

Government Orders

research will bring better medicine, enabling Canadians to live healthier and longer lives.

Another issue of concern, and again I think there has been some misinformation out there, is Mexico and the NAFTA. The claims made by the opposition that in NAFTA Mexico gets an eight-year delay in having to comply with drug patent protection requirements are completely erroneous. The NAFTA contains the same provisions and time frame as the GATT-Dunkel text and applies to all three NAFTA parties on the same basis.

I would like to briefly outline some of the amendments I have put forth and they concern the exception regarding regulatory approval of exports. On clause 4, the purpose of that amendment of mine is to ensure that patent monopolies are not extended beyond 20 years from the time a patent is filed as a result of regulatory approval and production delays.

In clause 6, concerning offences, the purpose of this amendment is to extend the limitation period to two years from the time the subject matter of proceedings becomes known to ensure that multinational corporate secrecy does not prevent the effective enforcement of pharmaceutical price controls in Canada.

The next one concerns excessive prices in clause 7, where the purpose of my amendment is to ensure that introductory pharmaceutical prices in Canada are competitive rather than monopolistic.

The next one, concerning excessive price hearings, dealt with in the amendment in clause 7, means that the above amendment will ensure that pharmaceutical costs are effectively controlled by competitive prices and that Canada's universal health care system is preserved.

Another amendment concerns licences being continued.

Mrs. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I appreciate what the member is trying to do. He is trying to speak to amendments which he intends to put but which have not yet been put to the House, and he is aware that there will be a limit on the debate in this House and that he may not have the opportunity to speak to his amendments. There are others in this House who are in the same position.

I wonder if it is in order for him to speak to amendments that have not been put to the House.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I must simply remind hon. members that, following the intervention of

the hon. member for Ottawa West, the debate is on Motions Nos. 1 and 2.

As the hon. member knows very well, the rule of relevance is one of the most difficult to interpret. Since the Chair has been rather tolerant so far, because the debate is just beginning—members even talked about what went on in a parliamentary committee—I am still ready to show tolerance toward the hon. member for Markham—Whitchurch—Stouffville.

Once again, I recognize the hon. member.

[*English*]

Mr. Attewell: Under clause 12, just to continue, this amendment in conjunction with the amendments to section 15 will ensure that Bill C-91 is not applied retroactively.

In clause 13, if notwithstanding the position of the CDMA and the provinces, the federal government proceeds retroactively, this amendment will permit CDMA companies to be compensated for the expenditures they made in reliance on existing Canadian law.

Last, concerning clause 15, this amendment in conjunction with the amendment to section 12 will ensure that Bill C-91 is not applied retroactively. That is an issue that I discussed with my colleagues as much as six months ago.

In closing, I want to thank the Speaker for letting me continue getting on record my points about these amendments and also my support of the main thrust of Bill C-91.

The bottom line is that I want to be able to try to see if we can get a little more fairness and pass these amendments so that we can minimize this issue of retroactivity for the CDMA members.

Mr. Dennis Mills (Broadview—Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the opportunity to stand up and speak against this piece of legislation.

I want to begin by quoting from a journalist who I think most members around here would respect as having a fairly good insight as to what happens when policy or legislation comes before this House. It is from Carol Goar's article in *The Toronto Star* December 1, 1992. In this article she basically talked about the history of the drug policy in this country and talked about the fact that Canadians enjoyed the lowest prescription drug prices in the industrialized world. Now that we have this bill this policy is basically gone because we are handing a free rein over to the multinationals.