We have a snap-back provision that was negotiated in the trade agreement between Canada and the United States which has been used by the government when necessary.

The hon. member should be aware that the association which represents these producers requested a hearing be held into the dumping allegations. They have been working with the Department of National Revenue to assemble that information. The Department of National Revenue is co-operating in presenting this case. We have worked hand in hand with our sister departments and we will work with the producers.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, the minister knows, as every producer across this country knows, that the snap-back provision is absolutely useless. It just does not protect the industry.

The Department of National Revenue published a press release last week saying it would be making a determination in 90 days. That is simply unacceptable. The crops will all be ploughed down within 90 days.

Will the government bring in a determination for an anti-dumping duty by June 23 when the House rises? Will the minister give that kind of commitment to those producers today?

Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, as beneficial as that might appear, the hon. member would be the first to complain to our trading partners if they attempted to run roughshod over a process that was established to allow it to take place.

Those critics of doom and gloom who identified that the free trade agreement would cause the destruction of agriculture have to recognize fact. The fact is that the number of farms has reduced at a lower rate in the last five years in Canada than any time since 1941.

Another thing the hon. member and other colleagues should know is that agricultural food exports to the United States since the free trade agreement have increased 29 per cent, almost 10 per cent a year. The hon. member should recognize that.

WESTRAY MINE

Mr. Ross Harvey (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Oral Questions

Both the Nova Scotia government order establishing the inquiry into the Westray mine disaster and the provincial statute authorizing the order specifically restricts the inquiry to matters, and I quote, "in relation to which the legislature may make laws".

In other words, every aspect of the disaster within federal jurisdiction, such things as federal government investigations and safety assessments or regional development funding or cabinet assessment, is beyond the scope of the Nova Scotia inquiry.

Will the Prime Minister now admit that all the government's assurances for the last month that no federal inquiry was needed were in fact completely incorrect, that the Nova Scotia inquiry cannot inquire into strictly federal actions and responsibilities in the disaster?

An hon. member: He should go to Hollywood. The walk would do him good.

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Ross Harvey (Edmonton East): That is not entirely comforting, Mr. Speaker, so I would ask a question of the Acting Prime Minister.

The inquiry commissioner, Justice Richard, himself said yesterday when talking about the huge volume of documents his inquiry already had to review:

I have no jurisdiction as a provincial inquiry over documents outside the province.

The justice himself recognizes the restrictions on his inquiry.

Will the government now stop trying to hide its own actions and responsibilities behind a provincial inquiry which cannot investigate them and call a federal inquiry which can?

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)): Mr. Speaker, it is certainly true the judge did say that he did not have jurisdiction over documents issuing from a federal jurisdiction, but we sent them to him anyway.

FISHERIES

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. It concerns a matter of paramount importance to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador: the state of the fishery.