

real Star that they will not be allowed to circulate in Ontario unless these liquor advertisements are omitted.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: They have done it in the United States.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I confess that the section will prove very drastic if it is lived up to and if the Ontario Government is sincere. Immediately after this Bill is sanctioned we will have a test of its sincerity. If it is sincere it will prohibit these papers from circulating in Ontario.

Mr. MARCIL: I find in the Montreal Gazette of to-day two advertisements, one for "Molson's Extra Mild Ale" and another for "White Horse, the pride of the Army."

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Rainville): We are not on clause 2 yet.

Mr. DOHERTY: We are on clause 1.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Mails not to be used for circulating liquor advertisements, etc., in province where such advertisements are prohibited:

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Last year I very strongly supported legislation of this character, and it is a matter of more than ordinary satisfaction to know that the province of Alberta, at the last session of the legislature, availed itself of the very provision of the statute that we then passed. I submitted at that time that any province might pass legislation limiting the quantity of intoxicating liquors that any of its citizens might have in his possession, and that once that limit was imposed by provincial legislation, it followed that by virtue of the legislation we then passed, any attempt on the part of any person either to ship or to import into that province a larger quantity than the quantity fixed by the law of the province would be a violation of the law and subject both the importer and the shipper to the penalties that are provided. So that, on the first day of July of this year, there came into force a statute passed by the legislature of Alberta which provides that if any individual has in his possession a greater quantity than one pint of intoxicants, he shall be subject to the pains and penalties provided by the statute.

Mr. CARVELL: Not even a "square-face."

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Not even a "square-face"—and a larger quantity of beer. It follows that in that province to-day, if the firm in Montreal to which my hon. friend has just referred, endeavoured to ship to

[Mr. Lemieux.]

the city of Calgary, consigned to me, a case of whisky, I should be liable under the terms of the Act of last session, and the shipper would also be liable because of the shipment into Alberta of a larger quantity than by the law of the province I could have in my possession. Therefore, this statute in actual practice is working out to the very end that was sought; and by and by, when public opinion has become educated, and there is behind the law that sanction of public opinion without which no statute can become effective, the legislature will declare that it is an offence for any of its citizens to have any quantity of intoxicants in his possession. When that moment arrives, as it will arrive, any shipment from Ontario or British Columbia into that province will be a violation of the provisions of the statute and prohibition will be an accomplished fact.

My hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) referred to the fact that the Federal Government might have enacted a statute forbidding the manufacture of intoxicants. But I desire to point out to him that large investments have been made in this country for the manufacture of intoxicants, not necessarily for the use of the Canadian people, and for my part, while I am content to see placed upon the statute books of my country, province and Dominion alike, legislation which will bring about prohibition, I am not yet so ambitious as to desire to impose my views as to sumptuary legislation upon the minds of those who may desire to import Canadian whisky into their own country. The enactment of temperance legislation goes on in Canada and if we were to carry the laws on the statute books to their ultimate end these intoxicants could find a market only outside of Canada and in those countries that may desire to use them. That is the position. I do not believe that my hon. friend would think that it would be proper on the part of the Canadian Parliament and people to say: We will forbid you to manufacture for those people in South America who like Walker's whisky or a form of gin that is manufactured. If these people see fit to use these intoxicants they must be the best judges as to what they want. I would resent very keenly the people of South America undertaking to determine what I should eat or drink. If they desire to use intoxicants in that manner, I submit, we should not prevent them. If we so desire, legislation looking to the accomplishment of prohibition in Canada, can be made absolutely effective. The province of Alberta is now on the highroad to that end. As far as