

Government Orders

The next day, we were conducting a clause-by-clause review of the bill, which means that the Canadian steel industry only had a few hours to propose amendments or changes. I must say that they worked diligently and in a professional manner, since the next day, at dinner time, we had a series of very specific, comprehensive and to-the-point amendments concerning the steel industry's expectations.

I gather that the amendments proposed by the steel industry were far too specific and well designed for the government party to accept them. We were told that the vision the Americans have of the Uruguay Round Agreement as reflected in their legislation is not right, that our vision of the Uruguay Round Agreement as reflected in our legislation is better and that, consequently, we cannot do the same thing as the Americans nor support their point of view.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to say that I find this position rather too meek and legalistic, since we have to deal with a powerful and, if I may say so, intrusive trade partner, that is, the United States. We must be able to work along the same lines, with the same means, on a level playing field.

Since our colleagues did not see fit to acknowledge the accuracy of the arguments presented by the steel industry at the committee stage, the steel industry agreed, in response to concerns expressed by our colleagues and in particular by the hon. member for Rosedale, to give more thought to another amendment which is far more precise, in fact, shorter, if I can say, far more general in the sense that it applies not only to the steel industry but also to several other industries, several other sectors of our economy.

Our friends from the steel industry have begun consultations with parliamentarians from both sides of this House in order to make their expectations known. Not knowing if our colleagues from the government, the Reform Party or the New Democratic Party would bring forward the amendment proposed by the steel industry, we placed the amendment before us on the Order Paper. Motion No. 10 does not come from the Bloc Québécois, but from Canada's steel industry. We are merely bringing this amendment forward on behalf of the industry because nobody else would.

• (1615)

Clause 185 of Bill C-57 deals with the way the Canadian International Trade Tribunal must evaluate complaints related to dumping. For this tribunal, it is imperative not only to prove that dumping has indeed taken place, but also that such dumping has caused injury to the Canadian industry.

Moreover, the bill in its present form stipulates that the tribunal can determine injury only if the circumstances causing such injury are clearly imminent. We have to recognize that, on

one hand, this is much too restrictive and, on the other hand, it is much too vague. The bill also stipulates that the Governor in Council may, if he so wishes, make regulations to give the Canadian International Trade Tribunal detailed information on acceptable evidence and on the general interpretation of the new conditions with regard to dumping.

As I was saying earlier, the Americans have gone a lot further in giving their tribunals much more detailed information on the interpretation of these new conditions and on the evidence that can be presented. This means that Canadian producers are clearly at a disadvantage compared to their American competitors because they have no indication as to how they must prove that they have been victims of dumping.

It must also be understood that injury has to be determined before any anti-dumping measure can be taken. That is the whole point. Getting back to the Canadian steel industry, I think it is important to put it in context to show how important it is.

The Canadian steel industry generates \$8.6 billion worth of sales each year, including \$3 billion worth of exports, and provides 33,000 jobs, including 10,000 to meet export market requirements. To show how important it is to have legislation similar to the United States, or to give us a level playing field, I will point out that 90 per cent of our steel exports go to the United States while more than 60 per cent of our steel imports come from there.

Canada is the largest steel export market for the Americans. In the steel industry, the need for a level playing field in both countries is essential. What is more, our industry must be able to ward off blows, to get ready for any threat of dumping, as the Americans are doing. If the rules are too vague on this side of the border only, our industries will not be able to take advantage of the benefits resulting from agreements such as the GATT agreements.

So, this amendment seeks essentially to ensure not that the Governor in Council be allowed to make regulations on what should be considered as dumping but more particularly that the Governor in Council be required, rather than leaving it up to him, to make the necessary regulations setting up guidelines to be followed by the courts when making determinations about dumping.

This amendment also seeks to specify the kinds of evidence to be considered among the factors described in the regulations. Finally, those regulations will have to be made on the joint recommendation of the Minister of Finance, as provided in the bill, and the Minister of Industry so that the industry's competitiveness will be taken into account in decision-making. We all know that the Minister of Industry is often in a good position to understand the rapid changes in market conditions at that level.