

*Employment and Immigration*

I repeat, the Canada Pension Plan is an earnings-related program and has nothing to do with the kind of work a person does. Having said that, I thank the House for having considered this bill, and its promise to support it.

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** Is the House prepared to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed and bill read the third time and passed.

\* \* \*

[English]

**EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION  
REORGANIZATION ACT**

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION, ETC.

The House resumed, from Thursday, July 7, consideration of the motion of Mr. Cullen that Bill C-27, to establish the Department of Employment and Immigration, the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission and the Canada Employment and Immigration Advisory Council, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, and to amend certain other statutes in consequence thereof, be read the third time and do pass; and the amendment thereto of Mr. Peters.

● (1440)

**Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in this debate to support the motion moved by my colleague, the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters). He correctly pointed out that instead of attacking the unemployed in Canada, as this legislation does in a very discriminatory and unfair way, the government should be bringing forward measures to create job opportunities for Canadians. We find this a totally convincing example of the insensitive nature of this government.

In speaking to the motion for a six months' hoist, not only do we say that jobs ought to be created instead of attacking the unemployed, but we can provide, in the example I am going to give, very specific information about how, within the government's own operations right now, it should be providing significant increases in employment for Canadians. In so doing, I want to address myself to the concerns of the automotive industry, that sector of the Canadian economy which employs over 100,000 Canadians. That sector has been virtually ignored by this government since 1965. Since I came here in 1968 there have been three ministers of industry, trade and commerce. They have not made the effort they ought to have made to create more jobs for Canadians by improving that agreement.

[Mr. Lalonde.]

I remind the House that that agreement came into being in 1965 as a result of continuing balance of payments problems that existed between Canada and the United States. We were losing billions of dollars cumulatively, hundreds of millions of dollars annually, in trade with the United States in the automotive sector. Ironically, the proposal of the Canadian government at that time was to set up what became subsequently for the Americans their DISC program. We were going to establish that in 1965 as a way of extricating ourselves from this serious problem. Understandably, the Americans objected. A series of negotiations took place. The result was the Canada-U.S. automotive agreement of 1965.

I want to quote from clause 1 of the agreement. I notice the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) is in the chamber. This matter ought to concern him. Clause 1 of that agreement is very relevant to the kind of concerns that we now have in this House—namely, jobs. It states that the purpose of the agreement was for each country “to participate on a fair and equitable basis in the expanding total market of the two countries”. We were supposed to get real and substantial benefits. As a result of this agreement, the Americans have tariff-free access to the Canadian market. One of the consequences of this was supposed to have been a substantial reduction in the price of cars to Canadian consumers. I will get to that in a few minutes. Another major consequence was supposed to be a real increase in employment opportunities for men and women in Canada. That, too, was to follow from the agreement.

That pact has been in existence for more than the nine years that I have been here as a member of parliament. After being elected to this place, representing an automotive constituency I spent some time looking at the pact. I made some criticisms to the then minister of industry, trade and commerce, the hon. Jean-Luc Pepin, who interestingly enough has taken on other errand-boy tasks for the government. I pointed out to his successor, now the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie), and the present minister some very serious problems in the implementation of the auto pact as it affects the Canadian economy, the Canadian consumer and the Canadian worker.

All of this has been documented by a study, not by the NDP research staff, some trade union in Canada or some source whose credentials the government might question, but by a special task force from within the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. What have we learned? That study was tabled in the House about a week ago. It points out that there are serious problems in the parts sector of the Canadian industry, in investment patterns, in research and development, and last but not least it singled out very serious injustices being done to Canadian consumers who are paying millions of dollars a year, cumulatively, more for cars than they ought to be paying.

I want to deal with some of these points in series. First, employment, which is our paramount concern in this House right now, at least on the opposition side and certainly for Canadians whether they live on the east coast, on the prairies