

Athletic Contests and Events Pools Act

on to the premises, this evidence would automatically disappear and be disposed of in what we called the toilet. What I am concerned about is that if the Government opposes the proposition put forward by my colleague, the Hon. Member for St. Catharines (Mr. Reid), we will have an accounting system which will be totally reliant on flashpaper.

● (1640)

The Auditor General will not be able to conduct a meaningful investigation of the expenditures and the kind of patronage games that might be played. On the basis of this legislation, the Government is entering into flash paper accounting. It is giving bookies a bad name. It will give the bookie, someone who is shunned in society, the wrong idea. Not only will they make money from booking, which is criminally wrong, but they will also avoid their income tax responsibilities because the Government would not worry about proper accounting to any official or to Parliament. That is the issue we face today.

I say this in almost a jocular fashion but I have a serious message that I want to leave with those backbenchers of the Government Party to whom I am particularly addressing my remarks. What can be wrong with the proposition put forward by my colleague from St. Catharines, so admirably seconded by the Hon. Member for Brampton-Georgetown (Mr. McDermid), that the Auditor General should audit the books? Money is being taken from people in Canada, very often the poor, and they are entitled to have the best possible accounting system to ensure that the money is properly spent in the final analysis. What is wrong with fairness in the operation of this particular activity? What does the Government have to hide by not allowing this amendment to go through?

I remember when my colleague for Halton (Mr. Jelinek) raised questions a long time ago to which he received denials by the then Minister responsible and now by the Secretary of State for International Trade (Mr. Regan). I remember sitting in the House and being absolutely amazed that the Minister could stand and deny that their sports pool proposition was coming forward. At the same time we had evidence of that being the case; the Hon. Member for Halton had it in his hand. Yet the Government continued to deny that it had any intention of entering into a sports pool proposition.

If you were buying a used car from a man like the Minister of State for International Trade and he dealt with you in that way, Mr. Speaker, would you be very secure in accepting his word that it would be run properly and the car would be all right? I would not even kick the tire for fear of it falling on my foot. But that is the type of attitude which the Government takes. It has been an attitude of deceit, of prevarication of speaking with a forked tongue, one of stating that which is contrary to the truth. I cannot think of enough ways to describe what is happening here without being thrown out of the House by the Speaker.

That has been the record of the Government and that is why it is so important for us to fight this particular proposal and to vote against it. That is what I intend to do.

Mr. Charles Mayer (Portage-Marquette): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support motion No. 4 which was moved by my colleague from St. Catharines (Mr. Reid). I cannot understand why the Government or anyone would not want to vote for this amendment. It will be interesting to see how backbenchers opposite will vote.

Not only is the manner of raising this money questionable but, as has been pointed out many times, the way money has been spent from similar lotteries in the past is very questionable. One manner of ensuring the proper expenditure of this money, if there is a proper way to spend money raised in this fashion, would surely be to give the Auditor General the opportunity to review those expenditures.

Let me go back and deal with Loto Canada. From 1977-78 to 1978-79, expenditures on furniture alone went from \$273,000 to \$402,000. This is an example of what the Auditor General could examine to determine if such expenditures were proper.

Given the fact that the Government will push this legislation through, I do not understand why it does not want to let the Auditor General review the expenditures of this new Crown corporation unless it wants to use it as a slush fund to look after some of its supporters. If that is not the case, then let the Auditor General look at it. I do not believe it can make any logical argument that the Auditor General should not look at the books of this new Crown corporation which will be established.

Aside from that I find it absolutely incredible at the end of this session, during extended hours, at a time when there are two millions unemployed in this country, that we are debating a measure as foolish and nonsensical as establishing another lottery in this country. It boggles the mind how any Government which would call itself responsible would be using this time at the end of June during extended hours to deal with this kind of nonsense. It reminds me of what my father said about people who did not make sense; he said people like that had about as much sense as a sucking goose. In many ways it is a reflection of what the Government is doing when establishing its priorities. It certainly makes no sense to me.

We should be dealing with piece of legislation which would help provide jobs and increase productivity in the country. Why are we not talking about increased cash advances for western farmers? Why not discuss some of the issues concerning the voluntary sector which were raised last night by the Hon. Member for Waterloo (Mr. McLean)? The voluntary sector is in great need of some consideration by the Government. If the Government were to give priority consideration to this sector, we could pass legislation that would encourage people to become involved in the voluntary sector and provide services to two million unemployed in their time of need. It is only logical that the Government should consider legislation such as that.

However, we are debating legislation seeking to allow the Government to act legally but immorally. We all know that the Government is financially, morally and intellectually