

sidy might be withheld. I do not know that any notice was ever sent out. I rather think not. This traffic could not be carried on to any great extent if the government employees did not connive at it. If the government employees were determined that they would not be any party to it but would do the best they could to prevent it, and if the officers of the steamers subsidized by the Government would act in the same way, the traffic, so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, would be practically stopped. I would like it very much if the Minister of Justice, and the Government generally, would take any action they could along that line. We are peculiarly situated in Prince Edward Island, because practically the whole traffic is carried on between that province and the mainland by government-owned railways and steamers, and the smaller portion is carried by the subsidized steamers. I think something ought to be done to prevent the traffic.

Mr. DOHERTY: Government employees and employees of the steamships are subject to penalties under the Act, as everybody else is, but quite apart from that, I quite recognize that anything that can be done to impress upon them the necessity of being law abiding citizens ought to be done, and I shall be glad to call attention to what the hon. gentleman has stated.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: At whose instance is this amendment introduced? Is it at the instance of the Provincial Governments, or any of them, or temperance societies?

Mr. DOHERTY: The suggestions come from different directions. The principal sections are concurred in by the commission in Ontario charged with the administration of the provincial law and by people very much interested in the enforcement of the prohibitory law, I might say in a special way, in New Brunswick.

Mr. MURPHY: What commission in Ontario is that to which the minister refers?

Mr. DOHERTY: I cannot give the official designation of it, but I understand that, in the operation of the provincial prohibitory law, large powers are entrusted to a body which I believe—I have had the pleasure of meeting the head of it—is called a commission.

Mr. MURPHY: The Ontario Government Liquor License Commission?

Mr. DOHERTY: The authority constituted under the provincial Act to see to its ad-

ministration. Representations have come from New Brunswick, and strong representations from different associations interested in the promotion of temperance, in support of such of the provisions as are new. As I have intimated, one of the provisions—and it is an important one—seeks to reintroduce and to replace in the Act of last session a section which the Senate struck out. That provision we are introducing now in fulfilment of a promise, made when the Bill came back from the Senate last year and was accepted with that clause struck out, that we would again ask the House to pass the section and send it back in order to afford the Senate an opportunity of reconsidering its action.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Act which we passed last year is to give effect to different temperance legislation passed in different provinces. So far so good. If this amendment in the first section is asked for by the temperance societies, I have nothing more to say. But it seems to me that it is opening the door to very severe abuse and not making the enforcement of the law easier. Drug stores are places in which such legislation may be violated, and it is a well known fact that in many sections drug stores supply liquor. Suppose a druggist imports a certain quantity of liquor. If you ask him what he is importing it for, he will say, with some appearance of reason, that he is not importing it for beverage purposes, but that he requires liquor in the preparation of his drugs. Drugs are frequently prepared with alcohol, and this provision is supplying a good reason for the druggist to say: I want it in my own business. The effect may be to break the law.

Mr. DOHERTY: As I said a few moments ago, this suggestion came from gentlemen representing the commission in Ontario, and was with a view to making our law strike at those things which the provincial laws prohibit. As our law stands at the present moment, it is too wide in this sense that it applies to all intoxicating liquor. As I have pointed out, it is well known that large quantities of alcohol are used for purposes that have nothing to do with beverages, and none of the provincial laws so far purport to prohibit the sale of liquor for such other purposes. We, therefore, find ourselves with a law which is intended to aid provincial legislation, which strikes at something at which provincial legislation does not strike at all. My attention was called to the matter solely in the way I mentioned, and it seemed to be