

It was truly said by the honourable gentlemen from Pictou (Hon. Mr. Tanner) and Winnipeg (Hon. Mr. McMeans) that this measure does not seek the enactment of any new legislation so much as the acknowledgment of provincial rights. The adoption of it would simply confer upon the provinces the right to do as they please in the matter of sweepstakes.

I am supporting the Bill not only that I may be consistent, but because I want to force the issue, and also because I am desirous of helping in my humble way the hospitals which are in need of funds. I am well aware of the existence of certain municipal problems that were referred to by the right honourable gentleman from Eganville (Right Hon. Mr. Graham). It is true enough that many patients are sent to hospitals nowadays when they could be taken care of at home, but on the other hand it is possible that collective treatment can be given at a lower cost per patient. For one thing, no private practitioner, however much goodwill he may have, can continue to treat people indefinitely for nothing; but persons who have virtually no means can be treated free by hospital staffs, while others, who are able to pay, but may presently be short of money, can be given credit extending over a long period of months, if necessary.

One honourable member said he considered that gambling or the purchase of a lottery ticket was not a sin, but something more or less immoral. I should like to know the difference. It was also contended that if a lottery were established in one province it would mean that before long we should have nine, because all the provinces would find it necessary to follow the example. Well, one way of solving that problem would be to reduce the number of provinces to three or four.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: Change the Constitution.

Hon. Mr. LACASSE: With all due respect to the views expressed by my honourable friends who oppose the measure, I intend to vote for it.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: Honourable members, this Bill has been before us three times since I entered the Senate. Formerly I did not take occasion to comment upon it, but was satisfied merely to vote in the negative. The same course would have been followed by me at this time but for the introduction of certain comments by the honourable senator from Parkdale (Hon. Mr. Muddock), to which I think some reference should be made lest they go out to the public as

perhaps representative of the feelings of all honourable members. I do not know what those comments had to do with the matter at issue. In fact, I can see no relationship at all. They were observations on a report, appearing in the morning press, of evidence given yesterday before a committee of the other Chamber, and they reflected upon the fairness, and perhaps even upon the business ethics, of certain institutions in Toronto.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: Will my right honourable friend let me make that point clear, if he did not understand me? What I meant was this, that in my judgment the attitude of the distinguished gentlemen who want to unload upon other people their obligations to help sustain hospitals, is the very same as the attitude of thirty-eight employers in the city of Toronto who, we were told by the morning press, were paying such small wages that the municipality had to give additional money as relief to numbers of those wage-earners who are heads of families.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not able to see that the fact of small wages being paid in factories, if such is the case, is an argument in favour of this Bill or against it, and I understood that the debate had to do solely with arguments on one side or the other. I do not know anything of the great majority of the companies referred to in this evidence—or perhaps, to be more in order, I should say who were referred to in the morning press—but I think it is most unfair that evidence which was submitted, and as to which there has yet been no opportunity for explanation or contradiction, should be heralded as indicative of bad habits, unethical practices, and unfair dealings on the part of reputable companies towards their employees. These companies have as yet had no opportunity to make themselves heard, and consequently we have to admit that at the present time we are not in possession of the facts. It may be that what has been said cannot be contradicted or explained, but until opportunity is given for contradiction or explanation we are not justified in saying that we know the truth. I have information in respect of one case which seems to me not only to throw a different light upon evidence given yesterday, but to reflect very seriously upon the responsibility of the man who gave it. Consequently I feel rather strongly that we are adopting a very unfair and unjust practice in assuming an ex parte statement by one individual to be the whole facts.

Hon. Mr. LACASSE.