

attention to them, it might be reasonably apprehended that his course of conduct was likely to create confusion in Canada between his wares and those of a competitor.

We passed an act in 1952 or 1953 which I believe has not been proclaimed, and which will supersede the legislation to which I have just referred. But, as I understand it, it deals perhaps a little more specifically with the problem in mind, since it refers to the geographical origin of the goods in question.

I do not want to demonstrate one particular article, but I do have in my hand an article which is marked "made in Canada" and the package is marked "printed in Canada". The article contained in that package was marked "U.S.A." What I rather suspect is that the fabric out of which the article was made originated in the United States and was brought into Canada and probably turned into a child's garment in a Canadian factory, but marked "made in Canada".

At a time when the textile industry is in need of work, it seems to me that anything of this nature should be very carefully looked into by the government, and the legislation should be strengthened, if possible, so that an article marked "U.S.A." cannot be put in a package that is marked "made in Canada", in a package also containing, in print, "printed in Canada". It seems to me that we should have on our statute books legislation that would prohibit that sort of marking when the article is made—of course, I am giving the company the benefit of the doubt in this respect—from an imported fabric in a Canadian factory. But my real purpose in rising is not only to say that we should strengthen the legislation to meet problems of this description, but to say that we also have on the statute books of Canada an act of this parliament which might assist, and which has not yet been proclaimed. That is the point I have in mind. Whether we can succeed in formulating new legislation that would meet cases of this description, or not, I do not know because I am not a lawyer; but I do know that we have stronger legislation than the legislation now in effect. And what I am suggesting to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Garson) and to the government is that the legislation passed by this parliament in an attempt to do something along the lines that I believe necessary should no longer be delayed; it should be proclaimed and brought into effect immediately, as I say, particularly in view of the conditions in an industry which needs all the work that it can possibly get. I am not asking for any protection for Canadian industries; all I am asking is that we should have packages accurately marked. If the goods are made in Canada, then they should be marked "made

Marking of Packages "Made in Canada" in Canada"; but if the goods are partly manufactured or, as I think likely in this case, if the fabric itself is manufactured in the United States, then some marking should be put on the package to indicate that, while the article may be made in Canada, the material from which the article is made originates in another country.

Whether it is the United States or any other country does not concern me at the moment. What I am concerned with is that we have passed legislation which was designed to strengthen our administration in this regard. That legislation is on the statute books but has not yet been brought into effect by proclamation. Why this delay? What I am asking is that the government should proclaim this legislation, if it is stronger, as we were told it was at the time, and endeavour to restrict the marketing of goods claimed "made in Canada" which are not in reality made wholly in Canada.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, as I am the minister responsible for the legislation in question now on the statute books but not yet proclaimed, I should perhaps give a word of explanation as to the reason for the delay in proclamation. This legislation for its operation requires rather extensive and detailed regulations. A committee has been working on the preparation of these regulations for the entire period since the act was passed at the last session of the last parliament. I have received a report of the committee within the last few days and as soon as it is possible to bring it before my colleagues I intend to do so. I think, however, it will be necessary to give a good deal of publicity to these regulations after they have been made in the interests of the people who will derive benefit from the legislation. There will have to be a period during which the regulations can become known, otherwise there would be considerable confusion. However, I hope that that period can be kept to a minimum and that the will of parliament can be carried out as soon as possible.

With respect to the other point raised by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar, as I indicated to the house at the time legislation was before us dealing with the Patent Act, it is intended to set up a commission of inquiry into the Patent Act, the Copyright Act, and other related legislation. It is not intended that this inquiry should go into the whole scope of new trade mark legislation recently passed by parliament, but I should think the terms might be made broad enough so that interested parties who wish to make representations in regard to further improvements in that act would have an opportunity to do so.