welfare organizations under provincial jurisdiction.

In previous debates, as we know, everything was said about provincial lotteries. The bill I am presenting today is identical in every respect to the one I had the honour to introduce last year. It is a very simple bill, for its sole purpose is to amend section 179 of the Criminal Code in order to authorize the provinces, so desiring, to legislate in matters of provincial lotteries. At this point, I should like to remind the house of the position taken by members of the official opposition when the hon. member for St. Maurice-Lafleche (Mr. Chretien) introduced Bill No. C-2, to amend the Trans-Canada Air Lines Act so that the name "Air Canada" could be officially recognized. On that occasion, you will remember that all members of the opposition co-operated with the hon. member for St. Maurice-Lafleche and readily accepted the amendment.

Now, last year, when I introduced a bill which was substantially the same as this one, all members of the various parties in this house agreed with the intent and purpose of Bill No. C-22.

May I be allowed to read into the record some quotations to that effect, so as to prove that the stand taken by the members of the house seemed quite sympathetic to the bill I was introducing at that time.

As recorded on page 4302 of *Hansard* for November 1, 1963, the Liberal member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) had this to say:

> No member on this side of the house has any intention of filibustering this bill.

He was speaking of the bill introduced by me.

Further on, he stated:

> I am 100 percent in favour of the bill introduced by the hon. member for St. Mary.

Now, I presume the hon. member for York-Humber spoke on that occasion on behalf of the Liberal party and that this party would therefore be prepared to support the motion I am introducing today.

The hon. member said also, as recorded on page 4305 of *Hansard* for November 1, 1963:

> I believe that this opportunity also should be given to the Canadian people as well as that of buying lottery tickets which would be legalized by the bill of the hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Valade).

Later on, as recorded on the same page, the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard), on behalf of his party, introduced a motion requesting the house to decide by a vote of the fate of that bill.

Afterwards, in the course of the debate, I note that the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Perron) also introduced a bill identical to the one I am introducing this afternoon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as unanimity seems to prevail on this bill, I would invite the house to vote and to take a stand officially and according to the opinions expressed by members of each of the parties on the 1st of November, last year.

I hope the few government members present today in the house will not use their time to unduly delay the passage of this bill, as all of them have expressed their opinion, for or against such a measure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as Bill No. C-22, which I have the honour to introduce today, is identical to Bill No. C-36, which I submitted on November 1, 1963, and as all other parties came out in favour of that bill, I am certain that any further discussion would only have the effect of preventing the passage of this bill.

I therefore move, seconded by Mr. Winkler, that the question be now put.

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): The hon. member for St. Mary moves that the question be now put. I apologize to the house, the hon. member is moving a previous question on his own motion.

Mr. Valade: I think the Speaker should read the motion I put, just to be clear.

Mr. Winch: Is it not very unusual for a member who moved a motion to sit down and then move the previous question? I think it is completely out of order. I have no objection to it, but I think it is out of order.

Mr. Valade: I think this question is not a debatable one and should be put by the Chair.

Mr. Knowles: The hon. member is wrong on both counts. It would be debatable, but he is out of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): I would have to rule that the hon. member for St. Mary already has a motion before the house and therefore is out of order in moving the previous question.

Mr. Valade: I ask that the question be now put.

Mr. Winch: This is my point. I understand that the hon. member has moved the motion which is now before the house and he is therefore, the mover of a substantive motion. As the mover of a motion he cannot,