

effects in all phases of the industry have been good.

Mr. Nesbitt: That is what you say.

Mr. Gray: We have this House of Commons, the government and the opposition in order that we can put forward our different points of view. The hon. member has made reference to a committee. I feel flattered that he thinks I have the ear of the minister. I will ask the minister to give careful consideration to this suggestion put forward by the hon. member for Oxford. I must leave it to the minister to state any official point of view in this regard.

At this point, after taking into account the debate on the amendment moved by one of the opposition parties to a supply motion last year, after taking into account the opportunities for debate we are now having in this house, and after taking into account the full opportunity that has been and will be given to individual firms and their trade associations to come forward with their representations and discuss them with the minister, his colleagues and individual members of this house on all sides, I think there has been ample opportunity for discussion and that the need for a study to which the hon. member referred does not in my opinion have the priority that he sought to assign to it.

Mr. Nesbitt: Does the hon. member apply that argument to functioning of all committees? If he does there is no purpose in having any committee meetings.

Mr. Gray: I do not accept that statement. We are dealing here with a particular case and in regard to this situation I believe we have followed an appropriate course. It may be that as time passes we will want to consider the progress made under this treaty. At that time we may seek an opportunity under the new committee structure to look into the matter. At this time I believe we have had reasonable opportunity for discussion. Certainly so far as I am concerned the industry, either from the point of view of individual firms or trade organizations, has had full access to the minister and individual members to put forward their positions. As far as I am aware they will continue to do so, and I am certainly willing to assist them in this regard in so far as I am able to as a private member.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, for the past few minutes, I have

23033—305

Canada—U.S. Automotive Agreement

been listening to questions and answers popping up from both sides of the house, particularly intent upon weighing the administration of the present government and that of the government prior to 1963.

I hardly think that time should be wasted on judging governments while we have under consideration such an important item as a new agreement. If the government prior to 1963 emphasized exports and the present government wants to emphasize employment, I think quite objectively that it is ill-advised in both instances to champion such tendencies exclusively, because the economic field, whether in exports or in employment, is not solely influenced by the Canadian government but also by foreign and provincial factors that weigh upon economic patterns.

There is before the house a proposed resolution moved by the Minister of Industry and Defence Production (Mr. Drury) as follows:

That it is expedient that the houses of parliament do approve the agreement concerning automotive products between the government of Canada and the government of the United States of America, signed on January 16, 1965, and that this house do approve the same.

In the text of the agreement distributed by the Department of Industry, we read that the agreement is entitled: Agreement concerning Automotive Products between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States of America.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this agreement is a very important event. I congratulate the government as well as the officials of the various departments who have shared in the formulation and the completion of such an agreement.

This is an important event since it concerns our relationship with the United States and our foreign trade. As concerns the United States, we have reached the point of self-awareness. Canada, with its small outlet of 20 million people, next to a giant with 200 million inhabitants, with geographic and economic conditions at times different, is at the point where it is establishing a closer and more profitable relationship. We have improved our economic problems, our commercial relationship with that country, and the areas of production and employment within Canada.

Thus, this agreement is a loyal gesture and I hope it will constitute a precedent, an open door to further agreements in this direction.

Since yesterday we have been hearing a lot of criticism, that is the members' role. I often