Message from the Senate

access to and participate in our society. The standing committee will be a major vehicle through which those changes will be mirrored. I, therefore, want to thank the House for its participation in this issue.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Hon. Minister. Under the circumstances, perhaps the Chair can observe for the record that all Hon. Members join in the general sense that that which we have just heard with regard to the handicapped is indicative that Hon. Members in this place are seriously working toward the resolution of these problems and a better life for these of our fellow Canadians. It is of significance that this matter has obtained the unanimous support of all Members of this place.

The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following Bills, without amendment: Bill C-15, an Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Canada Evidence Act; Bill C-21, an Act to exempt certain shipping conference practices from the provisions of the Competition Act, to repeal the Shipping Conferences Exemption Act, 1979 and to amend other Acts in consequence thereof; Bill C-42, an Act respecting financial institutions and the deposit insurance system; and Bill C-66, an Act to establish the Veterans Appeal Board and to amend other Acts in relation thereto.

• (1530)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

PATENT EXTENSION (ASPARTAME) ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT—CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENT

On the Order: Private Members' Business

June 29, 1987—Consideration of an amendment made by the Senate to Bill C-259, an Act to extend the terms of a patent relating to a certain food additive.

Mr. Kilgour: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This proposal requires the unanimous consent of the Chamber.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, I have a question. I wonder if the Parliamentary Secretary who introduced the Bill can give us some explanation as to the public interest in the Bill. A spokesperson for the Consumers' Association of Canada expressed concern over the legislation, and then a spokesman for the manufacturers of soft drinks indicated the same thing, and a spokesman for the Canadian Food Manufacturers Association, Mr. Don Jarvis, took a similar position. Mr. Speaker, I wonder, if, before giving unanimous consent, the Hon. Member could possibly explain how the public interest was protected in the Bill.

[English]

Mr. Dingwall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I appreciate the Hon. Member's concern in terms of trying to seek clarification. I would not be opposed to a very short, succinct, two-minute clarification as to what the intent might be, but I check for your guidance as to when you will call for unanimous consent for this Bill to be heard in the Chamber. That is the key.

Mr. Kindy: Mr. Speaker, I want to re-emphasize that we must have unanimous consent. I am preoccupied with this Bill. It concerns Aspartame, a cancer-causing drug, and we are giving an extension for five years to a company, with unanimous consent of the NDP and Liberal Parties. The critic for the NDP, who is the critic on the Patent Act, suddenly lost his principles. I cannot give unanimous consent to that Bill.

Mr. Speaker: The Bill cannot proceed without unanimous consent. I notice a number of Members rising. I take it from what the Hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Kilgour) said, that at least at the moment he is not prepared to give unanimous consent. The Hon. Member for Calgary East (Mr. Kindy) has indicated the same thing.

Mr. Dingwall: As well as I, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: As well as the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—East Richmond (Mr. Dingwall) and others.

However, the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis) was seeking the floor. I will hear him.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to make a short intervention. I am disappointed that things have deteriorated to this extent. I cast the blame right at the desk of the Hon. Member for Calgary East (Mr. Kindy).

If he is going to be straightforward with Members of the House, he will know that this originally was a decision made by the coming together of the three political Parties. The best information we had at the time indicated that this was an appropriate initiative to support.

It was in the best spirit of the House that the Conservative Party, Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party worked together. That Member is essentially casting allegations against selective Members. I want to make it very clear that that might not have been the best decision we made collectively in the House, but it was made unanimously and that Member supported it.