

in every province of Canada will some day have the benefit of consuming coloured margarine.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: And without a sales tax.

Hon. Mr. King: If they wish to consume it.

Hon. Mr. Euler: Yes, if they wish it. I for one would not lift a little finger to prevent the people of any province from consuming and enjoying this wholesome and comparatively inexpensive food.

At this point I want to note a remark of the honourable senator from Montarville (Hon. Mr. Godbout), a former premier of Quebec, who, in reflecting on the healthfulness or wholesomeness of margarine, damned it by saying "It is not a poison." I am afraid he is completely out of touch with modern thought if he does not know that the highest medical authorities in the United States, Canada and other countries have stated that margarine is as wholesome and nourishing as butter. I could not allow the honourable senator's remark to go without contradiction. He also said something about "pressure groups" being behind this legislation. I do not know whether they are or not, but I have not much doubt that the Minister of Agriculture received at least a little pressure, and I suppose that he did not need a great deal of pressure, to induce him to bring in his legislation. If my honourable friend is looking for an example of a pressure group in action, I think I can give it to him. When the Supreme Court decided in effect that the sale of margarine in this country was entirely legal, the manufacturers immediately produced a coloured brand. In passing, I might tell my honourable friend the leader of the government (Hon. Mr. Robertson) that this supply of margarine came on the market within three weeks after the prohibitory law was declared unconstitutional, and not three years afterwards, as he predicted would be the case.

Hon. Mr. Robertson: Conditions change.

Hon. Mr. Euler: Although the Premier of Ontario said that he was not going to interfere with the colour of margarine, for some reason or other—and I am quite sure it was through pressure from some quarter—he had a law enacted to prohibit the colouring of margarine; and his example was followed in all the other provinces. I assert that there was a pressure group behind that action; and I will also say that that term describes very well the Federation of Agriculture.

However, I did not rise for the purpose of discussing the question of margarine. It is not the chief and vital factor in this bill or in this debate. The issue goes much deeper.

Of course I am and always have been interested in the question of margarine, and as I said yesterday, I have taken a great deal of satisfaction in the fact that its manufacture and sale are legal in most of the Canadian provinces. But as regards this bill, margarine comes only incidentally into the picture. My objection to the bill rests entirely on what I regard as its vital principle: that it would give authority to the executive to restrict—no, more than that—to prohibit trade between the provinces. That is contrary to the spirit at least, of the constitution of this country.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: And the letter.

Hon. Mr. Euler: I think it most reprehensible that parliament, as far as the Commons is concerned—perhaps also as far as the Senate is concerned—is ready to surrender a power which should never go out of the hands of parliament itself. That is my chief objection to the bill.

In that connection I may have gone a little farther afield than was my original intention; so I want to make it clear that my opinions about margarine have nothing to do with my motive in proposing my amendment or in making this speech. Nothing in this bill is devised to prevent the manufacture of margarine in Ontario or any other province. But I have already voiced a suspicion, the reality of which was acknowledged yesterday when my honourable friend from Grandville (Hon. Mr. Bouffard) said that what was wanted under this bill was the right to prevent the people of Hull and vicinity from coming to Ottawa, buying a few pounds of margarine and taking it home for the benefit of their families. My honourable friend was very frank about it. I suspected all along some motive of that kind: that was the only reason I mentioned the matter of margarine at all.

This debate, as I see it, has presented four more or less outstanding features. First, the greater number of those who have spoken expressed themselves as, in whole or in part, against the principle to which I have just referred, that is, interference by the federal government in trade between the various provinces. Second, those who supported the bill—and I think I must include the last speaker—spoke entirely from a provincial and not a national standpoint.

Hon. Mr. Vaillancourt: No, sir.

Hon. Mr. Euler: Third, the course of the discussion has confirmed my suspicion that clause 6 is definitely designed to restrict the use of margarine in certain parts of the country, and that it may be used, and I suspect will be used if the bill becomes law, to limit production, and sale in other provinces. Fourth—and this, it seems to me, is