

*Oral Questions***TRADE**

UNITED STATES EMBARGO ON GROUND FISH IMPORTS FROM CANADA

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance.

Today we learned that while the American negotiators were negotiating the trade agreement with the Minister and his Government, on the other side of Washington the Americans were placing an embargo on fish imports from Atlantic Canada.

Nothing has been done about the countervailing duty on Atlantic groundfish. The American Government has now imposed new embargoes on Canadian imports.

Can the Minister tell the House what other measures or actions by the American Government is he aware of that threaten Canadian jobs and industry?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Fisheries I wish to advise the Hon. Member that this was an action taken by the Secretary of Commerce of the United States at the behest of the New England Fishery Management Council.

The Americans have size restrictions on the catching of fresh groundfish down there, and using that as a subterfuge they are now applying those size restrictions on imports of fresh whole groundfish. They state that their intention is to have the restrictions extended to fresh fillets of groundfish.

The Government put in a strong protest to the American Government on November 10. We requested that the ban be lifted. We know that other companies, even American companies, are opposing this action. As a matter of fact one company has initiated legal action against the U.S. Secretary of Commerce for having approved this action.

● (1450)

The National Fisheries Institute of the United States has also approached the U.S. Secretary of Commerce.

An Hon. Member: Here we go.

Mr. Crosbie: I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman who interjected reads something, because I thought he was entirely illiterate.

We are going to continue to work toward a bilateral settlement. However, if we fail to resolve that matter bilaterally, then it might well be our turn to take a matter to the GATT of which the hon. gentleman's Party opposite is so fond.

SPIRIT OF CANADA-UNITED STATES AGREEMENT—EFFECT OF U.S. ACTION

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State for External Affairs has already admitted to the House that the Americans have violated the spirit of the

trade agreement by interfering with our grain exports. We now have another example, apparently in a diplomatic note, of what the Government has called the "undermining" of the agreement.

Does this not show, before we have even seen the text of the agreement, an absolute lack of faith on the part of the American Government in this deal?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, this is an action taken by the New England Fisheries Management Council.

It was at their instigation, and it is allegedly to do with protection in the catching of undersized fish. Of course they realize, or they should realize, that in Canada we have the most efficient and best fisheries management policy in the world and that, therefore, there is no reason whatsoever to apply these American rules to fish imported from Canada.

If it were extended to fillets, it could mean something like reduced Canadian exports of those products of between \$25 million and \$30 million. It is obviously a subterfuge. Unless the matter is settled to our satisfaction, we will certainly have to proceed to the GATT to get it reversed.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

POLICY APPLICABLE TO POLITICAL ADVERTISING

Mr. Jack Scowen (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Communications. The CBC will not allow the Saskatchewan Government to advertise free trade on its stations in Saskatchewan.

Will the Minister explain why political advertising was allowed on CBC during the Quebec referendum but was not allowed for a political ad in Saskatchewan?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, because I knew that there was some concern about this matter I made inquiries and found that CBC Radio-Canada did not carry any advertising for either the *oui* or *non* side during the Quebec referendum. I looked into that particularly. Private stations may have done so, but the CBC did not.

I found, however, that while they did not address or allow advertising from either of the protagonist sides during that referendum, there were ads during that period, one which dealt with anti-alcohol abuse and ended with the slogan "say no", and another with regard to seat-belt legislation which ended with "buckle up for Quebec". Those ads were used at that time, but there was no advertising accepted from either the federal Government or the Government of Quebec.