

Mr. Speaker, I feel it is necessary once again to bring to the attention of this House the dismal financial circumstances which now surround the 1976 Montreal Olympics. Not only have initial costs risen far above the forecasts, but net proceeds from coin sales are falling far short of the expected \$250 million. Results have been particularly disappointing in the United States, where large sales of coins were anticipated. As of April 1, with the main portion of the first of seven in the series completed, the net return, less reserve but including stamps, has been a meagre \$2.5 million.

Even the most optimistic sales projections based on proceeds thus far envisage a deficit of at least \$200 million, notwithstanding the success of the lottery program. Now is the time to face reality and accept the fact that a large deficit will be incurred by COJO, the city of Montreal and the province of Quebec. It is not good enough simply to expect the Canadian people to support the spirit of the Olympics and share the financial responsibility, as they will ultimately do. We find the Montreal city council authorizing the construction of Olympic facilities with moneys obtained from federally-authorized programs such as the sale of coins and stamps, and doing so without offering contracts for public tender. The time is long overdue for the federal government to take an active role in supervising the over-all financial administration of the Olympics, particularly as such matters relate to the Olympics financing legislation passed by this House. As a nation which has committed itself to the Olympics in Montreal, we cannot now wash our hands of the whole affair as the Prime Minister seems to be doing.

The air of secrecy which has surrounded the entire Olympics program from its inception, including the arrangements for the letting of the television contracts and the closed bidding on other contracts, must be dispelled, and the indifferent attitude of the Prime Minister must be changed so that Canadians may be able to lend their complete support to the 1976 Olympics. Only then will they see clearly the many benefits which will accrue not only to our youth but to our entire country.

There are many other areas which should be looked at, Mr. Speaker—areas which have long been contentious as far as Canadians are concerned. For example, the issue of abortion continues to divide hospital boards and interfere with patient-doctor relationships. It has sparked demonstrations both in favour and against, and has inspired mass advertising by those on either side of the argument. Yet the government is still afraid to clarify the issue by bringing it before the House for open discussion.

As a matter of record, Mr. Speaker, on November 5, 1973, I introduced in this House a motion which read as follows:

In view of representations made to most members of the House over the past few days, not only in person but also by thousands of telegrams and letters, urging the House to examine the abortion laws now in existence in this country, and in view of the fact that this is a matter dealing with life itself, I move:

That the government be instructed to form forthwith a committee comprised of members of this House to thoroughly investigate this entire area affording such organizations as the Alliance for Life and others, in fact all segments of our society, the opportunity to express their views in a matter involving the very lives of thousands of unborn children.

The Address—Mr. Jelinek

The Liberals felt at that time that this motion should not go forward, and it was defeated. I believe they did not wish it to go further because they felt it would be too embarrassing or too risky, too controversial, in a period prior to a possible federal election. An election did indeed follow. However, the party opposite now has an over-all majority and they know they will be here four or five years. The time has come to look into this serious question by means of a committee such as I have proposed. I urge all hon. members to look forward to the setting up of the committee in order to give a chance of participation to millions of Canadians who are interested in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I see it is one o'clock. Perhaps I can continue after lunch.

[Translation]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being one o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until 2 p.m.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

[English]

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. Jelinek: Mr. Speaker, prior to one o'clock I had the opportunity of touching on numerous subjects, such as unemployment insurance, illegal strikes in essential services, as usual I touched on the Olympics, and I finished off by saying that the government obviously became afraid to raise the abortion issue. Naturally, I also discussed the inflation problem of which the whole country except, it seems, this government is totally aware.

I would continue on that line by saying that there were other areas touched on so lightly and superficially in the Speech from the Throne as hardly to constitute serious consideration. Can anyone really find a determined effort to curtail the excessive government spending which has grown out of all proportion under this Liberal administration? It is true that vague references and veiled promises have been made, but these are hardly sufficient to initiate cutbacks in spending by provincial and municipal governments, as this government is now preaching. Nowhere was there any specific reference to federal government cutbacks in spending or hiring programs, and I am wondering whether this government does not believe in the principle of example but relies on the "do as I say, not do as I do" principle.

I should like to quote a few statements made by Mr. J. Wilson, president of the Ontario Chamber of Commerce, who spoke at a dinner last night. These statements are contained in today's *Ottawa Journal*. He said:

The record of government spending, stacked up against spending in any other sector of the economy, leaves no argument against the contention that government is one of the major contributors, if not the major contributor, to the current inflation problem.

We all know that, Mr. Speaker.

The civil service was increasing "at wartime rates" but without a national crisis to account for the attitude of the public to this growth—