

*Bonus Bond Draw*

I have touched upon a few of the very major drawbacks involved in adopting some kind of a lottery bond scheme, which have created very serious concerns. As yet, I have seen no public need which would be usefully served by the implementation of such a program at this time.

**Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic):** Mr. Speaker, I shall speak briefly on this matter because it is certainly not my intention that the Bill be talked out, although I see that the Government has its bodies lined up to do just that.

**Mr. McKenzie:** The civil servants prepared their speeches.

**Mr. Nickerson:** Yes, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine (Mr. McKenzie) says that the public servants have undoubtedly prepared their speeches, and that I do not disbelieve. I have seen that done before on many occasions, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to say that this idea is not a new one. Rather than each individual bond holder being paid a small amount of money, all of the interest payable on those bonds is put into one pool and then a draw is made to determine which of the bond holders gets a chunk of that aggregate interest. That idea has worked quite successfully, having been applied in a number of other countries.

I know that there have been bonds of this nature in Great Britain for some time. I think that on the street they are called "Ernie" bonds, but I am not certain about that. However, a slightly new twist to this idea has been added by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine in that under his scheme, a certain low-interest rate on the bonds would be paid, presumably to protect them from inflation to some degree so that the capital amount is not eroded too badly. The remainder of the interest would be put into this one pool, or one part, and the distribution of that would be decided by lots.

● (1630)

After having said that this is not a new idea and has been applied successfully in other countries, I would like now to go into some of the rather spurious objections raised by the Hon. Member for Lambton-Middlesex (Mr. Ferguson). He went out of his way to attack the mechanics of how such a system would operate. I think the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine went into considerable detail in his proposal as to how the mechanics would work, who would be the agents of the Ministry of Finance in the distribution of the bonds, and how the funds would be administered. Other countries have worked out the details of the mechanics of handling such a situation. So any objection to the scheme based on details of who are to be the vendors and by whom the money is to be handled does not hold water.

This is not a lottery in the common sense of the word. People do not dig into their wallets and fork over \$10 or \$20 to buy a lottery ticket and then, if they are unsuccessful, lose all that they had at risk. In this case, a person might buy a bond in the denomination of \$1000, maybe a little more or maybe a little less. That capital would be protected. It would not be put

at hazard. It would be protected, especially under the scheme proposed by the Hon. Member, wherein low interest payments would be made to keep up with inflation. The proposal is not in the nature of the common lottery system as we know it in Canada.

The Hon. Member for Lambton-Middlesex accused the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine of hypocrisy. Nothing could be further from the truth. I would venture to suggest that if there is hypocrisy prevalent in this Chamber, it is emanating from the Hon. Member for Lambton-Middlesex. He is a part of the Government that has actively promoted lotteries in the worst sense throughout Canada. The Government is presently engaged in the new sports pool lottery. It has changed it in midstream. It is that Government which is promoting the purchasing of lottery tickets by those who can least afford them. The Government is trying to take kids' shoe money from the low-income earners of Canada and risk it in these games of chance. That is where the hypocrisy comes in. In the scheme of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine, people would at least be required to have a minimum of \$500, or maybe \$1,000, in order to purchase one of the bonds. Only the accrued interest of that money would be at risk.

It is not the low-income earners, the poor people of Canada, who would be engaged in this type of activity, because they would not be able to afford to tie up that kind of cash. They would not have that kind of cash available. It is only the people who have been successful enough to acquire some capital and who can afford to have that capital tied up who would get into this type of activity.

We heard some other rubbish from the Hon. Member for Lambton-Middlesex dealing with the redemption terms of the bonds. The Hon. Member who proposed the scheme again went into considerable detail on how redemption would take place; how it could be done at the option of the Government so that it could issue or take back bonds in order to help with the normal financing program of the Government of Canada. All those red herrings about redemption that were dragged into the debate this afternoon just do not make any sense.

**Mr. McKenzie:** I did not say we would sell them in coffee shops.

**Mr. Nickerson:** If we are to look at the question of gambling, especially gambling promoted by government, we cannot have it both ways. We cannot argue, as did the Hon. Member opposite, that it is bad in this case, but it is permissible in the worst type of lotteries which are actively promoted by the Government over there. If it is immoral with respect to one lottery, then it is equally immoral with respect to another type of lottery. If we are going to get into an argument about the degrees of morality, then the proposal from this side of the House—and I am going against my previous argument—would be a little bit less immoral than the proposals, or those things which have already been put into effect, by the Government of Canada. We can argue morality. Personally, I do not feel that a government should promote gambling in Canada, but we cannot have it both ways. We cannot argue on one side