

Supply

On Canada's initiative NAFO member countries approved last fall the use of aerial surveillance to monitor compliance with the hail system. If there is a difference between where the vessel is observed by the aircraft and where it is said it would be, the vessel may be cited for an infraction of the hail system. This will make it harder for vessels to misreport where they were fishing.

The additional resources the government is now putting into both aerial and surface surveillance along the 200-mile limit and the nose and tail of the Grand Banks, \$28 million annually, is paying off.

In 1991 Canada logged over 3,000 hours of air surveillance, recorded 4,600 individual vessel sightings and conducted some 310 inspections of foreign vessels in the NAFO area, 285 inspections on European Community vessels alone. These surveillance efforts enable us to keep track of activity in the area and to keep NAFO informed of any apparent infringement of the NAFO rules.

With the hail system, aerial surveillance, NAFO inspection, this is a good start but clearly there is still a lot more to do to achieve control of fishing activity in the NAFO area.

• (1600)

Action cannot be delayed. This is why Canada sought a special meeting of NAFO to discuss enforcement issues and to get the agreement of other NAFO members on measures to be adopted as soon as possible in 1992. Other NAFO members have agreed and a special meeting will take place in May at the NAFO headquarters in Dartmouth. Canada will pursue a number of initiatives at that special meeting.

[*Translation*]

An important point is including catch reports as part of the radio reporting system. Vessels will be required to report their catches when they report their geographic location. This information will be a great help to authorities of NAFO member countries who are asked to keep track of catches by their vessels, and also to fisheries inspectors who board vessels to check whether quotas and other NAFO regulations are observed.

Canada would also like to see a regulation that would oblige vessels fishing in the NAFO-regulated zone to show their logbooks to NAFO inspectors, who would

then be able to check log entries and compare them with the catches stored in the ship's hold.

We also would like to see changes in NAFO reports that would make it easier to spot vessels accused of violating NAFO regulations and to know what coercive measures were taken to prevent further violations.

Creating an international observers program within the NAFO zone, similar to the one that has been so successful in Canadian waters, is another item on the agenda of the organization's special meeting in May.

Other NAFO members have told us that an observer program would be very costly and difficult to administer. However, what could be more effective than a program that puts observers on board fishing vessels to remind fishermen that they must observe NAFO quotas and other regulations?

There are a number of other surveillance and control mechanisms that could be adopted by NAFO later on. The use of electronic procedures to track ship movements is now common practice. NAFO members are considering a system that would control the number of vessels allowed to take fish stocks subject to quota by NAFO. Some countries have already taken steps along those lines. Another option that will be discussed at the special meeting is bilateral agreements on regulation enforcement, similar to the international agreements applied to salmon fishing in the northern Pacific.

In concluding, Madam Speaker, I would urge members to reflect on the progress that has been accomplished since that memorable day in 1977, when Canada assumed responsibility for fish stocks within its new 200-mile limit. There are still problems that remain to be solved, but during the past 15 years, Canada has entered into international alliances and designed mechanisms that can and should be used to deal with the present crisis. All this was achieved within the limits of international law, because this country has always recognized the rule of law.

[*English*]

Mr. Dennis Mills (Broadview—Greenwood): Madam Speaker, I am happy to have the opportunity of seconding this opposition motion today and I would like to repeat it for our viewing audience because I think it is important that we understand exactly what we are putting forward in the House today.