

Liberal fund raising dinner, the Prime Minister stated and I quote, "we are creating a national industrial strategy." In light of this commitment, when will the minister be announcing this, to use his words, "all-purpose grandiose government game plan called an industrial strategy for Canada"?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I have made it quite clear on a number of occasions that one strategy is not going to be sufficient for Canada. We have various industrial sectors. We are currently working on 19 separate industrial strategies for Canada for 19 specific sectors.

Mr. Andre: Is the minister confirming to the House that the Prime Minister's statement that we are creating a national industrial strategy is inaccurate or at least incomplete?

* * *

FISHERIES

EFFECT OF RECOMMENDATION NO INCREASE IN NUMBER OF VESSELS FISHING GROUND FISH ON PROPOSALS AT LAW OF SEA CONFERENCE—AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR SHIPBUILDING

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of State (Fisheries). In view of the minister's statement outside the House yesterday outlining a \$50 million federal program to assist the fishing industry and his recommendation that there should be no increase in the number of vessels fishing groundfish stocks, will he tell the House if this means the government has given up all hope of securing agreement at the Law of the Sea Conference on Canada's proposal to manage the resources on our continental shelf, since this area would require increased rather than decreased fishing effort. Also, will any funds be made available for assisting shipbuilding this year?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the first part of the question, in no way does this decision indicate that we have given up hope of securing agreement on our proposal to manage resources on our continental shelf. I will check into the exact wording, but what I meant to say was, in the area where the species are already heavily exploited, we should not extend that type of fishery. With regard to the other part of the hon. member's question as to boat building subsidies, I hope to be in a position to announce something within the next 15 days.

● (1450)

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the minister. Since the minister's statement really signals to the world that we have no intention of increasing our fishing activity at this time, thereby placing in serious doubt our delicate bargaining position at the Law of the Sea Conference, why was the minister's statement covering the freezing of our fishing fleet not delayed until the results of the Law of the Sea Conference were made known on May 10; and in light of the minister's statement

Oral Questions

will we be taking unilateral action to protect our resources in this area?

Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent): Mr. Speaker, in no way was I signalling to the rest of the world that we would be giving up anything. I was signalling to the rest of the world that the state of the fishery off our coast now is creating a situation so far as stocks are concerned in which we have to intervene with rather heavy financial commitments. It is important to tell the world community our priorities respecting our own coastline. This effort on our part to support the groundfish fishery is a good way to make the point.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

LAW OF THE SEA CONFERENCE—GOVERNMENT POSITION ON PROPOSAL TO SHARE REVENUE FROM MINERAL EXPLOITATION BEYOND 200 MILE ZONE

Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary and bears on the Law of the Sea and it is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. It relates to the mineral exploration question as distinct from the fisheries question. Has the government reconsidered its position on total economic control of our continental shelf beyond the 200 mile economic zone, and is the government now ready to offer revenue sharing from mineral exploration and exploitation, so that this acceptance of international authority can lead to a package agreement promoting the common heritage of the seas?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the government has not given up in any way its assertion of control. The question of revenue sharing is one upon which we have some flexibility, but it would not in any way, in our opinion, impinge upon the question of control. We do assert that mineral exploration is an area over which we have control.

Mr. Roche: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to have a point clarified. May I ask the Acting Prime Minister whether it is the policy of the government that Canada, which already occupies 7.3 per cent of the land surface of the world, should have total economic control of our continental margin beyond the 200 mile economic zone, and how does this reflect the Prime Minister's recent speech in London to the effect that "we must aim for nothing less than an acceptable distribution of the world's wealth"?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman is confusing two issues. We have had recognized our right to exploit the minerals out to the margin or the slope—I am not sure which is correct—beyond the 200 miles. The question that has arisen at the Law of the Sea Conference is quite a different one, and it is whether we would be prepared to share the revenues that might be derived from our exploitation. On that matter, we have some flexibility at the present time.