

Canada-U.S. Automobile Agreement

with this agreement; because their Government has written into legislation guaranteed protection for the workers who may be adversely affected by this economic adjustment; they have said they will look after those who are temporarily unemployed and who must be retrained and placed in some other part of the automobile industry or in some other industry. But there is no such provision in this agreement which we are now discussing. I was interested in noting that Mr. Leonard Woodcock, Vice President of the U.A.W., when he appeared before the Congressional Committee had this to say:

He also decried the failure of the Canadian Government thus far to provide protection for Canadian workers and their families similar to that proposed in the U.S. and he scored auto manufacturers for failing to pass on to consumers in Canada the \$50 million a year savings they are realizing as a result of the removal of the Canadian tariff.

Woodcock told the Committee the U.A.W. was able to support the Bill because of the machinery it sets up to provide adjustment assistance for American workers who may be injured through loss of employment as a consequence of the Act. "In the absence of such provisions", he said, "we would have no alternative but to oppose it."

"The agreement has been entered into because our Government believed it would bring benefits to our country and to the people of our country but, in achieving those benefits for the people as a whole, adjustments will undoubtedly have to be made within the auto industry.

"Jobs will be lost, new jobs will have to be found and other adjustments will have to be made by auto workers in this country as side-effects of an action taken by our Government for the benefit of the country as a whole".

He went on to say:

"Then why should not the cost of these dislocations be considered simply as one of the costs of a national benefit, to be paid for by the nation? We believe", he said, "there would be every justification for adopting the principle that any worker adversely affected by the implementation of the automotive products agreement ought to be protected in full against any consequent financial loss".

I draw attention to this significant comment, Mr. Speaker, from an American trade union leader appearing before a United States Congressional Committee:

Commenting on the failure of the Canadian Government to provide protection for Canadian workers displaced by reason of the new agreement, Woodcock called on the Johnson administration to "make known to the Canadian Government the concern of the United States that adequate safeguards be provided for the Canadian workers affected by the agreement". Refusal of the Canadian Government to act "will certainly jeopardize the fulfilment of hopes that the principle of the automotive products agreement will be extended to other industries", Woodcock said.

"For, if the Canadian Government refuses to step up to its responsibilities toward those ad-

versely affected by the agreement", he warned, "Canadian workers can be expected to oppose vigorously the negotiation of other similar agreements".

Mr. Speaker, that summarizes very clearly the position of American labour, that in their opinion adequate protection has been provided under the Automotive Products Trade Act, but they regret—as I am sure many of the Members in this House must regret—that no adequate provisions have been made in the Canadian automotive agreement with respect to Canadian workers.

So that I may keep within the rules, Mr. Speaker—I have a few more words to say—I should like to now move an amendment, seconded by the hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That all the words after the word "that" be deleted, and that the following words be substituted therefor:

"this House regrets that when the Government entered into the Canada-United States Automotive Agreement it failed to take any steps to safeguard the interests of the Canadian consumers, the automobile workers and the small parts manufacturers".

I was interested in noticing the other day, in a report in the *Montreal Star* dated April 28, some comments by the Minister of Industry (Mr. Drury). The news report says:

The Minister added that the Government was now in the process of gathering information from all big three Canadian auto manufacturers—General Motors, Ford and Chrysler—concerning the extent of the "manpower adjustments" that would be required in adjusting to the new free trade agreement.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that is an amazing statement. Four months after the agreement is in effect as far as Canada is concerned, the Minister is now in the process of gathering information from the three automobile companies to see what men are going to be affected and what is going to be done about them. Mr. Speaker, can you conceive of a Government entering into an agreement that they knew was going to affect the jobs of thousands of automobile workers in this country, without some guarantee from the three companies, to whom they were handing \$50 million a year, that those companies would participate with the Government and with the United Automobile Workers in setting up the necessary machinery to retrain the workers, replace them in jobs and keep them and their families adequately cared for during the retraining period?

One would have thought that either the Government itself would have set up the