

Unless something is done to relieve the situation, the final outcome will not be in the best interest of the people nor of the province.

If this Bill becomes law it will, I believe, provide a source of revenue which cannot be obtained in any other way. It will be the means of getting contributions—I do not mean in a philanthropic sense—from untold numbers of residents of British Columbia who otherwise would not think of giving one cent to hospitals, although they might be quite ready to receive the benefit of their services in time of need. And then, no doubt, tickets would be sold in the United States, and thus a certain revenue would be received from people in that country. A further result of the Bill would be to put a check on the flow of money that has been going from this country—at least, from my province—to purchase tickets for sweepstakes in various parts of the world, such as the Irish Sweepstakes, the Calcutta Sweepstakes, the London Stock Exchange Sweepstakes, and others.

I have already mentioned that the present Bill is different in one respect from the one previously introduced. Last session the honourable senator from De Salaberry (Hon. Mr. Béique) gave notice of intention to introduce certain amendments, the effect of which was to provide that the sale of tickets on any authorized sweepstakes in any province should be confined, within the Dominion of Canada, to the province in which the sweepstakes were authorized. That is to say, if we chose to take advantage of this plan in British Columbia, we could not sell sweepstakes tickets in Ontario, or Quebec, or any other province, but we should not be prevented from selling them in the United States, for example, or in any other foreign country. I was agreeable to such amendments last year, and I have incorporated them in the Bill.

One point that perhaps was not given as much consideration last year as it should have been is that the proposal is not to legalize the operation of sweepstakes for the benefit of any individual. The Bill provides that the Attorney General of any province which decides to take advantage of this plan shall have the power to appoint a committee to conduct the sweepstakes, and that he may make regulations as to the percentage of receipts that may be allowed respectively for expenses of operation, contributions to hospitals, and prizes. Furthermore, the Attorney General may make regulations providing for the auditing of the accounts of the conducting committee, in a manner satisfactory to himself. Should any of my honourable friends from Ontario, Quebec, Manitoba, or any other prov-

ince, feel that they cannot conscientiously support this Bill, or that the people they represent would not like to see it become law, may I remind them that if the Bill is passed, the Attorney General of each province—and, I suppose, his opinion would be that of his Government—would refuse to authorize sweepstakes if the public opinion of the province were opposed to them. All that this Bill does is to enable sweepstakes to be held in any province in which, in the opinion of its Government or the principal law officers of that Government, the public would desire it.

I understand and appreciate quite well that there are in this country a number of people who conscientiously object to money being raised in this way; but the only arguments which I have heard adduced in favour of their contention do not appeal to me. Of course, it is a matter for every man's conscience; but to my friends who have so strenuously opposed this measure in the past I would say that this Bill is at least a fair, honest, and, I think, practical attempt to deal with the solution of a problem which is presented. If they do not agree with it, if they feel constrained to vote it down, all I can say to them is that I think it behooves them at least to suggest some other method of financing the institutions to which I refer.

With these few remarks, I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. L. McMEANS: Honourable gentlemen, I want to congratulate the mover of this Bill on the very plausible way in which he has introduced it. I believe it contains many meritorious clauses. However, I would point out this fact, that sometimes a Bill passed by this Senate and sent to the other Chamber, no matter how meritorious, is simply put upon the list of private members' Bills, to which only one hour a week is allotted. Then if anybody wants the Bill defeated, it may be put down at the bottom of the list and never be reached. I think we have had a good deal of experience of that kind. On no less than four different occasions, I think, this House passed a Bill in regard to divorce, it went to the lower Chamber, was sponsored there by a private member, and, as only one hour a week was given to private members' Bills, it met the usual fate of such proposals.

Though I voted against the present Bill last session, I am not inclined to vote against it this year, so far as my present knowledge goes. But the point to which I desire to call attention is this. After the Upper Chamber has spent time in deliberating upon this or any other Bill, and has passed it, why should the other House treat us in such a way that,