

The Response of the Anglican Dioceses of Perth and Sydney to the Introduction of State Lotteries from 1920 to 1945.

Cameron Howard

INTRODUCTION

Between 1920-1933, a series of legislative changes introduced State Lotteries into Queensland, New South Wales (NSW) and Western Australia (WA) for the first time in Australian history. These developments were a source of considerable public debate and received widespread condemnation from Protestant churches across Australia. This essay will examine the specific responses of the Anglican Dioceses of Perth and Sydney to State Lotteries from 1920 to 1945. In particular, this essay will focus on the specific theological/moral reasoning that led each Diocese to adopt their respective position. After discussing the historical context in which State Lotteries developed, it will be shown that the Perth Diocese initially opposed the Lottery as it considered it intrinsically evil, illegal, detrimental to wider society and ineffective at fundraising. However, Perth's strong emphasis on the social gospel combined with the effects of the Great Depression meant that it became necessary not simply to endorse the State's use of lotteries for raising revenue but to accept such finances themselves to fund their orphanages. Likewise, they adopted a consequentialist ethic which justified lotteries morally, and employed numerous arguments to distinguish lotteries from other forms of gambling which they remained opposed to. In contrast, it will be demonstrated that despite similar economic challenges, Sydney remained resolute in its opposition to lotteries, regardless of their use. It viewed them as sinful; rejected consequentialist justifications for lotteries; considered them detrimental to society and wasteful economically. Moreover, its strong evangelicalism meant that it required its own

fundraising to be sacrificial direct-giving; that it considered gambling to be risking eternal salvation and so must be opposed; and viewed its ultimate responsibility not to enact social change or welfare, but to preach the gospel.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Legal, Political and Economic

Throughout the nineteenth century, a raft of legislation across Australian States widely prohibited lotteries and similar gambling practices.¹ Consequently, when the first Australian lottery began operating in 1881 by George Tattersall, although it was economically successful and often temporarily tolerated by officials, it faced regular Government opposition.² Tattersall's Lottery, which initially began in NSW, was forced to move to Queensland and then Tasmania due to legislative opposition.³

The first Government operated lottery commenced in Queensland in 1920. In 1916, the Queensland Patriotic Committee had gained permission to conduct a lottery for their soldier repatriation fund which was extremely successful in raising funds and by 1920, the Queensland Government took over control of the lottery and placed all profits into the newly created Motherhood, Child Welfare and Hospital Fund.⁴ Numerous economic and political factors led to the Queensland Labor Government's support of this lottery. By 1919, Queensland hospitals required an extra £250,000 per year, which was far beyond the government's financial capabilities.⁵ Similarly, the Government had adopted numerous social welfare reforms and public investment policies that required additional social and health

¹ Wendy Selby, 'Social Evil or Social Good? Lotteries and State Regulation in Australia and the United States', in *Gambling Cultures: Studies in History and Interpretation* (ed. Jan McMillen; London: Routledge, 1996), 65-8; John O'Hara, *A Mug's Game: A History of Gaming and Betting in Australia* (Kensington: NSW University Press, 1988), 115.

² Selby, 'Lotteries', 66-8.

³ Selby, 'Lotteries', 68.

⁴ Selby, 'Lotteries', 65.

⁵ Selby, 'Lotteries', 70.

services and thus additional funding.⁶ When combined with the ‘Queensland loans affair’, when from 1920-4 the Government received an embargo on funding loans from London, it was forced to adopt the Lottery to provide the necessary funding for hospitals and similar institutions.⁷

Whilst initially opposed to such measures, Queensland’s success in raising revenue encouraged the Governments of NSW and WA to follow suit, and in 1931 and 1933 respectively, each adopted State Lotteries to fund social welfare activities.⁸ It is widely agreed that the Great Depression was the major factor in encouraging the adoption of lotteries, as increased public demand on social services and reduced revenue meant the States could not effectively fund social institutions.⁹ This was exacerbated by the loss of revenue to the Queensland lottery, with 31 per cent of all Queensland Lottery tickets sold in NSW whilst WA lost considerable potential revenue to the Queensland and NSW lotteries.¹⁰ As Selby argues, ‘the loss of this gambling revenue at a time of great economic hardship tipped the scales’ for Governments initially opposed to lotteries.¹¹

Public Perception

As is widely noted, it was Protestantism and the largely Protestant middle-class that had been mostly responsible for earlier prohibition against gambling and this opposition continued with the introduction of State Lotteries.¹² There was almost unanimous condemnation from

⁶ Selby, ‘Lotteries’, 70.

⁷ Selby, ‘Lotteries’, 71.

⁸ Sian Danielle Supski, *A Proper Foundation: A History of the Lotteries Commission of Western Australia 1932—2008* (Perth: Black Swan Press, 2009), 28, 22, 64; Selby, ‘Lotteries’, 77. Victoria did not loosen restrictions until 1953 and South Australia was the last state to introduce lotteries for public funding in 1966.

⁹ Selby, ‘Lotteries’, 77; Supski, *History*, 20, 64; NSW Lotteries, ‘Our History,’ n.p. [cited 1 April 2013]. Online: <http://tatts.com/nswlotteries/about/our-history>.

¹⁰ Selby, ‘Lotteries’, 73; Supski, *History*, 21, 24-5; ‘State Lotteries: The Government Proposition, Opposition by Churches’, *Geraldton Guardian*, October 14, 1924: 1; ‘State Lotteries: Another Clerical Protest. Letter to Politicians’. *The West Australian*, October 9, 1924: 13.

¹¹ Selby, ‘Lotteries’, 77.

¹² Jan McMillen, ‘Understanding Gambling: History, Concepts and Theories’, in *Gambling Cultures: Studies in History and Interpretation* (ed. Jan McMillen; London: Routledge, 1996), 12-13; Selby, ‘Lotteries’, 66-7; O’Hara, *Game*, 131-6, 142; Supski, *History*, 3.

Protestant churches across Australia. Even a cursory glance at newspaper records of the time shows the prevalence of this opposition, with widespread official condemnation from the Synods (or equivalent bodies) and representatives of the Anglican,¹³ Methodist,¹⁴ Presbyterian,¹⁵ Baptist,¹⁶ Congregationalist,¹⁷ and Salvation Army churches¹⁸ across Australia as well numerous interdenominational bodies such as the Women's Christian Temperance Union¹⁹ and various Councils of Churches.²⁰ Gambling was seen not just as inherently immoral, but as a threat to national efficiency.²¹

However, whilst the largely Protestant middle-class was opposed to lotteries, gambling had always been popular amongst the largely Roman Catholic, working-class of Australia and this too continued with lotteries.²² Newspaper articles after the introduction of lotteries show how widely it was accepted, with regular news regarding upcoming draws and winners,²³ lottery

¹³ 'Local and General', *Albany Advertiser* [Adelaide]. September 12, 1929: 2; 'Lotteries and Synod: Bishop's Criticism', *The Mercury* [Hobart]. August 25, 1941: 2; 'Bishop Opposes Synod's View: Use of Lotteries', *The Sydney Morning Herald*. August 25, 1941: 4.

¹⁴ 'Church News and Notes', *The Mercury* [Hobart]. November 30, 1921: 2; 'Methodist Ministers: Problem of Unpaid Stipends', *The West Australian*. December 7, 1932: 10; 'Lottery Die-Hards', *The Daily News* [Perth]. November 3, 1932: 6; 'The Lotteries Bill: Methodists' Attitude. "Uncompromising Hostility"', *The West Australian*. November 3, 1932: 16; 'General News', *The West Australian*. November 7, 1936: 15; 'Methodists to Renew Their Onslaught on State Lotteries', *The Daily News* [Perth]. February 20, 1937: 2.

¹⁵ 'Among the Churches', *The West Australian*. February 29, 1931: 5; 'The Churches' Attitude: Opposition Predominant', *The West Australian*. October 12, 1932: 14; 'Churches Favor Fewer Betting Shops: Anglican and Presbyterian Protest', *The Advertiser* [Adelaide]. February 14, 1934: 19-20; 'Summed Up: Epitome of To-day's News', *The Daily News* [Perth]. October 10, 1921: 1.

¹⁶ 'The Churches' Attitude: Opposition Predominant', *The West Australian*. October 12, 1932: 14; 'Lotteries and Charity', *The Argus* [Melbourne]. August 27, 1941: 3.

¹⁷ 'The Churches' Attitude: Opposition Predominant', *The West Australian*. October 12, 1932: 14; 'Religious Notes', *The Registrar* [Adelaide]. July 19, 1924: 4.

¹⁸ 'The Churches' Attitude: Opposition Predominant', *The West Australian*. October 12, 1932: 14; 'Council of Churches and State Lottery', *The Central Queensland Herald*. August 28, 1941: 29; 'Against Aid By Lottery', *Sunday Mail* [Brisbane]. August 24, 1941: 3.

¹⁹ 'The Lotteries Bill', *The West Australian*. October 12, 1932: 14; 'Women's Fight for Vice Reform', *The Daily News* [Perth]. September 3, 1941: 19.

²⁰ 'Council of Churches Against Lotteries', *Cairns Post*. August 25, 1941: 4; 'Council of Churches and State Lottery', *The Central Queensland Herald*. August 28, 1941: 29; 'Dean Against Gambling', *The Mail* [Adelaide]. August 23, 1941: 2.

²¹ Selby, 'Lotteries', 66-7; McMillen, 'Gambling', 13; Supski, *History*, 11, 36.

