

Government Orders

the process. People from all walks of life, people who were known Liberals, Tories, New Democrats all joined together in that effort.

The past president of the Conservative Association of Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, a fine gentleman by the name of Mr. Bob Binmore, helped me a lot in the campaign. Symbolically, in order to show that there was no partisanship at the time, I attended every public meeting in the riding wearing his tie. We thought this was a symbolic thing. As a matter of fact, I am wearing it today. This is Bob Binmore's tie. I do not think this constitutes a display for the cameras and it does not offend the Standing Orders, although when some of my colleagues see how aggressive this tie is, they might want to comment on that. It is very aggressive. It makes a statement about our Canadian provinces and Canadian unity. This tie was given to Mr. Binmore by his daughters, Julie and Jennifer, and I made him a solemn promise to wear it in the House today, the first day back.

We all behaved in an unpartisan way and I am proud of that. However, we are only back a few hours today and the government goes at it, jack-boots and all. I thought the minister responsible for fisheries was a little less partisan than some of the others across the way because at one time he had the good sense to be a Liberal and that would make him immensely better than some of his colleagues. However, I see it did not make much difference.

I have before me a stack of little cards sent to me by constituents and people right across Canada who are just concerned about this Bill C-91. There must be a pile four or five inches thick of these postcards sent to me. I am sure the member for Dartmouth received postcards from people paying the high price of prescription drugs who are concerned about the future of the pharmaceutical industry.

Here is what the postcards say. I will read a few sentences from one of them: "On June 23, 1992, the federal government introduced Bill C-91, legislation intended to extend retroactively to December 20, 1991, patent protection for brand name pharmaceuticals and eliminate Canada's system of compulsory licensing. This

legislation will result in significantly higher drug prices in Canada and its retroactive provisions will cripple the Canadian owned generic pharmaceutical industry". This is not what I said. This is what hundreds and hundreds of Canadians have said.

An hon. member: And the government ignores them and wants to cut them off.

Mr. Boudria: However, no one across the way wants to listen to what all these Canadians have to say. They say there are going to be millions, possibly even billions, of dollars invested in Canada and thousands and thousands of jobs will be created with this new bill. There is a certain *deja vu* as we say in French, because in 1987 I heard the same refrain from the Conservatives opposite.

In 1987 they said that Bill C-22 was necessary and would create thousands and thousands of jobs. That is what the Conservatives opposite said. I have in front of me an article in *The Gazette of Montreal* last September which says there are few benefits from 1987 drug patent changes. This speaks of a study by the federal government, by Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I think that is the same guy who introduced this bill on June 23, the same Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the same department at least, that was telling us then that Bill C-22 would create all these new jobs. Now, years later, the minister wants to introduce another bill which is supposed to create all these new jobs. If he keeps repeating this over and over again I suppose some day, somewhere, some jobs might be created.

Here is what the study said. The government predicted first of all in 1987 that 3,000 jobs would be created by 1996. These are 3,000 jobs which might be called high-tech jobs, scientific jobs, stuff like that.

Lo and behold, according to the study by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, only 1,386 jobs had been created between 1987 and 1990, and half of them were in marketing and sales.

As my colleague from Dartmouth said a little while ago, a number of them were also in areas that were not related to marketing and sales. Some of them had to do with—shall we say, not all of course; I do not want to diminish this—being a janitor.