

Agriculture	\$ 3,474,000
Forestry	\$ 3,166,000
Transport	\$ 9,386,000
Fisheries	\$60,133,000
Industry	\$ 8,198,000
Tourism	\$ 1,592,000
Mining	\$ 1,310,000
Reserve and Administration	\$ 195,000

[Translation]

Mr. Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth): I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 62—ATLANTIC CANADA

Mr. George Baker (Gander-Twillingate) moved:

That this House condemns the Government for its indifference and negligence toward Atlantic Canada, especially with regard to regional industrial development, fisheries and transportation.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in debating this motion which speaks of the neglect and indifference of this Government toward Atlantic Canada, its transportation problems, its fishery and its regional development, I am reminded of a suggestion made to me by a fisherman to whom I spoke on the telephone the other day. He suggested a way to solve two major problems facing the fishery in eastern Canada. He made the suggestion because the Government of Canada was not taking any action. He said to me, "I suppose it would be a good idea for the Prime Minister of the country, while he is attending meetings in Bonn, to turn to the President of the United States on his right and whisper into his ear, 'Ron, will you lift those tariffs you imposed on our saltfish that is going to the United States?' He should then lean to his left to say to Mr. Kohl, 'Will you please stop overfishing our resources on the East Coast of Canada?'".

The reason the fisherman said that is quite logical and simple. Since the Government came to power, the most serious action ever taken by another country against our country involving the export of saltfish from Canada was the tariff imposed by the United States Trade Department on the importation of Canadian saltfish. Why was that tariff imposed? It was imposed because a fish company in Puerto Rico figured

Supply

that it was the one and only fish company that actually salted fish within U.S. legal jurisdiction.

Because of the action taken by that small fish company in Puerto Rico, the U.S. Trade Department had to impose a tariff. This tariff ranges from 15 per cent up to 26 per cent, averaging out at 22 per cent. Every time producers from eastern Canada and from the Prime Minister's own riding—and the Prime Minister's riding is even more affected by this tariff imposed by the United States Government than any other riding—export saltfish to the United States, they have to post a bond of 22 per cent on average. That practice began two months after the Government was elected and is still going on today. Surely there is some diplomatic way for this Government to get the U.S. Government to lift that tariff that was imposed for the first time on Canadian exports of saltfish into the United States. However, nothing yet has been done about that.

We have now learned that for the last three months West Germany has been fishing on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland using nine factory freezer trawlers of over 300 feet in length with feeder boats. These trawlers take in incredible amounts of codfish. For the past three months they have been violating an agreement signed by the EEC and Canada in 1983 that was to extend until 1987. They have overfished to the extent of, as the Department of Fisheries shows in its records from boat inspections made on the high seas as of three weeks ago, 30 times their assigned quota. However, I have learned that not all of the boats were visited by inspectors. They do not really know right now how much fish the West German fleet has caught.

● (1210)

Those fish, Mr. Speaker, are the offshore and inshore stock. They migrate to what is called the Nose of the Grand Banks and then inshore. In other words, they are the stock that Canadian fishermen in Atlantic Canada have to use to make a living. That stock creates employment in eastern Canada.

What is wrong with our system, our Government, which allows this to go on? The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Fraser) admitted today that he sent his first note back in March to the EEC saying that they were violating the long-term Canada-EEC fishing agreement. But then I discover that the EEC had replied to the Canadian Government on April 17 saying categorically and bluntly that they do not recognize that as being Canadian jurisdiction. It always was and always has been recognized internationally as being Canadian jurisdiction and the fish as being Canadian stock. But the West German fleet is blatantly violating its quota and the EEC is backing them up and saying they do not recognize that as Canadian jurisdiction.

What, then, is the normal procedure for this Government to follow when that kind of action occurs? What do you do when you have a blatant violation of a written agreement and a foreign country is fishing beyond its quota to such a degree as to probably destroy the stock? The options open to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, the Secretary of State for Exter-