

Supply

cannot come into this country, tranship and change crews. They cannot come into this country for water and food. If they insist on overfishing we will continue our action. Regardless of what fishery they are in, regardless of what it is that they do, they cannot enter into our ports.

We have increased surveillance. We have 100 per cent observers on foreign trawlers.

The Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) will be meeting with his European counterparts. He will make the same points. It continues to be said at the highest level. The country is unhappy. We will not continue to tolerate overfishing. It is not in the interests of the world that this happens. Will the Hon. Member comment on the inconsistency of that?

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Speaker, first, I apologize to the Hon. Member for attributing statements to him. I meant his colleague who is in Cabinet from St. John's. If I mentioned the wrong riding in some of my comments, I am sure the *Hansard* reporters will correct that.

With regard to having tea or coffee with the Prime Minister of Spain, I do not think that is enough. We have known about the situation with regard to Spain for many, many years. Because the Prime Minister happens to be in Europe this week, happens to have a free day and goes to Spain, is not something which indicates a very forceful position whatsoever. That is the truth.

I remind the Hon. Member that I understand his desire to defend the Government. The day I had my Private Member's motion on Atlantic Canada before the House, he got up and spoke with some eloquence, I must admit, about the need for the Atlantic agency. I think he spoke at about five or ten minutes to six. Just one-half an hour later it was his Minister who went before the committee to announce that the Government was cutting the funding for the Atlantic agency.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The time allotted for questions and comments has now terminated. We are now going forward with the suggestion made by the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier). As the

House agreed, there will be 10-minute speeches and five minutes for questions and comments.

The Hon. Member for Moncton.

Mr. George S. Rideout (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, the issue we are dealing with today as Atlantic Canadians and as Members of the House is an issue of fairness. We submit that there has not been fairness and equality of treatment as far as Atlantic Canadians are concerned. Is it fair that the Government should cut 1,200 jobs at the CNR Shops in Moncton, New Brunswick, putting 1,200 people out of work? Should the Government now talk about cutting jobs at VIA Rail, putting another 200 people out of work? In fairness, should the Government talk about closing CFB Moncton and putting another 215 people out of work? Is that fair? Is that fair to Moncton? Is it fair to Atlantic Canadians?

What Members opposite usually do is quote statistics for all the jobs they have created. However, they have not gone through the CNR Shops and looked one worker in the eye and felt his concern and despair. He wonders what will happen to his family, his career and whether or not he has to move and if his family has to go on welfare. Those are the things people have to face.

The Government is concerned about the bottom line, about trying to manage the economy. Atlantic Canadians say: "We are prepared to co-operate and work, but we do not have to suffer and suffer in this way". I look at the infrastructure in this country and the fact that we were to have a rail line running from sea to sea to be constructed after Confederation. We now read that subsidies to VIA will be cut. Only nine VIA lines will be protected. Is it fair that none of those protected lines are in Atlantic Canada? I say that it is not fair.

There has been a recent announcement that CN and CP can apply for abandonment of unprofitable lines, but western lines are protected until the year 2000. However, Atlantic Canadian lines are not protected at all. Is that fair to Atlantic Canadians? Again, I suggest it is not.

When one analyses the approach the Government is taking, one sees that it is trying to solve the problems of deficits and the problems of upper Canadians on the backs of Atlantic Canadians. We do not feel that is fair.