

she may sell her products throughout the world, but I point out that the United States has signed an agreement prohibiting importation of butter except with special permission.

The senator suggested that the sales tax of 8 or 10 per cent on margarine should be removed, to make the product more readily available to the poor consumer. Well, honourable senators, let me put on the record a table showing the costs of the ingredients of margarine as of last winter and as of today, and compare those figures with the price of margarine some months ago and its price today. This is the table:

Type of Oil	Cents per pound Feb., 1951	Cents per pound June, 1951
Cottonseed Oil.....	24.5	.15
Soybean Oil.....	21.1	.14
Coconut Oil.....	24.3	.13
Peanut Oil.....	27.0	17.25

In spite of the above figures, the price of margarine is higher today than it was in February. Poor consumers! Happy manufacturer!

Hon. Mr. Euler: It is still a lot cheaper than butter, is it not?

Hon. Mr. Vaillancourt: This is my last point. Much is said about margarine and what it has done for the poor working man. Take, for instance, a family of six, which by using three pounds of margarine a week instead of three pounds of butter will save roughly 60 cents. But what does that same family pay for meat? It must spend \$3 or \$4 a week for meat because Canadian cattle are being sold south of the border. Yet last week meat in the United States was cheaper by 10 or 15 cents a pound than it was in Canada. Indeed, honourable senators, there are some things so strange that no one can explain them. But one reason that meat is so scarce is that the farmers cannot get a market for their milk, and so cattle are disappearing. Soon we will not only not have butter, but we will not have meat.

My honourable friend from Grandville (Hon. Mr. Bouffard) spoke yesterday about protecting Quebec. We want to protect the farmers all across the country, for they are the builders of our nation.

My last words are: Farmers, kill the cattle before margarine kills you!

Hon. L. M. Gouin: Honourable senators, I am quite prepared to make my few remarks now, but I do not see how we can possibly dispose of the bill before lunch-time. I move, therefore, that the debate be adjourned.

The motion was agreed to, and the debate was adjourned.

The Senate adjourned during pleasure.

At 3 p.m. the sitting was resumed.

Hon. L. M. Gouin: Honourable senators, I will try to be as brief as possible and to consider quite objectively the bill which is now before us. I do not intend to argue the case either against or for margarine. What I want to do is to throw a little more light on the subject. I want to see the whole truth, whether or not it appears to justify my own attitude.

Our colleague from Kennebec (Hon. Mr. Vaillancourt) referred to the differences of opinion which exist so habitually between lawyers, and to the constitutional aspect of the question. On this latter point, I wish to advert to the remarks which were made by the honourable senator from De Lorimier (Hon. Mr. Vien), on the decision in the Margarine Case, and which our colleague from Grandville (Hon. Mr. Bouffard) intended to answer, but did not have time to refer to as he had to reply to the remarks made by the honourable senator from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck) concerning the possibility of an eventual separation of the Province of Quebec from Confederation.

The decision in the Margarine Case, as was stated by our honourable colleague from De Lorimier, is to be found in 1950, 4 Dominion Law Reports, page 689. That case relates clearly and simply to the manufacture and sale of margarine within a province. At the moment we are dealing with quite a different problem: the bill is intended, rightly or wrongly, to regulate international and interprovincial trade.

I am of opinion that parliament has indubitable jurisdiction, under section 91 of the British North America Act, the clause relating to the regulation of trade and commerce, to regulate trade with foreign countries and from one province to another. I do not want to take much time on this point, but those who are interested will find a very clear review of the matter in the report of the reference made to the Supreme Court of Canada in *Re Natural Products Marketing Act*, 1936, 3 Dominion Law Reports, pages 625 and following.

I come now to section 121 of the British North America Act, cited by my honourable friend from De Lorimier, which provides for the free entry into one province of the products of another. But the interpretation of the word "free" in this provision has been given the meaning "free from customs duty". That point was decided by the Privy Council in *Atlantic Smoke Shops Ltd. vs. Conlon*, 1943, 4 Dominion Law Reports, pages 92 and 93. The noble Lords make their own the remarks which had been made by the Supreme Court of Canada in the case of *Gold Seal Limited vs. Dominion Express*