

the important point—those who advocate this legislation have paid very little attention to the fact that the bill makes it possible, not to restrict, not to regulate, but to prohibit inter-provincial trade, one of the basic principles of confederation.

The Minister of Agriculture, who is an old colleague of mine, is the father of this bill. I know him, or at least I used to know him, pretty well. I have a very high regard for his ability, though very little liking for his policies. I think my honourable friend from Edmonton (Hon. Mr. MacKinnon) will agree with me that the minister's persistence is as great as his success in getting what he wants; and he knows what use he will make of the powers available to him under this bill. It may be said that he cannot do anything except by order in council, which means except with the consent of the members of the cabinet. But those who have been in the cabinet of this country know that when a minister brings in an order in council to cabinet, what he wants generally goes through: other ministers very, very seldom offer any opposition. If restriction is imposed in the case of Quebec, I would not be at all surprised if the Minister of Agriculture, knowing his antagonism to margarine, were at some future date to forbid the people of Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia and the Maritime Provinces having this product, unless the margarine industries themselves were established in those provinces. He might not do that, but I would not be at all certain that he could not be induced to do it.

Hon. Mr. Beaubien: The provinces can manufacture margarine now, can they not?

Hon. Mr. Euler: Certainly, but they cannot deny the right of anyone to take the product from one province to another. The manufacturers of margarine are largely concentrated in Ontario, and they can send their product anywhere in Canada, except to Quebec and Prince Edward Island. If the Minister of Agriculture decided, however, not to let margarine into the province of Saskatchewan or Alberta or British Columbia—

Hon. Mr. Golding: You do not want to insinuate anything like that?

Hon. Mr. Euler: I am not insinuating anything.

Hon. Mr. Golding: I think you have more confidence than that in the minister. I have anyway.

Hon. Mr. Euler: I do not say this with any disrespect to the Minister of Agriculture, but my friend has more confidence in the policies of that gentleman than I have.

Hon. Mr. Farquhar: That is not very nice talk.

Hon. Mr. Euler: I want to re-emphasize that I would reject this bill because it is a direct attack on the rights of the provinces to sell to each other. That is the vital principle involved here.

The suggestion has been made, by a number of those who have taken part in this debate—in good faith, I think—and by a number of others to whom I have spoken, that they are opposed to the principle of section 6 of the bill; but at the same time they have said that they would like the bill to go to committee where amendments could be made to it. I should like to remind honourable members that you cannot send a bill to committee without it first having been given second reading.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Euler: And you cannot give a bill second reading without endorsing its principle.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Euler: Therefore, if you give the bill second reading you endorse its principle, and I am sure that those gentlemen who have said to me that they are opposed to the principle of section 6 would hardly want to endorse the principle of this legislation by consenting to its second reading.

I am directly opposed to the principle of the bill, and to the bill itself, because it is shot throughout with all the implications that we find in section 6. The first part of the bill deals with grading, classification, and so on. I have no objection to that. But in clauses other than clause 6 there are implications of the same thing that we find in clause 6.

It is for these reasons that I think it was perfectly logical for me to move the six-months' hoist and to ask you to reject the bill in its entirety. I do not question the good faith of anyone, including the members of the government, but I think the bill is thoroughly vicious in principle. As such, especially as it comes to us in the dying moments of the session, it ought to be rejected. If you send it to committee, as probably you will, it will at best come back in an emasculated form to which probably the government and the Commons will object. If they do, what will happen in these last days of the session? I repeat the question we have heard so often: What is the hurry with regard to this bill?

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.