

unfortunately, there is nothing in this agreement to prevent the same thing from happening again.

As I represent British Columbia in this Parliament, I cannot deal with trade without a reminder to the Senate of the Pacific dimension to this country. The Pacific Rim is a dynamic region of the world—its fastest growing region in economic terms. It is a fact, as pointed out in a recent series on immigration in the *Vancouver Sun*, that 50 per cent of new Canadians are now coming from the Pacific Rim. Canada's role in the Pacific has been largely *ad hoc*. That approach must be changed. We must develop and act on a comprehensive strategy for trade and for our overall relationship. There is a growing recognition of the need for the creation of a "Pacific Coalition", to give it the name Senator Bill Bradley of New Jersey coined in a speech on December 8, 1988, to the Economic Club of New York. He proposed a new international organization in which the nations of the Pacific would join to promote trade and economic growth. Canada would be well served to consider this objective, similar to one proposed by Secretary of State Shultz in Bangkok last April. Indeed, we should be among the initiators of such a group.

In conclusion, honourable senators, the government has its mandate, and on that basis, and on the responsibility of the Prime Minister, this bill will pass. The government has won a battle, but the issue is far from settled. For my part, the most I can bear to do is to abstain from defeating this bill, but I cannot refrain from believing that it is not to the advantage of Canada.

Hon. Finlay MacDonald: Honourable senators, I should like to ask Senator Austin a question. After hearing the high quality and obvious preparation made by the previous speakers, I was hoping that we would not be subjected to future speakers making references to the fact that the majority of Canadians voted against this legislation. I would suggest to Senator Austin that he has absolutely no way of proving that particular point. He might, however, help me by telling me when was the last time in this century that a party in this country, with a three-party system, received 50 per cent of the vote. Also, if he has perhaps analysed the results of the last election, Senator Austin might also tell me how many people voted for the Liberals or for the NDP and did so because they did not like Brian Mulroney, or because they did not like the pharmaceutical bill or because they did not like submarines, or a host of other things.

Senator Frith: How about the Prime Minister, in a submarine, taking a pill?

Senator MacDonald: Perhaps Senator Austin, if he can, would explain those things to me. I say to Senator Austin that a man of his experience and background should not make statements that he cannot back up.

Senator Austin: It would take a reasonable man, Senator MacDonald—and I hope I am that—to make the statements I have made. Also a reasonable man such as yourself, Senator MacDonald, may differ with me. In the meantime, I wish you a Merry Christmas.

[Senator Austin.]

Hon. Sidney L. Buckwold: Honourable senators, Senator MacDonald might be interested to know that I, in common with most other senators, have received literally hundreds of letters, telegrams and phone calls with respect to the issue of free trade. In those communications the comment is often made that the majority of Canadians voted against the government and that the Senate should now act on behalf of that majority. To that comment my response is, and will always be, that the Senate asked for an expression of opinion by the people of Canada. That expression was given; the government was returned with a majority, and that is the way in which the system works. The government won the battle; it is now their ball game, and, although I did promise to rise and say a few words in the Senate, I have to acknowledge the responsibility of the government to carry the bill. That sentiment has been, I think, expressed very clearly by our leader, Senator MacEachen, in his preliminary remarks this afternoon.

Therefore, honourable senators, what I have to say is perhaps not so much a résumé of all of the arguments we have heard, pro and con, with respect to the Free Trade Agreement and this bill—although one cannot help but point out a few of the most disastrous effects that some of us foresee—as it is a look ahead. Perhaps it is more appropriate to look ahead at some of the problems that will face us as a result of this legislation.

Honourable senators, I gladly and freely admit that at one time I supported the concept of free trade. As a matter of fact, I still do on the basis of the philosophy of free trade, although perhaps that is a platitude. However, I began to have my first doubts when we started into consideration of Bill C-22. During that debate I saw the power of the American pharmaceutical lobby moving in and using, for the first time, that famous phrase, the "level playing field". To those of my colleagues who have forgotten or who are unfamiliar with Bill C-22—

Senator Barootes: How could we forget, since you have reminded us?

Senator Buckwold: Senator Barootes, I know you have a long memory. However, there are some new senators who may not be familiar with the contents of Bill C-22. That bill dealt with the removal of some forms of generic competition from patentholders of pharmaceutical drugs. However, as we travelled around the country and listened to discussion of Bill C-22 supported by the pharmaceutical industry, it did not take any great genius—you did not have to be an Einstein—to realize where the initial impetus for this iniquitous legislation came from. Although it was denied time and time again, nevertheless—and I think that even most of those on the other side would agree—there was that push from the powerful American lobby of the pharmaceutical industry in Washington, which moved in and said to Mr. Mulroney, "Mr. Mulroney, if you want this deal, you had better clean up your act on competition in drugs." That was my first awakening.

• (1640)

Then, as a member of the Banking, Trade and Commerce Committee, along with Senator Finlay MacDonald and others, I crossed the country hearing representations on the imposition