

*Patent Act*

The report then goes on to enumerate what that new policy should be.

I would like to give the Minister an opportunity this afternoon to assure the House and Canadian seniors that the policy he just announced will be the Government's policy from here on in, and that come 1989 we will not be faced with the same restatement of policy. I would like to have that assurance from the Minister and I am quite sure others would.

At the end of the Minister's remarks he said that he would be introducing legislation in the House. It is my recollection that there was no legislation introduced in the House when the Government changed the policy; it was done by an Order in Council. Perhaps the Minister could respond to my remarks after I have concluded, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that that was a large part of the grievance that we in the Opposition had about that policy change and the fact that the representatives of this country were not allowed an opportunity to debate the policy. In fact, people directly affected by it, superannuates and those retiring from the Armed Forces, had absolutely no input. If the Government feels that legislation must be introduced in the House to effect the change the Minister has just announced, then I can assure him that our Party will give him all the assistance it can to make sure the legislation is adopted as speedily as possible so that the people who were denied benefits who were properly entitled to them can receive them.

The Minister in his remarks said that some retirees receiving benefits on January 5, 1986 when the policy came into effect were disqualified. The Minister seems to be suggesting that he is asking the Unemployment Insurance Commission to review those cases with a view to restoring the benefits if the allegations are proven. It has been my experience with the Unemployment Insurance Commission that when an individual is disqualified from receiving benefits, for whatever reason, that information is recorded. I would not like to see a large number of people whom the Minister seems to be attempting to assist in this matter being forced to file appeals before boards of referees in order to get benefits that they should have continued to receive following January 5 when this new policy came into effect.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in the last months those individuals have led a rather frustrating life and should not be subjected to any more anxiety. Perhaps the Minister could ensure that the Unemployment Insurance Commission will take a look at the disenfranchisement served on individuals and if an individual was disqualified because of the new policy, then it seems to me the commission should be instructed immediately to reinstate benefits from that time without necessitating people having to go through the whole appeal process which, as we all know, can take a very long period of time.

**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 now read a second time and referred to a legislative committee; and the amendment of Mrs. Killens (p. 1378).

**Mr. David Daubney (Ottawa West):** Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Standing Committee on Research, Science and Technology, I am pleased to take part in this important debate this afternoon on a Bill which can do a great deal to redress the current high technology imbalance in our balance of payments which our country has faced in the high technology area for some years. We all agree that there is much less pharmaceutical research and development being done in Canada than our Government and the Canadian research and development community would like. This is because Canada has been regarded, as the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Andre) pointed out so well this afternoon and for the last several weeks, as a country with a hostile climate toward investment in this area. The innovative drug companies doing basic research do not want to invest here because Canada has refused to reward them for their efforts.

Drug research in Canada is now almost totally oriented toward the clinical research and trials necessary to obtain permission from Health and Welfare Canada to market a drug in this country. The basic research that should provide employment for our university science graduates is being done in other countries at a loss to Canada. Bill C-22 will provide the means to correct this inequity for Canadian pharmaceutical research, and will lay the groundwork for employment in Canada for Canadian university science graduates. I believe that the steps being taken in this Bill and the new investment in research and development that will result are a major step forward in support of a truly significant pharmaceutical industry.

It is expected that as much as 30 per cent or \$420 million of the estimated \$1.4 billion of 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.

• (1540)

I would like to bring to the attention of the House a report by the Medical Research Council of Canada. It is a draft report on this legislation provided to me by the council. It points out that until the late 1960s the international pharmaceutical manufacturing community regarded Canada as a desirable country in which to expand research facilities. Good