

principally to American buyers, who in their attempts to meet the unprecedented demands for beef in the United States have been paying as much as \$350 for a heavy grade cow. It has been pointed out to me that, if this dangerous trend continues much further in my own province, we shall have to import milk from some other province or from across the line.

The honourable senator from Cariboo (Hon. Mr. Turgeon) took exception to section 6 of the bill. I have read over the bill—not hastily; not once or twice, but a number of times—and looking upon it from a practical point of view I express the opinion that the entire bill is predicated on sections 5 and 6; that the whole bill has been brought in for one specific purpose—to give the government of the Minister of Agriculture power to prohibit certain classes of dairy products or other foods from passing from one province to another. I say that if that were not the purpose we never would have seen this bill here. Can any honourable member successfully refute that statement?

I find the bill somewhat ambiguous, in that in sections 5 and 6 power is given to the Governor in Council to act, while in section 7 it is given to the minister.

I have every sympathy with the farmers who, after raising certain products, find themselves in competition with the products of other provinces and with substitutes. I cannot be accused of speaking on behalf of the promoters of margarine, because I favoured the ban on its manufacture and sale.

I note by section 6 of the bill that power is given to prohibit the conveyance from one province to another of the following articles: milk, cream, butter, cheese, condensed milk, evaporated milk, powdered milk, dry milk, ice cream, malted milk or sherbet. Now, those are not substitutes; they are the genuine articles. In the province from which I come we make very little butter, but we have a big market for fluid milk and powdered milk. I am just wondering whether the passage of this bill would mean that such a product as powdered milk, which is manufactured in British Columbia—and which we think is the best obtainable—would be banned from shipment to other provinces. He would be a poor man indeed, who did not stick up for his own province; so I am wondering what will happen to our powdered milk?

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** It will be barred.

**Hon. Mr. Reid:** The real danger from this measure is that what may apply to dairy products may be extended to other articles. For instance, the poultrymen in British Columbia last year—before the Manchester disease disseminated their flocks—were faced with heavy imports of eggs from Alberta and

Saskatchewan. They appealed to the provincial authorities, and also to me, to see if the sale of these eggs in British Columbia could not be prohibited. But what will happen when this bill passes? Will the Senate of Canada refuse to give to the poultrymen the same protection it would give to the dairy farmers? And what about the apple growers? We know that British Columbia ships apples into every other province; it has even supplied apples to the university in the Annapolis Valley.

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** After the Annapolis Valley apples were gone.

**Hon. Mr. Reid:** The statement made by the university was that they were still available. I recall the controversy that took place at that time: the students were being chided for purchasing British Columbia apples when Nova Scotia apples were available. I can foresee legislation of this nature being extended so as to prevent the flow of British Columbia apples to any other province; and in turn I can see the fishermen of that province asking that Newfoundland fish be shut out, regardless of price. The western fishermen may well ask, "Why should this province be getting kippered herring and smoked codfish from Newfoundland, when we can catch lots of fish in the Pacific Ocean"? I do not think the Newfoundland fishermen get the same financial return as the B.C. fishermen do with the help of their unions. I say to honourable senators, no matter what sympathies they may have for the farmers, that this bill brings in a principle that will have a far-reaching effect.

I never thought I would see the day when the House of Commons would so easily give up freedom of trade between the provinces. Now the Senate, the house that is supposed to protect provincial rights and public opinion, receives this measure in the dying days of the session. I suppose there is a majority in this house today who will vote for the measure, but I warn them what the passage of this bill will mean. The province of Ontario, for instance, will be entitled to protection from the importation of British Columbia powdered milk. When the demand comes for such an extension of the principle of this bill, I hope honourable senators will remember my warning that this measure is bound to bring friction amongst the peoples of the various provinces. Surely we have enough friction in Canada without raising tariff barriers.

Perhaps some lawyer will tell me it is wrong, but let me give my own interpretation of the effect of this bill. We in British Columbia, for example, import potatoes from Washington and California at certain seasons of the year. The farmers can do nothing about it, and the government does not choose