

Mr. Deans: Quite frankly, I would be prepared to share the information with the member and let him read my copy. However, I know he would like to have a copy of his own. I do not know what he is going to do with it, but I know he would want it.

I say to the members of the House that they have to stop closing this member out. They have to let him into the inner circles of the government. They have to give him access to information. They have that obligation. They heckle me at a time like this when their own member is in despair and unable to gain access to documents.

I see a genuine concern on the part of every member on this side of the House and a desire to support the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert). I say to him, "We support you. We want you to have this. If you move the motion and get on with the vote, we would be delighted with this or some other appropriate measure being taken to have this vote taken so that this nasty government, which refuses to give him information, will be forced to do so". It is a shame. It also speaks directly, I might say, to the principle of freedom of information. This fine, outstanding member who desperately needs this information, to the point of taking up the time of the House for yet another hour, is being denied by the ministry rightful access to information. I say to you it is mind-boggling.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I urge you to allow this matter to come to a vote quickly in order that the hon. member not be denied access to information any longer.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): None of us will speak until we have the vote.

Mr. Deans: If there is one member of the House who is denied access to information that is available to all other members, that is a very serious matter. In fact, I am surprised that the hon. member, in whose name this motion stands, has not risen on a point of privilege to demand that he be given the exact same rights and privileges as the rest of us.

When he rose at the beginning of the private members' hour, I felt confident that he was rising simply to demand that rights and privileges given generously to everyone else be accorded to him as a member. Mr. Speaker, if you would permit a vote to take place now, I would yield my spot to allow it to take place. I say to the member, "No wonder you are disaffected, no wonder you are disenchanted, no wonder you are angry with this government and no wonder you are thinking of quitting". If I were a Liberal backbencher and were denied what others had, I would feel the same way.

Mr. Ralph Ferguson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)): Mr. Speaker, when this motion was previously discussed, frequent reference was made to the automotive agreement and to the various studies and reports which had been made on the industry in the last few years.

It was pointed out that the automotive industry is in a period of very rapid technological change, and the suggestion was made that the automotive agreement was obsolete and

Automotive Agreement

inadequate. I would like to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the research done by the two members who spoke previously is obsolete and inadequate or perhaps inexistent. On page 2231 of *Hansard* the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce said:

Madam Speaker, the documents requested by the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert) are very voluminous and would require a lot of time and a lot of public funds to prepare. So I would ask the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert) to withdraw his motion.

At page 3550 of *Hansard*, the hon. member for Vaudreuil is reported as saying:

As a result of the calling of this motion today, I have had meetings with the officials of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and have reviewed with them the 115 orders in council which have been passed in the intervening 15 years. They made interesting reading. I have several copies with me. Of those 115 orders in council, 67 were passed to take care of companies that were not in existence in 1965 and, therefore, could not benefit from the agreement. Of those 67, 35 companies are still operational.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member has seen these papers. They are available for inspection by individual members, and therefore they are public.

An hon. Member: You are the one wasting the public's money.

Mr. Ferguson: Before coming to a discussion of the orders in council which are called for in the motion, it is probably appropriate to spend a few minutes considering not only the automotive agreement itself, but also the suitability of that agreement in terms of the automotive industry as it is emerging in Canada and in the world today.

Prior to the implementation of the automotive agreement, the Canadian automotive industry had experienced the problems of manufacturing for the limited Canadian market.

Canadian vehicle manufacturers were producing a wide variety of models, with a total production volume of only 600,000 vehicles annually. It resulted in higher costs in both assembly and manufacturing operations than those experienced by their parent companies.

As a consequence of these higher sales, the motor vehicle industry in Canada came to rely on imported components. Faced with a declining market in Canada, Canadian parts manufacturers and producers found it increasingly difficult to meet the United States competition. Canadian content in motor vehicles production in Canada was not growing, and imports of vehicles and parts were increasing rapidly. By 1964, Canada had a trade deficit of over \$500 million in automotive products with the United States. The Canadian government, in an effort to encourage specialization and exports to the United States, introduced in the fall of 1963 a duty remission scheme for imports based on export performance. Exports to the United States under this program could have been subject to countervailing duties.

Discussions were therefore held with the United States. The outcome of these discussions was the Canada-United States automotive agreement, signed by Prime Minister Pearson, a Liberal Prime Minister, and President Johnson, on January 16, 1965. The agreement sets forth three broad objectives.