

Government Orders

He tried to pit the loyalty of one region against another. That is a phoney argument and neither we on this side of the House nor Canadians will fall for that phoney argument. We are also not saying we should run the brand name companies out of town. No one is suggesting that for one moment on this side of the House, nor is anyone suggesting the brand name companies should not get a return on their investment and make a profit after spending a lot of capital on R and D. No one is suggesting that.

• (1320)

The fact of the matter is, as other speakers have pointed out, the brand name companies in Canada enjoy a 92 per cent market share. They have not done that badly. We are suggesting to keep the status quo, for goodness sake. We are saying to leave the system intact, which allows generics right now, as we speak, an 8 per cent window. Any company or industry in Canada that enjoys a 92 per cent market share for most Canadian companies in this recession is dreaming. Yet we want to change a system because the brand name companies think 92 per cent of the market share is not good enough.

We know how strongly and passionately Canadians feel about our medicare system. It is good and different from others. It defines who we are in a certain sense. We travel across the globe, particularly at Christmas time and find ourselves in various parts of the world, whether on business or on holiday. People always marvel at the system we have in Canada if they get sick in those countries. Even some Conservatives are courageous enough to say so.

If they are proud that our medicare system is fairly unique in the world, why are they not proud at being very unique in the pharmaceutical industry? We have a made-in-Canada, for Canadians, by Canadians system that is working well for the health care system, for our consumers and for our Canadian pharmaceutical companies. Why should we not be proud of leaving intact and further enhancing its foundation rather than trying to dismantle it?

The government comes across saying: "Well, it is a question of research money and the universities are going to get some dollars from the brand name compan-

ies and it is a question of jobs." Sure, but we can also say the same for the generic firms because 100 per cent of R and D, 100 per cent of taxes paid by those companies, 100 per cent of profits and 100 per cent of all the jobs are here in Canada. You cannot say that for the brand names. A lot of profits, a lot of jobs, a lot of stimulus and a lot of R and D flow back to the parent company wherever it may be located. We can also talk about jobs and stimulus.

Members opposite talked about Eli Lilly Canada investing \$170 million this week in the city the member for Broadview—Greenwood and I have the honour of representing. However, they fail to talk about the quote in *The Financial Post* by the president of Eli Lilly, Canada that invested \$170 million in a brand name plant in Toronto. This is what he said: "The bill, C-91, currently being debated in the House of Commons did not help to bring the investment to Toronto." I repeat: "The bill, C-91," which we are debating today, "did not help to bring the investment here."

That was an honest, candid remark. If we also look at that \$170 million figure, and I compliment this company for doing so at this particular juncture of our economy, we have to keep in mind \$40 million is for wages. Are wages an investment or are they part of the parcel? Also, the plant expansion will cost \$50 million.

I do not want members to mislead by saying it is \$170 million in R and D.

The president has the honesty to say "You know, we planned this long before Bill C-91 came along. The system was fine. We were getting more return on our system".

It is going to cost taxpayers. Just the retroactivity component to last December is going to provide a windfall of \$2 billion to brand name companies. Over \$1.3 billion of that \$2 billion windfall is going to one brand name company. Is that right? Is that fair when Canadians are reduced to worrying about job security and affordable health care in case they get sick? Is this the right message to be sending to Canadians at this moment rather than stimulating the economy and getting people back to work? We are talking about dissolving a system so our prescription drug costs will go up.