

Government Orders

Again, we cannot motivate Canadians if there is no protection for those who are going to invest their careers to do this sort of thing. It is one of the strongest features in this particular bill.

The strength in the Patented Medicine Prices Review Board will have a key role in ensuring that patented drug prices remain reasonable for all.

An effective balance has been sought and I believe can be seen in this bill between the need to keep prices reasonable and the need to encourage new pharmaceutical research.

In doing so it offers a solution that will serve the best interests of all Canadian consumers and especially all those in need of this service, and how it will improve their lives.

I am happy that the member opposite sees the pivotal importance of Bill C-91. He sees the most important element in it, the fact that it rewards individual Canadian intuitiveness and creativity in a field that Canadians have been known in, in a field that Canadians now will get international rewards for and cause even more Canadians in the future to be involved.

I hear the member opposite who represents a university in his home city calling this rubbish. I do not think he is going to say that to the faculty of medicine or the faculty of science at Queen's University. I do not think they want to hear that at Queen's. Queen's says it is one of Canada's top universities. I do not believe their member does not support research and development. I do not believe they have elected a member to this House to represent a university city, a city which prides itself on its medical research who does not support research and development, who does not support the right of an author to creativity. I just cannot believe that this would be true in Kingston.

It is not true in London, Ontario. We know that the tests that are done on the drugs in our community to benefit our fellow Canadians are landmarks. Our community supports this kind of endeavour.

I am shocked that some other community that prides itself on academic development, on being a world centre

in medical research, could have a member of Parliament who does not support this legislation. I just do not understand it.

I really appreciate the opportunity to put these views on the record today and find out from the members opposite that they are not prepared to listen to their constituents on this matter.

Mr. Joe Fontana (London East): Mr. Speaker, as usual the member for London—Middlesex does not know what he is talking about. For him to suggest that this side of the House and my colleague from Kingston and the Islands are against research and development is absolutely ridiculous and rubbish. This is the heart of the bill.

First, it would be absolutely irresponsible of me not to spend at least a few moments talking about the process. It tells a big story about what this government is all about and what it has been doing for the past eight years. Canadians have become cynical about this institution and cynical about governments. The government continually perpetrates upon the Canadian people the view that democracy does not mean anything any more. It has abused closure more often than previous governments over the past 125 years in the short period of time that it has been in power.

It has done it again on one of the most important pieces of legislation that has come before this House. It has done exactly the same thing, eight hours of debate before we broke for the summer and then the referendum. We came back and had a good five hours and the Conservative member for Manitoba says that is enough. The bill goes to committee. We cannot even hear 89 witnesses who want to be heard, including the Canadian Hospital Association.

Mrs. Dobbie continues to want to say no to everyone.

Mrs. Dobbie: Mr. Speaker, I am fed up with the opposition refusing to obey the rules. Yesterday in debate and again today they used my name. We know that is against the traditions of this House. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you impose the rules on the members opposite.