

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

to me but directly to my colleague the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin). I recall that litany and say it is greatly exaggerated but the hon. gentleman this evening has exaggerated it even more.

I might remind the hon. member that the direct mail printing industry, having repeated all these complaints last October and November, now admit they foresee a 10 per cent increase in direct mail usage next year, not a decline. Perhaps people in the direct mail industry will go out of business, perhaps there will be a reorganization, I do not know; but as I say, the industry foresees a 10 per cent increase in printed material sent by direct mail despite increased costs.

The hon. member is really asking me to accept an increase in the deficit of the post office of \$20 million, \$30 million or \$40 million. When he asks me to do that, I suggest he should also make clear his position on whether we should reduce by a similar amount equalization payments to the provinces, subsidies to farmers, aid to Prince Edward Island, or aid to education, to health or to welfare. Because the same \$20 million will not cover all these fields.

FISHERIES—SEALS—DISPOSAL OF NORWEGIAN SHIP UNDER SEIZURE

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, when I set this question down for an adjournment conversation I did not realize that the fisheries and forestry committee were scheduled to meet this evening, otherwise I might have been able to deal with the matter there. However, the other day, in inquiring about the seizure or arrest of a Norwegian sealer, I asked in a supplemental way whether the government would be a bit more severe in prosecuting this case than it was in the case of the Japanese fishing vessel arrested off the west coast a short while ago.

In the case of this Japanese fishing vessel, I am given to understand that there were two ways of proceeding against the owners. One was by way of indictment, which carried with it a maximum fine on conviction of \$25,000. The other way was by summary conviction, which carried with it on conviction a maximum fine of \$5,000 plus the possible seizure of the vessel, its gear and the like. I am told the proceedings were by way of summary conviction, and that the prosecutor on behalf of the Crown indicated to the court it was sufficient simply to ask for a \$1,000 fine, the boat having been found inside the 12-mile fishing zone some two and a half miles.

[Mr. Kierans.]

The magistrate did not agree with that and levied a fine of \$2,500, but even so I think this amounted to nothing more than the charging of what might be called a licence fee to a foreign fishing vessel to poach in our waters. Everybody on the west coast has heard of many cases of fisheries officers proceeding against native Indian people fishing for food by way of taking possession of and actually cutting up and burning their nets, by seizing their boats and by restricting them to fishing at certain periods of time. In other words, the penalty imposed upon our own Canadian people is far greater in severity when compared with that imposed upon this massive Japanese fishing company.

I am sure many west coast fishermen will have communicated to the department the fact that certain foreign fishing vessels on the west coast, both from Japan and the Soviet Union, do follow the practice of moving in to within a mile or a mile and a half of our shores at night, without running lights or any lights whatsoever, dropping their gear and dragging it out beyond the 12-mile limit. In other words, they are deliberately and consciously fishing inside our fishing zone, indeed, inside our territorial seas. They are doing so contrary to standard safety practices at sea by running at night without any lights visible, and so on. These boats have been seen engaging in this sort of practice by trawlers on the west coast. I submit that we should prosecute the Japanese fishing vessel and the Norwegian sealer that was apprehended to the fullest extent of the law, to indicate to other nations and captains of foreign fishing vessels in our waters that we intend to assert our economic rights. The penalty ought to be severe enough to deter others from indulging in similar practices.

● (10:20 p.m.)

In this regard our fisheries protection vessels, either because the ships are too small or because of the temerity of their captains, are not doing an adequate job. Perhaps we ought to use the navy to enforce our rights; the navy seems to be doing little that is useful, and it might be wise to use naval ships to protect our fisheries. We must enforce our fisheries regulations with the greatest severity in an effort, hopefully, to deter others have no right to be there from fishing in our waters.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) will recognize that we