




-  Join this Wiki
-  Recent Changes
-  Manage Wiki

Search 

- Home
- About Mr.Surra
- American Government - Pd. 2
- American Government - Pd. 8
- American Government - Pd.7
- Economics - Pd. 1
- Economics Pd. 3
- Psychology - Pd. 4

[◀ Back to Discussion Forum](#)

Big Three Auto Rescue. Good, Bad, Ugly?



dsurra Feb 5, 2010 4:53 am
<http://bigthreeauto.procon.org/>

Follow the above ling to ProCon.org. It will lead you to a web page that debates the Issue of the US Auto manufacturers Bailout by the United States Government for GM and Chrysler. **Read through the following pages and make a determination whether or not the Auto Bailouts should have taken place. Then Explain Why or why not you believe that way using facts from ProCon.org.**

**Remember that the Economy of St. Marys Hinges on much of what the U.S. Auto Manufacturers do.



re: Big Three Auto Rescue. Good, Bad, Ugly?
smrkrise Feb 5, 2010 5:02 am

I think that bail outs are good because it keeps some jobs around for the american people. thats why i believe in balouts.



re: Big Three Auto Rescue. Good, Bad, Ugly?
smbpenfield Feb 5, 2010 5:03 am

i believe that the Big Three Auto companys should not get a taxpayer bailout. Due to the big insodent that most people know about that the CEO's of these outo companys flew to D.C. in privatly owned jets that cost thousands of dollars to fly and they still asked the government for money when they could use some of their own fortune to support their companys instead of relying more on the middle class taxpayers to bail them out of trouble



re: Big Three Auto Rescue. Good, Bad, Ugly?
smjday Feb 5, 2010 5:05 am

I think that the Auto Bailout is a good idea. i think this because the automotive industry has so many jobs that it would affect the economy of the U.S. as a whole. Without the bailout, the auto manufactures would go out of business, thus losing a lot of jobs for thouands.



re: Big Three Auto Rescue. Good, Bad, Ugly?
smgcarr Feb 5, 2010 5:05 am

Toyota and Honda can produce more cars because they dont have to pay their workers as much and they dont have labor laws. But for us we have to pay so much and ccan only work so many hours and thats why we cant produce as many. In order for americans to keep their jobs we need bail outs.



re: Big Three Auto Rescue. Good, Bad, Ugly?(Dwendel)
smdwendel Feb 5, 2010 5:05 am

I think no matter what happens we will suffer a great loss, but i think that the bailout should happen. Without cars being made we will have to buy from out of country places and make them richer. We are the country in a recession and that needs the money, yes it will cost us some but i think in the end it will all pay off. We need to have a reliable source for informarion on the cars we bought also.



re: Big Three Auto Rescue. Good, Bad, Ugly?
smjauman Feb 5, 2010 5:06 am

I think that the government bailout for GM, Crysler, and Ford, was a good thing for the town of St. Marys because our surrounding industries rely on making parts for the big auto companies. The bailout was extremely bad for the economy as far as im concerned. I think this because instead of giving these huge businesses money, the govt. could have used it to find more jobs for the people so the unemployment rate would go down. But on the other hand if one of these big auto makers would fail, alot of jobs wuld be lost. To solve the automakers going broke, they could pay their employers less. Some guy thats sitting in a chair putting in a bolt in the same place on every different car shouldn't be paid so much. If they would cut wages, then the car wouldnt be so expensive also, so the average working person might be able to drive a ice car instead of all the old rusted out gas hogs. New cars bring better fuel economy, just like the cash for clunkers the govt. did not long back, if we could get the old junk cars and trrucks off the road, we wouldnt have to worry about the scarcity of crude, because we would burn less gas.



re: Big Three Auto Rescue. Good, Bad, Ugly?

smjclark Feb 5, 2010 5:07 am

In my opinion, the bailout is a good idea. I think that if this was occurring at a different time, my answer may be different. But, this is a time when we can't afford for all these people to be out of jobs. I believe that the future of these businesses is critical to the health of the U.S. economy. the assistance they are acquiring now will save millions of jobs and produce benefits for all of us in the years coming up.



smseozzo

smseozzo Feb 5, 2010 5:07 am

Yes, because we need cars to get places and if some companys went out of business we wouldnt have some cars that people enjoy today. Also if the cars wouldnt get baild out then their would be thousands of people out of jobs and then their would just be more people out of jobs then what we have now. Ford also has the big trucks so if they would go down then people wouldnt have some of the trucks they need to hall things.



