

*Patent Act*

Government is now prepared to sell out Canadian senior citizens and the sick, those who are the least able to pay.

I heard a Member from the government side talking about following the system in the United States. I would ask that Hon. Member to see in which kind of shambles the American health system is. Over the last couple of years, because my husband's family is from the United States, I have had a chance to visit there. Almost without exception, every time I have been to my husband's home town of Tampa, Florida, I have read in the paper accounts of at least two or three cases of suicides, people who have killed themselves because the cost of medical care is so prohibitive. The last time I was there, I heard of a murder-suicide. A young mother whose son had been in a motorcycle accident and who did not have medical insurance killed her son and herself because she simply could not face the thought of losing everything the family had worked hard for. There was no hope because of the condition of her son. I do not think we should hold up this kind of a system as one to emulate.

We know that the current Canadian pharmaceutical system was studied by experts from the United States who wanted to find a way of bringing down the escalating costs of drugs. Those experts looked to Canada for leadership. At a time when our Government should be showing leadership and telling American multinationals that we like our system and are going to keep it, why are we buckling down to pressures from multinationals? Why has the Prime Minister led us down the garden path on our merry way ever since the Shamrock Summit, a summit which really did put the sham back into the word "shamrock"?

**Mr. Orlikow:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps). She made a very eloquent speech in which she attacked the Government for bringing forth this legislation which will add tens of millions of dollars each year to the costs borne either by individual Canadians or private or public pharmacare plans for prescriptions. She has lauded the legislation passed in the late 1960s by the Liberal Government which gave us the system which the Conservative Government is proposing to change in such an ill-advised manner.

If those are her views and the views of her Party, why, when the Liberals were in government, did the Hon. Member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet), who was then the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, buckle under to the pressure of multinationals by telling them he was willing to think about changing the system? Why did his successor, Mrs. Erola, appoint Prof. Eastman to look at the question if the system was working well? Why did the Hon. Member for Sudbury (Mr. Frith) in June assure Conservative Members of Parliament that if the Government brought the Bill forward before the summer break, the Liberals would not oppose it and only members of the NDP would, so they would get it through quickly? Why do Liberal Members continue to talk on both sides of every question?

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, I believe the response of the previous Liberal Government to pressure from multinationals was in fact to set up the Eastman Commission. As I understand it, from discussions with members of the New Democratic Party as well as members of the Liberal Party, there is a broad range of views on how far Eastman went, how far he should have gone and what recommendations should be accepted. I believe it is common knowledge that Liberal Members were prepared to accept some of the recommendations of the Eastman Report, and that is also the case for members of the New Democratic Party. I am not quite sure what the Hon. Member is driving at.

The Liberal Party did not change the patent law. It appointed an expert who would look at the question and return to Parliament with a report, thus giving us a chance to examine the questions as he has suggested we should do. We did not get the Eastman Report in this Bill, we got a carbon copy of the message Mr. Ronald Reagan sent to the Prime Minister at the Shamrock Summit. Even though Eastman did his work and tried to find out the general feeling among the population as well as the producers, his recommendations were ignored. What we have before us is basically a regurgitation of what American multinationals wanted from the Prime Minister and got from him in the first place.

The Hamilton and District Labour Council, a member of the Canadian Labour Congress, wrote to the Prime Minister with a carbon copy to me, the Member for Hamilton East, objecting to this measure. Surely the Hon. Member is not suggesting that I should not voice to the Government my concerns and the concerns of the Hamilton and District Labour Council about the changes which will result in this kind of monopoly. Surely he does not want us to stop fighting the Government on this issue. Is that what he is suggesting?

**Mr. Mazankowski:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This morning I rose to indicate my intention to serve notice that there would be an amended motion put providing for the number of additional days for debate on this issue pursuant to a notice I gave last Friday. I understand there has been some uncertainty as to the interpretation of the number of days in the motion and I wish to make it very clear that in the motion I proposed—

**Ms. Copps:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Mazankowski:** I am speaking on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Ms. Copps:** I had the floor. There was a question and answer period and I believe that I had—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Order.

**Ms. Copps:** Well, I had the floor. You can't stand up on a point of order in the middle of anything.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The Hon. Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) has the floor. I will