²² David Dixon, 'Illegal Betting in Britain and Australia: Contrasts in Control Strategies and Cultures', in *Gambling Cultures: Studies in History and Interpretation* (ed. Jan McMillen; London: Routledge, 1996), 93; Selby, 'Lotteries', 65, 67, 71; O'Hara, *Game*, 171-6; Selby, 'Lotteries', 71; Supski, *History*, 41. It likewise received approval from the Roman Catholic church e.g. 'Council of Churches and State Lottery', *The Central Queensland Herald*. August 28, 1941: 29; 'Against Aid By Lottery', *Sunday Mail* [Brisbane]. August 24, 1941: 3.

²³ 'Buckets of Money', *Geraldton Guardian and Express*. August 26, 1933: 1; 'News in a Nutshell', *Western Mail* [Perth]. August 5 1937: 33; 'Summary', *Sydney Morning Herald*. March 25, 1933: 1; 'Home News', *Sydney Morning Herald*. September 29, 1936: 1; 'What is Happening in Your Home State', *Army News* [Darwin]. October 4, 1944: 2.

advertisements,²⁴ and even businesses advertising their location in relation to the lottery office address²⁵ whilst opponents were criticised as ‘wowsers’.²⁶

The diminishing influence of Protestant churches and the relative smallness of Australia’s middle class meant the widespread Protestant opposition had minimal impact on legislation and lotteries’ popularity.²⁷ Moreover, by linking lotteries with causes such as funding hospitals, State Lotteries were further legitimised and popularised amongst Australians.²⁸

THE DIOCESE OF PERTH

Early Opposition

Whilst by 1941 the Perth Anglican Diocese had officially endorsed the acceptance of Lottery proceeds, its initial response was one of opposition to the State Lottery. As early as 1921, when a State Lottery was first suggested, the Diocese’s Social Questions Committee unanimously carried a resolution which ‘earnestly urges representatives of Parliament not to sanction the holding of lotteries’.²⁹ It rejected lotteries as not just ‘morally unsound’ but also as a means of funding charities, arguing ‘that when associated with any charitable or other worthy movement it becomes even more harmful’.³⁰ It urged Parliament to consider alternate means of funding good causes ‘by a more equitable method which will not be injurious to the moral welfare of the community, and will ensure each adult member of the community bearing a fair share of the cost’.³¹ This Committee’s findings were adopted by the 1921

²⁴ e.g. ‘Zero Hour is Almost Here’, *The Daily News* [Perth], August 18, 1939: 15.

²⁵ *Sydney Morning Herald*, January 28: 1933: 3; *Sydney Morning Herald*, December 3, 1949: 40.

²⁶ ‘Notes and Comments’, *Sunday Times* [Perth], November 6, 1921: 4

²⁷ Selby, ‘Lotteries’, 76-8; also O’Hara, *Game*, 151, 248-9. Queensland in particular was the most Catholic Australian state, and the Catholic church had strong politic influence and so the introduction of a lottery was widely supported at a social and institutional level (Selby, ‘Lotteries’, 71).

²⁸ McMillen, ‘Gambling’, 18; Selby, ‘Lotteries’, 73, 79, 81-2; Supski, *History*, 3.

²⁹ ‘Legalising Lotteries: Protests from Public Bodies’, *The West Australian*, October 3, 1921: 8.

³⁰ ‘Legalising Lotteries: Protests from Public Bodies’, *The West Australian*, October 3, 1921: 8.

³¹ ‘Legalising Lotteries: Protests from Public Bodies’, *The West Australian*, October 3, 1921: 8.

Synod,³² with no apparent record of opposition. When the first Bill permitting lotteries was defeated in Parliament, Synod members expressed 'keen satisfaction'.³³

Opposition continued in 1924 when the Lotteries Bill was reintroduced, and the Synod passed a motion expressing 'regrets that the Government is seeking to establish State lotteries as a means of raising funds to maintain hospitals and charitable institutions'.³⁴ It asked the Legislative Council 'to reject a Bill for which there is no justification and for which there is no public sanction'.³⁵

Perth also partnered with other Denominations to oppose the Lottery. For instance, in 1924 Archbishop Riley, as part of an Inter-Church Committee, wrote to members of Parliament condemning the State Lottery and urging them to vote against it.³⁶

Indeed, even after Le Fanu became Archbishop of Perth (under whom the Diocese would approve the Lottery), the Diocese still expressed opposition. For example, at the 1932 Inter-Church Committee of Social Questions meeting, Canon Parry stated, 'the Government should have nothing to do with the organisation of State-wide lotteries' and for churches cited the Perth Parochial Statute which prohibited 'any methods of gambling for the purpose of raising funds' for Church work.³⁷

This initial opposition consisted of several key interrelated objections to lotteries. First, lotteries were viewed as intrinsically immoral as seen in statements by its Social Questions

³² 'Anglican Synod: Social Questions', *The West Australian*. November 5, 1921: 9.

³³ 'Anglican Synod: Social Questions', *The West Australian*. November 5, 1921: 9

³⁴ 'Metropolitan News', *Geraldton Guardian*. October 23, 1924: 4.

³⁵ 'State Lotteries: Government's Bill. Opposition by Anglican Church', *The West Australian*. October 1924: 8.

³⁶ 'State Lotteries: The Government Proposition, Opposition by Churches', *Geraldton Guardian*, October 14, 1924: 1; 'State Lotteries: Another Clerical Protest. Letter to Politicians', *The West Australian*, October 9, 1924: 13; Riley's opposition also noted by P. J. Boyce, 'The First Archbishop: Charles Owen Leaver Riley', in *Four Bishops and Their See: Perth, Western Australia 1857-1957* (ed. Fred Alexander; Nedlands: UWA Press, 1957), 97-8.

³⁷ Church of England Diocese of Perth, *Code of Statutes with a List of Legislative Ordinances, Canons of Provincial Synod and Determinations of General Synod* (Perth: E. B. Bayliss Print, 1937), 18; 'The Churches' Attitude: Opposition Predominant', *The West Australian*. October 12, 1932: 14.

Committee, which said ‘the principle in itself is morally unsound’³⁸ or Diocesan newspapers which called it ‘morally... evil’.³⁹

Secondly, it argued against lotteries because gambling was illegal. Thus, one Diocesan newspaper urged the Government to safeguard citizens ‘from a practice which is illegal’.⁴⁰ It was argued that if the Government simply enforced the existing laws prohibiting gambling, there would be no need to run a Lottery in order to regulate illegal gambling.⁴¹ Related to this, it likewise saw a State Lottery as creating a conflict of interest that was damaging to the Government’s ‘prestige and to the impartial administration of the law’.⁴²

The Diocese of Perth also considered lotteries harmful to social order.⁴³ For instance, the 1921 Committee argued ‘the passion to get rich quickly, without honest work or by chance is inimical to a sound social order, opposed to the development of a true standard of national productiveness, and therefore operates against the best interest of State itself’.⁴⁴

Finally, the Diocese simply considered lotteries to be poor fundraisers. The Diocese’s letter to Parliamentary members cited the case of England where although used for 200 years to raise revenue, lotteries had been abolished from 1826 due to their ineffectiveness.⁴⁵

However, whilst the official position of the Diocese in this early period was opposition to the lotteries, a change of attitude can clearly be seen developing. For instance, whilst the 1924 Synod condemned lotteries, numerous members nonetheless defended the morality of lotteries. The Archdeacon of Fremantle said ‘Let it not go out from Synod that we consider it

³⁸ ‘Legalising Lotteries: Protests from Public Bodies’, *The West Australian*. October 3, 1921: 8.

³⁹ ‘Among the Churches’, *The West Australian*. January 2, 1926: 9.

⁴⁰ ‘Among the Churches’, *The West Australian*. January 2, 1926: 9.

⁴¹ ‘The Churches’ Attitude: Opposition Predominant’, *The West Australian*. October 12, 1932: 14; ‘State Lotteries: The Government Proposition, Opposition by Churches’, *Geraldton Guardian*, October 14, 1924: 1; ‘State Lotteries: Another Clerical Protest. Letter to Politicians’, *The West Australian*, October 9, 1924: 13.

⁴² ‘The Churches’ Attitude: Opposition Predominant’, *The West Australian*. October 12, 1932: 14.

⁴³ e.g. ‘The Churches’ Attitude: Opposition Predominant’, *The West Australian*. October 12, 1932: 14; ‘Legalising Lotteries: Protests from Public Bodies’, *The West Australian*. October 3, 1921: 8.

⁴⁴ ‘Legalising Lotteries: Protests from Public Bodies’, *The West Australian*. October 3, 1921: 8.

⁴⁵ ‘State Lotteries: The Government Proposition, Opposition by Churches’, *Geraldton Guardian*, October 14, 1924:1; ‘State Lotteries: Another Clerical Protest. Letter to Politicians’, *The West Australian*, October 9, 1924: 13.

a sinful act to take a ticket in a lottery'.⁴⁶ There were likewise amendments to the motion which, whilst rejected, attempted to remove all language condemning the Lottery as immoral.⁴⁷ Likewise, in 1932 Canon Parry, whilst opposing lotteries acknowledged 'there were some who recognised that a hard and fast rule should not be laid down as to what was actually gambling, and who would have welcomed the rescission' of the Parochial Statute prohibiting gambling as a fundraising means.⁴⁸ Such statements show a clear minority developing who were unopposed to lotteries.

