

Patent Act

regressive Bill. It is a Bill that ignores the reality of Canada, and ignores the reality of the lot of the average Canadian.

I petition Members opposite—

An Hon. Member: You say that about every Bill.

Mr. Tobin: I petition Members opposite, as they did in respect of the attempt to deindex senior citizens' pensions, to go back to their ridings, to go across this land, to go into the main streets of the towns and communities and into the houses at the end of the street and on the wrong side of the tracks, and to then come back to this Parliament and tell us that Bill C-22 is necessary or that it can still be supported in good conscience.

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the speech we have just heard gives new meaning to the word "demagoguery" in terms of content. I see that the Hon. Member for Sudbury (Mr. Frith) has just entered the Chamber. Perhaps the Hon. Member for Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin) should talk to his colleague, the Hon. Member for Sudbury, who is himself a pharmacist and who said, in *The Canadian Pharmaceutical Review*, that he is in favour of restoring—

An Hon. Member: Give us Eastman.

Mr. Andre: —that he is in favour of restoring patent protection to the inventors or discoverers of drugs. He accepts the centuries-old principle that the inventor, the creator, has in fact created something of value, something of importance, and as such deserves patent protection.

He might invite his Leader into his plush office—and I presume he was describing his office when he went on about the plushness of offices. He might invite his Leader into his plush office and talk to his Leader about the time when he was in the private sector, as Chairman of Sandoz, a multinational drug company, and the fact that his Leader, while in that position, was frequently heard to say to his colleagues in the business that the Government had gone too far in 1969 and that patent protection should be restored, with some limitations on the compulsory licences.

He might talk to the former Member for Nickel Belt, the Hon. Judy Erola. Perhaps he should talk to the Hon. Member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet) who, as Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, brought down a White Paper admitting that in fact it was necessary to make changes to the Patent Act to restore patent protection. This was a White Paper of a Government of which the Hon. Member was a supporter.

Before he launches into these great tirades about understanding and sensitivity, he might perhaps examine the record of his own Party. But then, of course, Sir, I would be asking him to be an exception in his own Party. If they have two positions on trade, two positions on the Cruise, why should they not have two positions on Bill C-22?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Andre: Why not?

Mr. Dingwall: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On a point of order, the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—East Richmond (Mr. Dingwall).

An Hon. Member: Here we go again! No one interrupted his speech.

Mr. Dingwall: Mr. Speaker, I cannot help it if the Hon. Minister is extremely envious of the fact—

An Hon. Member: What is the point of order?

Some Hon. Members: This is not a point of order.

Mr. Dingwall: —is extremely envious, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that we have with us in the Liberal Party perhaps the greatest orator in the House. If he is jealous of that fact, Mr. Speaker, fine; but—

An Hon. Member: That is not a point of order.

Some Hon. Members: Order!

An Hon. Member: What is the point of order?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sure the Hon. Member will tell us.

Mr. Dingwall: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is this: I do not think it appropriate for a Minister of the Crown, particularly in respect of a piece of legislation before the House, to mislead the House purposely on the positions of other Members.

An Hon. Member: Well said.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Andre).

Mr. Andre: Mr. Speaker, before I run out of time, I wish to inform the House as follows: There has been consultation among representatives of the Parties. It has not been possible to reach agreement respecting the provisions of Standing Order 115 or Standing Order 116, dealing with the report stage of Bill C-22, an Act to amend the Patent Act and to provide for certain matters in relation thereto. Therefore, at the next sitting of the House, I shall propose a motion, pursuant to Standing Order 117, to allocate one sitting day to the report stage and two sitting days to the third reading of Bill C-22.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some Hon. Members: Shame, shame!

Mr. Andre: Mr. Speaker, just before members of the Opposition get on with their demagoguery, I wish to make a