

*Athletic Contests and Events Pools Act*

named in the Bill plan, develop or organize without any commitment on funding? It is a poor Bill indeed when not one of those beneficiaries can count on any percentage of funds if as and when a division of funds takes place. It is our position that the responsibilities of Government cannot be met by games of chance, lotteries or sports pools.

In Committee we were primarily concerned with two things. The first was whether it would be reasonable to expect the sports pool to generate the sufficient funds to finance the Calgary games or to meet the \$200 million commitment of the federal Government. The second was the assurances that any of the beneficiaries might have that they would receive any funding at all.

On the first matter, the Minister responsible reduced his exaggerated original estimate of \$100 million net per annum by a Committee announcement that it might only be some \$80 million net.

The Hon. Reuben Baetz, the Ontario Minister of Tourism and Recreation and Chairman of the Provincial Lottery Corporation appeared before the Committee. He was the only person who appeared before the Committee who had any experience in a lottery or in funding. He pointed out that at best the federal Crown corporation to be established under the Bill would receive no more than \$30 million to \$40 million per year gross. That is a far cry from the \$80 million the Minister said they would receive under a sports pool game.

● (1640)

I want Members of this House to consider an additional fact, Mr. Speaker. The Minister responsible could not offer a single scrap of evidence to support his claim, while the Province of Ontario had data, information and documents to support its presentation before committee.

Let us look at these facts as well. On November 30, 1982, the Province of Quebec launched its Hockey Select sports pool concept game, based on Canada's most popular game, hockey. The gross from the second weekly draw, the most lucrative during the whole of the season, was \$136,000. It has been steadily going downhill from that time to the end of the hockey season. By January, 1983, the weekly gross was down to \$70,000; in February it fell to \$40,000. Indeed, Quebec is considering the discontinuation of Hockey Select or the sports pool game. I would ask the Minister, if he cannot sell pool tickets in the Province of Quebec on the Montreal Canadiens and the Quebec Nordiques, where does he expect to sell his sports pool tickets?

**Mr. Paproski:** In Nova Scotia.

**Mr. Reid (St. Catharines):** Government Members like to talk about the success of pools in Europe. They talk about the great success of Lotto or whatever game they refer to. But the results they quote are far more fiction than fact. Let us look at some of these lotteries. In Belgium the sports pool receives 1 per cent of the lottery games; in the Netherlands, 10 per cent; in Poland, 7 per cent; Switzerland, 5 per cent, and so it goes.

If those percentages were transposed to the Canadian lottery market, it is easy enough to see that the provincial estimate of sports pool revenues is much more readily justified, and that the federal Department's projections are simply a figment of someone's imagination still not supported by facts or figures. Any honest, realistic assessment of sports pool revenues will lead to the conclusion that such a game will not produce the funds necessary to meet the expectations of the beneficiaries described and referred to in Bill C-95. What that means, simply and clearly, and what the Provinces point out, is that the federal Government will get into the lottery business and run the risk of losing that new-found \$30 million per year. The Government will put us back into pre-1979 years of competition with the Provinces when Loto Canada was the biggest media spender in the country.

The Provinces view the inclusion of Clause 14(1)(b) as a deliberate indication of an intent by the federal Government to get back into the lottery business, and deliberate contempt for an agreement which the Provinces entered into in good faith. They have paid \$94.5 million to this federal Government since 1980 and have assumed an additional sum of \$29.8 million, which was a commitment by the federal Government to the building of certain arenas across this country. Over \$120 million have come from the provinces to federal coffers under that agreement.

It was stated in committee by some Government Members that it is not the intention of the federal Government to get back into lotteries. It is incumbent upon the Minister to say clearly whether or not it is the intention of the federal Government to become involved in lotteries.

If it is alleged that Clause 14(1)(b) is needed as a back-up measure to guarantee the success of the sports pool, and if it is intended that such a back-up is not going to be a lottery, then I challenge the Minister to spell it out and tell us just what is the nature of the game the federal Government proposes to use as a back-up to a failure or a doomed sports pool. Why should Government Members over there be so anxious to vote for a provision which puts them in a position where they will be voting for a gaming operation about which they know nothing? There is no indication of any kind about the nature or type of game the Government proposes to use. Are we as a Parliament, or is the Government of Canada to be involved in an operation of a Las Vegas-type of video electronic gambling parlour-casino? What, Mr. Minister, do you propose to use as any other lawful game as referred to in this Act? Withdraw Clause 14(1)(b); better still, withdraw the Bill.

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

\* \* \*

#### PRIVILEGE

MR. NIELSEN—REPORTED LEAK OF PROPOSED BUDGETARY MEASURES—RULING BY MADAM SPEAKER

The House resumed consideration of the Question of Privilege of Mr. Nielsen.