

different from the attitude of the government at the time of the original bill.

Manufacturers have made investments. They are on production runs. There are wholesale distributors, small entrepreneurs, and small shopkeepers who have bought many souvenir articles which have on them the Olympic symbol or a variation thereof, and now all of a sudden the government says, "Oh, no; stop." Surely COJO with all the personnel at its disposal could have thought about its trade marks and proprietary rights much sooner. For instance, clause 4(3) on page 3 of the bill clearly indicates that June 13, 1975, will be the cut off date. What do we do about these people? They have gone ahead and become involved. Many of them are willing to funnel money back into the amateur athletic union and to foster amateur sports, and now the government says it wants passage of this bill.

I would think that the least the government could do would be to look very critically and objectively at the amendments we are putting before it. I submit that the process is no different than it was in 1973 when the opposition had to amend the original bill, and I can appreciate the position of the government on the Olympics, its wanting the Olympics to be a success, and the financing difficulties which have surrounded the Olympics.

The government has brought in a bill in a haphazard way, and when amendments are brought forward to strengthen the bill some government members take the view that the opposition is anti the Olympics. That is the very same argument they used in 1973. Madam Speaker, may I call it ten o'clock?

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Sharp: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, tomorrow it will be the intention of the government to call Bill C-66 to amend the Excise Tax Act. It will be our intention to continue Bill C-66 throughout the ensuing days until it is completed, except that on Thursday afternoon we will complete Bill C-8, which is subject to an order of the House.

Mr. Hargrave: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the government House leader if he intends to bring Bill C-50 back on Thursday as well?

Mr. Sharp: I had hoped that we would have made more progress today. I am afraid that many of these bills which we would like to see disposed of may have to be held for quite some time.

Mr. Baldwin: They wouldn't if we could get a few amendments accepted over there. Don't be so stubborn.

An hon. Member: Write better bills.

Adjournment Debate PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—REQUEST FOR WITHDRAWAL OF AID FROM UGANDA PENDING DECISION ON FATE OF DENNIS HILLS

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Madam Speaker, it may be the opinion on the government side of this House that the subject to which I am addressing myself this evening is no longer a matter of concern and that it is a past issue. I refer to my question which was addressed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) and answered by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) with reference to the conduct of the President of Uganda.

● (2200)

I should like to draw attention to the innocuous, watered down, waffling, response of the minister. I asked what action the government was prepared to take. I suggested that one of the avenues of applied muscle would be CIDA, and the response I received was that he was not sure if it would be an appropriate action for Canada to take when we disagree with the actions of another government.

I must assume from that statement that the minister did disagree with the actions of the President of Uganda so I must ask him he disagreed, if the cabinet disagreed, if government disagreed and certainly if Canadians disagreed, what action did he take—what action did we take?

We understand that CIDA has wound down in Uganda. I would be the last person to suggest we use the muscle, the threat of withdrawal of aid from a nation filled with hundreds of thousands of wretched people living under the dictatorship of this man. I would point out that Canada enjoys a good reputation in Uganda due to our CIDA program. Certainly if a senior commonwealth country ever had an opportunity to extend a little bit of diplomacy and to do a service for Great Britain and for that miserable fellow with the death penalty hanging over his head, this country had that opportunity. Like so many other things, however, when it comes to diplomacy this country gives no demonstration of intestinal fortitude.

What was the real reason that the President of Uganda decided to back down? Was it because of our diplomacy? He managed to get Britain where he wanted it. When Britain sent its envoys to Uganda where did they find the president? Waiting for them in a grass hut. The entrance to this hut was about two feet high so that the envoys were subjected to the demeaning posture of getting down on their hands and knees in order to enter the hut to see the president. Are we going to accept that kind of thinking from a man who is ruling a country in an insane manner?

The real reason that President Amin succumbed was not due to the pressure from Britain or from this country. It