The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. The hon. member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) rises on a point of order.

Mr. Prud'homme: Madam Speaker, I would like to submit to your kind attention that the point of order currently raised by the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey) is in no way a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Indeed, it was a matter of debate.

[English]

Mr. Mackasey: Madam, the hon. member knows very well that he has no point of order. His argument is a rather silly argument, I might say, when he only now is finding out the attitude of the government on the amendment. Had he been here during second reading and the committee stage when the amendments were defeated, it would have been very obvious to him what the attitude of the government was on the proposed amendments. They were defeated, but the hon. gentleman did not know that because he was 150 miles from here trying to get Convention delegates when he should been in the House of Commons defending the Olympics. When he spoke about chickens coming home to roost he would have been doing much better if he had come home to roost in the House of Commons.

I rose to pilot this bill because the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) was away on business. He will speak a little later. If anyone in this House has worked harder than the President of the Treasury Board then I do not know who it is. When I notice so much flack from a party which is supposed to be so dedicated to the passage of this bill, it makes me wonder, and I thank goodness that the party is led by a gentleman as honourable and responsible as the leader of that party. I am sure the hon. gentleman is not getting up to dispute he is honourable and responsible. Madam Speaker, the hon. gentleman just asked if he could buy the first gold coin.

I shall ignore some of the silly remarks some of the bigots speaking from their seats have just made. The hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi is very sensitive about the fact that he was not here. He should have been here at second reading and committee stage to support the question of the amendments but that he was not. If he will let me finish my speech I will get back to the bill. He has his choice. I simply say that if I strayed from the bill it was only because the hon. gentleman brought in a strawman, and that trick is a little too old for most of us. He has no monopoly in this country on the desire to see this country united. He has no monopoly among English speaking Canadians.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mackasey: You do not like it when you are receiving it but we had to listen to his diatribe for 20 minutes. And now he is getting a little of it back. Remember, if you do not like the bill we can have a recorded vote despite the gentlemen's agreement not to do so. The gentlemen's agreement was that we would have a divided vote. I really think everybody wants to help the Olympics. If you want to help the Olympics we can get back to the bill. If I do not

Olympic 1976 Act

go ahead, Madam Speaker, it will be because of the anvil chorus in the corner of the House whose only claim to fame is the ability to sit in a chair. As a matter of fact if their ears were as long as their tongues they would not only sound like jackasses but they would look like jackasses. I simply want to say—

• (1510)

An hon. Member: Have you ever been kicked by a jackass?

Mr. Mackasey: I stay far away from you, that is why I have not.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order. The Postmaster General (Mr. Mackasey) has the floor. Perhaps he could be allowed to speak. If hon. members wish to participate, they will be allowed to do so later.

Mr. Mackasey: Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) in his contribution at third reading made the point that the Canadian government somehow solicited the Olympic games. I suppose that to a degree that is true, but it is not the whole truth. I am sure his error was unintentional. The games were first solicited by three different cities;—Montreal, Toronto, and Hamilton. Montreal was chosen by the Canadian Olympic Association, which in those days was the right of the association, if I am not mistaken. Upon that official blessing by the association, Montreal made its case, in competition with Moscow and other cities such as Los Angeles, and won the right to host the Olympic games. Of course we were all very pleased about it.

There is no doubt that many mistakes have been made in the preparation of the Olympics. I think I said at second reading that the costs got out of hand. One of the positive things that has resulted out of the furor about the cost of the present Olympics is that in future invitations or solicitations for the honour of hosting the Olympics must be made by a country rather than a city. When the invitation is put forward by a country there is much more flexibility and latitude in choosing a city where the games will be held, and there is an opportunity to exercise a degree of decentralization and a means of spreading the economic benefits across the country. This is one of the positive criticisms that has come out over the last year or two. But the government made its position very clear, and I can only repeat what its position is. The President of the Treasury Board will reiterate it later on.

What we did through an act of parliament was to place at the disposal of the Olympic committee various methods of raising the necessary sum of money, that was realistically set at \$300 million or thereabouts. There were three methods—the lottery, the coins, and the stamps program, and related stamp and coin items. This was a new venture by Canadians, a venture in which few other countries have engaged.

The lottery went well beyond our expectation; the stamp program is just about what was anticipated; and the silver coin program is precisely as the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Drury) suggested, at \$100 million. I think that with their amendment the opposition, quite wisely and properly, suggested that to protect Canadian currency at no time