

regard to the financing of the games that I was not permitted to table it; they did not care to look at some of the figures sent to me by Commissioner General Roger Rousseau.

The Postmaster General knew we had been demanding an accounting from COJO, and on his way out after that long committee meeting he turned round and said that though he had some accounting he would not table it, or show it to the committee, because we had not asked for it. I have said on past occasions, in fairness to the minister, that he has always answered in the best way he could as far as his part of the bill was concerned. But his unwillingness to show the figures in his possession to the committee puzzled me a great deal.

Since I am talking about the committee I should like to put on record a few quotations from the minutes. The first is a question I put to one of the witnesses, Mr. Lafontaine, and his reply.

Why should COJO, in this case, have far more power than any other government agency or any other corporation or business, or any government agency for that matter? I would think if more power were needed government agencies should have more power. But why COJO in this case? Mr. Chairman, a minister should really be here to answer that one—

This prompts me to point out that the whole bill stands in the name of the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien). The Postmaster General is responsible only for the coin and stamp area. The bill before us, as well as the original bill, go far beyond the coin program. The rights of opposition members of parliament have not been looked after. They did not have an opportunity to question the proper minister. We enjoyed questioning the Postmaster General. He gave us answers. But they dealt with only part of the bill.

The President of the Treasury Board was not present on second reading, and he was never to be seen during the committee stage. He is not here now, yet the bill stands in his name and deals with matters far beyond the area for which the Postmaster General is responsible.

The Postmaster General has said himself that he is responsible only for the coins and stamps, and for distribution. He has done his best. He took over a department which probably matches in chaos only the Department of Transport and I sympathize with him because, as the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers) said, he took over a total mess. Thus, we cannot blame the Postmaster General altogether for failing to achieve what was originally intended as far as the coin program was concerned. Nevertheless, we cannot question him on these other matters, particularly with regard to this motion of mine which relates to the Trade Marks Act.

Let me explain, briefly, what I have in mind. Clause 13 of Bill C-63 reads as follows:

The Olympic Corporation is, and always has been, an organization operated in Canada for the purposes of the Trade Marks Act.

As I understand it, this clause was to stay in the bill and everything else was to be deleted. As I suggest in the motion we are discussing, COJO would be able to get its trade marks, registrations and so on under the Trade

Olympic Financing

Marks Act. I will quote first from the opening paragraph of section 3 of that act:

A trade mark is deemed to have been adopted by a person when he or his predecessor in title commence to use it in Canada or to make it known in Canada or, if he or such predecessor have not previously so used it or made it known, when he or such predecessor filed an application for its registration in Canada.

I move, now, to the pertinent section of the Trade Marks Act, section 9:

● (2120)

No person shall adopt in connection with a business, as a trade mark or otherwise, any mark consisting of, or so nearly resembling as to be likely to be mistaken for . . .

(n) any badge, crest, emblem or mark . . .

(iii) adopted and used by any public authority in Canada as an official mark for wares or services

in respect of which the Registrar has, at the request of Her Majesty or of the university or public authority as the case may be, given public notice of its adoption and use;

The reason I quote from the Trade Marks Act is that COJO still has the right to register like any other private company or corporation in Canada. But as the bill now stands, COJO is given unprecedented power to deprive individuals and businesses of certain property rights.

Let me make it very clear that hundreds of manufacturers in this country have been marketing products bearing trade marks that may or may not be similar to the trade marks COJO wants to register in connection with the 1976 Olympic Games in Montreal. These products were being distributed long before it was ever known the Olympic games were coming to Montreal. These manufacturers are now faced with the fact that COJO may want to adopt the trade mark that they have been using.

As we heard during committee stage, if the products had been manufactured before June 13 they will be able to continue to manufacture them. But let us remember that manufacturers like to expand their products. Take a clothier, for example, who may have been manufacturing T-shirts for the last 20 years and who uses some crest on them that is pretty identical to one COJO wants to use. He has expanded his line into socks, sweaters, hats, and has spent \$20,000 on machinery. Manufacturers of sporting goods fall into the same category.

I suggest that this bill will strongly hurt such businesses. To take an example, Leatherware Limited of Montreal—and there are many others—applied to register crests prior to their knowledge of this bill. They have spent a great deal of money in preparing this crest. All of a sudden they are no longer allowed to continue with their plans to manufacture and distribute the crest, having spent thousands and thousands of dollars on its preparation.

This clause of the bill is putting an unnecessary burden on many businesses and corporations in Canada, and millions of dollars will be lost to the economy as a result. The small businesses will suffer the most.

Mr. Lefebvre is a counsel with the Department of Justice and was a witness before the committee. As reported at page 39:47 of the committee proceedings he said:

I would like to add that if this amendment is to be effective, it is crucial that such power be given because of the short time we have. A