are pretty nearly as bad. Bearing in mind what happened in the United States, I think it would be a very great mistake to give this Bill second reading. If it became law, lotteries would not be confined to the province of British Columbia: all the other provinces would have to conduct lotteries in self-protection, and the whole country would be demoralized.

But apart from this side of the question, will the sanctioning of lotteries result in any substantial benefit to our hospitals? The Irish Hospital Sweepstakes are frequently cited as an effective means of raising funds for hospitals. It may interest honourable members to know that many hospitals in the Irish Free State have refused to take part in the proceeds of those lotteries, and they do so advisedly, because, as the honourable member from Montarville (Hon. Mr. Beaubien) said the other day, such lotteries discourage contributions and bequests from charitably disposed persons. But that is not the only drawback, as this extract from the Irish Times, of Dublin, would indicate:

> Although the Cork South Infirmary has been in the Free State sweepstakes from the start, its financial condition is now serious, for voluntary subscriptions are down to the vanishing point, and the Free State Government for two years has delayed payment of sweepstakes money. At a meeting of the committee of the hospital the treasurer said they owed their bankers £3,249, and the position at the end of the year would be impossible, as they would be £5,000 to the bad.

From this it is evident that the hospital sweepstakes in the Free State have not accomplished the purpose for which they were inaugurated; otherwise the Cork South Infirmary would be in a good financial position. But in any case a very small proportion of the receipts go to the hospitals. As I have said, I agree with the honourable senator from Montarville that the institution of lotteries would tend to discourage charitable gifts to our hospitals, and that as a result these institutions would suffer substantial financial loss. But apart altogether from this probability, I submit we should take cognizance of the demoralizing effect of lotteries and decline to approve a measure of this kind. I am not arguing that it is sinful to gamble, but it is an exceedingly silly practice. A lottery can never work out to the advantage either of those who buy tickets or of the institution for whose supposed benefit it is conducted. I sincerely hope that the Bill will be rejected.

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

PRECIOUS METALS MARKING BILL

SECOND READING

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN moved the second reading of Bill 2, an Act to amend the Precious Metals Marking Act, 1928.

He said: Honourable senators, I owe it to the House now to make a brief explanation of the Bill. I may add at once that it is intended to refer the Bill to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. This is not a highly important measure. As honourable members know, the Parliament of Canada, having jurisdiction in matters of trade and commerce, seeks to regulate in this respect, at least to the extent necessary to prevent what savours of fraud, if it is not indeed actual fraud, in the sale and purchase of certain goods. It is impossible for the ordinary purchaser of precious metals to say just what is the composition of the article that he is buying, and consequently the original Act provides that when any ornament or article made from the precious metals is sold under a certain nomenclature, it must be of the character specified. If, for example, it is sold as gold plated, there must be a certain percentage of gold in the plate. This in general is the purpose of the Precious Metals Marking Act. The present Bill does not in any degree extend the principle of the original Act. It restates the law, mostly for the purposes of clarification. It goes further in certain respects, as to mountings upon jewelry and some other apparently not very important features. In the main the inspectors who enforce the law deem the proposed amendments necessary in order to prevent certain technical infringements.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: For instance, an article of sterling silver quality must be so stamped.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes; not only that, but the dealers or manufacturers must themselves vindicate the stamp.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Since 1928, in the Banking and Commerce Committee, we have given careful study to similar bills, and I am glad my right honourable friend is suggesting that this Bill should go to the select committee.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: I submit that public bills should be considered by Committee of the Whole. We have got into the bad habit of referring public bills to select committees. Every member is supposed to be interested in a public bill and to know something about it. I should like the right honourable gentle-