Government Orders

There is other evidence. What happens when you get a generic competitor in the marketplace? The government will even agree that on average it drops the price of that particular pharmaceutical product, that chemical entity by anywhere from 25 per cent to 32 per cent because with competition, prices come down.

• (1050)

I am going to refer to a table dealing with the effect of competition on drug prices. If there are two competitors in the marketplace the average cost of the prescription is 76.2 per cent of what it would be if there was no generic competition. If there are three competitors in the marketplace, the cost to consumers for that drug goes down to 61.2 per cent of what it would be. With four competitors in the marketplace, four compulsory licences, it drops down to 45.1 per cent.

When the integrity of Canada's health care system is in question why in the name of goodness would the government ram a bill down the throats of parliamentarians? It has done this by having three hours of debate, closing the debate, sending the bill to committee, refusing to hear the witnesses who wanted to be heard at committee, then bringing the bill back to the House.

If I want to be prophetic, probably at some point in the next few hours it will try to ram both report stage and third reading through the House by using closure. Why are they doing it?

Members of the Liberal Party have made it very clear from the beginning that we are opposed to this type of billion dollar bonus to multinational drug companies. We have heard evidence even at those truncated hearings that the loss of compulsory licensing in Canada will cost the Canadian health care system in the next 12 years between \$4 billion and \$7 billion. That is the effect of eliminating compulsory licensing.

The government is not just going to eliminate compulsory licensing. It has decided to do something unique. Not only when this bill passes will compulsory licensing be gone, but it is also going back to December 20, 1991. The impact of retroactively getting rid of compulsory licensing in Canada is that it could cost Canadian consumers over \$2 billion just for the retroactivity alone.

It is no wonder this government does not want a full airing of the impact of this bill on Canadian consumers. No wonder it wants to hide itself in the rules of Parliament and the tyranny of the majority called closure.

The government knows full well that what it is doing is obscene. It is obscene at the very time that Canada's health care ministers are dealing with reduced transfers by the federal government to maintain quality health care no matter where one lives in this country. This government comes in with a bill effectively giving the biggest bonus Parliament has ever given to anybody or any organization.

If this bill passes by Christmas with the elimination of compulsory licensing there will be a multibillion dollar Christmas bonus to multinational drug companies in Canada.

We are going to have full debate on the floor of this Chamber today, tomorrow, the next day, and the next day, and the next day if we have to so that Canadians understand what this bunch opposite is doing.

By the time we finish on this side of the House I know there will be some Tory backbenchers opposite who will be just a little widgety and squidgety in their chairs. They are going to be getting calls from consumers back home asking why they would ever support a bill like Bill C–91 that gets rid of compulsory licensing and that may damage the integrity of Canada's health care system.

Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North): Mr. Speaker, I too wish to rise and speak on this amendment.

The amendment I have put forward has the same effect of restoring compulsory licensing on pharmaceuticals in Canada. Before I start speaking on the substance we should look at what has happened in the last two weeks to Canadian democracy as it applies to this bill.

The government introduced the bill on November 16 and after only three hours of debate brought in time allocation which forced closure the following day. On the following Monday we set up the committee to study this bill.