

if we left the Committee free to decide as to its need of that evidence and simply empowered it to ask for a copy? Perhaps the request would still have to pass through the Senate.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The delay is all I wish to avoid. I do not want the Senate placed in the position of being responsible for any delay on the part of the Committee. I want the Committee perfectly free to carry on its work as it may be advised. But if, for example, the Committee, after this House adjourns to-day, should see that it ought to have the evidence in order to go on, it would be rather reprehensible on our part that we had adjourned without providing for that requirement. I therefore feel that, as doubtless the Committee will wish the evidence, the motion had better be carried. We could wait until Monday if honourable members were willing that the Senate should adjourn from to-day until Monday.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: No. I was simply wondering whether we should not leave the matter to the Committee. But I see the difficulty that the Committee would be in if the Senate were not sitting.

The Hon. the SPEAKER: It is moved by Right Hon. Mr. Meighen, seconded by Hon. Mr. Robertson:

That a message be sent to the House of Commons requesting that House to grant leave to their Clerk to appear and produce before a Special Committee of the Senate a copy of the evidence adduced during the last session before the Special Committee of the Commons appointed to investigate the Beauharnois Power Project.

The motion was agreed to.

HOSPITAL SWEEPSTAKES BILL

MOTION FOR SECOND READING— DEBATE CONTINUED

The Senate resumed from yesterday the adjourned debate on the motion for the second reading of Bill A1, an Act with respect to Hospital Sweepstakes.

Hon. A. D. McRAE: Honourable gentlemen, in speaking in support of the Sweepstakes Bill introduced by the honourable senator from Victoria (Hon. Mr. Barnard), I quite appreciate that a considerable portion of our Canadian people are adverse to so-called gambling. Not a few of them would entirely prohibit gambling of all sorts, were that possible. With those I frankly disagree. It might not be amiss to review very tersely our national attitude towards gambling.

As a whole are we Canadians a gambling people? That is a blunt question. My answer

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

is: we are, both by inheritance and by environment. The British race has long been recognized as a race of sportsmen. It was the boldest and best sports of their day, both French and British, who tempted fate and discovered this Dominion, later exploring it to the Pacific and to the Arctic. We never tire of referring with pride to those ancestors, to their spirit of adventure and to their daily gamble with life and death. Adventure is akin to gambling; the two are inseparable.

As the descendants of those adventurers, what outlet do we find to the spirit that is inbred in us and that we in turn shall pass on to our children? Speaking for myself, I have found an outlet in the commercial life of the Dominion, and I am sure many other honourable senators can say the same thing. In that life there are many gambles. As I look back on the long years I have spent in business I realize that some of the greatest gambles I ever took were in my commercial ventures. Undoubtedly, many of you honourable gentlemen have had similar experiences. When the gamble turns out well, when we win, we are given credit for unusual business acumen; when we lose we are said to have made a poor gamble. Such is modern business.

We come from races that took their chances. Should we—indeed, can we—eradicate in our generation the spirit that we have so well inherited? I do not believe we can. Would it be wise to do it if we could? I do not think so. That spirit has been responsible for the development of the Dominion to its present position. The restoration of that spirit of adventure—or gamble, to use the less polite term—would perhaps do more than anything else to bring about the return of prosperity.

With such breeding, instead of destroying, should we not endeavour to control and direct the avenue through which this national spirit may find its outlet?

I do not share with the honourable senator from De Lorimier (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) the fear that the adoption of sweepstakes may undermine the morale of our people. By our approval of the *pari mutuels* in several provinces—for example, in my own Province of British Columbia, in Ontario, and, I believe, in Quebec as well—we have not only authorized gambling, but we have reconciled the public conscience to the necessity of it. We have gone a step further by taking as our *quid pro quo*, for the benefit of the public treasury, a rake-off from that particular enterprise, a form of gambling that many people say fails to give the public a fair run for