

receive a good deal of commendation from them on my action, but to my surprise they were all buying margarine themselves”.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not in Manitoba.

Hon. Mr. Euler: I ask the Senate to reject this bill, not particularly because of the effect it may have as regards margarine—of which I have perhaps spoken more than is necessary, though I used it illustratively—but because of the bad precedent the bill would set in restricting trade between the provinces of Canada. In that respect, to my mind, it is entirely opposed to the principles of confederation.

Recently the Senate spent weeks, perhaps months, in discussing a more or less futile resolution as to how this body could be made more useful. I did not take any part in that discussion; but if I were to give my opinion on the subject now I would say that apart perhaps from the abolition of this body, the best way to reform the Senate would be for us to reform ourselves by recognizing that once in this chamber we are no longer Grits and Tories or Liberals and Progressive Conservatives, and that we should judge legislation on its merits, for that, I think, is what the people of Canada expect of us.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Euler: Herein lies an opportunity for the Senate to perform a real service. It is sometimes said that we are here to review “hasty legislation” which comes from the other house. I believe this bill is an outstanding example of hasty and ill-considered legislation. It received practically no consideration in the other place, it comes to us on almost the last day of the session, and in my opinion should never have been presented in its present form. The Senate now has an opportunity to reject or to amend it. It is certainly my intention to vote against the bill if it is pressed to second reading. As a matter of fact I am going to move an amendment, seconded by the honourable senator from Leeds (Hon. Mr. Hardy):

That Bill 403 be not now read a second time, but be read a second time six months hence.

Hon. A. L. Beaubien: Honourable senators, it is not my intention to speak at any length on this bill. One thing that pains me a good deal is that on this question I am unable to agree with my honourable friend from Waterloo (Hon. Mr. Euler), with whom I have been associated in political activities for many years. His whole argument has been based on margarine.

Hon. Mr. Euler: No, no.

Hon. Mr. Beaubien: Well, if it was not, he certainly mentioned that commodity very often.

Hon. Mr. Euler: Certainly. I used it as an illustration.

Hon. Mr. Beaubien: The point which concerns me is this. There are in this country 450,000 dairy farmers. The total annual returns from the dairy industry are in the neighbourhood of \$500 millions. That industry is very important not only to the economic well-being of the country but to the health of the people. My information is that there are about seven manufacturers of margarine. I have nothing to say against margarine: I have more objection to certain other substitutes which are sold all over the country and are contributing to the destruction of the dairy industry.

Two important questions in this connection are: 1—Is the dairy industry important to the economic well-being of Canada; and 2—Is it important to the health of our children. I contend that its importance under both these headings is very great. It makes a valuable contribution to the economic well-being of Canada, for if the dairymen were put out of business the harm which would follow would take years to repair.

Some years ago, when my honourable friend from Waterloo introduced a bill with regard to margarine, he argued that the manufacture and sale of this product in Canada would develop a national oil industry in which the farmers themselves would participate; that the production and extraction of oil would form part of their farming operations.

Hon. Mr. Euler: I said it could, not that it would.

Hon. Mr. Beaubien: I do not remember precisely what you said, but I think that was your contention. My information is that close to 98 per cent of the oil that goes into the manufacture of substitutes for milk and milk products are imported. Therefore, the contention that the manufacture and sale of margarine would create an industry in Canada which would benefit the farmers is all shot to pieces. Not only that, but it will be found today that margarine has reduced our production of butter and of fluid milk. If this trend continues there will soon be no fluid milk for our children.

There may be some objectionable features in this bill, but surely my honourable friend from a Waterloo (Hon. Mr. Euler), for whom I have a great deal of regard, will be generous enough to permit the bill to be read a second time. Then it could be referred to the Standing Committee on Natural