

it is the duty of the Senate to reflect in a large degree the sentiments of the people of the Dominion. Our independent position increases our responsibility because we can do just what we ought to do. There is no doubt that the opinions expressed in the Senate in reference to this legislation reflect public opinion. My honourable friend from Middleton (Hon. Mr. Ross) did not think it necessary for us to pass the legislation of last year because the Orders in Council existed for one year after the declaration of peace. He thought matters should be left as they were. The other day the remark was made that there were two ways of killing a cat, which reminds me of how easy it is for a legal man to suggest means of killing legislation. Now the honourable gentleman suggests that we should allow this legislation to stand over until next session. I say let us repeal this legislation next session if we find that it has not the support of the public; I think that is the attitude that we should take. It may be late in the session, but this is not a new question. The progress of all reforms is slow, but demands have been made and will continue to be made in regard to this matter. The platform of one of the new parties calls for the abolition of the Senate. Without giving any special regard to the attitude of the farmers of Canada on that subject I support this legislation. I am not a fanatical temperance man, but I believe that this legislation will be for the common good. The people of the country believe that it is for the common good; and as the people of the country have expressed their views, I am in favour of this legislation.

Hon. R. H. C. PRINGLE: Honourable gentlemen, the Bill that is before us at this session has in it all the elements that the Bill of last session had with reference to the British North America Act and the question of its constitutionality. In this particular legislation there is also involved the question of the abandonment to the provinces of the sovereign powers of the Dominion. I do not wish to enter into the merits of this question at the moment. The whole Bill bristles with constitutional points, and we have, perhaps, an hour to deal with it. (I am going to read something that may interest some honourable gentlemen. It is from the editorial columns of the Pioneer of October 24, the leading prohibition journal in the province from which I come, and voices, I presume, the opinion of the prohibitionists of Ontario. It is headed "In-

Hon. Mr. THOMPSON.

adequate." After reciting the provisions of this Bill, it goes on to say:

This method of dealing with the liquor traffic is entirely unsatisfactory and cannot be accepted by the prohibitionists of the Dominion of Canada. It is open to two main grave objections.

First, it is distinctly an evasion by the Dominion Government of definite responsibility regarding legislation upon this important issue. The duty of a province to legislate is to co-terminous only with its constitutional powers. The duty of the Dominion Parliament also extends to the limit of its constitutional power.

At every stage of progress in the temperance reform efforts have been made by the members of the legislative body approached to unload responsibilities on others.

Then it shows how that has been done, and further on it says:

Now the Dominion Parliament is seeking to sidestep its duty and throw the onus on the provinces. Such a course is not creditable; it is too shifty; it is not statesmanship.

Second, the Bill is inadequate and complicated. It does not deal at all with the exportation of liquor. To permit the manufacture of beverage intoxicants in Canada for exportation is wrong. Now, we are permitting not only the exportation but the manufacture.

Hon. Mr. TANNER: Would my honourable friend be prepared to give them the kind of statesmanship they want?

Hon. Mr. PRINGLE: I would give them anything that is constitutional.

Hon. Mr. TANNER: Would my honourable friend give them a Dominion-wide Act?

Hon. W. B. ROSS: I would.

Hon. Mr. PRINGLE: Come along with it. That is what is asked for here:

It would stand to the disgrace of Canada if we prohibited the traffic in intoxicants ourselves, but allowed the manufacture and shipment to China, South America, Africa, and other countries, to debauch and degrade the citizens of other lands.

It prohibits only the manufacture and importation in and into such provinces as, by an absurdly roundabout process, follow certain procedure and vote upon the question, and allows freely the manufacture and importation into all other parts of Canada.

To call this a solution of the temperance question would be a joke if that question were not so serious.

I do not want to tire the House by reading the rest of the editorial, but in the light of what I have read, and in the light of constitutional questions, no motion could be better than that of my honourable friend from Middleton (Hon. Mr. Ross).

Hon. JOHN WEBSTER: I agree with the viewpoint of the honourable member for Assiniboia (Hon. Mr. Turriff), who said that maybe this was not all that the