

Government Orders

available in Canada, which we are losing, at \$10 and \$12 an hour.

While this bill is a bureaucratic movement toward greater facilitation of exchange of regulations and rules between international countries on the UN agenda, it denies the existence in Canada of any standards whatsoever that are comparable to the European Common Market.

If the government were serious about this bill, it would bring in a social charter and a job guarantee charter like the European Community has. I do not think it is fair. I think it is unfortunate. Frankly it borders on false that this government puts forward the argument that there are the same kind of components in the free trade agreement that exists in the European Community and that this bill will be dealing with the facilitation of trade—

Mr. Blenkarn: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There is a requirement in this House that the speaker address the bill and address the matter before the House. There is nothing in this bill dealing with labour or anything of that nature. This is a bill that facilitates a convention of the United Nations and creates an International Sales of Goods Act.

This member completely misunderstands the total concept of the bill and is leading the House on a great goose chase. He must be ruled out of order or be required at least to address the bill.

• (1630)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I recognize the hon. member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, inviting him again to stick to the subject matter of the bill before the House.

[*English*]

Mr. Barrett: Mr. Speaker, far be it for me to be embarrassed by the interjection of that member. He obviously has not read the bill. He has not studied exactly what the government's position is on this bill, and for his edification, I would like to repeat exactly the words out of the mouth of the government's spokesperson. I have been precise in confining myself to those specific areas because I took the notes from his speech.

I repeat, for the edification of that unfortunate member who found it necessary to reveal that he did not know what he was talking about by interjecting—I repeat, for his information, should he care to listen. The speaker who introduced the government's position on this bill gave three specific areas, two of which I am dealing with in precise detail. Time does not permit me to deal with the third one because to analyse that would take another day and a half.

Mr. Nicholson: With unanimous consent.

Mr. Barrett: Plus the time available to me is limited. But I have to educate the government again on what it said. I repeat three areas which the member mentioned, the first being the facilitation of trade.

Mr. Nicholson: Right on.

Mr. Barrett: Did you hear that, Mr. Speaker? I wish he would convey that through the Chair to the member who so rudely interrupted. Number three was the greater equity in trade. Right on, right on in parliamentary terms.

If I can continue with my elucidation related to those particular two points, then we will— No, Mr. Speaker, the interjection was hallucination. This is elucidation, and that is the difference.

This government has hallucinated on trade agreements. That is correct.

An hon. member: It hallucinates on everything.

Mr. Barrett: It is because of that that we are now faced with the horrendous loss of 160,000 jobs under the free trade agreement, and the government thinks that it will clean it up with this kind of bureaucratic nonsense.

Time permits me only a brief moment to elucidate. Again I come to the question of the Mexico-Canada-U.S. agreement on facilitating greater trade. I use the words of the very member himself, who said it was the weaker nations against the strong. Does the member suggest in any way that he will protect Canadian workers from a Maquiladora program where Mexicans are being paid \$3.61 for a full day's work while the rate here in Canada would be \$10 to \$12 an hour? Is there any way through the bureaucratic structure that he wishes to put up that workers in this country who have lost their jobs in the face of the kind of appeal that the Maquiladora program has to Canadian manufacturers by saying come to Mexico and we will save you \$25,000 per year per worker? Where is the equity in that? To quote the