

proud to say that this was instigated by a New Democratic Government, and the same thing has happened in Manitoba. It is very interesting that the Social Credit Government, an ultra-conservative Government, has been in power in British Columbia for many years, but one thing it dared not take away is the pharma-care program. That is because it is so important to elderly people who rely so heavily on this plan to help cover the costs of their medical expenses.

As my colleague said, the big concern of, I am sure, even Social Credit Governments, as well as the Government of Manitoba, is that with the price of drugs going up, which would be a result of this legislation if it ever passes, there will be a tremendous burden on the provinces. I would think the provinces are going to have trouble covering their costs. In fact, the federal Government has even acknowledged this by offering compensation to the provinces, not nearly as much as they would have to pay out, but a token compensation, so even the Government admits that it is a real problem.

Another worry I have is that provincial Governments may not be able to maintain the pharma-care programs. In conservative areas it could be an excuse to do away with these programs. That would be a great worry. I think senior citizen groups across the country must surely feel very badly that the Government, which has appointed a Minister for seniors—and I note he has not been up on his feet speaking on this Bill—has failed to recognize this. These groups believe strongly in the pharma-care program and want to keep the costs of drugs down.

**Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I would love to join in this debate and point out how it is a debate for the future of this country, for the future of our young scientists and researchers who will be able to take meaningful jobs so that this country can get onto the cutting edge of high technology. Of course, we know the position of the New Democratic Party. It wants to keep everyone in poverty, as does every socialist government around the world.

I recently went through a list of 160 countries and the socialist countries are the ones which have the poorest people because they are denied any ability to get out and create jobs.

With those temperate words, I move:

That the House continue to sit beyond the ordinary hour of daily adjournment for the purpose of continuing consideration of the motion standing on the Order Paper in the name of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in relation to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-22, an Act to amend the Patent Act and to provide for certain matters in relation thereto.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All those who object to this motion will please rise.

*And fewer than 15 Members having risen:*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.  
Motion agreed to.

### *Patent Act*

**Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville):** Mr. Speaker, just moments ago we were talking about honesty. We heard the Hon. Member, who just successfully introduced a motion for extension of the debate, give us another display of the consistent devotion to dishonesty and hypocrisy of the Conservative Government.

**Some Hon. Members:** Order.

**Mr. McCurdy:** I will repeat myself, Mr. Speaker. We have had another manifestation of the consistent devotion to dishonesty and hypocrisy of the present Government.

**Mr. McDermid:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe the language that is being used is unparliamentary. In fact, the motion that was put before the House and passed is within our rules. It is allowing us to debate a very important Bill. What it is doing is putting us to work in the hours after six o'clock tonight, and Members of the New Democratic Party are objecting to working. That is their objection. Because we are following the rules of the House, and we had a motion pass, the Hon. Member is calling the Government dishonest. I think that language is excessive and he should be called to account for using that type of language in this Chamber.

**Mr. Orlikow:** Point of order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** There is no need for me to hear the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) on that point of order. There are two things; first, the motion obviously was in order and decided to be so by the Speaker. I do not think there is a problem there.

With regard to the words mentioned by the Hon. Member for Windsor—Walkerville (Mr. McCurdy), the Member knows the rules and I am sure he did not aim his remarks at any particular Member, at least that is the way I understood them. Therefore, if they were not aimed at a particular Member, the remarks are not unparliamentary. The Hon. Member has the floor on debate.

**Mr. McCurdy:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for exhibiting the keenness of hearing and intelligence so lacking on the other side. And in respect—

**Mr. McDermid:** Now look at the arrogance coming from over there.

**Mr. Siddon:** What a hypocrite. Now who is being dishonest?

**Mr. McCurdy:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Siddon) called me a hypocrite. That was heard. It was directed specifically at me.

**Mr. McDermid:** He said: "Listen to the hypocrisy".

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I did not hear the word. I will look at the "blues" and report back to the House.