

believe that the words of the motion put by the Hon. Member for Waterloo (Mr. McLean) are absolutely correct. It states:

That this House condemns the Government for its failure to honour the commitment made both in 1974 and in 1981—

And it goes on to urge the Government to do, in effect, what it has been saying all along it was going to do. I repeat, we can go on and on forever talking about the reasons there may be difficulties with definitions or difficulties with certain proposals, but we miss the fundamental point if we do that.

The fundamental point is, and I say this particularly for those who have raised several issues today, can we reverse our thinking on the issue? Can we stop finding ways to say no to people who are trying to help others, and find ways to say yes to them? They have not asked for very much. If we want, we can get hung up on questions of whether we should treat non-profit institutions differently from charitable institutions. We can get hung up on the questions of what shall be acceptable activity and what should not. Why not do the sensible thing and say "we will define what you may not do"; we will tell you what activities, presumably to use their own definition, such as the support of a political party. Those will not be activities acceptable for people who have tax exempt status. Why do we not give them the freedom that they should have to be able to make representations to us, as every other Canadian can make on issues that are matters of public policy?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Bosley:** Why should that be a surprising idea? Somehow we have invented some mindset that says if an organization has a view about public policy, it is all right for it to raise a lot of money, conduct a public education policy and run ads about that issue, which presumably would have an indirect effect on us through the voting public, but if we were able to prove that its purpose was to influence the legislation, we would declare it illegal. Or as one Member opposite told us recently in his view it is all right if they educate the public because the public are the people who elect us, and then the public can respond. In other words, if they can influence us indirectly, that is fine, but they shall have no right to influence us directly, to make their views known to us. Surely that is lunacy; surely it is self-evident lunacy, that we would say that to the National Cancer Society, the opera society, or others, for example the cultural organizations who we asked to tell us through the Appelbaum Hébert process, through parliamentary committees for a year and a half what policies there should be. We paid many of them some expense money to come here to tell us, because they are the practitioners, what cultural policies should be. Does it not sound absurd to have a law that says Revenue Canada might then be able to go after them for appearing before a Parliamentary committee because they had now violated the law, were illegal and could lose their charitable registration for telling what public policy should be in the area of arts and culture? Surely it is self-evident lunacy. What justification can there be for the delay?

### *Adjournment Debate*

Before I sit down, I want to say something about some of the responses made today to the give and take proposals in the area of the policy distinction that must be made between grants and tax credits. According to some, notably the Hon. Member for Mississauga North (Mr. Fisher), the issue is more than simply grants and tax credits. It is whether we accept the principle that people should be encouraged to give of themselves voluntarily for public purposes and objects about which they care.

The grant systems of government are designed to find vehicles, whether they be in or out of government—notably out of government—to do things, projects, programs, be it for the Minister of State for Sport (Mr. Olivier) or the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin), and which the government has decided should be done. The Minister of State for Sport provides funds for the ski team if he chooses because he believes it is important. That is a grant. What if somebody on the ski team, in the association or someone in the health programs or in culture believes there is a program their organization should mount that is within their purposes as a charitable organization? Surely it is equally self-evident that the purpose of a tax credit system is to assist people doing work within the public arena of purpose, to do projects they believe are important within those objects, within the registration and within what is permitted activity.

If we ever were to get to a situation, as the Hon. Member from Mississauga was suggesting, not only would we define a charity for the purposes of the law, but we would then define, restrict and control the programs they could get into by administering them through a grant system as opposed to a system of encouraging people to give to them. Then we really would be crazy.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault):** It being 6 p.m., it is my duty to inform the House that in accordance with Standing Order 62(11), the proceedings on the motion have expired.

● (1800)

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 45 deemed to have been moved.

LOTTERIES—SPORTS POOL CORPORATION. (B) REQUEST FOR FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL MEETING

**Hon. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton North):** Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I did not get a chance to speak in the debate today. I would have contributed more impetus in so far as the voluntary sector with regard to the different sporting fraternities is concerned. It would have been a great little bit of debate. I