

activity, create thousands of long-term jobs and, at the same time, strengthen our competitive position in a high-tech sector?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the Opposition surely knows that the governments of Quebec, Ontario and Canada have already invested just under \$6 million in a high-speed train study. The three governments expect the report to be ready by this summer and we will, of course, be reviewing it with a great deal of interest. The study is being carried out jointly by the aforementioned three governments and I hope the Leader of the Opposition is interested in seeing the results, just as these three governments are.

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, what reasons can the Prime Minister give, I wonder, for his reluctance to state clearly what he thinks, and where he stands on the HST project, when all the while, the federal government has invested and will continue to invest—I would even say waste, at least in the case of Hibernia—billions in Hibernia, not to mention the exorbitant sums spent on upgrading the rail system in the West?

Why is the Prime Minister holding off on disclosing his views on an HST that will link Quebec and Canada with the United States?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, if we want to talk about decisions made by this government, I would point out to the Leader of the Opposition that the most successful company in Montreal is Canadair. It was during my tenure as Minister of Industry and Trade that the government bought Canadair back from private interests, got it back on track and invested money to develop the Challenger jets and other aircraft responsible for Canadair's current success. This was all due to the intervention of this government.

• (1420)

The Leader of the Opposition is always asking us to work with the provinces, but the Minister of Transport has just said that he is working very closely with provincial governments on this matter. Now the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that we not listen to the provinces.

We do listen to them and, when the proposal is ready, we will respond. If it represents no cost to us, then of course the project will get the green light. However, if the costs are exorbitant, we will have to take into consideration this government's financial situation.

\* \* \*

#### PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, according to the Minister of Industry, the federal government apparently wants to review the drug-patent law. This legislation extended to 20 years, need we remind you, the protection offered to

patented drugs and led to the announcement that nearly \$1 billion would be invested in research and development in Quebec by 1996. By the year 2000, the total value of investment projects could reach \$5 billion in Canada.

Does the minister admit that it is because of pressure from lobbyists representing the interests of generic-drug companies, mainly concentrated in Toronto, that he is about to review the drug-patent legislation?

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry):** Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that I have no interest in lobbyists' efforts. What I care about the most is Canadians' interests.

We promised during the election campaign that we would review Bill C-91, and that is what we explained again yesterday. We are interested in drug prices and in the investment and R and D track record here in Canada.

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, Quebec's Minister of Industry and Commerce stated this morning before a parliamentary committee in Quebec City that the mere mention of a review of Bill C-91 caused the immediate postponement of a \$50-million investment in Quebec's pharmaceutical industry.

Does the Minister of Finance, who is also responsible for regional development in Quebec, admit that a review of the drug-patent legislation would be disastrous for the brand-name drug industry, which is mainly concentrated in Montreal?

[English]

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry):** Mr. Speaker, this is the same kind of exaggerated hyperbole that we have heard on both sides of this debate for too long.

We are trying to deal with the facts and we are going to determine what the facts are. The facts will indicate what policy direction the government should take in the future.

I want the hon. member to understand, because he was not here when Bill C-91 was passed, that law contains within it a statutory review that would occur within four years of its enactment in 1993. That is already in the bill. There is nothing new about saying that we will review legislation passed by the previous government.

\* \* \*

#### HEALTH CARE

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

Recently the Minister of Human Resources Development was forced to cancel a federal-provincial meeting on job training because several of the provinces objected to the federal government's approach.

Now it appears the Minister of Health may scuttle the planned forum on national health care with her ill-advised tax on provincial health care initiatives in Alberta and British Colum-