

as to how we would best proceed with a trilateral negotiation of a possible U.S.-Mexico-Canada free trade agreement. The U.S. administration agreed to that then.

I will be having a meeting at Brussels toward the end of the week or on the week-end with the minister of trade of Mexico and Carla Hills, the U.S. trade negotiator on that subject. Our officials have had several meetings. We are working on a series of papers in that connection. By the early winter we expect to know whether or not we will engage in a such a trilateral negotiation.

• (1440)

**Mr. David Barrett (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca):** Mr. Speaker, there is a difference between having a siesta and being asleep at the switch.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** If the hon. member says there is a difference, I accept that there is a difference.

**Mr. Barrett:** Having sold out Canada in the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement, the minister is now being asked what specific conditions the Americans are asking for. Of course he has not answered that question.

I now ask the minister what steps he will take to ensure Canadian working men and women that they will not be faced with cheap Mexican wages competing with existing Canadian jobs in Canada and lose thousands of jobs, as they already have under the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement.

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is apparently afraid of every country in the world that has lower wages than Canada. If that is his policy, then we will cease trading and we will raise prohibitive tariffs against every developing country in the world. This apparently is the new humanitarian NDP policy: we cut off every country in the world that has lower wages.

As a matter of fact, since January 1989, 207,000 net jobs have been created here in Canada, of which 180,000 or 87 per cent have gone to women. That is the record of

success that we have achieved despite difficult economic conditions.

\* \* \*

### GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

**Hon. Roy MacLaren (Etobicoke North):** Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister for International Trade.

In the Uruguay Round of the GATT, tougher rules regarding intellectual property are being sought, including for pharmaceuticals.

Is the Canadian government satisfied with the draft proposals permitting Canada to continue its current system of compulsory licensing in the pharmaceutical industry? Or, does the government envisage that it will need to change the present Canadian system?

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact there is an interesting comparison here between a sensible question being asked and the previous question that was asked.

This is an important issue that the hon. gentleman is asking about. There is a negotiation on TRIPs, so-called, trade related intellectual property, and about the U.S. and parts of Europe including Switzerland. The European Community has made suggestions in connection with the intellectual property matter that would prohibit compulsory licensing systems, for example, applying only to special fields of technology.

As far as the government is concerned, we are very satisfied with the present system that we have in effect. It was passed by the House several years ago, as I remember. There was considerable opposition from members opposite, but now they apparently support that system. I gather from the tenor from the hon. member's question that they realize their mistake and are supporting our system. We intend to continue to support it ourselves.

**Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk):** Mr. Speaker, my sensible question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

The minister will be aware that the use of generic drugs has saved consumers hundreds of millions of dollars. If compulsory licensing is dropped at GATT, it could wipe out thousands of Canadian jobs.