

Patent Act

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the Hon. Member. Would he agree with this comment which was made on July 17, 1981, and reported at page 11679 of *Hansard*:

At the very outset I must say that I abhor this tactic.

Referring to what the Government was attempting to do:

I find it offensive. I find it repugnant because it strikes at the basic fabric of our parliamentary democracy. Instead of having a parliamentary democracy, we have what resembles a parliamentary dictatorship.

Mr. Rossi: Who said that?

Mr. Riis: That was said by the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) on July 17, 1981.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): How could you, Don?

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Member is quoting a statement out of context.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mazankowski: Any time that the function of Parliament is frustrated and not allowed to work, denying any Government Member, cabinet Minister or Private Member the right to introduce a Bill and have it debated, the right for Parliament to work and the right for democracy to work, it is a total subversion of the parliamentary process. That is what we have been putting up with here for the last week.

Mr. Rossi: That is what you did in 1981.

An Hon. Member: That is why you are out of power.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): That is debate. The Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) has the floor on a question or comment.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I was asking my hon. friend what he thought of the quote. I will just finish it. The Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) 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.

By virtue of a closure motion today we have a further contempt for and erosion of the spirit and privileges of this institution.

He goes on to say in closing:

I believe tyranny begins when parliamentary debate ends.

Would the Hon. Member comment on that?

Mr. Mazankowski: We want parliamentary debate.

Mr. Boudria: Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that that was very well said indeed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions and comments are now over. The Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) on a point of order.

[English]

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. You said that the time for questions and comments is over, but I think in all fairness that we should take the time used by the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) in attempting to give us a lesson. We need no lessons from people who wanted to let the bells ring for 14 days.

• (1250)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I would like the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) to note that I gave the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) an extra minute and a half because of the questions and comments. Therefore, the period for questions and comments, as I said, has now terminated. Resuming debate.

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on Bill C-22 because it has become obvious that this is going to be a very rare opportunity. I was surprised on Friday when, after only seven speakers had addressed themselves to this Bill, the Government House Leader indicated he would bring in a motion for time limitation, a form of closure.

This is a Bill of great importance to all Canadian people, yet the Government is introducing a form of closure after only a few speakers have had a chance to address themselves to this issue. We have introduced Petitions from literally thousands of Canadians from coast to coast who protest against the nature of this Bill. They point out it is going to result in increased costs to themselves and to their provinces. They object to the way in which this Government is bowing down to the United States. They are calling upon the Government to not proceed with this Bill. But we have a Government which wishes to push the Bill through the House as quickly as possible. We expect it will then try to do the same in committee because it is afraid of its own Bill. It does not like what is in this legislation and does not want the legislation to be examined by the Canadian people.

Our purpose in this debate and in the entire process, both within the House and outside of it, is to try to draw as much public attention to this Bill as we possibly can, because when the people realize what is in the Bill they will oppose it. The Government knows it is in some trouble with Bill C-22 and wants to try to dispose of it as quietly as possible. We do not intend to let that happen.

Canadians do not like this Bill for a number of reasons. The more they know about it the more they dislike it. First, of course, they see it as just one more example of the way in which the Government is bowing down to the dictates of Uncle Sam. Uncle Sam is spending \$100 million to send the Contras