

Ms. Copps: In Hamilton Liberals fight to keep prices down for consumers. I hate to be accused of being Marxist-Leninist, just because I would like to prevent an increase in further profits to a sector which in the last fiscal year experienced the most profitability of any other sector, that is, the pharmaceutical sector.

The pharmaceutical sector in Canada is doing very well. As a result of the Shamrock Summit and the promise of the Prime Minister on bended knee to the President, we have a decision to turn around and give blanket monopolies to pharmaceutical multinational companies to gouge Canadian consumers. If I have to apologize for that—and I am certainly not a Marxist-Leninist—as a Member of Parliament I am going to fight for that.

Mr. McDermid: On a point of order—

Ms. Copps: I was responding to a heckle.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On a point of order, the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Trade (Mr. McDermid).

Mr. McDermid: Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy the bombastic presentation of the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps). However, we are discussing softwood lumber on third reading—and the drug patent Bill was passed some weeks ago—and it might be apropos for her to get back to the subject matter of which she knows a great deal.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the same point of order, the Hon. Member for York South—Weston (Mr. Nunziata).

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, my balding colleague across the way persists in his interruptions of the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps). I would ask that you, Sir, exercise your good judgment and discretion and request of the Hon. Member for Brampton—Georgetown (Mr. McDermid) to refrain from his heckles so as to allow the Hon. Member for Hamilton East to continue with her most interesting discussion of this particular issue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Parliamentary Secretary on the same point of order.

Mr. McDermid: Mr. Speaker, I do not need lectures from a rookie, bald-headed friend of mine across the floor.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On debate, the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps).

• (1700)

Mr. Nunziata: I just have a high forehead.

Mr. McDermid: I will remember that, cue ball.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, I think this whole discussion is patently absurd. I was responding to unsolicited heckles from the government side of the House. It was suggested to me that,

Softwood Lumber Products Export Charge Act

because I was concerned about the precedent being set by the Government, I was somehow a Marxist-Leninist.

The Hon. Member for Brampton—Georgetown claims perhaps that there is not a precedent. I think Clause 6 of the Memorandum of Understanding provides a very dangerous precedent. The Government of Canada will take no action. Here we are promising the Americans on bended knee that we will take “no action” and we will take all reasonable steps to ensure that no other government Party in Canada takes any action directly or indirectly which has the effect of offsetting or reducing the export charge or replacement measures. Further, if we do not live up to our Agreement, Mr. Ronald Reagan promises in writing that “I will take action if Canada does not live up to the terms of agreement”. What that means to the average lumber worker is that jobs supported by the Employment Support Act, which was introduced in 1971 to support almost 22,000 jobs, would no longer be supported by that Act because we have guaranteed we will not intervene in any other way to offset the effect of this particular tax.

In legislation being considered for passage here today we are suggesting that we make promises to the United States of America that what we do with our employment programs and our lumber industry has first to be vetted through the White House and through Washington. If we do not get the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval from Ronald Reagan, then he can step in and revoke the Agreement at any time. If Canada does not live up to the Agreement, the President can move in immediately and invoke a 15 per cent tariff within 30 days.

Where is the fairness in GATT if Canada is imposing an export tax of 15 per cent on products only going to one country? What about the notion of a level playing field for all the countries covered under GATT? Instead, what we are seeing is another example of the Canadian Government and the Prime Minister being so wedded to Washington that they are unprepared to launch a Canadian sovereign policy in lumber which would save Canadian jobs and which would protect the ability of the Canadian Government and provincial Governments to act in our best interests when it suits Canadians. We should not have our policy on export tax dictated by Washington. It is as simple as that.

My Leader today asked the Prime Minister what he was prepared to sell out. Who is speaking for Canada, Mr. Speaker? I think it is pretty clear that my Leader's suggestion that we are moving toward a 51st state was not an unreasonable one when you examine the sequence of events over the course of this Government. We have said goodbye to the Canadianization of the petro-chemical industry, to Canadianization of most of our major multinationals because FIRA has been neutered and left with absolutely no power under the rubric of so-called Investment Canada. What about our major resource industries, softwood lumber, fisheries? Perhaps steel and the petro-chemical industry will be next. We are so bound and determined to get this Agreement with the United States that we are making all kinds of sacrifices along the way.