

Government Orders

talking about the generic companies trying to survive in that 10 per cent market share.

I ask the hon. member and the government she is part of if that is unfair. Are we saying that we have run the multinational corporations out of town when they enjoy 90 per cent of a billion dollar market rather than 10 per cent?

The research and development and the profits, the taxes and the stimulus from the brand name companies do not all stay in Canada. At least we can say in trying to have those two co-exist that with generic firms the direct employment, direct spin-offs, direct taxation, direct research and development all happen on Canadian soil and nowhere else. The hon. member forgets that. The hon. member forgets that Apotex Inc., the leading generic drug company in Canada has put on hold a multimillion dollar development in the city of Winnipeg because of the legislation we are debating today.

Is the member from Manitoba speaking up for Manitobans and the people of Winnipeg or is she paying lip service to the policies of her government which clearly have not passed the test? I advise the member to go back to her province, check her facts, check with the interests of Manitobans and then come back to this Chamber and talk intelligently.

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. member for what I thought was a well turned intervention, not challenged seriously from the other side. I do not know where the other side gets its numbers but the actual facts show that only half as many jobs were created as they claim in their own statistics and other statistics were left out.

I was interested in something the hon. member had to say. The hon. member who speaks on behalf of the Official Opposition will know that just before it was defeated in the early eighties the Liberal government was planning changes to compulsory licensing of an undetermined sort. Nevertheless it was perfectly clear that compulsory licensing under the previous Liberal government was under threat.

• (1630)

It is also true that the former Prime Minister was a member of the board of directors of Sandoz. It is true

that the present spokesperson on behalf of the multinational drug corporations is a former Liberal cabinet minister who is one of those interested in changing compulsory licensing. We know as well that one member has been communicating with other members of the Liberal caucus, along with others, opposing the Liberal position on Bill C-91.

I was very glad to hear the hon. member point out that the Liberal Party as usual is unified on this. I would be interested in knowing just what machinations went on to achieve such unity within an otherwise divided house.

Mr. Marchi: Mr. Speaker, I said that the party position was that advocated by our consumer and corporate affairs critic who spoke before this House recessed.

I do not think it would do much good for the hon. member to speak of divided houses because the rumblings coming from the NDP caucus and the challenges to his leader's ability to control the divisions within the constitutional issue indicate that the member is on very thin ice when he talks about divided houses. Obviously he should take a look at the sensitivities in his own party before he casts the first stone.

The fact of the matter is that it does not do anything for the national debate if I were to point out that the NDP Government of Ontario is cutting back on health care and that the NDP Government of British Columbia is prepared to take certain drugs off its list. However it does not do anything to further the debate.

The core of this debate is whether Canadians should have access to a system of prescription drugs that allows the pricing of those drugs to be controlled, that they remain affordable, and that they not escalate beyond the means of average Canadian families who must unfortunately rely on prescription drugs and medicines when a member of their family is ailing. That is the central premise of the issue.

The second one for me is allowing generic companies that only have 10 per cent of the market share to continue as Canadian corporate companies and citizens so that they can invest in this country and give rise to further jobs and stimulus.

If the NDP wishes to look at divided houses we would be happy to have an emergency debate and respond to every one of those challenges.