re: Big Three Auto Rescue. Good, Bad, Ugly?(jpistner)

smjakepistner Feb 5, 2010 5:07 am

I don't believe that the auto bailouts should have happened in a true free market this should happen every once in a while. when one big company goes down another one will take its place sooner or later. Plus if GM Ford and Chrysler would have gone into bankrupsy then when/if they got their assets together they could have become more competitive and possibly came out with alot of better cars and trucks than they offer even right now after the bailout has taken place. Now we even have the possibily that the automakers will be asking for this again someday, using government money as a crutch and not moving forward fast enough to keep up with the ever changing times and demands that people want in a modern vehical.



re: Big Three Auto Rescue. Good, Bad, Ugly?(sruprecht)

smsruprecht Feb 5, 2010 5:08 am

I think that the auto bailouts should have taken place because this town is made up of factories that make parts for cars. If these companies would go bankrupt then factories in this town would close, alot of people would lose their jobs.Paul Krugman said that if these companies would go under then you would be able to see a million plus jobs disappering. Rick Wagner CEO of GM stated that last year GM,Ford,and Chrysler bought \$156 billion in parts, materials, and service throughout all 50 states.



re: Big Three Auto Rescue. Good, Bad, Ugly?

smbginther Feb 5, 2010 5:08 am

no,because ford and dodge are better made vehicles and are more dependable.GM makes good vehicles but they dont compete with ford or dodge because GM trucks dont hold up or last as long as a ford or dodge does.i think the government should just let GM go under.



re: Big Three Auto Rescue. Good, Bad, Ugly?

smmdefrain Feb 5, 2010 5:08 am

I think that the bail outs are good because they keep jobs in america, but I also think that some of the CEO's of these companies dont need to be getting paid as much as they are. Instead of paying CEO's so much money use a share of the money for expenses.



re: Big Three Auto Rescue. Good, Bad, Ugly?

smemitchell Feb 5, 2010 5:09 am

I think they shoul have bc we need to keep us produts moving to make money so we can pay off are det and buld up are cerency



re: Big Three Auto Rescue. Good, Bad, Ugly?

smemitchell Feb 5, 2010 5:09 am

I think they shoul have bc we need to keep us produts moving to make money so we can pay off are det and buld up are cerency



re: Big Three Auto Rescue. Good, Bad, Ugly?

smemitchell Feb 5, 2010 5:09 am

I think they shoul have bc we need to keep us produts moving to make money so we can pay off are det and buld up are cerency





re: Big Three Auto Rescue. Good, Bad, Ugly?

[smmatt](#) Feb 5, 2010 5:10 am

As much as people don't want the auto bailout, without it i believe all the jobs that are associated with the top three will dissappear (just like in Detroit). I think the top three are "to big to fail." They just need to be more competitive in the global market. If we didnt recive the federal "bail-out" they would be forced to cut wages and benifets for workers.



re: Big Three Auto Rescue. Good, Bad, Ugly?

[smangeleeh](#) Feb 5, 2010 5:10 am

No, i don't think they should have been bailed out. The fact of running a business is taking a risk of failure. Toyota and Honda are doing fine, so the GMC, Ford and Chrysler should step up their game and get some new ideas on how to get their business back and running. If Toyota and Honda weren't doing so well then maybe we should help them all out. But it's like the same thing with a class. If a third of the class is getting a's, and two-thirds of the class is failing. It shows that it is possible to pass, and that either two thirds of hte class aren't trying hard enough to pass, or need some new habits. Chrysler, GM, and Ford need to think of something to bail themselves out; but our government shouldn't have had to do it. If they file for bankruptcy they can at least work on rebuilding their business. A bailout would be a new opportunity for the companies.



re: Big Three Auto Rescue. Good, Bad, Ugly?

[smaehrensberger](#) Feb 5, 2010 5:10 am

The bailouts could end badly but i think we should go with them. That way we keep jobs in america and help out our own economy.



re: Big Three Auto Rescue. Good, Bad, Ugly?(B. Glass)

[smbglass](#) Feb 5, 2010 5:10 am

I believe that the bailouts should have taken place because they are helping jobs all over the US. The auto industry is buying parts from companies that are helping people keep their jobs. Without this bailout, there would be no jobs for anyone.



< Previous **1** **2** Next >

1 - 20 of 33

Please [sign in](#) to post messages. It's fast and free to [join](#).

[Help](#) · [About](#) · [Blog](#) · [Terms](#) · [Privacy](#) · [Support](#) · [Upgrade](#)

Contributions to <http://surrasocialstudies.wikispaces.com> are licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution Share-Alike 3.0 License.
Portions not contributed by visitors are Copyright 2010 Tangient LLC.