great historical principles and practices of that party has been the principle of protection, a perfectly honourable political philosophy which, at various times in our history, has won great support in this country. Its basis is the fact that infant industries in a young country do need a measure of aid so that they can compete with well-established industries in older countries, such aid being given by duties on the importation of products from foreign lands or by an outright ban. The purpose of such a policy is, however, not to stifle industry within the country. Its purpose was to encourage every type of industry within the country.

Thus while the Conservative party, believing in protection, might endorse the ban on the importation of foreign oleomargarine or might support a duty on foreign margarine, it would do so as a measure of encouragement to the manufacture of margarine and butter within the country. I never have understood the Conservative policy of protection to extend to stamping out competitive industry within the country. There is only one place where I have ever heard that practice called protection, and that was in Chicago twenty years ago. Al Capone and his gang used to supply that type of "protection" to businessmen; for a high fee they rub out any rival business in any area by simply eliminating that competition by intimidation and violence. And that is the type of protection which this legislation affords the butter industry.

Mr. CASE: Leave Al Capone out.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I will tell the hon. member for Grey North, who is a Progressive Conservative that I am right in this view, as shown by *Hansard* of 1923, where the leaders of the Conservative party of that day the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen, the Hon. R. J. Manion, who was later a leader, made splendid speeches in this strain and voted for margarine, as did the Conservative party by a 19-13 vote.

[Mr. Sinclair.]

I turn next to the C.C.F. party. It is conceivable, to me at least, that in the planned and regimented state they hope one day to govern, their master planning board might order that only one of a variety of similar products should be produced, for economy of production. If such a choice were made, the product chosen would surely be that which, measuring up to the required standards, would be the cheapest and easiest to produce, so that there would be a saving in labour to the producer and a saving in money to the consumer. If that were the case, then certainly margarine would be the obvious choice over butter. The C.C.F. have always held themselves out to be the implacable foes of private monopoly. That should certainly include the butter monopoly. They have always shown real concern over the plight of the poor and those with low incomes, so I cannot see how they can condone such a monopoly which leaves butter short in supply, high in price to the consumer and permits great companies to make exorbitant profits.

I turn now to the Social Credit party. I must confess, as on previous occasions, that I have never been able quite to grasp their financial theories. But this I do know about them. No party in this house has been more vigorous in its championing of private enterprise, meaning by that free competition between business, each striving to produce the best and cheapest product. That being so, they can scarcely condone the stamping out of one industry in this country to provide an unrestricted field for another.

They believe in an economy of abundance as against an economy of scarcity. No one can deny that our present butter economy is one of scarcity. Butter is in short supply and high in price, a condition which can be cured only by the economy of an abundance of margarine.

I now turn to my own party, the Liberal party.

Mr. KNOWLES: This is going to be good.

Mr. SINCLAIR: If there is one party in this house which, as a matter of principle, should fight against this ban, it is the Liberal party. That is because of the reasons embedded in our very origin as a political force. One hundred and fifty years ago there were only two British political parties, the Tories and the Whigs. They differed only in one particular. The one party thought that power should be vested in the king, while the other thought that power should be vested in their own privileged hands.

On the scene began to appear the first reformers and radicals, men who were appalled