

*Oral Questions*

We do not regard the date of April 1 as being of great importance. You will recall that last year the agreement for the year beginning April 1 was reached only in June. Since the Japanese are not disputing whether or not there will be an agreement but what the contents of the agreement will be, we do not deem it to be a matter of great concern whether we reach the agreement by April 1 or not. We are confident that when an agreement is reached it will begin on April 1, and since it will be a year-long agreement, the shipping of automobiles in the early months will, of course, be taken into account in the over-all figures for the year.

## CANADIAN CONTENT IN IMPORTS

**Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa):** Madam Speaker, I remind the minister that the agreement we got last year was supposed to achieve a 4 per cent reduction in imports from Japan, and as a result of the brilliant negotiations conducted by the Liberals it resulted in a 54 per cent increase.

We are a little concerned on this side of the House, I can tell the minister. Can he tell us why it is the case that Brazil has a 95 per cent Brazilian content requirement for foreign automotive companies; that Mexico has a 50 per cent Mexican content requirement for automotive companies; that Australia has an 85 per cent Australian content requirement for companies operating there; and why it is that these countries which are concerned about their industrial future can obtain these objectives when the Canadian government obtains absolutely nothing?

**Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Madam Speaker, I am sure the hon. member would not really ask me to comment—

**An hon. Member:** Why not?

**Mr. MacGuigan:** —to comment on the policies of other countries.

**An hon. Member:** Poland?

**Mr. MacGuigan:** It is true that we have—

**An hon. Member:** You do it every other time.

**Mr. MacGuigan:** It is true that we have not reached agreement with the Japanese up to this point for the next year. The reason we have not is precisely that we are not satisfied with the kind of arrangement which is available and we are negotiating for a better arrangement. I want to assure the hon. member that we will make the best arrangement which is possible with the Japanese, and I would also remind him of the fact that we have a favourable balance of trade with Japan.

## JAPANESE TARIFF ON CANADIAN LUMBER EXPORTS

**Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa):** Madam Speaker, the more than 30,000 laid-off automotive workers will find a lot of reassurance in that answer from the minister.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Broadbent:** I would like to switch to a different part of the country also involved in the trade negotiations that are going on in Japan. Right now in British Columbia there are 30 per cent of the workers in the lumber business who are unemployed. Many of them could be at work producing finished lumber for export, in part going to Japan, if it were not for a Japanese 10 per cent tariff which in effect keeps it from coming into the country. How can the government account for its failure in this area? Why could it not get that 10 per cent barrier removed entirely, or substantially reduced, so that some of these British Columbia workers could be put back to work? Finally, when is the government going to come to grips with producing a manufacturing strategy for Canada instead of perpetuating its resource sell-out strategy?

● (1430)

**Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for making my case. The fact is that our negotiations with Japan do not concern only the automotive industry, although that is a very important part of our negotiations with the Japanese. They concern other products such as the white woods of British Columbia, which he mentions. My colleague was negotiating on those subjects as well with the Japanese.

**Mr. Broadbent:** He lost that as well.

**Mr. MacGuigan:** We have not lost anything. We are negotiating with the Japanese.

\* \* \*

## INDIAN AFFAIRS

## STATUS OF INDIAN WOMEN MARRYING NON-NATIVES

**Mr. Lorne Greenaway (Cariboo-Chilcotin):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. She has lost so much weight lately, I am not sure she is in the House.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Greenaway:** My question concerns the situation where Indian women marry non-natives and lose their status. I notice in the March 12 edition of the *Vancouver Province* that the minister had been speaking to the Women's Network in Vancouver. I will read part of one sentence where she said:

—the fact that no Indian woman has lost her status rights by marrying a non-Indian since she was first appointed a minister in 1976.

I thought that was a rather interesting statement. We telephoned the Department of Indian Affairs. In the four years from 1976 to 1979, 1,792 women in Canada lost their status for this very reason. Can the minister clarify this statement for us?

**Hon. Monique Bégin (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** With pleasure, Madam Speaker, because it is a very