

million worth of coins to its inhabitants and to visitors, but found it could dispose of only about two-thirds or \$179 million. Is Canada the last of the big-time spenders? Apparently blind to the experiences of other countries, Canada proposes to market over \$400 million worth of these coins. Reluctantly, I join with a host of others who doubt that this can be done, even over a period of three years.

● (1630)

One thing is certain, however; whatever happens, the people of Canada will have given the Olympic games upward of \$200 million through the federal government's yielding of the normal profit on coins, or seigniorage. They have donated this amount. If these coins do not sell, then the Olympics, like Expo '67, will show a loss and Canadians will pick up this loss in one way or another. Whether it is the Canadians who live in Quebec who will be forced to pick up the deficit because of the Prime Minister's assurances of no extra federal subsidy, whether they are forced to pick it up through higher taxes because it is laid at the door of the Quebec government and the city of Montreal, or whether the deficit will be spread over the total Canadian population, is largely incidental and irrelevant in my opinion. A group of Canadians will be forced to pick up this deficit.

No one likes to be constantly negative and pessimistic, and especially since my party tends to be associated with the doom sayer and hand wringer image. Boosters, of course, are more welcome than knockers, but I have moved over the last four months from a reluctant acceptance of the Olympics to a sober reappraisal. People like Toronto's Reverend Don Stirling and W. O. Johnson in his book about Olympics "All That Glitters Is Not Gold", and as well as others have impressed me greatly with their arguments. In his examination of the arguments in favour of the Olympics, Mr. Stirling puts forth each one, and then goes on to topple each in its turn. What are the favourable social considerations advanced?

First of all, it is asserted that the Olympics are worth while because they provide an arena for the finest amateur athletes in the world. That is nonsense. The recent Olympics have been an incredibly expensive showcase at state expense for the elite of sport, those young people, and I give them great credit, who must sacrifice years for the single goal of athletic excellence in their field. This may not be so bad if they care to do it. I do not think we should be critical of that side of it, but let us not say that these people are amateurs. They are not amateurs and cannot be. All athletes of Olympic calibre receive some sort of athletic benefit or support, but they still have to swear an Olympic oath that they have never benefited financially from their athletic ability.

I hope that the things I have said on this particular point do not denigrate in any way the excellent efforts of Canadian athletes or their coaches. Some of you may have been with me last spring, I believe, during the proud moment when we honoured Canada's Olympic athletes at the National Arts Centre in our capital. We saw then Nancy Greene and the men from Moose Jaw who won the gold medals for the equestrian events. We heard from cyclist, Torchy Peden from Victoria, and we were introduced that evening to Barbara Ann Scott. It was a great

Olympic Bill

moment for many Canadians who are interested in sports. Any one who attended that event could not help but be moved by the experience. Anything I say about athletes now I hope will not be taken as a denigration of their accomplishments. Canadians have nothing but pride in the accomplishments of Canadian athletes at the Olympics for their high levels of attainment.

The second point advanced in favour of the Olympics is that Olympics are worthwhile because they further physical fitness and healthy athletic endeavour. Certainly, Olympic athletes benefit, at least in the area of their specialty. No one could deny that. But the games benefit relatively few gifted athletes, and the populace, the general mass of participants, are by and large ignored. They can watch the games on television. This is especially true of Canadians, and Russ Kirby, in his book "Participation in Sports", estimates that the physical fitness of a 30 year old Canadian male is roughly equivalent to that of a 60 year old Swede.

Mr. Jelinek: That is why we need the Olympics in Canada.

Mr. Rose: The third point advanced in favour of the Olympics is that the Olympic games further goodwill internationally and therefore are worthwhile. It may have been true once. I am not that ancient—although I am developing a number of grey hairs—that my experience would go back to the Athenian games, but—

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): But Stanley was there.

Mr. Rose: The history of the recent Olympics from the times of the Berlin games sponsored by that great humanitarian Adolph Hitler—incidentally a man much admired by Avery Brundage, the venerable Olympic top dog—is one of nationalistic rivalry and a good deal of bitterness. In the last few games we saw tragedies through assassinations and student protests. For recent examples, see Mexico student protests and Munich Black September assassinations.

Finally, the fourth point advanced in favour of the games is that the 1976 Olympics will be worthwhile because the games will stimulate tourism and employment. It may do that, but both Mexico and Munich experienced a brief tourist boom during the games, followed by a devastating slump. No reasons, of course, have been advanced for this. As for the building boom and resulting employment, it is the contention of my party that more lasting benefits from the transfusion of millions of dollars could be achieved through slum clearance, transportation and pollution control in the city of Montreal.

So much for the arguments and counter arguments articulated by Mr. Stirling and others. It appears to us, therefore, that there are substantial economic, social and political costs and benefits accruing from any proposal, whether for Olympics or not. Anyway, as I have been able to weigh the evidence at my disposal in terms of the cost and benefit, I would not argue with the point made by the previous speaker—how did he put it—that the Olympics is the spirit—

Mr. Jelinek: I said that and more than you are saying.