

"seven additional sitting days".

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I will allow debate to proceed and will reserve a decision on this motion.

**Mr. Ross Belsher (Fraser Valley East):** Mr. Speaker, we have just heard a tirade from the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) about the Government not being able to get on with the job. Nonetheless, we were elected to do the job and to govern this country. I must tell you, Mr. Speaker, that when I go back home, people complain to me about why we are not using our majority to get legislation through this House. They ask why we are letting members of the opposition Parties roll all over us and thwart the will of the House.

Back on November 6, the Opposition was not even courteous enough to allow the introduction of the Bill. Those Hon. Members rant and rave here today about what we are doing to Parliament and about the legislation, but they would not even permit first reading of the Bill. Who is being ridiculous in what is being said?

I think it is time the Canadian people woke up and realized what is really happening here in Ottawa. I am sure they are very confused. It is interesting to note that in the *Gazette* a headline reads: "Don't back down from the drug law change". Yesterday in the *Toronto Sun* a headline read: "The feds are right to stop the legalization of drug piracy". These are the things in which the Canadian people are becoming interested.

We have heard the rhetoric of members of the Opposition that we are down on the poor and the sick so on. But they have not stopped to explain the total story. Why should those companies which spend the money on research to develop new drugs and bring them on the market have them cherry-picked by other companies for the payment of a 4 per cent royalty to produce them? Is that fair? Is that the way in which the Patent Act should be used? Why should our country be out of step with the rest of the industrialized world? We are not putting in place the 17-year measure which other countries have in place. Instead, we are putting in a 10-year measure. We are taking a balanced approach.

● (1550)

We are also putting in place in the legislation provisions for how these measures can be watched and looked after. We have appointed a committee which will be the watch-dog of these issues to see that abuses of the system are not made. I believe we have also put in provisions which allow for a parliamentary review after a period of up to 10 years. These are the measures we have placed in the legislation to ensure that there will be an orderly review process. In this way the companies that want to do business in Canada will know the rules under which they must operate. It is for these reasons that I endorse the motion put forward by our House Leader that we get on with the business of the House and permit only two more days of debate to take place on this issue. It will then go to committee and we will get on to the point—

### *Time Allocation*

**Mr. Riis:** It is one day of debate.

**Mr. Belsher:** I am sorry. I did not have my hearing aid on when the Minister read his motion.

When the matter goes to committee it will receive a thorough airing and a proper venting. The opposition Parties will be part of that process. I am sure they will be inviting various groups which they think will put forward their thoughts and their ideas on this issue. By the same token other responsible groups will be invited and I hope will apply to make representations to the committee so that we can get on with dealing with the Patent Act as it affects the people of Canada and, more particularly, the drugs required by so many people in their health care.

I endorse the motion. I am glad that the House Leader has brought it forward. It is time that it was brought forward. It does not mean that drug prices will rise tomorrow. Members of the Opposition do not tell that story. There is no evidence to prove that that is possible at all. I am glad that we are getting on with the job—the sooner, the better.

**Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West):** Mr. Speaker, I repeat the opening line I made in a speech I made earlier in the short time we had available to us to debate the second reading of this Bill. It is that those who would make a profit from the misfortunes of others are basically immoral. I want to say to my friends in the PCP Party and my friends in the LFCP Party—

**Mr. Allmand:** What does that mean?

**Mr. Benjamin:** The Liberal Federation of Canada Party is what it means. Then there is the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada.

I wish to start by reminding the House that the mover of the motion, the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), the Government House Leader and Deputy Prime Minister, said:

Mr. Speaker, I participate in this debate with a degree of sadness and regret having regard to the fact that we have just had thrust upon this House one of the most repugnant and most destructive devices ever perpetrated on the democratic process.

He went on to state:

It is with a great deal of regret that I see it cut off prematurely having regard to its importance and the fact that some Members who wanted to speak will not have that opportunity.

He stated further:

—the government's actions have turned the debate into one of bitterness and division; the atmosphere has become poisoned.

At another point he stated:

At the very outset I must say that I abhor this tactic. I find it offensive. I find it repugnant because it strikes at the basic fabric of our parliamentary democracy. Instead of having a parliamentary democracy, we have what resembles a parliamentary dictatorship.

My colleague just mentioned jackboots. The Government House Leader went on to say: