

one who is sufficiently interested in the matter can provide butter for himself quite easily.

However, I do not believe that enough people will go into the producing of butter to bring about impoverishment of the dairy industry. Nor do I think that that industry is languishing because of the consumption of butter substitutes. If the facts were honestly analyzed it would be found, I think, that such factors as transportation and labour costs have had a great deal more than anything else to do with the economic condition of the industry.

Reference to substitutes brings up a very vital economic principle. From time immemorial human beings have exercised the right of discovering and using substitutes for articles that have become too costly or out of reach. This bill would deny to our people the exercise of that fundamental economic right. If the principle of this bill were to be generally adopted we might be presented some day with a bill providing that for the protection of persons engaged in the breeding, raising and sale of horses, farmers shall be prohibited from using tractors and any other mechanical implements designed to replace horses.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Lambert: Similarly, we might have a bill for the protection of churn manufacturers, prohibiting dairymen from purchasing or using separators. The principle that human beings shall be free to establish their own habits in the use of substitutes for any products is as fundamental as life itself. This bill takes the very reactionary position that for all time the people of Canada may, if the government so decides, be denied the use of a substitute for butter.

Who can tell what butter substitutes ingenious men of science might develop in their laboratories next year? Are we to pull down the curtain on all intelligence by denying the economic principle of freedom to use substitutes, simply to satisfy one entrenched class interest in this country?

When I say that, I have reference to a certain intimation that was made during the debate that this measure followed a recent conference in Ottawa of representatives of the various provincial departments of agriculture and of a federal department. A similar conference is held here every year, its purpose being to review the condition of agriculture and to assess advisable policies as to production and so on for the coming year. The honourable leader on this side (Hon. Mr. Robertson) suggested, and I know, that the policy decided upon at the recent

conference reflected the point of view of the National Dairy Council and the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, and it is upon that policy that this measure has been formulated. Personally I object to being a party to any sort of special pleading of that kind, and for that reason I am going to support the motion to give the bill the six months' hoist.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Cyrille Vaillancourt: Honourable senators, I shall be very brief. After the remarks that have been made by the senator from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck) and the senator from New Westminster (Hon. Mr. Reid), I do not know whether a member from Quebec will be permitted to express his point of view. We should speak not only for our own province, but for the whole of Canada; we are all Canadians, and we love our country as well as our province.

I have three points to make in answer to the proposals of the senator from Kitchener.

Hon. Mr. Beaubien: Waterloo; he only lives in Kitchener.

Hon. Mr. Vaillancourt: I am not a lawyer, so when I want legal assistance I go to a lawyer, put my case before him and get his advice. If I go to a second lawyer, he may express the opposite point of view on the same set of facts. The subject may then come before the courts, and one side will win and the other lose. The matter may be appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada, and on it goes. Whether I am right, I cannot always be sure, but I do my best to see the light.

If the laws respecting agricultural markets are sound, then this bill is all right. My friend from Ottawa (Hon. Mr. Lambert) said that he could buy maple butter in Ontario. I would point out to him that my maple products cannot be sold in Ontario unless they are properly graded and marked; and British Columbia apples cannot be marketed in Quebec unless they are in accordance with marketing regulations. That has been the law for the past thirty years. And now we are questioning the principles behind it. Why are we doing that? Is it because of the introduction of margarine? For my part, that is only one item, and should not be taken too seriously. It must be remembered that if this bill passes, the people who will administer the law are not entirely foolish; they will apply the law with judgment, and the minister involved will properly supervise it.

Again, I say that I am not a lawyer, but I try to reach my own conclusions. The senator from Waterloo (Hon. Mr. Euler) said that Canada has general agreements whereby