

## Questions

2. How many post offices in that constituency have been closed since 1960?

3. Which post offices in the constituency of Nickel Belt does the department intend to close in the next two years?

4. Where in the constituency of Nickel Belt does the department intend to build post offices between 1969 and 1972?

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** I am informed by the Departments of Public Works and Post Office as follows: 1. Five post offices and one addition

(a) Location	(b) Cost
Azilda	\$21,651 including land
Chelmsford	84,985 including land
Noelville	22,026 including land
St. Charles	26,498 including land
Val Caron	33,562 including land
Hanmer (1964) addition	16,350 including land

2. Four.

3. At this time the Department does not intend to close any post offices in the Nickel Belt constituency.

4. The Department of Public Works intends to construct post offices during 1969-70 at Rutter and Wanapitei, subject to funds being available. From now until 1972 the Department's preliminary planning includes the provision of accommodation at Capreol, Dowling, Garson and Onaping, subject to confirmation of requirements by the Post Office Department at the time of construction and to approval of funds by Parliament.

## \*SELLING PRICE, FORD "MAVERICK"

Question No. 2,060—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. What were the results of the meeting between the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and representatives of Ford of Canada regarding the selling price of the new "Maverick" car in Canada?

2. After making allowances for exchange rates and sales tax, will this new car be made available at the same price in Canada and the United States and, if not, for what reason?

3. If the price of the "Maverick" will be higher in Canada than in the United States, will Canadian manufactured "Maverick" cars exporting to the United States at lower prices be violating GATT anti-dumping regulations?

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, as the answer to this question is quite long would the house agree that it be printed and the answer considered as read?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

[Mr. Serré.]

**Mr. Forest:** Mr. Scott, president of the Ford Motor Company of Canada noted that the price differential between Canadian and United States produced cars had steadily diminished since the inception of the auto agreement. He expressed confidence that despite certain higher business costs experienced in Canada, the price gap would continue to narrow as the economics of industry rationalization were more fully realized.

The suggested retail prices for the "Maverick" are United States \$1,995 for sales in the United States and Canada \$2,375 for sales in Canada. After making allowances for exchange and the higher federal sales tax in Canada, and allowing for the effect of dealer mark-up, a difference of about Canadian \$100 or 5 per cent still remains.

For Maverick sales to be made in volume in the U.S. market the car must be priced competitively with other cars in the Ford range and competitive cars of other makers. Since the general level of prices is still lower in the U.S. than in Canada this results in a differential pricing situation between the two countries.

If the selling price of the "Maverick" in Canada were higher than in the United States, this would not in itself be dumping. Under the GATT code to which both Canada and the United States subscribed, dumping would only occur if the export price of the Canadian car, following adjustments for exchange and differences in quantities and other circumstances of sale, were found to be lower and, furthermore, if material injury to the United States industry resulted. Both the elements of lower adjusted price and injury must be present to constitute dumping.

## PUBLIC SERVICE REHABILITATION TRAINING

Question No. 2,107—**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):**

1. With reference to certain "lay-off" procedures designated in the *Canada Gazette*, Part 2, Volume 10 Extra, pertaining to the Public Service Employment Act, is it the intention of the government to provide members of the Public Service declared "surplus to staff" with (a) rehabilitation training (b) rehabilitation grants?

2. If the answer to any part of paragraph 1 is no, what are the reasons for not doing so?

3. Is the government considering the advisability of revising the legislation governing the payment of Unemployment Insurance so as to permit voluntary participation by Public Servants?

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** I am in-