

common front which would have allowed them to set in advance the maximum amount payable for broadcasting rights in the United States.

It is therefore with full knowledge of the facts that the organization committee sought expert advice to obtain the best possible contract. This is why there were no public calls for tenders; the committee did not want to be boxed in by such a move and perhaps forced to accept an amount that it considered too low.

Mr. Speaker, the negotiating committee came to an agreement in principle with the ABC network for the amount of \$25 million on November 17, 1972. This agreement was then ratified by the COJO and ABC boards. A contract duly prepared by the legal services of both parties was signed on January 3, 1973.

I find it simply absurd that the member for High Park-Humber Valley (Mr. Jelinek) could not even differentiate between an agreement on principle and a formal contract when speaking of this matter. Throughout the negotiations, the CBS and NBC networks had the possibility of making better offers than the ABC proposition of which they were fully aware.

In its own interest, COJO encouraged CBS and NBC to make offers, even after the official signature of the contract. Until the ratification of the agreement by the International Olympic Committee, that is May 12, 1973, the CBS and NBC networks were absolutely free to approach the International Olympic Committee with a better offer. Nothing was done under cover, as it were; all three networks knew perfectly well what they had to do. The hon. member should know that it is the International Olympic Committee that had the last word. Since the contract was ratified only in May, they had enough time to make any offer they wished.

I am assured by COJO officials that there lies the real reason for the reserve clause put into the contract by ABC, because the other networks could make directly a better offer to the International Olympic Committee.

Therefore, the CBS and NBC networks had all the time required to make an offer, even after that of ABC, and they deliberately chose not to exercise their option. The hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley tried to make the House believe that the IOC repudiated the way in which the contract was awarded when he quoted Lord Killanin, president of IOC, as saying, and I quote his words as reported on page 90 of *Hansard*:

Future television negotiations will be conducted jointly by the organizing committee and the IOC board.

The sentence is quoted out of context and I say once again to the hon. member that he is either ignorant or malicious.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that COJO asked for the censure of IOC by negotiating a contract whereby the latter must share the cost of television technical services as well as the income. Those services will cost something like \$9 million. The hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley will therefore be happy to learn that COJO will use those \$9 million to make up part of the \$25 million it will pay the CBC as official telecaster of the games. If Lord Killanin is unhappy, it is not because IOC feels the contract was unsatisfactory but because he realizes that as a result of

The Address—Mr. Ouellet

the decision of the Canadian committee IOC will get less than it had originally hoped. In any event, I want to quote Lord Killanin, and it is important that I do so, since the hon. member tried to impute motives to the president of IOC. Lord Killanin said: "It is very clear that the contract between COJO and ABC was in order; that is why the International Committee sanctioned it in May last."

And in a press release from Lausanne, one can read this:

● (1510)

[*English*]

Lord Killanin, president of the International Olympic Committee, declared that he is convinced that claims of irregularities in the awarding of television contracts for the 1976 Olympic games are without foundation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, in Munich in 1972, the international broadcasting rights for television were sold for \$17.5 million. The Innsbruck winter games in 1976 will be sold for some \$10 million. By comparison, COJO sold the rights for the United States for only \$25 million and it hopes to sell them to Japan, Europe and to the rest of the world at a price much more reasonable and much higher than that paid in the past by those countries. This is why it has hired an expert to help it negotiate these contracts and obtain the best conditions and as much money as possible. Mr. Speaker, \$25 million is the biggest amount which has ever been paid for television rights. The hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley should be delighted about such a contract rather than trying to reflect discredit upon the Olympics Games.

On January 11, 1974, this member made in this House unfounded statements particularly when he declared as you can read at page 9280 of *Hansard* and I quote:

... when the National Broadcasting Corporation had in fact indicated that they were prepared to bid up to \$32.9 million, without any strings attached?

The representatives of COJO have told me that NBC never made such an offer. Furthermore, newspapers reported that one of the people in charge of NBC had denied that the network was prepared to pay such an amount.

On page 9280 of *Hansard*, the same member states that Mr. Carl Lindeman, Vice-President of the CBS network, was told point blank that he would have to pay \$5 million to the Quebec government as payment for contract negotiations with COJO.

Mr. Speaker, I have this to say: When any one makes a statement with such implications, such a serious statement, he should verify his facts, he should not say whatever he thinks. Mr. Carl Lindeman does not belong to the CBS network, as the hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley claims, but he is Vice-President of the NBC network in charge of sports. This shows clearly how accurate the hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley can be in his statements.

The hon. member by his statements in and outside the House has brought such doubts about the integrity of ABC that the network communicated with him to ask him for details and a retraction, because he was hurting the network's reputation. This is what the hon. member was forced to do. In a letter addressed to Mr. Roone Arledge,