

Criminal Code

ty not just of those present of the total membership of the House of Commons.

Having said those preliminary words which were prompted, of course, by the remarks of the Minister of Justice and those of the hon. member for Calgary North, I should like to turn to the narrow point with which I would still like the house to deal. On April 21 at the report stage I moved an amendment which sought to delete from clause 13 of the bill the two subparagraphs which would make it legal for the federal or provincial governments of this country to hold state lotteries. My amendment, as I say, was moved on April 21 and is recorded in *Hansard* for that date at page 7774. The vote was taken the next day, April 22, and is recorded in *Hansard* at pages 7838 and 7839. My amendment was in fact defeated by a vote of 118 to 54. I believe that under our new rules there is one thing about which there is no question; once we have made a decision in the house, with Mr. Speaker in the chair, on an issue at the report stage, it would not be appropriate to try to revive precisely the same issue at the third reading stage. Therefore I do not intend to make that effort. I still think the house was wrong in approving of state lotteries, federal or provincial, but that decision has been made and I have to accept it, just as the minister has to accept some other decisions that were made.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The house is never wrong. You just regret the decision.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is a euphemistic way of putting it. If you want me to say I regret the decision, I will; but I also say the house was wrong. However, I want to make it clear that I feel just as strongly now as I did on April 21 and on other occasions when I spoke on this matter, that whatever views we may be willing to agree to regarding private lotteries, games of chance, bingo and all that kind of thing, I thoroughly disapprove of federal, provincial or municipal governments being put in a position where they can resort to the holding of lotteries for the raising of public revenue. I think this is a backward step of the most regressive kind. As I have said on other occasions, we get some pretty regressive taxation proposals from the present government, but this is even worse in its potentialities than some of those put forward by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson).

● (4:30 p.m.)

○ My position is not one that is held by only a few of us. I will not take the time of the [Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

house to read it all, but on those occasions when the *Winnipeg Free Press* supports me editorially I think it is time to get it framed or, as my friend says, to watch out.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Watch that you are not framed.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): My colleague thinks that I might be framed. I think not, for this editorial is a very serious one. At any rate, I invite the minister to read the editorial which appeared in the *Winnipeg Free Press* on Thursday, April 24, the heading of which is "Invitation To Folly". The *Free Press* editors, without qualification, expressed their regret, to use the minister's language, that the government did not see fit to accept the amendment that I moved on April 21. I say without going into it at length, because I have done so on previous occasions and because there is nothing we can do about it anyway, that I think permitting state lotteries as a means of raising public funds is a regressive step that we should not take. However, that decision has been made. But there is a detail in that decision which has not been discussed, has not been argued at any of our stages, at second reading, in the standing committee or at the report stage, namely, that clause 13 in Bill C-150 not only permits state lotteries but in the case of the federal government permits those lotteries to be held in accordance with regulations made by the Governor in Council.

It is on this point that I wish to move an amendment in a few minutes. When the minister was arguing for these subparagraphs in his bill he spoke about symmetry. He said he wanted to provide for the federal government to have the same position that was accorded to provincial governments. Again I point out that subparagraph (b) of the legislation in question says that provincial governments may conduct lotteries only in accordance with any law enacted by the legislature of the province concerned. But in the case of the federal government, the government has drawn up this bill so that once it is passed the federal government may organize any kind of lottery it wishes, and it can do so entirely by Order in Council. It can make any conditions or terms it wants. It can give away its own shirt and the country's shirt too, and it does not have to come back to parliament to get approval for the terms and conditions of any of those lotteries. It can all be done by Order in Council.

○ It is on this point that I am registering this lastditch objection. Despite my objection to