

Hon. Mr. Euler: If you are trying to help my argument, I thank you. The Province of Ontario, where I live, makes boots and shoes, furniture and rubber goods. The same articles are produced in Quebec. The government might pass regulations to prevent the shipment of such goods from Ontario to Quebec.

Hon. Mr. Beaubien: They could not do it under this bill.

Hon. Mr. Euler: But my point is that a precedent established respecting dairy products can well be applied to other products. Indeed, the fish caught in Nova Scotia might well be prohibited from shipment to New Brunswick; British Columbia might be prevented from sending its fish and forest products to the other provinces of Canada; Saskatchewan coal might not be allowed into the province of Alberta, and vice versa. The passage of this bill would establish an absolutely vicious precedent, contrary to the whole spirit under which confederation was accomplished.

In conclusion I shall refer once more to the matter of margarine, because I am quite sure that this item was not absent from the minds of those who inspired this bill. Look at the record of the government, if you will, respecting margarine. In 1946 a bill introduced in this house to provide for the legalized manufacture and sale of margarine was defeated. In 1947 a similar bill was introduced, and was again defeated. The bill introduced in 1948 met the same fate. Then this house—and I think it deserves credit for it—passed a resolution requesting the government to submit the question of the constitutionality of the prohibitory law to the Supreme Court of Canada. Somewhat to my surprise—and I need not mention the reason for it—the government complied with the request and submitted the case to the Court. The government argued at the hearing that the prohibition was constitutional. This was just another move in its opposition to margarine. Notwithstanding that, the Supreme Court of Canada declared the law unconstitutional and *ultra vires* of the federal parliament. The manufacture of margarine—the coloured product—began at once. Some months later the Province of Ontario, followed by the other provinces, with two exceptions to which I shall refer later, decreed that the manufacturers of margarine should not be permitted to colour their product. The sole purpose of this move—and I do not think it can be denied—was that the housewife, by reason of being put to the trouble of messing about in her kitchen with the colouring of margarine, would be discouraged from buying it and would buy butter.

Hon. Mr. Dupuis: No; that is not the reason.

Hon. Mr. Euler: That is the only reason.

Hon. Mr. Bishop: There is no other reason.

Hon. Mr. Dupuis: The purpose was to prevent margarine from being confused with butter in the retail stores.

Hon. Mr. Euler: It cannot be. All packages are marked. You cannot go into a retail store and buy margarine except it be in a clearly marked package. I know that there is a good deal of margarine consumed in Quebec, the province of the honourable senator, so the provincial government's prohibition of the manufacture and sale of margarine in Quebec is a most unjust discrimination against the consumers of that province. The same statement, though perhaps not in a similar degree, is applicable also to the Province of Prince Edward Island. After the Supreme Court made its decision, the manufacture of margarine was proceeded with, mainly in Ontario. Then the Dairy Council of Canada decided—in its wisdom, if one chooses to put it that way—to appeal the matter to the Privy Council, and did so. Some of us defended in that court the consumer of margarine, and again we had arrayed against us the Government of Canada, which sent to the Privy Council in Great Britain, as it had sent to the Supreme Court of Canada, the Deputy Minister of Justice. Again we defeated the opponents of margarine—a result, I may say which gave me considerable satisfaction.

Last year I moved in this house that since margarine was a recognized article of food, consumed by millions of Canadians, it should be exempt from the sales tax, from which practically all food products are exempt. The motion was rejected. The government, of course, took no action about it. This year, in the present budget, another 2 per cent was added to the sales tax, with the result that margarine is now subject to a sales tax of 10 per cent, which is not paid by its sister products to which I referred some time ago. That imposition adds, I suppose, from three to four cents a pound to the price of margarine. Yet what a boon this product has been to the people of this country. I suppose no one will deny that, in spite of the outrageous ban on colouring, people buy margarine more and more.

I was mildly amused yesterday when a friend and colleague of mine remarked to me, "You know, I have always voted against your margarine bill". "Yes," I said, "I know". He said, "I thought that when I went home to my farmer friends I would