

they may or may not swim by next year. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans does not know the answer to that question and that is what annoys those fishermen. The Department tells the fishermen that they cannot catch any more than the allowable limit for this year in the interest of conservation and of ensuring that there will be some fish in the following year. The fishermen do not see tuna for another ten years, at which time they come back in abundance.

My point is that we need more information about these matters. The Department should not limit the tuna catch if it does not know what the results of that limitation will be, particularly if it means that that resource will be lost to the industry.

There are other problems affecting the coastal fishery. I have already spoken in Parliament about the Georges Bank problem. What will happen if the Government loses the Georges Bank case? It will not talk about it because it believes that it will not lose the case. I say again that the federal Government is gambling with Nova Scotia's chips in the International Court at The Hague. If it does not win that case it better have an alternative plan because there will be a problem when Government Members meet those fishermen on the south shore of Nova Scotia who are deprived of their ability to fish off Georges Bank.

Let me conclude my remarks about this area on a positive note. I know that my colleague, the Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall), agrees with me that our economic hope for the future lies in international trade. It is said that a \$1 billion increase in international trade creates 17,000 jobs in Canada. If we could return to the share of international trade that we had in the mid-1970s, we could eliminate unemployment in Canada. The fishery is very much a part of this international trade because it is an exported product in its finished state.

I want to make one suggestion about this to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. I suggest that free trade zones would be one method to provide greater access to international trade for the fishery. That is to say, areas where fishermen from all nations could come and process fish, which would really become a Canadian product with Canadian labour being utilized and then exported. This is a real possibility.

The Minister must know that the future of the fishing industry, the Atlantic fishery in particular, is dependent on the development of international markets and that development is dependent upon co-operation with foreign nations that are interested in the fishing industry. It will not be helped by taking foreigners off their boats and fining them in Canadian courts. That may be necessary to protect the industry and the fish stock, but co-operation is also required.

In conclusion, my advice to the Minister is to meet with officials of other nations that are interested in the fishery and ensure that we participate to a greater extent in international trade with respect to fish products. In that way we will not only benefit from the restructuring of the Atlantic fishery, but we will remove what must be the worst social problem this nation has faced in its history. I am speaking of the unemploy-

Coastal Fisheries Protection Act

ment problem we face today, the 1.5 million Canadians who are officially unemployed along with the many more who have stopped looking for work, those who are employed part-time and those who have jobs below their qualifications.

● (1250)

We are not trying to save the fish, Mr. Speaker. We are trying to help Canadians. We will only do that if we use the fish stock to create a better economic condition for Canadians. Specifically that means employment for Canadians. The fishing resource can do that. All the industry needs is proper help, direction and assistance from the Government of Canada.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I do not purport to be an expert on fish. Some people might say I am the exact opposite. However, I would point out that my riding is one of the few landlocked ridings in the lower mainland of British Columbia, the only one that does not face on the ocean. We do have a lake, Trout Lake. You can sort of throw a stone across it and I hope this weekend to do some fishing there. However, I do have many fishermen in my riding, including the President of the United Fishermen and Allied Workers Union, Mr. Jack Nichol, who is a strong advocate for the fishermen's cause, and Bill Jarvie, a fisherman in my riding who comes to Ottawa many times.

The Hon. Member for Halifax West (Mr. Crosby) who just spoke used the old slogan about too many fishermen chasing too few fish. It is a bit of a cliché. It comes out of the West Coast Pearce Commission. A lot of fishermen on the West Coast would dispute that. I do not think the Hon. Member adopted it. If you look at that expression of too many fishermen chasing too few fish, you could apply some of the Prime Minister's Jesuit logic and say what you have to do is either one of two things. One is to decrease the number of fishermen which, of course, is what the Government would propose to do; or you could increase the number of fish.

That is why we support this Bill. It has one element, only a small element, to help increase the number of fish. The Bill, as I understand it, proposes to revise the penalties for the violation of the Coastal Fisheries Protection Act. It will make it an offence to violate the regulations made under the Act and it will increase the penalties. This really applies to foreign countries that fish in our waters. I believe there are 15 of them which have fishing treaties with Canada. I understand that when foreign fishing fleets did violate the Act, the fines were too small to make much of a dent in their fishing practices. Perhaps boats could be seized in addition to the levying of fines. Perhaps there is an element of international law and particular difficulties of which I am not aware that would preclude doing that, or there may be other statutes that would allow it.

I shall speak only briefly on the Bill because I think the Bill should go through today. The Bill does increase the fines, and that is good. But perhaps the Department should also look at increasing enforcement. I used to be a Crown attorney. I know you can increase fines. Fines are some element of a deterrent but you have to catch the violators before you can fine them. It