

some definite action in regard to this matter. I know that there is a feeling against drastic legislation of this kind. Many of our people are perfectly willing that restrictive measures should be adopted. Now, the argument used is that if you pass a law of this kind and it is not observed, it will give our young people who are growing up a contempt for all law. I have had some experience in regard to restrictive legislation and my opinion is that if there is an evil in the country it is pretty hard to license and restrain it. Talk about people having a contempt for the law and violating the law! I would ask any hon. member of this House if there is any law more persistently violated than the license law designed to restrict and restrain the liquor traffic. I have had some experience with these matters and my opinion is, after thinking it over, that if you have an evil in the country it is almost impossible to license and restrain it. The best thing to do is to stamp it out. That is why I have taken up this matter in connection with this cigarette business. It is not because I have very much personal knowledge of the subject. I live in a rural constituency, in a small village in which I do not think there is so much harm being done as in larger places. I am sincere in the view which I am upholding because I think that we should not handicap our boys in the struggle of life. I think everything should be removed from them that will injure them or which will interfere with that physical ability which is necessary to enable them to undertake any position in this democratic country, which may be open to young men and that they may have the mental and moral qualities which will enable them to fill creditably any position in which they are placed. There are a great many people who shrink from the word 'prohibition.' I am not afraid of the word 'prohibition.' Is not all legislation in restriction of that which is wrong, prohibitive in its character? Upon all legislation of that kind from the decalogue to the present time is written large and full the memorable words 'Thou shalt not.' That is nothing more than we are trying to introduce by this legislation and I trust that a large majority of the hon. members of this House will be in sympathy with the resolution which is brought before them and vote for it as they did last year, and that they will vote for the Bill based upon this resolution so that we may stamp out this cigarette habit which is admittedly an evil in our country.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to interfere with this discussion but merely to try to get at it in some regular way. I rise to a point of order to inquire whether this is regular or not. The notice paper contains a motion which says:

That it is expedient to bring in a Bill to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes.

The motion which was put from the chair as I understood it, was that this House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to bring in a Bill. In the first place I draw attention to the fact that the motion on the Votes and Proceedings must be in accordance with the notice, or the notice in accordance with the motion, and in the second place if it is claimed that the notice which the hon. gentleman gave the other day when motions were called should be regarded as a notice of motion, I draw attention to the fact that he did not withdraw his original notice, which was on the paper, and that he cannot anticipate it by another motion dealing with the same subject and that while the notice on the paper deals with the abstract question the motion to which the hon. gentleman is talking now is that the House resolve itself into committee to bring in a Bill on some subject.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. MacLaren), after giving the notice of motion which is to be found at page 4 of the order paper the other day, substituted for it the notice of motion which I find printed in the Votes and Proceedings of March 21st, and which is as follows:

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon)—On Wednesday next—Will move that the House do go into Committee of the Whole—To Consider the following resolution:—That it is expedient to bring in a Bill to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes.

I understood that this motion was in substitution of the motion of which the hon. member had previously given notice. The only question before the chair is the one that I do now leave the chair to enable the House to go into committee.

Mr. SPROULE. Should that motion not have been dealt with when you called 'motions'?

Mr. SPEAKER. The only order on the paper was the motion which I have put that I do now leave the chair to enable the House to go into committee to consider the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Huntingdon.

Mr. SPROULE. I ask you whether the notice on the motion paper covers that?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may explain again. The hon. member (Mr. Sproule) evidently did not understand me. The hon. member for Huntingdon first gave notice of a motion as printed on the order paper of to-day. His attention having been called to the fact that this was irregular he substituted a notice of motion that he would move that the House go into committee to consider the resolution. I take it that the motion is now quite in order and that the hon. member, having given notice of it, was privileged to move it to-day.