

Adjournment Motion

relations. They are worth it in the sense of respecting the principle of intellectual property, recognizing that people who create have a right to enjoy their creation. However, when you look at the industrial benefits, the research and development, and recognize their importance, and balance that against any potential increase in costs, you cannot reach any conclusion other than that this is a good Bill, good for Canada, and will provide enormous benefits. I look forward to committee study so I can talk about this in more detail.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Hon. Member for York South—Weston (Mr. Nunziata) rising on a point of order?

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the House was magnanimous enough to allow the Minister to continue beyond his allotted time I would ask you to canvass the House to determine whether or not there is unanimous consent to allow questions of the Minister in view of his lengthy statement.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member has requested unanimous consent to put questions to the Minister. That is not the rule, but if it is the unanimous wish of the House and the Minister, then it can be done.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Andre: Mr. Speaker, I am really anxious to get this Bill to committee so I can answer all the questions which might be put. I am reluctant to take up more time of the House and deny the Liberal Party spokesman an opportunity to participate in the debate. I gather there was a precedent this morning as well where we were denied that opportunity, which causes my colleagues to say, regrettably, no.

● (1600)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 66, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier)—Royal Canadian Mounted Police—Inquiry whether agreement exists to reduce number of Francophone employees. (b) Request for explanations concerning letter; and the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—East Richmond (Mr. Dingwall)—Regional Development—Distribution of expenditures. (b) Regional disparities—Request for new policy.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

PATENT ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Andre 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.

Mrs. Thérèse Killens (Saint-Michel—Ahuntsic): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to take part in the debate on the proposed drug patents legislation, and it is indeed a pleasure to do so, since this is the first time I have had a chance to rise in the House as the Official Opposition critic for consumer and corporate affairs.

In fact, the Right Hon. Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Turner) had just given me that responsibility, when fate decided otherwise. A car accident kept me from any active involvement in the legislation tabled by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs last year and passed by Parliament. I am referring to the amendments to the Tax Rebate Discounting Act and to the Competition Tribunal Act.

Before going any further, I would like to take this opportunity to thank publicly my colleagues who substituted for me during my convalescence. They are: the Hon. Member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet), who was very successful in his work on the two Bills I just mentioned; the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) who took charge of the lobbying dossier; the Hon. Member for Grand Falls—White Bay—Labrador (Mr. Rompkey), who monitored the copyright issue and diligently attended the proceedings of the Standing Committee on Consumer and Corporate Affairs; and the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) who saw to the representation of my constituents and their concerns. I also wish to thank those Members who covered all proceedings relating to consumer and corporate affairs. Furthermore, I want to thank all Members and employees on the Hill who sent me their best wishes for a speedy recovery. It was much appreciated. Finally, I want to thank the Hon. Member for Sudbury (Mr. Frith) who was in charge of monitoring the drug patents dossier and who prepared the Liberal response in anticipation of the introduction of this legislation on June 27 this year. The Hon. Member for Sudbury condemned these proposals as being too severe and lacking any justification, considering the absence of any firm and explicit commitment in the Bill.

When the revised version of the drug patent provisions was tabled last November 7, I denounced the Bill because these propositions quite simply ignore the Eastman Commission recommendations and tip the scales in favour of the multinationals.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that Hon. Members fully understand my position and that of our Party. The Liberal Party has never come out against changes in this sector. The