

profits going to the companies and little benefits to the consumers; with immediate disadvantage to the workers in the industry, who will have to suffer unemployment and who will have, owing to the inaction of the Government and the fact that the Government did not consider in advance the possible dangers of this agreement to the automobile workers in Canada, to bear the brunt of this reorganization with consequent heavy unemployment for periods of weeks or months. All in all, for the time being at least, there are very few benefits for the people of Canada from this agreement.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I want to make a very few observations in connection with this matter and try to explain the position I am going to take when the vote comes. In the first place, coming from the part of the country I live in, which is not only the West but the Northwest, and having the philosophical attitude toward trade that I do, I do not like the original measure either—this United States-Canada automotive agreement, falsely called a free trade agreement. If ever there was a misnomer, Mr. Speaker, this is it, because I can see no measure of free trade in this agreement at all. In fact, the people who properly use the words "free trade" would have a good action for libel, I should think, against the Government in attaching the words "free trade" to this particular agreement.

● (5:20 p.m.)

In my view it is simply protectionism, and protectionism of the worst kind. Usually in industries which have a measure of protection we find that as a result of customs tariffs imposed, whether intended or not, there is secured for the treasury of the country a certain amount of revenue, which is then passed around among the taxpayers, including consumers of the commodities being produced, who are to a very small extent at least getting some dividend from this arrangement. But even this advantage is lost to the potential car owners of this country, because this money will definitely not be available for them. So I say, per se, I do not like the agreement or any part of it. Even when you walk around, get it standing up, pinch it, and examine it, no matter what else it may be, it is still a protectionist agreement. Therefore, this being the case, I do think the onus falls upon the Government and those who propose an arrangement of this kind to indicate to Parliament and to the country that

Canada-U.S. Automotive Agreement

there are facets of this agreement which are good. I do not think this can be done in the way that has been attempted so far—by means of statements made from time to time, by press releases, or even by means of a statement such as that made in the House by the Minister last night.

The only way this can be done, Mr. Speaker, is by doing precisely what is being done in the United States, and that is by presenting a bill to the House and by having the bill go to a committee for examination, not in the way we can examine it here in the House, but in a competent and adequate way, having the very competent officials of the department present, and receiving representations from those who have or hope to have some vested interest in this agreement, including the consumer generally in Canada.

That is the way it is being done in the United States, Mr. Speaker. This may take a little longer, but I think we would then have a true picture before us. I believe the individuals who would be on such a committee, before which this matter would go, would have knowledge of the subject in order that they could deal with this matter. I am sure that following such an examination we in this House would be in a better position to come to a decision.

I must say, per se, I do not like the agreement and am opposed to it. It may well be that there are aspects about it which, with adequate protection such as has been suggested in part by this resolution, if introduced, might change my mind.

Some mention has been made of the United States Trade Expansion Act. I have here a pamphlet issued by the Canadian Trade Committee of 1963, which is directed particularly toward an assessment of what is called "Adjustment Assistance Under The U.S. Trade Expansion Act". The sort of action which we could and should take is referred to at page 8 of this pamphlet. It states:

Thus the Statement of Purpose of H.R. 9900 reads, in part:

It is the purpose of this Act, by lowering trade barriers through trade agreements to stimulate the economic growth of the United States, maintain and enlarge foreign markets for the products of the United States industry and agriculture, and make available to the people of the United States a greater variety of goods at lower prices—

It is Bill 9900 from which the Trade Expansion Act was ultimately constructed.

If the Government can establish to my satisfaction that this measure will ultimately