

for human rights. We can also increase our diplomatic presence.

My question is this: Will the Government take immediate action to help Salvadoran refugees? Will it change our aid program to reflect our concerns? Will our diplomatic presence in El Salvador be increased? Indeed, will the Government take action to help that country?

Mrs. Landry: Mr. Speaker, again, I think I understand my hon. colleague's concerns.

We now have in El Salvador two representatives from our embassy in San José who are there to help with the situation.

Refugees are quite able now to apply as provided for in our system and we believe that the present staff there is sufficient.

Of course, if the need should increase, we would agree to add staff to meet the demand.

As for our aid, I would repeat to my hon. colleague that given the present situation, we saw fit to suspend the distribution of aid projects, if I may say. But I would repeat that in spite, perhaps, of my hon. colleague's objections, the aid which has been delivered is really reaching the displaced and impoverished people. Many have confirmed that our aid projects do really reach the people. Last year, these projects helped 200,000 people suffering from the situation in El Salvador.

I can assure my hon. colleague that we shall continue to monitor the situation very closely and act so as to restore lasting peace to El Salvador.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mr. Fernand Robichaud (Beauséjour): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

In early October, the Prime Minister tried to reassure thousands of Atlantic lobster fishermen that they would not be affected by American legislation to limit the import of live lobsters of a certain size into the United States. An industry of over \$100 million is at stake!

Oral Question

The Prime Minister told us that he had spoken with the President of the United States and that External Affairs had undertaken a series of very special representations.

In spite of all that, we know that the U.S. bill has now passed all stages and only requires the President's signature.

Obviously, the Prime Minister and External Affairs failed completely in their task.

So here is my question: Where is the Minister of Fisheries on this issue? What other representations does the Government intend to make to ensure that Atlantic fishermen will not be affected by this U.S. measure which threatens to cause them serious losses? And finally, how come, with the free trade treaty, we are still harassed in this way by the Americans?

[English]

Hon. Frank Oberle (Minister of State (Forestry)): Mr. Speaker, perhaps you would permit me to answer on behalf of the Minister of Fisheries who is unavoidably absent today.

As my hon. friend knows, the minister is very much seized with this issue. It has been dealt with at the highest level. As the member himself said, the Prime Minister discussed this issue with the President himself and the President's signature is not on any document. I can tell the hon. member that the minister is very much concerned as is the hon. member and others, and we are on top of the situation.

Mr. Robichaud: The minister is now seized with this question, the fishermen will be seized this coming Monday when they set their traps in Nova Scotia for a new lobster season.

What assurances can the government give the fishermen that they will not be affected by their ineffective action? What assurances can he give them that the price of lobster will not be affected and that the revenue of all those families will not be affected. Can he give them those assurances?

Mr. Oberle: Mr. Speaker, with respect, the hon. member has acknowledged that action has been taken. The Prime Minister discussed this issue with the President. So why do we not wait to see what the outcome of those deliberations are and not raise any fears that may not be justified.