

Through a deal involving complicity, I might say, concerning amendments concocted by the government and the Official Opposition over one weekend, committee hearings on the bill were hurriedly closed without any opportunity being provided for the committee to examine any witnesses other than those two hon. gentlemen, the Postmaster General, and the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury). Because of that deal in which the Tories were found in bed with the Liberals, the committee hearings were concluded with undue haste and the bill was reported back to the House.

• (1430)

Our misgivings about the Olympic financing proposals were outlined in detail at that time. I do not believe they need repeating on this occasion. We believed then and still believe that \$250 million spread across the country for fitness and amateur sport to build rinks, swimming pools, coaching facilities and track and field outlets would have had far more spin-off effect than putting millions in one spot. In terms of four years, Canada could not only have expected to be host to a world athletic extravaganza but Canadian athletes would have had a genuine opportunity to win a suitable number of events for a change.

That argument is now behind us. Our party lost the fight on the Olympic bill, although the NDP track record on other energetic policies has improved considerably lately.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Rose: We lost out on the Olympic bill. We do not intend to cry about that today. On July 26 I concluded my third reading remarks by saying:

I would love to have been in cabinet and overheard the discussions on this bill. I hope the optimists will be accurate and the pessimists will be wrong. If we are going to have the Olympics, we want them to be a success.

Having said those words on July 26, I can say no less today. We, of course, want to be assured that, should there be a shortfall in the \$250 million coinage expectation, the federal government will not, I repeat not, accept further responsibility beyond the \$100 million already committed for security, housing and broadcasting.

There is little more that can appropriately be said at this time, except to extend our unequivocal best wishes to the minister and his promotional staff.

[Translation]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that from the beginning when Montreal authorities took the first steps regarding the Olympic Games and coins, the Social Crediters in the House have given all their support to the proposals of His Honour the mayor of Montreal and His Excellency Mr. Rousseau, who are at the origin of the Olympic Coins Program for the 1976 Games.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the members who supported Bill C-196 and also the minister, who has just said that hon. members will be able to give concrete support to this program. I would like him to note that for the 16 employees on my staff I will order Olympic coins for the coming Christmas season.

Order Paper Questions

However, Mr. Speaker, there are always contradictory details in the projects submitted to us, contradictory not for us but for the minister. When he said, for instance, that the Olympic Coins Program will increase revenues to \$500 million, this means half a billion dollars of new credits, which greatly resembles the theories of the Social Credit, which the minister does not want to recognize ordinarily, but which he recognizes for the Montreal Olympic Games.

The minister also said:

I am at present engaged in a series of personal visits to key centres across the country, with the dual purpose of disseminating information about the Olympic Coin Program...

Next Sunday, the minister will be at Nédélec, in my riding, to deliver a political speech or distribute olympic coins to my electors.

Mr. Speaker, we are convinced that this undertaking will be highly successful in Canada and throughout the world and are happy about it.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

[Text]

OPERATION OF SUBMERSIBLE VESSELS INSIDE THE JURISDICTIONAL PURVIEW OF THE GOVERNMENT

Question No. 2,328—Mr. Forrestall:

1. To the knowledge of the government, how many submersible vessels of all types, and by such types, have operated inside the jurisdictional purview of the government, in each calendar year since 1963 inclusive?

2. Does the government have knowledge of the approximate locations and courses of the United States submersible vessels that might from time to time come into waters that would normally be considered under the jurisdictional purview of the government and, if so, through what other department or agency of the government than the Department of External Affairs would such information be handled and available?

Mr. John M. Reid (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of National Defence as follows: 1. The following is a list of military submersible vessels of all types operating with Maritime forces in the years in question: 1963, 1964: 1 U.S. Submarine on loan, 2 R.N. Submarines on loan; 1965, 1966: 1 U.S. Submarine on loan, 1 'O' Class submarine; 1967: 1 U.S. Submarine on loan, 2 'O' Class submarines; 1968: 1 U.S. Submarine on loan, 3 'O' Class submarines; 1969, 1970: 1 former U.S. submarine, 3 'O' Class submarines; 1971, 1972, 1973: 1 former U.S. Submarine, 3 'O' Class submarines, 1 SDL-1.

2. In so far as U.S. Naval submersibles are concerned, this information is known to the Department of National Defence.