

tage. So far as I am personally concerned, I concur in the opinion expressed by another honourable member, that neither fear, favour nor affection, nor the possibility of the abolition of this Senate, nor any consideration of that nature, should ever interfere with the way in which I give my vote at any time. But I am particularly anxious to have carried out the will of the great majority of the people.

Hon. P. C. MURPHY: Honourable gentlemen, just a word in explanation of the position I am going to take to-day. I feel, like the honourable gentleman who has just spoken, that measures of such importance as this should not be foisted upon the Senate in the dying hours of the session. Last session, when a similar Bill was under consideration, I voted against the decision of the House of Commons. The present Bill is of an altogether different character. The reason why I voted as I did last year was that I believed that the Federal Parliament had no right to impose its will upon an autonomous or semi-autonomous province. This year the situation is different. The proposed measure gives the province the right of self-determination, such as is laid down by the Peace Treaty, and I feel that it would be wrong to reject it. For the reasons which I have stated I will vote this year in the affirmative.

There was another reason why I voted in the negative at last session. The Bill of last session would have caused all the distilleries and breweries to be scrapped. This year, by an amendment introduced in the House of Commons, the vested rights of those who have money invested in such establishments are protected, and the breweries and distilleries are allowed to continue manufacturing for shipment outside of Canada or to any province in Canada in which beer, light wines or other liquors are allowed to be handled.

Coming as I do from the original prohibition province, I feel that the sentiment is overwhelmingly in favour of prohibition. We must deprecate as I do deprecate, the extreme position taken by prohibitionists. I believe that, especially for the labouring man, beer should be allowed. In the old days the workingmen who took their lunch to their work could get a bottle of cool beer, which helped them to eat their midday meal in the hot days of summer. Now this is all done away with. The working man has now to eat his bread dry or with water, something that I think is very wrong. However, as this Bill is evidently in harmony with the sentiment of a very

large proportion of the people of this country, I will cast my vote in its favour.

Hon. Mr. McSWEENEY: Are the people of Prince Edward Island in favour of it?

Hon. Mr. MURPHY: Yes, nine-tenths of them.

Hon. ROBERT WATSON: As the honourable gentleman has just said, the legislation of this year is changed from that of last year, but I do not think it is changed in the right direction to suit the people of Canada. I think they would like to stop the flow at the fountain head. Some honourable gentlemen objected to the legislation of last year because under it distilleries were going to be scrapped. The people of the country, if I understand their sentiments, want the distilleries scrapped, because they realize that it is almost impossible to stop the sale of liquor until the manufacture of it is stopped. In that respect our legislation is retrograding, for it does not carry out the wishes of the people.

The temperance people throughout the world have been attempting to bring about world-wide prohibition. By this legislation we are going to permit the distillers to make liquor to be shipped to other countries. World-wide prohibition is not going to be secured by such legislation.

As I understand the Bill, it provides that when the question is submitted to a province a majority carries prohibition. I do not think that is going far enough. I think that any law which is to be enforced by fines and penalties should contain some provision empowering a provincial legislature to say what majority it would require in order to pass such legislation.

I supported the legislation of last year and will support that of this year.

Hon. F. P. THOMPSON: Honourable gentlemen, I had almost supposed that my honourable friend was opposed to this legislation, because it did not suit the people throughout the country. I think it is proper that the Senate should remember what the sentiment of the people throughout the Dominion is and should pass whatever legislation may promote better conditions. The expense in connection with the administration of the Scott Act was paid by the Dominion. We have the Scott Act in the county of York, and I do not hesitate to say that conditions in Fredericton have been improved to a marked degree since we have done away with the bar-rooms. Every time the question has come before the citizens they have supported the Scott Act. I think