

Government Orders

We do not have and are unlikely to have a patent drug industry that puts huge amounts of money into research and development so that management, research and development, production and sales are centred in Canada.

They told us that they were going to increase the number of scientific and highly-trained technical jobs by 3,000. Here one finds oneself immersed in a morass of statistics. According to the drug companies' statistics, 1,386 new jobs were produced. Two-thirds of those jobs were in administration and in sales. What is irreconcilable with that is the evidence gleaned from other sources which indicates that 850 production jobs were lost in the drug industry in which we are supposed to have 3,000 new jobs for scientists and technicians. It did not happen.

With respect to the promise that the prices of drugs would not go up, well, we know the evidence. We know that 40 per cent of new drugs were beyond the guidelines imposed by the Canadian Drug Prices Review Board. We know that the prices of drugs, after the passage of Bill C-22, exceeded the average increase in the CPI by over 2 per cent, 6.2 per cent as compared to 4.4 per cent for CPI.

We know from statistics prepared in Ontario and British Columbia by Green Shield that there have been massive increases in the price of drugs.

I should add this additional little piece of information. The industry promised that it would increase the amount of research investment in R and D by \$1.4 billion over the level expected by the trend lines without Bill C-22, if you can understand what I am saying.

• (1550)

They have come nowhere near that, but what we have to understand is that the drug companies, even if they had put in that so-called \$1.4 billion, would have spent nowhere near that amount. Something that has not been pointed out in this Chamber before is that in the province of Quebec, for every dollar the drug companies brag about putting into R and D, they in fact only invest 30 cents. Seventy cents of that dollar came from the Quebec government or the federal government.

In fact, anywhere in the United States the drug companies have to put 65 per cent of that dollar in.

Nowhere in Canada do the drug companies have to put any more than half what they claim to put into R and D.

Now we have Bill C-91. Bill C-91 will eliminate compulsory licensing. It will provide the benefits of complete patent protection for 20 years for companies that do not even work their patent in Canada, that do nothing with respect to all those promises in Canada.

Furthermore, it is retroactive. It requires no production of fine chemicals in Canada. It is not good. Members sit over there and tell us that it is not going to cost Canadians any more for drugs. The government's own spokespersons say that by the turn of the century the budget for drugs in this country will be increased by \$550 million per year.

Other statistics indicate that almost as soon as this legislation is passed, the cost to this nation for these patented drugs will increase by \$500 million, and by the turn of the century, \$1 billion more will be spent for drugs because of this bill than is being spent now.

This is offensive legislation introduced by a government that has offended the whole country. It should be withdrawn. If there are any Conservatives who give a damn about Canadians, they should stand up and say: "No more. This country has had enough of the wreckage that this government has imposed on Canada and Canadians, and on what Canada stands for". This bill should be defeated by true Canadians.

Mr. J. W. Bud Bird (Fredericton—York—Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the hon. member opposite and other hon. members speaking with such great disrespect about this bill.

I am quite pleased and proud, frankly, to rise in support of this bill and to say, among other things, this is not just a bill about patent protection and about pharmaceuticals. It is a bill about economic development and I will get to that in a moment.

We have been focusing in detail on the provisions of Bill C-91 and it has been a useful and a necessary exercise. This is complex legislation, as it must be, to achieve the balance we need. It is also very important as we do so that we do not lose sight of some of the basic aims and principles which underlie this legislation. I would like to touch on these now.