

the world and can demand that kind of respect when it behaves like a Third World country when it comes to intellectual property, when it is willing to confiscate the intellectual property of people who work in the pharmaceutical sector. That is a legitimate question.

Tom Axworthy, the former principal secretary to the former Prime Minister, said that the greatest diplomatic coup of the External Affairs Department of this Government was get admitted to the then G-5 and now the G-7 group. Well, he was right. It was a tremendous tribute to the diplomatic skills of our Prime Minister. Part of being a member of that group, of demanding to be respected as one of the major industrialized countries in the world, is to respect its rules, including its rules of commerce, trade and property. We cannot, as we have, confiscate private property and expect others to say: "Oh, well that's all right. We will let Canada be the one exception in the western industrialized world. Canada can behave like Argentina or other Third World countries and we will understand and tolerate that and of course we will not take that into account when we discuss other important questions". Of course they will take it into account. Of course that has cost us.

It strikes me as being completely absurd that with the blessing of opposition Parties, and quite properly so, we spend hundreds of millions of dollars every year on our relationships with our partners in the western industrialized world in an attempt to sustain and foster them and to work together as partners while we do something as silly as this. This tells everyone else that when they are dealing with Canada, they may not be dealing with a country like the others but with a country that cannot make up its mind if it wants to be a first-class industrialized country or a Third World country which sponges off the investments of others.

I put the following question to any Hon. Member: what would happen if nowhere in the world were there patents for drugs? The answer is very obvious. There would be no research. There would be no drugs to help cure the sick and the elderly. No one can argue against that fundamental premise. I would then ask Hon. Members the following question: what justification is there in all honesty for thinking that Canada should be excluded from having to pay for any of this research?

● (1530)

What if we thought the rest of the world should do that research? It would be wonderful if they found a cure for cancer, a better ulcer treatment or better heart drugs. Would we try to get access to them as cheaply as we could and not respect the property of the people who had made those discoveries? Nobody could do that and hold up his head. However, that is what we have been trying to do, and it has cost us dearly.

A few years ago I was in London talking with the Agent General. He was trying to raise some investment funds from their large pension funds. In talking with him I asked what was

wrong with Canada as a place in which to invest. He said that there were three things wrong with Canada in particular, the Foreign Investment Review Agency, the National Energy Program which confiscated private property, and the Patent Act which confiscated private property.

What did that cost us? Who knows? It was certainly hundreds of millions, if not billions of dollars, of investment capital. No one considers that in the equation. How many people might be working today if in fact this law was not in place in 1969? I am sure it would be quite a few more.

There is the question of consumer protection. What good would come of it if we had all kinds of new drugs and no one could afford them? If the sick and elderly could not get access to the drugs, what good would come of it? Opposition Members have been trying to scare everyone to death by saying that prices will rise and the sick and elderly will not have access to them. That is absolutely irresponsible propaganda, worthy of the CBC and nowhere else. The fact of the matter is that as soon as Prince Edward Island brings in its pharmacare scheme, 100 per cent of senior citizens in Canada will be covered by drug plans.

Mr. Orlikow: Then the provinces will pay any increased costs.

Mr. Andre: I agree with the Hon. Member. However, does the Hon. Member feel that it is therefore dishonest for him and others to say to senior citizens, as they have been doing: "You will pay more for your drugs"? Does he not think that it is dishonest to say that they will pay more for their drugs?

Mr. Orlikow: Don't seniors pay taxes?

Mr. Andre: The Hon. Member is trying to frighten senior citizens by telling them they will pay. He knows that is false.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. I ask Your Honour to rule on whether the Minister has the right—and I will deal with his arguments when I speak—to say that I know what I am saying is false.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I will certainly read the "blues" and report back to the House later this afternoon.

Mr. Andre: I am prepared to concede that he may be saying that out of ignorance. That is quite possible. It could be deliberately; it could be out of ignorance. In either case it is hardly forgivable.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would just ask the Minister to not use comments such as the word "deliberately", please.

Mr. Andre: Over 85 per cent of Canadians are covered by drug plans. In terms of the consumer *per se*, the direct effect if any is very minimal. What will be the effect on drug prices in general? What will be that effect? Let us consider what happens in Canada in terms of the marketing of drugs. I will return to the 1950s and 1960s.