

*Patent Act**[Translation]*

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the policies inherent in Bill C-22 are aimed at achieving all these objectives which were endorsed by the nation-wide Liberal convention. I simply hope that the Right Hon. Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition will respond to these questions when he takes the floor.

A few additional comments, Mr. Speaker, the most telling of them all. I get letters, lots of them, but they do not come from the average Canadian as depicted by the NDP, nor from the ordinary Canadian as described by the Liberals. They come from Canadians, and reflect sincere beliefs rather than the product of sensational distortions or national petitions. They are unsolicited and express support for our efforts.

[English]

One letter is from a family doctor, diagnosed as having acute leukemia, who says that current Canadian drug patent laws provide no incentives for drug companies to research and develop drugs in Canada. The doctor writes:

In conclusion, please do not oppose the new drug Patent Act for soon-forgotten political points and newspaper coverage Please remember that to oppose this legislation will deny the hope of new treatment and new cures for patients like myself, for your constituents and perhaps even yourself and your family members.

I would also like to note a January, 1987, article in the *Winnipeg Sun* describing a national lobby for Patent Act changes coming out of Toronto. This is not a product of multinational corporations. It is a campaign initiated by Doris Campbell, a quadriplegic who has vowed to fight for the new legislation as long as she can wiggle one toe. I should add that at the moment she can only wiggle one toe and communicates by tapping out Morse code messages with that toe. It is for the Doris Campbells of this world that we are going forward with this legislation because Doris believes that the issue is developing cures through research to save Canadian lives.

I apologize for all these quotes from Canadians, Mr. Speaker, but I want to make the point that the Government is pursuing these legislative changes for people, not for votes, which I suggest is the only reason Members opposite have forsaken principle, honesty and humanity to oppose what we are trying to do.

One final note is from the Lutherwood Institute which treats the emotional and psychiatric problems of children. This institute spends a significant amount of money every year on drugs. My correspondent is particularly blunt in his remarks about our proposed legislation. He says:

While costs to the consumer are always an issue to us, I also recognize the importance of research in developing new and more effective medication for a variety of physical and mental illnesses. As a result, we would encourage you to proceed with the implementation of Bill C-22 in order to encourage the necessary innovation in Canada for the development of prescription drugs.

What can I say, Mr. Speaker? We have principle on our side. The Canadians who are supporting us are not coming forward because we are misrepresenting the issue, they are coming forward because they have a stake in the results of our

policy. They desperately need the solutions which we are putting forward. In fact, according to the results of a recent poll by Decima Research, two out of three Canadians support the amendments to the Patent Act which affect prescription drugs. I defy a single Member opposite to come forward with such telling support for his or her position on this issue.

I have one more thing to say, Mr. Speaker, then I will sit down and let rhetoric and political expediency take over the debate. I am very concerned about the processes of the House of Commons which allow 47 new amendments to come forward from opposition Members at report stage of this legislation when these same Members proposed only 11 amendments within committee. I submit to you that these amendments should have been considered and discussed rationally and openly in committee with public submissions to expand the debate on them.

Mr. Orlikow: Then they could not have been discussed here.

Mr. Andre: I get the feeling, and I will not put it any more strongly than that, that these final-hour amendments were nothing more than an attempt to delay this essential legislation.

Mr. McCurdy: What a parade of nonsense.

Mr. Andre: They were a forum for political points that those opposing this legislation did not feel competent to make in committee.

Mr. McCurdy: If ever there was a kangaroo court, it was that committee.

Mr. Andre: However, despite these rather underhanded and unparliamentary tactics of the Opposition—

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member may rise on a point of order, but I hope this debate will carry on in calmness.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Minister did not want to mislead Members of the House or the public, but the facts are that had amendments been moved in the—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): That is not a point of order, it is debate. The Hon. Member will have an opportunity to bring that up when he has the floor.

Mr. Andre: Mr. Speaker, I hope those who may be observing this debate here or on television will note that when one says something with which socialists disagree they attempt to shout you down. That is the socialist tactic. Whether it is a member of the Government or a visitor, such as the President of the United States, they shout you down if they do not agree with you. That is what socialists believe democracy is all about.

However, despite these rather underhanded and unparliamentary tactics of the Opposition, I know the House will approve of the policy embodied in the legislation and will pass it without undue delay. I will be listening to the subsequent