

Criminal Code

such regulations to do anything described in any of paragraphs (a) to (f) of subsection (1) or subsection (4) of section 179;

Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of deleting that paragraph. I cannot see why the central government which has at its disposal far better means than lotteries, or, as the leader of the Ralliement créditiste termed it, the "national barbotte" would legalize gambling. It could use for instance the excellent means of the Bank of Canada to improve the purchasing power of the people. The government has really no need for lotteries. Deleting that paragraph would be perfectly all right and I therefore support that suggestion.

To my mind, this house would enhance its prestige by saying that it does not see why the federal government should assume certain rights in that field. Why? Because the amendment concerning lotteries was brought forth as a result of certain representations. Whose? Certainly not those of the federal government. They must therefore have been made by welfare groups, charitable organizations, various religious groups and public associations.

In fact, those bodies have been calling for the legalization of lotteries for several years. A little later, the municipalities and the provinces, especially that of Quebec have also asked that lotteries be legalized.

No representations have ever been made at the federal government level asking that it conduct and manage lotteries. I therefore do not see why we should accept that paragraph.

On the other hand, I accept paragraph (b) which would also be deleted through this amendment. I agree with it, Mr. Speaker, all the more so because of the present federalist concept which prevails, especially since the present right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has come to power, whereby it seems that the provincial governments are to be considered merely as large municipalities and gigantic benevolent societies.

That is so true, Mr. Speaker, that we notice, as representatives of the people, that the majority of the requests which are made to us as members of parliament, concern various problems to be solved, most of which fall within the jurisdiction of the provinces.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Provinces have become enormous welfare societies within which there is a run on social welfare allowances. As a matter of fact, this run has become a real lottery and people are

vying with one another to get one as soon as possible.

Provincial governments having become, according to the present federalist concept, enormous charitable societies, it is, therefore, almost normal in this crazy system in which we live, that we should avail ourselves of the necessary means to help the large and the small welfare societies solve their financial problems in organizing lotteries, in exploiting the passions of the mass and,—I say so again,—the gambling instinct by which people are possessed.

That is why we should recognize the merits of such a solution until it is understood that we should resort to more realistic means. But, for the time being, we are against the principle of lotteries.

I have been agreeably surprised a moment ago, to hear the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) say that he accepted some of the Social credit theories. If he could study them in depth, so as to understand them better, we would be even happier.

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege.

It is almost four years now since I came to this house and I keep harping away at that matter.

Mr. Matte: I hope there will be an ever increasing number of my colleagues willing to grapple with the Social Credit economic theories and that they will eventually put them in practice, even only as an experiment.

But we shall not adopt that way of thinking until we renounce tax and surtax as the sole means of administering the country. We shall have to find more palatable means to snatch away—not to say steal—the people's money.

I have nothing against that clause, provided paragraph (a) is deleted. Therefore, to a certain extent, I am in favour of the amendment. Nonetheless, I would like my reasons to be examined and understood, and I think that the real problems which led us to discuss lotteries should be taken into consideration.

I would go even further. I wonder why, for instance, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), of the New democratic party, which, as a rule, is in favour of any measure of socialization, does not support state lotteries. I would even go as far as wondering if it would not be possible, in order to make the pill easier to swallow for the taxpayers, to set up not only a voluntary