

Criminal Code

and he may be chiefly responsible for the motion for second reading of his bill not being passed this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member mentioned a few moments ago the co-operation given by non-members when Bill No. C-2 was introduced—

Mr. Caouette: C-22.

Mr. Laniel: No, no. I am speaking of Bill No. C-2 introduced by the hon. member for St. Maurice-Lafleche (Mr. Chretien) with regard to Air Canada.

I should point out to the hon. member that Bill No. C-2 concerned the management of a crown corporation, whereas the bill now before us contains an amendment to the Criminal Code so as to authorize the various provinces to establish lotteries.

Mr. Speaker, I think that before putting the question it is important that this matter be fully examined, and that we consider the possibility of initiating negotiations or continuing consultations with the provinces.

The hon. member for St. Mary often boasts of being a great autonomist. This afternoon, he is standing up for Mr. Lesage, but when he introduced his bill last year—

Mr. Valade: We are not standing up for Mr. Lesage, we are standing up for the province of Quebec.

Mr. Laniel: —he brought up the question of provincial politics. He was then even somewhat scolded by the Speaker. This year, however, he is not saying a word; he wants his motion to be passed without a word being said; in short, he does not want anybody to express an opinion.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I know that the hon. member for Beauharnois-Salaberry would like to get me into an argument; however, when he suggests that I tried to prevent discussion of the bill, I believe that perhaps he did not quite mean what he said.

[Text]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. The hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Valade) is disagreeing with something said by the hon. member for Beauharnois-Salaberry (Mr. Laniel). On such an occasion there are two possibilities open to the hon. member for St. Mary. When the hon. member for Beauharnois-Salaberry has completed his remarks he can, of course, ask the unanimous consent of the house to speak again, although that would not be necessary on this occasion since

he, having moved the motion for second reading, still has an opportunity to speak when he winds up second reading of the bill.

I would not be able to accept the view that for one hon. member to disagree with what another hon. member is saying constitutes a point of order or a question of privilege.

Mr. Valade: With due regard to Your Honour, I was on a question of privilege. My point was that the hon. member who has the floor has accused me of wanting to foreclose the debate, an allegation which is not true. I question the merit of this accusation, and point out that I do not intend to foreclose the debate. I merely said that I wanted a short debate.

[Translation]

Mr. Laniel: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If I said that the hon. member for St. Mary had prevented other members from speaking, let us say that I did not want to suggest that such was his intention, but that he was acting as if it were.

Mr. Caouette: That does not make much sense.

Mr. Laniel: Mr. Speaker, I hear the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) and I am pleased to welcome him in this house, especially as I note that there are very few members of his party, who however, have always been in favour of this bill—

Mr. Choquette: He has been away for two months.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I hear the hon. member for Lotbiniere say that I have been away for two months.

An hon. Member: Two weeks.

Mr. Caouette: That was a king-size lie, and for the information of the house, I may say that I was away exactly five days for strictly personal reasons, which do not concern the hon. member in the least.

To refer to the unkind remarks by the hon. member who has the floor now, or rather who had it before I intervened, I may say that the hon. member is neither logical, nor honest in his statements. He said that there are not many of us in this house, but if he counts the hon. members now in their seats on the Liberal side, that is on the government side, he will realize that the proportion is much more substantial on my side than on his.