

*Government Orders*

energy, love, and care in raising children in the country and with the hope of better education, better economic opportunity. They want to know that those jobs that are promised out there will be made available. There may be bureaucratic coverage under this legislation, but government policy will deny that there is any real equality.

Why does the member come into the House and say “a uniform system of rights, equity between trading partners, and greater equity in trade” when the government has already displayed that it does not give a fig about equity for Canadian workers? That is confusing to me and the 160,000 Canadians who have lost their jobs because the government’s policies are also confused by the definition given by that member. It is small comfort to say that the government is now catching up with the UN Conventions, when the workers in the country have lost their jobs, their security and, in many cases, their homes.

• (1650)

I do not think this bill should go by quickly. It is important that we have detailed debate. It is important that we have in-depth answers and explanations for a government that seems—if I may use the expression—hell bent for leather to sell the country out in trilateral discussions with Mexico and the United States.

I refer particularly to a learned argument written in a document called *International Comparative Law Quarterly*. The first article in *International Comparative Law Quarterly* in January 1989, Part I, Volume 38, deals exclusively with this bill. It is entitled: “The Vienna Sales Convention 1980 in The Hague, Uniform Laws on International Sale of Goods—A Comparative Analysis”. This analysis was prepared by a graduate of Harvard Business School. If anybody wants a copy of this learned article, I will make it available to them.

Again, I am being precise and reflecting my comments on this bill in a clearly defined way. I refer to page 7, (d), the application of the Convention to International Contracts of Sale of Goods. Nothing could more clearly be related to the bill.

The opening paragraph states: “The UN sales convention as stated in article 1(1) applies to contracts for the sale of goods between parties whose places are in different states”. Related to that in the different states is the question of equality raised by my colleague. Again, the government does not address equality. It does not address the imbalance of trade. It does not address within this structure how it intends to accomplish what he says the government wants to do in support of this bill.

The problem has been that the government has been really out of order in debating this bill and its opening remarks. All it has done is make general comments about sales contracts, without any definition of how it intends to protect Canadians in those specific sales contracts, for example, the free trade agreement between the United States and Canada, and the continuation of the policy announced by the government that it wishes to participate in Mexico-Canada talks.

What is the position on those sales contracts in competing interests of Canadian and Mexican oil in the U.S. market? What will be the position of Hibernia, for example, under this? There will be \$2.7 billion dollars of Canadian taxpayers’ money going to the Mobil Oil Corporation in the biggest corporate welfare bum rip-off in the history of the country and, under this bill or contract, not a drop of that oil will be refined in Canada. That is a shocker. The people of Newfoundland think they are going to get thousands of jobs. The people of Canada are putting up the billions of dollars and the government says that it is concerned about those people. I say this: Give the \$2.7 billion to the Government of Newfoundland and let it determine what is best under this bill for the working men and women of that province.

Do you think it is going to do that, Mr. Speaker? Don’t nod your head, Mr. Speaker, because you are neutral. I will tell you this. I am not surprised that not a word has come out of the government’s mouth on this bill on that particular hand-out.

It is a cheeky-mannered government that we are dealing with. For any large corporation that wants money we will guarantee its sales contracts. If ordinary working people want a hand or anything such as that, nothing doing.