

actions, the ill-conceived whims of the federal government in terms of what it has done concerning the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency.

I bring to the attention of the Chair that this minister is grossly negligent in the fact that he supports the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency when his own president, an appointment made by Order in Council, said clearly and unequivocally that the user fees which are being charged by the Department of Transport at airports in Atlantic Canada are causing undue havoc to tourism in Atlantic Canada.

Oh, oh, the hon. member says this is not relevant. Sneaky, it is sneaky, Madam Speaker. That is why the minister has joined with his colleagues to put it in the bill. The sneak attack again, on a Friday afternoon. That is what they wanted to do, Madam Speaker. But, no, no—

**An hon. member:** We weren't born yesterday.

**Mr. Dingwall:** That's right. I want to tell the hon. minister opposite that if he does not think that is relevant, the president, Mr. Peter Lesaux, of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency said in a speech delivered to tourism operators in Atlantic Canada that federal government policy of increasing user fees at our airports in Atlantic Canada and in our ports has caused and will cause great difficulties and hardship for our tourism industry. That is not relevant?

I understand why it is not relevant, Madam Speaker; because the minister opposite just does not care. That is the fact.

There are a number of other items. Under section 113 of Bill C-35 amendments are made to the Patent Act. The old act read, and I quote from subsection 34(e):

An applicant shall on the specification of his invention particularly indicate and distinctly claim the part, improvement or combination which he claims is his or her invention.

It is very important in terms of intellectual property, the arguments which would flow from that in terms of the rewards that people give to individuals who go out and are creative, inventive, and what-have-you—and for patent protection. That is why it was in there.

### *Government Orders*

• (1500)

Clause 113 of this bill says that subsection 34(1), which I have referred to, of the Patent Act is amended by adding the word "and", and at the end of (c) thereof, by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (d) thereof, in essence repealing paragraph (e).

No longer will an applicant be forced to specify his or her invention, particularly indicating and distinctly claiming the part, improvement or combination which he or she claims as his or her intention.

I wonder who that protects. I wonder who this little benefit has been given to. Is it the generic drug companies which traditionally in this country have been able to help keep drug prices down to a reasonable level as reported in every federal-provincial document ever in this country. They have been the ones who have kept the prices down so that average Canadians, male and female across this country, can afford prescription drugs.

Madam Speaker, I ask: Who is this amendment under Bill C-35 appealing to? Is it the generic drug industry? Is it the employees of the generic drug industry? I do not think so.

I am not saying it is inherently wrong, but I think we should be clear as to whom and to what the government is attempting to do by Bill C-35. I am somewhat disappointed.

I am somewhat disappointed that the Minister of Veterans Affairs has left the Chamber and probably for very good reason. I do not comment on him leaving the House, but I do say that for ministers of the Crown to suggest and to imply that we, in the opposition, in reviewing Bill C-35 which affects upward of 90 federal statutes that somehow were not relevant, that somehow we ought not to be involved in this debate and that we ought to rubber stamp it is totally irresponsible.

I think it characterizes for me and for my colleagues on this side of the House the stage of mentality of the members on the government side.

It has been seven years. It has been seven long, arduous years for many Canadians. To tell you quite frankly, we know, we see, we hear and we watch the actions and the omission of actions of members opposite. We have come to the conclusion that it is not merely a game of incompetence by the other side or misman-