

Olympic 1976 Act

as these: The world press is still wondering about the 1976 Games. Yet, Madam Speaker, it seems that COJO and the City of Montreal authorities have succeeded over the last few months, in convincing the public that the Games will be ready on time. So there is a requirement now fulfilled. The magazine *L'Express* of February 23, 1975 had this headline: "Yes, the Games will indeed be held in Montreal and they will be presented on time". When Lord Killanin came to Montreal in May, he too visited the Olympic facilities and reached the same conclusion.

The *Herald Tribune* international edition of June 18, 1975 also reported the city of Montreal would be ready in time. After such concern was satisfied, we are now turning to the question of the deficit, which led the Postmaster General (Mr. Mackasey), responsible for the Olympic (1976) Act, to introduce the bill now before us.

All through this debate, reference was made for instance to other responsibilities of the city of Montreal, and other responsibilities of the Canadian government. Certain hon. members wondered whether a city the size of Montreal could spend so much money on Olympic facilities, when it is still dumping sewerage into the St. Lawrence River.

It is false to suggest that the city of Montreal makes no effort to solve that problem. In March of this year, the Minister of Environment (Mrs. Sauvé) announced jointly with the provincial minister of municipal affairs and the chairman of the Montreal Urban Community that \$40 million were being allotted, through the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, for the construction of a section of sewer mains that will cover the whole territory of Montreal, and also announced plans for the construction of a \$500 million sewage treatment plan. At the time of speaking, an application was filed with the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation covering the first phase of the project. It is still being implied however that the city of Montreal is not politically mature enough to discharge its environmental responsibilities in 1975. Well, every member in this House received that press release. How can it still be suggested the city of Montreal is not aware of its responsibilities? I am shocked that such remarks can still be made in this Olympic revenue debate.

I would also deal with the federal contribution and the Olympic contribution to amateur sport in this country. Surely my colleagues magnified capital expenditures versus expenditures for amateur sport. Now, Madam Speaker, up to this day, over \$10 millions have been handed over to the Canadian provinces in order to support amateur sports. And those \$10 millions would never have found their way to the Canadian provinces had it not been for the Olympic lottery.

I would like to quote some statistics, Madam Speaker in order to illustrate the extent to which the Olympic lottery program is meant to help amateur sports. It is not a program which was originally submitted to the House by a member of either party, it is a project which was set up by the Mayor of Montreal in order to support amateur sports in Canada. The province of Ontario has received over \$3,500,000 through the Olympic lottery, Newfoundland, \$80,000 and Alberta, over \$500,000.

● (1420)

The provinces are now able to support amateur sports even more significantly through this program, thanks to the Olympic Lottery.

Of course, it might be argued in an absolute way that the funds allocated to the Olympic facilities for home building or park development. However, Madam Speaker, a choice must be made: Either we host the Olympics or we do not. Once it has been decided to host them, we must make sure that minimum facilities are provided for the Games.

An hon. Member: Make sure you don't go beyond that minimum.

Mr. Joyal: Yet, who knows the criteria for these minimum facilities? Who lists these minimum facilities? It is not the mayor of Montreal, not even the Canadian parliament. The minimum number of places, of seats and of facilities that a city preparing to host the Olympic Games must be able to provide for the international athletes is provided for in the regulations of the International Olympics committee.

An hon. Member: Why do you not follow these minimum criteria?

Mr. Joyal: I wish that hon. members opposite would let me speak, Madam Speaker. I sat here for a whole day and I listened to all of them very attentively. And I am not making any partisan comments today; since the beginning of my speech, I have avoided all partisan references; I have not named a single member of this House. I have simply corrected the inaccuracies which have been said during this debate. I believe that in such cases, we must all make an effort as Canadians.

Whatever we may say about the Olympic Games, they will still be held; they will probably be more or less successful according to the position taken by Parliament. It is easy to say that we are all in favor of the Olympic Games. On March 5, 1975, the mayor of Montreal sent a letter to the members of the House inviting them to visit the Olympic facilities. When we got there, I was sad to note that only one party of the House was represented or had shown any interest.

I deplore this fact. As I said earlier, the Olympic Games will be held in my constituency. However, I want to give the hon. members the assurance that those responsible for organizing the Olympic Games have always been quite willing to answer any question. Moreover, the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mackasey) was right to say that he is not responsible for auditing the COJO budget, anymore than he is responsible for auditing the budget of the city of Montreal. There has been an election last fall in Montreal and an opposition party, which has been elected, takes it as its duty to question the way the City of Montreal fulfills its obligations. As federal members of parliament, we have no right to meddle in the business of Montreal town councillors. If we want to question their action, let us get elected as town councillors in Montreal and let us question the municipal administration. So far, we have no reason whatsoever to question again the way the City of Montreal behaved on the international level.