

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** That will be taken under advisement.

## MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

[English]

Item No. 22 allowed to stand by unanimous consent.

### ORDERS IN COUNCIL MADE PURSUANT TO CANADA-UNITED STATES AUTOMOTIVE AGREEMENT

The House resumed, from Thursday, October 9, 1980, consideration of the motion of Mr. Herbert:

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all Orders in Council since 1965 relative to the remission of duties under the Automotive Agreement.

**Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South):** Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert) would delay the bringing on of this matter because it is very important to the House. The motion refers to all orders in council since 1965 relative to the remission of duties—taxes—under the automotive agreement, which is the auto pact.

I enjoyed working with the hon. member for Vaudreuil on the task force on fiscal federalism. He and I worked very closely together during the period from April to July 24. One of the reasons that task force was successful was that the hon. member for Vaudreuil was able, through a number of Order Paper questions, motions for the production of documents and so forth, to supply to the committee, as a result of his own personal research, information about transfers from the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, about language training program costs, educational and medical expense matters and a great deal of other valuable information. It is in that context that I think we must support the hon. member for Vaudreuil to make sure this vital information with respect to taxes, the payment of duties under the auto pact and the remission of those duties is brought to the attention of the public.

We all know there are four companies—and that is all—which can benefit under the auto pact arrangements. Those companies are General Motors, Chrysler, Ford and American Motors. Those companies are able to bring into Canada auto parts and new automobiles duty free on the basis that they manufacture in Canada to a certain criteria under the auto pact. They therefore can import duty free and for their own benefit. Occasionally they cannot keep to the terms of the auto pact and therefore somewhere along the line a duty remission order—a special order in council—is passed for their benefit.

These automobile companies are not entirely charitable institutions. They charge the people of Canada a pretty good price for their product. Yet they are manufacturers in Canada and should pay the same taxes as anyone else. The auto pact gives them a great advantage over manufacturers in other

### *Automotive Agreement*

fields, and people wonder why the auto pact was not complied with. My constituents and, I am sure, the constituents of other hon. members wonder about that.

Duty remission orders are given to these automobile companies to protect them from violations of the auto pact. It is only fitting and proper that the Parliament of Canada should know about that remission of tax because when a taxpayer gets a special deal, we as Members of Parliament who are responsible to our constituents want to be able to say that that special deal was justified. We want to hear the government say it was justified. The government is responsible to this House of Commons for taxes and moneys raised.

If we do not have a sense of fairness with respect to taxes in our society, then there will be people who will say that some taxpayers are treated better than others. I am sure the government would not want that to be the feeling. The government should be happy to comply with the requirement of making information with respect to duty remission orders public.

**Mr. Laniel:** They are public.

**Mr. Blenkarn:** If they are public, why are we having this debate? They should have been released. Why have they not been released? That is the reason for this debate. They are not public.

**Mr. Laniel:** We have never refused.

**Mr. Blenkarn:** Obviously there must have been a refusal, or the matter would not be on the Order Paper for debate. That is why we are debating this matter, and that is why the information had better be produced. If they are public documents, and I am glad to hear they are, perhaps they should have been supplied. This motion is a result of the refusal to supply. I am sure the hon. member for Vaudreuil would not make a useless motion in this House. I have worked with him on a task force and I know he would not do that.

● (1720)

The hon. member for Vaudreuil should have an apology. He certainly would not come to this House after 45 minutes' debate previously and allow the motion to come on again in order to waste the time of the House if the material was already available. It is not available to me, and I want to see it.

I came to this private member's hour to find out about that material. I want to be sure, when one taxpayer is getting a benefit and another taxpayer is not, that we know the reason. I also want to know what benefits that taxpayer is getting over other taxpayers. That is what a duty remission is all about. That material must be made public.

Before I finish on this matter, I wish to move, seconded by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen):

That pursuant to Standing Order 6 this House continue to sit through the dinner hour this day for the purpose of considering the business now before the House.

I say that in view of the time that has been spent and to get over the 45 minutes under this motion, because if the matter is