

when young people gather from around the world to compete on the sports field, must be preserved for our children. So because we pledge our support for the Olympics, I therefore support the second reading of the bill and its referral to the committee so that we may incorporate the eminently sensible safeguards I have just suggested.

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, in stark contrast to the two previous speakers, my party and I do not, and I repeat "not", intend to support Bill C-196 on second reading. We have come to this view after some lengthy thought and caucus discussion as to the implications of our position. We recognize also that our opposition to Bill C-196 is a departure from the position I, personally, took last February in my response to the Prime Minister's statement on motions, which at that time was intended to assure the House that any deficit accruing from the games would not be borne by the federal government. I suppose our opposition to Bill C-196 will be widely interpreted or misinterpreted as being either sanctimoniously anti-sport or equally bigoted anti-French.

An hon. Member: Both.

Mr. Rose: Or perhaps misinterpreted as both by those people who do not know any better. If such a misinterpretation prevails my party and I regret it, because our vote against Bill C-196 means neither. I should like to state unequivocally here and now that the NDP is not opposed to sport per se. We support it and wish to broaden the base of sport to include the greatest possible participation at all levels of society. We do not oppose amateur sport at the international level either, or even the concept of the Olympic games. What we do oppose, however, is the continuation of this kind of Olympics, an Olympics so demanding in time, energy and money that hosting the games is denied to most of the nations of the world. In fact as now conceived, because of the massive resources required to stage the games, the modern Olympics has been virtually limited to five or six major cities of our globe.

We believe that the international Olympics should be so structured as to be far less expensive and far less elitist in its preoccupation with only the country's finest athletes, and the extra resources realized by a less expensive Olympics used to broaden the base of the athletic pyramid to provide more facilities at the community level, making participation sports more accessible to many whose major contact with sport is that of the t.v. observer.

Dealing with the second point of possible misinterpretation of our position, that of being anti-French Canadian, precisely the opposite is the case. Our party on the national level has a history of being intensely sensitive to the cultural, linguistic and economic aspirations of French Canadians, and even the most cursory look at our Commons voting record will prove this.

Our opposition to Bill C-196 can be regarded, therefore, as being perfectly consistent with our party's concern for the well-being of Francophones, because we can see very little in the plans of the forthcoming Montreal Olympics that will in any meaningful way improve the lot of the average citizen of that city. Quite the contrary, anyone even remotely familiar with Montreal's problems over the years could not fail to conclude that anyone supporting

Olympic Bill

the spending of in excess of \$500 million on what columnist Dick Beddoes has described as a carnival of sweat must have something seriously wrong with his sense of priorities.

Montreal has been described by urban sociologist Saul Aulinski as having an incredible slum housing problem of such magnitude as to equal and surpass any city in North America. The public housing record of Montreal in recent years, in terms of construction, has been about equal to that of Saskatoon. In addition, it has been said that almost 400,000 children in Montreal suffer from lack of adequate nutrition. Recreational needs of these children have also been overlooked, and adding to their social-recreational-economic disadvantages is the fact that totally untreated sewage spews forth so unrelentingly into the St. Lawrence River at Montreal the river has become unusable for the recreational needs of its millions of inhabitants.

Despite the appalling lack of recreational space in Montreal, the Mayor's initial proposal for the location of the Olympic Village cum-public housing was to create a low-cost urban ghetto in a park greenbelt area by encroaching on part of a golf course. This location has been opposed by at least 66,000 citizen petitioners and questioned by the Hon. Victor Goldbloom, the Minister responsible for the quality of the environment in the province of Quebec.

Would it not be far better in terms of genuine human priorities for Canadians to spend at least half of the \$500 million Olympic price tag on improved housing and sewage treatment for the city of Montreal? I, for one, would be pleased to give my share personally through my taxes for such purposes, but I object strongly to the financing of sport facilities through gimmicks such as coins, stamps and lotteries, especially in a city with so many other desperate needs, and particularly for facilities which, after the two-week athletic potlach is concluded, will not be used for the benefit of the average Quebecer and Canadian at all. These stadia facilities, paid for out of public funds, will be used to further the interests of the well-heeled American and Canadian moguls, beer barons, who dominate the North American professional sports industry, and who are in it not for sport at all but just for the bucks.

Mr. Jelinek: It will be used by Canadian athletes and the Canadian public.

Mr. Rose: Some will say that whether or not the \$70 million Olympic stadium becomes the new home of an NFL franchise from the states or the Expo baseball team is no one's business but that of the citizens of Montreal. In fact, I have said so myself, but I am not so sure about it today, since all Canadians will be contributing to the construction of the stadium. In any case, the citizens of Montreal should be warned that except for their predetermined role as consumers of sport, not participants, access to the publicly-built sport complexes in other cities in North America has been effectively denied to amateur sport participants, and this includes the Vancouver Coliseum.

Perhaps I have spent rather too long on what some members might regard as an attack on Montreal and its people. If it came out this way, it was not intended so and I am sorry. But, if on the other hand, my words convey a