

Right to Life

of the 1969 policy. This was because there was a need, the paper said, to generate more investment in research and development in Canada. In September of that year, the present Liberal critic for science and technology in the House, the then Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, said that the Government's objective is to maintain low prices for consumers and to create a business climate that will support development of the industry with an emphasis on the growth of return, the development of exports and an active ingredient manufacturing in Canada. The Eastman Commission, in its report, confirmed the need to rebalance existing patent policy by providing a guaranteed period of protection to innovative companies.

Many scientific, medical, pharmacological and other research groups across Canada have also called for amendments to the Patent Act to promote more pharmaceutical research in Canada. These groups have included the Canadian Federation of Biological Societies, the Canadian Society for Clinical Pharmacology, the Canadian Society of Hospital Pharmacists, the Research Institute of Montreal, l'Industrie du Médicament, the Deans of Pharmacy of Canada, the Medical Federation of Quebec and many others. We have heard from these groups as recently as this past week.

Bill C-22 answers these calls for the promotion of pharmaceutical research and development in Canada. The Government anticipates that the new investment will total some \$1.4 billion and that these investments will create some 3,000 high quality research and technology jobs in the pharmaceutical industry across Canada. Other estimates of the number of jobs that will be created are even higher. According to an October 1986 article in *Le Devoir économique*, the former Dean of the University of Montreal said that the number will increase from the present 17,000 to 25,000. These are the jobs for which the pharmaceutical and medical research groups have been calling.

I think it is absolutely essential that as the House moves forward with this debate, we as parliamentarians do whatever we can to promote research and development in Canada. In thinking about this Bill, it is essential that we ask ourselves what our track record in drug research has been over the last 10, 20 or even 50 years. We would be disappointed to learn that our creativity in the bringing forward of new drugs to protect the health of Canadians and other men and women around the world has not been as productive as we would have like it to have been.

Thinking about this further, and accepting that philosophy, we are in large part on an ongoing and continuous basis putting ourselves in the position of having to rely on research being done in other countries for many of our health care needs. If we are to do that, we will then have to pay what might be called the international price for new drugs. If that will be the case, we will have no protection whatsoever because we will not be able to establish in our own domain the method of controlling prices of drugs that are so important to the poor, the elderly, the needy and indeed all Canadians.

New drugs are expensive. Recently, I have read a little bit about the new drug cyclosporin, a drug that has revolutionized the entire approach to the transplanting of organs. This drug has been able to overcome the rejection phenomena we have been until now unable to accommodate. This has been a marvellous new development in scientific research and in human health. However, for those who have to use it, the drug is expensive. I understand that its use costs between \$2,000 and \$4,000 a year. However, that is the price of progress. I am sure that those who live with new organs find that a small price to pay.

There is another dimension to this. There is an entire generation of young scientists who are interested in biochemistry, biotechnology and medical research who are denied access to research laboratories because of our lack of encouragement and the lack of the appropriate economic and protective climate needed to allow pharmaceutical research in Canada. If these young men and women graduates of our universities want to pursue careers in this area, they usually have to go elsewhere.

It is expected that as much as 30 per cent or perhaps \$400 million of the new research and development expenditures will go directly to Canadian universities, hospitals and other private research groups. Medical schools and research institutes will all benefit from the increase in basic and clinical research and development that will occur as a result of this Bill.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): It being five o'clock the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

• (1600)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS--MOTIONS

[English]

THE CONSTITUTION ACT, 1982

RIGHT TO LIFE OF UNBORN HUMAN PERSONS

Mr. Gus Mitges (Grey—Simcoe) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of amending the *Constitution Act, 1982*, to include unborn human persons, and that the Governor General issue a Proclamation under the Great Seal of Canada to amend section 7 of the Canadian Charter of Rights so that it reads as follows:

"7. Everyone including a human foetus or unborn being has the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice."

He said: There is no question, Madam Speaker, that this country of ours has split into two decidedly hostile factions since the Criminal Code was amended in 1969 to exclude from prosecution those abortions performed in hospitals which have therapeutic abortion committees.