

cannot add very much to the discussion. The Bill has been thoroughly debated, and I am sure we all agree that the case for either side has been well presented. Personally I have given a good deal of study to the question of lotteries, and during a trip to France last month I spent some time endeavouring to discover just what effect they had upon the people of Paris. I may say that my observations confirm what has just been stated by the right honourable senator from Eganville (Right Hon. Mr. Graham), that the people who patronize the lotteries in that community are not members of the wealthiest classes, who can afford to lose some money, but belong to the poorer and working classes. In fact, honourable senators, I was very unfavourably impressed with the way in which the lotteries are conducted in the city of Paris. I was asked dozens of times on the boulevards to buy tickets. Little stores and shops have them for sale, and the bait that is held out is the possibility of large premiums being paid. I presume that the people on the streets who asked me to buy these tickets receive a generous commission on their sales or they would not engage in that work.

I inquired from a number of persons in Paris whether they thought lotteries were beneficial to charitable institutions, and their answer was in the negative. They stated it was an open secret that the charities had suffered from the loss of subscriptions which had been diverted into the lottery channels. I particularly sought the opinion of tradespeople, for I regarded their point of view as being very important. They strongly complained that the lotteries had made such a drain upon the money in circulation that business was slow in consequence. They told me that comparatively poor people would spend one hundred francs on the purchase of a chance in the national gamble and go without some necessities of life which they actually lacked. Many a woman who needs a new hat prefers to buy two chances of winning a few francs, with the possibility of getting one of the large prizes of five million francs, and accordingly there has been a reduction in the expenditures on millinery. The opinion expressed to me was that from a commercial point of view—I am not discussing the moral or the religious side of this question to-day—the proprietors of shops and the working people are sadly suffering by reason of the lotteries permitted in the city of Paris.

Hon. G. LACASSE: Honourable members, I had not intended to participate in this debate, especially after the impassioned plea made by my honourable friend from Park-

dale (Hon. Mr. Murdock) and the dispassionate one by the right honourable gentleman from Eganville (Right Hon. Mr. Graham). Their arguments, I appreciate, were well expressed. But having consistently supported this measure or a similar one in the last three sessions, I want to justify myself once more in speaking and voting in favour of it.

I had expected to hear before this the views of the honourable member from Vancouver (Hon. Mr. McRae), who sponsored the Bill last year. He is back with us from Florida, bearing on his tanned features the imprint of the tropical sun and evidence of contact with the salty winds of the sea. Surely he will not fail to give his views again before this debate is concluded, to show us that he has consistently maintained the attitude he voiced previously.

It has been said that the measure was disastrously defeated in another place last year. Well, the first and second times such a Bill was brought up in the Senate it was turned down too, and just as definitely as it was in the other House, but on the third occasion of its appearance here it was passed. So that gives us ground for a little hope as to what will be the fate of the measure elsewhere in the present session. The honourable gentleman from Pictou (Hon. Mr. Tanner) said that consistency and perseverance lead to success. Well, I challenge the consistency of some gentlemen who leave the poker table to rush down and vote against a measure of this kind. To show my own consistency and earnestness, I am willing to meet all opponents of the Bill half way, and if they can convince me that it is possible to abolish the practice of gambling, I too will vote against the second reading. I think it is not consistent to oppose a measure of this kind strenuously and close our eyes to the existence of charity bazaars, wheels of fortune, games of chance—

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: *Pari mutuels*.

Hon. Mr. LACASSE: —*pari mutuels*, and all the rest of these things. Stop all gambling, all games of chance, and I will vote against this Bill. My main reason for supporting this proposed legislation is that it would divert to our own sweepstakes a lot of money which is being spent to-day on other objects, no more worthy, and also that many thousands of dollars now being sent from Canada to purchase gambling tickets in foreign lands would be kept within our own country.

I agree with my honourable friend from Montarville (Hon. Mr. Beaubien), who said that the Bill would be better if it were drafted to include within its objectives the support of educational institutions.