

Criminal Code

Just before he made his closing remarks, the Minister spoke a very important mouthful. He mentioned the fact that he hopes and wants to reduce federal funding for sports organizations. That strikes me as being very odd. That is very different from what Ministers of the Crown should be advocating for their particular portfolios. It is like the Minister of National Health and Welfare who, several months ago, defended the deindexation of senior citizens' pensions. In fact, the Minister of National Health and Welfare was trying to be the Minister of Finance, forgetting that senior citizens fall within his Ministerial jurisdiction. The Minister of National Health and Welfare should not pretend to be the Minister of Finance. The former Minister of the Environment made wild cuts in her budget including cuts to wildlife services. She should not be walking around proudly telling us that. The Ministers should defend their own particular Ministerial jurisdictions.

Sports organizations are no exception. Rather than defending and fighting tooth and nail to have funding restored at least to the same level it was before, the Minister is prepared and hopes to reduce funding. This is much like the Government talking about the importance of multiculturalism while at the same time reducing the budget of this small Department by nearly 9 per cent. That Department absorbed the biggest budgetary cut of any Department on Parliament Hill. Yet the Government says it is serious about multiculturalism. It cannot suck and whistle at the same time. At least most of us cannot.

I would simply draw to the attention of the Minister that I asked specifically if he or the Government were against lotteries because in 1979 when the Conservative Party governed for a very brief time, the Conservative Government made a deal regarding the lotteries that in part funded sports organizations. At the time the lottery industry was a \$200 million industry. Now it is an industry worth upwards of \$300 million. The Conservative Government gave that away for an assurance of \$35 million. That is Tory mathematics. If the Tories agree with lotteries as a way of complementing financial resources given by the federal Government, how can they say that that is good negotiating?

Tories cannot always hide behind the argument that they want to have good federal-provincial relations. We should and we do have good federal-provincial relations. However, we should not compromise ourselves either. We should not sell ourselves short. That is exactly what the Government of 1979 did. If this Tory Government is prepared to say that it is against lotteries and sports pools because, as the Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport has already said, it believes it is a tax on the poor and an immoral way of raising taxes regardless of levels of Government, and if the federal Government were to eliminate lotteries, then I could respect and appreciate the Government's position. However, the Minister has been quoted as saying that he will look at another gaming operation. If he is not prepared to say that the Government is against lotteries but still gives them to the provincial domain, then what does that say about that Minister who is supposed to be protecting his jurisdiction? If he does not mind lotteries, why would he want to give them away when

a good part of the funds generated would help the very people he is supposed to represent?

Therefore, I would ask the Minister, if he is in favour of lotteries and if he is prepared to give the provinces the monopoly on lotteries, will he give the House and more importantly the sporting community his assurance that he will try to fight for the interests of the sporting community and negotiate with the individual provinces so that some of those funds can be used for the original purposes for which they were meant; namely, assistance to sports federations and organizations, be they amateur or professional?

Mr. Jelinek: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Member is getting boring. He has posed the same question four or five times. I have made the position of the Government abundantly clear. The position of the Government is that lotteries fall under the jurisdiction of the provinces. I cannot make it any clear than that.

While talking about this Bill which deals with Criminal Code amendments, the Hon. Member started to talk about multiculturalism. Yes, I am the Minister responsible for multiculturalism. Since he spoke about it, I can as well. Another example of the Hon. Member's misinformation is that the total budget for multiculturalism this year is slightly higher than it was last year. The Hon. Member once made a statement indicating that the budget for multiculturalism was reduced. It has not been reduced. The facts speak for themselves.

Mr. Marchi: The Estimates are for reductions.

Mr. Jelinek: I do not have the figures in front of me but I would be very happy to provide them to the Hon. Member. The budget for multiculturalism, under a Conservative Government, is slightly higher than it was under the previous Liberal administration.

As far as supporting and fighting for amateur sport is concerned, for goodness sake, I do not believe that amateur sport has ever had a Minister who has fought harder to try to get more for its community than this Minister. I am confident that I have done so. Amateur sports organizations are not suffering as a result of less money. They are all receiving more money because of the extra effort the Government has made in leading and encouraging the private sector to help us build on top of what the Government provides to amateur sport. I will never let amateur sports organizations suffer while I am the Minister responsible for Fitness and Amateur Sport.

In order for me to return to debating this Bill, I must say that when I was able to sign the agreement of June 3 of this year which resulted in the Bill we are debating today, I received congratulatory letters from the President of the Canadian Olympic Association. I received congratulations from the Olympic Organizing Committee in Calgary for having done something that the Liberals were unable to do. I do not blame the Liberals because there were about six or seven Ministers in this position within a period of two or three years. That Ministry became a joke. It was known as a revolving-door Ministry. Therefore, I cannot blame the