

Chrysler Canada

employment in Chrysler plants in Canada to above pre-layoff levels and to a level of close to 16,000, with all that means in terms of employment in supplier firms, in dealers and employment in an indirect way in all sorts of other companies in Canada.

To conclude, while my hon. friend suggests that the job guarantees were—I think the word he used was farcical—this is certainly not the view of the Canadian director of the United Automobile Workers of Canada, Mr. Bob White. I see he is quoted by the Canadian Press as having praised my efforts in achieving job and investment commitments from Chrysler. I do not think that Mr. White, being a tough and skilled negotiator and a very outspoken person when it comes to putting his views on the public record, would have said that if he did not believe that the agreement was a lot better than what was suggested in the remarks of my hon. friend. In fact, I could be mistaken, but I recall a radio report indicating that Mr. White had said that the agreement which the federal government negotiated with Chrysler Corporation and Chrysler Canada was the best agreement that could have been achieved under the circumstances.

These circumstances are very important. They involve the present situation of Chrysler Canada and the situation of the parent, as well as the reality of the very uncertain automotive market, not just now but for a number of years to come.

I say that on balance, and again repeating the words of the Canadian director of the UAW who represents the interests in terms of collective bargaining of the workers at Chrysler and its supplier firms, that this is a fair deal, and therefore a good deal for Canadian workers and the Canadian economy.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Madam Speaker, I would like to make a few comments. First, I greatly appreciate the efforts of the government. I said so during oral question period and the minister has surely received, as I did, the views of dealers in our respective constituencies who surely welcome the agreement, the government proposal which will finally allow us, as he said, to maintain 6,000 jobs, especially in Quebec.

I refer now to page 8. I hope that Chrysler Corporation will be in a position to find a source of materials and components in Canada. My question this afternoon—I now take this opportunity to refer to it—dealt with supplies and the minister will understand that we are talking about 6,000 jobs in Quebec, jobs which are directly or indirectly related to Chrysler Corporation. He also speaks of saving 40,000 jobs across Canada. Granted that is a high figure for the province of Quebec but it is still relatively low compared with the over-all Chrysler work force. I wondered to what extent representations were made to the minister. I should like to take this opportunity and ask him about the possibility of perhaps giving some consideration to subcontracting industries because, as the minister knows, where Quebec is concerned, there is very little direct participation in the manufacturing

industry. I should like to know, in view of that \$1 billion investment, just what could be considered as a legitimate and reasonable share of those investments for Quebec, in terms of manufacturing parts, if not the whole automobile.

Mr. Gray: Madam Speaker, I trust one of the results of the agreement between Chrysler and the federal government will be a sharing of the opportunities to manufacture parts throughout the country. Of course, that will depend in a way on the willingness of suppliers to tender for making such parts. Once again I want to mention to my hon. friend that Chrysler Canada already has important suppliers in the province of Quebec. For instance, Goodyear Canada Inc., at Valleyfield, supplies tires to Chrysler; Waterville Cellulose Products of Waterville, in the province of Quebec, supplies parts to Chrysler. I must not forget, above all, to mention Firestone Canada Ltd. which also manufactures tires for Chrysler and is operating out of the city of Joliette in the very riding of my hon. colleague.

[*English*]

Madam Speaker: It being so late, perhaps we could terminate the questioning after the hon. member for Broadview-Greenwood. I see there is another member rising, and I will recognize just one more after the hon. member for Broadview-Greenwood.

Mr. Bob Rae (Broadview-Greenwood): Madam Speaker, I have three brief questions for the minister.

Could the minister confirm my understanding that up until this time there were in fact three major plants in Windsor, a van plant, an engine plant, a V-8 plant, and the Cordoba-Newport car assembly.

With respect to the van plant and the transfer to the new T-115, the world product mandate for the van, according to the minister's statement, runs out as soon as the company pays back the loans which the government is guaranteeing. Can the minister tell us whether he tried to get the world product mandate extended beyond that time so that Canada would be producing at least one world product, not just for a short period of time but for a longer period of time? Could he tell us why he was unsuccessful in that regard?

Second, can the minister confirm that, as of August, 1980, there will be no engine production in Canada?

Third, I noticed that he tells us with respect to the car assembly plant that none of the facilities of Chrysler Canada can be closed permanently without obtaining the approval of the minister. Now, the question as to what is a permanent closure will be an interesting discussion. For example, when one looks at permanent lay-offs in an industry under the employment standards act of Ontario, this is a subject which has gone all the way to the Supreme Court of Ontario. It has been ruled that a permanent closing can be one that lasts for as long as a year, or even two years, under certain conditions.

If the market for larger cars continues to collapse the way it has collapsed, will the minister agree that there is a possibility