

Canada-U.S. Automobile Agreement

this agreement is not going to substantially change this imbalance of trade in respect of automotive parts between the two countries. If the Minister has additional information that he has not given the House, or is aware of additional firm commitments—we would hope in writing—from the Big Three, then it is about time he gave us this information so that we might know positively that we are not just handing a \$50 million bonanza to the Big Three.

There ought to be other contingent agreements in respect of this over-all arrangement between the Big Three and other smaller automotive parts manufacturers in Canada. As the hon. Member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) has pointed out, there certainly will have to be some adjustments in respect of the Canadian parts suppliers. I am sure the Minister will not deny that there will be some dislocation, along with the rationalization of the automotive parts manufacturing business. Surely there must have been some agreement of which the Minister is aware between the Big Three and their suppliers to the effect that the Big Three will not just simply accept the \$50 million, letting the smaller suppliers fend for themselves and assume all the costs of changing their plants to meet the new requirements.

Of course we would also expect that there must have been some consideration or communication to the Minister regarding the workers in these plants. We have known for some time that transmission manufacturers, and other component parts manufacturers, are fearful that they will be completely put out of business so far as supplying these parts for Canadian automobiles in the future, because they will be coming from similar plants in the United States as a result of this loss of tariff protection.

I hope the Minister knows all the answers to these questions and is prepared to take the House into his confidence and tell us what the arrangements are. If there is no firm commitment with the Big Three, that they are going to look after this \$50 million in a responsible way by using it for the good and well-being of the whole automobile manufacturing establishment in Canada, including the small suppliers, this seems to me to be an unjustifiable concession.

There is no real point in my going into a lot of detail or repeating much of what has been said by the hon. Member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, because I hope the Minister has already assured himself that the Big Three

[Mr. Olson.]

intends to make provision in respect of all those situations to which reference has been made. If there are no agreements or assurances which have been given to the Government by the Big Three, it seems to me that the Government has handled this in much the same way it has handled other arrangements. On many occasions the Government has followed the practice of shooting first and arguing afterwards. It has entered into an agreement first and then tried to work out the details after. The \$50 million item and the dislocation of a great many Canadian manufacturers and workers is far too important a matter to be dealt with on that basis.

Perhaps this is another example of calculation or miscalculation, such as the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) referred to in Montreal last Saturday. Is the Government tempting the Opposition, hoping that it will calculate itself into a defeat, or something of that nature? We in this Party think the Prime Minister made a formal commitment when he undertook to head the Government of this country, back in 1963, on the basis that he intended to carry on as though he had a majority, and for the normal length of a Parliament, which is four years. We hope the Government, by its automotive policy, is not tempting the Opposition to bring the Government down.

I do not intend to continue at length because I think this subject has already been covered sufficiently, and that the Minister of Industry is well aware of the questions we should like answered. I hope he is prepared to give those answers now, so there will be no further misunderstanding about the arrangement, first of all between Canada and the United States Government, and second, between the Canadian Government and the Big Three, which will be receiving the \$50 million annually.

• (5:40 p.m.)

[Translation]

Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval): I shall be brief, Mr. Speaker. However, I should like to make a few remarks about the amendment just moved. But before criticizing the amendment, I must tell the house how surprised we were at this strange procedure. As a matter of fact, we are being asked to pass without debate the motion to go into supply. And what is even more amazing is that the ties uniting the two old-line parties are getting closer and closer.

This is further proof, after the evidence given to us in the last few days, when