

\$1 billion, compared with a considerable surplus last year on trade alone. That, together with the continuation of their recession next year, will likely result in an increase in the current account deficit.

**Mr. Andras:** Can I take it the minister's answer is that he agrees his pessimistic view of the future trade picture is very much the result of the losses of those trading opportunities and contracts, which losses are the result of the actions of this government since May 22?

**Mr. Wilson:** I thought I made it clear that the deterioration in the trade picture is related to the recession which we are expecting will continue in the United States next year. In addition, the over-all current account deficit will be adversely affected by the increase in dividend payments next year as a result of the continuation of deficits from which we have been suffering for four years now.

**Mr. Andras:** Ten o'clock.

\* \* \*

#### CANADIAN EGG MARKETING AGENCY

##### INQUIRY WHETHER INVESTIGATION INSTITUTED— PUBLICATION OF REPORT THEREON

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. It is my understanding that the minister has asked the National Farm Products Marketing Council to investigate some of the allegations and charges made against CEMA.

Is the minister in a position to confirm that he has asked for an investigation? If so, can he tell the House the scope of that investigation; and, further, can he make a commitment to the House that the report, when it is finished, will be made public and that he will also refer it to the Standing Committee on Agriculture?

**Hon. John Wise (Minister of Agriculture):** In response to the hon. member's question, I did not have to contact the Farm Products Marketing Council or its chairman in order to instigate that inquiry: it is already in motion.

As to whether or not the report will be made available to the Standing Committee on Agriculture, I can give no commitment at the moment. I see no problem, though, in making it available. As I indicated yesterday, we have not only tabled the annual reports, but decided to have them referred to the appropriate committee.

**Mr. Nystrom:** A supplementary question to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that CEMA has confirmed that it has hired in the past a company called Roygold, which is partly or wholly-owned by the general manager of CEMA, and in view of the possible—and I underline the word "possible"—implications of such a practice as far as other Crown corporations and agencies are concerned, can the Prime Minister tell the House whether or not he might move to have the same conflict of

interest regulations as apply to government servants and government departments applied to all Crown corporations and public bodies of Canada?

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Prime Minister):** I think that is a very valuable suggestion. It is one we are considering now. We shall want to see whether it has any implications which I might not have foreseen up to this moment. If there are not, it will be our intention to move in the direction the hon. member has suggested. Indeed, we have been considering doing so for some time.

\* \* \*

#### NATIONAL RESOURCES

##### OWNERSHIP OF OFFSHORE MINERAL RESOURCES—FEDERAL OR PROVINCIAL

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister: it has to do with the policy of the government concerning offshore mineral resources.

I would remind the right hon. gentleman of his correspondence in September with the premiers and of the basic principles which he described in that correspondence as guiding this whole matter. The first, to refresh his memory, is that the province should own the mineral resources off the continental margin off its coast; the second is that such ownership would be consistent with, and subject to, the division of legislative competence between the Parliament and the legislature.

My question is: In this division of powers, is the Prime Minister retaining for the federal government the declaratory power and the expropriation power? In other words, would the federal government, in explaining its policy, indicate that in certain circumstances it would bring back federal jurisdiction over the offshore or might even bring back the ownership of the offshore resources as the constitution presently provides?

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Prime Minister):** The purpose of the move we are making with regard to jurisdiction over resources under water is to try to bring that situation in line with provincial jurisdiction over resources under ground. The declaratory provision would apply in both cases.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Which is to say that the declaratory power and the expropriatory power could be used to bring these resources back under federal jurisdiction in circumstances that Parliament wished. I want to make sure that the Prime Minister is saying this, and that the policy of giving those resources to the provinces applies only until such time as the Parliament of Canada wants to bring them back.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh!

**Mr. Clark:** Of course, that emergency power resting with the Government of Canada will continue to rest with the Government of Canada. But I would make it clear—and I want this to be understood not only by the Leader of the