

By the elimination of expenses the profits would be larger and a greater number of prizes could be allotted.

According to the circular of the Social Service Council, placed on Hansard:

1. Hospitals received only one-seventh of the amount wagered.

2. Prize money equalled approximately one-half.

3. The balance went to the sellers and to "expenses."

That is, two-fourteenths went to hospitals, seven-fourteenths to prize money, and five-fourteenths to sellers and overhead.

But even at that it is paying. Listen to this dispatch from Sydney, New South Wales, dated April 14, 1933:

When the 100th New South Wales State lottery was drawn recently, the Director announced that the total profit realized from the lotteries had been about \$7,500,000.

This, he said, was a complete vindication of the system of assisting the hospitals by lotteries.

The first lottery was drawn in August, 1931.

But under the present suggestion twenty-five per cent would go to the Government and seventy-five per cent to the purchasers of tickets. Expenses would be very small and would be paid by the purchasers of tickets. The real beneficiaries would be the workers and consequently the community at large; for, first, we have work to give; second, the purchasing power of the worker being increased, our industries would get their share of benefit; and, third, the works would remain as a permanent improvement. Then the provincial governments, not having to contribute to the payment of direct relief, would, as in the past, be in a position to help their hospitals and universities.

It has been stated that this gambling method of raising moneys cannot be countenanced by law; it is too dangerous. But, honourable senators, which is the wiser policy, to legalize a mild mode of gambling, controlled by the Government, well organized and kept in check, or to let our working classes starve to the point of despair? Which is the more dangerous course for our young people, to buy three or four lottery tickets a year, or to stand by idly witnessing the despair of their parents and with no hope of a betterment of affairs for themselves? In any event, lottery tickets will be bought in this country. Why not control and use to good purpose what cannot be stopped?

These are the things that I wanted to submit for your consideration and the attention of the Government. The aim of the present Bill is somewhat different from the

Hon. Mr. MARCOTTE.

objective I had in view, but even with its defects the measure is a step in the right direction.

For these reasons I shall repeat what I have done on previous occasions, and support the Bill.

Hon. A. D. McRAE: Honourable senators, as I was sponsor for the Sweepstakes Bill which was before this House last session, I felt that my views on sweepstakes were so well known and the subject had been so thoroughly discussed that there was no necessity for my taking up the time of honourable members in restating my position. However the honourable senator from Essex (Hon. Mr. Lacasse), when speaking in favour of the Bill on Wednesday last, expressed the hope that I would state my views again before the debate was concluded and show that I had consistently maintained the attitude I voiced last session. I willingly comply with his request. Of course I shall vote for the Bill. The reasons I advanced for its adoption last year exist and are even more urgent to-day.

That the sentiment in favour of sweepstakes is growing throughout the country every honourable member must know. I have made it a point during the past year to inquire carefully from time to time as opportunity offered, and it is my firm opinion that if a plebiscite on sweepstakes were submitted to the electors of my province the vote would be three to one in favour of sweeps. The Premier of one of our great provinces early in the year expressed himself as favourable to sweepstakes for charitable and educational purposes, and he speaks for the majority of the electors of that province. I presume the same sentiment prevails throughout the country.

Press reports following the conference of the provincial premiers in this city in January of this year indicated that there is the possibility of a general discussion on this issue in the other House. I agree with the honourable gentleman from Ponteix (Hon. Mr. Marcotte) that this is not an ideal Bill, but I submit it is in keeping with the sentiment which has been built up in this country in favour of the support of hospitals. As he quite rightly says, it is a step in the right direction. I am hopeful that the Government of the day, if unable to approve this Bill, will see fit to submit at the next general election a plebiscite on sweepstakes, with a view to obtaining a true record of the wishes of the Canadian people.

I followed very closely the debate which took place on this question last week. I wish to refer to only two points which, it