

As a member of the legislative committee, I shared in the time spent and wasted to a large degree in the committee that did not give us a chance to express ourselves due to the filibustering from both parties of the opposition.

In January 1992, Canada endorsed the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade proposals to extend patent protection for pharmaceuticals by eliminating compulsory licensing. On June 23, 1992, we introduced Bill C-91, an act to amend the Patent Act, to increase brand name pharmaceutical protection from 17 to 20 years.

Why are we doing this? It will mean more investments, more jobs, more research, better medicines, fairness and reward for innovation—

Mrs. Dobbie: That is right. A future for our children.

Mr. Layton: We are committed to an international trade consensus through GATT which represents 108 countries. We must do it now because investment decisions are being made world-wide. Industry is restructuring globally.

We must create the right environment in Canada to attract investments and by the by to attract back our very fine scientists who were drawn away from Canada to the job opportunities in the United States and around the world. The reverse brain-drain is happening and it will be good for Canada.

Mrs. Dobbie: That is right. More jobs for us.

Mr. Layton: It is because patent protection is a critical factor in any new investment decisions. The current patent regime in Canada is simply non-competitive.

Some claim we are rushing this bill. The government's policy decision was announced a year ago. There has been ample opportunity for input from all stakeholders over the past months. The provinces, generic copiers, innovative companies and many others were consulted. Any further delay will jeopardize \$500 million in investment commitments. Announcements are being made nearly every day.

Yesterday it was \$170 million by the Eli Lilly Company, earlier it was Merck and beyond that it was Glaxo. They are all looking for an opportunity to invest in Canada.

Mrs. Dobbie: Because of bills like this.

Government Orders

Mr. Layton: Just because of bills like this. The track record is good.

Bill C-22 which preceded Bill C-91 has been a great success. Innovative companies have kept their promises on all fronts. There have been more investments; over \$1 billion. There have been more jobs; 2,400 by 1991, on-track for 3,000 in 1996.

There has been more R and D. Canada, its universities and its brilliant scientists are leading the world in a number of areas, well ahead of the promises that were made for 1987, up from 4.9 per cent of sales in 1987 to more than 9.6 per cent in 1991.

Mrs. Dobbie: Real opportunities for Canadians.

Mr. Layton: We have strong price controls, increases that have been held to 2.9 per cent per year, well below the consumer price index of 4.4 per cent.

Finally, Bill C-91 improves price controls. There are new powers being given to the Patented Medicine Prices Review Board. There are better controls on the prices of new drugs and a greater role for provincial and consumer inputs. Nothing in the bill will contribute to increases of individual patent drug prices. These will continue to be regulated by the board.

The Montreal Gazette has not given a lot of support to our government initiatives but in this case it said last Friday in an editorial that went across the country: "Knee-jerk reactions don't help: The bill to extend drug patents is a sensible step".

How could such a sensible, necessary piece of legislation generate so much near hysteria? The bill is simple and fair. It is intended to give pharmaceutical companies the same 20-year patent protection that all other manufacturers get for their invented products. It will bring Canada into line with countries which support the GATT proposal giving drug makers 20-year patent protection.

"The bill also contains protection for consumers by strengthening the powers of the Patented Medicine Prices Review Board", says *The Gazette* to ensure that prices for all patented drugs remain reasonable. The Canadian pharmaceutical industry will not survive, let alone thrive without some respect for intellectual properties.