

Supply

That is what we have negotiated. We have negotiated equality with the United States whenever there is a dispute with that country. Nothing could be a greater affirmation of our sovereignty, nothing could give us more equal footing with the Americans than what we have done there.

People say that under the free trade agreement there has been job loss in Canada. We know what the Minister of Finance has said and we know what the economists are saying. It is quite true that we cannot trace everything to the free trade agreement, job losses or job creations. It is true that \$18 billion worth of exports more are going into the United States this year than went into the United States the year before the trade agreement.

It is also true that there has been a complete change in investment. I want to tell the hon. member from Windsor that tomorrow I am going to go to the opening of the new Chrysler plant, a \$600 million plant, in Windsor. There will be a \$2 billion expansion to the Ford plant in Oakville. There has been a tremendous expansion of Freightliner in St. Thomas. All of these things have been happening.

The hon. member for Windsor West just sat down. He knows about the \$600 million expansion at Chrysler tomorrow. This is all good news. It is there in large part because of the confidence people have in the Canadian economy. We only buy 9 per cent of the big three automobiles but we produce 18 per cent of them in Canada because we are so efficient and competitive.

What we now have is a free trade agreement that protects our sovereignty and strengthens us. With the NAFTA agreement, which the opposition wants us to abrogate or be against, we further consolidate what we captured in the free trade agreement and we finally get access to the Mexican market, which we have never had before.

Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to what the hon. member had to say, particularly to the fact that he mentioned his book in his opening remarks.

I happen to have read that book and understood from that book that the member had a much firmer grasp at that time of the political realities of the country than he seems to have today, at least if we take his rosy-glow approach to the trade deal as an indication of his current thinking.

I would also like to remind the hon. member that in opposition his party advocated that universality of social programs, for example, was a sacred trust. I would also like to remind him that before the last election, although his party was in government, his party said that it would introduce the best adjustment programs known to the civilized world if there were negative consequences from the trade deal.

In his academic analysis of opposition parties over the years, when has an opposition party come forward with a more complete description of a proposed economic agenda than the New Democratic Party. When has it been more fully costed? When was it submitted to a widely respected independent agency to have the results verified by somebody outside the political process?

• (1710)

The hon. member made reference to the CAEDS program, the aboriginal economic development program of which I and others in my party have been supportive. Why did he countenance in the last few years the fact that CEIC has withdrawn 25 per cent of its commitment to the program, that in the last budget the Indian affairs department withdrew 31 per cent of its commitment to the program, and that his own department withdrew 10 per cent of its program?

Is the member satisfied with the predictions of independent analysts and his own government figures indicating that this will be a jobless recovery, that for the next five years we can anticipate the same level of unemployment? If not, what proposals does he have to increase the level of employment among Canadians?

Mr. Hockin: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member's intervention. I take his points seriously.

On the first question of being a party which has put together alternative policies, my complaint was that the motion itself was not constructive. He is quite right though. I have to give the NDP credit. It at least looked at policy and produced a booklet three or four weeks ago that was an attempt to give its point of view.

It was costed, so-called, by Mr. McCracken and the Informetrica people. The Minister of State for Finance made very clear in the House today the problems, the way he looked at it. The way it was costed assumed certain things that were just not valid, especially the impact of what would happen to the Canadian investment climate if we abrogated the free trade agreement