

Criminal Code

to see hospitals collect the necessary money to run them as successful operations, and to some people lotteries seem a harmless and good way of raising that money. They see nothing wrong with lotteries. But in actual fact lotteries as has been discovered over the years, are thoroughly wasteful from the social point of view. A large amount of money is usually siphoned off to the promoters of the lotteries, and when you try to arouse the cupidity and interest of the people to give money to hospitals, you have to give them large awards which usually do them no good.

If you studied the experience of those who win large amounts in lotteries you would find that most of them thought originally that a wonderful opportunity had come to them, but later found instead that they had become the victims of shady salesmen, were harried to death and did not get any happiness from their win. Quite apart from that it is a redistribution of money which is not based on any logical or sensible foundation.

In the past many valuable institutions have been built from the proceeds of lotteries. For example, the British museum and Harvard University were assisted through moneys from lotteries. In course of time it was found that these lotteries were a means of siphoning off money spent by people who could not afford it but were excited by their expectations of vast gain, and whose contributions to the lottery had actually added to their poverty and misery.

I listened to the, as usual, eloquent remarks of the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) who has just spoken, and if anyone could persuade me on this I think he could; but I think that he is wrong in suggesting that this is a provincial matter. This is essentially a matter for the Criminal Code of Canada. We may disagree about whether or not we should have lotteries, but it is not a matter for the provinces. This is a decision for us and I hope that when we make it we will decide it on the basis of sound wisdom. I know that many people in my own constituency do not agree with my views, but after all we must all stand up for what we believe in. I accept the view of many other wise people who have studied the matter, and who have suggested that lotteries are not the right method to achieve the good purpose in mind in this bill.

I will sit down now, so that we can either come to a vote or someone other than myself will have the opportunity to talk it out.

[Translation]

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I must first register a protest against [Mr. Brewin.]

the hon. members for St. Mary (Mr. Valade), Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette), and Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) who have just stated that the bill is going to be talked out.

I have been here only one year and never have I had the opportunity to voice my opinion on this question. I am glad to be able to do so at this time, considering that the hon. member for Villeneuve sat in the house in 1946 and again in 1962. As for the hon. member for St. Mary he has been here for years. Consequently, since they have already expressed their feelings on that matter, why did they not refrain from speaking so as to give new members like myself a chance to say what they think?

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Considering the nature of the remarks he has just made, why does the hon. member for Lotbinière not abstain from speaking on the bill now since he accuses others of having taken too much time?

Mr. Valade: Because he wants to talk out the bill.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I will not refrain from speaking, because this is the first opportunity I have to express my opinion on this question.

The hon. member for Villeneuve has been able to do so on many instances and today he had a fine chance to remain seated. However, since he is fond of talking for nothing, he kept right on going. Like the hon. member for St. Mary, he is one of those who are doing some filibustering and who are going to prevent the passage of the bill.

It is also because of the childish points of order raised by the hon. member for St. Mary that the house will be unable to proceed to the vote on this matter.

Now, here is what I want to say, though I have only a few minutes left.

Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago the hon. member for St. Mary made a wrong comparison when he suggested that there was an analogy between the matter now under discussion and the bill concerning Air Canada.

If the Air Canada issue was settled most easily and without any opposition through the co-operation of all parties, it was because a higher principle was at stake, endorsed by all Canadian citizens of good will, i.e., the consideration of bilingualism in this country.

For that reason the Air Canada bill was passed extremely quickly and easily.

The hon. member for Villeneuve said a short while ago that, whatever way the prov-