

place, the Canada Temperance Act says that if the people of any particular Province vote for prohibition they must, if they want to stop private importation, have a plebiscite. We in this House have acceded to the view of a good many people in British Columbia that they are entitled to deal with their own internal affairs as they see fit. We from British Columbia view that as a term of the Statute. The other House now refuses to concur in that view for the reason that the expense of the plebiscite will be put upon the Province. I think the Senate should say unequivocally that they are prepared to stand by their amendment.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: It seems to me that the reasons assigned by the House of Commons do not touch the question at all. We are asked to balance the rights of the citizens of British Columbia in one hand against an expenditure of \$50,000 or \$75,000 in the other. If the people of British Columbia enjoy a statutory right, why should they not express their willingness to sacrifice it or their desire to retain it? The mere expenditure of the amount involved in taking a plebiscite, in a Province where a business is being carried on by the Province which represent profits to approximately \$4,000,000 a year, should not weigh for one moment.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I will simply say that the Government of the Province of British Columbia has felt that under the vote they, impliedly were authorized in their action. We have gone thoroughly into that question, so I will simply move that we do not insist on our amendment.

The motion of Hon. Mr. Dandurand was negatived, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the House of Commons to inform that House that the Senate doth insist upon its said amendment.

COLD STORAGE BILL

WITHDRAWN

On the Order:

House again in Committee of the Whole on Bill 9, an Act to amend the Cold Storage Act.—Hon. Mr. Dandurand.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I do not intend to proceed further with this Bill this Session.

ADMIRALTY BILL

WITHDRAWN

On the Order:

House again in Committee on Bill 117, an Act to amend the Admiralty Act.—Hon. Mr. Dandurand.

Hon. Mr. GREEN.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: We have had three or four discussions on this Bill, and it has met with some opposition for various reasons. The objection seemed to be the scope of the authority given the Governor in Council; and various suggestions were made. I do not know whether the members who objected are ready to waive their objections.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: I pointed out to my honourable friend that the appointment of Deputy Admiralty Judges should be confined to judges. The Bill is so widely expressed that it would permit of the appointment of laymen.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: What class of judges would my honourable friend insist upon?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: In many districts the County Court judges or the District judges act as judges in Admiralty. I think my honourable friend should withdraw the Bill for this Session, and should give consideration to the proposal made that the appointment should be of a judicial character. I do not limit myself as to the class of judges.

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT: Then there is the question of emolument. I doubt whether we could come to a conclusion unless we gave considerable time to the Bill.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Under these circumstances I will not press the Bill.

FISHERIES BILL

WITHDRAWN

On the Order:

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for the second reading of Bill 223, an Act to amend the Fisheries Act, 1914.—Hon. Mr. Beique.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: This Bill proposes to change from \$500 to \$20 the fee which the canneries are now paying. This slump has surprised the House, and the question has been asked: "Why do you make such a reduction?" My honourable friend read a statement from the ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries who had raised the fee from \$50 to \$500. It is represented to me by a member of this House when that was done there was an implied condition which does not appear in the Statute, that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was to limit the number of licenses. Such a policy was not followed, and it makes me somewhat doubtful whether the statement was made as a condition or as binding the Government. There seems to be a contradiction which requires some explanation. I would not doubt