

Criminal Code

to lotteries, provincial legislatures ought also to be exempted. Frankly, I question the wisdom of having parliament exempt charitable organizations. How can the government say that if provinces operate lotteries they will be breaking the law? Certain narrow exemptions are included in the bill. I do not think it is correct to say that an analogy can be drawn with respect to what is being legislated for the provinces and what is being permitted under the federal authority. When one considers the matter at all, one sees that the Criminal Code is being changed to permit lotteries to be operated by the federal government. In short, parliament is being asked to allow the government to run lotteries.

Such legislation goes far beyond any legislation that would merely amend the Criminal Code. Frankly, we are being asked to authorize the Governor in Council to establish lotteries. That is absurd. One may ask, why is this government asking parliament for authority to operate lotteries.

An hon. Member: Because Benson's desperate.

Mr. Stanfield: This is absurd.

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). The arguments of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) were so clear, concise, and convincing that it is hardly necessary for me to speak.

This afternoon the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) berrated me for praising the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) for the provisions regarding homosexuality. Probably I went a little too far in praising the minister. I think the amendments concerning homosexuality, abortions, guns, and parole have been brought in because the intention is to bring about an enlightened society—and Lord knows, we will have to wait a long time for a just society.

At present I am speaking about the lottery clause of the bill, and I support the amendment of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. The Minister of Justice may say that the lottery clauses are permissive only; yet I do not think that the introduction of this clause shows that the government has an enlightened view on this matter.

When supporting the idea of lotteries, many Canadians cite as an example the Irish sweepstakes. They say that much money from Canada is flowing out to foreign lotteries and

that if we have our own Canadian lottery the outflow of that money will cease. May I point out to hon. members that the Irish sweepstakes are operated, not by any government authority, but by private authority. In the 36 years this private authority has run the sweepstake it has made in profits \$1.2 billion and made available to hospitals and other charitable organizations only \$140 million. If that Irish private organization were considered in that country an ordinary corporation subject to corporation taxes it would pay much more than \$140 million in taxes on profits of \$1.2 billion. In other words, the \$140 million paid to charities and hospitals is less than any taxes a comparable corporation would have had to pay.

An hon. Member: What about the prizes?

Mr. Gilbert: Someone asks, what about the prizes? To that I can only say that the amount of money given to hospitals and other charitable organizations makes me think that the Irish sweepstakes have been hardly worth promoting. I do not think the state ought to make itself responsible for the provision of gambling facilities. It is undignified. The government of Canada should not enter the gambling business. Many studies into lotteries have been conducted in Britain and Canada. The Joint Committee of the House of Commons and the Senate studied in depth the question of lotteries. That was in 1956, I believe. That committee concluded we should not have lotteries here, and made that recommendation. They said that lotteries will bring little tax revenue. Studies have indicated that lotteries in Quebec will net that province little more than \$10 million at the highest, an insignificant figure which will do little in Quebec to help hospitals and charitable organizations.

I do not think we ought to support this new legislation, and we ought to support the amendment of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. The minister ought to know the effects of lotteries in New York city and New Hampshire. Responsible authorities there have said that lotteries, from the point of view of the state, have not been a financial success and have not helped to meet some of the problems they were intended to meet.

I asked the minister when he appeared before the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs who was promoting this new lottery legislation. He said no one in particular was, and therefore the responsibility for introducing this legislation must be laid at the minister's doorstep. Even though the hon.