

*Government Orders*

tions. Because of their age they do not feel well, they see doctor, and they get prescriptions.

The mere expedient of having a central registry so that physicians or pharmacists could check to see whether in fact this is duplication would save millions. In fact, reducing by one prescription per senior citizen would save more money than even the worst assumption in terms of what Bill C-91 would take into account. It is that kind of misinformation that makes it very difficult for the public to understand.

Figure three in the March 19, 1992 report of the Patented Medicine Prices Review Board shows very clearly in pictorial form since the introduction of Bill C-22 the prices of patented medicines—not all medicines, just patented because that is the only thing affected by this bill—rose less than the cost of inflation. In constant terms in fact the prices went down. They went down. That cannot be denied. It is incredible to me that that simple fact shown visually is ignored or distorted by opponents to this bill.

Look at the principle involved. The principle is very simple. It is a long-established principle. Creators have a right to exploit their creations. In terms of inventions the convention around the world is 17 to 20 years of exclusive right to market, to sell, to produce that which you invent and get the rewards for it. It is an absolutely essential ingredient in terms of promoting research, invention, creation.

Let me give an analogy. One of the significant costs of education is in textbooks, books for libraries, books for students. Those books are all copyrighted. The authors and the publishers have a copyright. You cannot duplicate the books. It is against the law. Why do we not save the education system money by having compulsory licensing of textbooks so that we could have generic copies? If there is a good book written, rather than paying the full price, we would allow somebody to produce a generic copy for the benefit of students and educational institutions. It would save hundreds of millions of dollars.

Who would support that in this House? Nobody. That is an affront to the author. It is an affront to the creative

skills of the author. We recognize that the author has the right to—

**Mr. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** Bring in the bill.

**Mr. Andre:** The hon. member from the New Democratic Party says bring in the bill. He would have generic copies of textbooks. That is an interesting policy. Maybe the NDP would like to propose that we should have a debate on that.

The reality is that in all modern societies we recognize something called intellectual property. If you create the product of your mind, just as the product of your hands is yours, it is immoral for governments to come along and say that the product of your mind belongs to the common good because what that does is it turns off minds.

In terms of the pharmaceutical industry what we had prior to Bill C-22 was the situation where it simply did not make sense to do research in Canada because you spent \$150 million to \$200 million to develop a new drug. You spend that money, you create a new drug. If it has any market at all, it is because it helps people with their illnesses. And then you say: "But you, the creator, do not have the exclusive right to enjoy the fruits of invention; somebody else will enjoy them".

Then what happens is that there is not much research in Canada. Indeed, prior to 1987 pharmaceutical companies operating in Canada spent about 6 per cent of their total sales on research versus a world average of 10, 11 or 12 per cent, in that order. We had about half the research.

**Mr. Milliken:** Where is it? Tell us where.

**Mr. Andre:** The hon. member from Kingston should listen rather than heckle from his seat.

What has happened now is that the pharmaceutical industry said to us in 1987 that if we passed Bill C-22 it would raise the level of R and D in Canada to international levels by 1996, 10 per cent by 1996. Well, what happened in 1991? It was 9.7 per cent. This year it has already exceeded what had been committed to by 1996. Why? Because once you provide some protection for the fruits of research you get research. Lo and behold, Canadian universities and medical establishments, Canadian laboratories have shown that they are very good. We