

*Automotive Agreement*

completed today at least we will get something completed on the Order Paper and have this matter attended to.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** The hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans).

**An hon. Member:** What about the motion?

**Mr. Laniel:** Mr. Speaker, to implement this motion—

**Some hon. Members:** Order.

**Mr. Laniel:** Mr. Speaker, I request that the Chair read the Standing Order so that everyone here knows how the rule applies.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** The Chair will have to be guided as to who is in favour of defending this motion. All those who propose the motion will please say yea. All those who oppose the motion will please stand.

All those who support the motion will please rise.

The motion has been defeated. The motion has been withdrawn.

**Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, that certainly was an exercise to behold. I cannot for the life of me understand what happened to the yeas and nays and all those other little things. I was told when I took on this responsibility that it was a learning experience and it certainly is. No wonder the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has taken ill!

In any event, I want to speak to the motion before us. I ask the hon. member who is promoting and sponsoring the motion why the motion is before the House. It certainly is a puzzle to me. I read the motion. It tells me that the member wants to have produced to the House all of the orders in council since 1965 relative to the remission of duties under the automotive agreement.

I know that hon. member follows the proceedings of this House diligently. I point out to him that on July 17, 1980 I put on the notice paper question No. 1,457 which reads:

What are the details of each motor vehicle general remissions order granted to the automotive industry between 1965 and June 1980?

The second part of my question read:

Since the inception of the auto pact in 1965, what were the details of each order in council issued regarding the performance requirements of the automotive agreement?

Subsequent to that I asked another question, No. 1,460 of July 17, 1980:

1. From 1965 to June 1980 how many orders in council were issued affecting Chrysler and its subsidiaries operating in Canada and what was the actual wording of each order in council?

2. What amount of customs duty was remitted for each order submitted concerning Chrysler and its subsidiaries?

3. What were the commitments from Chrysler and its subsidiaries in exchange for remitting each customs duty?

4. Did Chrysler and its subsidiaries meet each commitment?

On July 17, 1980 I asked question No. 1,461:

1. From 1965 to June 1980, how many orders in council were issued affecting American Motors and its subsidiaries operating in Canada and what was the actual wording of each order in council?

2. What amount of customs duty was remitted for each order submitted concerning American Motors and its subsidiaries?

3. What were the commitments from American Motors and its subsidiaries in exchange for remitting each customs duty?

4. Did American Motors and its subsidiaries meet each commitment?

I suggest to the hon. member who has asked that this matter be proceeded with today that there is a remarkable similarity between the matter we are debating and the questions that I placed on the Order Paper.

Frankly, I feel compelled to support the hon. member in his quest because it strikes me as passing strange that a member of the government backbench, who stands and supports the government at every turn, even to the extent of embarrassing himself by voting against motions that he himself has promoted, a member who I know is committed to the government and has done everything he possibly can to support the government, cannot get answers to his questions.

It is odd indeed if a member like myself can ask the same questions and be given the answers while this fine, upstanding Liberal backbencher is refused. It is disturbing that I can be asking the questions and receiving the answers, the very answers that the hon. member is seeking, and he cannot.

When you stop to think about it, Mr. Speaker, there is one of two things happening here today. Either that member is being denied access to information which is available to all other hon. members, or else he is wasting the time of private members' hour. It is one or the other.

I ask hon. members to consider what they would prefer to think was happening. Would they prefer the public of Canada to believe that this member was not being given access to information readily available to all other hon. members? Would they like the public to think that this member was being ostracized by the cabinet and government of this country? He is not being given access to information which is vital while all other members of the House have access to that information.

Or would they prefer the public to think that this member was simply wasting the time of the House? I know he would not waste the time of the House. I just know that would not be the reason for this debate taking place. Therefore I assume, and I hope rightly, that his reason for continuing this debate today is because he, an upstanding member of the Liberal party, having asked for this information, has been denied the very information that was made available to me. Therefore, it is an obligation on the part of each and every member to stand in his or her place and vote in favour of providing that member with the information. I think that is important. In fact, we should have that vote now so the member can get this information, rather than taking any longer on this. I know it is available.

● (1730)

**An hon. Member:** Let us vote.