

It should be noted that neither (11A) of the anti-dumping regulations nor the imposition of countervailing duties for reasons of export financing subsidies appear to have been tested as yet.

Then he says something that is crucial:

Moreover, the anti-dumping option would really only come into play after the fact,—

And I stress, Mr. Speaker, “after the fact”. He continues:

—which renders its use, other than as a threat mechanism, somewhat ineffective.

Here is the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce saying that the anti-dumping provisions we have in this country are useless. He says they have been nothing more than a threat. Yet we have the member for Yukon saying that if we discover the government is not living up to its moral commitments—and really all we have in the legislation is moral commitments—then we can do something about it in the House.

● (2142)

If the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Faulkner) had time to look at the bill, he would probably agree that we are giving a blank cheque to the minister. His own colleague said we do not have any mechanism to ensure that we will have Canadian content. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce said that the legislation is ineffective.

The hon. member for Yukon is playing with words. He picks up a dictionary and gives us the definition of “ensure” and “guarantee”. The two words are very similar. However, that is not the point we are trying to make in this debate. Our point is that we should legislate guarantees so that there are commitments in the bill to have Canadian content.

The hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes) is trying to be consistent in the amendment he is moving. Motion No. 9, which should be coming a little later, states in part:

—the level of Canadian content is at least 90% with respect to the origin of products, services and their constituent components,—

That means that 90 per cent of what goes into the pipeline is to be Canadian. That is part of the legislation. Just as we have legislation in Canada which states that every month old age pensioners will receive cheques and every year income tax will be imposed upon Canadian citizens and companies, so we should have legislation stating that 90 per cent of what goes into the Canadian pipeline must be Canadian.

The way the legislation reads now, a lot is left to the imagination of a minister. The ideology of a minister, even of the same party, or the sensitivities of that department's bureaucrats to negotiations going on vis-à-vis trade and so on, might play an important role as to how “guarantee” or “ensure” is interpreted.

All the legislation says in clause 3(f) is “to advance national economic and energy interests and to maximize related industrial benefits by ensuring the highest possible degree of Canadian participation in all aspects” of the pipeline. That may mean 90 per cent. However, it may also mean 25, 30, 40

or 50 per cent. We do not know what it will mean when it is not spelled out in the legislation.

The hon. member for Yukon referred to the premier of Saskatchewan. I spoke with Al Blakeney a week ago Saturday when the federal cabinet came to Regina about this question. He is indeed happy that the pipeline is going to be built and that the Ipsco plant in Regina can build some of the plant. If there is fair competition, he is sure that Ipsco can compete. They are efficient, have good management and can compete with anybody in the world. What he is afraid of is unfair competition as a result of subsidies given by American or Japanese steel producers in order to get a contract.

Mr. Nielsen: Does he endorse your amendments?

Mr. Nystrom: He endorses the philosophy of the amendments.

Mr. Nielsen: Does he endorse your amendments?

Mr. Nystrom: I am sure he would endorse the amendments word for word. He certainly endorses the principle of what we are trying to do, namely legislate a guarantee that my constituents, the constituents of the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn) and others in Saskatchewan will have jobs. They want security. They want a guarantee in the legislation.

The government talks about the importance of Canadian content and Canadian jobs, as do the members of the Progressive Conservative party. Why not put in the legislation what we are all talking about? Why be chicken-livered and leave it open to the interpretation of a future minister and future department? That is not good enough for Canadians. This is an important project that is going to cost a lot of money.

We are doing a favour to the United States by providing a land bridge to take American gas from one part of their country to another. In return, the fancy diplomatic language in the bill is not good enough. Instead of just saying we are going to ensure something, we should spell out guarantees in the legislation. That is not asking too much.

If the government really means what it is saying, why not legislate those guarantees in a clear and explicit way so that the Canadian people know they have security in the future? Workers in Saskatchewan, Sault Ste. Marie or wherever the steel is produced will then know what the future holds for them, and the companies can expand their plants and facilities accordingly.

That is not a hypothetical situation in my province. Ipsco is owned in part by the government of Alberta and in part by the government of Saskatchewan. They applied for a DREE grant to expand their plant and facilities on the prairies. Part of the future of that plant depends on whether they get a contract to help build the Alcan line and how large a contract they receive. If we can have a specific guarantee that a minimum 90 per cent of the content will be Canadian, they could plan their business and activities and the province could do likewise. That makes good business and economic sense.