

margarine anyway because of the international control of edible oils. It is true that edible oil production is controlled today by an international committee, which is expected to expire this year. However, South Africa embarked upon the manufacture of oleomargarine last year under exactly similar circumstances. Our domestic production of vegetable oils can be greatly increased. The hon. member for Winnipeg South (Mr. Mutch) has offered to develop this phase in his speech, and I hope too that the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Winkler) will tell the house of his own profitable experience last year in one of the prairie provinces in the growing of oil crops.

There are, too, animal fats—beef fats, hog fats—and the production on the coasts of fish, seal and whale oils to swell the supply. This entire argument can, however, be dismissed as pure sophistry, for if the dairy industry sincerely believed that the removal of the ban would bring no oleomargarine on the market, they would not bother fighting for the retention of this ban.

I turn now to those who are for margarine. First and foremost is, of course, the group corresponding to the dairy interests, those who for their own personal and perhaps selfish reasons would like to engage in the importation and manufacturing of oleomargarine and the primary producers who would sell them the vegetable, animal and fish oils for that manufacture. They say—and their stand is a personal one—that nevertheless they should have the same right to engage in their legitimate industry as has the dairy industry to engage in butter making.

There is a second group, however, a very large group to whom more attention should be paid, who are for oleomargarine. I refer to the very large group of consumers in Canada, those today who cannot find butter to buy, those today who cannot buy all the butter they need, those today who cannot afford to buy butter at seventy-three cents a pound. Their interest, too, might be described as being personal or selfish; although I do not think the word "selfish" could be applied to mothers who are anxious because they cannot supply enough butter for their children.

These are the groups most affected by the present ban on oleomargarine. They are the ones who most want to have it removed. A Canadian women's magazine, *Chatelaine*, conducted a poll across Canada and found that 80 per cent of the housewives were for the sale of oleomargarine, although many said they would not use it themselves. Sixteen per cent were opposed. In that sixteen per cent were, of course, included wives of butter

makers, and also those people who, through ignorance or stupidity, think the removal of the ban would force them to eat oleomargarine.

There is, however, another group in the country, a third group, a powerful group of national bodies and institutions who have no direct or selfish motives, but who feel on moral and social and economic grounds that the present ban should be removed.

First and foremost is the daily press, the greatest organ of public opinion in any free country. From Halifax to Victoria the daily newspapers in every city have thundered against this legislation. In editorials they have described it as evil, iniquitous legislation, a blot on our statute books, and have urged its removal. In all Canada I have seen not a single daily newspaper in its editorial columns champion the retention of the ban. Next to the daily newspapers are the national magazines of Canada: *Maclean's*, *Chatelaine*, *National* and *New Liberty*. These, too, have castigated this type of legislation.

Then come the great national bodies such as the Canadian Medical Association, the Canadian Hospitals Association, the Canadian Dietetic Association and the Canadian Welfare Association, comprising all the welfare agencies in Canada. This last named is the most informed on the plight of low-income families. In their fine brief to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) they have pointed out that, in a sample poll in the city of Hamilton, they have found that 55 per cent of the families with net incomes of \$2,000 a year or less, had to cut their butter purchases because of high prices.

Across the country are hundreds of smaller public bodies such as city councils—and I have in mind the city of Ottawa—labour councils, women's councils and veterans organizations; yes, and to their credit, some farmers' institutions, which have added their voice. I know of two in British Columbia, namely the Howe Sound Farmers' Institute and the Okanagan Centre Institute.

This great volume of public opinion demand the repeal of this ban. Where are the great national public bodies who, without selfish interest, have advocated the retention of the present ban on oleomargarine? There is none; no, not one.

In conclusion, I wish to conclude by pointing out some of the political implications of oleomargarine. It is said, of course, that margarine is political dynamite, that no political party dare touch it for fear of incurring the hostility of the dairy interests. One rural member told me that, although he