

these matters for his consideration, and trust that they will receive careful attention at his hands. I hope that, whatever we do, we shall not allow this occasion to pass without showing that we recognize the strong and healthy sentiment that prevails throughout the whole of the Dominion in favour of an effective measure of temperance legislation.

Mr. CHARLES J. THORNTON (Durham): Mr. Speaker, with your permission I should like to discuss some matters which I believe are of importance in connection with this question. I congratulate the mover (Mr. Stevens) and the seconder (Hon. Mr. Marcil) on the ability with which they have presented the case. I take exception to some of the things that the member for North Waterloo (Mr. Weichel) said in connection with this matter. One of the things he said was that we should leave law-making to law experts. I should like to commend to the attention of the hon. member for North Waterloo what has occurred in the legislature of the province of Ontario within the last few days. I would commend to him the words of the Premier of the province and of the leader of the Opposition as well. Each of these gentlemen says that he has the backing of the rank and file of his party behind him. Commenting upon a speech delivered by Premier Hearst last Thursday in the Provincial House in Toronto, a press report has this to say:

Premier Hearst said there was not now nor had there ever been room for difference of opinion as to the evil effect of intemperance or as to the fact that these evils existed in this province, although happily to a much lesser degree than in most places. The only difference of opinion was as to the best method to adopt, as to the best laws and the most beneficial course to take. He deprecated the branding by temperance workers of men with whom they could not agree as foes of temperance. Notwithstanding the drastic legislation the Government was about to submit he was well aware there were many conscientious men who might disagree with the Government and who honestly thought that a prohibitory measure would not attain the end sought.

There is, I believe, a call now—a most earnest and special one—for service and sacrifice by everyone in this Province and in every part of the Dominion, and every reasonable step should be taken at this time of stress and strain that will add to the strength of the country and conserve our resources in every way possible for the great task. It is surely a time for all of us to abstain from luxuries and extravagance in what we wear and what we eat as well as in what we drink.

In view of the dangers which confront us, which perhaps we do not fully realize here, and after full consideration of the question from

[Mr. Thomson.]

every standpoint, the Government has come to the conclusion that the time has arrived when further legislation might be enacted with advantage to the temperance cause and without introducing greater evils than those we are attempting to destroy.

This is strong language coming from the Prime Minister of Ontario. In his answer the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. N. W. Rowell, said:

I want to say this to my honourable friend the Prime Minister, and I want to say it to the members of this House, that while I may have my own view as to method of dealing with this matter, I have already placed myself on record as to what I would do in case the Government would introduce proposals of this character. By the statements I have already made in this House and which I have made elsewhere, I am prepared to stand, and I will give my cordial support to the Government in carrying out the proposals they submit if the proposals are, as I understand they are to be, as outlined in the Speech from the Throne.

I think that answers the statement of the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Weichel) that we should leave this question to law-making experts. He says further that cant, hypocrisy, and deception actuated prohibitionists. He further says—and I commend the statements to the House as the members will know how much weight to attach to them—that the grapes, the apples, the rye, the wheat, the potatoes, are all necessary for making of this luxury that men ought to have. He further states that the men who are pushing this measure are a few well paid organizers. I commend that to the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) and also to the seconder of the resolution (Mr. Marcil). The hon. member says that the more wine that is produced and used the less drunkenness. He says that prohibition is a failure and promotes vice and crime. I have just one answer to make to that: if prohibition does not prohibit, why then do the manufacturers of liquor and the dealers fight it so? The hon. member says that we ought to abide by God's law and that we ought not to say what a man should eat or drink. If God's law says anything, it is full of this: "Thought shalt not"—Prohibition complete.

Prohibitionists have no quarrel personally with the men who are engaged in the liquor business, some of the best men I know are engaged in that trade; their qualities are of the very best and they are men who are needed in the work of the world. Neither these men or their good qualities are to be destroyed, but they are to be put to a better use. In view of something further that the hon. member for North Waterloo said,