

attention to the report of the Royal Commission on Lotteries and Betting issued in London, England, in 1933.

That report quotes the resolution of the British Hospital Association, which states:

"That the British Hospital Association is not in favour of the amendment of the law affecting public sweepstakes, which purports to be for the benefit of voluntary hospitals."

Recent figures in connection with the Irish sweepstakes for hospitals, extending from 1931 to 1933, make clear that:

1. Hospitals received only one-seventh of the amount wagered.

2. Prize money equalled approximately one-half.

3. The balance went to the sellers and to "expenses."

That is, $\frac{3}{4}$ went to hospitals, $\frac{1}{4}$ to prize money, and $\frac{5}{14}$ to sellers and overhead.

In arriving at its findings the Commission states that "while gambling among private individuals should not be interfered with, organized gambling facilities should be prohibited or restricted where these facilities lead to serious social consequences."

In view of these considerations, the Commission reached the following conclusions:

1. "That the institution of large lotteries in this country (Great Britain) is not recommended. Such a step is undesirable in itself, and unlikely to assist, very materially in suppressing the sale in this country of tickets in lotteries promoted elsewhere."

2. "The existing general prohibition in this country of all lotteries, whether promoted here or abroad, should be maintained, and the law against foreign and illegal lotteries should be strengthened."

Certain legislation is recommended to give effect to the prohibition of lotteries, and under the Lottery Act the court should forfeit to the state any money or valuable thing connected with the proceeds of a foreign or illegal lottery.

Certain exceptions recommended from the general prohibition of lotteries deal with art union drawings, private lotteries proposed in clubs, and small public lotteries incidental to bazaars and sales of work, under certain conditions. "No exception should be made however, in favour of small public lotteries or prize drawings in which the public in general are invited to purchase tickets."

In view of the findings of this Royal Commission which deals with the whole subject of lotteries and other forms of gambling, and which points out the disastrous social and moral effects of lotteries upon the morale of the nation in a time of financial strain, the nation is a time of financial strain, the Social Service Council of Canada strongly urges that the bill for Hospital Sweepstakes be not passed. The Royal Commission by its findings states that Hospital Sweepstakes are not in the best interests of Great Britain. Why then should they be considered in the best interests of Canada?

Yours on behalf of the Social Service Council of Canada.

J. Phillips Jones,
General Secretary.

Hon. Mr. MACDONELL: May I ask the honourable gentleman a question? Does that

letter represent the public feeling of the whole country, from one end to the other, or is it merely an expression of opinion by a society?

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: My honourable friend is in just as good a position as I am to answer that question. I tried to be rather explicit in indicating where this letter came from. I have no doubt my honourable friend would regard it as being worse than useless, as he has the right to do, and I am only giving it as the expression of opinion of the Social Service Council of Canada. It may be that my honourable friend is not concerned about or sympathetic towards the Social Service Council of Canada, but that does not alter the fact that this organization, which presumably represents tens of thousands of reputable and responsible citizens of Canada, has seen fit to send out the letter I have read, a copy of which was no doubt sent to my honourable friend as well as to me.

The Ottawa Citizen of this morning carries an article, under the heading "Many Families at Toronto on Partial Relief," which tempts me to digress for a moment. It points out that some wage-earners, married men who are heads of families, are receiving from their employers in Toronto \$10 a week or less, and are securing from the Relief Department of that great city some additional money to enable them to maintain the health, happiness and well-being of themselves and their dependents. I happened to sit in and listen to the testimony given before a committee of another House yesterday, and thirty-eight Toronto firms were specifically mentioned as paying employees engaged in various forms of industrial activity such a pittance that the city, through the taxpayers, had to come to their relief.

That, in my humble judgment, is an exact illustration of the kind of thing that is proposed by the Bill now under consideration, an Act with respect to Hospital Sweepstakes. Last year the honourable senator from Vancouver (Hon. Mr. McRae) and this year the honourable senator from Victoria (Hon. Mr. Barnard) advocated the establishment of lotteries as a means of securing funds to meet the expenses of hospitals, to keep such institutions up-to-date and to enable them to do work which the cause of humanity demands should be done for those who are in need of it, if we are to live up to the teaching that each man is his brother's keeper. Now, what is the difference, I ask, between shirking our responsibility for digging down into our pockets for the necessary money to keep the hospitals functioning properly, and the em-