

their money. If it is true that through pari mutuels we have accepted the principle of participating in the profits of gambling, why should we not deal with the whole matter in a thorough, comprehensive way, under proper public control?

The honourable senator from Victoria (Hon. Mr. Barnard), who is sponsoring the Bill, has referred to the money going out of Canada in connection with the Calcutta, the Irish and other foreign sweepstakes. I find that a great many people in Canada to-day, aware of the fact, are beginning to feel that we should keep our money at home and at the same time give our citizens a fair gamble. No doubt these people have not entirely overlooked the little odd change that sweepstakes might bring in to us from other countries. Perhaps the present burden of taxation and the need for new sources of revenue may account for this softening of our national conscience with respect to these matters. Serious thought is being given throughout the Dominion to the possibility of raising funds by some such means as proposed in the Bill, and I am sure that the discussion here and in the other House, if honourable senators see fit to give third reading to the measure, will serve a useful purpose.

I intend to vote for the Bill because I am in favour of its principle, but I cannot say I am very enthusiastic about the idea of putting nine provinces into the sweepstakes business with nine different managers. I should greatly prefer federal sweepstakes, the net proceeds to be devoted to the retirement of the public debt. If our tender national conscience frowned upon contributions from such a source, then I should like to see the proceeds applied to unemployment relief, the burden of which is likely to be with us for some time to come, with the ever increasing difficulties of financing the same.

I hope honourable members will see fit to pass the measure and send it to the Commons. There the discussion as to the financial value of sweepstakes would probably be more detailed than it could be in this Chamber, the proposal should thus receive wider publicity and become a more general topic of conversation throughout the country. I think the sweepstakes issue will attract increasing public attention in the near future. The discussion on the present measure in this Chamber and elsewhere should therefore prove to be of an educational and generally useful character.

Hon. E. MICHENER: The honourable member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Barnard), who introduced this Bill, has given us some plausible reasons why it should be passed.

Having been mentioned as the seconder of his motion, I should be remiss in my duties if I did not speak to it. There are two sides to every question. It is not my purpose to review the arguments raised by my honourable friend, nor to repeat those which have been stated by honourable members who hold opposite views. I will say, however, that I think the incorporation of the amendment to which my honourable friend has referred has weakened rather than strengthened his Bill, for if we may have in one province sweepstakes in which the people of the other eight provinces cannot participate, then the merit of the whole thing is largely lost. The only virtue in the sweepstakes would be the providing of revenue for the hospitals in one province. But why should the people of Alberta, for example, be denied the right to buy tickets for the benefit of hospitals in British Columbia? This brings up a point which my honourable friend from Pictou (Hon. Mr. Tanner) stated in support of the Bill, but which in my opinion is really a reason why he should oppose it. He said he did not believe in legislation which could not be readily enforced, and I am sure we all agree with him on that. But if this measure passed and only one province took advantage of sweepstakes, would it be possible to prevent people in the other eight provinces from buying tickets for those sweepstakes? On the contrary, would there not be a great number of lawbreakers in this respect? It is commonly said that hundreds of thousands of people in Canada are illegally participating in the Irish and other sweepstakes. It seems to me that if the honourable senator from Halifax follows his argument to a logical conclusion, he will have to oppose this Bill on the ground that if it became law it would be unenforceable.

My honourable friend from Vancouver (Hon. Mr. McRae) has expressed the view that we are gamblers by force of heredity and circumstances, and possibly to a certain extent he is right. But there is a difference between gambling for sport and gambling with the object of contributing to hospitals or reducing taxes. One of the great public virtues is the ready and generous response that is made to appeals for donations to hospitals and other charitable and philanthropic institutions. It is perhaps the crowning glory of humanity that it follows that noble impulse to help those who are in need. I am convinced that people always will continue to give of their means to charitable objects, and I think it is undesirable to substitute sweepstakes for the higher incentive to which I have referred. As far