

*Time Allocation*

in many of our universities, go out of the country to find jobs in this field.

Since 1984, when the Progressive Conservative Party took over Government, we have reduced unemployment across the country by 3 per cent. That is our record of performance.

**Mr. Riis:** Tell that to Atlantic Canada and British Columbia. They will laugh at you.

**Mr. Gurbin:** The NDP are talking about the jobs that are necessary in Canada. Mr. Speaker, they cannot deal with facts and that is unfortunate.

• (1520)

**Mr. Riis:** The fact is you are dictatorial and antidemocratic.

**Mr. Gurbin:** There is much more to say on this topic, and I will be happy to do it at another time. I have only a couple minutes left.

**Mr. Riis:** We can shut Parliament down for three weeks if it will make you feel any better.

**Mr. Gurbin:** I was a medical practitioner for about 20 years and always found it discouraging not to have medication to treat a particular illness. I had to write prescriptions and my patients had to buy the drugs.

**Mr. Benjamin:** I'll bet you wrote "no substitutes, please".

**Mr. Gurbin:** The drug companies gave us samples and we gave them to our patients. This Party has supported changes in health care which have resulted in 85 per cent of Canadians getting help to defray the cost of drugs.

**Mr. Riis:** I see; you cut back on health care funding to support health care.

**Mr. Gurbin:** That is important.

**Mr. Riis:** You cut back scientific research.

**Mr. Gurbin:** The Government wants to ensure that Canadians are protected from bearing the burden of the overwhelming cost of health care. Therefore, we inserted protective clauses. Those are the kinds of things which will be examined when this important Bill goes to committee and we are able to proceed with it, as we must, after approximately 22 hours and 40 minutes of obstructive tactics by Members opposite who are—

**Mr. Riis:** Didn't you close Parliament down for three weeks?

**Mr. Gauthier:** How can you stand there and say that? For two solid weeks you closed it down.

**Mr. Riis:** You're a hypocrite.

**Mr. Gauthier:** You've got a lot of gall to use that argument. Two solid weeks you closed it down.

**Mr. Rossi:** Remember the bells.

**Mr. Gauthier:** You're a bunch of hypocrites.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jacques Guilbault (Saint-Jacques):** Mr. Speaker, if I could have some peace and quiet, I would also like to speak to—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Order please. The Hon. Member for Saint-Jacques.

**Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques):** Mr. Speaker, I would also like to give my views on the gag being imposed again by this Government, after only seven hours of debate on Bill C-22. This is a very important piece of legislation which, once it is implemented, is likely to have an impact on all Canadians. Seven hours of debate up to now is not much of an excuse for the Government to suddenly decide to apply steamroller tactics and gag the Opposition. This is a strange attitude to democracy for a Government that already has an overwhelming majority of 210 Members in the House of Commons, and so already has the assurance that when the question is put on Bill C-22, it will win the vote. So why bother to gag the Opposition which is trying to put questions to the Government regarding this Bill, questions that are not being answered? Mr. Speaker, if the Government is so anxious to get this Bill through the House, perhaps I may recall that, as you know, Mr. Speaker, last June the Government introduced a Bill similar to Bill C-22, in fact it was even a bit better than Bill C-22, but the Government neglected to follow up on it. Why did it not decide to consider the Bill back in September? Why did it wait such a long time before bringing this legislation before Parliament and having it debated here in the House?

Today, they are trying to rush us and get this Bill through the House quickly, although the Government knows perfectly well that the Opposition Parties are opposed to the Bill. Up to now, the Government has been stonewalling in response to our questions in the House. It has systematically refused to table impact studies on the cost of drugs. If the Government is so sure drug prices will not increase once Bill C-22 is adopted, why has it refused to table studies on the potential impact on drug costs? What does the Government have to hide? If it is so sure its Bill is a good one and will not cause the price of drugs to rise, I want to see those studies tabled here in the House.

Mr. Speaker, for two weeks we have been getting the same stupid answer during Question Period: Send the bill to committee and you will get answers to all your questions. Unfortunately, that is not how things are done in this House. First, we have to agree on the principle of a bill before it is referred to a committee, and that is the problem. We have difficulty with the underlying principle of Bill C-22 and we do not have all the information we need to believe that this Bill is a good thing. The Government is always accusing the Opposition Parties of being against research. Quite the opposite, the Liberal Party of Canada favours research, not only for pharmaceutical products, but in all scientific areas in Canada. Who cut back research funds, who took away hundreds of millions of dollars from the budget of the National Research Council if not the Government on the other side? And who objected to those cutbacks in research expenditures if not the Opposition?