

Furthermore, if you read the so-called Baucus-Danforth amendment, they have changed the reading so that it does not say that there has to be injury; it only has to be affected by a Canadian import. Then you can bring in the new provisions under the omnibus trade Bill, which will apply as part of this agreement and be part of the U.S. trade law, the new Section 301, which will give the President expanded powers and changes the definition of a subsidy. They substantially narrow what they expect a country like Canada can provide for its natural resource industries. Put together all these things and you end up with a package of U.S. procedures and laws that are much tougher than we had before.

In committee, when I raised this point and brought forward this amendment, the Parliamentary Secretary and officials said: "Yes, but we could do almost the same thing under existing law". They pointed to the Special Import Measures Act and the Customs Tariff Act. I went back to check those things out. It is not the same. Under the Special Import Measures Act it has to be the Governor in Council that requires the trade tribunal to undertake an investigation. There is a big difference in having a government decide to take that investigation, with all the kinds of pressures it is subjected to by its counterpart, the United States, as opposed to giving the industry that right.

Then they point to Section 59 of the Customs Tariff Act, which gives the right to Canada to respond. But it has never been used. There are not even any regulations determining how it will be used. It is a dead letter.

I say: "Well, let me call your bluff, put it into the Bill". At least this Government, for all its surrenders that have gone on, should be prepared to give Canadians the same rights that our American partners are acquiring under the trade agreement. I suspect that they might not. The reason they will not is because they would not want to provoke our powerful American partner, the powerful American Congress, into further action. So they are going to quietly sneak into the darkness once again, with a smoke screen behind them, trying to cover up, saying that it has been watered down.

We phoned around. We asked the Canadian Embassy in Washington and the Department of External Affairs and the trade office if they could analyse for us the impact of the omnibus trade Bill upon Canada. There is no analysis, they said. They have not bothered to do it yet. Or, if they have done it, they are not going to have it public, they are not going to give it proper exposure. They are well aware of the statements that were made last March by our Ambassador, Mr. Gotlieb, who said that the specific measures in the omnibus trade Bill that were contrary to the obligations of international trade law and were damaging to Canada have not been changed. They are still in that Bill. We are now incorporating those very laws

into the trade agreement that we will have to administer on behalf of the United States.

The case must be made that the one thing that the Prime Minister achieved with his negotiations is a tougher protectionist law against Canada. I ask him if he is going to tell all those people out there in the hustings that that is what he achieved. If he is not, he is not going to be telling the truth, because that is the truth as it is written in the U.S. legislation.

I will make one final point, if I may, before you rise to your feet, Mr. Speaker. The important amendment 93 deals with the U.S. Defense Department subsidies. The Americans claim that that is national security. In fact, it is a massive form of subsidy to their industries, which should be examined and we should be prepared to apply our trade laws to them. This amendment would do it. I say to you that these amendments will certainly tell us the real tale as to how prepared the Conservative Government is to protect Canadian interest.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. King): It being one o'clock p.m., I do now leave the chair until two o'clock p.m. this day.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[English]

HEALTH

GASOLINE—CALL FOR ACCELERATION OF LEAD REDUCTION

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, studies by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services indicate that lead is dangerous at levels far lower than those considered dangerous so far.

Until recently the presence of 25 micrograms of lead in a decalitre of blood marked the danger level. The new report says that 10 to 15 micrograms are enough to retard mental development. Lead pollution has been a suspect in that area and others for more than 20 years. It is believed to interfere with the synthesis of key substances in the blood, and is considered especially harmful to children. Lead has been held responsible in some instances for premature birth, hearing loss, and low birth weight.

Public health impacts should convince the Government to accelerate the lead reduction policy initiated in 1984 and achieve by December, 1990, the standard of 0.02 grams per litre of gasoline already enforced in the United States.