

think that what constitutes a crime can cease to be a crime simply because the benefits therefrom go to certain institutions.

An Hon. SENATOR: What about church lotteries?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I have already said that I never expect our statutes can be made wholly consistent merely by the defeat of this measure. I do not think there is any sense whatever in exempting church lotteries from the general prohibition of gambling.

I know there is gambling in everything. The honourable senator behind me said that gambling is in human nature and we shall never get away from it. I believe that is true. I do not believe there is any phase of life where the element of chance or fortune does not intervene. The success of one man as against the failure of another is often due in considerable measure to the hand of chance. In greater or less degree that element is always present. It is present in our everyday affairs—in the purchase of an animal, in the purchase of a picture, certainly in the purchase of a security. We never can eliminate that element. It is part of the whole game of living. In the stock market—and there must always be a market in order that business may be carried on—no man can say that he knows, as against the possibility of intervention of all sorts of contingencies, what is going to take place. Therefore it is essential that certain chances be taken, and they always must be taken by enterprising persons, if the world is to progress as it has done all through the centuries. But this is not to say that gambling, for the sake of gambling, is something that the law itself must encourage. Nor does it say that a man opposed to such encouragement is necessarily guilty of terrible inconsistency if he puts up a quarter on a poker game. When playing a game of poker for this small stake he thinks he is doing nobody else any harm and he is not breaking the law. But he may well say, "As a legislator I am not going to take the responsibility of helping to pass a statute to legalize a practice which I do not think it is generally desired should be encouraged."

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: Fire insurance is a gamble.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: But the gambling element is pretty well eliminated by the operation of the law of average. We eliminate the gambling element as far as we can, but because we cannot do so entirely it surely does not follow that we must make gambling lawful and encourage our young

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN.

men to believe that it is just as fine a way of making a living as any other. I agree wholly with the right honourable senator from Eganville (Right Hon. Mr. Graham). Surely we should not put on the Statute Book an invitation to young men to seek to make a living and to evade their honest debts to society, or to charitable institutions, by the practice of gambling. I should not like to have to defend such a stand, either in my own home or anywhere else, before my fellows. That is why I shall vote against the Bill.

So far as I am concerned personally, nothing more need be said. We never can get the world perfect. Some argue that the sale of liquor should be entirely prohibited. They say that because liquor is not good for society we ought to make its manufacture and sale a crime and ban it wholly. Assuming their premises to be sound, it does not follow that their remedy is feasible. If the traffic cannot as a matter of practical executive authority be banned, it may be better to seek to control it within certain limits. Our purpose is not to encourage, but rather to restrain the traffic, and we find in practice that we can restrain it better by laws of control than by attempting total prohibition. I must say that in the last few years there has been ample justification for this view in the experience both of Canada and of the country to the south.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: What about the marriage at Cana, where the Lord changed water into wine?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I was not present on that occasion. The reasoning by which we support liquor control, namely, that thereby we reduce a practice which we wish to discourage better than we could reduce it by attempted total prohibition, cannot possibly apply in support of this measure. We do not here pretend to say, "People are going to gamble anyway; therefore turn gambling into certain channels and control it within those channels." This Bill does not seek to do that. It does not seek to shut the door half way. It simply opens the door on certain terms. It says to the people of Canada, "If you wish the proceeds of gambling to go to this or that hospital we do not object, but we do object if you get the benefit yourselves." For these reasons I intend again to vote against the measure.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Marcotte, the debate was adjourned.

The Senate adjourned until to-morrow at 3 p.m.