

The Manitoba Legislative Assembly has directed me to send you the following resolution which it adopted on Wednesday, April 29, 1987.

The resolution reads:

• (1630)

Whereas the availability of safe pharmaceuticals at reasonable cost is fundamental to the health and well-being of Canadians, and

Whereas Section 41(4) of the Patent Act as amended in 1969 has provided the vehicle whereby Canadian licencees can produce low-priced generic substitutions of brand-name pharmaceuticals to be marketed in Canada, and

Whereas according to the Eastman Commission, these generic substitutions saved Canadians well over \$200 million in 1983, and

Whereas these generic substitutions resulted in a saving in hospital, pharmacare and prescription costs for Manitobans amounting to over \$14 million in 1986, and

Whereas the drug reimbursement paid out by the provincial Government through its universal pharmacare program has risen from \$4.3 million in 1975 to \$28 million in 1986, and

Whereas the proposed changes to the Patent Act which delay the introduction of new generic substitutions will result in even higher hospital, pharmacare and prescription costs, while providing few alternative benefits to Canadians, and

Whereas the cost to Manitobans of the delayed entry of new generic substitutions will be over \$2 million in the first year after the changes, and could total \$44 million by 1995, and

Whereas the increased costs will be borne directly by consumers both at the counter and through increased costs to our pharmacare program and will especially affect the elderly and those who require continuous medication, and

Whereas the federal Government, in spite of strong representation by the public opposing the amendments, and in the face of constant pressure from the multinational drug companies, continues to insist on amending the Patent Act.

Therefore be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the Government of Canada to withdraw the Bill outlining amendments to the Patent Act which would result in higher cost drugs for all Canadians, and

Be it further resolved that the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly be instructed to send copies of the resolution to the Federal Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and all other Members of Parliament.

This is signed by Mr. W.H. Remnant, Clerk of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba. The telex number is available if it is to be tabled.

There we have another legislature in this country speaking out against the harmful effects that Bill C-22 will have upon the citizens of that particular province, namely Manitoba.

We hear this cry from other provinces. Ontario sent a letter to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs opposing the proposals of Bill C-22. He offered some possible constructive changes to the Bill, and of course the Minister dismissed them. The additional costs in Ontario will be about \$35 million. The Government of Saskatchewan is opposed to Bill C-22. There was a provincial election and money for the farmers. Then Saskatchewan changed its mind. Representatives came to committee and made a presentation. I have to be fair, it was not the Minister responsible in the Province of Saskatchewan, it was the Deputy Minister of Health, I believe. He was the one who, under cross-examination by Members of Parliament, in reading through his brief had about 9 to 11 preconditions and if they were to be met, Saskatchewan would support the Bill. Fortunately, or unfortunately, when I

### *Patent Act*

questioned him, he would not, and perhaps in all fairness, could not say that he supported or did not support the Bill as it now stood because he was representing his Minister and was not in a position to exercise that sort of ministerial discretion which we know can only be given to a Minister and not his deputy.

We have seen government representatives, organization representatives, representatives of national organizations, representatives of non-profit corporations and representatives of Canadian corporations. We have had citizens groups, the Legion and people from the Church of Canada. Numerous Canadians from all walks of life, unions and what have you, all rose in opposition to Bill C-22. Some Members may say this is sickening. I do not think the stand, the suggestions, the queries and the concerns of the United Church of Canada are sickening. I do not think that the views of the Royal Canadian Legion of Canada, of their veterans, their associated members and all other members approximating 590,000, on the subject are sickening. I think they are relevant and germane to our deliberations as we proceed with the debate on Bill C-22 and the effects the Bill will have on Canadians from coast to coast.

The Canadian Drug Manufacturers Association, which I must admit is one of the lead organizations, is opposed to Bill C-22. It has a vested interest in being opposed and we should understand that off the bat. If one looks at the Canadian pharmaceutical industry, we want to see multinational corporations in operation as well as our own Canadian generic firms. That is what we want to see, Mr. Speaker.

I have listened attentively and patiently to many claims in committee. I wish to quote briefly what a number of organizations have said on this Bill. First, the Canadian Drug Manufacturers Association said this:

—we do not think there is any real social or economic reason to change the current system of compulsory licensing. It has brought only good to Canada . . . world-class industry must have six separate sectors: pure research, applied research, fine chemicals, brand name manufacturers, generic manufacturers and the new biotechnological companies . . . Bill C-22 will reduce Canada's industry to only two components and will result in whopping big reliance on foreign firms for our drugs.

That is found at pages 3:7 and 3:8 of the brief, if Members find it important enough and wish to check on it.

What does the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association of Canada say? It says:

These companies (the multinationals) have indeed made their announcements (of investments). I think they have also said very clearly that if the Bill is not passed, not all of this investment will go ahead, and I expect you will see evidence.

I am not saying that this is blackmail, but it is pretty close to it. It is either "you pass this legislation or we will not proceed with our investment intentions". As a Canadian parliamentarian and one interested in public policy, I find that to be a very unfortunate statement made by the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.