

drug prices. This proposed Crown corporation could assist these small companies to compete against the larger companies, and would receive the assistance of government credibility. For that reason I suggest such a corporation would be of great value to Canadians in their fight for lower drug prices.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I might point out to the hon. member for Selkirk that I was listening with some patience to the hon. member for Waterloo. The point at issue at this stage is not the substance of the amendment but whether the amendment is admissible. I am prepared to rule now on the admissibility of the amendment.

Clause 5(1a) of Bill C-102 deals only with the making of regulations respecting imported drugs. The amendment, if adopted, would necessitate the setting up of a crown corporation for the purpose, among other things, of manufacturing drugs in Canada, and in doing so goes well beyond the purpose of the bill and would have the effect of creating a public charge.

Reference may be made to paragraph 13 of May's 17th edition, page 551, where it is stated:

Amendments or new clauses creating public charges cannot be proposed, if no money resolution or ways and means resolution has been passed, or if the amendment or clause is not covered by the terms of the resolution.

Furthermore, as stated in paragraph 1 on page 549 of May's 17th edition:

An amendment is out of order . . . if it is irrelevant to the subject matter, or beyond the scope of the clause under consideration.

For the reasons stated I regret to say that the amendment is not in order.

**Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo):** Mr. Speaker, 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 immediately after clause 5 (b) the following new subparagraph:

"(c) the prohibition of distribution of drug samples by drug manufacturers for purposes of advertising and promotion, except when a physician or the pharmacist makes a separate specific written request for samples of the particular drug or drugs in which he may be interested,"

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Again I confess certain misgivings about this amendment but I am prepared to hear the hon. member for Waterloo briefly.

**Mr. Saltsman:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I must remark on your great constancy and patience. In view of the apparent difficulty

*Patent Act—Trade Marks Act*

that has been created in attempting to amend this clause in the particular way we have outlined and in the interests of expediting the work on this bill and the desire of almost all of us to see the bill become law, we would be prepared to withdraw this amendment as well as the next amendment. We will indicate our position in the debate on third reading.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Saltsman) withdrawn.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Am I to understand that the hon. member for Waterloo proposes to withdraw amendment No. 13 as well as No. 12?

**Mr. Saltsman:** That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The house will now turn to amendment No. 14 in the name of the hon. member for Perth.

**Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth):** Mr. Speaker, 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 adding clause 6, as follows:

"6. Within two years of the coming into force of this act, the Minister of National Health and Welfare shall prepare and table in Parliament a report reviewing the operation and the effect of the act and all regulations enacted thereunder and the said report shall be considered by parliament and its appropriate committees."

I do not intend to speak at length on this amendment, but the principle of it was first introduced this session by the members of the other place when they proposed an amendment to the hazardous substances bill somewhat along these lines. Despite the rather strong criticism of the industry by the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman), I feel that it is an important one. Incidentally, I am surprised that we have not heard, either yesterday or today, from the hon. members for Laprairie (Mr. Watson), Lachine (Mr. Rock) and Vaudreuil (Mr. Emard) who were so vehement in their remarks in committee. I would have liked to see them here today to present their case and to support me in mine.

However, as the evidence indicates, this industry employs some 10,000 workers, about 2,500 of them university graduates. I think there is a responsibility to let the house know just what is going to happen to this industry and what has happened to it in the past. I am not holding a brief for the industry as such, but I think it has been proven that as a result