

*Patent Act*

it in the United States. He did not patent it in Canada because he did not want to have his discovery exploited by somebody, to his detriment. I also spoke to a new professor who had arrived from France where he worked for a drug company; a French company, not a multinational. When that company discovers a new drug it licences companies in other countries to do the marketing. He told me that the company did not license companies in Canada because it did not want to lose the technology through lack of protection.

New drugs are being discovered which could help cure sick Canadians but they are being kept off the market and are unavailable to sick Canadians because of our Patent Act. If Members of the Opposition were here to listen and had real concern for sick Canadians they would include that as part of the equation. How many drugs are not available in Canada or are delayed entry into Canada because of our pharmaceutical laws? What is that cost?

I was at the University of Alberta last week where I met a bright young biochemist who I believe is doing some really fascinating work in the area of drugs. He was not able to raise any research funds in Canada, nor was he able to interest any Canadian company in pursuing this research. Why fund research in Canada if you cannot patent your results? He contracted with a Japanese company which funded his research. Part of the funding, \$80,000, was to buy the rights to his creation. The Japanese company in turn sold those rights to Cyanamid in the United States for \$15 million. Here was a discovery by a Canadian scientist in a Canadian university doing research here, but because of our patent laws it is enriching a Japanese company.

How many people in the Opposition making their cost calculations have included figures like that? What cost is that? What can you say about a country that educates brilliant young people but says, in essence, do not do research in that area because we are not going to protect the results? If you want to live in Canada and continue to do research find yourself a Japanese company to interest itself in what you produce? How in heavens can we hold up our heads continuing to do that kind of thing?

There is anecdotal evidence all over. Dr. de Bold, now at the University of Ottawa, while at Queen's University discovered a naturally recurring hormone that regulates high blood pressure. It is an amazing discovery, for which he has had all kinds of awards; he recently won the Manning Award. In *Saturday Night* magazine for August, 1986 it was stated:

There are, in fact, many reasons why de Bold, Queen's University, and Canada will not reap the full benefits of this medical discovery. Foremost are the lack of a strong domestic drug industry; patent laws that give consumers low priced generic drugs, but make it uneconomical for drug companies to do research in Canada—

Here is another case of a brilliant scientist, funded by Canadian taxpayers as a university professor and researcher, who has come up with a very important discovery but Canada will reap none of the economic benefits because of our patent laws.

How many Members of the Opposition have put that calculation into their sums when they looked at cost and benefits? Not one, Mr. Speaker. They would rather rant and rave about the National Research Council and so on rather than recognizing that what they are advocating is causing more damage to research in Canada than can be imagined.

Here is a letter from a physician at the Hospital for Sick Children:

I am a paediatrician training in pharmacology at the Hospital for Sick Children; in this capacity I was recently at an annual meeting of the American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics in Baltimore. While attending the meeting presenting a paper on research done in our lab, I was struck by the quantity and quality of research done by the pharmaceutical companies that was being presented. I also noted that, while many of the scientists and physicians were non-Americans, the majority of the work was being done in the United States. The challenge is clear—

He is pointing out that in order to do work in research and development our scientists have to go to the United States. We train them. I do not know what it costs to turn out an MD, Ph.D in Canada but a few hundred thousand dollars I would guess. We spend those tax dollars, then they go elsewhere to do their research and development. If Hon. Members in the Opposition are truly interested in costs, as they claim in their questions asked in Question Period over the last few days, let them put those costs into their equations. What is the cost to us as a country?

I humbly submit that anybody who takes an objective view of what we are proposing will see that we have in place enormous checks and balances to ensure that consumer prices of drugs remain reasonable. They should look at what we will get by way of research and development, and at the jobs this will create.

● (1550)

**Mr. Speaker:** I regret to inform the Hon. Minister that his time has expired. In these circumstances it is often customary for the House to give its unanimous consent to the Minister so he can continue for a few minutes in order to finish.

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Andre:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the indulgence of the House. I thought the opening speaker had unlimited time. I will wind it up very quickly.

This Bill provides protection for consumers through the Drug Prices Review Board policy review in four years and parliamentary review in 10 years. All of the price control mechanisms provincial Governments have in effect will also remain in place. Indeed, the head of the British Columbia pharmacology program indicated that in his view there was likely to be no effect on the cost to British Columbia because the existence of the price review board will help them in their job.

Whatever costs might be associated with this legislation will be minimal. They will not hit the consumer. They will be worth it in the sense of helping to improve our international