

Patent Act

(d) by striking out line 42 on page 17 and substituting the following:

"accordance with subsection (5) or (5.1),"

(e) by striking out line 17 on page 20 and substituting the following:

"purpose of the report referred to in"

(f) by striking out lines 2 and 3 on page 23 and substituting the following:

"shall contain

(a) a summary of pricing trends in the pharmaceutical industry; and

(b) the name of each patentee to whom a notice under subsection 41.15(1.1) or 41.16(5.1) was sent during the year and a statement as to the status of the matter in respect of which the notice was sent."

(g) by striking out lines 4 and 5 on page 23 and substituting the following:

"(2) The summary referred to in paragraph (1)(a) may be based on information and".

And that Senate amendment 16(a) be amended to read as follows:

That Clause 15 of Bill C-22 be amended by adding, immediately after line 17 on page 19, the following:

"(12) Where an order is made under paragraph 6(d) in respect of a medicine, the prohibitions set out in subsections 41.11(1) and 41.14(1) cease to apply in respect of the medicine effective on the date of the order."

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I wish to continue this debate on an important piece of legislation affecting all Canadians and to make particular reference to the reasonableness of opposition Members, opposition Parties, and the other Chamber with regard to suggesting amendments to Bill C-22. As I indicated yesterday, the Government had the opportunity to accept reasonable amendments which in no way derogate from the over-all thrust of Bill C-22, which merely codify in law the statements which the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Andre) made across the country, in this House, and before the various committees of Parliament.

Unfortunately, the Minister responsible has seen fit to reject those suggested amendments notwithstanding their reasonableness. Canadians must very seriously question the truthfulness of the statements which the Government is making.

I attempted yesterday to provide an analogy to Members in the House. When an individual goes to buy a car, stove, microwave, fridge, or whatever, and is told by the salesperson that the product has all sorts of guarantees and can perform in particular ways but learns, upon going to pay for the item, that the salesperson is not prepared to put in writing the guarantees of which he or she had spoken, the consumer will be very suspicious of the intent and truthfulness of the remarks.

Mr. Nunziata: They wouldn't buy.

Mr. Dingwall: As my colleague has said, they would not buy. We cannot buy the response which the Government has made to the reasonable amendments proposed to it. I ask again and again what the Government has to hide. Why can the Government not believe in its own words? Why can it not insert in the legislation the things which it has promised? After all, the amendments which we are seeking, which I am sure

would be supported by most reasonable men and women, would never be triggered if the commitments which we have heard from the multinational corporations were kept.

Our reservation, suspicion, and questioning of the truthfulness of the statements of the Government and the Minister are very real. We had hoped that we could codify the suggestions into law, thereby assuring all Canadians that the word of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs means something. The Minister talks to people in Quebec about job guarantees, additional expenditures to be made on research and development, and the maintenance of reasonable prices for prescription drugs. I would have thought that he would have seized this opportunity to show that he is really committed to what he has said.

It is with great regret that Members in this Party will continue to doubt and to question aloud the veracity of the statements of the Minister and, more particularly, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) because, in the end result, it is the Prime Minister, as the Leader of the Party and the Leader of the Government, who must bear the ultimate responsibility for the actions or lack of action of the Minister he has appointed to serve in his Cabinet.

I have said repeatedly in this Chamber that this Minister, who has been given the twofold responsibility of corporate interests and consumer interests, has chosen to represent only one, that is, the corporate interests of the country. As evidenced since 1984, consumers will have to continue to wage their battle to obtain fairness, equality, and objectivity from the Government. We will continue that fight on their behalf, not only on this Bill but on other measures which are lacking in the Government's agenda for supporting and enhancing the rights and economic viability of consumers from coast to coast.

The Prime Minister had an option to stand up for Canadian consumers. I regret most sincerely that he has chosen rather to stand up for and support foreign-based companies.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, Canada had developed a system for the research, production, and sale of prescription drugs. After a period of time, generic companies were permitted to pay a royalty and get a licence to produce drugs used with great frequency and to sell them to Canadians at half the price charged by the company which originally developed the drug. This system, which was developed and made operational by legislation that was passed in the late 1960s by a Liberal Government, after a great deal of study was working well. It saved Canadians hundreds of millions of dollars.

● (1540)

Yesterday, the Member for Cape Breton—East Richmond (Mr. Dingwall) implied that members of the New Democratic Party were waffling in our opposition to the Bill before us now. Nothing could be further from the truth. We have opposed the Bill from the beginning and we continue to oppose it.