Official Acceptance

The two competing views regarding lotteries came into direct conflict at the 1939 Synod. In 1937, the Lotteries Commission began funding all Anglican orphanages throughout Western Australia with a subsidy of three shillings per week per child.⁴⁹ In light of this, Rev. Brown moved 'that this Synod is not in agreement with the Church receiving money from the Lotteries Commission' and argued it was contrary to the Parochial Statute prohibiting fundraising through gambling.⁵⁰

However, because of conflicting opinions, an amendment was passed appointing 'a small committee to consider the morality of accepting money from the Charities Commissioners'.⁵¹

The Committee, which reported to the 1940 Synod and was discussed in 1941 found 'no moral fault against the laws of God and man in the theory and practice of The Charities

⁴⁶ 'Notes and Comments on Topical Matters', *The Daily News* [Perth]. October 20, 1924: 5; 'Metropolitan News', *Geraldton Guardian*. October 23, 1924: 4; 'State Lotteries: Government's Bill. Opposition by Anglican Church', *The West Australian*. October 1924: 8.

⁴⁷ 'State Lotteries: Government's Bill. Opposition by Anglican Church', *The West Australian*. October 1924: 8.

⁴⁸ 'The Churches' Attitude: Opposition Predominant', *The West Australian*. October 12, 1932: 14.

⁴⁹ Supski, *History*, 35.

⁵⁰ Church of England Diocese of Perth, *Diocese of Perth Synod Minute Book Number 4 1924-1944*. VolB 025 Accession 2008/00005, 241, 233; Church of England Diocese of Perth, *Code of Statutes*, 18.

⁵¹ Church of England Diocese of Perth, *Minute Book*, 241, 233, 257; Church of England Diocese of Perth Committee on Lotteries, *The Lotteries Commission*, 1940; Church of England Diocese of Perth, *Diocese of Perth Yearbook 1940-1941* (Perth: E. B. Bayliss Print, 1941), 56.

Commission'.⁵² Consequently, it ruled 'the practice of the Orphanages Committee [and by extension all church institutions] receiving money from the Charities Commissioners is justifiable'.⁵³

There was extensive debate over the report, with anti-Lottery proponents arguing that accepting Lottery proceeds was immoral and disobedient to God and calling gambling an evil that must be opposed.⁵⁴ They argued that lotteries were prohibited by the Biblical command to love one's neighbour and challenged Synod to trust God's provision, stating 'God has given us work to do, and He will provide the means for us to do it'.⁵⁵

However, despite such opposition, the report received widespread support including from the Archbishop. When Brown again moved 'that this Synod heartily disapproves of our Church's present practice of accepting moneys from the Lotteries Commission', the motion was lost by 84 votes to 33.⁵⁶

The Rationale of the Perth Diocese

Whilst there were numerous factors which influenced Perth's decision to accept lottery money, the two major factors that appear to have led to this acceptance were the Diocese's strong emphasis on the 'social gospel' which prioritised social action combined with the financial problems created by the Great Depression.

It has noted by historians that Archbishop Riley (1894-1929) brought a strong emphasis on the social gospel to the High Church Diocese and this appears to have continued under

⁵² Church of England Diocese of Perth, *Minute Book*, 248, 257; Church of England Diocese of Perth Committee on Lotteries, *The Lotteries Commission*, 1940; Church of England Diocese of Perth, *Yearbook 1940-1941*, 57; 'Lottery Money: Anglican Church's Stand. Committee Finds "No Moral Fault"', *The West Australian*. September 27, 1940: 12.

⁵³ Church of England Diocese of Perth Committee on Lotteries, *The Lotteries Commission*, 1940; Church of England Diocese of Perth, *Yearbook 1940-1941*, 57.

⁵⁴ 'Church and Lotteries: Anglican Synod Divided', *The West Australian*. August 18, 1939: 22.

⁵⁵ 'Church and Lotteries: Anglican Synod Divided', *The West Australian*. August 18, 1939: 22.

⁵⁶ Church of England Diocese of Perth, *Minute Book*, 257.

Archbishop Le Fanu (1929-1946).⁵⁷ Unfortunately, no detailed historical work has been undertaken on how this affected their priorities. However, it is clear from the argument surrounding the Lottery that it prioritised welfare activities such as running orphanages over other considerations, and this arguably is a result of Perth's social gospel influence. For instance, the paramount importance of funding lotteries is demonstrated by one author of the Lottery Report who 'asked if the conscience of objectors... should be satisfied at the expense of orphans – that a high moral resolution should be carried into effect at someone else's expense'.⁵⁸ This statement demonstrates a prioritisation of funding orphanages over the consciences of others. Canon Stillwell shows a similar priority in his reasoning in the 1939 Synod, arguing 'because the gambling instinct is deep in human nature we have been able to keep these charities going'.⁵⁹ For him, funding charities is the priority action and this motivates his justification of gambling.

Even the Committee Report notes that funding orphanages was the key motivation for accepting lotteries. Whilst the Report did argue that lotteries were not sinful, it conceded that 'it is arguable whether, in the event of full support being available for the orphanages from other sources, the Orphanages Committee should continue to receive funds from the Lotteries Commission'.⁶⁰ Such statements demonstrate that it was the inability to fund orphanages that warranted accepting lottery proceeds, as there were reservations about accepting such money if it could be found from other means.

When this strong prioritisation of social activities was combined with the financial cost of the

⁵⁷ Douglas Pike, review of *Four Bishops and Their See: Perth, Western Australia 1857-1957* (ed. Fred Alexander), *Historical Studies: Australian and New Zealand* 8:29 (1957): 109; Boyce, 'First', 97; J. H. M. Honniball, 'Archbishop and Primate: Henry Frewen Le Fanu', in *Four Bishops and Their See: Perth, Western Australia 1857-1957* (ed. Fred Alexander; Nedlands: UWA Press, 1957), 198; Brian H. Fletcher, *The Place of Anglicanism in Australia: Church, Society and Nation* (Mulgrave: Broughton Publishing, 2008), 164-5.

⁵⁸ 'Lottery Money: Use for Church Work. Divided Views in Synod', *The West Australian*. August 21, 1941: 4.

⁵⁹ 'A Matter of Ethics', *Geraldton Guardian and Express*. August 26, 1939: 2.

⁶⁰ Church of England Diocese of Perth Committee on Lotteries, *The Lotteries Commission*, 1940; Church of England Diocese of Perth, *Yearbook 1940-1941*, 57.

Great Depression which ‘kept the Church’s finances crippled’,⁶¹ this arguably necessitated the acceptance of assistance from the Lotteries Commission. The influence of the Depression meant Perth was no longer able to fund its charitable actions. For example, in 1929, voluntary donations which the orphanages relied upon were £1,750 but the Depression caused subscriptions to fall to £123 by 1936.⁶² Consequently, donations from the lotteries commission were necessary to supplement church finances.⁶³ Indeed, the 1939 Synod acknowledged ‘the difficulty the church would have in raising the money for its charitable institutions without the aid of the Lotteries Commission’.⁶⁴ When combined with a prioritising of social institutions like orphanages, it arguably necessitated the acceptance of lottery proceeds.

Consequentialist Ethic

Related to this, a clear consequentialist ethic arose that evaluated the lottery’s morality based on its results.⁶⁵ Thus, lotteries were considered not to be immoral as long as those purchasing tickets were able to afford it. At the 1939 Synod, Padbury argued that ‘providing people were not starving their families by buying tickets, he saw no harm in the lotteries’.⁶⁶ Archbishop Le Fanu likewise argued in 1941 that the Lottery was good because it was ‘the least harmful form of gambling’ and as an indirect taxation ‘caused no grievances’.⁶⁷ Such statements show lotteries were evaluated as not immoral because they were not seen as harming those involved.

Canon Stillwell makes the clearest statement that results are what determine the lotteries’

⁶¹ Honniball, ‘Archbishop’, 167.

⁶² Honniball, ‘Archbishop’, 204.

⁶³ Honniball, ‘Archbishop’, 205.

⁶⁴ ‘Church and Lotteries: Anglican Synod Divided’, *The West Australian*. August 18, 1939: 22.

⁶⁵ Further research is necessary to determine if this approach was dominant in other moral deliberations.

⁶⁶ ‘A Matter of Ethics’, *Geraldton Guardian and Express*. August 26, 1939: 2; also ‘Lottery Money: Use for Church Work. Divided Views in Synod’, *The West Australian*. August 21, 1941: 4.

⁶⁷ ‘Council of Churches Against Lotteries’, *Cairns Post*. August 25, 1941: 4; ‘Council of Churches and State Lottery’, *The Central Queensland Herald*. August 28, 1941: 29; ‘Church Favours Lottery’, *Sydney Morning Herald*. August 23, 1941: 12; ‘Will Accept Money from Lottery’, *The Argus* [Melbourne]. August 23, 1941: 5.

morality: 'There are some fruits by which you can judge whether a matter is good or evil. I cannot see any evil whatever in feeding the hungry and clothing the naked, even if it is done through a lottery ticket.'⁶⁸ Stillwell clearly indicates that it is the results ('fruits') which determine whether something is evil, and concludes lotteries cannot be if they feed the hungry. Stillwell likewise said 'he would not be ashamed to gamble... but would be ashamed if the church let people go hungry'.⁶⁹ For Stillwell, the actual evil would be to let people starve by refusing lottery proceeds.

Another consequentialist reasoning why the Diocese favoured State Lotteries was to curtail illegal gambling. Le Fanu for instance said, 'He did not think they would get rid of gambling, and for the State to regulate it was perfectly fair and right.'⁷⁰ The positive effect of regulating gambling justified State Lotteries for Perth.

