

*Oral Questions*

and I will draw the hon. member's comments to his attention when he returns.

**Mr. de Jong:** A supplementary question, Madam Speaker. Perhaps the former secretary of state can answer this. I would like to have an answer today by the Acting Secretary of State.

The former Liberal government in 1978 had cut the National Film Board budget by \$4.6 million. The former Conservative government restored it by some \$350,000, only for last year. It is obvious that the cutbacks have severely limited the role of the National Film Board. Would the minister inform the House if his government will consider increasing the National Film Board budget, especially the budget for production?

**Mr. Roberts:** Madam Speaker, clearly, the restraint programs have had a considerable impact on the National Film Board. The question about further spending priorities in relation to the National Film Board is one to which the present Secretary of State should respond. As I said earlier, I will be happy to draw the hon. member's concerns to his attention.

\* \* \*

**EXTERNAL AFFAIRS****BOYCOTTING OF MOSCOW OLYMPICS—GOVERNMENT POSITION ON OTHER SPORTS ACTIVITIES WITH SOVIETS**

**Mr. Otto Jelinek (Halton):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. In light of the long overdue but welcome decision by the government to boycott the Moscow Olympics, and in order for this government to be consistent in its actions condemning the Soviet Union's military invasion of Afghanistan, can the Prime Minister tell this House whether or not his government is now prepared to cease all further artistic and sporting ties with the Soviet Union, including the prevention of the Soviet hockey team from participating in this fall's Canada Cup hockey tournament? If not, can the Prime Minister explain the obvious inconsistencies that exist within his government's position in this regard?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Madam Speaker, I cannot comment on all the detail of this. Here again, the Secretary of State for External Affairs would be better able to do it than I.

On the specific point raised by the hon. member concerning the World Hockey Cup competition to be held here this fall, I point out to the House that the position of this government has been, not to ban the Olympics or sporting events, per se, but to ban them because they were being held in Moscow. That is the point we want to get through. I think that is the point President Carter first emphasized in his own policy. It is certainly our policy.

In other words, we are not condemning all contacts with Russian athletes, Russian artists or Russians of other kinds. We are condemning the Moscow Games. That is the purpose

of this government's policy. I do not know what the hon. member's policy was.

**Mr. Jelinek:** Madam Speaker, Canadian amateur athletes will forfeit their once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to participate in the Olympic Games, and rightly so under the circumstances. But the question I put to the Prime Minister—and I suppose he did not understand it the first time—is, how can he justify the fact that on one hand Canadian amateur athletes will have to forfeit this opportunity, and on the other hand the hockey players, for example, or the Soviet-built Lada car sales people in Canada, will continue to bring to the forefront Soviet Union industry and Soviet Union sporting events which, as the Prime Minister knows, is the number one propaganda tool of the Soviet Union?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Madam Speaker, it has nothing to do with amateur or professional status. Our condemnation is of games to be held in Moscow. That is the total aspect of it. We are not condemning sporting events, amateur or professional, held in other fora. As a matter of fact, and as the hon. member knows, Russian athletes were in the United States at Lake Placid just a couple of months ago. Therefore, the creators of the policy of the boycott, the Americans themselves, are interpreting the policy the way we are, not the way the hon. member is suggesting.

\* \* \*

**FISHERIES****OVER-THE-SIDE SALES TO FOREIGN FISHING FLEETS**

**Hon. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova):** Madam Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to elaborate briefly on the reported guarantees by his department in connection with over-the-side sales of fish, specifically to Joint Trawlers Limited, a Swedish-based consortium. I wonder if this is not tantamount to a subsidy and whether he could tell the House briefly the basis of this, if it is true.

**Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Madam Speaker, the discussions with the foreign company have, in fact, included the possibility of commensurate benefits being offered in exchange for coming in and buying Canadian fish from Canadian fishermen.

As the hon. member knows, we have experimented with the guarantee formula. We found that this created a lack of incentive to hang in if, for example, mackerel did not show up at the appointed time. We are now looking at the possibility of making available, as a commensurate benefit, fish in which Canadian fishermen have shown no interest in the past and which is surplus to our needs, for example, a certain quantity of silver hake. That is the approach we will be taking this year.

**Mr. MacKay:** Madam Speaker, I appreciate the minister's answer. I wonder if he could say whether or not there are any safeguards or provisions in place that would make sure that