

want to speak to it first because, with respect, Sir, it is quite a bit different from Motion No. 3, which deals with who shall be directors.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** Order. I appreciate the Hon. Member's remarks. The Chair, as Hon. Members understand, is sometimes given a grouping of Motions with the assumption there is similarity between them. However, upon second examination of the grouping which the Chair made earlier, I have asked that the matter be re-examined to ascertain whether there is similarity. The remarks of previous speakers that there is no similarity might be quite valid. In any event, that matter is being reviewed at this time, and if need be we will reverse that arrangement. The Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn).

**Mr. Blenkarn:** With your permission, Sir, I will devote my remarks entirely to Motion No. 1.

I think this Motion tends to mislead the House. Motion No. 1 refers to the appointment at some time of directors, one of whom must presumably come from arts and culture, one from fitness and amateur sport and one from the medical and health research field. The Motion does nothing about the quantum of directors.

This new sports pool corporation is really "gamble on the cook's sports pool or we will organize the game in a way that will result in someone winning." Aside from the problem that could well arise with interference in the results of professional and amateur sporting events with this whole sports pools concept, what we have is a motion produced by the Minister which is really a motion to paint a better picture on a Bill. It is pretty to paint a good picture on this Bill. The Minister says of my 15 directors we might as well give one directorship to somebody representing arts and culture, we might as well give one to somebody representing fitness and amateur sport, and one to somebody representing medical and health research; the rest can go to my favourite Liberal hacks.

One result of sports pools and betting is the accumulation of some free slush money for Governments. This is unaccountable money. If the Government wants to do a good deal for a favourite cultural group it is able to dip into a free pot and pay out. It may want to do something or provide a new building, stadium, or even a domed stadium. It is good politics to have a building built in somebody's riding. Therefore, the Government can dip into the pool and do something in the way of a grant for one person as opposed to another. After all, they are all represented on the board, are they not?

Out of a board of 15 directors there will be one for arts and culture, one for fitness and amateur sport and one for medical and health research, plus 12 hacks from the Liberal Party to make sure the Government in power has control over this wonderful free pot. The Government will be able to dip into it, honey dip it and do what it wants with the money.

Where does the money come from? It is supposed to come free. It is taken from those least able to pay and given to those the Government wants to look after.

#### *Athletic Contests and Events Pools Act*

The money does not come from the highly mobile or big wage earners, it comes from pensioners, pensioners in many cases who are at or below the poverty line. They are the ones who buy the \$5 tickets, the \$10 tickets, the \$1 tickets, or whatever, because they hope somehow that lightning will strike them and they will be relieved of their misery.

That this Parliament with this phoney director-system set out in Clauses 3 and 4 of this Bill, made more phoney by the amendment produced by the Minister, should approve the kinds of things that happen in a gambling operation designed to fool the poor, fool the least competent in our society, bring in the suckers and rip them off, is unconscionable. We would be better to allow the setting up of Las Vegas casinos. At least they have a tendency to attract jetsetters. At least that is what they do. At least Las Vegas casinos bring in the highflyers who can afford to lose a buck or two. What do these sports pools bring in? Do they bring in the highflyers? Not on your life. Do they bring in the people who are worried about amateur sport? Not on your life. They bring in the little people who desperately want to improve their position and somehow want to get out of the box of poverty and hardship. The sports pools rip them off.

What are the rip-off figures? The last time we had Loto Canada 28 cents out of every dollar went to discounts, wholesalers or advertising. I suppose it went back into the economy. Only 27 cents was profit. That is all there was in it for amateur sports, culture, medical research, athletes or perhaps an olympic game or two; and 45 cents was used for prizes to the lucky. Those are not good odds.

• (1600)

Why do we not tell people to gamble on the stockmarket? Maybe they would make something, maybe we would build the country. But what do we do? We organize the system, approve it as a moral position of our country, rubberstamp it and make it look good because, after all, we will put on the board of directors one person from arts and culture, one from fitness and amateur sport, and one who will represent medical health and research. Of course the rest of the group will represent the Government in power and the Government's right to dip into the pot and look after whoever it wants to look after.

The Bill, the amendment and the concept that we can somehow slide over the sleaziness of the Bill by appointing people, only three out of 15, to represent the supposed beneficiaries of this supposed benefit to society, are wrong, and the House should tell the Minister that they are wrong.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** Order, please. Earlier the Chair advised Hon. Members that it would have the arrangement of motions for debate and subsequent voting re-examined in light of the statement read earlier today by the Chair, taking into account the well-founded comments made by Hon. Members previously in the course of debate. The Chair finds that all motions should be debated separately and voted on separately in due course. Therefore the House is now debating