

*Adjournment Debate*

The same minister of international trade just half an hour ago in committee stated again that he was quite concerned with the fact that only 3 per cent of our manufactured goods are shipped to Japan. Yet in contradictory statements in this House he has said, "if there is going to be any form of protectionism, it will hurt our trade with the Japanese". We only export 3 per cent of our manufactured goods to Japan, yet many of our natural resources being shipped there. We are not doing ourselves any favours by selling Japan our natural resources. They need our natural resources. We are selling them at very low prices; prices even lower than those of Australia and New Zealand.

Why is it that Canada is virtually the only nation in the industrialized world with absolutely no control over the auto industry? Let me put a few examples on the record. Australia has 85 per cent local content in its imports. The United Kingdom has a 10.8 per cent share of Japanese imports; Germany has a 5.7 per cent share of Japanese imports; France has a 2.2 per cent share; Spain has 63 per cent local content; Venezuela has 51 per cent, and Brazil has 95 per cent local content. The list goes on and on.

Canada is the only nation in the whole industrialized world that has not had the guts to take a positive step in this regard. As a result, Canada is losing tens of thousands of jobs right across the country. The automobile industry is responsible for one out of seven jobs in Canada. It is responsible for one out of six jobs in Ontario. How much longer does the industry have to wait before some unilateral action is taken? When will the government come up with a specific policy, and what will that policy be? When will it be implemented? Are we going to have Canadian content regulations? Will we have incentives for the Japanese to invest in Canada and manufacture cars here, or will we simply allow the automotive industry to disappear totally from the face of this nation, ruining the industrial base in this country? These are very simple questions.

In closing I must say that the time is long overdue to end negotiations, to take a much tougher stand and come up with some of the answers to my questions, and those posed by the industry, the Canadian auto parts manufacturers, the UAW, the province of Ontario or the big three. This government must come up with answers before more jobs are lost.

**Mr. Ron Irwin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of State for International Trade (Mr. Lumley) has answered the hon. member on several occasions. The minister was in Japan from March 16 to March 19 and met with the Japanese minister of international affairs. He indicated that he put forth three positions to the Japanese.

First he would want an extension of the so-called "weather forecast" system for passenger cars, which means virtual restriction and prohibition. Second, he wanted the extension of that system to cover commercial vehicles. Third, he wanted meaningful discussions with the Japanese leading to an agreement vis-à-vis Canadian content. The hon. member

knows that the Japanese government has turned down these three positions although not entirely. The Japanese did agree to continue negotiations and we will be negotiating with them.

**Mr. Jelinek:** Further negotiations? It has been two years now.

● (2210)

**Mr. Irwin:** There are no free rides, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. member should know this. He is talking about the automobile industry today, but let us look at the textile industry. In 1979, because we have tariffs, it cost the Canadian consumer—someone pays—\$467 million. In the next five years Biggs and Wood estimated that because we have tariffs and quotas it will cost the consumer \$2.5 billion.

**Mr. Jelinek:** Have you ever heard of duty remission?

**Mr. Irwin:** Whether you call it duty remission, restrictions, or quotas, it will always cost someone something.

**Mr. Jelinek:** Not if you have duty remission.

**Mr. Irwin:** Perhaps he wants to look good today, but two years from now he will be saying the same thing about the automobile industry as he is now saying about the textile industry. Whether we are considering Sysco, Chrysler, Massey-Ferguson, or a Malibu, it is not restrictions or prohibitions which count, but, rather, it is the quality of the product sold on the world market for a profit.

We are traders, Mr. Speaker, and I remind the hon. member that the Japanese are good customers. In 1980 we sold them over \$4 billion in goods, and only purchased \$2.7 billion from them. There was a balance in our favour of \$1.3 billion. What does he suggest that we buy from the Japanese if we do not buy automobiles? There are no suggestions because he does not know. While he is at it—and there are no Liberals in western Canada—I would like to know what westerners think about his position on the sale of their goods to Japan which he is now saying should be restricted. What does he say about that? Does he want a restriction on those sales? If so, he should stand up in this House and say what goods in what areas and in what constituencies, rather than trying to look good to the automobile industry here in Ontario and, at the same time, failing to point out what constituencies in western Canada would be affected. He does not have the courage. He does not know. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Kempling:** That will look good in Windsor.

CORPORATE AFFAIRS—URANIUM PRICE FIXING TRIAL—QUERY RESPECTING CROWN IMMUNITY. (B) INSTRUCTIONS TO COUNSEL

**Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West):** Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in connection with a question I posed to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Chrétien) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on March 25 of this year. It concerned a situation which, on the basis of documented evidence and questions in this House, involved a very clear question of cover-up on the part of this