

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose that there is a distinction in the case of British Columbia and Quebec in that, as the minister has pointed out, those provinces did not take complete advantage of part 4 of the act, inasmuch as they were never temperance or "dry" areas in the sense that part 4 implies.

Mr. LAPOINTE: They were dry areas to a certain extent but they never availed themselves of the amendment of 1919 which gives the provinces the liberty of asking for a plebiscite to decide the question of prohibiting imports.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So that as the resolution stands there is no Dominion prohibition of imports into either Quebec or British Columbia.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not think there is; but so far as Quebec is concerned, certain provincial authorities think that under their own law they can prevent importation. I have grave doubts however that this would be held as valid by the courts.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I did not mean to raise that point; I simply wanted the situation understood so far as we are concerned. My hon. friend's position, which I think is absolutely right, is that there is no Dominion prohibition against importation into either Quebec or British Columbia. Once upon a time, I may remind the hon. gentleman, he would not have agreed to this legislation; I remember when the previous government was putting similar legislation through the House, certain gentlemen particularly from his own fair province considered it a terrible outrage that we should subordinate the functions of the Dominion to those of the provincial legislatures.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think my hon. friend has a vicious memory.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Unfortunately, a true memory.

Mr. BELAND: Treacherous.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, accurate this time. But I want to congratulate the minister (Mr. Lapointe) on his growth in liberal thought—thought for the wishes and the will of the people, and the desire to give them expression. He is treading in good steps in following the policy of the past government.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I hope my hon. friend will follow me in that respect.

[Mr. Ladner.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have much pleasure in supporting the resolution.

Mr. STEVENS: I have here the minister's answer to the question of my hon. friend (Mr. Ladner), but unless this resolution is the opposite of the one which we have been considering in regard to the Grain Act, so far as its intention is concerned, then I think the minister is in error. He may not intend it to apply to British Columbia, but as I read it, it means that it shall be illegal to import into any province the laws of which provide that the government shall have control of the sale of liquor. In other words, it is doing what I think the Attorney General of British Columbia asked the minister to do two years ago, in a slightly different way. I am not now expressing an opinion one way or the other as to the advisability of it, but I would like to be assured of the accuracy of my analysis.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend will see from the bill that it cannot apply to British Columbia.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister assures us definitely that it does not apply to that province?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, it does not apply.

Mr. TOLMIE: And that will be made clear in the bill?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. Section 154 of the Canada Temperance Act, which is amended by this legislation, is the section under part 4, which has never applied to British Columbia or Quebec.

Mr. LADNER: Has the government not had a request from the Attorney General of British Columbia in this connection?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, that is under consideration, but it is not dealt with in this bill.

Mr. GOULD: The minister stated that certain provinces, Saskatchewan included, had availed themselves of the provisions of part 4 of the act. Does the department in that event issue licenses to individuals living in the province to manufacture beer?

Mr. LAPOINTE: That does not come under the head of this legislation.

Mr. GOULD: The minister admits that licenses to manufacture beer may be granted to individuals living in provinces which have availed themselves of the provisions of part 4 of the act?