

the common decency to come into the House and place his proposal before the House of Commons. He sneaks off in the dead of night to hold a press conference. He whispers in the ear of the press. Let me say this: it is time the public business of Canada was conducted in the House of Commons.

Mr. Crosbie: Right on.

Mr. Deans: It is time this government started to accept its commitment to spend tax dollars in a reasonable, sensible and understandable way.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, there are as many problems about granting this government, as there are with almost any government, the unfettered use of borrowing power. Over the years I have felt it would have made more sense if the government were required to come back quarterly to this House for approval. Perhaps the government should come back at the end of each quarter and present its expenditure requirements for the next quarter so that we would have a handle on what is going on. Right now the House of Commons and the Members of Parliament do not have a handle on the expenditures of the government, its borrowing or the degree to which government exercises reasonable control over fiscal matters of the country.

As a result of the way in which this government has operated over the last number of years, and as it obviously continues to operate, what we will see is this government taking upon itself responsibilities which were never intended to be granted to the executive branch. It will have spent money long before it ever tells the House of Commons about the methods to be used to raise that money. It expects in return that we in the House of Commons will approve borrowing as if somehow or other it did not make any sense or any difference; or that it simply did not matter.

When I was speaking of the auto industry I wanted to draw into the picture the state of that industry. I was speaking of Chrysler and what I would do were I given the power—and God help I should ever have it—to make the decision. I know exactly how I would deal with Chrysler. I think the majority of Canadians would deal with Chrysler in the same way. In fact, I am sure they would. Many people have suggested to me that they cannot understand the government's motivation and attitude. I have said the government's motivation is political, but no one understands the government's attitude.

A study has been published, which shows the auto industry in this province, which is basically the auto industry of this country as it is substantially located here, is in very serious trouble. A major plan of redevelopment will have to take place for the auto industry if it is to survive in anything like the way it operated over the last 15 or 20 years. The study was done in the province of Ontario. I am sure you are aware of it, Mr. Speaker, but I want to refresh your memory as to the detail. The study was done for the provincial treasurer of the province of Ontario, at his behest. It predicts that the recouping of lost jobs foreseen in the coming year could be a shortlived relief. It says that the jobs which will be gained in the short run will be short run jobs, and that by 1985 Ontario could have 35,000

Borrowing Authority

fewer assembly and parts plant jobs than the nearly 100,000 it had in 1978. Incidentally, that is consistent with what I have been trying to tell the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce for the last year. It suggests that Ontario will be saddled with the sort of vehicle and parts production which is rapidly becoming obsolete, and that is consistent with what I have been telling the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce for the last year. There may not be the money or the willingness to convert some plants to the production of better selling vehicles if the rough years ahead spell doom for Chrysler, gloom for Ford, and a heavy debt load for General Motors. That, as you will recall, sir, is consistent with what I have been telling the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce for the last year. This report simply backs up the analysis which many of us who are familiar with the industry have been making about the industry.

● (2040)

You will recall that when I came back from meetings in the United States, I explained there were serious problems ahead for the automobile industry and that we must have a vehicle for putting back together an automobile industry which would have a stake in Canada.

The report goes on to say:

The Auto Pact has become irrelevant. If we have favourable costs for labour, steel and power, then we should be better than 10 per cent of North American production and that's what we should press for.

That is what I have been saying to the minister for the past year.

The report goes on to say that Ford at the moment, although it is doing reasonably well:

—isn't selling enough full sized cars to use the plant capacity of 650,000 engines a year—

You will recall that that is the whole operation, for which they were given some \$65 million about three years ago. I could not very well stop that here, but I tell you, sir, I explained what was going on to the then minister of finance of Ontario, Mr. McKeough, and to the premier of Ontario at the time. I pointed out to them that what would happen would be a rip-off, and that is exactly what happened.

The report goes on to state:

It is highly probable that by 1985, General Motors will have the only engine plant in Ontario, and after 1985 there might be no engine production at all.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that the Ontario engine and component production was worth \$2 billion in 1978? This report is saying that unless there is a serious attempt by the government and by industry to put back together this vital part of the economy of this country, it is entirely possible that by the year 1985 we will have lost another \$2 billion industry in this country.

The article goes on to say that:

The domestic producers plan to import 1.8 million engines from Japan, Mexico, Brazil and Germany for the U.S. and Canadian markets in 1983. The Auto Pact allows the engines to be brought to Canada duty free.