

—and this is the essence of it—

(c) sending or conveyance from any province to any other province or from any province to one or more designated provinces, of any class of products that is designated by the regulations as being

(i) milk, cream, butter, cheese, condensed milk, evaporated milk, milk powder, dry milk, ice cream, malted milk or sherbet, that contains fat or oil other than that of milk,

That means margarine, of course.

or

(ii) a substitute for milk, cream, butter, cheese, condensed milk, evaporated milk, milk powder, dry milk, ice cream, malted milk or sherbet.

And subsection 2 says:

The Governor in Council may, by a regulation made under subsection one, designate any class of products as substitutes for a dairy product for the purpose of the regulation if, in his opinion, products of that class are produced wholly or substantially as substitutes for the dairy product.

That again means margarine, although it seems to me rather significant that the word margarine does not appear in the bill at all.

I will pass over paragraph (a), which deals with importation, with very little comment, except to point out that to prohibit the importation into Canada of the products of foreign countries is entirely out of harmony with the spirit which was supposed to govern the proceedings at Geneva some years ago. The whole basis of the negotiations there, as I have said in this chamber before, was that no country should place a prohibitive tariff against the products of any other contracting country. Some products might get in over a tariff wall, but an absolutely prohibited article cannot come in at all. I may say, in passing, that the attitude of Canada at the Geneva convention was an exhibition of bad faith, a statement which I can prove by documentary evidence.

Now I come to paragraph (b), which may prohibit the exportation of these dairy products out of Canada. I have not a great deal to say about that. I would just point out that we are constantly trying to expand our trade, and I do not regard the restriction of our export trade as being a step in the right direction.

Clause (c) is the one which I wish to direct my remarks. This is *pièce de résistance* in reverse, and in my opinion it is thoroughly bad. I have said that I would refer to margarine as a dairy product—in fact, the bill in effect says that it is a dairy product. I would point out, as an illustration, that if this bill becomes law the Governor in Council will have the power to prohibit we will say, a housewife—we will say from Hull—buying margarine in Ottawa and carrying it to Hull to feed her family. And even worse, they could prohibit the sending of margarine from

a factory in Ontario, which I believe is the only province manufacturing margarine—

Hon. Mr. Beaubien: Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. Euler: Is it being made in Manitoba?

Hon. Mr. Beaubien: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Euler: I do not think it is being made in the other prairie Provinces.

Hon. Mr. Beaubien: It is made in Manitoba.

Hon. Mr. Euler: The government could prohibit Ontario margarine from being sent to feed the hundreds of thousands of people living in Western Canada. It would not satisfy me for anyone to say that the government would not do such a thing. When power is placed in the hands of the government they are apt to use it. I would say that such is the purpose of the provisions of this bill, and it must be regarded as such.

Until recently I have had the impression that the clause of the British North America Act which states—and I may not quote it exactly—that products of one province may be freely taken into another province, means what it says. I think that it ought to mean what it says. I am informed, however, that in another case—I think in connection with liquor—the Privy Council interpreted the clause to mean that no province could erect a tariff barrier against the products of another province. That is not as bad as the measure contemplated by this bill: products can surmount a tariff, if it is not too high, but a prohibition means an absolute cessation of all transactions between provinces in any product to which it applies.

I am particularly disturbed by the effect of the passage of this bill upon products other than dairy products. If the government be given the power to prohibit the carrying into another province of any class of product, such as a dairy product, why can it not logically come back next session and ask for similar legislation respecting any other product manufactured in one of the provinces? In the end we would have in Canada ten small countries, each sufficient unto itself, carrying on a prohibitory war, if you like among themselves. The illustration may be regarded as far-fetched, but a condition might come about whereby the manufacturers of boots and shoes in the province of Quebec would be prohibited from sending their products into Ontario. I understand that very good shoes are also made in New Brunswick.

Hon. Mr. Burchill: The best in Canada.