

know what it is. I read over the Bill when it was submitted to the House of Commons, but it has been so amended that it has been changed to quite another measure.

The Minister of Justice says: "Let us sit a day or two more." That will not help us to do the work right. The general practice, and the proper one, in dealing with measures of such importance as this, has always been to bring them before the House and give time to read them over carefully so that there can be a thorough discussion on the principle and the details. That would take more than two or three days; but there is only a quorum in the House of Commons now, and suppose we should make important amendments to the Bill here, who would be left in the other House to deal with them? The quorum there is but twenty members out of 212. Is that the way to legislate on an important subject? I do not think it is—it would be contrary to what I believe to be right.

It is no use to argue that something must be done. There is no more necessity for it now than there was a year or ten years ago. Since there is no certainty that we have a right to deal with this subject let us leave the matter in the hands of the local legislatures. That is the logical course to take.

As to the Bill itself, I may say this: as it stands now, though I have had only a few minutes to look it over, it does not seem to me to have received the consideration which a measure of such importance demands. I read one clause a few minutes ago and was surprised to find it in such a crude shape.

I will not say all that I have in my mind, but I believe that there is something behind this Bill—that it has not been drawn from the point of view of the Dominion but from the point of view of one Province. That is the conclusion to which I have come from a brief examination of the Bill itself. The fact that it has been passed in the other House does not prove that it has received the approval of a majority of the provinces. If that had been the case, I would have been forced to the conclusion that the representatives in that Chamber were not true to the provinces whose interests they were supposed to be there to guard. Had they been true to their provinces they would

not have allowed this Bill to pass without raising the constitutional question and entering a protest against such a precedent. If this Bill should become law the argument could be used in the Courts that this Parliament believe the subject to be one within their jurisdiction. We know very well that where doubt exists such an argument can be used with effect. Undoubtedly a difficulty exists but there are principles of law by which it can be solved, I say we would not be true to the provinces which we represent if we were to allow the Federal Power to deprive the Provincial Legislatures of rights which they have exercised during the past 16 years. That is my argument and I believe that it is a sound one. I am therefore prepared to vote for any amendment to the effect that there being no certainty as to the right of this Parliament to deal with this question the Bill ought to be allowed to stand until there is a final decision upon the constitutional question.

HON. MR. POWER—The Minister of Justice made a remark a little while ago which I think was calculated to leave hon. gentlemen under a misapprehension. He intimated that there was a consensus of opinion amongst legal men to the effect that this legislation is necessary. I need only call the attention of this House to the fact that, when a motion was made by the right hon. leader of the Government in the other House for the appointment of a committee to deal with this question, the gentleman that leads the Opposition, and who is admitted to be a good authority on legal and constitutional questions, made a most exhaustive and powerful speech going altogether to show that the Federal Parliament had nothing to do with this question, and had not the power to interfere with the granting of licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—He did not move in that sense.

HON. MR. POWER—He moved at the beginning that the committee should not be appointed.

HON. MR. PLUMB—He said it should be dealt with by the whole House.

HON. MR. POWER—It is not fair for