

*Patent Act*

I say to the Hon. Member that I believe I express the feelings of a great many Hon. Members in saying that we regret very much that Hon. Members had to be reminded of that unpleasant event.

---

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

**PATENT ACT**

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Andre that Bill C-22, an Act to amend the patent Act and to provide for certain matters in relation thereto, be read the third time and passed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** When the House rose at 1 p.m., the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—East Richmond (Mr. Dingwall) had the floor.

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue my submission on third reading stage of Bill C-22.

In his opening remarks, the Minister talked about a number of things and I responded by addressing the process of Bill C-22. I responded to the Minister's challenge regarding polls, and I believe that if you check the record, Mr. Speaker, you will find that I concluded just before the break by mentioning the positive effects the 1969 Patent Act had on job creation throughout Canada.

Unfortunately, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Andre) indicated to the House, though I do not believe he did so intentionally, that somehow opposition Members were merely attempting to promote fear and cause anguish and anger over Bill C-22. Nothing could be further from the truth. The fact is that Canadians who understand and realize only too well the effects of Bill C-22 have been writing to Members of Parliament and, yes, Members of Parliament have been writing to them.

I have here a letter from the Manitoba Women's Institutes dated January 16, 1987, signed by the executive secretary. She says the following in part:

The Manitoba Women's Institutes position re Bill C-22 is as follows:

1. We reject the proposed legislation.
2. We would accept a four year monopoly on a drug developed by a pharmaceutical company providing—
3. Any royalty monies derived be directed into research within Canada.

This particular representative of the distinguished Manitoba Women's Institutes made that presentation in a letter addressed to the committee studying Bill C-22. I do not believe it fair or reasonable to conclude that such individuals as this are attempting to promote fear, anguish and havoc among Canadians with regard to this Bill. These are legitimate

concerns of Canadian taxpayers with regard to this important piece of legislation.

● (1530)

An organization from Vancouver called End Legislated Poverty sent a letter to the clerk of the committee. It is signed by Jean Swanson, the co-ordinator. It reads in part as follows:

We believe that changes to the Patent Act proposed in Bill C-22 will increase the cost of drugs and jeopardize provincial free drug programs. The universality of the Canadian medicare system is at stake.

To conclude, we believe that the existing Patent Act and the program of compulsory licensing provides balance between the generic and brand name manufacturers and benefits sick Canadians. The Act does not need to be changed. If it is changed in accordance with Bill C-22 low-income Canadians will get poorer and sicker.

The Minister referred to letters which he received. I want to refer him to letters I received which I am sure other members on the standing committee received as well. I have a letter dated December 17, 1986, addressed to the clerk, copies of which were sent to Members of Parliament. It reads in part:

We are very concerned that the proposed Bill will raise the cost of drugs which are necessary to many people's health and are already too expensive.

Many women we work with don't have the money to pay for drugs now when they or their children are sick. We cannot afford any increases in those costs.

That letter comes from Ellen Woodsworth of Wages for Housework in Vancouver, British Columbia. The letter is dated December 17, 1986. I was not appointed to the legislative committee by my Leader until some time in January of 1987. This is another organization which opposes Bill C-22.

The Second Mile Club of Toronto wrote a letter on February 11, 1986, to the Clerk of the standing committee. They said:

The members of High Park Branch, Second Mile Club of Toronto, unanimously supported a resolution in support of the stand taken by the Ontario Association of Senior Citizens Organizations representing 18 organizations and about 250,000 seniors in the province protesting the forthcoming Mulroney Government Bill C-22 that the seniors claim will cost Canadians an additional \$650,000,000 in drug prices in the next 10 years.

They have attached a list of signatures of some of those individuals. I have no reason to question the authenticity of those names. I suppose I could spend my every waking hour for the next several weeks checking with every individual. That is another organization opposed to this Bill.

During our deliberations at committee stage we heard a number of good presentations. One of the best was that of the National Pensioners and Senior Citizens Federation which came before us and expressed a great deal of concern. They talked about the historical perspective of the Patent Act prior to 1969 and thereafter when legislation was passed by this House. They talked about the Canadian pharmaceutical industry and its profitability as announced by Professor Eastman in his study which was concluded in September, 1985.