

*Criminal Code*

for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). I deeply regret that this legislation, which in general is civilized and civilizing, would have incorporated within it this particular feature of permitting federal or provincial lotteries. In my view, this is a blot on what is otherwise an enlightened piece of legislation.

I do not know whether it is too late to appeal to the Minister of Justice to look at this matter again; I suppose it is. I do not know whether it is too late to appeal to the House of Commons here assembled to look at it again, and to reject the present provision in this bill. As I say, I believe in an otherwise enlightened and civilized piece of legislation, this is something that would be deeply regretted if the house saw fit to adopt it. I am not against lotteries because of any puritanical or restrictive points of view. I assume that gambling is a natural instinct, one that cannot be repressed.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** How otherwise would this government have ever got elected?

**Mr. Brewin:** That is a good point. But when we come to consider the effect of this legislation as far as lotteries are concerned, I think we have to admit that this provision is permissive of a socially unjust, regressive and unfortunate system of taxation; that is the net result of it.

I have here a quotation I should like to read to the house contained in a publication called *The Christian Century*, though I do not know to which century the reference is.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** It has not come yet.

**Mr. Brewin:** I agree with my colleague. The quotation is this:

In the final analysis, revenue must come from productive enterprise. Gambling produces no wealth; it merely redistributes it from the hands of the many into the hands of the few.

The essence of this legislation is that it permits a redistribution of wealth that hits the people who are the poorest and least able to give. It takes from the many and gives to the few. That is the basic effect of legislation of this sort. It dries up the well-springs of genuine and decent charitable giving. It has been tried out on many occasions. The pendulum for and against lotteries has swung first one way and then the other. I believe many important institutions were founded as

[Mr. Brewin.]

a result of lotteries. Somebody told me that Harvard University was built from the proceeds of a lottery. There used to be times when the sheriffs of the courts in England went out and sold lottery tickets, which was something like the raising of bond revenue for the government of the country. Similarly, when justices travelled throughout the country they sold lottery tickets. But every time it has been tried it has been found to involve all sorts of undesirable social consequences.

I am surprised at the permissive attitude of the Minister of Justice. He says: "Well, we don't intend to do this or expect to be asked to do this, but we will give the provinces permission to do it". That sort of permissiveness is the very vice that is destroying sound attitudes.

Britain has experienced this same swing of the pendulum. The British have passed legislation giving the opportunity for gambling wider scope. I have in front of me a press clipping, the headline of which is: "Britain's gambling craze saps energy and resources". I suggest that that is the natural tendency of legislation of this sort. A state lottery is bound to result, as the headline says, in a sapping of energy and resources. It is promoting delusions on the part of people who cannot afford to have such delusions.

● (9:10 p.m.)

I do not know why a piece of legislation which makes good sense, which is civilized and civilizing, should include a clause on lotteries when experience shows that lotteries do not work, are not sound, and do not bring intelligent results. I know that there is widespread public opinion favouring lotteries. I would not mind betting that if I consulted some of my constituents they would be in favour of lotteries. Why is that, Mr. Speaker? I submit it is because they have no experience showing how destructive and unjust lotteries can be.

I plead with the minister to look at this clause again. I plead with the house to take a responsible view of this matter and to support the amendment of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). I do not ask that because he is my colleague; I ask it in the name of common sense and good judgment.

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I am in a curious position. I say that if charitable organizations and municipalities are to be exempt from the provisions of the Criminal Code with respect