

Patent Act

already recognized that this is not reasonable. The Canadian consumer should not have to suffer such price increases.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I bring to your attention that the display of exhibits in the Chamber has traditionally been considered inappropriate. The Hon. Member has referred to a big stack of reports relating to his topic.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, could I just get to my point of order?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I know what the Hon. Member is trying to portray. I do not think he was displaying any Bills or anything like that. I feel that that is debate. If the Hon. Member does have a point of order, I wish he would come to it.

Mr. Hawkes: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I just wondered if the stack which he is displaying includes information on the 93 per cent of drugs which have no generic equivalent. Has he seen whether we are getting gouged in that area?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): That is not a point of order. That is debate. The Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) has the floor.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, as you probably recognize, not only is that not a point of order, it is not even a good point. I do not have a large stack of reports in my hand. I was referring only to one list. The rest of these documents have nothing to do with this issue, and I never said they did. Perhaps the Member across the way could listen a little closer, and I will tell him more about the price increases to which the Canadian consumer will be subjected.

The most difficult thing is to pronounce the names of these drugs.

Mr. Hawkes: Go to school.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, someone said, "go to school". I will not apologize for my humble beginnings. They have served me well until now. I will trade my oratorical skills for those of the Hon. Member at any time.

One thousand 100-miligram tablets of the Canadian generic product of chlorthalidone sells for \$37.29. The U.S. brand product costs \$613.01. The Minister has said in the House that prices will not really increase. However, the people whom he has hired to administer say that they will. The Minister then did not say that they will go up, but they could go up. Well, if something can go up and someone has a monopoly on it, it does go up. Most of us know that if there is an opportunity to make more money, more money will be made. If there is an opportunity to make the consumers of Canada pay more, the consumers will pay more. That is the way it works.

We have good legislation now. We could, of course, provide better protection for the people in the industry in order to encourage research. Research has been increasing, but we should not be satisfied with that. We want more research and more jobs. It is a motherhood question to ask whether we want more research. Obviously we do. However, that is not the issue before us today. We are dealing with whether Canadians want to give exclusivity through this Bill which will result in Canadian consumers being gouged in the manner in which I have just described. Surely that is not why we were elected to this place.

[*Translation*]

Last summer, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals held public hearings on drug patents. These hearings took place here in Ottawa and in Toronto, and I was privileged to attend them. We received briefs, we met with Canadian Consumers' Association executive members—a totally nonpartisan body, as we all know—and they proved to us Members of the Liberal Party . . . Had Conservative Members done the same thing, they too would have been advised by the Canadian Consumers' Association that this Bill as drafted does not serve the interests of Canadians.

I therefore urge Members from all political Parties, Conservatives, New Democrats and colleagues in my own Party, to vote against this Bill and prevent this measure from going any further because Canadians do not stand to benefit from it.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Are there questions or comments?

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the Hon. Member, both in the House and in my office.

Mr. Boudria: You were not even here.

Mr. Mazankowski: I said "in my office". Once in a while even the Hon. Member himself should look at his television image. In view of what has been transpiring, and pursuant to the notice I gave last Friday, I would like to advise the House that I will be moving a revised motion, which will provide for an additional one day of debate for the consideration of the Bill at this stage, at the appropriate time.

Some Hon. Members: Shame, shame.

Mr. Boudria: May I comment on that?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): You may if you want to.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, the Minister bootlegged that statement in under his privilege of asking questions on my speech. I want to use this opportunity to remind him that the notice of time allocation was given after two hours and 23 minutes of debate on offensive legislation.