

state lotteries in principle, I cannot do anything about that. I have to accept the fact that parliament has voted for state lotteries in principle, federal and provincial. But I do contend that I have the right to ask for this one thing to be done, for the minister's symmetry to be carried out, for the law to be changed by only a few words so that the same provision applies to the federal government as would apply to the provinces, namely, that any such lottery should be held only in accordance with a law enacted by parliament itself.

I speak of this with a fair amount of feeling so far as the subject of state lotteries is concerned. I think that if we start on this path we are responding to what the *Free Press* calls an invitation to folly. I think we are on a slippery slope. But I appeal even to members of parliament who favour state lotteries, particularly members on this side of the house and, I think, a few over there, to face up to the fact that one of the things that we in parliament should guard most jealously is the question of how much authority we give to the executive to act by Order in Council. If there is anything that has happened in modern times that is derogatory to the strength and the importance of parliament it is the extent to which the executive has been strengthened because it has asked for Order in Council powers and parliament has been willing to give the government those powers.

I think, for example, of a situation to which I will refer in passing. We did a pretty good job in this parliament on the National Transportation Act but we are discovering now that we gave a great deal of power to the government. We went even further; we gave a great deal of power to the Canadian Transport Commission. As a matter of fact, we gave a great deal of power to one man whose name is well known all over this house. There are other examples, but this is what we are doing here and I plead with members, even members like the hon. member for Sainte-Marie (Mr. Valade) if he were here, to realize that this issue goes beyond the question of lotteries. It goes to the whole question of the relation between parliament and the government. We should not lightly and without serious thought and concern pass a law in which we give another wide power to the executive to act by Order in Council without having to come back to parliament for any kind of endorsement or approval whatsoever.

### *Criminal Code*

Incidentally, the one paragraph in the editorial in the *Winnipeg Free Press* of April 24 that I would like to read zeros in on this point. It reads as follows:

The federal government pleads not merely symmetry but also virtue, since it does not now plan to set up an all-Canada lottery scheme. Mr. Turner, however, cautiously inserts two qualifying phrases, "as far as I know" and "at present". The important point is that the government, regardless of its intentions, is obtaining authority to introduce lotteries, as and when it chooses, by Order in Council. Obviously, it cannot bind its successors and it is not even clear from the minister's language, that it has bound itself for any length of time. This is a great and unwelcome change—

This is the *Winnipeg Free Press* talking.

—which could and should have been averted by acceptance of the Knowles amendment.

That is the amendment I moved on April 21, and since the government was not wise enough to accept that amendment I am going to give the government a chance at another one today. I am giving the government a chance to make restitution.

**Mr. Benjamin:** They do not often get a second chance.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** We are full of compassion over here and we would like to give the government a chance to do something about its sins. As the minister knows—and I am sure he will not mind my saying this—I spoke to him about this a few days ago, and today I sent him a copy of the amendment I propose to move because I am quite serious in what I am asking the house to do.

There are times, of course, when we move amendments knowing that there is not a chance of their being accepted, but we go through the motions anyway; we go through the ritual of making a motion, of having a vote and of being defeated, after which we can at least tell the country we tried. If one springs something like this on the government one realizes, of course, that the government has some excuse. I am not springing this on the Minister of Justice. As I said, I spoke to him about it last week, and earlier today I sent him a copy of the amendment in the hope that he will give it favourable consideration. If my amendment is accepted, it will not be an acceptance of the basic position I took on April 21 that there should not be state lotteries at all, but at least it will protect the government against the charge that it wants a blank cheque, that it wants one more Order in Council power, and that it wants to be able to bring in at any time any kind of