The result of this consequentialist justification was the Diocese no longer considered lotteries sinful. Canon Stillwell concluded from this that he could not see much wrong in buying a lottery ticket⁷¹ whilst the Committee likewise concluded lotteries contained 'no moral fault against the laws of God and man'.⁷² Likewise, Le Fanu concluded that saying 'you are never to touch funds from lotteries because they are morally wrong' is 'saying what is not true' and called the State Lottery 'a good thing'.⁷³

Distinction from other gambling

Importantly, throughout this period, the Anglican Diocese of Perth continued to condemn other forms of gambling. In response to accusations that the 1941 Synod's decision showed it

⁶⁸ 'A Matter of Ethics', *Geraldton Guardian and Express*. August 26, 1939: 2; 'Gambling and Want', *Border Watch* [Mount Gambier]. August 29, 1939: 4.

⁶⁹ 'Church and Lotteries: Anglican Synod Divided', *The West Australian*. August 18, 1939: 22.

⁷⁰ 'Church Favours Lottery', *Sydney Morning Herald*. August 23, 1941: 12; 'Will Accept Money from Lottery', *The Argus* [Melbourne]. August 23, 1941: 5.

⁷¹ 'Church and Lotteries: Anglican Synod Divided', *The West Australian*. August 18, 1939: 22.

⁷² Church of England Diocese of Perth Committee on Lotteries, *The Lotteries Commission*, 1940; Church of England Diocese of Perth, *Yearbook 1940-1941*, 57.

⁷³ 'Gambling and Want', *Border Watch* [Mount Gambier]. August 29, 1939: 4.

favoured all gambling, the Archbishop declared such allegations ‘absurd’.⁷⁴ The 1939 Synod for instance ‘unanimously’ passed a motion urging ‘the Government to close down all betting shops’ ‘in order to suppress the growing evil of betting amongst the youth of the state’.⁷⁵

Perth was able to condemn other forms of gambling by making a distinction between them and lotteries. Thus, the Archbishop wrote, ‘I think there is no comparison between, for instance, the Lotteries Commission and S.P. shops.’⁷⁶ It made this distinction in numerous ways. As previously demonstrated, Perth’s consequentialist ethic allowed lotteries to be approved as distinct from other gambling practices because of the supposed lack of negative impact from lotteries and their positive effect of raising funds for orphanages.

However, the Perth Diocese also distinguished between lotteries and gambling in general by making distinctions based on the amount gambled. In reporting the Lottery Committee findings to Synod, Rev. Hawkins ‘maintained that gambling was a question of degree and not of kind’.⁷⁷ The Committee likewise made such a distinction, stating there is a ‘distinction between moderate and excessive participation in a lottery’.⁷⁸ It argued that gambling ‘is like drinking tea, eating food, or smoking tobacco, harmful only when done in excess’.⁷⁹ They considered that it was the degree to which one gambles that determines its sinfulness, and not gambling in and of itself. Thus, the purchase of a lottery ticket which contains little financial cost was not considered immoral.⁸⁰

Another aspect was simply legality. As the earlier opposition to the Lottery included the

⁷⁴ ‘S.P. Betting: Dr. Le Fanu’s Condemnation’, *The West Australian*. September 6, 1941: 4; ‘Money from Lottery: Acceptance Defended by Primate’, *Morning Bulletin* [Rockhampton]. September 8, 1941: 4; ‘Clerics Clash on SP’, *The Daily News* [Perth]. September 6, 1941: 1.

⁷⁵ Church of England Diocese of Perth, *Minute Book*, 236, 242.

⁷⁶ ‘S.P. Betting: Dr. Le Fanu’s Condemnation’, *The West Australian*. September 6, 1941: 4; ‘Money from Lottery: Acceptance Defended by Primate’, *Morning Bulletin* [Rockhampton]. September 8, 1941: 4.

⁷⁷ ‘Lottery Money: Use for Church Work. Divided Views in Synod’, *The West Australian*. August 21, 1941: 4.

⁷⁸ Church of England Diocese of Perth Committee on Lotteries, *The Lotteries Commission*, 1940; Church of England Diocese of Perth, *Yearbook 1940-1941*, 56.

⁷⁹ Church of England Diocese of Perth Committee on Lotteries, *The Lotteries Commission*, 1940; Church of England Diocese of Perth, *Yearbook 1940-1941*, 56.

⁸⁰ Again, this arguably represents a form of consequentialist ethic, as the resulting cost to the participant is the matter that determines gambling’s morality.

reason that that it was illegal, once lotteries were legalised this was viewed as endorsing its morality. For example, Le Fanu distinguished between starting price betting and lotteries by stating ‘the lottery is legal by Act of Parliament. S.P. shops are illegal... The Lotteries Commission is carefully regulated, and above dishonest practice, whereas the starting-price system is damaging to everybody concerned, *because* it is continually dodging the law’.⁸¹ The Dean of Perth likewise said it must be recognised that the Lottery had been legalised and because of this he had no compunction about accepting its proceeds because this was the Government’s way of funding charitable institutions.⁸² Such means of morally evaluating lotteries allowed Perth to distinguish them from other forms of gambling which it still opposed as evil.

Questionable Use of Sources

One final aspect of Perth’s response that must be evaluated is its questionable citing of external authorities in the Lotteries Committee report. The report states the committee considered ‘various statements of opinion not only from the Diocese of Perth, but also from the Lecturer of Canon Law in the University of Oxford’.⁸³ The following paragraph then also mentions consulting Canon Green’s book *Betting and Gambling*.⁸⁴ Without denying that these statements may have been included simply as a record of the Committee’s endeavours, they arguably also have the rhetorical effect of adding validity and respectability to the report’s findings.

⁸¹ Emphasis mine. ‘S.P. Betting: Dr. Le Fanu’s Condemnation’, *The West Australian*. September 6, 1941: 4; ‘Money from Lottery: Acceptance Defended by Primate’, *Morning Bulletin* [Rockhampton]. September 8, 1941: 4. The poor logic of this was noted by Presbyterian Moderator, who states ‘If S.P. betting were legalised, as has been suggested in many quarters, the Archbishop’s logic would lead him to contend that S.P. betting had thus become morally good’ (‘Money from Lottery: Acceptance Defended by Primate’, *Morning Bulletin* [Rockhampton]. September 8, 1941: 4; ‘Clerics Clash on SP’, *The Daily News* [Perth]. September 6, 1941: 1.

⁸² ‘Church and Lotteries: Anglican Synod Divided’, *The West Australian*. August 18, 1939: 22.

⁸³ Church of England Diocese of Perth Committee on Lotteries, *The Lotteries Commission*, 1940; Church of England Diocese of Perth, *Yearbook 1940-1941*, 56.

⁸⁴ Church of England Diocese of Perth Committee on Lotteries, *The Lotteries Commission*, 1940; Church of England Diocese of Perth, *Yearbook 1940-1941*, 56.

However, through personal correspondence with the archivists for the Perth Anglican Diocese and Oxford University, it was discovered that no Lecturer of Canon Law position existed at Oxford University during this time and, indeed, it had not even awarded degrees in Canon Law since 1556.⁸⁵ It is possible that this unnamed lecturer was Canon Green, with the Committee in error about Green's role and poorly communicating its sources. However, Green's biography records no links with Oxford to warrant the committee's confusion about his identity, whilst newspaper reports on the Synod clearly understand the report as referring to two separate individuals.⁸⁶ It is also possible that Canon Green misrepresented his position; that another individual falsely claimed to be this Lecturer and the Committee reported in good faith; or that one or more members of the Committee deceitfully claimed the support of a non-existent 'expert'. Unfortunately, there are no further records within the Diocesan Archives or newspapers records that provide clarity on the issue.

The case for deliberate misrepresentation by Committee members may be strengthened though, when the citation of Canon Green is also considered. He defines gambling as 'an agreement between two parties whereby the transfer of something of value from one to other is made dependent on an uncertain event, in such a way that the gain of one party is balanced by the loss of another'.⁸⁷ The report states that it agrees with this definition although it argues the final phrase is not true for lotteries as a proportion goes to a charitable third party.⁸⁸ It then makes no further mention of Green's book, arguably implying its support. However, Green explicitly includes lotteries in his definition and counters Perth's argument that they

⁸⁵ Personal correspondence between myself, Lara Lynch (Perth Diocesan Archivist) and Sian Astill (Oxford University Archives Assistant) via email from 9th to the 11th of April, 2013.

⁸⁶ H. E. Sheen, *Canon Peter Green: A Biography of a Great Parish Priest* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1965); 'Gambling and Charity', *The Daily News* [Perth]. September 27, 1940: 4; 'Points from Letters', *The West Australian*. October 3, 1940: 13.

⁸⁷ Peter Green, *Betting and Gambling* (London: Student Christian Movement, 1924), 17.

⁸⁸ Church of England Diocese of Perth Committee on Lotteries, *The Lotteries Commission*, 1940; Church of England Diocese of Perth, *Yearbook 1940-1941*, 56.

can be justified for State or charitable revenue.⁸⁹ He likewise counters their argument that gambling is acceptable if it is not done to excess or if legalised or to reduce illegal gambling.⁹⁰ Indeed, he condemns all gambling as rebellious to God and unloving to one's neighbour.⁹¹ It is possible they cited Green merely for his definition, but on a plain reading their statement arguably implies his agreement even though this was demonstrably false. If this is true, they thus falsely implied his approval and this may support falsely citing an Oxford Lecturer. Unfortunately, there are again no further records to indicate whether it was poor communication, an innocent mistake or deliberate deceit.

