

butter at Vancouver in order to affect the market here. The moment a cable arrives announcing that two or three hundred thousand pounds of butter have been loaded at a port in New Zealand for shipment to Vancouver, that is quite sufficient to cause the jobbers to cut down the price in Canada, and that is where the injury takes place.

There is another serious feature, and that is the disposing of the summer surplus. In the west a great deal of butter is made in the summer and very little in the winter. The farmers do not dairy much in the winter—there is the trouble. It is important that they should dairy the whole year round, so as to get the greatest possible results from the business. But there is a surplus in summer that they cannot dispose of. Many men are in the habit of going to the bank; and one man told me he has borrowed from the bank one hundred to one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars for investment in butter which he holds in cold storage to supply his customers during the bare season of the year. He has to pay interest at seven per cent in addition to assuming the possibility of a falling market; so that there are two things he must consider. Now what is the result? Do you think he will take the risk of a drop in the market or assume the burden of paying seven per cent to handle the butter and carry it through the season, when he can make an arrangement with a house in New Zealand to supply him with butter for the winter season, and incur no risk at all? What is to be done with the consumption of the summer surplus? A market will have to be found for it, and if not there will be a drop in the price of butter and a loss suffered by the farmer.

Then my hon. friend made a comparison with oleomargarine. There is no comparison between oleomargarine and good butter. Nobody would eat oleomargarine if he could afford to buy butter. Oleomargarine never was and never will be a competitor of good butter, simply because of lack of palatability. It is not as good to the taste. The only man who will use oleomargarine is the man who cannot afford to pay for butter. So that oleomargarine is not to be compared with butter. On the other hand, butter made in New Zealand is made by experts who turn out a first class article, made off grass when our animals are being barn fed, and it will afford very strong competition at that season of the year with the Canadian product and is therefore a much more dangerous competitor than oleomargarine could ever be.

Another point I have not been able to understand is this: after expending nearly

\$6,000,000 a year on our agriculture; after steadily building up our experimental farm system, which is one of the best in the world, investing money in pure-bred stock, giving money to exhibitions, giving demonstrations in butter making, inducing farmers to handle their cattle better, and now being nicely on the way with an industry in this country, why should we open the door and give the market to somebody else, particularly to New Zealand, from whom we receive no return whatever?

I shall be glad to support the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland).

Mr. C. H. DICKIE (Nanaimo): Mr. Speaker, I wish at the outset to associate myself with the hon. gentleman who has just spoken in extending my congratulations to you on your re-occupation of a position which you so admirably grace. It is rather hard to speak after the hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Tolmie), who has just sat down. He is a product of the constituency which I represent; he votes for me, and I am very proud of the little fellow.

During the last week we have seen in the press more or less criticism of this side of the House for what is called our obstructionist tactics. If a person carefully analyses and studies the personnel of this group of 116 members sent here to do business for Canada, he will have a little confidence and justification in believing that they know what is the best thing to do for Canada at this juncture. We came here prepared to do business, but when we arrived here we saw a government in power that could not—and I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite will claim for a moment that this government can endure. A government in a much stronger position last session had to go to the country, and the reason they gave was that they lacked support to carry on the affairs of government in an efficient manner. This government has not the support it had; it cannot endure; and I say this, perhaps, with a small degree of sympathy for some hon. gentlemen opposite. I think the best interests of Canada will be served if they resign, go to the country and let us have a government that can carry on the public business efficiently. What Canada wants is a good strong government, be it Liberal or Conservative, and a good strong opposition. That is the government this country must have if we are going to succeed, and it is the government we shall have sooner or later. We will continue in the even tenor of our way, talking just as we have been doing, and we think the Jesuitical