

*Adjournment Motion*

It concerns me very much that Government members tend to gloss over this so lightly and that hon. members opposite are questioning the institution of Parliament and the institution of our parliamentary democracy as we know it.

The hon. gentleman who uttered those remarks was the Hon. Member for Vegreville, the present Deputy Prime Minister and Government House Leader. They are remarks he made on July 17, 1981, when the Liberal Government brought in closure on the Constitution debate.

It is a good thing that this type of legislation was not being proposed when Pasteur made his developments or when Drs. Banting and Best developed insulin, or when Jonas Salk developed the vaccine for polio. It is too bad that the Tories in their haste to privatize got rid of an organization that was one of the world's leaders in research and development, manufacturing and processing of drugs, namely, Connaught Laboratories. When one looks at the record of the Tories one sees that all the things they complained about when the Liberals were in power they are duplicating in spades. I do not know what members of that Party are complaining about. In fact, I learned some of the lessons of being in opposition from my Conservative friends, included among them the Hon. Member for Vegreville and other Hon. Members who arrived in this place even after I did. I thought I was fairly expert at opposing Government; but I learned a great deal from the Tories. When something happens to them, all of a sudden there is something wrong with the system. The Government could have allowed the process to proceed. The Government has the prerogative to bring in closure at any time it wishes. The consequences rest on its head, or on the heads of members of the Opposition. In this case the Government might have had a case had the Opposition used up 12, 14 or 20 sitting days on second reading. Then it might well have had a case to bring in closure. It could have said that that is enough of that, every opposition Member has spoken once or twice and we have run out of opposition Members. In that case the Government would have had a good argument to present to the Canadian people about bringing in closure.

● (1600)

The Government brought in closure after those few hours of debate at second reading stage. That was a perfectly good reason for my colleagues and me to do everything we could under the rules to prevent the Government from bringing in a closure motion. The Government gave us notice of the motion to bring in closure to allow two more days of debate. Then it reduced that to one more day of debate. When we knew that that was coming ahead of time, what the heck did the Government expect from the Opposition? Of course, under the rules, we would use every device and measure we could that the Speaker ruled in order to prevent or delay the Government from proceeding with this legislation. That is normal parliamentary procedure.

What is the PC Party of Canada complaining about? This has been done countless times since I was elected in 1968. Conservative Members did this quite legitimately, under the rules of Parliament and according to their own viewpoints and

policies. To think that this motion was proposed by the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski), a Member who made speeches on a number of occasions when closure was brought in!

I would like to close with a final quote from the Hon. Member for Vegreville who moved today's closure motion. He said:

If we believe in parliamentary democracy and the right to freedom of speech, then we must ensure that the rights and privileges of Parliament are always secure. I think those rights and privileges are very sacred.

After all, Parliament is the foundation of and very fundamental to our basic freedoms, and to suggest that we might be better off without it frightens me very much. I have been here for 13 years and I have seen an erosion of the rights and privileges of individual members of Parliament. We as individual members of Parliament obtain our rights, privileges and powers, whatever they may be, from this institution, and I would hate to see them eroded further.

By virtue of a closure motion today we have a further contempt for and erosion of the spirit and privileges of this institution. I believe tyranny begins when parliamentary debate ends.

The Hon. Member who moved today's motion said those words on July 17, 1981. I will not get so close to being unparliamentary as to call that hypocritical. I recall that opposition Members of the day, people all across Canada and the media supported and agreed with those statements made by the Hon. Member for Vegreville.

May I say to the Hon. Member for Bruce—Grey (Mr. Gurbin) regarding his remarks about drugs and drug prescriptions that I hope he will count the tens of thousands of prescriptions written by physicians for which there will be no substitutes. This means that provincial drug plans will have to pay the higher costs for brand name drugs, and that is another reason for debating this Bill for several more days yet.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Order, please. I find the motion put by the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) and seconded by the Hon. Member for Regina East (Mr. de Jong) to be acceptable.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 66, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The Hon. Member for Broadview—Greenwood (Ms. McDonald)—Health—Request for ban on cigarette advertising. (b) plea by physician's organization; the Hon. Member for Westmorland—Kent (Mr. Robichaud)—Railways—Future of 551 CN employees at Moncton. (b) Number of jobs retained in Moncton; the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi)—Refugees—Deportation of Iranian student from United States. (b) Request for Canadian action.