

Clearly these discussions between the U.S. and Mexico were going to happen. If there was a bilateral agreement between the U.S.A and Mexico on the one hand and a bilateral agreement between the U.S. and Canada on the other, one does not have to be a genius to figure out where the investment is going to go. The investment is going to go to the United States.

By being part of a trilateral agreement we have the opportunity to enhance investment in this country. That was an objective we sought. That was an objective we have achieved.

Second was to improve and protect the FTA, to resolve trade problems with the United States that had occurred during the past few years while ensuring no reduction in the benefits and obligations of the FTA.

The FTA was a complex document negotiated over many months and brought into place on January 1, 1989. Naturally as with any document of that magnitude there would be some chinks in the armour and some little problems that had to be worked out. The NAFTA negotiations provided us with an opportunity to put on the table the concerns of Canada as a government with the way the FTA was working, for example things like the establishment of Canadian content in automobiles. Things like that were sorted out in the NAFTA. The second objective was achieved.

Third and finally was our aspiration to see that Canada remained an attractive location for investment. Obviously investment is the key to growth. By being part of this large North American market of 350 million people Canada now has a marvellous basis for the attraction of investment from abroad, the result of which is going to be more jobs for Canadians and the opportunity to maintain the high standard of living we have.

In conclusion I must say when I reflect on the motion put forward by the hon. member opposite I really think it is time for him to go back to the drawing-board. I hope he will listen to the speech delivered earlier today by my hon. friend, the Minister of State for Finance and Privatization, who dealt with a number of fiscal matters. I hope he will listen to what I said on trade. I look forward to the rest of the debate. I trust my hon. friend on reflection will realize that perhaps this government is doing an outstanding job and should be sustained as it will be at the next general election.

### *Supply*

**Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a couple of comments and then pose a question to the hon. member.

He indicated that he was disputing the essence of the motion, that there is stifled economic growth. How would the hon. member respond to the concern of the youth around the country who say they have lost hope in this government? When they graduated with skills they could not find jobs. They also fear the skills they have today may not be relevant tomorrow.

Would the hon. member respond to the specific question of whether he would favour the establishment of a national apprenticeship program and the creation of a Canadian youth service to address the very emergent concerns of youth about unemployment and their future?

**Mr. McCreath:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to my hon. friend's question.

We can dress these programs up in any kind of fabric we want but the bottom line is that what is best for the youth of Canada is a strong economy. A strong economy where there is economic growth, an economy in which there are incentives for investors, will mean the establishment of manufacturing enterprises and that is going to mean job opportunities.

Job opportunities and the economic growth that would spring from them are exactly what young people are looking for today.

We have benefited for many years from a high quality of education in this country. Right now our education systems are challenged as never before, challenged in part because they are looked upon to accept responsibility for all the social evils of society and the difficult problems that kids bring to school, challenged also by the level of resources available to them. Government restraint is popular in principle but when it means not providing the growth in expenditures that may be expected, whether in youth programs, education, transfer programs to the provinces or whatever, they are difficult to cope with.

• (1540)

In the long run the best thing we can do for young people is not burden them with the debt of our past but ensure we have a strong economy that will provide them with the jobs and the opportunities they are looking for in the future.