

In those days public lotteries constituted the most popular and effective method of raising money for the worthiest causes. King's College, now Columbia University, was founded directly on the proceeds of a widely advertised lottery. Harvard, Yale, Brown, and Dartmouth repeatedly invited the public to take a chance for the benefit of higher education. John Hancock and Benjamin Franklin were among the chief patrons of various gambles for public progress and improvements.

The popularity of lotteries reached a peak during the Civil War reconstruction period in the days of the Grand Extraordinary Louisiana Lottery. Once a ticket in this gamble reposed next to the small change in the old cracked sugar bowl on the shelf in at least one out of every four kitchens in the United States.

This is the lottery mentioned by the honourable senator from Toronto (Hon. Mr. Hocken). What was the reason for its abolition? It was simply this:

The lottery promoters, a private corporation, abused their privileges flamboyantly and extravagantly. At a time when the Louisiana Company was doing a \$28,000,000-a-year business, the State collected only \$40,000 annually as its revenue. Louisiana clergymen and associated reformers broadcast news of the greed and dishonesty of the Louisiana Lottery promoters far and wide. Small merchants and solid citizens from Maine to Mexico were told time and again that if the nation's spenders didn't pour \$28,000,000 annually into the maw of the lottery monster this money would go into the tills of legitimate business. As a result the Louisiana Lottery was exiled to Honduras, by Act of Congress in 1893, and it eventually died there because of the avarice and crookedness of the people who ran it.

There you have the explanation as to why this lottery was abolished. It was a private affair, and consequently greed, avarice and corruption reigned.

However, increasing millions of dollars are spent in this country every year for foreign lotteries and sweepstakes—not to mention other millions spent on sub rosa lotteries operated here. Why can't the laws against lotteries be enforced in this country? The New York State law holds that anybody who "participates" in a lottery is guilty of a misdemeanour. The giving of "any consideration" for a chance to win a prize constitutes participation. If the Ladies' Aid Society of a Baptist Church in Zion City, New York, gives a charity entertainment, charges no admission whatsoever, but nevertheless gives a "chance" on a crazy quilt to everyone who attends, is that a lottery? It certainly is, under the law. Of course the law is never enforced. If it were, many of our leading Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant clergymen and laymen might go to gaol. A check-up shows that churches, lodges and fraternities constitute about eighty per cent of the lottery law violators in this country.

Now I come to the argument of the right honourable senator from Eganville (Right Hon. Mr. Graham).

The chief argument against the lottery is that it destroys the citizen's sense of civic responsibility (his willingness to pay taxes with-

out hope of return) and breaks down the moral fibre of the individual. Those opposed to lotteries can truthfully cite hundreds of cases of men who won cash prizes, got drunk, beat their wives, eloped with demi-mondaines, and finally died penniless.

Is there any probability of a change in our lottery laws? This winter Governor Ritchie found revenues for unemployment relief in Maryland inadequate. With his customary forthrightness he now tells the Legislature he wants to change the Maryland Constitution so that sweepstakes can be operated by the State. A vote by the people of Maryland next November on whether to permit a State sweepstakes lottery is now pending. The Maryland experiment will be worth watching. However, the probability is that our lottery laws will not be changed unless those who believe the gambling instinct should be legally curbed find their future tax burdens too much to bear.

Now you have the whole article, and I leave it to you, honourable senators, to decide whether you will draw from it the same conclusion that the honourable senator from Parkdale (Hon. Mr. Murdock) did.

I would not pass by the argument of the honourable senator from Stadacona (Hon. Mr. Webster), deduced from his study of the conditions created by lotteries in France. He states that he was informed that the lotteries were not beneficial to charitable institutions. There is a good reason for that. The benefits from lotteries are not for these institutions. The article just read mentions that 40 per cent of \$140,000,000—that is \$56,000,000—went for pensions and farm relief. I should like to know if our Western farmers, so hard hit for the last four years, would not be thankful for such relief.

The honourable senator was especially struck by the fact cited to him that many a woman needing a new hat would rather buy a chance to win a prize than purchase the hat. As the honourable senator made his visit to France just a few weeks ago, it may be that these ladies had sense enough to refuse to follow the fashion of wearing straw hats during the winter-time. But surely that is not the main reason for a lottery doing a business of \$140,000,000 in a few months.

Honourable senators, the article I have just read does not mention what is taking place in Canada, and that is what should interest us first and last. Under our Criminal Code small lotteries may be operated for certain purposes; certain gambling devices, forbidden otherwise, are allowed to function in certain places and on certain occasions. These sections of our Criminal Code are so well known that it is not necessary to cite them. Why this discrimination? It is simply because the benefits to the community are greater than the possible danger.