

airspace—Territorial sovereignty; the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow)—Municipal Affairs—Upgrading of infrastructures—Government rejection of request for funds—Government position—Cost of upgrading.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

PATENT ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND-CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS

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

That a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours that this House agrees with amendment 10(a) made by the Senate to Bill C-22, an Act to amend the Patent Act and provide for certain matters in relation thereto, but disagrees with all other amendments except amendments 1(c) and 8, because this House believes that amendments 1(a) and (b), 2(a) and (b), 3, 4(a) and (b), 5(a) and (b), 6, 7(a) and (b), 9 and 10(b) and (c) are in contradiction to the principles of the Bill which will increase intellectual property protection, increase research and development in Canada, create new high-technology jobs, improve the health care of Canadians, and protect consumers from higher drug prices. More specifically:

Amendments 1(a) and (b) delete the definitions of "Board" and "patentee". These definitions are necessary to support the powers of the Patented Medicine Prices Review Board, which is required to protect consumers.

Amendments 2(a) and (b) reduce Canada's export potential and fine chemical manufacturing.

Amendments 3, 4(a) and (b), reduce the periods of market exclusivity, thus eliminating the incentive for increased research and development in Canada.

Amendment 5(a) reduces the period of market exclusivity and export potential, thus reducing economic benefits for Canada.

Amendment 5(b) deletes the Patented Medicine Prices Review Board, which is required to protect consumers, and this amendment also removes the protection for Canadian-invented medicines and thus the incentives for increased research and development in Canada.

Amendments 6, 7(a) and (b), 10(b) and (c) arise out of amendments 1(a) and (b), 2, 3, 4(a) and (b), 5(a) and (b), and are therefore inappropriate.

Amendment 9 arises out of Senate amendment 8, but is not consistent with the House amendment to Senate amendment 8, as set out below. And, that:

Senate amendment 1(c) be amended to read as follows: "(c) Strike out lines 35 to 42 and add the following:

(2) For the purpose of sections 41.11 to 41.16, the notice of compliance that is first issued for either the original and distinct chemical composition of a medicine or the obvious chemical equivalent of the medicine shall be deemed to be the first notice of compliance issued in respect of that medicine."

Senate amendment 8 be amended to read as follows: "insert the heading "Transitional" and the following as clause 31:

31.(1) The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs shall pay to each province for each of the fiscal years commencing in the period April 1, 1987 to March 31, 1991, for the purpose of research and development relating to medicine, an amount equal to the product obtained by multiplying

(a) the quotient obtained by dividing

(i) \$25 million by

Patent Act

(ii) the total population of all provinces for the fiscal year in respect of which the payment is made, by

(b) the population of the province for the fiscal year in respect of which the payment is made.

(2) Payment of any amount under this section shall be made out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund at such times and in such manner as the Governor in Council may, by regulation, prescribe.

(3) For the purposes of this section, the population of a province for a fiscal year shall be the population of that province on the first day of June of that year as determined and published by the Chief Statistician of Canada."

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and pleasure that I rise today to speak to the House of Commons as the representative of the people of the constituency of St. John's East.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, I am proud and pleased today to address Members of the House of Commons on behalf of the people of St. John's East.

I intend to improve my knowledge of French to be more at ease when addressing this House.

[English]

It is of great significance to me that my first full speech in the House of Commons deals with a Bill such as this. I believe there is a lesson for all Newfoundlanders in this Bill and the actions of the Government. I was born six months before the Confederation of Newfoundland and Canada in 1949. I am very conscious that I am here as a Newfoundlander as well as a Canadian to fight to ensure that all Newfoundlanders get their fair and just share of the fruits of this great nation. I am also here to ensure that they get a fair and equal opportunity to use their talents and energy to better themselves, their families and their country.

For several hundred years before we became part of Canada the people of the communities of St. John's East struggled against a harsh and demanding environment in order to make a living, mostly from the sea in the great fishing and sealing industries which existed off our coasts and in Labrador. They also struggled against their economic masters, the great fish merchants of the west country of England, the multinationals of their day, and the fish merchants of Newfoundland, their local counterparts. The fish merchants determined the price they would pay fishermen for their fish. These same merchants often being the only source of supply, would also decide the price of food and other supplies sold to fishermen. This system benefited the few and neglected and kept down the many. As a consequence of this economic relationship, Governments of Newfoundland have also been in a position of subservience to other countries and other interests.

While Canada was experiencing a level of maturity constitutionally in 1931, Newfoundland was going through a very severe economic period. In its relationship with the mother country, as England was then known, the Newfoundland Government, not the people of Newfoundland, gave in to its