

stances in the Canadian market. The hon. Minister himself has stated that butter which they rejected as not fit to send to England realized 21 cents in Montreal. I am afraid he is mistaken; but 5 cents per pound more was obtained according to his statement for inferior butter sold in Montreal than was obtained for selected butter shipped to England.

Either the Government were not sufficiently careful or the experts were not sufficiently careful. The whole scheme was an attempt on the part of those not in the business to interfere with the natural course of business and to take out of the hands of those who understood the business a particular branch of trade, and place it in the hands of amateurs who know nothing about its practical side. I am very glad for all these reasons that the Government have seen fit to give up their butter shop business. The reason of the adoption of the policy was so very evident that it is hardly necessary to explain it. When the policy was initiated it was intended to have the elections brought on before this date. It was thought that it would be good policy for the Government to go to the farmers and tell them that the cheese business which had been encouraged, was somewhat overdone, and that butter was languishing, and so the Government were going to strengthen the price of butter and do a good deal for the farmers. That would have been a very nice manoeuvre if the elections had come on at the time originally intended. But in this, as in other cases, the Government's prophecies were not fulfilled. The elections were not brought on, and so we are now, unfortunately for the Government, able to discuss the results of this catch-penny enterprises before they take place.

The Secretary of State laid great stress on the cheese industry. He pointed out that it had been one of the largest lines of export for many years back. I could go further than he did, because our cheese industry, perhaps more than any other, enabled Canada to pull through a period of depression and hard times and make up to the farmers a portion of the loss inflicted by heavy taxation which this Government has imposed upon them. The hon. gentleman is well aware that the farmers have been heavily taxed. If he were not, he would not endeavour to make it appear that the Government would relieve him on his butter. Not one hon. gentleman opposite paid the farmers the compliment that they are men of ordinary common sense.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We have positive evidence of it during the last four elections.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. gentleman thinks the National Policy was the cause of victories at the last four general elections, he is much mistaken. The causes that led

to the return of the Government have been pointed out time and time again, and certainly they have not been due to the satisfaction felt by the farmers with the National Policy.

The cheese industry has been one of the greatest supports of Canada in years gone by, and it has largely flourished on account of the assistance given by the Governments of Ontario and Quebec before the Dominion Government had anything whatever to do with it. The assistance given by the provincial governments took the form of furnishing information. They taught the people how to make cheese, prepare it, and pack it for the English market. The rest of the cheese interest is distinct from the industry of making cheese, and depends on the business capacity of those engaged in the trade. They have shown themselves worthy of the duties resting on them, and they have built up a large and highly profitable trade. But now, the Minister says, that is a warrant for us to begin the butter dealing business, and if that fails, as it is admitted to have utterly failed, it justifies us in giving a bonus on the export of butter if not in the shape of cash payment, in the shape of payment for cold storage. Did they ever pay for cold storage for cheese in Canada or in the United Kingdom? Did any Government ever send agents around to find markets for cheese? I believe that the abstention of all Governments from interfering in the cheese business has been one cause of its great success. If it is thought that the producer of creamery butter, as distinct from the private maker of butter, is entitled to this public benefit, then the Government are in the right.

It must be understood, however, that the plan of the Government is to provide cold storage for creamery butter only, and that the butter made by the farmers' wives, some of which is just as good, cannot obtain the cold storage in a Government warehouse. That is a question for the Government to settle as between the patrons of creameries and the private makers of butter. If the Government are to have a corps of experts, why should not they select the home-made butter as well as the creamery butter. The proposal of the Government is not to favour Canadian butter generally, but only that which is made by the creameries. It is, in fact, a continuation of the whole policy of the Government, to favour the large manufacturer rather than the private producer.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Are you opposed to the principle?

Mr. CASEY. I am pointing out to the House what the Government propose, and I am not saying whether I am opposed to it or not. The hon. gentleman has not yet explained to the House why it is that the Government will not extend the same privi-