

Government Orders

The proposal suggested by the opposition member is inconsistent with the World Trade Organization. First, pursuant to article 3.7 of the agreement, implementation of article 6 of the act, the anti-dumping agreement, and article 15.7 of the World Trade Organization agreement on subsidies and countervailing measures, the specific factors listed in the motion are threat or injury factors. Adoption of the motion in our opinion would extend the application of these factors to injury and retardation in a manner inconsistent with the World Trade Organization specifically. Article 3.4 of the anti-dumping agreement and article 15.4 of the subsidy agreement require examination of a much larger list of factors in the broader determination of injury.

Second, with respect to the threat of injury, a list of factors will be set out in regulations being prepared under the authority of the new subparagraph 97.1(1)(a) which allows for full consideration of the factors set out in the hon. member's motion.

Third, the reference to the Minister of Industry in prescribing injury or causation factors should be deleted since he is nowhere else specifically mentioned in SIMA and the regulation making authority under SIMA is the responsibility of the Minister of Finance.

For these reasons and what I clearly stated earlier we are recommending rejection of the motion.

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we are being asked in Motion No. 10 to consider factors such as dumping, foreign subsidies and putting extra regulations into Bill C-57, an act to implement the World Trade Organization.

I am afraid I am going to disappoint the member for Verchères who has asked us to support the motion. It is not that I am unsympathetic to the discussions he outlined about the steel industry or any other industry undergoing trade actions.

• (1630)

The bill calls for minimum compliance to try to move these disputes forward quickly to the World Trade Organization. It has better mechanisms to resolve these disputes than is currently available in the Canada-U.S. trade agreement for steel, for example. A lot of regulations have been built up over the last several years and we still had several dozen trade actions on steel alone last year. Surely that is not the best approach.

The best approach is moving disputes to a forum such as the World Trade Organization where all factors will be taken into account by a panel that hears disputes. The panel will not just take into account things like unused production capacity, increases in exports and inventories. It will consider all relevant factors as it should.

We should not try to build up a big regulation wall. The steel industry said at committee that it wants us to build a big regulation wall like the United States is doing with the ultimate

goal of tearing it down at the World Trade Organization. We should not take the same kind of action that the United States is taking. The World Trade Organization panel will consider the type of regulations that are being built up in the United States in its implementing regulations. The panel will take that into account when it hears these disputes.

There is a process. It is a better process. We have to put our faith in it. It is going to work. Placing undue emphasis on the factors that were outlined just a few moments ago by the hon. member for Verchères might put undue emphasis on factors that would benefit things like supply management. It would also cause injury in some other sectors of our industries.

That does not say we do not have some problems. I outlined them during discussion of Bill C-57 at second reading. Those problems are internal trade barriers, high debt and deficit, our inability to trade. The Western Grain Transportation Act needs revision. There are problems with the tariff rate quotas. I do not believe we should have them. There is the problem with the sale and allotment of quotas but that is for a different day. Those problems have to be worked out in the next few months.

What is important is getting through the minimum compliance and have the World Trade Organization come into effect. Let us start hearing some of the disputes such as the wheat dispute that has been bubbling for the last year and the other disputes that have been talked about such as steel. Let us put the World Trade Organization to the test and it will come out with flying colours.

[Translation]

Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the steel committee for several years. Recently, you had the opportunity to meet the people from the steel industry, at the steel committee, and also on two occasions at the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, where we had the opportunity to hear their claims.

I want to tell you that what we are proposing in our motion is exactly what the steel industry is asking for.

I cannot understand the government on this issue. It seems to be stubborn. I cannot understand it. Earlier, I heard the parliamentary secretary talk about this, and I still do not understand why he does not agree with the amendment that we are proposing, all the more so since I do not agree either with the Reform member who just spoke on the same subject regarding dumping.

It is clear and obvious, and we heard that several times, including just last week or two weeks ago. The president of the Steel Producers Association came to the committee and clearly explained to us that, as for our protection mechanisms in dumping and steel trade between Canada and the United States, among others, the United States had regulations this thick, which she did put on the table before us, while we only had a few pages of regulations to protect us.