

of their food aid programs. So, we are looking at that and we are looking also at programs to make sure that the market is stabilized.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES TO CANADIAN NOTE CONCERNING IMPORT QUOTAS ON BEEF AND PORK

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister and concerns the note sent to the United States. It appears that the protest lodged by the Canadian government with the United States may not be worthy of reply. I would ask whether he can assure the House that the matter of beef and pork restrictions imposed by the United States will be high on the list of matters to be discussed with President Ford on December 4?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it appears some misinformation has appeared in the press about the response of the United States to this note. It is my understanding that the United States government is announcing today that it welcomes Canada's request for consultations under the provisions of the GATT.

* * *

FISHERIES

POSSIBLE DISCONTINUANCE OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE IN VIEW OF SUGGESTED GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME PLAN FOR FISHERMEN

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries. Is it the government's intention to establish a guaranteed income plan for Canada's 20,000 self-employed fishermen? If so, will the plan be administered by his department or the Department of Manpower and Immigration and will unemployment insurance be discontinued for those fishermen whose earnings are above a specified inflation index level?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, it is the intention to establish such a plan. I must confess that when the problem of who administers it is the only problem remaining I will be very relieved. As for the matter of discontinuing UIC, that is also part of the discussion that is going on right now.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

POSITION OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AT WESTERN ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES CONFERENCE ON JURISDICTION OVER NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister arising from an interview given by the Prime Minister to Ron Robert of

Oral Questions

Selkirk News Service on November 9. When asked about western problems and disaffection the Prime Minister said:

... the Western Economic Opportunities Conference was the place where we put our intentions and our objectives and our policies on the table...

At that conference did government representatives clearly, categorically and unequivocally assert the right to invade and occupy a field of federal jurisdiction, natural resources, as they have done by their actions over the last few weeks?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker.

INTENTION OF MINISTER OF FINANCE CONCERNING FAIR DEAL FOR WEST WHEN DRAFTING BUDGET

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Finance based on the same interview. I put it to the Minister of Finance because I assume he is an assiduous reader of primeministerial statements whether attributed or otherwise. In the same interview, the Prime Minister said that:

... we as a federal government are determined to make sure that the west has what you would call a fair deal in Confederation.

Did the minister have this before him when he drafted his budget or did he forget about it?

* * *

FINANCE

ALLEGED AGREEMENT WITH ALBERTA AND SASKATCHEWAN OF EFFECT ON EQUALIZATION FORMULA OF OIL REVENUES IN CAPITAL ACCOUNT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. Yesterday the minister said that there was an understanding between the Prime Minister and the premiers—presumably in particular the premiers of Saskatchewan and Alberta—that the provinces agreed that one-third of the additional revenues from oil and gas deriving from the international situation would be considered for equalization purposes. On March 28 in the House when reporting to parliament on that conference the Prime Minister said with reference to capital funds for energy development that the revenues taken into those capital funds would not be subject to equalization. He said, "would not be", Mr. Speaker—there was no qualification about percentage, whether 60 per cent, 40 per cent or 30 per cent. The Prime Minister said that the revenues so handled would not be considered for equalization purposes.

My question to the Minister of Finance is, when he said in the House yesterday that there was an understanding that this whole situation had been changed, between whom did this understanding take place? Was it between the Prime Minister and the western premiers, between the Prime Minister and members of his cabinet or whom?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker the last time this understanding was discussed it