

was referred to last week by the honourable the junior senator from Toronto (Hon. Mr. Hocken). This institution got the sum of £20,922 14s. 6d., or approximately a little over \$100,000 in our money to-day. Not a bad little hospital contribution, particularly as there is a North Cork Infirmary, which received the larger sum of £27,896 19s. 4d. Then the City of Cork lying-in hospital got £10,461; Fever Hospital, Cork, £24,409, and the Dental Hospital, Cork, £6,974. So we find the City of Cork hospitals got from this one sweepstake, the Derby, a total of £90,665 3s. 0d., or more than \$450,000. I understand Ireland runs four sweepstakes a year.

The honourable the junior senator from Toronto, speaking in the Senate on Tuesday, February 27, as reported in Hansard, page 86, read an excerpt from the Irish Times of Dublin (date not given) to the effect that the Free State Government has not paid the Cork South Infirmary for the period of two years—they must have been 1932 and 1933; and that at a meeting of the committee the treasurer said the hospital owed £3,249 and their position at the end of the year would be impossible, as they would have a deficit of £5,000. But that is not a bad showing, considering what they had received and apparently spent the previous year, namely £20,000, obtained from sweeps. I disagree with the conclusion of the honourable senator that the financial position of the South Cork Infirmary indicates that hospital sweepstakes have not accomplished the purpose for which they were inaugurated. Sweepstakes cannot be held accountable for the Irish Government's failure to turn over the proceeds to the hospitals.

I believe that the Irish Government have recently put a special tax on and derive a substantial revenue from hospital sweeps. This tax of course might account in part for the discrepancy between the figures given by the Social Service Council and the facts disclosed by the certified audits as to the expense of conducting sweepstakes.

I have given a great deal of thought and have made many inquiries in an effort to arrive at a fair conclusion as to the sum a single lottery would provide for the hospitals in British Columbia. I think most people feel that the amount of money paid out for prizes in the Irish sweeps is unnecessarily large. Fifty per cent, or one-half of the takings, would be just as satisfactory as 67 per cent, or two-thirds, which is the average of the two 1931 sweepstakes for which I have auditors' reports. Under the direction of an honorary board of citizens the expenses

Hon. Mr. McRAE.

should not exceed 10 per cent. If 50 per cent of takings is allowed for prizes, there remains 40 per cent for hospitals. Under proper organization, the takings of sweepstakes in British Columbia should amount to at least \$5,000,000, the larger portion of which would come from sources outside of Canada. Forty per cent of these takings would mean \$2,000,000 net for our hospitals in British Columbia—more money than they ever dreamed of getting in a single year, and more than they will need for any continuous period of years. That is why in my original proposal last year I included the sick, destitute and maimed.

As a further evidence of the money these sweeps would provide for our hospitals, allow me to read an extract from the Australian Press Bureau, of November 6, 1933, with regard to Australia's State Lotteries:

Sydney (Australia) . . . More than \$12,500,000 has been expended on hospitals in Queensland in recent years; 88 maternity hospitals have been equipped and constructed in provincial towns; \$600,000 is now available for the immediate construction of a new maternity hospital at Brisbane. All the money for this work has been obtained from the State's lottery.

These details were given by the Queensland Home Secretary, who said the State lotteries had enabled the Government to provide baby clinics, child welfare centres, and dental services for children and the unemployed.

So much for the financial advantages of these sweeps. I do not think that part of the question is open to argument.

I now come to the second point. I refer to the moral side, which has been dealt with at such length in this debate. The honourable senator from Parkdale (Hon. Mr. Murdock) when opposing this Bill disclaimed any holier-than-thou attitude. Personally I have nothing to say in that regard except that I do not plead guilty to the accusations of the holier-than-thou people who passed judgment on me in connection with a similar measure last year. I fear they are the same professional reformers who set back the cause of temperance for at least a generation. I am not unmindful of the fact that the Church dominant in the Irish Free State has not raised its voice against sweepstakes. I am one of those who believe in taking things as you find them, not as you would wish them, and then making the best you can of the situation; and that is the way I face this issue.

There is no use in shutting our eyes to the situation in this Dominion with regard to sweepstakes. It is a notorious fact that the practice of purchasing tickets in foreign sweepstakes is tremendously on the increase. The great majority of my acquaintances buy