

Patent Act

Tory back-benchers ranting and raving because the CBC did not cover for two nights in a row the hired demonstrators outside on the Hill.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. McDermid: Is that a nice way to talk about Canadian workers?

Mr. Murphy: That was the situation. That was the concern of the Conservative back-benchers. They did not talk about unemployment or problems in their ridings. They were concerned about what the CBC did or did not cover on *The National* last night. Then today at ten o'clock when the House convenes we have a motion put which allows the Opposition to drag out this legislation for another week when the Government knew we had no intention of doing so. I really do not feel I would be upset if one of our Members had a few more words to say. The Government has now given us the opportunity to make one more speech per Member.

We do not intend to stall the legislation. We intend to keep our word despite the provocation and tactical stupidity of the new Minister. It was completely stupid and completely unnecessary and I think in some ways unforgivable and I hope he will apologize to Members of the House.

Mr. Beatty: I hope you will apologize to the workers of Canada.

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands): Madam Speaker, I hope to speak briefly about the Government's tactics in just a few minutes, but I want to speak about the main motion which rejects the majority of Senate amendments to the Patent Act.

I am reminded of a Vancouver woman who some years ago married an up-coast logger and went to live with him at his float camp on an isolated inlet in British Columbia. In the first week at her new residence she decided she was going to bake some fresh bread for her new husband as a special treat. Something went wrong and the bread did not rise properly. Not wanting her husband to make fun of her when he came home, she decided to get rid of the bread. She took it out and threw it into the salt chuck. However, if the bread did not rise properly, it would not sink either. Instead, the tide carried it out, but not very far. The next tide carried it right back in. When her husband came home there was this ungodly-looking mess for him to see and ask what it was all about. For the next several days the tide would carry the bread out and then bring it right back.

Mr. Beatty: Yes, but she cast her bread on the waters.

Mr. Manly: Now we have Bill C-22 back on our doorstep when it should have been given a decent burial.

I suppose I should congratulate the Government on one significant achievement with regard to Bill C-22. Perhaps it is the Government's most significant achievement over the past

three years. It is something that none of us could have expected. With Bill C-22 the Government made the Senate look good. Only a reactionary Tory Government playing sycophant to Uncle Sam and the American drug industry could have made that obsolete, undemocratic relic of 19th century colonialism, filled with Liberal patronage appointments, look good. The Government has managed to do that and I say, congratulations.

The Government has now announced closure. That is not surprising. Every stage of this Bill has been rammed through by the Government with some form of closure or time allocation. The Conservatives have not been willing to allow the debate on this issue to run its full course. They have had to introduce some form of closure to ram it through.

All of us, opposition Members as well as Government, would like to be able to salvage a little bit of the summer. We are not anxious to prolong any debate. However, the NDP wants to see that the issues are properly raised, and in spite of my own personal wish to be back on Vancouver Island visiting my constituency and enjoying the sunshine, the beaches and beautiful scenery, I am not going to abdicate my responsibility to speak out against a Bill which is so contrary to the interests of ordinary Canadians.

During the last couple of days we have seen a few demonstrators on Parliament Hill calling for passage of C-22. I have no doubt that those people are sincere, even though I understand their pilgrimage here was heavily subsidized by the drug companies. The Tories claim that somehow this demonstration represents strong grassroots support for Bill C-22. If that were really the case I think the Government would have wanted to let the movement build a little before killing it by bringing in closure. If this measure were all that popular with the Canadian people would it not be natural for the Government to let the Canadians see that the Opposition is just being obstructionist?

• (1030)

Instead the Government is bringing in closure because it does not want the people to see this debate. The Government knows that the more Canadians know about this Bill the more they will oppose it. Any window dressing such as the demonstration the other day does not really convince the Government that it has any real popular support.

We have documented time and again the real reasons for this Bill. It is an appetizer for American business interests as they get ready for the great free trade barbeque. Perhaps a little bit of history would help us understand. Up until 1969 Canadians paid the highest drug prices in the world. Under this Bill we will revert to those times.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, let us remember the words of Joe Wallace who said:

Ours is a sovereign nation

Bows to no foreign will

But whenever they cough in Washington