THE DIOCESE OF SYDNEY

Throughout this period, the Anglican Diocese of Sydney faced similar pressure to the Diocese of Perth. Sydney Synod records regularly highlight the difficulties in funding its ministry and charitable activities experienced during the Great Depression.⁹² It was noted that Sydney needed extra finances to run their orphanages, 'slums' and schools; that many churches could not afford curates; that building projects had to be halted; and that the Home Mission Society was in debt and receiving inadequate support to function properly.⁹³

During this time, Sydney also expressed a similar concern to Perth (albeit with a differing priority) in caring materially for those in need. For instance, the Synod Presidential addresses show strong concern for orphanages, assistance in the 'slums', and education.⁹⁴ Indeed, Canon R. B. S. Hammond for example, who strongly opposed the lottery, is widely noted for

⁸⁹ Green, *Betting*, 18, 81-2.

⁹⁰ Green, *Betting*, 56-9, 77-9.

⁹¹ Green, *Betting*, 51-61.

⁹² e.g. Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1932* (Sydney: William Andrews Printing, 1932), 167-171.

⁹³ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1935* (Sydney: William Andrews Printing, 1935), 278; Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1939* (Sydney: William Andrews Printing, 1939), 251-3; Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1933* (Sydney: William Andrews Printing, 1933), 245-6; Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1932*, 168, 180.

⁹⁴ E.g. Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1935* (Sydney: William Andrews Printing, 1935), 278; Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1939*, 245.

his pastoral work among the unemployed and homeless, providing food, clothing and shelter to large numbers before and during the Great Depression.⁹⁵

Yet despite these pressures, Sydney, in contrast to Perth, remained resolutely opposed to the State Lottery from its inception. Motions opposing gambling in general and lotteries specifically were carried regularly and unanimously throughout this period. In 1920, when a NSW Lottery was first being considered, Synod carried a motion 'deploring the proposal to introduce a State Lottery'.⁹⁶ Similar resolutions were passed under Archbishops Wright (1909-1933) and Mowll (1933-1958) in 1921, 1931, 1932, 1934, 1935, 1936, and 1945.⁹⁷ These motions protested specifically against the State Lottery as a means of funding public hospitals and urged its abolition.⁹⁸ Synod likewise opposed any fundraising for 'church or charitable or any purposes whatever' through means of gambling and stated that church members should give via 'direct giving'.⁹⁹

The Synod Presidential addresses were also replete with opposition to the Lottery. Archbishop Wright, for instance, in 1921 called gambling evil, and condemned the proposed public lottery.¹⁰⁰ He said, 'Christians of every denomination ought to make their voice heard so that legislators will hesitate before they sully our name by the permission of such a

⁹⁵ Fletcher, *Anglicanism*, 136; Marcus Lawrence Loane, *Mark these Men: A Brief Account of some Evangelical Clergy in the Diocese of Sydney who were Associated with Archbishop Mowll* (Kambah: Acorn Press, 1985), 36.

⁹⁶ 'Anglican Synod', *Sydney Morning Herald*. December 18, 1920: 14.

⁹⁷ 'Gambling: Anglican Synod's Protest', *The Sydney Morning Herald*. November 29, 1921: 8; 'Church Funds: Card Parties and Raffles', *The Sydney Morning Herald*. September 15, 1931: 10; Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1933*, 280; Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1934* (Sydney: William Andrews Printing, 1934), 344; Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1936* (Sydney: William Andrews Printing, 1936), 350; Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1937* (Sydney: William Andrews Printing, 1937), 334; Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1946* (Sydney: William Andrews Printing, 1946), 68.

⁹⁸ e.g. Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1932*, 187-8; 'Church Funds: Card Parties and Raffles', *The Sydney Morning Herald*. September 15, 1931: 10; Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1936*, 350; Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1934*, 344.

⁹⁹ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1932*, 187-8; also Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1933*, 280.

¹⁰⁰ 'Anglican Synod: Responsibilities of the Church. Outspoken Address', *The Sydney Morning Herald*. November 22, 1921: 10; 'Anglican Synod: State's Attitude on Gambling Condemned by Archbishop', *Barrier Miner* [Broken Hill]. November 22, 1921: 3.

measure.¹⁰¹ The Diocesan Administrator Bishop Kirkby in his address in 1933 said that despite the Lottery's popularity within society, he hoped 'it will not be allowed to remain in our midst', arguing there was no 'sound moral defence offered for it'.¹⁰² He condemned it as a means for the State to raise funds for hospitals and said the Government 'must wipe them out, and that quickly'.¹⁰³ Archbishop Mowll likewise condemned lotteries in his 1935, 1936 and 1938 Addresses and urged their abandonment, stating 'it is impossible for us to endorse State lotteries, no matter in what direction some of the proceeds are to be applied'.¹⁰⁴

The Diocese also actively partnered with other churches in opposing the Lottery. In a 1921 meeting of Sydney Protestant Churches, Archdeacon D'Arcy Irvine representing the Diocese said they must oppose the State lottery bill.¹⁰⁵ Canon R. B. S. Hammond likewise convened meetings of the Anti-Gambling League of Australia, 'with the declared intention of ridding the State of gambling'.¹⁰⁶ Archdeacon Davies also seconded the Bishop of Newcastle's 1932 General Synod motion which highlighted the 'the social, political and economic evils' accompanying gambling and recorded an 'emphatic protest against the policy of those States which are raising revenue by means of lotteries...' as well as condemning 'the use of any form of gambling in raising funds for Church purposes'.¹⁰⁷ Furthermore, Archbishop Mowll and other Diocesan representatives, such as Canon R. B. S. Hammond and Archdeacon Davies, were involved in numerous deputations to the State Premier with other Protestant denominational leaders, to 'urge the abandonment of Government lotteries' and argue for

¹⁰¹ 'Anglican Synod: Responsibilities of the Church. Outspoken Address', *The Sydney Morning Herald*. November 22, 1921: 10.

¹⁰² Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1934*, 304.

¹⁰³ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1934*, 305.

¹⁰⁴ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1939*, 266; also Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1936*, 300-2; Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1937*, 288-9.

¹⁰⁵ 'The Lottery: Vigorous Protest by Churchmen. Personal Appeals to Legislators', *The Sydney Morning Herald*. August 24, 1921: 11.

¹⁰⁶ 'Growth of Gambling: Protest at Government's Part', *The Sydney Morning Herald*. July 30, 1937: 10.

¹⁰⁷ Church of England in Australia and Tasmania, *Summary of Proceedings of the General Synod of the Dioceses in Australia and Tasmania Session 1932* (Sydney: Joseph Cook, 1932), 67. This motion passed 'almost unanimously' ('Gambling Condemned by Anglican Synod', *Singleton Argus*. October 24, 1932: 2).

alternative means of public funding.¹⁰⁸

Rather than simply provide opposition, the Sydney Synod conversely proposed that the public funding of utilities should reflect ‘the Christian ideal of the corporate responsibility of all citizens for the welfare of each’.¹⁰⁹ It proposed, with the backing of experts such as the Chairman of the Hospital Board, that hospitals be funded like other public utilities through direct taxation or hospital insurance.¹¹⁰

Moreover, unlike Perth there is no evidence of a minority favouring gambling. Synod notes and newspapers record these Synod motions as being adopted ‘unanimously’ in 1931, 1933, 1935, and with ‘only two dissentients’ in 1930.¹¹¹ Moreover, although it was noted that some Church people ‘were prepared to countenance the lottery’¹¹² and one Presidential Address bemoaned that ‘even Church-people have been known to descend as low as to offer a lottery ticket as the prize in a parochial effort’,¹¹³ these were rare exceptions that received Synod disapproval.

The Basis of Sydney’s opposition

There were numerous reasons why Sydney opposed the State Lottery and like the early response of Perth, the first is because it considered gambling inherently evil. This is

¹⁰⁸ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1936*, 300; *Text of Deputation to Premier Stevens: ‘Moral Considerations Bearing on the Question of the State Lottery’*, 1933 or 1935, Canons Box 0417; ‘Fate of Lottery: Deputation to Premier’, *Northern Star* [Lismore]. November 5, 1932: 7; ‘The Lottery: Combined Protest. Deputation to Premier’, *Goulburn Evening Penny Post*. November 4, 1932: 3; Presbyterian Church of Australia, *Typescript Statement Regarding the Evils of Gambling Employed by Anglican Member of Deputation to Premier Stevens*. n.d. Canons Box 0417.

¹⁰⁹ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1936*, 350; ‘Sydney Synod: Condemnation of Lottery. Request to Government’, *The Sydney Morning Herald*. October 17, 1935: 12.

¹¹⁰ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1933*, 249; ‘Fate of Lottery: Deputation to Premier’, *Northern Star* [Lismore]. November 5, 1932: 7; *Text of Deputation to Premier Stevens: ‘Moral Considerations Bearing on the Question of the State Lottery’*, 1933 or 1935, Canons Box 0417; Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1936*, 302; ‘Church Funds: Card Parties and Raffles’, *The Sydney Morning Herald*. September 15, 1931: 10.

¹¹¹ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1932*, 187-8; ‘Anglican Synod: Social Questions. Important Resolutions’, *The Sydney Morning Herald*. November 11, 1933: 16s; ‘Sydney Synod: Condemnation of Lottery. Request to Government’, *The Sydney Morning Herald*. October 17, 1935: 12; ‘Anglican Synod: All Gambling Condemned’, *Barrier Miner* [Broken Hill]. September 5, 1931: 1. Other years have no record of dissentients.

