

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

PATENT ACT

ALLOCATION OF TIME TO CONSIDER SECOND READING AND REFERENCE STAGE OF BILL C-22

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Mazankowski:

That, further to the notice given on Monday, November 24, 1986, by the Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council, and pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 117, in relation to Bill C-22, an Act to amend the Patent Act and to provide for certain matters in relation thereto, one additional sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration of the second reading and reference to a legislative committee stage of the said Bill: and

That, at fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for the consideration of government business on that day, any proceedings then before the House shall be interrupted, if necessary, for the purpose of this Order and, in turn, every question necessary necessary to dispose of the said stage of the Bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

And the amendment of Mr. Riis (p. 1798).

Mr. Jack Shields (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I have a very short time in which to respond to my friends, the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) and the Hon. Member for Yorkton—Melville (Mr. Nystrom). They both indicated that there has been a short time for debate. One can only take that as NDP double-speak when looking at the history of the Bill.

The Bill was introduced on November 6. There was delay after delay and one need only read *Hansard* beginning on November 6 right through to today to see the delaying tactics put in place by members of the NDP at every opportunity. They did this along with their coalition partners, members of the Liberal Party.

The Opposition did not want to debate this Bill. The problem is that they did not want to see the Bill go forward into committee where it would stand to scrutiny and the test of clause by clause study. They did not want to do that because they knew they would not be able to sustain their case along with the scare tactics they have used right across Canada. They have been trying to scare old and sick people, and I personally feel that that is an immoral approach to this whole situation. They did not have the courage to allow the Bill to go to committee where it would be studied and scrutinized by learned people from all across Canada. That is the problem and has always been the problem with the NDP Party.

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Tardif (Richmond—Wolfe): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak to this important matter, and I think the Government's attitude has made it abundantly clear the Opposition is quite right in objecting to closure. After a scant seven hours of debate on a Bill that will have an impact on every Canadian in this country—who has not at some time in his life been prescribed drugs?—a Bill that will have a

Time Allocation

dramatic impact on the cost of drugs, the Party opposite would have us believe that, for the sake of creating jobs, we should agree to a proposal as objectionable and shocking as this one happens to be.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that in the interest of consumers and Canadians generally, this House should have had a lot more time to consider and examine this important piece of legislation that will have an impact, as I said earlier, on all consumers of prescription drugs.

The cost of the jobs that may be created and to which the Party opposite is constantly referring will be astronomical, Mr. Speaker. The multinationals will get phenomenal amounts of money out of the consumer and invest only a marginal portion of that money which, in the final instance, may create a few jobs. I believe that the interests of the consumer and of all Canadians are being blatantly sabotaged by the Government's attitude, and more particularly by the motion this afternoon to put a gag on our right to speak in the House.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. It being 4.08 p.m., the two hours provided for the consideration of the motion now before the House under the provisions of Standing Order 117 have expired. Accordingly, under the terms of the Standing Order, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put every question necessary to dispose of the motion.

The question is on the amendment standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Call in the Members.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Riis) which was negated on the following division: