

the U.S. Government by the nine Canadians in question, the Government of Canada would consider taking this case to the International Court at The Hague. Could the Minister advise me and the other people involved when such action might be proceeded with?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I think the first step is to try to seek a bilateral settlement with the United States. Officials of my Department have been in consultation with a solicitor in Washington who is acting for these persons. There are certain documents that would be helpful which are not available for a number of reasons. When we have explored that aspect of the case it will then be time to make a judgment on what international steps we can take. But we certainly are exploring the international law on this subject and we think there is a basis by which we might consider taking action in the International Court.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### INDUSTRY

##### BENEFITS OFFERED TO BELL HELICOPTER FOR LOCATION OF PLANT SITE

**Hon. Roch La Salle (Joliette):** Mr. Speaker, my question is also directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Considering the interest of all Canadians—and I think the Minister ought to know that on this side of the House we are still very happy about the location of the Bell Helicopter plant—my question is very simple: At the time, the Minister emphasized Government assistance and benefits in connection with two locations being considered in the Province of Quebec, namely Bromont and Mirabel. Could the Minister give the House and those concerned in the Eastern Townships, the assurance that the benefits offered to Bell Helicopter for locating at Mirabel were exactly the same as they would have been if the company had located in Bromont?

[English]

**Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion):** First of all, Mr. Speaker, may I say that, based on the questions I had from the Conservative Opposition, this is the first time that one of their Members has praised this particular project. I am happy to see at least one Member over there appreciates the project.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lumley:** Secondly, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the two sites, I think the company narrowed down to Bromont and Mirabel. I forget the specific details, but there was a substantial difference between the financial assistance for both based on the tier category of the locations at which they originally looked. When it came down down to the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, for a number of reasons over and above the financial assistance, the company chose the Mirabel site.

#### Oral Questions

#### FISHERIES

##### MANAGEMENT COSTS OF WEST COAST SALMON FISHERY

**Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries, who knows that the value of the landed salmon catch on the Pacific coast is about \$240 million. The cost of operating the Department there is about \$84 million, plus the cost of operating the Ottawa Department. With management costs of 35 per cent to 50 per cent of the value of the catch, does the Minister feel he is getting value out of his Department?

**Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very simplistic presentation of the figures. The Hon. Member fails to say that the Department of Fisheries and Oceans has a great number of responsibilities on the Pacific coast besides the fishery. We have hydrographic services, fishery research, oceanographic research, and two of our major laboratories are on the B.C. coast. Contrary to the Hon. Member, my intention is to increase the activities and the budget of the Department on the Pacific coast.

##### NUMBER OF VESSELS ENGAGED IN COMMERCIAL SALMON FISHERY

**Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta):** Mr. Speaker, with an increase in the budget we have a decrease in the amount of stock available. In the days of the free entry program into the commercial fishery there were approximately 20 vessels per year which entered the commercial fishery. Since 1969, with the buy-back program and restricted entry, there have been about 45 vessels per year entering into the fishery. In view of the proposed new buy-back program, is that another excuse for expanding vessel entry into the fishery?

**Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Mr. Speaker, again the Hon. Member is alluding to rumours that there is going to be a new buy-back program. I have said repeatedly that no decision of that sort has ever been made by cabinet. The Hon. Member is right to say that already two buy-back programs have been implemented in the past and that has not prevented the participants in the fishery from over-investing and over-fishing to the point where today's stock has been the object of substantial pressure.

[Translation]

**Mr. Speaker:** In the light of the present developments, I am going to allow the Hon. Member for Joliette a supplementary. However, I may point out that the Chair was told the Hon. Member only wanted to ask one question. Supplementary for the Member for Joliette.