¹¹² ‘Sydney Synod: Condemnation of Lottery. Request to Government’, *The Sydney Morning Herald*. October 17, 1935: 12.

¹¹³ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1933*, 249.

demonstrated repeatedly in the Synod motions, Presidential Addresses, and statements by leading Diocesan figures throughout this period. For instance, a 1931 Synod motion protested ‘against the State Lottery which organises the evil of gambling upon a wide scale’,¹¹⁴ whilst gambling was again explicitly rejected as ‘evil’ in the 1938 motion.¹¹⁵ Other motions expressed similar sentiment, with a 1921 motion opposing the State lottery because gambling is ‘wrong in principle and immoral’ and the 1935 Synod opposing raising money through the lottery because ‘gambling is ethically wrong’.¹¹⁶ In their Presidential Addresses, Wright calls the lottery a ‘great evil’ and Mowll calls it ‘evil’ and ‘a sinister influence’.¹¹⁷ Furthermore, in a deputation to the Premier, Canon R. B. S. Hammond labelled it ‘an abomination’.¹¹⁸ Such a view of gambling’s inherent sinfulness was the main reason Sydney opposed lotteries.

Lotteries were also condemned by Sydney as they considered them motivated by selfishness and greed. For example, one deputation to the Premier argued the lottery was ‘partly the outcome of sheer avarice; a desire to obtain money for the sake of money and by any means available’.¹¹⁹ They thus argued it should be opposed as covetous: ‘Moral objections to the State Lottery may also be based upon the Tenth Commandment; “Thou shalt not covet.”’¹²⁰

Conversely it was felt they encouraged further selfishness. Mowll for instance argued that ‘gambling destroys the spirit of true charity’¹²¹ and whilst the Lottery system had helped aid hospitals, it did ‘nothing to develop a real sense of obligation to assist these necessary and

¹¹⁴ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1932*, 188.

¹¹⁵ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1939*, 286.

¹¹⁶ ‘Gambling: Anglican Synod’s Protest’, *The Sydney Morning Herald*. November 29, 1921: 8; Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1936*, 350; see also Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1937*, 334; Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1933*, 280.

¹¹⁷ ‘Anglican Synod: Responsibilities of the Church. Outspoken Address’, *The Sydney Morning Herald*. November 22, 1921: 10; ‘Sydney Synod: Condemnation of Lottery. Request to Government’, *The Sydney Morning Herald*. October 17, 1935: 12; Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1936*, 300; Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1941* (Sydney: William Andrews Printing, 1941), 54.

¹¹⁸ ‘The Lottery: Combined Protest. Deputation to Premier’, *Goulburn Evening Penny Post*. November 4, 1932: 3; ‘Fate of Lottery: Deputation to Premier’, *Northern Star* [Lismore]. November 5, 1932: 7.

¹¹⁹ *Text of Deputation to Premier Stevens: ‘Moral Considerations Bearing on the Question of the State Lottery’*, 1933 or 1935, Canons Box 0417.

¹²⁰ *Text of Deputation to Premier Stevens: ‘Moral Considerations Bearing on the Question of the State Lottery’*, 1933 or 1935, Canons Box 0417.

¹²¹ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1937*, 289.)

excellent institutions, but tends to destroy it, and, at the same time, encourages the propensity to selfishness and the fostering of the gambling spirit'.¹²² Indeed, Mowll noted in 1935 that since lotteries began, 'personal subscriptions to hospitals have fallen in five years from £564,000 to £192,000' as proof 'the lottery had killed charity as far as hospitals were concerned'.¹²³

It was also seen as undermining society in numerous other ways. One deputation argued lotteries were anti-social in character, setting 'the people one against the other as competitors in avarice, with each competitor hoping that he will be able to secure the possessions of others. It disintegrates communal life. It sets selfishness against altruism'.¹²⁴ The deputation also argued it undermined hard work, stating:

'In this day the Gospel of Easy Money is being very widely preached... Our need at the present is that every incentive should be given to individual effort and that the old standard that every man should earn his living by the sweat of his brow should not be thrown into the discard. The State Lottery cuts across the honest decencies of ordinary life making the alluring offer of money without work.'¹²⁵

These detrimental social impacts, such as encouraging selfishness and laziness whilst reducing altruism were another reason why Sydney opposed the Lottery.

The Sydney diocese, in contrast to Perth, was also unwilling to accept consequentialist justifications for lotteries such as funding hospitals. For instance, Mowll stated 'it is impossible for us to endorse State lotteries, no matter in what direction some of the proceeds are to be applied',¹²⁶ whilst Wright argued 'evil does not become good merely because it is

¹²² Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1941*, 54.

¹²³ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1936*, 301; 'Sydney Synod: Condemnation of Lottery. Request to Government', *The Sydney Morning Herald*. October 17, 1935: 12.

¹²⁴ *Text of Deputation to Premier Stevens: 'Moral Considerations Bearing on the Question of the State Lottery'*, 1933 or 1935, Canons Box 0417, 1.

¹²⁵ *Text of Deputation to Premier Stevens: 'Moral Considerations Bearing on the Question of the State Lottery'*, 1933 or 1935, Canons Box 0417, 1.

¹²⁶ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1939*, 266.

used to promote a good end'¹²⁷. Such a view is also demonstrated by Archdeacon Hammond who calls gambling proceeds 'blood money unadulterated'.¹²⁸ Indeed, the extent of this unwillingness is seen in the words of Rev. Bidwell who said 'he would rather go out of the church than build it up with the aid of card parties, dances or raffles'.¹²⁹ For him the end result clearly does not justify the means, as he would rather leave the church than have gambling proceeds build it up.

It was also held that lotteries were a waste of money at both an individual and societal level. At an individual level, Mowll laments that lotteries encourage 'people to waste wealth which ought to be a sacred trust, and, whether in small or large proportions, waste of this kind is positively sinful'.¹³⁰ At a wider societal level, he likewise called it 'a most extravagant waste of the money of the people'.¹³¹ Archdeacon Hammond likewise considered it an alarming misuse of money which 'should be working hard for the nation's legitimate and productive commercial enterprises'.¹³²

Finally, at an economic level it was argued that such a scheme simply did not work. The Diocese cited the South Australian Royal Commission which, in deciding against State lotteries, concluded 'that a lottery is an insecure foundation on which to base a system of financing hospitals' and 'that the amount of money that eventually went to hospitals was small compared with the amount invested by the public'.¹³³ It likewise cited an 1808 British Government report which concluded 'that the pecuniary advantage derived from the State

¹²⁷ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1922-3* (Sydney: William Andrews Printing, 1923), 257; 'Anglican Synod: Responsibilities of the Church. Outspoken Address', *The Sydney Morning Herald*, November 22, 1921: 10.

¹²⁸ 'Australian Gambling: "Degrading the Nation"', *The West Australian*, October 12, 1939: 12.

¹²⁹ 'Protest by Church Synod: Card Parties and Raffles Condemned', *Singleton Argus*, September 7, 1931: 4. The context clearly indicates that the terms card parties and raffles are not limited to just these but apply to all gambling forms.

¹³⁰ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1941*, 54.

¹³¹ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1933*, 249.

¹³² 'Australian Gambling: "Degrading the Nation"', *The West Australian*, October 12, 1939: 12; 'Cleric on "Economic Waste" of Gambling', *The Courier-Mail* [Brisbane], October 12, 1939: 9; 'Gambling in Australia "One of Australia's Major Industries": Denunciation by Archdeacon', *Morning Bulletin* [Rockhampton], October 12, 1939: 7; 'Gambling Major Industry: Attack in Anglican Synod', *The Canberra Times*, October 12, 1939: 2.

¹³³ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1937*, 289.

Lottery is much greater in appearance than in reality'.¹³⁴

These are just some of the reasons the Anglican Church in Sydney opposed State Lotteries. Others included the view that the public nature of lotteries would corrupt children, encourage crime, and rather than suppress illegal betting would tacitly endorse and thus encourage all gambling.¹³⁵ It also rejected views that Perth found convincing such as lotteries not being sinful if made legal or if individuals spent only a small amount, arguing 'financial expediency should never govern our morals'.¹³⁶

Sydney's Evangelical Nature

One major feature that ultimately distinguished Sydney's response to Perth however was how it evaluated this issue in relationship to the gospel. As is widely noted, the Diocese of Sydney at this time was conservatively evangelical, and became more so during the 1930-40s.¹³⁷ Its evangelical theology shaped its response to lotteries and gambling in four distinct ways.

First, Sydney's evangelicalism meant that it had a cross-shaped understanding of giving when it came to funding church-based activities. This is evident in the 1931 Synod motion which states:

'this Synod, recognising that the self-sacrificing spirit of the Cross is the Divine ideal of giving to God's work, strongly recommends to all church people the method of direct giving for Church objects, condemns all games of chance for any purposes, and also strongly deprecates the organisation of dances and card parties for the support of God's work...' 138

¹³⁴ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1936*, 301.

¹³⁵ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1933*, 249; Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1934*, 304; Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1936*, 300-1; 'Growth of Gambling: Protest at Government's Part', *The Sydney Morning Herald*. July 30, 1937: 10; 'Anglican Synod: Responsibilities of the Church. Outspoken Address', *The Sydney Morning Herald*. November 22, 1921: 10.

¹³⁶ *Text of Deputation to Premier Stevens: 'Moral Considerations Bearing on the Question of the State Lottery'*, 1933 or 1935, Canons Box 0417; 'Sydney Synod: Condemnation of Lottery. Request to Government', *The Sydney Morning Herald*. October 17, 1935: 12.

