

Ontario and Quebec; bricks from south of the border and Quebec. That is what we are talking about.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, we are seeking agreement in intimate consultation with the provinces, and we shall continue to do so, as I think we have indicated in an unusual degree of commitment to the process. I want to point out to my hon. friend, however, that the right of the Parliament of Canada to initiate these negotiations is not *en cause*. This Parliament and this Government are empowered by the people of Canada to act on behalf of the people of Canada and we shall—

**An Hon. Member:** Get though with the provinces.

**Mr. Mulroney:** The provinces indeed have a full right with regard to those areas where their area of jurisdiction and area of competence are involved, and we will continue to consult intimately with them. We are trying to find a formula of ratification. However, there can be no doubt about the Parliament of Canada acting on behalf of all Canadians.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

#### AUTO PACT PROVISIONS

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister why last night, in his attempt to rise above the tide of battle, he did not mention, at any time, either of the two key safeguards that have been responsible for the success of the Auto Pact in my community, the Canadian content provisions and the equal production to sales commitment in this country. Why was that essential part of the Auto Pact left out of what was supposed to be a clarifying statement?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, there was nothing left out. There was a reference to—

**Mr. Blackburn (Brant):** Not much put in, either.

**Mr. Mulroney:** Well, my hon. friend says that there was not much put in. It is interesting that many people, I think, came to that conclusion, having heard the Leader of the Opposition; but I did not, because anything that we hear from the Leader of the Opposition on this subject is news.

With regard to my hon. friend and his very good question, I just point out that the statement is:

History tells us that whenever barriers to trade come down, new prosperity follows.

Take the example of the 1964 Auto Pact.

I am using the illustration of the advantages that flow to free societies with liberalized trade, and I drew no conclusions beyond that.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

#### Oral Questions

**Mr. Langdon:** In fact, the industry, unions and the communities all conclude that it is the safeguards in that pact—

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** Relevance, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Langdon:**—which have won those jobs.

#### AUTO PACT DEBATE

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** My question for the Prime Minister is the following. Does he agree with these comments from the Conservative Member for Peace River in 1965?

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** Order.

**Mr. Langdon:** He said:

—this United States-Canada automotive agreement, falsely called a free trade agreement. If there was ever a misnomer, Mr. Speaker, this is it, because I can see no measure of free trade in this agreement at all.

**Some Hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Speaker:** I will allow the answer if the Prime Minister wishes to make it, but the Hon. Member could phrase that question in such a way as to make it more direct, I think.

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Surely, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend is not attempting to suggest that the Auto Pact is anything other than an instrument of liberalized trade and commerce between two countries and that it has been very, very instrumental in bringing new wealth to Ontario and great trading advantages to Canada. If I may say so, and I think it will interest my hon. friend, as I said just a few days ago in Toronto with regard to this item, that is what the trade talks are all about: extending the benefits of Auto Pact to all industries, to all parts of Canada, not by piecemeal action but, rather, by a comprehensive treaty covering all our trade with the United States.

[Translation]

#### FREE TRADE WITH UNITED STATES—EMPLOYMENT CONSEQUENCES

**Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint-Léonard—Anjou):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Right Hon. Prime Minister.

Yesterday evening and again today, the Prime Minister said that free trade with the United States would create more jobs. Can he explain the study carried out by the Department of External Affairs which states that a free trade agreement with the United States would cause a net loss of at least 130,000 jobs?

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, it is not the first time that I am misquoted.

#### FREE TRADE WITH UNITED STATES—PRICE PAYABLE BY CANADA IN JOB LOSSES AND PLANT CLOSURES

**Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint-Léonard—Anjou):** I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What price will Canadians have