

Oral Questions

be full public discussion of these reports and an opportunity for appropriate input from the citizens groups that have worked with the government, as the minister knows, up until now, and that these reports will in fact get the public scrutiny that they deserve so that the people of the area will be satisfied that the final decision is based on proper facts?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, I am ready to table all the reports and have them referred to the Standing Committee on Transportation of this House for full discussion.

* * *

FISHERIES

DUMPING OF HADDOCK INTO THE SEA AS RESULT OF ICNAF QUOTAS—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of State for Fisheries. Due to ICNAF quotas, some trawlers operating out of east coast ports, in fact out of my home port of Lunenburg, are reportedly dumping up to 100,000 pounds of haddock per trip. Since these fish are dead when they are dumped back into the sea, is it the minister's intention to permit this flagrant waste of fresh fish through government regulation to continue, or will the government make representations to ICNAF for the revision of the haddock quotas in order to permit all fish once caught to be landed at Canadian ports, thereby cutting down on ocean dumping which causes pollution, as well as saving valuable food and increasing the fishermen's income?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, no one deplores waste of food more than I, as I think I have made clear since taking this seat in the House. Last year we did change the regulations, after consultations with the fishermen, allowing a larger amount of fish to be brought in. Most of this fish in many cases is incidental catch, rather than directly fishing for haddock. We allowed a larger amount to be landed in order to avoid wastage.

It is obvious that some of our efforts to restore haddock are successful, and we could hope for an increase in the quota and more flexible regulations. I should like to make one thing very clear, and that is that if I could change the regulations, as we can in the normal Canadian fishery, I would change them tomorrow morning. But in this case, if we abrogated the regulations, every other nation would have access to what we are trying to build up, that is, haddock stocks.

Mr. Crouse: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I would point out that 100,000 pounds of any kind of fish is not an incidental catch. Under the ICNAF regulations in the United States, the United States fisherman is allowed to catch fish until the U.S. quota is reached. This seems to me to be the solution to the Canadian problem. Would the minister consider adopting the same practice as that adopted by the United States in order to conserve our vital fisheries resources which are literally being wasted under the present government's policies?

[Mr. Fraser.]

● (1440)

Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent): Mr. Speaker, first of all the 100,000-pound figure is an estimate, and is very much a figure picked out of the air. I do not think anybody has any firm facts on that. Even if it were 1,000 pounds I would deplore this. I would say to the hon. member that one of the real problems we have here is a conflict between small inshore fishermen, medium-size boats and very large trawlers. If we were to allow the keeping of all the catch, what would obviously happen is that large trawlers would very quickly serve themselves, the quota would be exhausted. Many small inshore fishermen would be left out.

* * *

AIR CANADA

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE OF FULL CO-OPERATION WITH ESTEY INQUIRY—POSSIBLE BROADENING OF TERMS OF REFERENCE OF INQUIRY AND PUBLIC AUDIT OF CORPORATION

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, in light of the latest revelation as reported in today's *Globe and Mail* to the effect that Air Canada has engaged in some very questionable accounting methods in an attempt to cover up loses, and in an attempt to circumvent the work of the parliamentary committee, and in view of the position taken by Air Canada's lawyer, which appears on the surface at least to be a position somewhat less than open and frank, I would ask the Minister of Transport whether he can assure the House and the country that Mr. Justice Estey is receiving the fullest co-operation from Air Canada officials and Air Canada's lawyers? If he has any reason to believe otherwise, would the minister advise us what action he may be contemplating?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the last report I had about half an hour ago is to the effect that—

An hon. Member: Half an hour?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Yes, and I do not like to comment on inquiries and I do not want to start doing so because there is no end to it. I would just refer to what Mr. Justice Estey said, that he thought the *Globe and Mail* should correct that story which is not true.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, in light of this new development—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not want to interrupt the hon. member. However, the matter is before a commission of inquiry and I think the hon. member should be guarded in respect of the type of question he is asking.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, in view of this latest development, I wonder whether the minister would consider the possibility of broadening the terms of reference of the Estey commission so that all these new issues which are now surfacing can be thoroughly and properly aired I wonder, too, in light of this situation whether the minister would consider immediately undertaking an independent