

Patent Act

Senate could scuttle the Bill anytime, I think they should be commended for their dedication and excellent job. I think that the amendments which they are proposing to this Tory Government—for what reason? Everybody is saying: We want to protect Canadian consumers. The Government should say so in so many words in the legislation, to make sure that consumers will be protected and that the multinationals will not abuse the situation. Government Members will have to come clean in their own riding and answer the question: Why did you not support this or that amendment to the Bill?

Contrary to the NDP, the Liberal Party is saying: We want to make sure that there will be jobs in the Montreal area and in other areas. That is what we want and that is what the Senators are asking: Put this down in writing, right into the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, all Conservative Members, including Quebecers and others, but particularly those of Quebec, will have to come up with an answer. Why did you not want to guarantee this provision in the Bill, why did you not include this provision in the Bill? Considering the attitude of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Andre) yesterday when he tabled amendments in English only, I am not surprised that he could not care less about protecting Quebec consumers.

Finally, I dare hope—and this is my position, Mr. Speaker—that the Bill will be sent back to the Senate. The Government wanted to forge ahead, the Government wanted to stick to its position. Hopefully the senators will let it go through as passed by the House, despite the fact that I will vote against Bill C-22, despite the fact that my Party is against this measure.

With respect to democracy I think it is important that the House should always have priority over the non-elected. Mr. Speaker, I hope that in two or three years, if ever we realize that consumers have to pay high prices—this mistake—costs, consequences, then we will be able to blame the Government and the Senate for working at loggerheads instead of trying to find effective means to protect consumers and jobs.

Mrs. Bertrand: Mr. Speaker, I usually listen when the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) speaks because I know that he always speaks his mind. However, I never saw him skating around as much as he did this evening. It is true that the hockey season has started, but the Hon. Member certainly skated around this evening.

His speech was in three parts. He closed by accusing the New Democratic Party of just about everything. What I find surprising is that, most of the time, the Liberal Party votes with the New Democratic Party in this House.

Second, he blamed the Senate for its position. Another thing which surprises me is that I read in last week's newspapers that, according to the leader of the Quebec Liberal caucus, the whole federal caucus is behind the Senate. It made the headlines of the newspapers. I did not believe my own eyes. Perhaps the Hon. Member is being frank, but I still do not understand his attitude. He is skating around the issue.

Finally, I would like to ask him a question since, as a Quebecer, he is aware that Quebec would receive nearly 45 per cent of all the benefits of this bill because of investments and jobs created, especially for our young people, and as a Quebecer, he knows that all the parties in the National Assembly asked unanimously on two occasions that this Bill be approved, as has the *Fédération de l'âge d'or*. In fact, I have heard no one in Quebec object to this Bill; even the man in the street, who should find such a technical and complex Bill difficult to understand, is asking: What is happening in Ottawa and why is the Senate blocking this Bill? Can the Hon. Member, who is a Quebecer and who knows that nearly everyone in Quebec, which is the province I know best, fervently wishes that this Bill be adopted, justify the fact that he will vote against it?

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, it is simply because the Hon. Member and I do not meet the same kind of people. The House will recall that the Hon. Member, who just commented on the issue of old age security pensions, stated that a government was under no obligation to keep its promises and could renege at any time.

She started by saying that I was frank and forthright but was skating on thin ice. Since I am against the Liberal Senate, she said that I was forthright. I will try to put all this into perspective for the Hon. Member. First of all, one can be either for or against a Bill, even if Quebecers are in favour. The people of Quebec do not want the money to go to the multinationals. They want a minimum of protection. Second, I have every right to be against this Bill and even to object to the behaviour of the Senate because its Members are not elected. I think that is my privilege. If my lieutenant in the caucus wanted to say what he said, it is up to him to answer the question. As I said before, I have a motion on the Order Paper asking for limitations on the power of the Senate ... maybe the Hon. Member has not been following this issue very closely.

Even when she says—I mentioned that there were people in Quebec who were in favour. However, to be perfectly honest, and I think intellectual honesty is very important here, we have the FADOQ which is in favour, and the AQDR which is opposed. We should not give the impression, and if I did I would be imitating the rhetoric of the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt, we must not give the impression that all Quebecers are in favour. Just because the Leader of the PQ and the Leader of the Liberal Party are in favour does not mean everybody else is as well.

In the world outside and here in the House, and perhaps this could enhance the quality of the House, the vast majority of Quebecers are in favour of some kind of protection. People do not make a distinction between seven and ten years. They are in favour of protection in order to create jobs, but especially to protect the consumer. To be perfectly honest, there is a group