

"Last Line of Defense."

Mr. Nixon asked him if he enforced the sweepstakes law and Mr. Roebuck held that in that case he was not obliged to do so. He claimed that, under the C.T.A., the citizens in the municipalities affected had "home rule" rights on the issue. The act, he said, was brought into the municipalities by a vote of the majority and could be repealed only in the same way. The resolution, he urged, should not be passed unless they were guaranteed of their rights.

He referred to a report in The Globe and Mail, which suggested that the government proposed to place liquor stores in Manitoulin. Mr. Hepburn said the matter had not been considered, but pointed out that, under the Canada Temperance Act, there was no restraint placed upon the Crown to establish stores and to sell.

"If the Canada Temperance Act is abolished, what is to stand in the

way of the government establishing stores?" asked the member.

Mr. Hepburn replied that the restrictions under the Liquor Control Act were more restrictive than those under the Canada Temperance Act and that it would take a three-fifths vote make the municipality wet or dry.

"I agree," said Mr. Roebuck, "that in all probability if there is a reference to the courts they will find the Canada Temperance Act invalid. But I do say that Canada Temperance Act is the last line of defense of the temperance organizations," he added, as he termed it the "sheet anchor to those who do not want unrestricted sale."