

Since the tabling of the tariff report with respect to fruits, vegetables and other farm products, organizations of farmers and food processors have made repeated and well-substantiated representations to the government to indicate the precarious economic position in which the industry finds itself.

In view of the need for new markets, can the Deputy Prime Minister tell us today what new markets he anticipates will result from GATT negotiations either for fresh fruits and vegetables or for processed foods?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and President of Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, the objective of the Canadian delegation at the talks is to increase our access into all markets, but we obviously have a considerable interest in the United States market, in the European community and in Japan because they are big markets indeed. It is impossible to tell at the moment precisely what commodities will be successful in gaining additional access.

**Mr. McCain:** Mr. Speaker, we were described by a gentleman from the European Economic Community, who was familiar with the negotiations, as dealing there "naked as a newborn babe", with very little to offer and obtaining very little.

If new export opportunities are not obtained, can the Deputy Prime Minister assure the industry that arrangements will be made for expanded access to our own markets and an element of restriction on imports which are extremely detrimental to agricultural income in this country?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, the observer from the European community must have been thinking of some other country, not Canada, when he made a comment of that kind. I believe our negotiators have established a reputation for being very tough and shrewd. For example, following the last round of negotiations it was commonly stated that Canada had received disproportionate benefits. We do not believe that, but that was the image which had been created by our negotiators, and I think the same image is present today.

On the specific question, the hon. member cannot have it both ways: he cannot ask for additional access into other markets for Canadian products and, at the same time, advocate a reduction of access into the Canadian market. This is a reciprocal process and every country which gives benefits at the talks expects to gain advantages from other countries. It is a reciprocal operation and there cannot be a parallel movement to cut tariffs for us and to raise them for others.

**Mr. McCain:** Mr. Speaker, I think we have been the Good Samaritan, in spite of what the Deputy Prime Minister has stated. We are so recognized by those outside Canada, according to the reports which some of us receive.

**Mr. Corbin:** Question.

**Mr. McCain:** Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria wishes to make a speech, perhaps he could be given a special opportunity this afternoon.

### *Oral Questions*

Other participants at GATT have overriding legislation which is used to protect hard-pressed sectors of their economies. Others are using non-tariff barriers or regulations in a multitude of ways to negate concessions which it was felt had been made in good faith. Does the Government of Canada intend to advise our trading partners that it is our intention to protect hard-pressed Canadian industries without compensation, as can be done by the EEC, Japan and the United States, or are we to remain as naked as we have been?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, I should tell the hon. member that, in addition to negotiations on commodities or the exchange of goods, there is also a very important aspect—perhaps the most important—in the effort to reduce non-tariff barriers to which the hon. member has referred. If we are successful in establishing new codes of conduct for trading countries in that field, that might be more significant than, or as significant as, the exchange of goods.

The hon. member raises the question of the test of injury and how quickly a country can move in order to protect its domestic production against sudden, unexpected and probably unfair competition from abroad. We have been doing quite a number of things in that regard already in Canada, but one of the objectives is to improve and surround more clearly with legal mechanisms the test of injury and the possibility of countries acting to protect their domestic production in the situations I have mentioned.

\* \* \*

### FISHERIES

#### RIGHTS OF INDIAN BANDS

**Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development is back in his place, because I have a question to ask him. Has he managed to reconcile or resolve the difference which arose between him and the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment arising out of a "goof", as the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment described it, in the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development following the failure of the minister to disallow bylaw 10 of the Squamish Indian band?

**Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. member understands the history of the difficulty very well. The difficulty is the one pointed out by the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment, namely, that there are two statutes. One is the Indian Act, which provides very clearly for bands to pass bylaws dealing with matters of conservation. There is also the Fisheries Act. There is some dispute about which of these two statutes has pre-eminence.

That is the origin of the problem. I am satisfied that between the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment and me, with the assistance of conservationists, wildlife people and, particularly, Indians, we can resolve it. However, the pursuit