

with copies, but I would like to have a complete set in order to be able to follow the discussion.

Mr. BENNETT: I am bound to say that I only saw them a few minutes ago myself, because the law clerk only concluded his work upon them since half past ten. I shall ask that they be sent to the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, I realize that it is not anyone's fault, but I should like to have them as well on file.

Motion agreed to; amendments read the second time and concurred in.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 73, to amend the criminal code.

He said: There are several amendments. It will be remembered that in the bill as introduced and passed by this house there was a provision to amend what is known as the horse-racing clause. The Senate have now introduced a further amendment which was not in the bill passed by this house, to provide for trotting race meetings up to fourteen days in any one year. That places trotting races in the same position as running races. Hitherto trotting races at which betting by pari-mutual was allowed were limited to three days. By this amendment they may carry on for fourteen days in any one year or two meets of seven days each.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Is that in addition to the ordinary racing?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, the present law is that a racing association which has only running races may carry on for two meetings of seven days each or one of fourteen days. Hitherto trotting races have been limited to three days per year. The effect of this amendment is to put the trotting races on the same plane as the running races.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Then they could have two weeks of running races immediately followed by two weeks of trotting?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Well, they are different associations. They do not have both at the same meetings. The jockey clubs run the running races and the trotting associations run theirs.

Mr. McINTOSH: It would mean then twenty-eight days of racing and trotting during the year?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, that does not follow. The trotting association meets I think are in midsummer, on different tracks, under different auspices, they are different organizations. I am not very familiar with them but that is my idea.

Mr. HEAPS: Would the minister kindly explain the legal distinction between trotting and running?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The act I think sets that out pretty clearly. If my hon. friend will read section 235 of the criminal code he will see. This amendment provides for the race meetings at which there are trotting or pacing races exclusively. They cannot be mixed, there cannot be running and trotting. I think trotting and pacing are well-defined terms that sportsmen understand, and all people who have to do with horses. If this amendment is carried these trotting associations will be entitled to fourteen days racing per annum, just as the running races are now.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Does my hon. friend accept this amendment?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have no view on the subject. It is a new suggestion to me.

Mr. LAPOINTE: You are not concerned whether it is trotting or pacing?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, I am not. There are some racing experts in the house but I am not one of them.

Passing that for the moment, the next amendment was suggested after the bill had passed this house, I think in the first instance by the county crown attorney in the city of Ottawa and also some other county crown attorneys in different cities of Canada. It is to check as far as possible these gambling devices found in stores and places where the public resort, in regard to which the law is a little uncertain at the present time. The Senate has put in a clause that any person who:

conducts, manages or is a party to any scheme, contrivance or operation of any kind by which any person, upon payment of any sum of money, or by obligating himself to pay any sum of money, shall become entitled under such scheme, contrivance or operation to receive from the person conducting or managing such scheme, contrivance or operation, or any other person, a larger sum of money than the amount paid or to be paid, by reason of the fact that other persons have paid or obligated themselves to pay any sum of money under such scheme, contrivance or operation;