

Government Orders

It has opened up the telecommunications field to wide open competition.

Look what it has done to the airline industry. The airline industry is being deregulated, opened up to competition because this government believes that competition is a necessary thing to impose the rigours of the marketplace upon our industries so that they will become competitive world-wide. To demonstrate the hypocrisy of this government, what do we see in this legislation? In this legislation, in exchange for the \$48,000 a year that the PC Canada fund gets from the drug companies, these drug companies are being given the exclusive monopolistic right. It is a restraint on trade, it is a restraint on competition, it is exactly what the Tories say they do not stand for.

Why are they giving this exclusive right, not to the creators of these drugs or these chemicals, but to the people who have the money to buy the products of the creative researchers and the creative scientists who operate in Canada, the United States and around the world? Why are they doing this? There has to be a better explanation than the pat line that was given to us by the House leader that creators have the right to exploit their creations or the line that was given to us by the member from Alberta in a similar vein.

I cannot even understand the logic of the arguments being made by the Conservative government opposite.

An hon. member: A last favour to their friend, George Bush.

Mr. Skelly (Comox—Alberni): The drug companies are doing very well, thank you very much. Why do they need this additional protection, except to satisfy an unbelievable greed on the part of those drug companies? Look at the return on investments that those companies have enjoyed over the past many years, even when they were in competition with the generic drug manufacturers.

Here is a report about pharmaceutical patents and politics Canada in Bill C-22 which reports the pharmaceutical industry enjoyed an extremely healthy rate of return: in 1972, 24.7 per cent; at the same time all manufacturing companies were enjoying a return of 14.1 per cent. In 1976, still under the compulsory licensing division, 22.7 per cent return for drug companies whereas all manufacturing—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): It being 4.45 p.m., pursuant to an order made earlier this day in accordance under the provisions of Standing Order 78(3), it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the second reading stage of the bill now before the House.

Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 241)

YEAS

Members

Anderson	Andre
Aitwell	Beatty
Belsher	Bernier
Bertrand	Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)	Blais
Blenkarn	Bosley
Bouchard (Roberval)	Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Bourgault	Boyer
Brightwell	Browes
Cadioux	Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Cardiff	Casey
Chadwick	Champagne (Champlain)
Charest	Chartrand
Clark (Yellowhead)	Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Clifford	Cole
Collins	Cook
Cooper	Corbeil
Côté	Crosbie (St. John's West)
Damis	Darling
Della Noce	Desjardins
Dick	Dobbie
Domm	Dorin
Duplessis	Edwards
Epp	Fee
Feltham	Ferland
Fontaine	Fretz