

*Government Orders*

should, and the generic industries are in there to moderate those prices and to give incentives to Canadian companies and jobs.

This is yet another institution touched by this government. This is the removing of yet another piece of fabric in that Canadian blanket that we have been proud of, which in the end serves to define who we are and who we are not. The government took all those individual strands: VIA, the airline industry, our infrastructure in transportation, Canada Post, doing away with FIRA in terms of protecting Canadian industry, not anti-foreign investment but standing up for number one, and the trucking industry.

The CBC is not able to promote Canadian unity. Can you imagine anything more insane for a Canadian broadcasting channel? Now the government touches the compulsory drug licensing system. I am not advocating, our critic who has spoken on this matter eloquently is not advocating and our party is not advocating, that we run the multinational companies out of town. Not at all.

We are suggesting that the compulsory drug licensing system allows both the brand names and the generic names to live and coexist, and allows each to do well. Does the House know who benefits in the current system, leaving the brand name and generic companies alone for a moment? Canadians do because Canadians get a health care system that is more affordable. Canadian companies do well. There are jobs and profits, and taxes are paid in this country.

Why fix something that is uniquely Canadian and that is not broken whatsoever?

Fourth—I do not like raising it but I will—is that in the debate on Bill C-22 elements on that side suggested: “If you are against Bill C-22 you are against Quebec”. We hear those voices again now on Bill C-91. A lot of brand name multinational corporations are in Quebec, though not exclusively. In my own province of Ontario there are quite a number as well, but there is a large component of companies in Quebec.

Now voices opposite suggest: “Hold on, if you are against Bill C-91 you are against the province of Quebec and its interests”. This is precisely the type of allegation that poisoned the referendum debate that all of us were engaged in. These are the voices that are the true enemies of Canada.

We know where we stand with the province of Quebec. We know what we did during the referendum when

Canadians spoke, and whose voices must be respected. Bill C-91 is not a test of loyalty or patriotism to one province in our federation. Bill C-91 is an issue of health care. Bill C-91, whether there are brand name companies in Quebec or not, and there are, is of interest also to Quebecers, to Canadians in Quebec, because they too are concerned about how much they spend for their prescription drugs on which unfortunately they must rely.

Those are the four issues at stake. It is not: “Believe me, Canadians, this is a good policy for Canada”. If that is good for Canada I would hate to see what the minister’s definition of a bad policy is, and I think Canadians are wise to it.

I urge Canadians to rally to the defence of this compulsory drug licensing system which is a Canadian, home-grown, home-bred institution. This issue can be a sleeper. Do you remember when the party opposite tried to deindex senior citizens’ pensions, thinking that the seniors were somehow not powerful and would not be able to mobilize public opinion? Do you remember when that beautiful, elderly lady called the Prime Minister a Charlie Brown? She captured the imagination not only of senior citizens but of young Canadians, nephews and nieces, and mobilized them until this government was forced to back down.

• (1620)

This issue is something like that debate, particularly when we talk about senior citizens. They are the ones who are most reliant on our health care system and the provincial drug plans that provide prescription drugs for them.

I urge senior citizens and not so senior Canadians to involve themselves in this debate. We certainly will stand our ground. This system has worked well. It has provided for moderate increases in prices, and it has allowed both the brand name and generic companies to co-exist, to continue.

Why must we let go without a fight an institution that has worked well for Canada and for Canadians? We must be concerned about the safety of our health care system. At the very time when provincial health care ministers are coming to Ottawa on a daily basis talking about the increased costs, this government is moving in the oppo-