¹³⁷ Tricia Blombery, *The Anglicans in Australia* (Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1996), 18; Stephen Judd & Kenneth Cable, *Sydney Anglicans: A History of the Diocese* (Sydney: Anglican Information Office, 1987), 247.

¹³⁸ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1932*, 187-8.

Such motions demonstrate how for Sydney, the cross was viewed as the model of self-sacrifice that giving should follow and so Christians were encouraged to give sacrificially through direct giving, rather than indirectly and non-sacrificially through gambling. This evangelical understanding of giving was thus one reason why it would not allow gambling for fundraising.’

Secondly, Sydney’s evangelical nature meant that having identified lotteries as sinful, it could not endorse them regardless of their temporal benefits. For instance, Wright argues that ‘the support of the hospitals is no excuse for the corruption of the public mind... Even if the Lottery did produce an adequate return, it ought to be condemned, for the health of the mind is far more important than the health of the body’.¹³⁹ For Wright, without denying the importance of eradicating poverty, his evangelical view clearly saw avoiding sin (‘the corruption of the mind’) as having greater priority.

Indeed, Sydney could not endorse lotteries as it viewed individual’s eternal salvation as potentially at stake. Mowll for instance, having condemned the lottery argued ‘in the last analysis it is the conflict between the spirit of materialism and the spirit of Christianity with which we are confronted’.¹⁴⁰ In discussing this materialism he recites Jesus’ question, ‘what shall it profit a man to gain the whole world yet lose his own soul?’¹⁴¹ Such statements arguably demonstrate that for Mowll, to accept gambling was to capitulate to something contrary to Christianity and which endangered a man’s soul. His evangelical beliefs meant that this thus could not be accepted. This is seen in another address condemning gambling where he said, ‘if our Christianity is to be anything more than a name it will... put the supreme things of the soul in the higher category, and directs men to labour not for the meat

¹³⁹ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1933*, 249.

¹⁴⁰ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1937*, 288-9.

¹⁴¹ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1937*, 305-6.

which perisheth, but for that which remaineth unto everlasting life'.¹⁴² His evangelicalism meant that eternal matters had priority over temporal ones and when combined with the belief that gambling threatened eternal salvation, felt that it must be opposed.

The evangelical nature of the Diocese also meant it viewed the Gospel as the only means to transform behaviour so that gambling was abolished. For instance Mowll, whilst conceding that legislation 'is of undoubted assistance' in tackling gambling, said 'the real need is virile religion, that will create a public opinion which will not tolerate these obstacles to true national progress and Christian living'.¹⁴³ Indeed, he argued, 'it was the rise and growth of the Evangelical movement that led to the abolition of the State Lottery in England' and from this and other examples concluded 'that a renewed heart is the source of a renewed life' and so warned against focusing on mere social reform which neglected preaching the gospel.¹⁴⁴

Finally, because Sydney viewed eternal salvation as the highest priority, the Diocese considered that its key responsibility in response to the lottery was preaching the gospel for the sake of others' salvation. For instance, in his 1938 Address, Mowll acknowledged that the church had a 'duty and obligation' regarding 'social problems and social evils' yet nonetheless argued the gospel is the church's true priority.¹⁴⁵ He stated:

'in and through all we must give our wholehearted attention to the great commission our Lord had laid upon us---the work of evangelism at home and abroad. Nothing can compensate for any neglect of this... Men have immortal souls; they have needs which no betterment of their material condition can ever supply; they stand in peril because of sin...'¹⁴⁶

For Mowll, saving immortal souls was the Diocese's ultimate responsibility and the issue of gambling was not to detract from that. He thus warned against 'well meant social reforms'

¹⁴² Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1941*, 47.

¹⁴³ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1939*, 266.

¹⁴⁴ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1948* (Sydney: William Andrews Printing, 1948), 52.

¹⁴⁵ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1939*, 245.

¹⁴⁶ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1939*, 246.

that neglected the gospel and sunk 'to lower and lower levels of mere humanitarian ameliorations'.¹⁴⁷ Rather, he urged the Diocese to 'address ourselves earnestly to the task appointed us by the Apostle: "We preach Christ crucified"'.¹⁴⁸

CONCLUSION

Whilst their initial responses were similar, the economic influence of the Great Depression combined with their distinct theological emphases and ethical approaches meant that the Anglican Dioceses of Perth and Sydney reached opposite conclusions about State Lotteries. Although the Perth Diocese initially opposed State Lotteries, the economic impact of the Great Depression meant the Diocese was unable to fund its welfare institutions such as orphanages. When combined with its strong emphasis on the social gospel which prioritised social work, Perth moved not only to endorse the State Lottery but to accept its proceeds to fund their orphanages. Its consequentialist ethic also meant that it was able to justify lotteries as moral, and it distinguished them from other forms of gambling to which it remained opposed to on the basis of this ethic, as well as additional arguments regarding the amount gambled and these actions' legality. In contrast, whilst Sydney faced similar financial pressures during the Great Depression and maintained a desire to help those in need, it vigorously opposed State Lotteries, even as a means for the Government to fund social institutions and it rejected all forms of gambling for its own church fundraising. This is because it viewed lotteries as inherently sinful, motivated by greed and selfishness and encouraging these vices as well as laziness in society. It explicitly rejected a consequentialist ethical approach which Perth used to justify lotteries, whilst it also viewed lotteries as economically immoral and unsound. Moreover, the strong evangelical nature of Sydney Diocese greatly influenced its response. It viewed the cross as the model for giving to God's

¹⁴⁷ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1948*, 52.

¹⁴⁸ Church of England Diocese of Sydney, *Year Book 1948*, 52.

work and so believed its fundraising should come from church members' sacrificial, direct-giving rather than through gambling. Having identified gambling as sinful, it could not endorse lotteries because it felt individuals' eternal salvation was at stake; something it considered to be of paramount importance. Finally, whilst it did not neglect caring for the poor, it viewed its ultimate responsibility in light of the increasing prevalence of gambling in society to simply keep preaching the gospel both because this was the only means through which gambling would be truly abolished, but more importantly, so that people could receive eternal salvation through Christ.

Bibliography of Sources Cited

List of Primary Sources Cited

Perth Diocesan Archives, Anglican Church Diocese of Perth. Lara Lynch: Diocesan Archivist

Church of England Diocese of Perth Committee on Lotteries. *The Lotteries Commission*. 1940. Box 363 Accession number 2008/00064/043.

Church of England Diocese of Perth. *Code of Statutes with a List of Legislative Ordinances, Canons of Provincial Synod and Determinations of General Synod*. Perth: E. B. Bayliss Print, 1937. VolB129 Accession 2012/00019.

Church of England Diocese of Perth, *Diocese of Perth Synod Minute Book Number 4 1924-1944*. VolB 025 Accession 2008/00005.

Church of England Diocese of Perth. *Diocese of Perth Yearbook 1940-1941*. Perth: E. B. Bayliss Print, 1941.

Sydney Diocesan Archives, Anglican Church Diocese of Sydney. Dr Louise Trott, Sydney Diocesan Archivist

Presbyterian Church of Australia. *Typescript Statement Regarding the Evils of Gambling Employed by Anglican Member of Deputation to Premier Stevens*. No date. Canons Box 0417: Social Problems Committee.

Text of Deputation to Premier Stevens: 'Moral Considerations Bearing on the Question of the State Lottery'. *Typescript with Manuscript Emendations*. 1933 or 1935. Canons Box 0417: Social Problems Committee.

Other Publically Accessible Primary Sources including Diocesan Yearbooks, Published Books and Newspaper Articles

'A Matter of Ethics'. *Geraldton Guardian and Express*. August 26, 1939: 2.

'Against Aid By Lottery'. *Sunday Mail* [Brisbane]. August 24, 1941: 3.

'Among the Churches'. *The West Australian*. January 2, 1926: 9.

'Among the Churches'. *The West Australian*. February 29, 1931: 5.

'Anglican Synod: All Gambling Condemned'. *Barrier Miner* [Broken Hill]. September 5, 1931: 1.

'Anglican Synod: Responsibilities of the Church. Outspoken Address'. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. November 22, 1921: 10.

'Anglican Synod: Social Questions. Important Resolutions'. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. November 11, 1933: 16.

