

industry is not complaining bitterly about lotteries. If somebody buys a \$10 lottery ticket, obviously that money is not being spent on going to the movies. It in no way contributes anything to the economy.

This Bill is another proliferation of the con game. I do not believe the national Government should be involved in a con game. Obviously Members opposite think that a good con game is a great thing. If it is not a con game to suggest that the Olympics in 1988 require this; that is utterly ridiculous.

A lot of my friends here, particularly westerners, have spoken about the Calgary Olympics. May I remind all Hon. Members that we are not talking about the Calgary Olympics. We are talking about the world Olympics being held in Canada. Those Olympics belong as much to Quebec, Ontario, the Maritimes as to British Columbia, Alberta and the rest of the country.

If the national Government is not prepared to spend money to make them a success, it should be thoroughly ashamed of itself. It is using this blackmail to get another lottery scheme in place when we already have eight or nine in the country. These lotteries drain off millions and millions every year right across the country. It is a totally useless activity. One in 800,000 wins. There are 799,999, including the smaller lotteries, who lose.

The only advantage I can see in buying a lottery ticket is the dream of having a million dollars, until they draw the numbers. That is all you get. On a moral basis, is it proper to give someone that kind of dream? I always believed in the right of the individual to make a damn fool of himself if he wanted to. However, standing here as a Member of the House of Commons, a Member of this august assembly, I am not so sure I have the right to feel that way when a con game of this nature is perpetrated upon society by a Government.

I only wish that Members sitting on the Government benches would hear what is being said by any number of Members on this side. They do not listen. They have not listened to anything. They have not heard anyone over here or any of our reasons.

If they were adjudicating on the debate, if they had to sit down and determine where the truth lies, who is right and who is wrong, who has presented the better reasons on this Bill and the various amendments, they would have to come to the conclusion that in this case—it is not always true, but mostly true—the Government has to be wrong in foisting this con game on the Canadian people. There are far too many of these lotteries.

There are two or three quotations which express better than I can some of my feelings in connection with this legislation. I quote:

The present acceptance of lotteries seems to arise out of political expedience. Governments, under pressure to fund undertakings beyond the traditional expectations of the fiscal system, have resorted to the lottery instead of tax reform, and have found ready to hand a gambling medium, publicly attractive for its accessibility, simplicity and large stakes. Governments have, moreover, been able to pour millions of dollars into seductive advertising which creates the illusion of a "normal" activity in which winning is also interpreted as "normal". This attitude on the part of Government is particularly destructive when

Canadians should be challenged to give for their country rather than get for themselves.

Professor D. McCormack Smyth of York University stated:

Liberal democratic government has been based on a number of central ideas. One is that governments must respect human beings. Governments must not exploit human weaknesses. Through their promotion of lotteries governments are appealing to one of the lowest human qualities—that of greed. For one individual to win a million dollar lottery ticket, 199,999 other individuals must lose \$5.

I am on the side of 199,999 rather than the one who takes the prize. In January, 1983, the Baptist Federation of Canada, the Council of Christian Reform Churches in Canada, the Salvation Army and the United Church of Canada stated in a brief:

We see gambling as that which divides rather than unites; as destructive to genuine philanthropy; as harmful to persons, communities and nations; as pandering to the debilitating desire to get something for nothing.

It is those kinds of words that I would hope those opposite could hear, believe and understand. This Bill will not do any good for our country. This Bill will bring disrespect to every Member in the House of Commons who votes for it when he or she returns home to face his voters. Again I quote:

The lotteries in Canada, with all the power of governments behind them, have already become a source of contention between Ottawa and the Provinces. They present a new and powerful form of political patronage and potential for corrupting abuses. They raise expectations among community organizations, where perhaps none should exist, with respect to assistance from the public purse. They lull politicians and the public away from the task of analysis, the setting of priorities, and the making of commitments, which are indispensable for the ordering of social life.

We have seen in this Government a tendency, a disease or a stumbling into scandal after scandal, a massive mismanagement of the economy. Canadair is one example. There are many others. Now this legislation is being proposed. If there is anything true about gambling dollars, it is easy come, easy go. The easy come from the lottery means there is a lot more money to play with, a lot more money to spend foolishly, a lot more money to spend on patronage, and a lot more money to use to the detriment of the Canadian people. For God's sake, gentleman, reconsider.

Mr. Walter McLean (Waterloo): Madam Speaker, in entering the debate this evening on Motion No. 3, I do so with the shared conviction that the beneficiary structure of the present legislation is too large and too vague. If the sports pool earns \$30 million to \$40 million a year, it is certainly not clear how much of that money will be divided between the Calgary Olympics, fitness and amateur sport, health and medical research, art and culture and added to that, worthy capital projects.

In the moments available to me, I want to focus some attention on groups which have been named and whose expectations have been raised with the introduction of Bill C-95. How are these groups to plan on funding when there is no clear indication of what percentage is to go to each group and when in the future and under what formula they can anticipate receiving them?

Surely the distribution pattern of the money should be determined before the money is collected, not after, unless it is