

*Adjournment Debate*

cars. That is what it is all about. As I say, it is a damned shame there is no one here to reply. There is only one member of the entire Liberal party on the other side of the House tonight.

● (2222)

**Mr. Maurice Dupras (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I wish my distinguished colleague would not judge the interest of our party in the automobile pact question by the absence of most of my hon. friends. The minister and his parliamentary secretary have made a commitment which they could not break and they could not be here to speak tonight. Nevertheless, I shall attempt to answer the observations of the hon. member with regard to the automobile agreement.

[*Translation*]

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to the main points mentioned in his presentation, namely a fair share of the auto production, the loss of 25,000 jobs in the automobile industry, and finally the payment of subsidies to the industries in that sector.

First, the fair share. Paragraph (c) of the Auto Pact reads as follows: Development of conditions allowing the market forces to interact efficiently for the most economic development of investments, production and trade. No mention is made of the automatic right to a "fair share" of jobs, production or investments. In fact, no mention is made in the agreement of jobs. The fact that one country or the other gets more or less than of its fair share should be determined, according to intent of the agreement as I understand it, by such factors as the relative cost of production in the two countries and the relative return of new investments.

[*English*]

The attainment of a "fair share" of production and investment is obviously the objective. We achieved and surpassed

this objective in the early 1970's when production costs and returns on investment were in our favour. The route to re-achieving this objective is not to require companies to invest in less than economic propositions in Canada. It is to recreate conditions in which it is in the interests of the industry itself to invest in Canada.

We are working with both the vehicle industry and the parts industry to demonstrate to them that, in large measure, these conditions have been recreated and that it is in their interests to invest in Canada.

The number of jobs that we are reputed to have been shortchanged under the automotive agreement keeps escalating. I assume that the 25,000 number has been taken from a report prepared by the treasurer of Ontario. We have trouble with the arithmetic contained within that report. Almost 6,000 of the 25,000 jobs we are reputed to be short are in vehicle assembly. Statistics Canada reports that we have a trade surplus with the United States of over \$2 billion in completed vehicles and that we exported almost \$600 million of North American vehicles to third countries. It is beyond me how the treasurer could conclude that we are short of jobs in vehicle assembly when in fact we have a substantial surplus. Were we to achieve automotive agreement trade balance, which would be my definition of fair share, we would have additional automotive employment of about 5,000.

I see, Mr. Speaker, that you are about to rise to tell me my time has expired. Perhaps I might simply add that I know the minister is about to make an important announcement in the field of automotive parts.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. A motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at eleven o'clock a.m.

At 10:25 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.