

whether in England, India or Africa, could write to the minister and ask for a copy of his speech, but that would not be a great deal of help to Canada's reputation around the world.

I think the minister would be well advised to consider his position and accept the amendment. The amendment is a good one and would be helpful to the government. If there is some wisdom over there, the Liberals should accept it. The minister says the committee looked at it, and he is in the hands of the committee. He also said we should not talk nonsense around this House. What does he mean, in the hands of the committee? In the hands of the government! We know how committees go here. He went on to say, "in the hands of parliament". In the hands of parliament, when the government has a majority? What is parliament going to do when the government has a majority? Under our system, when the government has a majority they virtually have a dictatorship.

With few exceptions, it is the government that decides what happens in this House. Let us get off this "I am in the hands of the House and the committee" task. The minister is in his own hands, not the committee's. It is not parliament that makes the decisions; it is the government and cabinet. I do not see that the reasons put forward by the minister are sufficient explanation for altering the amount of gold in this coinage or to justify the House accepting that position, and the House should vote against it.

I am very concerned, Mr. Speaker. I cannot see what the minister is worried about in accepting the amendment. If the price of gold is going to fluctuate, the Mint may have to pay more for the raw gold than the \$100 face value of the coin. Surely the answer is to increase the price at which the coin is sold. That will happen with the coins already issued. If the price of gold rises, the coins in circulation outside the Mint will rise in value. If the minister intends to say that we are going to hold down the value of the coins which are outside the Mint, he will find he cannot do that. While I admit to not being an expert on coins—

**Mr. Blais:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Saltsman:** Mr. Speaker, the difference between myself and the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais) who made that remark is that I at least have taken the first road to wisdom, which is to recognize some of my own inadequacies. It is something he has never considered, and he has good reason to consider it.

The government has an obligation to maintain the integrity of our coinage. The minister has said it has this obligation, and I agree with him. He said that we have to maintain it in silver; then he made a great non-sequitur slipping from silver to gold, which is an entirely different matter. If he wants to maintain the integrity of the coinage and Canada's good name, he should arrange for a fixed amount of gold in each coin and let the value fluctuate according to the value of gold on the international market.

● (1610)

**Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley):** Mr. Speaker, my remarks on this motion will be brief. I shall say more when we discuss the other motions, particularly

### *Olympic Financing*

those having to do with the copyright and trade marks part of the bill. Much of the bill, which is only eight pages long, deals with trade marks and copyrights. I support motion No. 1. I think it is sensible and I cannot for the life of me understand why the minister opposes it. Should we not take it for granted that there will be uniform amounts of silver in the silver coins, just as there will be uniform amounts of gold in the gold coins? The gold pieces will be more expensive than the silver pieces; hence it is more probable that the gold pieces will be tampered with.

My party supported the Olympic Games from the beginning. My party's support for the original Olympic bill 2½ years ago made the forthcoming games possible in this country. As you will remember, the government was in a minority position; the NDP strongly opposed the bill, but my party supported it. After proposing amendments which have proven to be worth while, warning COJO that a deficit was possible and warning the government that its projections for coin sales were too ambitious—we have only reached 10 per cent of the projected target—we approved that legislation and made the Olympics in Canada possible. So I resent hearing members suggest in the House and in committee that my party opposes the idea of the Olympic Games, that we oppose their being held in Montreal. I have said repeatedly that no city in Canada is better able to cope with the problems of the Olympics than is Montreal.

We co-operated with the government when the bill was before the House on second reading. I then said, on behalf of my party, that we supported the bill going to committee but reserved our right to vote against it later, if necessary, or to change it at committee stage. We asked for satisfactory explanations, for the opportunity to examine numerous witnesses and for an up-to-date accounting of the budget and operations of COJO in Montreal.

The government's position has consistently been that it is not involved. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has often said the government has no involvement in the Olympics per se, or their financing. That is ridiculous. The minister himself indicated that \$292 million is to be raised by sales of coins, stamps and lottery tickets, which are most important. The government has admitted, but not explained, its direct grant of \$140 million to COJO for security, CBC broadcasting, immigration and other things. We are talking in terms of \$500 million worth of direct and indirect aid made possible by federal legislation, but the government is unwilling to ask COJO, even though it has the power, to account for the spending of taxpayer's money.

To be fair, in the committee the Postmaster General (Mr. Mackasey) answered all the questions he could about coins and stamps. But no other ministers attended the committee. Bill C-63 stands on the order paper in the name of the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien). I have not seen him participate in debate on the bill either in the House or in committee. The ramifications of the bill extend far beyond the Post Office and gold coins. Perhaps the Canadian public does not know that most of the bill does not deal with gold coins. I shall return to this matter later when we discuss motions 3 and 4 and problems much more serious than those to do with gold coins.