

The data provided thus far demonstrate that the 1969 Act had no adverse impact on employment in the pharmaceuticals industry in Canada. That is very, very clear. But the data tell us nothing about employment in the Province of Quebec. In this respect the Minister has hauled out from time to time a resolution tasked by the National Assembly in the Province of Quebec.

What happened in Quebec? As we know, the pharmaceuticals industry is almost exclusively concentrated in the Toronto and Montreal areas. The data that I have show that between 1953 and 1982 Quebec's share of employment appears to have declined in this industry and gone to Ontario. For example, in 1953 some 48.3 per cent of employment in the industry was in Quebec while the corresponding 1982 figure was 43.3 per cent. It should be emphasized, however, that these percentages fluctuated a great deal from year to year, as shown in the figures that I have here in front of me.

The question which now needs to be asked is whether or not this relative loss of jobs in Quebec is the result of the impact of the 1969 Act concerning pharmaceuticals. It does not appear to be. The employment data in fact indicate that the ratio of employment in Quebec decreased in many industries since the 1960s. In manufacturing alone Quebec's percentage of employment dropped steadily after 1962. In 1962 employment in the manufacturing sector in Quebec was 32.7 per cent while in Ontario it was 48.3 per cent. In 1982 the figure had decreased to 26.5 per cent in Quebec while it was 48.4 per cent in Ontario.

The conclusion must therefore be that the 1969 Act had no adverse effects on employment in the pharmaceuticals and medicines industry in Canada or in the Province of Quebec. I share that information with Members opposite who for whatever reasons would want us to believe that the 1969 Act had a disastrous effect on job creation in Canada when nothing could be further from the truth.

The Minister said that he had received a great many letters from Canadians in support of Bill C-22. Members on this side of the House would have hoped that Members opposite who are receiving such mail by the carload in support of the Bill would have participated more in the debate that preceded today's debate. But that did not take place. The Minister touted some of his—

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I apologize to the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—East Richmond (Mr. Dingwall) for interrupting him, but I waited until one minute before one o'clock since I know that he will resume his very good remarks at three o'clock.

Mr. Speaker, after listening carefully to the remarks of the Minister who spoke a short time ago, this is the first opportunity I have had to give notice of a question of privilege, if we find on checking the "blues" that there seems to be one. I believe that I heard the Minister say that the Opposition used

under handed and unparliamentary tactics in reference to some 11 amendments in committee and some 40 at report stage. It is not unparliamentary for any Hon. Member in the House to abide by the rules of the House. His remarks are a reflection on the integrity of Members, specifically opposition Members of the committee. More specifically, they reflect on the Chair. The Chair would not allow unparliamentary procedures. I believe the Minister should withdraw his remarks.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Now that the Hon. Member has risen on a point of order I hope that he will give written notice of his question of privilege so that this matter can be brought up tomorrow, since the "blues" cannot be used in this respect. If the Hon. Member is willing to do that then I am sure the Speaker will consider the matter.

It being 1 p.m., I do now leave the chair until 2 p.m. this day.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[English]

DISASTERS

TRAGIC DEATHS OF FISHERMEN OFF EAST AND WEST COASTS

Mr. George Henderson (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, every day on the open waters, far from land, our fishermen have learned to respect the awesome power of Mother Nature. They know that they are often only an accident away from certain tragedy. This year has brought much sorrow to our fishing communities.

In January the fishing vessel *Myers III* was caught in a sudden storm off Newfoundland's south coast, claiming the lives of five fishermen including four brothers from the Myers family. Then, on the Pacific Coast, the vessel *Scotia Cape* disappeared with its six crew members. Several days ago there were two accidents in the Gulf of St. Lawrence which claimed the lives of four fishermen. Those fishermen were all trying to make a living in a very tough occupation.

It is often said that our fishermen and other primary producers are the backbone of our economy. Too often they have made the ultimate sacrifice. I am sure I speak for all my colleagues in asking the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Siddon) and his cabinet colleagues, along with their provincial counterparts, to do everything possible to make our fishing industry safer. I cannot think of a more worthy cause.