

Adjournment Debate

as provided under the law. However, the Minister did acknowledge that the film could, inadvertently, give the impression that most Canadians cheat or try to cheat the system. This was certainly not the intention of the film, nor is it a view espoused by the Department or the Government. The objective of the film was to promote voluntary compliance with the laws and to inform people of their obligations. If the impression was otherwise, it was not the intention of the Department. The Minister was concerned that the objective of the film was not met and therefore withdrew it.

Hon. Members should now be aware that the Minister has announced that the National Film Board has been asked to suspend distribution of this film since he was concerned with the educational value in its presentation. The Minister has asked that a group of specialists in the communications field within the public service review the over-all communication strategy of Revenue Canada taxation with the public. The Hon. Member can rest assured that this film will be part of that review.

OLYMPIC GAMES—FUNDING OF CALGARY WINTER OLYMPICS.
(B) TERMS OF DECEMBER PROPOSAL—GOVERNMENT'S POSITION

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I asked to be put on the adjournment debate in order to attempt to straighten out the public record. As reported at page 771 of *Hansard* for January 26, I put questions to the Minister about funding for the Calgary Olympics. The Minister said that the position of the Canadian Government has always been the same. Later in my remarks I will show that that is not true.

The Minister went on to say "Never before did a Canadian Government invest that much in a sporting event in Canada—". The amount in question is \$200 million, Mr. Speaker. The Minister is from the Montreal area and knows that the Canadian Government gave the Montreal Olympics \$613 million in the mid-70s. That amount, three times as large as this \$200 million, indicates clearly that there is some misinformation around. I hope the Parliamentary Secretary will clarify that.

I also want to bring to the attention of the House the fact that the new Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport (Mr. Olivier) may have been misled by his officials. I have in my hand a press release dated January 19, 1984. In the first paragraph the Minister is quoted as saying that the Government of Canada has decided to strengthen the offer to the Calgary Olympics. In a few minutes I will show that the offer is quite a bit weaker.

In paragraph three, the Minister indicated that the proposal has been presented to COC-88 and the other participants in the games, and that they have reacted favourably to the Government's offer. There are two pieces of misinformation in that one sentence, Mr. Speaker.

I have in my other hand the offer, dated January 20. The press release was dated January 19. How could it be in their hands when it was not even prepared until one day later? The indication is that they had reacted favourably. Mr. Speaker, it

is well known in Canada today that the Olympic Committee in Calgary did not react favourably and refused to sign the agreement reach on January 20. There are two pieces of misinformation in that one paragraph and one in the preceding paragraph.

What is at issue in terms of the agreement begins with the offer made by the previous Minister of Sports to the Calgary Olympic Committee on December 22, 1983. It was accepted, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of the Crown negotiated, the local committee accepts and, all of a sudden, in less than a month, we have a new Minister and a new agreement.

● (1830)

What are the characteristics of that change in agreement between those two documents? The first change is that the Government of Canada will accept all of the responsibility for building Olympic Park except that, if there is a cost over-run, the people of Calgary will pick up the cost of the Government's mistake. Who in his right mind, Mr. Speaker, would sign an agreement which says, "You control the building and I pay the bills and have no say over the size of those bills or the over-run"? That is the first change, and it is completely unacceptable to the people of Calgary, Mr. Speaker.

The second change relates to the disposition of surplus. If in fact the local committee runs an effective games and produces a surplus, the federal Government all of a sudden steps in and says it wants a veto over surplus. That runs against the agreement with the International Olympic Committee and is totally unacceptable to the international body, let alone the people of Calgary.

Next, Mr. Speaker, the federal Government wants a veto over cash flow. What are the implications for the people of Calgary? If we must borrow money to pay current bills, the people of Calgary must pay the interest on that borrowed money, yet the federal Government controls cash flow.

The next difference, Mr. Speaker, is that the federal Government wants to designate the operating entity for Olympic Park after the games are over. Why on earth is the federal Government not running the stadium in Montreal, if that is the principle? Why should the federal Government run Olympic Park in Calgary? Why can it not be turned over to the people of Calgary when the games are over? That would be fair and just.

The Government wants to give \$30 million to the Olympic Endowment Fund and it wants all the credit. Lo and behold, when the games are over, it wants to tell the Olympic Endowment Fund how to spend the money so it can get more credit. If one makes a donation to an endowment fund, Mr. Speaker, you usually let the people who run the endowment fund decide how to spend the money. One cannot get credit for making an endowment and still retain control.

There are some other points which are also serious. The federal Government steps in between those two dates and says it wants exclusive jurisdiction over the logo and all the symbols of the Calgary Olympic Committee. That was not done, Mr.