

Oral Questions

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Haddad visited Canada and made a number of public statements which were patently false. Presumably he can do in writing that which he can do orally. That is the only explanation I have.

• (1425)

If the Hon. Member has been doing his homework he will be aware that the Government he supported in 1983 announced its decision to restore patent protection for drugs—

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Axworthy: Nonsense!

Mr. Andre:—because the 1969 Bill had gone too far. I ask the Hon. Member what American multinational forced the Member for Papineau in his then capacity to announce the Government's decision to restore patent protection in this important area?

REQUEST THAT AMBASSADOR APPEAR BEFORE COMMITTEE

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I say with great regret that the Minister has persistently and consistently refused to acknowledge in the House that representations have been made to the Canadian Ambassador in Washington. On Monday I met with the Canadian Ambassador and he admitted to receiving representations from the Chairman of the President's Advisory Committee and the chairman of one of the most profitable corporations in the United States. Will the Minister, as well as the Secretary of State for External Affairs, agree to have the Canadian Ambassador come before the External Affairs Committee and testify about an obvious contradiction which is being perpetrated by the Minister?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, and as the Member well knows, Canada has been under pressure from the rest of the western industrialized world for 17 years. Our ambassadors and high commissioners in Britain, Switzerland, Germany, France, the United States, Japan and everywhere have been under pressure in this regard. That is no secret.

The fact is that this legislation will improve the health care of Canadians. It will produce 3,000 high-tech jobs and \$1.4 billion in extra research and development. The only Party that is preoccupied with what the Americans think is the Party opposite. Why do they not read the Bill as it is and give it a factual and honest examination? They will see that the benefits to Canada are extraordinary and it should be passed forthwith.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

CANADA-UNITED STATES TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Will

the Minister advise the House whether the Canadian Wheat Board and other marketing agencies, as well as postal rates, copyright protection, and pharmaceutical patents are all part of free trade negotiations between Canada and the United States?

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I heard the whole list. He asked if all on that list were included. I am reasonably confident, subject to reading the whole list, that the answer to the question would be no.

U.S. REPORT ON FOREIGN TRADE BARRIERS

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, I have in my hands a copy of the foreign trade barriers report from the office of the United States trade representative, which lists all of those items I just mentioned as being part of the negotiations between Canada and the United States. Will the Minister advise the House whether this information that we received from the United States Embassy is, in fact, correct?

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would have to read the document, which I will do with care, as I try to listen with care to the question of the Hon. Member. However, I believe that my answer stands.

PATENT PROTECTION QUERY

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. On December 8, 1986, my colleague, the Member for Windsor—Walkerville, asked the Minister whether patent protection was on the table for negotiation. The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs said, as reported at page 1879 of *Hansard*:

The fact is that this matter has nothing to do with the free trade talks.

Why would the United States trade representative specifically mention patent protection in his report and say that they were continuing to discuss this matter at the free trade negotiation table with Canadian representatives?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many times it is necessary to repeat that this legislation was introduced because it is of benefit to Canada.

Mr. Young: Is this part of free trade?

Mr. Andre: The whole question of intellectual property, which includes copyrights, patents, trademarks, industrial design and so on, is in fact within the ambit of the free trade discussions. There is no question. There may be in fact other aspects of patents which may be discussed; I do not know. However, I am telling the Hon. Member, as I told the Hon. Member for Windsor-Walkerville, that this legislation, Bill C-22, was brought in because we are concerned about Canada's research and development capabilities and future. We are