

have either interference with personal liberty or anarchy.

We are also told that prohibitive measures are ineffective and that there is more liquor consumed under prohibition and local option than under the license system. If that be true we would naturally expect distillers and brewers to be the most enthusiastic supporters of prohibitive legislation, but their support has not yet been very conspicuous. If we are to judge faith or belief by works, we must conclude that those who are financially interested in the increased consumption of intoxicants believe that their profits will be greater under the license system, and that their trade will eventually be destroyed by prohibitive legislation, should such legislation be generally adopted, and we must also conclude that those friends of prohibition who have no interest in the matter outside of their desire to better humanity and to decrease the consumption of liquors with the evils resulting therefrom, are of a like mind. Surely these people are not all in error. Surely there is some foundation for their practically universal faith as shown by their works.

This question has been before the House on many occasions, and in various forms, but heretofore it seems to have been felt that public opinion was not sufficiently advanced, that the people were not quite ready for complete prohibition for all Canada. That objection can hardly be said to exist now. The advance in public sentiment has been shown by the rapid increase in the number of places throughout Canada where liquor Acts of a prohibitive nature have been put in force, and this advance has been more rapid since the commencement of this great war. The present seems to be a time when this Parliament is in duty bound to enact prohibition for the whole Dominion, because the people of Canada, from coast to coast, are insisting, in tones the earnestness of which must not be underestimated, that we shall now enact legislation for all Canada to prevent the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor, at least during the period of the present war, or better still, for all time. Although I intend to vote for the resolution, I do not think that prohibition should be confined to the period of the present war; I believe

10 p.m. that we should have permanent prohibition and that the people of Canada are in favour of such a measure. If, however, we have prohibition for three years or more, we shall have prohibition

[Mr. Thomson.]

thereafter, if we are to depend on a vote of the people, so that there is not much difference of opinion between my hon. friend and myself. I am in the habit of attending the conventions of the Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association, of which we sometimes hear in this House. At the last convention, which was held recently and at which I made it a point to be present, this question came up and a vote in favour of Dominion-wide prohibition, without any rider attached as to time, was passed unanimously. Further than that, the officials of the three Western Grain Growers' Associations met together a short time ago and passed a similar resolution.

If we are to have prohibition only for the duration of the war, the resolution proposed by my hon. friend from Kings (Mr. Hughes) should also be adopted by the House, because, if we are not establishing prohibition permanently, we should give the provinces and municipalities power to go further than they have been able to go under the law as it exists at present. I am not wedded to any particular plan, and, as I understand that there is considerable objection to amending the British North America Act wherever it can be avoided, other means could be devised whereby without amending that Act, we might accomplish the same purpose as my hon. friend has in view. I have no doubt that the Minister of Justice could frame some such legislation. I had my attention called by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney), who has been heard in this House frequently and always with great attention, to an amendment of the Canada Temperance Act in 1908, and from a careful perusal of that amendment, I believe that the underlying idea and something more might be made use of in this resolution. I refer to section 117 of the Canada Temperance Act which, as amended in 1908, reads:

From the day on which this Part comes into force and takes effect in any county or city and for so long thereafter as and while the same continues or is in force therein, no person shall, except as in this Part specially provided, by himself, his clerk, servant or agent—

(a) expose or keep for sale, within such county or city, any intoxicating liquor; or,

(b) directly or indirectly on any pretense or upon any device, within any such county or city, sell or barter, or, in consideration of the purchase of any other property, give to any other person any intoxicating liquor; or,

(c) send, ship, bring, or carry or cause to be sent, shipped, brought, or carried to or into any such county or city, any intoxicating liquor; or,

(d) deliver to any consignee or other per-