

*Government Orders*

Who is to prove how much more substantial a new product or an old product under a new disguise or a new camouflage is going to be for people. The Ontario government says: "We cannot afford these prices under the OHIP program". Therefore they take it off the list. The constituent says: "I cannot afford the \$100 a month to pay for the drug bill". Who is at fault? I suspect the people at the top are at fault. but the person at the bottom of the heap always pays the price.

These are drugs that are absolutely essential to these people; life-threatening without them and they cannot afford to pay \$100 a month. We can talk about GATT, NAFTA, free trade, patents and compulsory licences, but the bottom line is that average Canadians will pay considerably more. Really, once the bill is passed we will never know because there will be no effective police individual to look after the interests of Canadians.

I want to say when Bill C-22 was passed, the president of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association of Canada said: "This means the beginning of a new era in Canadian biomedical research".

**An hon. member:** They meant bigger profits.

**Mr. Butland:** A new era. Four years later the era is over and we are embarking upon a new era I suppose. It is the shortest era in history.

**An hon. member:** Hot era.

**Mr. Butland:** Hot era, that's a good line.

She was telling Canadians that their drug laws were not up to international snuff, but then Judy Erola was insisting Canada is the odd man out.

We certainly do not want to be the odd person out in the international world because our prices are a little bit too low. We would not want that to happen. That just would not be appropriate.

This is the second time in the four years that I have been here that the word retroactivity has been mentioned in legislation. The last time it was not all that noxious or consequential, but this time there is no doubt about it.

Today I received a fax—I did not know those Glaxos or Eli companies existed out there—saying "Dear Mr. Butland, we are delighted to tell you that we are going to

invest \$170 million". Isn't that wonderful? Today I got the fax.

It was purely fortuitous, purely coincidental that it would happen today when we are debating Bill C-91. We are hearing from all of these people. I understand they are jamming the faxes. They are all going to invest, invest, invest. It is no darn wonder. I would invest too if I were making the profits they are making.

The Americans have been unabashed in telling us in books, in reports and discussion papers about trade deals. This is what it is all about. I remember the Shamrock summit. It was indicated that President Reagan and the Prime Minister were discussing this and Mr. Reagan was particularly upset with the Prime Minister, saying that we have to move forward, we have to get Canada in line and he was very disappointed with us.

The Prime Minister, not wanting to disappoint the President, has brought this forward at the behest of his good friends in the pharmaceutical companies of this country and of course they are, as someone has pointed out, only branch plants of the multinationals.

This is a reprehensible bill and it is a bitter pill for Canadians to swallow at this particular time. Once again this bill is going to be shoved through Parliament. The last bill shoved through at Christmas was a claw-back bill. When everybody is into their world of good spirits of the Christmas season is when this government acts. That is when it acts quickly. That is when it must be watched even more closely, with more scrutiny.

Here we are at Christmas time and the very last bill we are going to pass in this Parliament is going to hurt Canadians. It is going to cost Canadians. The Grinch stole this Christmas and last Christmas, but I expect this will be the last Christmas it will have an opportunity because on this side of the House the New Democratic Party will vociferously oppose this bill. We only wish we had more time to oppose it.

**Mr. Lee Richardson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to comment on a couple of points made by the previous speaker because I think there may be some misunderstanding as to why Canada no longer wants to be, in his words, the odd man out in terms of international law and international agreements, why countries around the