

Criminal Code

When we read paragraph 1 of that bill, in fact, there is only one—

Mr. Valade: It is still too difficult for the Grits.

Mr. Caouette:—we find this:

—a lottery organized and operated by a provincial government to provide financial assistance to hospitals or for other social welfare purposes under provincial jurisdiction.

The hon. member for St. Mary deserves congratulations for having introduced such a bill in the house. His bill is logical in all respects.

I do not think that anybody will agree—and the hon. member who just took his seat, the hon. member for Salaberry—

An hon. Member: Beauharnois-Salaberry.

Mr. Caouette:—agrees that the bill, pardon me, the hon. member for Beauharnois-Salaberry—will agree that the bill is logical. I am convinced that his colleagues in the Liberal party, on the government side, also accept that point of view.

But the question that immediately comes to mind is this one: Why, a year ago or so, when the Conservatives were in office, sitting on your right, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Mary did not introduce the same bill he would like to have passed today by the Liberal government, blaming that government for not being prepared to go ahead and allow the provinces to provide financial assistance to charitable agencies, provincial hospitals, and so forth? Why did he not take any action at that time?

As I said time and time again it is strange that when they sit in opposition, they feel they have abilities of which they are deprived as soon as they come into office.

Last year, the Liberals found themselves in the same position, the same circumstances. This year, we have the Conservatives in the Liberals' place. The roles are changed.

A while ago, I heard the hon. member for Beauharnois-Salaberry ask himself and ask—

Mr. Valade: He did not say much.

Mr. Caouette: I can see why the hon. member for St. Mary should tell me that the hon. member for Beauharnois-Salaberry did not say much. Be that as it may, last year, it was the hon. member for St. Mary who was not saying much.

Mr. Valade: Have you not read the speeches I made on the subject?

Mr. Caouette: The roles are changed. This year, now that he is in the opposition, he can show more courage.

[Mr. Caouette.]

When he was a member on the government side, he did not say a word about this matter. He kept absolutely quiet on the subject; I know, because I was in the house at that time—

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

Mr. Caouette: There is no question of privilege.

Mr. Valade: There certainly is, and the reason I am rising on a question of privilege is this: the member for Villeneuve is again making a false statement in saying that I did not look after this matter when I was a member on the government side; that is not true. He only has to look at the record to find that my name appears more often than his when he was a member of the house—

[Text]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I must again point out to the hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Valade) that disagreeing with any statement made by an hon. member is not necessarily a point of privilege. I would again point out that when the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) has finished his remarks, if the hon. member for St. Mary wishes to rise and make an explanation, with the consent of the house he is of course permitted to do that.

Mr. Valade: But they will not give me time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): But it is not permitted to interrupt an hon. member who is making his speech. The hon. member for Villeneuve.

[Translation]

Mr. Caouette: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The interruptions—

Mr. Valade: That is an old trick.

Mr. Caouette: The vitriolic interruptions of the hon. member for St. Mary do not frighten me at all. He says that he was more active than we were when he was on the government side, but we just have to look up the *Hansard* index or *Hansard* itself to realize the difference between the numerous interventions of the group I represent in the house and the ones he made.

Mr. Valade: There were none in 1958.

Mr. Caouette: But there were some in 1962, and the hon. member was nearly replaced by a Social Credit member in his own riding—

Mr. Valade: The Social Credit candidate lost his deposit.