

Americans on a North American free trade agreement. He talked positively about the need for freer trade, as is exemplified by our actions in the GATT negotiations now and the negotiations that led to the free trade agreement with the United States.

The hon. member talks about job loss. This is another instance of the hon. member for Etobicoke North saying that every time someone loses his job—every time a sparrow falls—we will blame it on free trade. What must be recalled is that in the first two months of the year, the bottom line is that there have been 64,000 jobs created. There were some 250,000 jobs created bottom line last year.

About four million jobs change hands during the course of a year, some through job loss, some through people moving from one job to another, but because of the significance of that dynamism in our economy, the important thing to look at is the bottom line, and the bottom line is very positive, 64,000 jobs in two months.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, the bottom line contained in the minister's own documents tabled in this House at budget time is that there will be 100,000 jobs less this coming year than there were last year. Is that as a result of the free trade agreement? Is that what he is saying is a benefit?

The government commissioned its own study on the auto parts industry which points out that we are already facing intense competition from Mexico and the south-eastern United States. We are in danger of losing close to 80 per cent of our auto parts industry. The government is providing no support for the restructuring of that industry and now it finds itself being drawn into a North American trade agreement.

When is the government going to get a sound policy that will protect the interests of the workers in the auto parts industry and the workers throughout this country?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, the views of the hon. member from Winnipeg-South-Centre on free trade are well known, and I suggest his reaction is no surprise. It has become a fixation and there is no way anybody can change that. However, I believe people realize the automobile industry right now is going through a period

Oral Questions

of over-production and under-consumption, and is now in an adjustment period. Clearly, the automobile parts industry also is affected. However, we have now seen since the beginning of this year that a number of laid-off employees have been recalled. Again, I believe this is typical of that industry. Let them blame that on the United States or free trade if they will Mr. Speaker, and I am even amazed that today's rain is not being blamed on the United States.

* * *

• (1500)

[*English*]

PRIVILEGE

NOTICE OF TIME ALLOCATION ON BILL C-62

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I gave you notice of a question of privilege which I believe affects myself and other members of this House. In introducing the question of privilege, I would like to quote from the ruling you made in the House on April 14, 1987, a ruling that you referred to again on March 26, 1990. You said:

It is essential to our democratic system. The controversial issue should be debated at reasonable length so that every reasonable opportunity shall be available to hear the arguments pro and con and the reasonable delaying tactics should be permissible to enable opponents of a measure to enlist public support for their point of view. Sooner or later every issue must be decided and the decision will be taken by a majority. Rules of procedure protect both the minority and the majority. They are designed to allow the full expression of views on both sides of an issue. They provide the Opposition with a means to delay a decision. They also provide the majority with a means of limiting debate in order to arrive at a decision. This is the kind of balance essential to the procedure of a democratic assembly. Our rules were certainly never designed to permit the total frustration of one side or the other, the total stagnation of debate, or the total paralysis of the system.

Mr. Speaker, I remember the night you made that ruling. You made that ruling at a time when the opposition parties were fighting C-22, the drug legislation. At that time the opposition had totally paralyzed the government's ability to move forward on that legislation.

You, Mr. Speaker, in making that ruling, recognized that you were going beyond the mere written rules of the House, that you were looking at the purpose of debate, at the purpose of the rules. You recognized that you were looking beyond the actual wording. You made a