

*Oral Questions*

**Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Mr. Speaker, we are experiencing exactly the same situation as the United States, something which occurs periodically in the phases of business. The business cycle in Canada peaked last year and our productivity declined accordingly. I expect our productivity to start to pick up in the next few months.

**Mr. Hees:** Is it the view of the minister that if other industrial countries happen to be experiencing—

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** That is argumentative, George.

**Mr. Hees:**—industrial troubles at the same time as we are, this makes it impossible for Canada to even consider doing something on its own?

**Mr. Gillespie:** On the contrary, Mr. Speaker. As the hon. member knows, we have a large array of programs aimed at assisting Canadian industry to improve its productivity. I recited a number of these in the debate in the House last week. I can assure the hon. member that we will continue to offer these incentives to the Canadian enterprise system unrelentlessly.

**Mr. Hees:** I have a final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that industrial productivity has been declining sharply despite the programs which the minister has recited on so many occasions, is the minister not convinced that the time has now arrived to bring in innovative measures and stop pretending that everything is all right and that "business as usual" is satisfactory to his department?

**Mr. Gillespie:** Mr. Speaker, I would be the last one to suggest that we should carry on a business as usual basis. I would agree with the hon. member that there is a large section of Canadian industry which is being hurt. It is being hurt because our customers are not able to import on the same basis as they did before. Their economies are not as strong as they were and not as strong, relatively, as the Canadian economy.

**Mr. Hees:** And the minister is not as strong as he should be.

**Mr. Gillespie:** Let me assure the hon. member that we will maintain our onward thrust in trade programs, in industrial programs and in incentive programs.

**Mr. Hees:** And keep on failing and failing and failing.

\* \* \*

**OLYMPIC GAMES****POSSIBILITY OF DIRECT FEDERAL AID—GOVERNMENT POSITION**

**Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board. Because of the fact that revenue from the Olympic coin program for the last six months to March 31 totalled a mere \$1.5 million, at which rate less than one eighth of the expected \$250 million will be realized by 1976, and

[Mr. Hees.]

acknowledging the fact that the cabinet will indeed introduce legislation permitting the minting of gold coins even at this late date, which may help the situation somewhat but certainly not enough, could it therefore be taken for granted that the government will not subsidize Montreal directly or indirectly other than through the coin—that is, both silver and gold coins—and stamp programs?

[Translation]

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board):** Mr. Speaker, the government policy regarding the Olympic Games is well known. We have helped Montreal and the province of Quebec through the programs mentioned by the hon. member, but it is not the government's intention to finance them otherwise than by the self-financing program.

[English]

**POSSIBILITY SEIGNIORAGE ON ALL COINS WILL GO TO OLYMPIC COMMITTEE—GOVERNMENT POSITION**

**Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley):** I have a supplementary question for the Postmaster General. With planning under way at the Canadian Mint for the minting of all Canadian coins, such as nickels, dimes, quarters and others, to bear the Olympic logo, and with reports that the seigniorage from all these coins is to go to the Olympic Committee and not the Consolidated Revenue Fund where it belongs, could the minister on behalf of the government come clean with the Canadian public and tell this House that this will not be the case, or can it be assumed that a direct grant, which this can be taken for, will in fact be forthcoming through this means? I wish the government would stop trying to fool the public in this regard.

**Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General):** Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, it would be preferable if his premise were accurate. There is no intention of diverting the regular seigniorage, which normally goes to the Canadian public through the Consolidated Revenue Fund, to the Olympic next year. I did read press reports about the possibility of there being abnormal high seigniorage due to the staging of the Olympics in Canada. That could be legitimately considered as part of the coin program, but as I said and as my colleague beside me said, there have been no firm decisions even on the gold coin at the present moment, so I think the question is based on an inaccurate premise. I can only repeat that if, theoretically, we were to consider the seigniorage route, then we would make it amply and abundantly clear that the normal seigniorage would not be diverted to financing the Olympics or helping it to meet any deficit, if one occurs.

\* \* \*

**EXTERNAL AFFAIRS****POSSIBILITY OF INCREASING CANADA'S CONTRIBUTION TO NATO—GOVERNMENT POSITION**

**Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. In view of the right hon. gentleman's statement in which he pledged to main-