

our Bill having to be introduced by a private member, it receives no consideration at all? When a Bill comes over from the Commons to this Chamber it is considered at once and is usually given the three readings and passed. But if a Bill goes from the Senate, even if it is passed unanimously here, what is the fate that awaits it in the other House? I think we should receive more consideration. I think the Government should see to it that when we pass a Bill and it goes to the Commons it is not dealt with so unceremoniously as it usually has been.

Hon. RAOUL DANDURAND: The remarks of the honourable gentleman from Winnipeg (Hon. Mr. McMeans) concern the procedure governing the relations between the two Houses. Therefore it would not be amiss for this House to suggest a conference with the other Chamber to see if some amendments or modifications of the rules of the Commons could not be made in order that that House might be given an opportunity to examine Bills that are sent there by the Senate. For a considerable number of years the complaint has been made that the procedure of the other House does not facilitate the bringing before it of the legislation initiated and passed here. However, this complaint does not prevent us from dealing with any matter brought before us in the form of a Bill. Even though we must await the good graces of the House of Commons in taking up and considering the question, it is our duty to examine any proposal that may come from any honourable member of this House.

I should like to tell my honourable friend from Victoria (Hon. Mr. Barnard) that I admire his zeal for the hospitals of British Columbia. They are not the only ones that suffer from the present depression, and if I were disposed to yield in the least in the attitude which I have taken in this matter, the first exception I would make—and I would gladly do so—would be for such a proposal as that which is embodied in his Bill.

He has stated that people conscientiously opposed to the principle of the Bill might well limit their objection to the application of the principle to their own provinces, and that those people who do not intend taking advantage of the Bill should permit the neighbouring or other provinces to apply it. He has spoken of the opinions of some members of this Chamber being governed by conscience. I may say that my attitude has not been governed in that way. With me it is rather a question of social policy.

Hon. Mr. McMEANS.

In 1900, or thereabouts, there developed in the Province of Quebec a system of art lotteries which seemed to have a considerably disturbing effect on the minds of the younger element of the population. Such was the extent of the evil that police magistrates represented to the Attorney-General of Quebec and to members of Parliament, sitting in the Commons and in the Senate, that quite a number of young men were being brought before them for stealing money from employers in order to buy lottery tickets.

We all know that lotteries have been prohibited in many countries. The effect of the lottery system seems to be to sap the vitality of a people. According to writers who have dealt with the subject, it has done so in other countries, and the Anglo-Saxon race has been quite firm in refusing to allow the adoption of that system. I know it does not exist in Great Britain to-day—at least, I do not believe it does; but it does exist across the English Channel.

The Senate in 1900 passed a Bill that restricted lotteries to those of the Art Gallery Association of London and one or two others, which I succeeded in having exempted. Those were the only exceptions from the operation of the Criminal Code. Not without some difficulty, the Bill passed in the House of Commons also, and art lotteries disappeared from the city of Montreal and other places in the Province of Quebec. I need not explain the system on which they had been operating. At first there were drawings once a week. Then there came to be drawings once a day and art lotteries were being organized in all quarters of the city.

Shall the principle of restricting games of chance, such as lotteries, be maintained? That is the question for the Senate to decide. The Parliament of Canada has been quite insistent on restricting such games of chance. Now, it is on the second reading of this Bill that we must give our views.

Hon. Mr. BARNARD: Will the honourable gentleman tell us anything about horse-racing and the pari-mutuel system?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Yes, there are such things as horse-racing and the pari-mutuel system.

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: Did you ever try it?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I have never attended a race nor bought a ticket. But if I had been at the races I should not have hesitated to take one ticket on an unknown horse.