

Athletic Contests and Events Pools Act

Mr. John McDermid (Brampton-Georgetown): Mr. Speaker, I hope we will have more questions like that coming from the other side. I might suggest that the Hon. Member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Pelletier) stand up and participate in the debate. He likes to stand up and make speeches; why does he not participate in the debate? There has not been one Grit who has had enough nerve to get on his feet during this debate today. It has been a shameful display today by the Liberal Party.

I rise to speak to Motion No. 3, an amendment by my colleague from St. Catharines (Mr. Reid), to restrict the sports pool or numbers racket to provide funding for the 1988 Calgary Winter Olympics. I support that amendment.

Earlier today I spoke about the money paid out to the Grits already in trying to set up this sports pool. Martin O'Connell, a former Member of Parliament, received \$3,102 to define financing and accounting systems. Goldfarb received \$16,000 to do research. An outfit by the name of Howard & Associates received \$297,687 to do a number of things. Somebody by the name of Dr. Schwartz—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. I am not going to draw the Hon. Member's attention to the issue of relevance. It is my view that he can continue in the vein in which he is now proceeding. However, I must remind the Hon. Member that the precedents of the House indicate that an Hon. Member cannot make the same speech twice.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. McDermid: Mr. Speaker, I know how much it hurts the Government to hear these things repeated to them. Therefore, I will continue with—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order. It is irrelevant to the Chair whether it hurts the Government or does not. The rules are that the Hon. Member cannot make the same speech twice in a row.

Mr. McDermid: With the greatest of respect, Mr. Speaker, if you read the blues you will find that is is not the same speech.

I want to read a press release which the Minister issued when he was discussing this Bill, to show the Canadian people how misleading he has been in presenting it. It is dated March 18, 1982. I quote:

By introducing the legislation now, Mr. Regan expressed the desire to see the Bill passed as expeditiously as possible, so that the new corporation can be established quickly and the sports pool game finalized and in operation. The Calgary Olympics will be given substantial financial support from Sports Pools revenues and it is important that funds become available soon so that the planning and preparation of facilities can begin.

That may not be the most misleading statement coming from that Minister, but it is one of the most misleading.

The planning and preparation of the facilities by the people in Calgary has been going on for a very long time. For the Minister to try and convince the people of Canada that the Olympics depends on the success of this sports pool or numbers racket is absolutely foolhardy. I can show that the moneys to

be received from this numbers racket, if it ever gets into place, will not be there for the olympics. Let us look at where the money will go. The Minister is afraid to be specific. He thinks that Calgary will receive approximately 40 per cent of the net proceeds. He says that the net proceeds in one year will be about \$100 million.

I want to go back to Loto Canada. In 1977-78 and 1978-79, the two full years it was in operation, lotteries were at their heyday. There was very little competition like there is today. In 1977-78, the net return to Loto Canada was \$74,300,000. the following year 1978-79, it dropped dramatically to \$62,471,000. At that time there was very little competition for lotteries, sports pools, or whatever you call them. It was going down rapidly when Loto Canada was put out of business, and rightly so.

Let us talk about the costs of those two years and the type of spending which the Government did on those lotteries. In 1977-78 they spent \$10,400,000 on advertising and in 1978-79, \$13 million. Ticket printing in 1977-78 was \$3 million. It went to \$8 million in 1978-79. Sales promotion went from \$5 million to \$7 million in one year. Public relations went from \$322,000 in 1977-78 to \$1,436,759 the following year. What did public relations take into account? I can see the staff giggling up there, but I want to tell Hon. Members that Loto Canada had a permanent hotel suite in the Four Seasons, outfitted with the finest of booze, food and entertainment all the time. The Chairman of Loto Canada had his own limousine and driver—nothing to it. That is where the money was being spent. That is why expenditures went from \$322,000 to \$1.4 million in one year.

Office supplies doubled in one year, \$317,000 to \$722,000. Furniture almost doubled from \$250,000 to \$402,000 in one year. Expenditures were phenomenal. This is why people do not want to see these great corporations, Crown corporations, established by this Government. They waste money, even though it is money raised by gambling, it is atrocious.

In our Motion No. 3 we say that we want the money to be slated for one purpose and one purpose only. If the Government is going to bring in this ill-conceived method of funding the Olympics as well as all the other things listed, then heaven knows where the money will go. We say it should be for the Olympics and the Olympics only. It should not be open-ended. There is no sunset clause and no real accounting to the Canadian people of what is going on. Some of the mess created in Loto Canada is now just coming to the fore, a mess created when it was being run by the Government that was then in power.

Let us take a hard look at Bill C-95, in particular where it says who will be the beneficiaries of this sports pool. It says there will be worthy capital projects in the area of fitness and amateur sports or arts and culture. Does that mean that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Caccia) will take money from this lottery to build a dome stadium in Toronto, for example? Is that what it says? It does not even define it clearly in the Act.