

thing relevant to the Chair at this point is the fact that technically, if you wish, unparliamentary language has been used. I would, therefore, very respectfully ask the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry to withdraw, not out of spite for the other side of the House but out of respect for the House itself. That is the only request I would put to the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry at this point.

**Mr. Axworthy:** Mr. Speaker, I have respect for yourself, Sir, for the Chair and for this House. I would hope that the Secretary of State for External Affairs would have equal respect, and when he says something which is not the case, when he cites a fact which is not true, and I ask him to withdraw it he would do so. I am simply asking him to withdraw it and I will withdraw my remark about him. It seems to me that would be the proper way of doing it.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest):** I have already said that we all understand that the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry has made it quite clear he disagrees very strongly on a question of fact. May I remind the Hon. Member, and all Hon. Members of the House, that the debate provides for a period of questions and comments at which time Hon. Members can rise and express either a point of view or put a question to the person who has just spoken, and in fact put the case about which he does not agree. That is why the rules were made. That is why we do have a period for questions and comments. The Hon. Member can very well make his point at that time.

However, and I am trying to make this quite clear, the only thing relevant to the Chair at this point is that the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry has used unparliamentary language and I am, therefore, under obligation to ask him to withdraw immediately and without any equivocation.

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** Mr. Speaker, if I might speak on the point of order. The Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) is correct and an Hon. Member is bound to accept the word of an Hon. Member in the House. I will respect that rule and I would hope that the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry will immediately and without equivocation or qualification withdraw the unparliamentary language he has used.

**Mr. Axworthy:** Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances of the Secretary of State for External Affairs withdrawing his statement, I will withdraw my statement concerning his statement.

**Mr. Cook:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We have wasted approximately five minutes of time on this particular inner debate. I would hope that time would be added to the speaking time of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark).

**Mr. Gauthier:** It is not a waste of time, come on.

### Supply

**Mr. Fulton:** Dither, dither, dither. Sit down.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest):** I will take that into account, but time listening to the Speaker is never time wasted in the House.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** Mr. Speaker, very briefly with regard to the questions of FIRA, the National Energy Program and NORAD, those were matters on which the people of Canada had an opportunity to vote. They voted. They wanted to be rid of the NEP and FIRA and they wanted Canada to honour its obligations. It was for Canadian reasons that the Government of Canada acted, as it always is.

Let me come to the question at issue here. It might help if I start with a little historic perspective. I had an opportunity to consult the now defunct *Montreal Star* of December 31, 1964 in which there was a very interesting article referring to a telegram sent to the federal Government of that day by the Canadian United Auto Workers. The telegram said that the early implementation of the Auto Pact would leave auto workers with "a pig in a poke". The United Auto Workers went on 22 years ago, to say: "We do not consider it enough to have bland assurances that the plan will expand employment for Canada". The point is that there was blind opposition to the Auto Pact 22 years ago to the point that Canadians did not want the Government to pursue an arrangement which would be better for Canadians. We have found with the Auto Pact that it is possible, if Governments have the vision and determination to pursue better arrangements, to achieve better results for Canada.

The purpose of this Government is to achieve better trading results for Canada and to provide some kind of protection against precisely those virulent forces of protectionism which are causing such a threat to Canadian jobs right now.

I wonder sometimes why it is on questions of this kind that Members of the Opposition take such a consistently negative position when leaders of Government, often leaders of their own Parties, are prepared to exercise much more responsibility in the national interests. I suppose it has to do with the precise question of responsibility.

The 10 premiers who met here last night with the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), premiers representing the Liberal, New Democratic, Social Credit and Progressive Conservative Parties, all had some questions about the trading relations between Canada and the United States. All had some reservations; but instead of being blinded by their reservations and instead of putting their Parties first they put their country first. They are allowing Canada to go forward into those negotiations now with a united front that will allow Canadians to achieve the best possible conclusion for the people and the workers of this country. That is a model I would recommend to Members of the House of Commons.