

I would wish for a compromise, but I cannot ask this of the Postmaster General because it is not his responsibility. I come back to my original statement. Perhaps the acting Prime Minister could tell us why this clause of the bill is here, and why the powers must be placed in the hands of COJO and taken away from the businesses. Some say this is not unprecedented because there was similar legislation in respect of Expo 67. It is true that there was, but there was also a four-year warning to manufacturers, businessmen, and individuals. Expo 67 we know took place in 1967, but the bill for Expo was introduced four years earlier so there was ample warning. I say this is an unprecedented case. It is a dangerous situation. It is far more dangerous than we realize because it will set a precedent by which corporations and a few government agencies will be able to bypass the Trade Marks Act and make it obsolete. The corporations or agencies will bypass the Trade Marks Act and refer to this bill. So I think we have before us a sad state of affairs. I hope I have been able to point out the inadequacies.

Although this is more or less a finance bill we did not have an opportunity to question the Minister of Finance at the committee stage. This part of the bill is a farce. It has been put together in a hurry. It has been admitted that mistakes were made. If they had been made earlier something would have been known about trade marks. This should have been one of the first pieces of legislation introduced. It should not have been introduced just before the Olympic Games are to take place. I say this part of the bill is shameful.

An hon. Member: Shameful!

Mr. Jelinek: Yes. It is shameful to hear anyone opposite make such a comment because it is obvious that he has not read this clause.

● (2140)

I am all for assisting COJO and the Montreal Olympics, but not at the expense of manufacturers, and that is what this bill is doing. I hope that the government will in some way amend the bill, and perhaps even take out the retroactivity provision. Only the minister responsible for that part of the bill can do it. Although the Postmaster General is not responsible for this part of the bill, I hope that some action will be taken in this respect.

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, I count it a privilege to have the opportunity to speak on this motion. I think that if there is a section in the games that can be allocated to jugglers, the mayor of Montreal should be allowed to compete in that sport and I am sure he would run off with the gold medal.

I think it is time we restored some historical perspective to the games. I can imagine the planners of the Olympics in Athens 2,000 years ago being worried about the amphitheatre they would have, and what kind of multimillion dollar project would be needed to stage the games, how many coins they would have to mint, how many stamps they would have to print, and who would get the patent on all the products that would be sold as a result of the staging of the Olympics. It seems to me that the focus has been taken away from the real purpose of the Olympics to

Olympic Financing

the stagecraft, the backdrop, the choreography, rather than physical fitness.

I should like to ask the minister if he has figures that would give us a comparison between the money spent on the physical features of the games, on the buildings and the promotion, and the money spent to make our athletes physically fit. How much awareness is there on the part of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) of the need to assist athletes to maintain physical fitness, and how much is he spending from his department's funds to ensure that the next generation of Canadian men and women will be physically fit? Again the focus is all on the choreography, the materials, the impressions rather than the people. We are worried about the machinery, not the athletes. I must add as an aside that if the athletes have to depend on stamps, they are licked.

I would like to point out also that other hon. members are no doubt getting the same kind of correspondence that I am getting from the corporations of Canada, the bottling companies and so on. One of them writes as follows:

... our hope is that in this way we will not only improve the calibre of the performance of amateurs in Canada but we will be creating an increased awareness of physical fitness.

We have come to a sorry state of affairs when corporations, which incidentally have an invested interest in this program, talk about awareness of physical fitness but the Government of Canada talks about minting coins, slogans, patents, and so forth. To highlight the sorry mess of this whole project I would like to refer hon. members to a headline in the *Globe and Mail* of Tuesday, June 17. Some interesting statements were made by Mr. Rousseau of the organizing committee. I think he should be quoted in some literary magazine to illustrate some of his redundancies and prophetic fallacies. Let me give you one of the jewels that this gentleman uttered at that particular press conference, and listen to his self-complacency. The article reads in part:

"The games will be self-financing for us, but we'll have to have governments allow us things, that's all," Mr. Rousseau said.

I ask hon. members to put that one together for me. He says it will be self-financing for us but the government will have to give them things, that is all. I would not mind having some programs that are self-financing that way.

Let me give you the second jewel, and I think that perhaps here he missed his beat a little and lapsed into honesty when he said; "We're in shifting sand and we're fighting". The sad thing is that he is not fighting for athletes or for physical fitness, he is fighting for buildings, for the reputation of Montreal, and all the physical things around which the choreography will be staged.

Let me give you another of those jewels. The article states:

He said if journalists hadn't pressed so much to find out the cost of the games four years ago he wouldn't be in a position to have to explain any deficit today.

Is that not beautiful? That is what you call accountability Montreal style. If we would not ask them for facts, they would never have to justify them.

Let me give you one more. The article states:

Mr. Rousseau explained the mayor's figures of last December were lower because the project planners trimmed costs a little this spring.