

## IMPORTS OF BUTTER FROM UNITED STATES INTO CANADA.

Into Ontario and Quebec.	Imported. Lbs.	Entered for home consumption. Lbs.
1883 .....	169,403	26,740
1884 .....	262,359	39,750
1885 .....	773,055	139,064
1886 .....	932,857	145,925

I took a leading part, and was largely instrumental in bringing about the legislation of last Session dealing with this question, although hon. gentlemen opposite, and the press representing them, claimed all the credit for that measure which the *Globe* says now is not producing the desired result. I may say that when I read this article I was somewhat surprised, and immediately undertook to investigate the correctness of the statements it had made, because, if the figures quoted by the *Globe* are correct, some further legislation would be necessary in order to protect the dairy industry, and, I am sure the Government would grant this legislation to the farmers of this country at once. But, Mr. Speaker, I find the figures given by the *Globe* as being a correct statement, have been manufactured for the purpose of misleading the farmers of this country, and making them believe that they are being injured, when such is not the case. The correct figures were given by the Trade and Navigation Returns. The quantity of butter imported into the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec and entered for consumption in the year 1883, was 115,218 lbs., while the *Globe* says there were 26,740 lbs. In 1884, the quantity entered for consumption was 13,068 lbs., while the *Globe* says it was 39,750 lbs.

Mr. CASEY. For Ontario, or the Dominion?

Mr. TAYLOR. For Ontario and Quebec; the *Globe* only deals with these two Provinces. In 1885 the *Globe* says there was imported 139,064 lbs., while the fact is there were but 4,468 lbs. imported and entered for consumption in those two Provinces. The *Globe* says that in 1886 there were 145,925 lbs. imported, while the fact is there were 59,007 lbs. imported and entered for consumption. I also have a statement of the quantity imported during the last six months of the year 1885 and the corresponding six months for 1886, after the Oleomargarine Bill was passed by this House last Session. During the last six months of the year 1885, there were 148,751 lbs. entered into the whole Dominion, and during the last six months of 1886, there were 86,696 lbs. entered for consumption in the whole Dominion. But 78,439 lbs. of that was entered in British Columbia, leaving but 6,167 lbs. for the balance of the Dominion for the last six months of 1886, after the Oleomargarine Bill was passed. For Ontario and Quebec, the quantity was 5,237 lbs. But the *Globe* goes on further to make some other points in dealing with this matter. It says:

"Why upon earth should one single pound of American butter come into Eastern Canada and pay four cents a pound tax, seeing that Canada exports butter largely to the United States? The answer is not very difficult. The alleged American butter which comes into Canada cannot be butter, but must be oleomargarine. Otherwise, why should the consumption of American 'butter' in Eastern Ontario and Quebec have been multiplied by six in four years' time? Surely the efficiency of our dairymen has not decreased during that time. On the contrary, has it not increased to a most remarkable extent? If there is any other than an oleomargarine explanation of this phenomenon we should like to know it."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the *Globe* that it is unnecessary to import butter for home consumption into Canada, and also agree that our country is making rapid and substantial progress, that our dairy industry is progressing rapidly; but I disagree with the statement that 145,925 lbs. of butter were entered for consumption in 1886 for the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, while the fact is that only 69,007 lbs. were entered in those two Provinces in that year, and the great bulk of that was previous to the passing of the Oleomargarine Bill, because since the 1st of

Mr. TAYLOR.

July, 1886, up to the 1st of January, 1887, there were 5,237 lbs. entered; which proves conclusively that the passing of that Bill has acted as a prohibitory measure, practically. The *Globe* makes another reference. It says:

"And as to the large quantity of American butter which is imported and re-exported—is there any guarantee that this, too, is not oleomargarine? And is it not sent abroad as Canadian butter, to the great damage of the none too good reputation of the real article?"

Well, with that part of the subject I am not prepared to deal, for I am not conversant with the bonding regulations of this country. I do not think, however, that it is possible to import into this country American butter and export it again to the English market as Canadian butter. However, I will let the Minister of Customs deal with that matter, as he is conversant with the regulations concerning importations in bond and exportations, as this charge is directed against the management of his Department. The next point the *Globe* makes proves conclusively in my mind that it has become an out-and-out protectionist as far as the farmers of this country are concerned. I do not know whether it made the statement when the Oleomargarine Bill was before the House, but it says:

"When the Oleomargarine Bill was before the House of Commons last Session we expressed the opinion that there is no way of excluding oleomargarine from this country save by forbidding the importation of butter. There is not a Custom-house officer in the country that can tell oleomargarine from butter. Even the leading dairy scientists have not yet agreed that there is a perfect test between the two articles. We again say that the only way to protect our dairymen from the competition of oleomargarine is by forbidding the importation of butter."

I am glad that since the hon. leader of the Opposition made his Malvern speech, the *Globe* has fallen into line, and is now an out-and-out protectionist in the interest of the farmers of this country, and in order to give protection it goes in for prohibition, and would prohibit an article being brought into this country of which we can manufacture enough to supply the home demand. This may be one way to deal with the question, but it might possibly be called a Retaliatory Bill if we were to prohibit the butter of the American and English farmers. I think the better way would be for the Government to raise the duty on butter to eight or ten cents a pound, and that will effectually prohibit oleomargarine being imported into the country and passed off as butter on the Custom-house officers, as I admit it is nearly impossible to tell a genuine article of oleomargarine from a genuine article of butter. But the *Globe*, when trying to raise a feeling of antagonism between the farmers and manufacturers of this country, says:

"The Government would be fast enough to do this"—

To prohibit butter coming into the country altogether—

"were it a lot of subsidised and tributable manufacturers who were concerned, instead of the farmers."

I wonder the *Globe* does not remember that the leader of the Opposition said in his Malvern speech, that if he was returned to power the manufacturers would have nothing to fear. The *Globe* appears to have forgotten that statement, and it intimates, and in fact insinuates, that with the present Government manufacturers are a favored class to the detriment of the farmers, and it gives a long string of figures purporting to have been taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns as a correct statement, in order to prove its assertion. But the statement it has given is not correct in any particular. I have given, in my opinion, the correct figures as I gather them from the Trade and Navigation Returns; but, in order to verify them, I move the motion now before the House.

Mr. CASEY. I think the hon. member must know that he is in error with respect to the claim he puts forward for credit as regards the prohibition of the importation of oleomargarine, for there is no doubt as to where the credit for the prohibition should be given. The hon. gentleman introduced a Bill, not to prohibit the importation of oleo-