

*Criminal Code*

Let me now refer to the gun laws. When the original bill was presented I found this subject to be the most contentious in my riding, apart from the abortion provisions. All sorts of gun clubs made representations to my colleague, the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall), and myself. We have heard nothing from them since as a result of the changes the minister has brought about, so I fully support the measure as it now stands. Indeed, my strong reluctance before was that it seemed to impose perhaps overly strong burdens on members of professional gun associations, those people who would not be expected to misuse guns in any event. As far as the general principle is concerned, I do not believe there is an inalienable or sacred right to carry weapons. I fully support the idea that we must have gun laws and gun control.

Thirdly, sir, I give my wholehearted support to the concept set forth at page 101 of the omnibus bill which involves the question of day parole. This is the first time we have had day parole as such spelled out with reference to the functions of the National Parole Board. It was the magistrate I mentioned earlier, Mr. Haley of Dartmouth, who first used, at least to my knowledge, day parole in Canada. He felt that somebody given a jail term for impaired driving or the like should not have to spend all the time during his sentence in jail because this would impose a hardship on the wife and family. He felt certain persons should be allowed out by day to earn a living, while still undergoing the stigma of being in jail at night.

I believe the idea of day parole probably began in respect of offences under provincial statute. I am glad to see this idea extended as a nationwide principle. I hope members of the committee will invite Judge Haley to come to Ottawa to tell about some of the cases he has dealt with on these terms. This is a far-reaching step in Canada, but it is a method which has been used in other parts of the civilized world, including the state of California where it was perhaps first tried.

Finally, I should like to turn to those areas in respect of which I am in strong disagreement. The first of these concerns lotteries. Lotteries are mugs games or methods of having the people who do not have the wherewithal to pay taxes pay for services that should be paid by state taxes. To my knowledge there has not been such a lottery which has lived up to expectation. New York State is trying one and the revenue is running well

[Mr. McCleave.]

below what it was hoped to achieve in this way. The state of New Hampshire has had one for several years, again with the same result.

Getting closer to home, the city of Montreal is trying to run a lottery and is now having to increase the prizes, still without achieving the intended goal. Montreal calls their scheme a voluntary tax measure, but whatever it is called it still smells the same as a lottery. The town of Moose Jaw seems to be getting sucked into this general trend. I hope the people there will have sense enough to turn back before they become embroiled in a venture which will not achieve what they have in mind.

The United States was chock full of lotteries during the last century. Some 60, 70 or 80 years ago federal law wiped out every last one and there were very few, except several skilled promoters, who mourned the passing of lotteries. I suppose the following generation has forgotten about them and now thinks we should give lotteries a try. I suggest this is a mug's game or a method of talking poor people into spending money ill-advisedly on the chance that lightning will, in some pleasant way, strike them. No responsible parliament should give its sanction to this method of raising public revenue.

A British royal commission in 1951, after examining this question came to the conclusion:

—that there is no important advantage to be gained by the establishment of a national lottery and that there is no reason, in this particular case, to depart from the general principle that it is undesirable for the state to make itself responsible for the provision of gambling facilities.

I turn to the view of two gentlemen who faced each other across the aisle in this very chamber for a long period of time. They were two bachelor Prime Ministers, neither of which was the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). In 1934 when R. B. Bennett was prime minister and spoke about a bill to legalize lotteries, he said:

When I am asked to exercise my vote as a member of the House of Commons of Canada to say that we shall legalize that which has brought the misery to the human race that games of chance and lotteries have brought, I propose to exercise my vote against any such thing... If I were to sit upon a jury, I would have to find the evidence against lotteries far outweighs any support that can be found either in the past or the present.

• (8:30 p.m.)

From the other side of the aisle Mackenzie King, perhaps agreeing with the Right Hon.