

Canada-U.S. Automotive Agreement

ers to adjust, where necessary, to changes brought about by this agreement. In my view this concept is expressed very well by an editorial which appeared in the *Windsor Star* of Monday, April 26, from which I quote briefly:

The Government, which negotiated and signed the auto agreement, has a responsibility to all workers in the industry. Even if the long term effects are beneficial, the responsibility to workers temporarily hurt by the plan is strong. The Government should take every step to make the transition as easy for the workers as possible...

There is also, in this case, a heavy responsibility on the company. It is laying off employees because it wants to be able to take full advantage of the larger markets provided by the auto plan. It must give every consideration to the employees whose services have helped it to prosper in the past and who will be needed in the more prosperous future...

It is a general responsibility to make sure that those affected along the way are made the beneficiaries, not the victims, of progress.

In our system needed legislation can be introduced into Parliament and proceeded with more swiftly than in the United States Congress, with its different system. I am confident that the Government will be prepared to take such further steps as may be required to assist in adjustment so that auto workers in particular will be able to benefit from this agreement to the same extent as their fellow citizens. But, Mr. Speaker, let us not lose sight of the major objectives of this agreement, the major objectives of expanding employment and production in Canada very substantially over the next few years. This agreement will lead to lower manufacturing costs in Canada which will benefit Canadian consumers. It will lead to increased production in Canada which will create additional opportunities for manufacturing in Canada as well as increased job opportunities for Canadian workers. I therefore urge the defeat of the amendment now before the House.

Mr. Fisher: Very well read.

Mr. Douglas: The hon. Member said he would answer a question. I want to ask a question about one thing I noted while he was reading his speech. He said that the short runs in Canada made the price of cars much higher in this country. I want to ask him how he accounts for the fact that Canadian made cars are now being sold in the United States for much less than they are being sold in Canada.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, first I should like to point out to the hon. Member and the House that in delivering my speech I referred

[Mr. Gray.]

to my notes to no greater extent than does the hon. Member himself, and particularly the eminent author from Port Arthur. It is my understanding that the sale to the United States to which the hon. Member referred is merely an experiment or trial involving a relatively small number of vehicles, in order to see what problems may arise in selling completely Canadian manufactured vehicles in the United States. Basically, from the point of view of expanding production and employment in Canada I think it is a good thing that the Ford Motor Company has adopted this trial procedure to see how this can be done. I think it is something that a company the size of Ford can do, inasmuch as it is only a trial involving some 400 cars a month over a period of only a few months.

Mr. Douglas: Does the hon. Member think that 80,000 Valiants by Chrysler is also an experimental run?

● (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. Gray: I hope it won't be an experimental run because it will lead to increased jobs for the people of Windsor. The leader of the N.D.P. does not like this, which again expresses what he really thinks of the people who live and work in Windsor at the present time.

Mr. Douglas: Do not display your stupidity.

Mr. Gray: So far as I am aware, the price at which these cars are to be sold, if this is to be carried out, has not been announced. I think we ought to suspend judgment on that aspect until we find out about that.

Mr. Fisher: I should like to ask the hon. Member a question. He mentioned a figure of \$280 million, and I think this is over a four year period. I understand also that over a four year period the tariff lapsing will be in effect. It is estimated to cover a figure of \$50 million for the first year, so projecting it would be even more than this. As a consequence of a total tariff gain of somewhere over \$200 million in the same period, we get \$280 million, as a sort of guarantee of increased production. Can the hon. Member suggest any other industry anywhere that has ever been given an opportunity under such favourable terms?

Mr. Gray: In the first place, I think it is over a period of three years, not four. I do not believe there is much value in talking about the so-called loss of duties involving a greater degree of production, which was not in existence at the time the duties were