

Burgeo. That is such a false argument. I have maintained that if the boats are given to Canso and Burgeo, they will survive because the boats will land the fish there. I have maintained that if the fishermen are given the amount of money that cancels their debts and to go out and equip themselves for the under-utilized species, we would all be fishing. If the amount of money in guarantees and loans given out in this deal was given to plants, they would also be able to fish, process, market, and keep the jobs here in Canada, as well as giving it away to other countries.

My colleague said this morning that we do not go into the other countries' waters. Since 1977 and the declaration of the 200-mile limit, we are the only country that is not fully utilizing a resource that is at its doorstep when there are thousands of individuals without work in the Atlantic provinces. We do not give those individuals the deals. We give it to one or two people. We give it to the big guy. We give it to the National Sea's or we give it to the Seafreez's. I do not think we give it to the people of Canso and Burgeo. If we did, we would be doing it for everybody. You do not change the playing-field by giving some people free fish while others have to go out and buy it.

I cannot believe that the government, is slanted in one direction and one direction only. That is what pleases it and it does not care about the rest of Canada. The government does not care about the little people. It does not care about an inshore fishery that has provided jobs and work for many people on the east coast. This is an example of that type of legislation.

We have asked for good biological studies. The government has said no. We have asked and presented plans to the government. I am not talking about northern cod but in relation to the southern part of Nova Scotia.

We have asked that, rather than cut back and have only one word in his vocabulary, capacity—over-capacity as stated in the Hâché report—why did he not listen to all the other responsible people in the fishery as to what they could have done to solve the problem? But, no, he has to do it his way, or as the government says it, “my

Government Orders

way or no way”. I think it is almost a song now in Canada. One either does it their way or it is no way.

We just saw the effect of it last week when we got eight new senators because the government did not want to play the game of Parliament. It is just my way or no way.

I know my time is short, Mr. Speaker, and I just want to say that at one point the minister said something and I challenge him. I challenge the minister when he says: “This is why it is proposed in the bill that for these offences the current maximum of \$5,000 be increased to \$100,000 on summary conviction and \$500,000 on indictment”. That is a drastic increase. He said: “Those who choose to violate the Fisheries Act and jeopardize the future of fishermen in Atlantic Canada as well as the Pacific coast, those who choose to take the livelihoods away from the kids”. He may think he is taking the livelihoods away from the kids, but he is taking the livelihoods away from thousands of fishermen. He said: “Those who take the livelihoods away from the kids in Atlantic Canada who may become fishermen and some of them will, they will pay for it.” They being the thousands of inshore fishermen.

This bill should allow that for an offshore offence the penalty should be so much greater because it is a much bigger enterprise, and that foreigners caught in our waters which are part of a big enterprise and freezer factory ships should be penalized more heavily. Why does he have to lump the inshore with the foreigners who are overfishing with the offshore who are not? In my view, it is only a company that is going to pay for it and some of them are being subsidized by the government.

The Americans who have been overfishing have been overfishing to the tune of thousands of tonnes of fish on Georges Bank and we cannot prosecute them. The enforcement is valueless until it is agreed to by the U.S. government and that means getting the east coast states to agree to it. This bill is bad legislation. It is slanted against the inshore fishery without, in my view, due justification because they want to conserve and restore the stocks. There are many other ways, if the minister would only listen, as to how you could conserve and restore the stocks in Atlantic Canada in the inshore fishery without having a bill—and I am not against the