

felt much better about placing \$2 in a horse race where at least at worst they get a ten-to-one chance of winning something.

There are several things that have yet to be done for the benefit of racing in this country. Whether our present Minister of Agriculture has the intestinal fortitude to do it or not I seriously doubt. One of them is to allow the provinces to decide for themselves whether they want off-track betting. Another one is to attempt to persuade them, and to provide statistics in support, that the government's share must be reduced and that they will take less out in order to gain more money.

Mr. Whelan: Which government, this government?

Mr. Cook: All governments.

Mr. Whelan: It is 0.6 per cent to the federal government.

Mr. Cook: It is 0.6 per cent to the federal government, says the Minister of Agriculture. What he did not report was the surplus that the government keeps from that 0.6 per cent, to the detriment of the individual bettor across Canada.

The implications for racing with this new legislation, which I fully approve of, are substantial. It is a good move this government has made and I am pleased that they have done it.

As a final word, Winston Churchill in his declining years was once asked by a reporter, if he had to live his life over again, what would he change, what would he have done differently? After much thought, his statement was: "I wish I had bet more on the black at Monte Carlo!" I suspect that if I am asked that same question in my declining years, my answer would be: "I wish I had found more time to spend at race tracks!"

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cook: Mr. Speaker, I have a few more brief comments, but because of the nature of them I wonder if we might call it one o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): If that is agreed, it being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): When the House rose at one o'clock, the hon. member for North Vancouver-Burnaby (Mr. Cook) had the floor, but the chair has been advised that there may be a point of order with respect to last night's proceedings.

Point of Order—Mr. MacKay

POINT OF ORDER

MR. MACKAY—BILL C-108—REQUESTED CHANGE IN RECORDING OF VOTE

Hon. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, my point of order is very brief. It has to do with the vote I registered last evening with respect to Bill C-108. Due to some confusion or juxtaposition of my seat at the time the vote was taken, the vote I cast was wrongly ascribed. I wish to be on record as having voted for Bill C-108—with the government in this instance—and I request that the record be changed. If it requires a motion to accomplish this, I would be pleased to put a motion; but if that is not required, I would just like to have this on the record, and I have already spoken to *Journals* about it.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, if it is required to seek unanimous consent for the purpose of reverting to motions to present a motion which would clarify the anomaly referred to by the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay), I as well would be quite prepared either to move or to second that motion.

In any event, the point of order is to clarify any anomaly at the time of the taking of the vote last night. At the conclusion of the taking of the votes from the side opposite and when the last vote had been recorded, both the hon. member for Central Nova and I rose with the intent and purpose of supporting the bill. As I pointed out on a brief question of privilege last night, the bill before us at that point did contain a matter of importance and urgency to maritime Canada. It is incumbent on me to join with the hon. member for Central Nova and to inquire about whatever the proper procedure is to remove any anomaly with respect to the recording of that vote last night. It was my intention—and it remains my intention—to support the content of Bill C-108 at third reading.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay) and the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) have both been so kind as to advise the Chair of their intention. Of course, being in the chair last night, I was also aware of the events in relation to the vote. I think probably the best way to do this is to seek the unanimous consent of the House to have the hon. member for Central Nova and the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East recorded as having voted in favour of Bill C-108 last night. That constitutes a correction of the House of Commons Debates record, *Hansard*, and I presume there would be no difficulty for hon. members throughout the House in that regard. However, it is procedurally necessary to seek the unanimous consent of the House to make that change in *Hansard*. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.