

Another suggestion was made that a million dollars went from Toronto to Ireland and that this money ought to have been kept in Canada and directed into the coffers of Canadian sweepstakes. It was advanced as an argument that the people of Toronto—I do not know whether the figures are correct; I am simply taking the argument as advanced—who sent a million dollars to Dublin were so anxious to give it to a hospital that when they could not give it to a Toronto hospital they had to send it to a similar institution in Dublin. Therefore it was contended that we in Canada ought at once to give them an opportunity to contribute to a Toronto or an Ontario hospital. The argument has only to be stated to see how ridiculous it is. In the first place, if we had an Ontario sweepstake, people would still, if they could, buy tickets for the Dublin sweepstake. Why? Because of the hope of those \$100,000 winnings. When the newspapers at each drawing for the Irish sweepstake spread the news of a family in New York, or Toronto or some other part of Canada, drawing \$100,000, \$125,000, \$70,000, \$10,000, and so on, the avaricious instincts of thousands of people are stirred up and they go out and buy a ticket—what for? To contribute to the Irish hospitals? No. They have no more interest in the Irish hospitals than that inkwell on my desk. All they are thinking of is that they have a wild chance of getting a winning ticket, which chance I understand, taking all the prizes together, amounts to about one in three thousand; something extremely small in any case.

For these reasons and many others I am opposed to this bill. I repeat what I said just now, that the law against gambling as it appears on the statute books of this country is either a good law or a bad law. If the law is faulty we should correct it, not for sweepstakes for one purpose; for if sweepstakes are good for that purpose they are good for other purposes. That is not the test of the value of the law. The test of its value is that if it is desirable that some people should have an advantage, the same advantage ought to be open to any citizen of Canada for any purpose. So I say the law is either good or bad, and the test should be whether we wish to remove from the statute books the law against gambling or whether we prefer to stand by the experience of a great many years and retain this law which most of us believe is necessary in the interest of good social conditions in this country.

Mr. O. B. ELLIOTT (Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, seeing that it is just about nine o'clock, I should like to adjourn the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. ELLIOTT (Kindersley): After serious consideration I have decided to support this bill, not because I believe that the particular bill is necessary to prevent gambling or anything of that kind, but because I believe there should be a certain measure of control in this matter, as there is in other ventures in this dominion. Let me state briefly some of the reasons why I believe we should have this control. Consider first the Winnipeg grain exchange, where speculation is permitted in the buying and selling of grain futures, not for the benefit of the people as a whole but for the express purpose of making money. I refer to the grain commission inquiry report, page 47. In regard to speculation in grain futures, we find it said that:

. . . business on the Chicago board of trade would be seriously handicapped, if not wholly dislocated, by the elimination of speculative buying and selling (or even by the elimination of only speculative selling) in the market.

I am convinced by the evidence that the presence of speculators in the Winnipeg futures market is just as essential to the proper functioning of that market as is the case in Chicago. The volume of their transactions may not be as great and on this point there is no definite evidence, but experience has shown that in Winnipeg if the speculator is away the market is in difficulties.

And on page 48:

As long as you have the present method of marketing, speculation is a very necessary element in the existing system and its absence is certainly to be regretted.

I have no brief for gambling in any manner, shape or form; but in the case of the Winnipeg grain exchange, where we are permitted to endanger even the lives of primary producers through the manipulation of the market because of rising and falling prices, we also know that the percentage of winners is small. But as the profits made from this source assist the large grain brokers in handling the crop, assuring them of safe margins, the casino is permitted to exist.

We have the same conditions in the stock market. Stocks are bought mostly for the purpose of making money, not for the purpose of developing property or for any material interest in the welfare of the country. I have here a magazine, the *Newsweek*, dated May 30, 1938, in which I find the following item in reference to the stock market. It is rather amusing to me, after reading articles during recent months trying to explain why investors have not been taking advantage of the present low prices of stocks. I maintain that the reason is very simple; they have