

Adjournment Debate

backers, Bob White and company, want them to say. And incidentally, Bob White is doing pretty good for himself, too, these days.

Canadians should realize the kind of position the socialist party is taking. They should realize that in 1965, they were against free trade in the auto industry. Today, we have the socialist party and Bob White who want to maintain all the advantages of free trade in a specific sector of our economy here in Canada. Mr. Speaker, every Canadian should seriously reflect on the position taken by the socialist party. In 1965, they were against free trade, and now that their workers enjoy the benefits of free trade, workers who are paying Bob White a handsome salary . . . He gives the orders, he supports their campaigns and their political financing, and that is why these people cannot consider the well-being of all Canadians, because they are indebted to Bob White, who has been enjoying the benefits of free trade since 1965.

● (1815)

[*English*]

Mr. Murray Cardiff (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Hon. Member for his timely question. I might just follow it up by stating that this is not the only time that the NDP has been wrong.

Members opposite have a record of negativism on free trade and other issues. I need go back only as far as this Government's economic statement of November, 1984, when the Leader of the NDP said in the House on November 9, 1984, that the Government would "destroy thousands of jobs . . . The effect of this program would be a net increase in unemployment".

As we all know, that simply is not the case. Since September, 1984, 959,000 new jobs have been created. Total unemployment is down by 336,000, and the rate of unemployment is down by 3.1 points.

This historic free trade agreement, which the Opposition is opposed to, will build upon that impressive record of job creation. It will secure access to our biggest export market and it will create jobs. That is what this deal is all about—jobs. If the NDP is truly concerned about unemployment in Canada, it will support this major initiative.

I would also like to briefly touch upon free trade and its benefits to the auto industry. We said when we went into these free trade negotiations that the Auto Pact was not on the table, and it was not. The Auto Pact, including the safeguards, remain in place.

That is what the Canadian Auto Workers wanted. That is what the auto parts industry wanted. That is what Ontario wanted. Although, as my colleague has just finished pointing out, that is not what the NDP wanted in the past. However, this Government felt that the Auto Pact was working well. Therefore, we did not raise it at the table.

The free trade agreement preserves the benefits and the obligations of the Auto Pact for the original participants. It really has become the Auto Pact "plus" because it also recognizes that there are nine other vehicle assembly companies with projects under way in Canada and the United States which have been left out of the current arrangement.

What we have done is written a set of rules that will allow them to obtain the benefits of rationalized production within North America if they meet a tough new rule of origin that will require them to buy more domestic parts. This policy will create jobs much more effectively than the fortress Canada policies espoused by the NDP. Time will prove this Government's vision for Canada right, and the NDP's lack of vision wrong.

TRADE—SERVICE INDUSTRY—EFFECT OF CANADA-UNITED STATES TRADE AGREEMENT/PROVINCIAL JURISDICTION OVER SERVICE JOBS

Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, the question I raised on October 14 and some of the discussion I have heard this afternoon are very similar. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) responded to my question by stating that the Advisory Council on the Status of Women said that a free trade agreement with the United States would improve the economic prospects of Canadian women. Some of the statements that I heard in the chamber this afternoon frightened me because I suddenly recognized how little research and depth of knowledge there is in the Government when it is going ahead and signing a free trade agreement, and it does not understand what "managed trade" is and what "free trade" is.

● (1820)

The Mulroney trade pact is something that is very dangerous to the economy of this country. When we looked at the Auto Pact, thank goodness our representative, Tommy Douglas, who was such a great Canadian, had his input at that time to make sure that there was Canadian content in every automobile manufactured. That was certainly what managed trade is all about.

My question was a question of the services. Those services have never been studied by the Economic Council of Canada. We do know that other countries have consciously excluded services from trade agreements, recognizing the potential threat to the economic and social programs, and that the development of indigenous service industries is critical to maintaining independent political and economic situations.

We also know that many of those services come under provincial jurisdiction. We have asked, and have not received an answer, as to what type of negotiations and agreements were made with the provinces to allow them to negotiate away many of the jobs of the women of this country.

An Ontario Government study of services under free trade concluded that there is no net benefit in a free trade agreement in five specific areas: banking, culture and broadcasting, investment dealing, telecommunications, and transportation,