

### Olympic Bill

it will be heard internationally in 1974. The organization group in Vancouver has been seeking to discuss this question with the government. I say to the government, through you, Mr. Speaker, that they had better discuss it now, not tomorrow or the next day.

If the Olympics, and sports generally in this country are to have any credibility, we cannot afford to pull the gaffe that we have pulled on these summer games, with all the anguish that is involved. As one who has been a member at large of the Olympic committee and who has been deeply interested in sports all my life, believing in the ideals of the Olympic movement, I say with great sincerity that the Government of Canada will have to be much more realistic than it has been about its role in the early stages of decision-making in Olympics and international sports federation events. If we can learn from our mistakes, then we are getting somewhere. It is my hope that we can and we will.

Coming back to the bill, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the object is to put \$250 million into the Olympics fund in order to defray the cost of the games. I am seriously concerned whether a \$470 million issue of coins will be sufficient to give us the revenue. There seems to be a lot of doubt about this. I think the committee will have to look very hard at this suggestion to see how effective it will be. We must recognize that whatever city had been awarded the games, the federal government would still be put to other expenses. In looking at the immediate costs of the games I do not think we should forget all the other expenses the federal government will be put to with respect to immigration, security and other matters. These expenses must be accepted, no matter which city holds the games. In fairness we must consider that aspect of the matter.

● (2130)

We must also carefully consider just how accurate the cost estimates are and in what way the federal presence is to be exercised in order to keep costs within the estimates. We must keep in mind especially that there are letters of guarantee from the city of Montreal and from the government of the province of Quebec which say to the people of Canada and, in effect, to the federal government, "If we are wrong and fall short of funds, we will not come to you for funds."

I hope hon. members realize that if we are to retain credibility in the eyes of the public, we cannot put this bill through and say, "There, we have solved it," and a short time later have this matter brought back before the House and face the accusation that we did not look at it carefully enough. Let no one say, "Although we said we are not going to come back for any more money, you should have realized that we could not do it." That is the argument that has been used consistently.

I must concede that what hon. friends to my left say sounds like an ominous warning. It behooves all of us, when examining this bill in committee, to heed that warning. The organizing committee, the Canadian Olympic Association and departments of government must make sure that the House does not again debate this issue. I cannot be too emphatic in saying that if anyone is to blame for what is happening, it is the government that

[Mr. Fraser.]

either did not see or refused to see that it cannot slough off its responsibilities. The question of whether we shall have the games or not have them has gone beyond the point of asking. We are Canadians in this House and we are Canadians across this land, and we have made a bad start in this matter.

However, there is no reason why, given good will, some hardheaded thinking and responsible action, we cannot join together to make these games unique and worth while and, like Expo, an event which will bring Canadians who are not Quebeckers to that beautiful part of our country so that Quebeckers can meet many people not from Quebec in an atmosphere of comradeship, pride and patriotism, and so we can continue building this country into the sort of country we believe it can be.

**Mr. John Harney (Scarborough West):** Mr. Speaker, I must begin my speech by referring to the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser) who just resumed his seat. Whenever I am here and the hon. member speaks, I always listen attentively to what he has to say to the House. I should like to discuss what I think is the major point he made in his address before making my own remarks.

He made the point that this country has already made a commitment and that we cannot go back on it, no matter how unhappy we may feel about it or about the way in which the commitment was made. I suggest to hon. members of this House that the commitment has not been made, that commitments of this country are made in this House, and this one is now being discussed. There is still time for us to make the right decision. The invitation, as the hon. member quite rightly said, is not from a city or section of this country but is from this country as a whole, and as we extend this invitation we should be fully aware of all its implications.

I also admired another point that the hon. member made, which is this. It is clear that the people of Canada as a whole will pay the bill, if indeed there is a bill to be paid and we strongly suspect there will be. However, there is something more direct about the bill that is before us. It is as if the government were asking us to pretend that we are not involved and that all we are being asked to do is facilitate a process which has to be carried on and directed by somebody else. I say that if we are to be involved in this we will pick up the cost, but we will also participate in the invitation and in the direction of the Olympic games.

Although I find myself disagreeing with the stated intentions of the hon. member for Vancouver South, I must admit that I listened to his proposals with interest and in the spirit in which they were delivered. They were forthright, direct and to the point before us—very unlike, I am sorry to say, the remarks addressed to this House by an hon. member who preceded him, the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner) who spent considerable time not in arguing about the bill but, to use language which is not that of Voltaire or Shakespeare, in *argumentum ad hominem* directed at the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané). The hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe also referred to the language of Shakespeare but did not use the very words of Shakespeare when he suggested, in so