

the Chamber, as one is likely to win \$1 million in Loto Canada. I would encourage some Hon. Member from the Government side to rise now and tell us why, in terms of the present amendment to Clause 21 of Bill C-95, there should not be an annual audit by the Auditor General of Canada. I would like to hear why the Government would oppose that.

Mr. McDermid: There's not one person over there who can do it.

Mr. Jelinek: Mr. Minister, can you answer for the Government?

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Mr. Speaker, if the Government will not take up the challenge to explain to the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton), who made a very valid point, I will do my level best. I will put myself—

Mr. Cullen: Same old gang.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: —in the position, pardon the expression—and I get choked up whenever I think of the prospect—of being a supporter of the Liberal Government.

Some Hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I will try to put my mind into that of the backbencher and of the Government Member to try to explain to the Hon. Member for Skeena why the Government does not want this amendment to pass. It is a very simple proposition. It is because the Auditor General has a record and a history of disclosing expenditures which, in his estimation and according to the guidelines given to him as a person who reports directly to Parliament, constitute misuse of public funds.

A private accounting firm will not necessarily have that mandate. What will Price Waterhouse or Peat Marwick or any of these companies do in a normal audit? They will simply give a balance sheet to demonstrate what moneys have been received, what has been expended by way of expenses, without elaboration necessarily of the type of expenditure. For example—the Auditor General and Government Members will not like this because they will not think it very funny politically—the Auditor General will give an illustration, by way of expenditure, of the way in which the chairman of the sports pool organization conducts himself or herself in terms of personal amenities in that responsibility. He will undoubtedly point out that the chairman will have a chauffeur-driven, large automobile at his or her disposal while in Ottawa. He will point out that there will be a permanently paid up suite in an expensive Ottawa hotel available not only to the chairman but also to the members who are on the board.

Mr. Fulton: And all across the country.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I do not pull these examples out of the air; I give an example of what transpired with Loto Canada. That was the lifestyle to which the people who were looking after the money extracted from the poor of our country, those who could not afford it, became accustomed and to which they felt they were entitled. When we came into Government and appointed Mr. Hamilton as chairman of Loto Canada, let me

Athletic Contests and Events Pools Act

tell the House that he was met on his arrival in Ottawa by a chauffeur-driven Cadillac—

Mr. Mayer: A chauffeur in uniform.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: —in uniform, who also carried on responsibilities in a suite at a prominent local downtown hotel, permanently paid up. Those are the kinds of expenditures that would very likely be offensive. It would not sit well with Liberal supporters because it would be an awful thing if we had to bring this out into the public arena.

What else would we find out? We would possibly find out, by way of the Auditor General, that there are other expenditures which are offensive, such as the mode by which these people are travelling across the country. We would find out the precise percentage of money that is being expended from these funds for administrative purposes, quite contrary to the idea that we are supposed to be supporting out of the proceeds of these moneys worth-while, often charitable purposes, and admirable purposes, by way of seducing the people of Canada to support this lottery that is now coming forward, this gaming endeavour of the federal Government.

I was pleased to hear the representative of the New Democratic Party speaking out on behalf of his Party. I was concerned that the NDP was silent on the issue. As its Members come to meet and to redo the Regina manifesto, I think it is about time that they started thinking about their moral position with respect to the issues in this country. It is damn well time, and the people of Canada will be watching with some interest as they gather in Regina to rewrite and rethink their philosophy which has brought them to the heady level they now occupy today in the Gallup poll. However, I want to return to the subject.

When I was practising law, I had an opportunity to represent people who, to use the vernacular, were bookies. I had many clients who were in that trade, "turning book" as we say. I am concerned. I support this particular motion because I think the Government will give these people who turn book in Canada a bad name and lower their reputation. Damon Runyon of Canada could write stories and talk about these people. They were a very interesting group and basically nice people. However, they were breaking the law. Of course, that would not worry the Government of Canada; it is getting right in there.

Mr. Masters: Didn't worry you, did it?

Mr. Hnatyshyn: It will be going full steam ahead, breaking the law, moving ahead, changing the law. Let the Government of Canada do what these poor fellows who are trying to make an honourable living cannot do. They were a great bunch, actually very entertaining, nice people; but they were breaking the law and they needed the best defence they could get, so they consulted me. They had a number of devices. One of them was known as flashpaper. When they took down bets they used a type of paper which had an amazing capacity for incendiary activity on the slightest provocation. All of a sudden, if there were any visitors, such as officers of the law, who would come