

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, April 28, 1972

The House met at 11 a.m.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### TRADE

EFFECTS OF U.S. DISC PROGRAM ON CANADA—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to move a motion under Standing Order 43 on a pressing matter. In view of the fact reports from Washington show that automobile and auto parts manufacturers as well as manufacturers of non-auto products are exporting their products to Canada under the United States DISC program, contrary to information given this House by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin), with possible serious consequences to Canadian manufacturing and Canadian jobs, I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent):

That this House refer the subject matter of the effects of the DISC program on Canada and the urgent need to develop an effective Canadian response in order to safeguard manufacturing and jobs in Canada to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs for immediate study and report to this House.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for York South proposes this motion under the terms of Standing Order 43 which requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** There is not unanimous consent. The motion cannot be put at this time.

\* \* \*

### TRADE

TABLING OF TELEGRAM TO CANADIAN COPPER PRODUCERS HAVING CONTRACTS WITH JAPANESE PURCHASERS

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2) I wish to lay on the table the text in both official languages of a telegram I have sent to Canadian copper producers who have contract arrangements with Japanese purchasers.

25104—49½

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### TRADE

UNITED STATES DISC PROGRAM—USE BY AMERICAN AUTO MANUFACTURERS—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT BY MINISTER PRIOR TO BUDGET

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question arising out of a statement made last March by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, to whom, as he might assume, my question is directed. At that time the minister said the government understood that United States automobile manufacturers had no intention of using the DISC program. In view of the revelation today that Ford did establish a corporation under that program last December and is exporting cars and trucks under it, is the minister going to make a statement to the House on the subject?

• (1110)

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** I will try to answer the question succinctly, Mr. Speaker. As my hon. friend has suggested this was my "understanding" and "impression," and I referred to it in the House always in those terms. My understanding was based on conversations I have had with representatives of the automobile manufacturing industry in Canada. I emphasized in the House that I received no commitment from them. My understanding of these conversations was confirmed by discussions which took place between my officials and officials of the United States in respect of the automobile agreement. They, too, understood the U.S. manufacturers would not use DISC. I might observe that we received information from Ford to the effect that it was registering for DISC status last week, and we received information from General Motors yesterday. So I want to stand on what I said to the House; I said it and nothing else. It has to be observed also that U.S. companies—

**Mr. Lewis:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, if the minister is making a statement he should return to motions for that purpose.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Obviously the minister must determine whether he simply wants to answer the question or revert to motions for the purpose of making a statement. If an answer is long and involved, normally the information conveyed at that point should be conveyed by way of a statement on motions. At that point the minister should seek the consent of the House to return to motions. If not, he should be satisfied with replying to the question.