

their official journal, the *Canadian Medical Journal*, in August, 1947, had an editorial eulogizing oleomargarine, and concluding with this sentence:

From the economic and nutritional aspects, good margarine is superior to butter.

However I will offer one other authority we should all respect, the government of Canada. That government has a Department of National Health and Welfare whose special duty it is to watch over the health of the Canadian people. They put out many good publications, one of the best being "Canadian Nutritional Notes," published especially for the benefit of dieticians in Canada, especially those in hospitals and schools.

In the December, 1947, issue of this splendid publication there appears an excellent article entitled "The Place of Fat in Nutrition." Let me read one paragraph from it.

Mr. KNOWLES: Any reference to the minister.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Let me read:

So far as is known at present good margarine is a complete nutritional substitute for butter in an ordinary diet. Margarine is made from a variety of vegetable fats and oils, and may have added animal fats. As a source of energy margarine and butter are equal for equal fat content. Margarine may be coloured by the same dye as is used for colouring butter. A good margarine contains 16.5 per cent skim milk for flavour and texture, plus minute amounts of glycerin derivative to prevent spattering in frying, and some lecithin to prevent burning and sticking to the pan.

On the back of this excellent booklet appears the familiar signature of Paul Martin, Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Mr. KNOWLES: I wonder how he thrives.

Mr. SINCLAIR: There may be some financial critics of the government, like the hon. member for Peterborough West (Mr. Fraser), who will denounce as a scandalous waste of public money the publishing of a bulletin extolling a food which Canadian dieticians cannot buy. I take a broader view. I think the Minister of National Health and Welfare, with his usual perspicacity, is merely anticipating the passage of this bill, and getting proper material into the hands of the public well in advance. If such is the case, I respectfully suggest to him that he start his missionary work much closer to home and give a copy of this excellent bulletin to his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), who was reported in the press last month as having told the people of the west that he thought

the introduction of margarine would be detrimental to the health of the Canadian people.

Mr. GARDINER: But not on the ground that it was not a good food.

Mr. SINCLAIR: That was the statement in the report. Therefore I submit that this booklet proves beyond question that margarine today is a pure and wholesome food which can stand on its own merits, and therefore the grounds for the original ban have vanished.

The federal government, under the British North America Act, has the power, under customs, to ban or to put heavy duties on the importation of any foreign goods. But nowhere in our constitution is there given any right to the federal government to ban the manufacture and sale within the country of a perfectly proper article of commerce. This I may say was the view of a great Liberal, W. S. Fielding, the great Haligonian, in the 1923 debate. If any authority has that right, then the provinces may have it as a property and civil right. Therefore I submit to the house as my first point that the present ban on margarine, as far as the ban on the manufacture and sale is concerned, is clearly unconstitutional.

My second argument is an economic argument. The present ban on the manufacture and sale of margarine establishes the butter industry as an ironclad monopoly in this country. The butter industry, of course, hotly deny that. They say that, far from being a monopoly, hundreds of creameries and dairies across the country are all busy producing butter, competing with each other and never getting together to fix prices or restrict production. That may be so. Most monopolies and cartels result when manufacturers who could flood the country with their production get together and restrict production and fix prices.

There is, however, no need for the butter industry to do that. The annual production of butter in Canada, as we well know today, is insufficient to meet domestic needs. More than that, the parliament of Canada, by its legislation, has removed from the field the only competitor which could take up the slack and compete in price. Therefore today we find that there is an automatic fixing of the price of butter in this country, which is set by the cost of production of the least efficient producer, the backwoods farmer on the marginal farm who makes his extra cream into dairy butter. As a consequence, the more efficient producers of the country enjoy a gratifying price. However, the real tragedy of this policy is that it results in abnormally high prices to the consumer, with no real benefit to the primary producer, because in winter when the price is high, his cost of production is high.