

but I really do not see the necessity for it. I should prefer the Committee to make progress now, but I am not pressing the matter. There is no difficulty about framing an amendment to meet any view the Committee may have. Personally I could not make this a good Bill in any way. The suggestion of the honourable member from Montarville (Hon. Mr. Beaubien) is simply that the measure be enlarged to include universities as beneficiaries of sweepstakes; and the honourable member from Saltcoats (Hon. Mr. Calder) suggests that one-half the proceeds of sweepstakes be devoted to hospitals and the other half to any purposes that the Government might determine.

Hon. Mr. HUGHES: That the Provincial Government might determine.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: It means the Provincial Government. If the Committee wishes to give expression to that or any other view, it would be the work of but a few minutes to prepare an amendment. Personally, being opposed to the measure, I should like to see its purpose limited, because by limiting its purpose we limit participation in sweepstakes. I must repeat that I see no necessity for the Committee to rise just now.

I may say that I have some letters of commendation—for my opposition to the measure, not for the reasons I gave; also letters of criticism from two or three cowardly yaps, who did not sign their names. I make that remark only in the hope that in some way the definition will reach them.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: Honourable members, there is of course the danger that the Bill may not be passed if we widen its scope. It was an enlargement of the list of beneficiaries which killed the previous measure. The question is how far the sweepstakes door is going to be opened. If we open it too wide, people may object on the ground that we shall be having sweepstakes throughout the year. The sponsor of the Bill, the honourable gentleman from Victoria (Hon. Mr. Barnard), objects to any widening because of this very danger. Therefore I have made my amendment as narrow as I possibly could make it with a view to the present needs in the province of Quebec. However, I recognize very well that the needs are different in the various provinces, and if the intention is to increase the number of beneficiaries of sweepstakes I would strongly urge that we should not restrict the provincial governments to spending on hospitals alone any money received as a result of this measure. In the province of Quebec most of the hospitals are maintained

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN.

by the Public Charities Fund. I think I read to the House last session a list of no fewer than fifty of them. In other words the people are paying, through taxation, for the upkeep of these institutions. Well, if this Bill is passed and the Government of Quebec decides to establish sweepstakes, why should it be obliged to apply the receipts to something for which the public is already paying freely?

It seems to me, honourable members, that we must either limit the application of this measure or make it wide enough to include all charitable, educational and philanthropic purposes. If the second course is chosen, then the Government of each province will be free to use the funds according to their local needs. I have made my amendment narrow because I did not want to hinder the passing of the Bill. The principle of the measure has been adopted by the Senate by a substantial majority. Personally I am sorry that that is so, but we cannot always have things our own way. However, in view of this action by the Senate, I feel that I should not be justified in putting any obstruction in the path of the Bill, and for this reason I have restricted my amendment to include the giving of aid to our universities.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: I am inclined to think that that is a somewhat narrow view. The honourable member speaks only for his own province. Of course, he has a right to do that, but at the same time he must consider the conditions that exist in other provinces. It is proposed that this Bill shall be, not purely a Quebec measure, but one applicable to all the provinces that desire to take advantage of it. The situation respecting universities in the province of Quebec is different from that in Saskatchewan, where our only university is already taken care of by the State. And I think I am safe in saying that ninety per cent of our hospitals are provided for, and have not been obliged to rely upon public charity or private contributions. If we should have sweepstakes in Saskatchewan, for what should we use the proceeds? It is all very well to say that this Bill is bad and must therefore be kept within certain bounds which would suit one particular province, but we must have a wider outlook than that. This question must be considered from the standpoint of all the provinces. If sweepstakes are good for this country, if we are to have them, we must frame the Bill to suit conditions existing throughout the Dominion.

There are in this clause one or two other features that at present I am inclined not to favour. However, I have not examined the matter as closely as I should like to do, and