

Criminal Code

Mr. Marchi: Mr. Chairman, Otto talks about running away. After my hon. friend from the NDP spoke for 20 minutes, the Hon. Minister got up to say he likes the speech which he gave. Talk about courage, Mr. Chairman.

I also want to cite some quotes from the Hon. Minister. In describing the gaming operations, the Minister said in the *Ottawa Citizen* on September 21 that: "The operations are a tax on the poor and perhaps an immoral way of raising taxes, whatever the Government". What is his and his Government's view of the lottery business? When he describes it as a tax on the poor and a way of immorally raising taxes, does he not believe that that principle holds true whether it is the federal or provincial Government that is involved in the gaming operation?

I have another quote from the *Ottawa Citizen* of September 18, 1984. The Minister stated that: "A different form of gaming operation could continue after that— "referring to the dismantling of the Sports Pool." —because clearly we have to keep our commitment to the Calgary Olympics and we will". Why is the Hon. Minister wasting the time of the House by saying that lotteries are evil and the federal Government should not be involved in them while, on the other hand, he is quoted as saying that gaming operations, sports pools or lottery mechanisms could in fact be established to raise the funds?

The Minister is obviously sending conflicting statements. On the one hand he states that it is immoral to be in the lottery business, yet he signs a monopoly in the lottery business over to the provincial Governments. He said that the previous administration was wrong in operating the sports pool and using the lottery business as a way of generating funds for sports teams. However, he is quoted as saying that once he has dismantled that pool he could perhaps begin another.

This leads me to my third question. If the former sports pool or another gaming operation was in fact making money that would help sports teams, would the Minister be in favour of such a mechanism? Would he be prepared to give it away to the provinces?

● (1710)

Mr. Jelinek: Mr. Chairman, first when my friend made reference to the speech that Mr. Epp from the New Democratic Party made and I did not respond to it, it was because he read my speech from a few years ago and he did not ask for a comment nor did he ask me any questions on it. I wanted to stand up and say that I thought the words Mr. Epp read were words of wisdom on amateur sport.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I hate doing this to the Minister but he has been here long enough to know that we must refer to Members not by name but by constituency. The Minister has referred to Members by name. I know he is not here very often but let me remind him that he should follow the rules and refer to Members by their constituencies and not by their personal names.

The Chairman: The Hon. Member for Ottawa Vanier is correct. I am sure the Minister is aware of the rule.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Chairman, the normal practice in parliamentary standing committees and legislative committees is to refer to Members by name. We are in Committee of the Whole. Is the rule different for Committee of the Whole?

The Chairman: Yes. I ask the Minister to refer to Members by their constituencies which I am sure he will.

Mr. Jelinek: Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the Member for Ottawa-Vanier. That is the first thing he has said that is correct today.

Mr. Gauthier: Stick around. I can teach you a few things.

Mr. Jelinek: I will refer to my friend as the Hon. Member for York West. In addressing his concern about my not responding to the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay-Nipigon, it is because he did not ask a question nor for a comment. I just commented on the words he read which were from my own speech.

The Hon. Member asked a couple of questions. I will take them in reverse order. He asked why we closed down the Sports Pool Corporation.

Mr. Marchi: No, I didn't.

Mr. Jelinek: He asked why we did not continue to practice the policy of the Liberal administration. I said already in this debate today on three or four occasions that besides the fact the Sports Pool was losing \$1.5 million of taxpayers' money a week, it was also a federal-provincial irritant. Therefore, we felt it was wise to close it down.

It is true that while we were considering this, in answer to a question from a reporter at the time—I am talking now about 13 months ago—whether there were other options other than closing down, I said—and I cannot make a comment as to what was quoted in the newspaper—

Mr. Gauthier: Have you changed your mind since then?

Mr. Jelinek: I never change my mind. I said that officials of the Sports Pool Corporation said it could be revised in such a way as to be a money-making operation.

Finally, the Hon. Member asked for my personal views on lotteries. As a Minister of the Crown, my personal views are irrelevant. The views of the federal Government of the Day are that lotteries belong under provincial jurisdiction. Therefore, we have acted accordingly.

Mr. Marchi: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is certainly correct about one thing, that all his views are irrelevant.

The Hon. Minister said that in my preceding question I asked why the Government dismantled the Sports Pool. I did not ask that question. My question was specific. If that Sports Pool, or any other sports pool or lottery, was making dollars, money that would be going to aid sports organizations, would