

*Olympic Financing*

businessman could come on and leave the market, leaving his goods on the market, and there would not be proper time to go through a lengthy trial or, maybe, to provide all the evidence that would normally be required.

As I read that, Madam Speaker, he wants us to pass this legislation very quickly so as to hurt these businesses and bring them to court. In the same committee meeting it was admitted that there will be many court cases resulting from this legislation. Then I said to Mr. Lefebvre:

I know of an awful lot of businesses that have for years, even prior to knowledge of the Olympics taking place in Canada, used symbols along these lines. They have been using them and, to answer your question, that they are allowed to use it on the products they are using now, I understand that, but a lot of these businesses have planned to expand and broaden their variety of products within a particular class, with intentions of using some of these symbols, and you are seriously going to hurt this expansion process.

Mr. Lefebvre, who as I say is a counsel from the Department of Justice, then said:

Shall we hurt them or hurt COJO?

So again he is admitting we are going to hurt the small businessman. Although I do not think we should hurt COJO, I would also say that we should not hurt the businessmen of this country who are legitimately trying to sell their wares and not to take advantage of the Olympic movement. As I say, reference should be had to section 9 of the Trade Marks Act which I read earlier.

It is a disgrace that we have to debate this question at this point when we are in support of the whole Olympic movement. We want to assist COJO in its financing, but at the same time it is the responsibility of the opposition to protect the taxpayers and businessmen of this country. This is why I say that the government should have made proper provision to cover the situation.

I suggest that the public knew nothing about this trade marks aspect of the bill, and that the majority of the members did not know either. All we heard about was the gold coins. Simpson's has been selling order blanks for gold coins for some three or four months now before this aspect was made public. I am not blaming the Postmaster General. The fault lies with the government which is expecting us to give blanket approval without question.

You know, Madam Speaker, it is really ironic. I have been pressing the government to give some assistance to COJO, and finally when we get this bill in committee stage we are not allowed to ask questions, or we are jeered at when we do so by the Liberal members who sit so smugly opposite. Regardless of what our suggestions may be or what our amendments will be, the government goes ahead and makes a mockery of the committee and the House of Commons, so far as I am concerned.

● (2130)

One of the witnesses before the committee was Mr. N. M. Thurm, Registrar of Trade Marks and Director, Trade Marks Office. He was asked if somebody is in business today and is using that mark quite regularly whether we would be putting him out of business so far as those projects are concerned. He was asked if there is a conflict. He answered, "Quite right, Mr. Chairman".

All these points I make follow along similar lines. I make these points in order to bring out the fact that these witnesses, who are reliable government witnesses, have

[Mr. Jelinek.]

contradicted themselves. I have given three or four examples. There were more during the committee stage. This is not a clean bill. There are many discrepancies in it. There were many contradictions before the committee. One can read these contradictions in the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Miscellaneous Estimates Committee for Thursday and Friday of last week.

I think we know what happened. The mayor of Montreal with his COJO officials came to the government and requested a rubber stamp on some things. That is precisely what has been happening. If the government had its way we would not be here bringing forward some of these facts.

The last example of the ridiculous committee procedure in respect of this bill was when I compared this bill in respect of trade marks to Bill C-2, the competition bill with which in a general way I agree. This is in direct contradiction to the competition bill. All the powers are being given to COJO and are being taken away from the legitimate businesses which were manufacturing before COJO was formed. These manufacturers were manufacturing products which bear some of these symbols, but when I brought up the fact that there was a contradiction between this bill and Bill C-2, the Competition bill, the chairman of the committee flatly stated that that was out of order, and that we were not allowed to compare this bill with another bill, just as he said it was out of order to ask the vice-president of COJO, who was present in the room, to answer questions no one but he could answer.

According to the chairman this was out of order, and the eleven Liberal followers just naturally nodded their heads either because they were sleepy or for some other reason. They could not make a contribution. I repeat that they could have made a contribution by asking for this legislation earlier. We had asked for this legislation to come before the House at a much earlier date. However, everything surrounding the Olympics, so far as the government is concerned, has always had a veil of secrecy of some sort around it. When members of the opposition asked when the bills, this one and the original one, were coming forward, we never received direct answers.

It is ridiculous for the government to say continually it is not involved in the Olympics. It is involved to the tune of perhaps half a billion dollars. There are at least half a dozen ministers and departments directly involved with assisting the games. No one questions this involvement. I think the government should be involved. I think Canadians should be proud of the fact that Canada is to have the Olympic Games. Why should everything be hidden? The Postmaster General questions why we keep asking these questions. I agree that he has not hid things when there have been specific questions, but it is the over-all financial aspect of the Olympics to which I refer.

In closing I should like to say that I am not the only one concerned about this clause in the bill. I have spoken to numerous legal advisers about this, and I am informed that even the Patent and Trade Marks Institute of Canada is quite disturbed about this clause, and that in fact it will be writing the government regarding this clause in the not too distant future.