

Government Orders

An even greater disgrace than that is that in that zone, this year coming up, 1992, the Soviet Union will have 1,624 tonnes of cod given to it inside Canadian waters, inside of our 200-mile zone. The former Minister of Fisheries and Oceans knows exactly what I am talking about. He knows what I am talking about because I will tell you what he did, he exchanged it for capelin. Right, Mr. Minister. The minister got them out of there by saying: "Oh, go catch capelin and go catch redfish and go catch silver hake".

The minister is nodding his head because that is what he did.

Again, Mr. Speaker, here we have a crisis in Canada, and the Soviet Union is shown for 1992 with 1,624 tonnes and a Canadian boat gets picked up last night for catching 200 pounds. Here we are today debating a bill that is going to exclude all of those foreign vessels if they are used as fishing vessels.

I understand how difficult it is to be a minister in a government and to be advised that External Affairs has done this and that and this is the custom to do and the department says: "This is the way it has always been done and you cannot really disturb that." All it takes is for somebody to sit back and say: "Right is right and wrong is no man's right. We are going to stop these foreign boats from getting these Canadian licences and from being exempt in this bill. We are going to stop them because we are not allowed to go and do the same thing off their coast". Let us do what Namibia did. Imagine little Namibia last November. Let us do what it did, kick them out and have no more of this nonsense of saying as a policy: "Well, we are going to exclude them from the act and what our party position is". That is what the PCs say and the NDP; we will maintain them in our own shipyards.

That is not good enough. Canadians want them booted out. Canadians do not want them in Canadian waters any more.

Mr. Lee Richardson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am listening and enjoying what are always entertaining comments of the member. They are always entertaining if not redundant. It reminded me of the great western Canadian, former

Prime Minister John Diefenbaker. There was a story that went around about Mr. Diefenbaker that whenever he got a question in the House, if there was any doubt about it, it went something like his response would be: "Are you asking me about wheat? I love Parliament". He liked to talk about Parliament and would answer the question about Parliament. So if he did not know the answer he would talk about something like Parliament. I am always reminded of that when the hon. member for Gander—Grand Falls gets up.

I appreciate that this bill, Bill C-33, an act respecting the use of foreign ships and non-duty paid ships in the coasting trade, was just introduced this afternoon so one cannot expect the member would have had an opportunity to have read through it. I am sure he would not have made the comments he had had he made an effort to read right through it.

With respect to the comment made several times by the hon. member, subclause 3.2. states:

Subsection (1) does not apply in respect to any foreign ship or non-duty paid ship that is

(a) used as a fishing vessel, as defined by the Coastal Fisheries Protection Act, in any activity governed by that Act—

• (1650)

The simple answer is if the member had only read the next paragraph from the one that he got so exercised about he would have seen that all of his reservations are completely covered by the bill. It is simply a matter of his concerns being covered in another act. We cannot have two acts saying exactly the same thing. We simply make this exception in subclause 3(2)(a), used as a fishing vessel as defined by the Coastal Fisheries Protection Act, so that we do not have double legislation. It is already covered in the Coastal Fisheries Protection Act. I want the hon. member to be aware of that so he would be perhaps less exercised and more straightforward with the viewing audience as it were.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, I can understand that the hon. member is relatively new in the House and perhaps he has not read the legislation as carefully as he should.

For years, as you know, I had a job as a law clerk in a legislature and if there is one thing I learned in that position it was to thoroughly read the section.