

*Olympic Bill*

the coins for 40 cents on the dollar, taking the production cost out. If you deduct the production costs of 40 per cent, then for a \$5 coin they would pay \$2. The Olympic Committee could then use the \$5 and \$10 coins as prizes in the lottery. Just think about the prospects of winning a ton of \$10 coins. That is imagination!

● (1430)

**Mr. Drury:** It's against the law, too.

**Mr. Howard:** I am serious about this. And may I say this is the only time during my remarks that the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) has perked up his ears. The suggestion struck home because this may be what they are contemplating doing. In any event, this is a gimmick way of getting rid of the coins in the first place and, in the second place, raising the money.

The other thing we have to think about, and it was also mentioned this morning, is that during 1976 the Olympics will not be the only event taking place in the city of Montreal that will be an attraction for coin collectors. That is also the year of the 100th anniversary of the independence of the United States, and it is currently planning to sell coins to commemorate that. We all know of the ability of the Americans as marketers, promoters and sellers. In that year, and in the years leading up to 1976, the United States will be embarking on a competition with Canada over the production, sale and distribution of coins. Are we going to attempt to operate in that same market?

I point out that in 1967, which was the best year we ever had either emotionally for the Canadian people or in terms of the sale of numismatic pieces with no competition from the United States, the best we could do with respect to the \$4 cost item, the proof-like set containing \$1.91 in face value coins, was to dispose of 963,000 units or pieces. Now, we are seeking to try to flog 16 million pieces a year? That is a hoax; that is a lot of flogging. I do not want to go too far into that. I just think somebody has sold somebody else a piece of goods, and the government of Canada, through ignorance and lack of understanding in this area, has agreed to try to fob off this concept upon the people of Montreal because they are the ones who will have to find the \$200 million difference. The poverty and housing conditions are bad enough in the city of Montreal without making them this much worse.

I have concern, too, about our total system and our attitude with respect to what is most valuable. Is it the elitist-type fanfare that can be generated for a few weeks in one part of Canada, in one year of our time? Or is it the concern we should have about housing, about accommodation, about transportation, about poverty, about Indians? That is my major reason for objecting to this piece of legislation. The first is that it is a financial hoax, and the second is that this is a social hoax. It is an attempt to capitalize and further advance the opiate of the people, namely, sports involvement vicariously, not personally. I am completely and thoroughly in support of sports activities involving younger people. The older one gets the more your thoughts on sports turn to theoretical aspects rather than to the actual participation, whether it is indoor sports or outdoor sports you are talking about.

**Mr. Drury:** Speak for yourself.

**Mr. Howard:** But with respect to the involvement of young people, I am thoroughly in support of that.

I come from an area of the province of British Columbia that contains a large number of smaller communities. It is a rural area in a sense. And, Mr. Speaker, every member who does not come from a big city riding knows this as well, that every community in my constituency, every small community in all of Canada, which tries to get a few bucks to build an ice arena, a curling rink, an auditorium or a swimming pool finds it is like pulling teeth. They have to run around on hands and knees and beg from every agency, municipal, provincial and federal. Hon. members know the response that they get, the people in Fort St. James, Burns Lake, Hazelton, Terrace, and in my own community of Prince Rupert. Mr. Speaker, you know the response we get from the federal government. Oh, it is done politely. It is not done with malice, or with disregard for the interests of people in those communities, but very sadly the response is, "no help, no consideration—tough—do it yourself." And the people do it themselves. The buildings that they erect by that process of community participation by citizens' groups, by municipal taxes bearing the load, are much more valuable to this nation and to the spirit of the young people in this nation than all the Olympic villages that are going to be built, whether in the city of Montreal or some other place.

If we could generate in this House the same spirit for supporting participation by our younger people as we can for this project in Montreal that is being put to us now, we would be a damned sight better off in our nation than we are at the moment. It is to our undying shame that the federal government prates and talks about endorsement of sports, of amateur activities, of younger people, out of one side of its mouth, and denies some financial support to those projects out of the other side of its mouth.

I am very much afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the citizens of the city of Montreal are going to wake up—I should not put it in that light in meaning that they have been asleep—are going to have disclosed to them at the conclusion of this great venture that they will have to find at least \$200 million somewhere. They won't like that. That will be the result of Mayor Drapeau having been sold a bill of goods by coin dealers and stamp dealers, accepting what was told to him because that was what he wanted to hear, without checking into it. That is the type of thing we are going to visit on the people of Montreal, and I do not want to see that happen in 1976 or any other time. The other objection I have is to this preoccupation with the question of sports at the top level, at the international level, at the money level, and nothing at the human level, all of which is placing the emphasis in the wrong place.

**Mr. Ian Arrol (York East):** Mr. Speaker, there is no way that the Olympics can be cancelled with honour and the time for criticisms should now be passed unless, following the criticisms, valid alternatives and means of financing can be suggested. There are those who criticize the Olympics on the basis that, first of all, money should be spent on housing and such other matters. There are those who would not allow society anything in the way of spectacular fun and games until all social problems are solved. Man does not live by bread alone, nor by adequate housing, adequate sewers and full employment. If society had fol-