

Patent Act

need the kind of major changes that in fact this Bill will lead to.

Mr. Heap: Mr. Speaker, since there has been so much evidence, as the Hon. Member has reminded us, that the Bill was not needed or, if it was partly needed, that it goes far beyond what was needed in order to maintain for Canadians the advantages of the drug industry that are available in Canada, would the Hon. Member care to comment on what he thinks is the reason that the Government has, as he put it, almost apparently allowed the Bill to be written in the offices of the multinational drug corporations? What is the reason for the Government's surrender to these corporations?

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, let me give the Hon. Member two reasons. First, as I indicated during the course of my speech, the multinational drug companies are tremendously profitable companies in Canada, in the United States, and in the western European countries in which their head offices are sometimes established. They are able to mount very powerful lobbies in all of these countries, including Canada. They are able to make major financial contributions to political Parties who will listen to them and try to accommodate them. That is one reason.

The other reason is that we believe, and I think there is substantial evidence to substantiate it, that in the discussions between President Reagan and our Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) leading up to the free trade proposal it was made very clear to our Prime Minister by President Reagan, on the advice and the urging of the multinational corporations whose head offices are in the United States, that if we wanted a free trade agreement, this legislation, which would change the system we have, would be necessary. This system demonstrated to Americans and to American Senators and Congressmen that, if introduced and implemented in the United States, American citizens could save hundreds of millions of dollars a year. Thus they wanted this Bill out.

So I believe that part of the reason that the Government is so determined to enact this Bill and is so obstinate in its refusal to consider even the most mildly limiting amendment to it is that there was a commitment made by the Government to the President of the United States that we would pass this Bill as proposed and fostered by the multinational drug companies.

We believe that this was part of the agreement to get the so-called free trade deal between Canada and the United States. Of course, there is no reference to the events which occurred when the Government assumed office and began hearings in the United States that its number one trade irritant was the drug patent law and the concessions that were made at the Shamrock Summit on intellectual property. Of course, the Government has never admitted that that is why it brought in this Bill. But there has been more than enough testimony in Senate hearings and in hearings before the House of Representatives, as well as that given by representatives of the multinational corporations in the United States, that this was

part of the price that Canada would have to pay if we wanted a free trade deal.

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have always thought that this Bill was a bad Bill. I heard about it several years ago, that is to say when it was at the committee stage. Everything that was told to me about it by people who were studying it perhaps four years ago seems to be well supported by what has come out during the debate in Parliament. This is now the third time that we have debated it in Parliament.

I was surprised a while back to see an editorial in *The Toronto Sun* in which I find that *The Toronto Sun* agrees with me.

Mr. Boudria: You should reconsider your position.

Mr. Heap: The Hon. Member says that I should reconsider my position. I did. I read the editorial very carefully. The only other time I can remember an editorial in *The Toronto Sun* agreeing with me—in fact it even alarmed me by naming me and stating its agreement with me—was when I spoke in favour of the abolition of the Senate a year or two ago. When *The Toronto Sun* said it agreed with me I had to read that editorial very carefully. It turned out that its reasoning was not entirely the same as mine, although it did overlap mine somewhat. I consulted with some of my colleagues and my constituents and they confirmed my view that I was on the right track in spite of the fact that *The Toronto Sun* agreed with me. I have had a great deal of experience with *The Toronto Sun* over the past decade or so as a resident of Toronto and as a member of Toronto City Council. I always thought that it was a good, reliably far right-wing example of the conservative point of view.

Mr. McCurdy: Are you talking about *The Toronto Sun*?

Mr. Heap: *The Toronto Sun*, that is right. I was startled again to see this editorial on October 23, 1987, entitled "Upper downer". The opening line states, "Harvey Andre's outrage with the Senate rings more than a little false in our ears".

The whole editorial is in disagreement with the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Andre). It contains statements such as, "I would sooner lose this Bill... than acquiesce to the principle that we have a bunch of unelected Liberals exercising veto power over the elected government of Canada are pure rhetoric". The editor of *The Toronto Sun* then says bluntly that, "Such bluster does not deal with the fact that the drug patent Bill is a bad Bill and the changes are reasonable". He is referring to the changes proposed by the Senate. He says that the changes are reasonable because it is a bad Bill. That is very plain language. *The Toronto Sun* always uses plain language. Whether or not one likes what it says, it does not leave much doubt about what it is saying. It says that this is a bad Bill for both business and the consumer.