

The question of intention is of importance in that connection. Let us assume that some person, designing fraud upon a community, forms an association to appeal to the public for the charitable purposes mentioned in this Act. Will my hon. friend say that enterprise is laudable? Does not the question of intention count. The purpose of this Bill is to prevent organizations of that character appealing to the public throughout Canada. In that way, if the Act is carried out, only those organizations that have official sanction through registration, in other words proper organization, will be allowed to appeal to the public, whose sympathies can be enlisted readily in any project that promises aid to sufferers during this war. If hon. gentlemen desire to take up time discussing the Bill, I am willing to sit and listen, but I must confess that the arguments put forward by hon. members do not appear to me to be well founded, if the principle of the Bill is sound, namely that it is the duty of the public in war time to protect the public from appeals to their sympathy that may be made by parties who are not disinterested, but who are seeking to promote their own advantage, and to divert funds which were raised for certain worthy purpose to other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLES: I do not know just how far the Act goes, and I desire information. I know that a great many lectures were given on the prairies this year, in towns where there was no Red Cross and no organization of any kind. I gave quite a number myself. Collections were taken up at these entertainments, and were sent to the nearest Red Cross or Patriotic Fund, or devoted to purposes as the local people thought fit.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They would be liable to a fine of \$500, under this Bill if they were not registered.

Mr. KNOWLES: The minister does not intend taking action against these people, and I am satisfied no person will make trouble for them. But it is not wise to enact laws that will, even in a good cause, be broken. It is quite a common thing for young people on the prairies to have their evening entertainment. They dance at these places, and charge a fee each evening to those who dance, and, after all the expenses are paid, the money goes to charitable purposes. They sometimes make \$60 and \$70 a night, and they send it to Moosejaw or Regina as the case may be. A large amount of money has been contributed in that way. I remember a Conservative candidate in the provincial election in Saskatchewan could

not get an audience, and he announced that there would be a dance, and basket social for the Red Cross. They held the meeting, had the dance, held an auction, and sold off the baskets. They got \$150, and they had the time of their lives getting the \$150 from the Conservative gentleman, who held the bag with the money. However, that was not the fault of the association. Perhaps the hon. minister will make provision to prevent cases of that kind occurring. Will the minister say if these entertainments would be prohibited by the Act?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I would say that is not an association having for its object the purposes mentioned in this Bill. This measure would not prevent parties getting up social or other entertainments, on certain occasions.

Mr. KNOWLES: That is all I wanted to know.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The difficulty is that the Bill does this extraordinary thing: it mixes up the money that is raised with the institution that raises it. Charity is defined to be a fund, an institution, or an association. Therefore, under this, a church organization is a charity within the meaning of the Act, and a temperance organization is a charity. The individual fund becomes a charity. It seems to me the Act ought to define charity to be the fund which is raised. Let that be the charity, and let the organization be entirely separate and distinct from that. One of the difficulties about this Bill is the confusion caused by the minister attempting to give one meaning both to the money which is raised and to the institution which raises it. You cannot do that, and make a satisfactory Bill. That is the reason why my hon. friend cannot accept the amendment of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that the title of the Bill should be "An Act relating to War Contributions." It would be very much better to use the words "War Charities," and to define war charities to mean the funds which are raised for the objects to which the money may be devoted. Let the institutions be an entirely different thing. Then I would exempt churches, and generally religious organizations. There is no reason in the world why they should be compelled to register.

It would be unwise to place the pastor or other officials of a church who raise money for the Patriotic Fund, the Red Cross Fund, or for other war purposes, in the position of criminals simply because they fail to ob-