

Supply

because they do not fit their market driven agenda, which is not the problem.

I want to ask a question of the hon. minister. We have another amendment to a suggestion being put forward by the NDP today. It is a constructive amendment. If there are flaws in the NAFTA, which we and the majority of Canadians believe there are, why not sit down and renegotiate them? If we cannot do that as they profess, can we bring forward the parallel agreements on the environment in order to correct the agreement—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): In fairness I have to give the floor to the hon. minister.

Mr. Hockin: The question is: Why could this government not countenance some improvements through amendments to the NAFTA? That is the question. I gather the improvements would be a subsidies code, improved environmental standards and improved labour standards.

We are the government. We are the party to this negotiation that suggested 14 months ago both environmental improvements and labour code improvements. Finally the United States is looking at them. We have been out front. We do not need their amendments to have us do it; we suggested those changes 14 months ago.

On the subsidies code we have said we have a beautiful solution to that. It is the GATT subsidies code. Rather than rewrite the GATT we will just take the GATT subsidies code and use it. In fact I gather the negotiators are looking at that. What we did 14 months ago was exactly what the hon. member for Hamilton West is asking us to do. Why amend a piece of legislation when we are already doing what he is asking us to do?

The other more profound point he was making was a good point. He said: "We amend legislation. Therefore we are being constructive". He wants to go through life amending here and there great pieces of architecture.

Where is his great piece of architecture? All he wants to do is add a little garage here or a small door there. That is what he wants to do. They are small amendments. That is his view of governing. We produce the architect. We build the building. We have the original

and comprehensive thoughts. What is missing from the opposition, especially in the Liberal Party, is any sense of architecture on what to do beyond adding some minor amendments.

• (1720)

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, when I first looked at the NDP motion we are debating today I thought that it might be possible to find a number of things in it with which many members of this House and many Canadians could agree. For example, the motion starts by saying that this House recognizes that the government's economic recovery plan has been a failure.

I think most Canadians would agree with that because we have just started to come out of what has been three years of the most severe recession this country has faced in modern times, a recession which the Prime Minister boasted was deliberately induced by Conservative government policy.

Even though we are starting to come out of this Conservative induced recession, this movement toward the light of economic recovery is slow, anguished and painful because we still have 1.5 million people out of work. It is not clear when most of them are going to find jobs. In fact there are all too many among our unemployed who have little prospect because of Conservative government policy of ever finding jobs. We are faced with an unparalleled disruption of our industrial base in this country as a result of the hammering of misguided Conservative policies. Therefore it would be very easy to agree that this motion makes a good point, a point that has already been made over and over by Liberals, that this government's economic recovery plan has been a failure.

Also it would be easy at first glance to be able to agree with what this NDP motion says to the effect that there has to be a comprehensive economic recovery program which includes such things as a strategy for full employment, a jobs plan, an infrastructure program and a national child care program. These are all things which, well before this motion was put down on the agenda of this House, Liberals have been calling for, working for and pushing for in spite of the blindness and deafness of