

Patent Act

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order. Before I call it one o'clock, I believe the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) would like to ask a business question. The Hon. Member for Windsor—Walkerville (Mr. McCurdy) will have two minutes left for debate plus 10 minutes for questions and comments when we return at two o'clock.

* * *

[Translation]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the House Leader and Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) what business he intends to call for Monday, Tuesday, and perhaps Wednesday.

[English]

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, indeed I can. On Monday we will continue with Bill C-25, the privatization of Canadair Bill. That will be followed by Bill C-23, the Income Tax Act and Bill C-18, the national transportation Act. Tuesday will be an allotted day and Wednesday will also be an allotted day.

Mr. MacDougall: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have agreement from all three Parties to introduce our Standing Committee's report to the House at this time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it so agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this day.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

PATENT ACT**MEASURE TO AMEND**

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Andre that Bill C-22, an Act to amend the Patent Act and to provide for certain matters in relation thereto, be now read a second time and referred to a legislative committee; and the amendment of Mrs. Killens (p. 1378).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): When the House rose at one o'clock the Hon. Member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr.

McCurdy) had the floor. Since he is no longer in the Chamber, I recognize the Hon. Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The procedure has got a little accelerated, and we understand and appreciate that. As a matter of fact, I am glad Stanley Knowles is here to listen to my speech.

I rise to speak on this legislation because we believe it is bad legislation. It does not do what the Government says it will do in terms of increased research and development. It does not create more jobs, it does not give Canada a new and larger variety of drugs, and it will not give us better drugs. It definitely will give the country higher drug prices. Despite what the Minister has stated, prices will go up. They will not go down.

The Minister is fond of saying in one breath that prices will not go up, "not one cent", he said. Then in the next breath he announces additional support of some \$100 million for the provinces over a period of four years to accommodate higher drug prices. The Scottish have a great phrase for that, and only you, Mr. Speaker, would understand it, "You can't blow hot and cold". This is what this Minister has attempted to do.

Some estimates put the cost to Canadians of removing generic competition, as this Bill will do, at upwards of \$4.73 billion over the next 10 years. Dr. Eastman states in his report that in the year 1983 alone Canadians saved \$211 million as a result of generic competition. Dr. Eastman has said repeatedly that there is no doubt that prices will rise as a result of this Bill. It is simple logic. If the presence of generic drugs is what has kept drug prices down over the last 15 years, then if you remove the bite of that generic competition, it is inevitable that drug prices will rise. They will rise as a result of the withdrawal of that immediate competition. Everybody in the House understands that. I believe that most people in the country understand it. The only person who does not understand it is the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Andre), who keeps on insisting that it will not be the case.

When we challenged him with Dr. Eastman's statements that indeed prices would rise, the Minister referred us to that famous interview that he and Dr. Eastman had conceded to CBC's *As it Happens* on November 19, in which he and Dr. Eastman agreed, according to the Minister, that prices would not rise. To a certain extent, I sympathize with the Minister's position. He got flustered here in the House and he stated that the CBC had fabricated the interview. He was worried that perhaps the tapes had been interfered with. We tried to put the conversation together, the direct question from the journalist and the direct response from Dr. Eastman. Perhaps when the issue gets into committee we can call a few witnesses and find out exactly what happened to that great conversation.

I would like to quote what Dr. Eastman said in the interview: