

Supply

Part of the debate already has focused on whether this is entirely offshore or to an extent also inshore. I can tell members that in my own visits to Isle-de-la-Madeleine, to Prince Edward Island, to Newfoundland, it has been very interesting to see in early morning some of the fishing boats coming in, their holds filled with fish, knowing that they have been able to use a lot of very scientific equipment in finding where the fish are and catching them, and the use of radars and sonars and so on.

There is no question here that this is a sport or a hunt. It is a very scientific based activity, to commercially harvest fish stocks and there is a whole economy that depends on that.

But it is a sobering thing to see the extent to which technology has been advanced in perfecting the methods of harvest. That has gone on and on, both inshore and further out, to an extent that we now face this crisis in the Atlantic fishery.

I listened to the minister expressing his views about the need to develop a consensus on the issue, the need to have co-operative multilateral approaches and so on. He listed a great many steps that have been taken.

Last week a new issue came to mind when I met with five members of the European Parliament who were in Canada looking at this question of our east coast fishery. One of the Tory members from the United Kingdom, Bryan Cassidy, asked me why Canada had never taken this issue to the World Court. I had no answer for that. I would like to raise that question in debate here, from one of our colleagues in the European Parliament to fellow parliamentarians here in Canada, to actually ask that question.

We know that the NAFO quotas have been carefully established. We secondarily know that beyond that several European countries, members of the European Community, have gone beyond those quotas. We heard the minister this morning refer to both Spain and Portugal not only catching well beyond the quotas but also using nets with a finer mesh than is legal for them to use and other evidence like this that has been documented.

The question therefore is when there is clear evidence of a violation of accepted international rules, a breach of legal agreements regarding net size and so forth, why has the Government of Canada not taken this issue to the World Court as part of its effort. I think that is an issue

that we have to examine more carefully here in Parliament.

I should also report to other parliamentarians here that in this discussion I had with the European parliamentarians several of them had been singularly unaware of lobbying efforts by the Government of Canada to raise this issue of overfishing. For example one of the members, Mr. Henry McCubbin from Scotland, a member of the European Parliament, a Labour Party member, sits on the fishing committee of the European Parliament. He indicated that he had not ever been approached by a representative of Canada with respect to this overfishing issue.

This is important information to put on the record in the Canadian House of Commons because it will cause us to reconsider what new efforts need to be made in bringing to the attention of Europeans the issue of overfishing, working officially and also through party relationships, indeed the need to redouble this effort at bringing the issue to bear. A number of them were thinking of returning to the European Parliament and introducing a resolution there dealing with the overfishing and the abuse by Spain and Portugal of the quota system. This is action coming as a result of concern and conscientious European parliamentarians getting the facts about the cod fishery. I think it is important to see that we in Canada are putting that information out effectively.

One of the issues that the minister referred to, and several others—the member from Saanich, British Columbia was mentioning the seals and their relationship with this depletion of the cod stocks. The minister said that it was important to keep our eyes on the issue and that the seal population and their consumption of fish was not directly relevant to this problem. I would agree with him.

I have here a copy of the Malouf report. This is yet one more in a long series of royal commissions in our country. They seem to be very expensive these days. We are hearing of royal commissions on election law and on reproductive technology in the \$20 million to \$25 million range. I understand the Malouf report which was completed in 1986 is in something like the \$23 million range. What amazes me moreover is that this report on seals and sealing in Canada, a very substantial three volume report, is not well known in the country. It is not well known by many people who are dealing with this issue either in government or in Parliament.