

er. In other words, Mr. Speaker, that is what part IV precisely attempts to remedy.

He later discovered that he could buy the wire from a Winnipeg firm, wire allegedly produced in Canada but imported from the United States, at a cost of \$14 a hundredweight. What this story points out is that it is virtually impossible for the west to compete in manufacturing with central Canada as long as in the west raw materials are far more expensive and no law enforces the concept of price equity. If this bill helps here, then it is worth while.

Under the loophole clause in 31.2(c) of the same part, "ample supply" as stipulated there would perhaps, I am afraid, enable a supplier to get out from under his obligations because what constitutes ample supply is a very debatable matter. I suppose that any supplier could plead short supply. I find that throughout this bill there are some other very equivocal words and statements which, although they may not be deliberately vague, should be tightened up in committee. As I say, any supplier could plead short supply, somewhat in the same manner as the U.S. oil companies which deliberately refrained from going ahead and building refineries during the past five years. As a result, they can deliberately and accurately plead short supply simply because they have not built the refineries, and premeditated refinery shortage is used as an excuse to raise prices.

With special reference to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde), we welcome the reference in proposed new section 32.3 to professional and amateur sport. For far too long sport has been regarded as of no particular concern of government. Of course, other countries have not felt the same way and as a consequence were much quicker to see the cultural, physical and propaganda benefits of sport. Our country has only belatedly begun to interest itself in sports promotion and regulation. It is fair to say that over the past five years we have spent only about half of the annual \$6 million budget for fitness and amateur sport. So lethargic has been Canada's approach to sport and fitness that some \$15 million allocated over this period was never used for the benefit of our citizens.

In spite of this underspending, Mr. Speaker, I notice that this year the budget is increased to \$17 million from \$12 million in 1973. I take it that the extra budgeting is somehow related to pre-Olympic preparations. I do not know whether it is for the fitness of our citizens or for hot-housing some athletes—the minister shakes his head—but it is interesting that, not having spent the money budgeted over the past five years under a different minister, now the budget all of a sudden is increased to \$17 million. As I say, I find it interesting.

But far outstripping the growth and support for amateur athletics, the past five years have witnessed an outstanding growth in professional sport both here and in the U.S.A. Professional sport is no longer the preoccupation of a few sports-minded hobbyists. Coupled with our affluence, both gate and TV revenues from sport are extremely attractive to the diamond-studded aristocrats who can afford to buy sports franchises in major centres of the continent. There must be a number of these men in North America because the expansion of leagues and franchises, certainly in football and hockey, is enormous.

Competition Bill

● (1630)

But, I insist, we are no longer dealing with simple game playing but a developing sports industry of major proportions. This major industry, I submit, should be subject to legislation and control, as is any other business. It is a business, and that is why I cannot accept the argument of those people who say it is not the government's business whether the World Football League is allowed a Toronto franchise or whether the proposed \$178 million Olympic stadium in Montreal, paid for by the people of Canada, will or will not be the future home of an NFL franchise. A Montreal NFL franchise would be attractive, of course, not to benefit the people of Montreal but for the economic benefit of whichever mogul or covey of private entrepreneurs is successful in securing such franchise.

In supporting the Minister of National Health and Welfare in his attempts to arrive at some solution to American Athletic imperialism, many members of my party are extremely concerned about the future of the Canadian Football League and especially about the community-owned teams in western Canada. We are concerned about the current World Football League player raiding of the CFL, and that is why we back the minister in his stand against the WFL Toronto franchise application.

Incidentally, if some members of the official opposition can justify keeping out American beef to protect the Canadian cattle industry, why can't they extend the same logic to keep the WFL out of Canada? To get back to the sports provisions under section 32.3, while we welcome them I would remind the House that they seem to be a bit equivocal and raise more questions than they adequately answer. The appearance of the word "unreasonably" as in 32.3(1)(a) "to limit unreasonably the opportunities for any other person to participate as a player," etc., or in section (b) "to limit unreasonably the opportunity for any other person to negotiate", or in 32.3(2)(b) "a reasonable balance among teams", seems very subjective to me and naturally subject to a number of interpretations depending upon who is making the determination. As a result, we are not at all sure what the whole section means to professional and amateur sports because in spite of the fact that much explanatory space is given to the other sections of the bill, the pages opposite pages 27 and 28, the sports sections, are blank. There is no explanation at all for the rationale behind the clauses given for members of parliament or the interested sports groups who are following the legislation with much interest.

I suggested that the section raises a great many questions and I will list three. First, will the section disturb the cozy reserve and option clauses which are rampant in pro sports and which have been the subject of much heated controversy both in Canada and the U.S.A. over the years? When I speak of the reserve or option clauses, I am speaking of the extra year after a contract runs out which binds the player to a kind of peonage for one year after he has fulfilled his obligations. I do not know of any other business or vocation where this sort of thing is allowed. It is a practice which was criticized vehemently by the government's task force on sports in their report issued a few years ago.

Second, will this section ensure that cities wishing franchises—like Vancouver which wanted an NHL franchise