

Government Orders

goods would just flow down on us from heaven. Some people refer to it as the trickle down theory.

• (1530)

Well, it has not worked. We have gone from bad to worse. The trickle down theory does not work. Neo-conservatism does not work. We have looked at Thatcherism in England and it is wanting. We have looked at the United States and what has happened under Reagan. Look what happened under Bush. It went from bad to worse. The United States of America went from the greatest creditor nation to the greatest debtor nation in a mere eight years of Reaganomics.

Yet, this is what the government is saying. Despite all the woes and despite all the failures of neo-conservative economics, we want more. Just get the government out of the road and leave it to the big boys, in this case to those big pharmaceutical companies. Happy days are going to be here again. We know that is not the truth. That is a crock.

The government said some time ago that it was not going to cost a lot of extra money. After all, we were going to get some new research and new development and we would get jobs and any little increase in the prices of drugs would be offset by this renewed economic activity, especially in the province of Quebec. The cost was going to be about \$29 million or something like that. Just yesterday we got an estimate from *The New York Times* that the cost is not going to be \$29 million; it is going to be in the neighbourhood of \$500 million.

The headline in *The Globe and Mail* states: "Drug law cost set in the billions". Here is the headline from *The Ottawa Citizen* of today: "A bitter pill. Drug bill will cost Canadians an extra \$550 million by the year 2000". Can you imagine? Yet, we are supposed to swallow this pill because it is good for the friends of the Progressive Conservative Government of Canada.

There is a higher calling than the Conservative Party of Canada. That higher calling is the country and the people of Canada and they do not want this Bill C-91 because they do not want to pay higher drug costs, which is exactly what is going to happen if Bill C-91 is passed.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I would like to point out that no applause is allowed from the gallery.

[*English*]

It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Domestic Worker Program; the hon. member for St. Boniface—Unemployment; the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley—Softwood Lumber; the hon. member for Burin—St. George's—Westray Coal Mine; and the hon. member for York West—Drug abuse.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Monique Tardif (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to rise in the House today on second reading of Bill C-91, an act to amend the Patent Act.

The government tabled its bill in the House on June 23, and on September 17, a little over two months ago, the debate started on second reading. It is now time to continue the process of adopting this important bill and give our country legislation that is in line with the latest patent legislation for pharmaceutical products and reflects the most advanced provisions in this field.

Today I simply want to give an overview of a bill with which hon. members are already familiar. There are certain basic questions I will try to answer: What kind of amendments are we proposing to the Patent Act? What will be the fundamental advantages of this new legislation? Will the Canadian public also benefit as a result of these amendments? How will these amendments put us in a better position to meet current challenges in the pharmaceutical industry, on Canadian and global markets?

Reasons for reinforcing the Patent Act include promoting investment in an advanced technology industry and making Canada more competitive on the international scene in a sector where competition is intense.