

*Patent Act—Trade Marks Act*

the minister as a directive to the Patent Commissioner in the setting of a royalty for the compulsory licensing of drugs.

**Mr. Saltsman:** Would the hon. member permit a question? Is he suggesting that all expenditures on the cost of information, regardless of how extravagant and unnecessary they may be, be reimbursed?

**Mr. Ritchie:** Mr. Speaker, the answer is that I feel each drug has to, shall we say, carry its own weight. If it is felt that the promotion is over expensive, then the Commissioner would cut back the amount allowed. I think we have to take into account and give some weight to this factor in awarding the royalty.

**Mr. Saltsman:** As a further question—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member is asking questions. I wonder if the hon. member for Dauphin is prepared to receive questions after he has completed his contribution to the debate.

**Mr. Ritchie:** Mr. Speaker, I will answer this question also, if I can.

**Mr. Saltsman:** I wonder if the hon. member has some suggestion for the establishment of criteria of what constitutes a fair selling price and a fair cost of providing information?

**Mr. Ritchie:** I have no real percentage formula. As I say again, it will have to depend on the individual case, but I bring this forward as I think promotion is necessary. I think the hon. gentleman would agree with this, and it should be given some weight in the awarding of this royalty.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the house ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said amendment? All those in favour of the said amendment will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Speaker:** Those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the amendment lost.

Amendment (Mr. Monteith) negatived.

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford)** I move:

That Bill C-102, an act to amend the Patent Act, the Trade Marks Act and the Food and Drugs Act be amended by inserting in Clause 1 (4) after the word "prescribed" on line 29, page 2, the following words:

"that the Commissioner may at any time revoke such a licence, where the terms specified in the application are not complied with."

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the amendment is very important. In fact, it is predicated upon the same principle, that is the protection of the consumer.

It reads as follows:

—that the Commissioner may at any time revoke such a licence, where the terms specified in the application are not complied with.

The same problem always arises. We have read numerous briefs presented to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) and there is not yet a code to protect the consumers.

A code should have been adopted under which rules would have been clearly defined so that consumers could be properly protected. At present, many companies delight in putting on the market toxic chemicals that are health hazards.

Many companies are happy to sell "scrap" and I am shocked to see tonight that the government wants those products to remain on the shelves. Perhaps we asked ourselves: Do we have a "scrap" government?

We should like the Canadian consumer, who must pay high prices for his drugs, to be able to get quality products, and so be able to differentiate between quality products and "scrap" products by means of a code or regulations established in his favour.

A few years back, that is in 1967, an important committee has studied all the aspects of the manufacturing and sale of different products. Briefs were submitted by consumers associations from all the provinces. Some manufacturers complained that they had to meet the unfair competition from other unscrupulous companies which would put anything on the market and use packaging system designed to deceive the public. Prices were not correct considering the weight, the measure, the quantity, and the quality indicated on the label.

● (9:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

**Mr. Basford:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of order. While undoubtedly the hon.