

that I am in perfect agreement with what has been stated by the honourable member from Alma (Hon. Mr. Foster) and the honourable member from Assiniboia (Hon. Mr. Turriff). Without desiring to prolong the debate, I wish further to point out this. Last year, if I understand the situation correctly, this House refused to assent to the principle of this Parliament putting Dominion-wide prohibition into operation. In other words, this House, in defiance of the vote of the House of Commons, refused to assume the duty of deciding whether there should be or should not be Dominion-wide prohibition. I am not discussing the question whether the House was right or wrong, but that was the position taken. What is the situation today? We are asked to leave the question to the provinces. Is this House going to take the position that it will not assent to Dominion-wide prohibition being enacted by the Canadian Parliament and will not assent to the principle of this Bill, namely, that if a province wants prohibition it may have it?

The House of Commons, representing the people, sent up legislation on this subject last year, and the Senate, an appointed body, refused to assent to that legislation. I need not point out, what has been already stated and what is well understood, that this is not a new question. A prohibition Bill comes back to us in this form. It has, I understand, received an overwhelming vote in its favour in the Chamber representing public opinion. A year ago, when we were discussing the question of daylight saving, one of the most powerful arguments used in this House by member after member was that the House of Commons was opposed to daylight saving, and therefore this House should recognize their position and not take a stand in opposition to them. If that attitude was logical then, it ought to be logical now. We know that the overwhelming opinion as voiced in the House of Commons is that this legislation should go on the statute book.

In this connection, honourable gentlemen, I want to state my view that the Senate assumes a very critical position if it undertakes, on the grounds which have been set out here, to defeat a measure of this kind which has passed the House of Commons. It cannot be said that the Senate is at all popular in the country. We regret that it does not appear to have that grip upon public opinion which we should like it to have. As has been pointed out by the

honourable member from Alma (Hon. Mr. Foster), there has been unquestionably in this country, as well as in the United States, a tremendous growth of public opinion in favour of the enactment and enforcement of prohibitory legislation. Is this Senate going to set itself like flint against that public opinion, as expressed not only in the House of Commons but also in the country? If it is, I desire to say this—I regret exceedingly to have to say it, but it strikes me as a very important element in this debate: this Senate will invite a conflict, not only with the people but with the House of Commons; and any honourable member who reads the history of conflicts between elected chambers and appointed chambers must inevitably come to the conclusion that the appointed chamber is certain to go down in the conflict. That has been the history of conflicts in the old countries of Europe between elected chambers and appointed chambers, and as surely as the sun sets if this honourable Chamber undertakes year after year to defeat legislation which the people want, and which the House of Commons decides the people should have, then this House will become engaged in a conflict which will bring disaster upon itself.

The argument which has been used here, that we have not time to discuss this matter, is to my mind entirely fallacious. Any honourable gentleman who has had experience in public life, who has sat in this House or in any legislative body, whether federal or provincial, knows that, as the honourable gentleman for Assiniboia (Hon. Mr. Turriff) has stated, important legislation has always come down at the end of the session, and as long as the sun rises and sets that will continue to be the case.

Under these circumstances, honourable gentlemen, it is my intention to support this Bill, and I shall sincerely regret the action of this Chamber if it puts itself in opposition to the will of the people in this matter.

Hon. E. L. GIRROIR: In what I have to say I am not actuated by any fear that the representatives of the people and of the provinces in this Senate, if their opinions run counter to the opinions of the House of Commons or to those of any other legislative body in this country, may be swept away, as has been suggested by the honourable gentleman who has preceded me. I think that the prohibition senti-