

Government Orders

have some excellent people. Given the opportunity to pursue research and the opportunity to enjoy the fruits of that research, Canadians have responded.

The November 10 issue of *The Globe and Mail* on the report on health and pharmaceuticals says: "Robust industry defies sick economy". There are several pages about how robust the pharmaceutical industry is in Canada as a result of Bill C-22. What do we have? We have investments in research and development near international levels finally. We have a robust industry employing people and growing.

I will never forget the young man who stopped me on a street in Montreal and said: "Thank you, Mr. Andre. I have been working in California since graduating with my Ph.D. in biochemistry. As a result of Bill C-22 I have been able to come back to Canada and work in my home country doing research and development". The member from the New Democratic Party over there chuckles about this. He thinks it is pretty funny that we provide an environment for Canadian scientists to work in Canada.

What was said about Bill C-22? Let me read you some quotes on Bill C-22, one by the now NDP leader, but not then: "Estimates suggest that it will double or even triple the cost of prescription drugs in the country". What happened? They actually went down in real terms. I think it was the member for Essex—Windsor: "The bill will bring Canada dramatically higher drug prices and very little research". Wrong on both counts. More research, lower prices. What did the then leader of the Liberal Party say? "Consumers could wind up paying billions more under C-22." Wrong, dead wrong.

Mr. Milliken: Where are the facts on this? Who says so?

Mr. Andre: The facts say so. The hon. member from Kingston can read. He should read the report and look at the chart.

Mr. Milliken: It went up 4 per cent a year.

Mr. Andre: And inflation was more than that. The hon. member should know.

There was Ed Broadbent who said that already prices for drugs were going up four times the rate of inflation. Then there was that great journalist, Don McGillivray, who said: "The policy will not cause prices to rise, said

Harvie Andre. He must have been talking for the benefit of the people who believe in the tooth fairy".

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Order please. Time is running out and I invite the hon. speaker to conclude.

Mr. Andre: Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by reading a quote from an article in *The Ottawa Citizen* of October 6 because I think it explains why we are doing it: "Canada risks becoming a mere bystander in the global race for new drugs and treatments unless the government passes its controversial drug patent law, a group of researchers warned Monday. The real losers are going to be Canadians in need of innovative medical treatment, said Dr. Howard Dickson, chairman of the Coalition for Biomedical and Health Research and associate dean of research at Dalhousie University's faculty of medicine". It goes on to say: "The coalition is urging the passage of C-91".

The reality is that the scientists of this country want us to pass this bill because it is right. Those who understand what research and intellectual property is about want us to pass it because it is right. Those who look fairly at the success of Bill C-22 recognize that this is a move in the right direction that will produce more research, better drugs for Canadians, more jobs for Canadians, and in fact is the kind of legislation that any intelligent government would pass.

• (1620)

That is why I am pleased to support it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to speak on Bill C-91. I want to address three issues: compulsory licensing, research and development in jobs and the cost of pharmaceutical drugs. First of all, I want to assure my hon. colleagues that I have in fact looked at the research and I am going to try to make a case which I think is fair.

We have to understand that compulsory licensing was brought in because the prices of pharmaceuticals in Canada were really much higher than in most countries of the world. Because it was difficult to try to make these medications available to our population, there was a different way to do it. In fact it was the right hon. member for Vancouver—Quadra who amended the Patent Act so that holders of drug patents no longer had a monopoly on the production and the bill established, as I was indicating, a system of compulsory licensing whereby generic drug companies could produce a patent drug