

*Government Orders*

not agree, I still believe that the hon. member for Verchères proposed an excellent amendment.

The amendment is an attempt to provide the basis for certain rules on what constitutes injury, with respect to dumping. At the very least, what I have to say may expand the horizons of the parliamentary secretary. During the past few weeks, through the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, we were able to consult many Canadians and Quebecers.

They admitted their concern about the lack of clear provisions in Bill C-57 with respect to dumping. A number of people said they were afraid that imported goods would be sold on the Canadian market at prices below those prevailing on national markets and, in some cases below cost.

Bill C-57 already contains certain provisions on the evaluation of complaints about dumping by the Canadian International Trade Tribunal. An attempt is made to determine whether certain unlawful acts would harm the interests of Canadian and Quebec producers.

However, the bill provides that the tribunal cannot recognize the existence of injury unless the circumstances causing injury are clearly perceived and imminent.

• (1645)

These provisions are not only extremely restrictive but also extremely vague. The bill contains no detailed instructions for determining what constitutes clearly perceived and imminent injury. It does not define the type of evidence that may be considered by the Canadian International Trade Tribunal.

Furthermore, it is simply left up to the governor in council, on the advice of the Minister of Finance, to establish regulations, if necessary. If he feels like it, as the hon. member for Verchères said. We think it is important that the Minister of Industry, who is in the best position to know about the problems facing Canadian businesses, should also be able to make recommendations to the governor in council on factors to be considered in determining whether there is a case of dumping. More should be done, however.

Our American neighbours have issued clear and detailed instructions on approaching tribunals with complaints about dumping and on the evidence to be considered by those tribunals.

It is therefore imperative that Canada provide clear and specific guidelines on the factors that would be admissible as evidence before the tribunals. Without these guidelines, Canadians and Quebecers, when they lose the advantage as a result of unlawful acts—I am thinking of steel producers, for instance—will not know how to argue their case to obtain justice:

[English]

**Ms. Bonnie Brown (Oakville—Milton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to respond to the amendment put

forward by the member for Verchères. I appreciate his initiative. This has come upon us fairly quickly. He has responded very quickly to the concerns of the steel industry by getting an amendment in by the deadline.

I think his speed and his responsiveness demonstrates the commitment not just of this government but indeed of this Parliament to both the management and the workers in the steel industry.

In the all-party steel caucus that support is obvious at every meeting. We sit around the table, people from all parties and management and labour, working together. It really is quite an exciting experience to be part of that particular group here where usually the setting is so highly partisan.

I should point out that we did have the opportunity yesterday to speak with the minister. He pointed out to us the difference in the wants of the way we legislate and the way the Americans legislate. It is much more their style to put a lot of details into their legislation whereas it is more our style to keep things pretty clean and put the details into regulation.

Yesterday the minister did not seem to be adverse to the idea of those concepts in the amendment in the regulations, however he pointed out to us that it was going to require as the parliamentary secretary pointed out the involvement of the Minister of Finance. He could not speak completely freely at that meeting knowing he had to get a cabinet colleague on side.

I would like to inform the mover of this amendment and those who are supporting him that I happen to know that this issue has been brought forward to the Minister of Finance in the last 24 hours by the Deputy Prime Minister. We now have three members of cabinet responding to the concerns of the steel industry as my colleague across the floor has responded today.

Keeping in mind that those three members of cabinet will work together on it, I think I can assure him that the general intention of what it is he wants to achieve will probably come forward. However, the idea of this amendment does not seem to be true to the Canadian tradition of how we write legislation and therefore I will have to join the parliamentary secretary in voting against it.

I would also like to assure the member that within the steel caucus we will continue to press to make sure that these things are achieved but in a more subtle way.

• (1650)

[Translation]

**Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis-Hébert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I will be brief, first of all because the member for Verchères has explained quite well the theoretical and practical basis of his amendment as well as the need for it.