

Deer (Mr. Speakman); it was very logical, very clear, but he came to the conclusion that the tiny speck of advantage that might accrue to the farmer temporarily was well worth his support. That is just where I differ with him. Whether the principle of protection is involved matters not to me, but I think my friends in that corner of the house made a mistake in changing their attitude in regard to protection for the farmer. As representatives of farming constituencies they have, I think, made a mistake in allying themselves with those who would have protection; for I believe it would cost the farmer a great deal more than the benefit he would receive. The benefits from protection, as the member for Red Deer pointed out, would be very small indeed, and I am inclined to think those benefits would be lost in a very, very short time. After that the price of butter—and that is the commodity around which most of this discussion has centred—would in all probability be less to the producer than it is now. He would be selling his butter all the year round on an export basis, whereas now in the winter months he is receiving a higher price than the export price. It has been pointed out several times that he is receiving two cents a pound more than producers in the United States, and they are in a highly protected country. I will not detain the house longer.

Mr. KELLNER: Will the hon. member present the same argument in regard to wheat and ask the government to take that twelve cent duty off?

Mr. MILLAR: I am pleased to answer my hon. friend. I think the member for MacKenzie (Mr. Campbell) in his address made the point very clear. When there is a large export surplus it is impossible to increase the price by protection. As long as you can keep production below demand you can protect and benefit the producer of that commodity. But the main argument from this side of the house that I have listened to, and the argument that I stand by, is that in the matter of production it will be easy indeed by reducing consumption and increasing production to have an exportable surplus. I may add another remark: when there is a surplus for export you can protect those producing only if you have control of the output. Take fruit in the United States: the Americans export about seven per cent of their apples; with control they can get rid of that surplus of seven per cent at a slight loss or perhaps at bare cost; which enables them by reducing the home supply to bring that supply below the demand, and then they can protect the apple growing industry and raise

the price of the 93 per cent above export price. I think that is a sound argument. I believe one reason why the producers of butter in Canada cannot be benefited by protection is simply that they have not got control of their output, and I do not see how they can get it, for they are too scattered. They are unlike the manufacturers of agricultural implements who are comparatively few in number and can get together on a gentleman's agreement, and so control their output, selling their small surplus abroad at a slight loss or at a small profit and then compelling the home market to pay a higher price. But that is not the case with the wheat grower, and it is quite evident that with a large surplus it is utterly impossible to benefit the producer of wheat by protection.

Mr. G. G. COOTE (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the debate has already taken up too much of the time of the house, and I think this is due to a custom which has grown altogether too common of late; too much time is spent in indulging in personalities and in criticism of other members, involving charges of inconsistency, apostasy and the like. We would make more progress if we confined our remarks to the question at issue. I am speaking simply for myself. Each member of this house is responsible to his constituents and not to his fellow members. The view that he expresses or the attitude that he takes on any questions coming before the house is his own particular business. If a member favours a measure I think he should advance any argument he may have in support of it, or if opposed he should advance argument against it, but leave questions of inconsistency and the like to the country.

So far as the question of consistency is concerned in my own case, I want to say that I opposed the Australian treaty in 1925 when it was introduced in this house, and I still oppose it. In that regard at least I am consistent. I am not opposed to the government entering into negotiations with New Zealand for securing, if possible, a better treaty, but I do not like to run the risk of voting to instruct the government to do so. I do not like the job they made when they negotiated the treaty with Australia and if they make as bad a job or worse in negotiating a treaty with New Zealand, I am sure I would feel compelled to oppose it and then I might be charged with inconsistency in that I had voted to instruct the government to enter into negotiations but refused to support the treaty when it was brought down. One always runs the risk of being charged with inconsistency in this house; I have found that out since I became a member.