

Patent Act

Mr. John Reimer (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege which arises out of the comments made by the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps) in her supplementary question to the Minister of State for Immigration (Mr. Weiner). Her comments amount to a misrepresentation of the meeting held between myself and some members of the Public Service Union in Kitchener.

The issue raised with me by the Public Service Union was initially the issue of the confidentiality of the employment records and files in the Kitchener Employment Centre. To that point, the Hon. Member for Hamilton East is correct. However, as the September meeting to which she referred continued with union representatives, they admitted that the real issue was not confidentiality but was, first, contracting out of cleaning services and, second, job security. This is where I believe the Hon. Member for Hamilton East was not fully informed.

Unfortunately, because the Hon. Member was not fully informed, she ended up misrepresenting what took place at that meeting. I, therefore, respectfully request that the Hon. Member for Hamilton East be ordered to withdraw her allegations and correct her misrepresentation of the very good and productive meeting I had with the Public Service Union representatives in Kitchener.

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I am glad the Hon. Member for Kitchener (Mr. Reimer) at least has the decency to admit that the meeting did deal with the issue of confidentiality of records. Of course, it dealt with the issue of contracting out at the same time because there is a lot of concern by a lot of Public Service unions in Canada that it is impossible to guarantee confidentiality when they have a contracting out process which does nothing to guarantee the kind of commitment to the Public Service by private companies which must come perforce from public servants. Therefore, I see no conflict between a discussion of contracting out and confidentiality. In fact, the two go hand in hand.

The representations which were made to the Hon. Member were that the concerns about confidentiality were raised because of contracting out. The Hon. Member said he was going to take those concerns to Ottawa. The concerns were expressed more than a year ago. The confidentiality was breached at the Kitchener office this week. I would suggest to the Hon. Member that he and his Government should get their act together on the issue of confidentiality.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair has heard the question of privilege and has heard the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps) in reply. I think I would have the approval of all Hon. Members in noting that this is not a question of privilege. It is certainly a question of a different recollection of facts. Both Hon. Members have had a chance to put the record as they would have it and that closes the matter.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

PATENT ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs) moved that Bill C-22, an Act to amend the Patent Act and to provide for certain matters in relation thereto, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate—

Mr. Murphy: Point of order.

Mr. Robinson: Point of order.

Mr. Andre:—today in the second reading debate—

Mr. Murphy: Point of order.

Mr. Andre:—on Bill C-22.

Mr. Murphy: Point of order.

Mr. Andre: This is an essential and important piece of legislation for Canada.

Mr. Murphy: Point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy) on a point of order.

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Speaker, as soon as you recognized the Minister, I rose at that very same point with the intention of moving that the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) be now heard.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mazankowski: Sure you did. Forget it.

Mr. Murphy: I did so. I do move, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member for Burnaby be now heard.

Some Hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Hon. Members will know that under the procedure which is in effect at the present time it was appropriate to recognize the Minister and it was not appropriate to recognize any other particular Hon. Member. The Hon. Member who rises to move that some other Hon. Member be heard must realize that there are times when the Chair would have to entertain that particular motion. However, this is not one of them.

Mr. Andre: Mr. Speaker, the debate surrounding Canada's Patent Act has been long, complex and controversial. When the Liberal Government made changes to the Patent Act in 1969, it was a regressive step for Canada. These changes not only resulted in misuse of the Patent Act in an attempt to control prices but also tampered with the fundamental purpose