- ‘Anglican Synod: Social Questions’. *The West Australian*. November 5, 1921: 9.
- ‘Anglican Synod: State’s Attitude on Gambling Condemned by Archbishop’. *Barrier Miner* [Broken Hill]. November 22, 1921: 3.
- ‘Anglican Synod’. *Sydney Morning Herald*. December 18, 1920: 14.
- ‘Australian Gambling: “Degrading the Nation”’, *The West Australian*. October 12, 1939: 12
- ‘Bishop Opposes Synod’s View: Use of Lotteries’. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. August 25, 1941: 4.
- ‘Buckets of Money’. *Geraldton Guardian and Express*. August 26, 1933: 1.
- Church of England Diocese of Sydney. *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1922-3*. Sydney: William Andrews Printing, 1923.
- Church of England Diocese of Sydney. *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1932*. Sydney: William Andrews Printing, 1932.
- Church of England Diocese of Sydney. *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1933*. Sydney: William Andrews Printing, 1933.
- Church of England Diocese of Sydney. *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1934*. Sydney: William Andrews Printing, 1934.
- Church of England Diocese of Sydney. *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1935*. Sydney: William Andrews Printing, 1935.
- Church of England Diocese of Sydney. *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1936*. Sydney: William Andrews Printing, 1936.
- Church of England Diocese of Sydney. *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1937*. Sydney: William Andrews Printing, 1937.
- Church of England Diocese of Sydney. *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1939*. Sydney: William Andrews Printing, 1939.
- Church of England Diocese of Sydney. *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1941*. Sydney: William Andrews Printing, 1941.
- Church of England Diocese of Sydney. *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1946*. Sydney: William Andrews Printing, 1946.
- Church of England Diocese of Sydney. *Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1948*. Sydney: William Andrews Printing, 1948.
- Church of England in Australia and Tasmania. *Summary of Proceedings of the General Synod of the Dioceses in Australia and Tasmania Session 1932*. Sydney: Joseph Cook, 1932.
- ‘Church and Lotteries: Anglican Synod Divided’. *The West Australian*. August 18, 1939: 22.
- ‘Church Favours Lottery’. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. August 23, 1941: 12.
- ‘Church Funds: Card Parties and Raffles’. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. September 15, 1931: 10.
- ‘Church News and Notes’. *The Mercury* [Hobart]. November 30, 1921: 2

- ‘Churches Favor Fewer Betting Shops: Anglican and Presbyterian Protest’. *The Advertiser* [Adelaide]. February 14, 1934: 19-20.
- ‘Cleric on “Economic Waste” of Gambling’. *The Courier-Mail* [Brisbane]. October 12, 1939: 9.
- ‘Clerics Clash on SP’. *The Daily News* [Perth]. September 6, 1941: 1.
- ‘Council of Churches Against Lotteries’. *Cairns Post*. August 25, 1941: 4.
- ‘Council of Churches and State Lottery’. *The Central Queensland Herald*. August 28, 1941: 29.
- ‘Dean Against Gambling’. *The Mail* [Adelaide]. August 23, 1941: 2.
- ‘Fate of Lottery: Deputation to Premier’. *Northern Star* [Lismore]. November 5, 1932: 7.
- ‘Gambling and Charity’. *The Daily News* [Perth]. September 27, 1940: 4.
- ‘Gambling and Want’. *Border Watch* [Mount Gambier]. August 29, 1939: 4.
- ‘Gambling: Anglican Synod’s Protest’. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. November 29, 1921: 8.
- ‘Gambling Condemned by Anglican Synod’. *Singleton Argus*. October 24, 1932: 2.
- ‘Gambling in Australia “One of Australia’s Major Industries”: Denunciation by Archdeacon’. *Morning Bulletin* [Rockhampton]. October 12, 1939: 7.
- ‘Gambling Major Industry: Attack in Anglican Synod’. *The Canberra Times*. October 12, 1939: 2.
- ‘General News’. *The West Australian*. November 7, 1936: 15.
- ‘Growth of Gambling: Protest at Government’s Part’. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. July 30, 1937: 10.
- ‘Home News’. *Sydney Morning Herald*. September 29, 1936: 1.
- ‘Legalising Lotteries: Protests from Public Bodies’. *The West Australian*. October 3, 1921: 8.
- ‘Local and General’. *Albany Advertiser*. September 12, 1929: 2.
- ‘Lotteries and Charity’. *The Argus* [Melbourne]. August 27, 1941: 3.
- ‘Lotteries and Synod: Bishop’s Criticism’. *The Mercury* [Hobart]. August 25, 1941: 2.
- ‘Lottery Die-Hards’. *The Daily News* [Perth]. November 3, 1932: 6.
- ‘Lottery Money: Anglican Church’s Stand. Committee Finds “No Moral Fault”’. *The West Australian*. September 27, 1940: 12.
- ‘Lottery Money: Use for Church Work. Divided Views in Synod’. *The West Australian*. August 21, 1941: 4.
- ‘Methodist Ministers: Problem of Unpaid Stipends’. *The West Australian*. December 7, 1932: 10.
- ‘Methodists to Renew Their Onslaught on State Lotteries’. *The Daily News* [Perth]. February 20, 1937: 2.

- ‘Metropolitan News’. *Geraldton Guardian*. October 23, 1924: 4.
- ‘Money from Lottery: Acceptance Defended by Primate’. *Morning Bulletin* [Rockhampton]. September 8, 1941: 4.
- ‘News in a Nutshell’. *Western Mail* [Perth]. August 5 1937: 33.
- ‘Notes and Comments on Topical Matters’. *The Daily News* [Perth]. October 20, 1924: 5.
- ‘Notes and Comments’. *Sunday Times* [Perth], November 6, 1921: 4.
- ‘Points from Letters’. *The West Australian*. October 3, 1940: 13.
- ‘Protest by Church Synod: Card Parties and Raffles Condemned’. *Singleton Argus*. September 7, 1931: 4.
- ‘Religious Notes’. *The Registrar* [Adelaide]. July 19, 1924: 4.
- ‘S.P. Betting: Dr. Le Fanu’s Condemnation. *The West Australian*. September 6, 1941: 4.
- ‘State Lotteries: Another Clerical Protest. Letter to Politicians’. *The West Australian*. October 9, 1924: 13.
- ‘State Lotteries: Government’s Bill. Opposition by Anglican Church’. *The West Australian*. October 1924: 8.
- ‘State Lotteries: The Government Proposition, Opposition by Churches’. *Geraldton Guardian*. October 14, 1924: 1.
- ‘Summary’. *Sydney Morning Herald*. March 25, 1933: 1.
- ‘Summed Up: Epitome of To-day’s News’. *The Daily News* [Perth]. October 10, 1921: 1.
- Sydney Morning Herald*. December 3, 1949: 40.
- Sydney Morning Herald*. January 28: 1933: 3.
- ‘Sydney Synod: Condemnation of Lottery. Request to Government’. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. October 17, 1935: 12.
- ‘The Churches’ Attitude: Opposition Predominant’. *The West Australian*. October 12, 1932: 14.
- ‘The Lotteries Bill: Methodists’ Attitude. “Uncompromising Hostility”’. *The West Australian*. November 3, 1932: 16.
- ‘The Lotteries Bill’. *The West Australian*. October 12, 1932: 14.
- ‘The Lottery: Combined Protest. Deputation to Premier’. *Goulburn Evening Penny Post*. November 4, 1932: 3.
- ‘The Lottery: Vigorous Protest by Churchmen. Personal Appeals to Legislators’. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. August 24, 1921: 11.
- ‘What is Happening in Your Home State’. *Army News* [Darwin]. October 4, 1944: 2.
- ‘Will Accept Money from Lottery’. *The Argus* [Melbourne]. August 23, 1941: 5.
- ‘Women’s Fight for Vice Reform’. *The Daily News* [Perth]. September 3, 1941: 19.

‘Zero Hour is Almost Here’. *The Daily News* [Perth]. August 18, 1939: 15.

List of Secondary Sources Cited

- Blombery, Tricia. *The Anglicans in Australia*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1996.
- Boyce, P. J. ‘The First Archbishop: Charles Owen Leaver Riley’. Pages 47-110 in *Four Bishops and Their See: Perth, Western Australia 1857-1957*. Edited by Fred Alexander. Nedlands: University of Western Australia Press, 1957.
- Dixon, David. ‘Illegal Betting in Britain and Australia: Contrasts in Control Strategies and Cultures’. Pages 86-100 in *Gambling Cultures: Studies in History and Interpretation*. Edited by Jan McMillen. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Fletcher, Brian H. *The Place of Anglicanism in Australia: Church, Society and Nation*. Mulgrave: Broughton Publishing, 2008.
- Green, Peter. *Betting and Gambling*. London: Student Christian Movement, 1924.
- Honniball, J. H. M. ‘Archbishop and Primate: Henry Frewen Le Fanu’. Pages 157-214 in *Four Bishops and Their See: Perth, Western Australia 1857-1957*. Edited by Fred Alexander. Nedlands: University of Western Australia Press, 1957.
- Judd, Stephen and Kenneth Cable. *Sydney Anglicans: A History of the Diocese*. Sydney: Anglican Information Office, 1987.
- Loane, Marcus Lawrence. *Mark these Men: A Brief Account of some Evangelical Clergy in the Diocese of Sydney who were Associated with Archbishop Mowll*. Kambah: Acorn Press, 1985.
- McMillen, Jan. ‘Introduction’. Pages 1-5 in *Gambling Cultures: Studies in History and Interpretation*. Edited by Jan McMillen. London: Routledge, 1996.
- McMillen, Jan. ‘Understanding Gambling: History, Concepts and Theories’. Pages 6-42 in *Gambling Cultures: Studies in History and Interpretation*. Edited by Jan McMillen. London: Routledge, 1996.
- NSW Lotteries. “Our History.” No pages. Cited 1 April 2013. Online: <http://tatts.com/nswlotteries/about/our-history>.
- O’Hara, John. *A Mug’s Game: A History of Gaming and Betting in Australia*. Kensington: New South Wales University Press, 1988.
- Pike, Douglas. Review of *Four Bishops and Their See: Perth, Western Australia 1857-1957*. Edited by Fred Alexander. *Historical Studies: Australian and New Zealand* 8:29 (1957): 108-9.
- Selby, Wendy. ‘Social Evil or Social Good? Lotteries and State Regulation in Australia and the United States’. Pages 65-85 in *Gambling Cultures: Studies in History and Interpretation*. Edited by Jan McMillen. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Sheen, H. E. *Canon Peter Green: A Biography of a Great Parish Priest*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1965.

HOWARD: A Response to the Introduction of State Lotteries.

Supski, Sian Danielle. *A Proper Foundation: A History of the Lotteries Commission of Western Australia 1932—2008*. Perth: Black Swan Press, 2009.