

*Government Orders*

Some multinationals tell us we have a bad system because it does not cater to them. They cannot make as much profit as they would like but why should we abandon what works for Canada. Surely we can stand for what is good for us as opposed to always having to march to the tune of the foreign nationals or the Americans. We should be able to do that.

We have developed a Canadian generic industry that has only 8 per cent of the market, employs some 3,000 people and has 22 per cent of all the assets of the pharmaceutical industry in this country. Do you know what? They are doing basic research and clinical research. They are doing the kinds of things we want Canadian home-grown industries to do.

Do you know what else has happened since the Liberals put compulsory licensing in place in 1969? We have been able to develop our own fine chemical industry in this country. Without our own fine chemical industry, we would not be able to have our own drugs.

Another aspect of this bill will seriously impact on people, not only the drug companies but the fine chemical industries that came about because of generic industry and our compulsory licensing system.

I know I do not have too much time, but I want to cover two or three other aspects. One has to do with the question of retroactivity and the amount of extra cost this bill will bear on consumers.

Consumers and experts have indicated the cost of this Bill C-91 to them, the Canadian system, small businesses that pay for group insurance and the health care system will be something between \$4 billion and \$7 billion in the next 12 years. That is what is going to come out of the pockets of Canadians in one way, shape or form.

What have we asked for in return? At least with Bill C-22, we asked the pharmaceutical industry to put its money where its mouth was and create some good quality research jobs and not cheap ones. In this bill, we have not asked that of them. Why is that? In the United States and Europe, 20 per cent of their sales are reinvested in R and D.

In this country we have asked for only 10 per cent under Bill C-22 and in this bill we have not asked for anything. If we are going to give them a windfall profit, surely to God the government has an obligation and a

responsibility to Canadian society to put something back. That means R and D should be at 16 per cent or 20 per cent at least. Why are Canadians not deserving of that?

I see my time is up. I would love to talk more, but unfortunately I cannot.

**Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West):** Mr. Speaker, I too join my colleagues in the Liberal Party and caucus in condemning a piece of legislation which incorporates Bill C-91 that is very detrimental and threatening to the medicare system of Canada.

It is a one-sided piece of legislation that would essentially cripple the generic, Canadian pharmaceutical industry. That industry is entirely Canadian owned and home grown thanks to the system we have had in place since the late 1960s called the Compulsory Drug Licensing System.

That system will dissolve with the implementation of Bill C-91. That system will essentially be done away with. If we do away with the Compulsory Drug Licensing System we will first have increased prices for prescription drugs used by Canadians. That is a fact. The brand name companies have said so. The government members who have spoken on it have said so.

One of the reasons the right hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, when he was consumer and corporate affairs minister in the 1960s introduced this Canadian system was to moderate the cost of prescription drugs for Canadians. What is wrong with that objective? The system in fact, did that.

If the system is also done away with, it means we are not going to have any more companies like Apotex and Novopharm, which are state of the art Canadian companies operating in the pharmaceutical world. It will mean no more incentives to encourage Canadian high-tech firms operating in this domain. It will mean less diversification. It will mean a monopoly.

These are things I thought were part of the Conservative dogma of diversifying for healthy competition. The government wants to stay away from monopolies whether they are in the air or in a pharmaceutical industry. That is what is at stake, not some phony argument that if you are against Bill C-91, you are against the province of Quebec. That is phony. It is divisive and that is the "real enemy" of Canada which the Prime Minister talked about in the referendum.