

we are going to penalize the fishery. We are going to penalize who, Mr. Speaker? Who do we penalize in this?

I say that most of the present surveillance effort is concentrated on the inshore sector. The new enforcement provided in the adjustment program announced earlier is directed toward the inshore sector as well. It is the inshore sector that gets it again.

It stands to reason that those who will be caught overwhelmingly will be from the inshore sector. And why is that? Because our fishery in Canada has been an inshore fishery and has progressed to the point of being a very efficient inshore fishery. We just have to look at the subsidies which the government has handed out in the last year. They have been to the offshore sector of the fishery to help boost it, contrary to the free trade agreement. We should be self-sufficient in selling into the U.S. First of all, we subsidized National Sea on the northern cod, and more recently in the Seafreeze deal where we paid off the loans of Canso and Burgeo that were outstanding for National Sea Products.

We have an efficient inshore fishery. We have an inefficient offshore fishery, and now we are going to bring in stiffer penalties. Who are they going to affect? Well, the bulk of the people are in the inshore fishery. So, the people in P.E.I. who violate part of the Fisheries Act or the small herring fishermen somewhere else who violate the Fisheries Act are going to be affected more by these amendments. I will speak of these penalties in a minute.

• (1600)

With regard to conservation, there are no solutions to conservation from the government by having stiffer penalties. I want to say why it is going to affect again the inshore, because in the past we have not been able to enforce the existing provisions for defying the Fisheries Act against the offshore sector or against the foreigners within our waters.

We do not have the power to do it, number one, because if we are talking about the Americans, they go quickly over the Georges Bank area and quickly get back into their own waters, away from any Canadian enforcement, if we had the capacity even to chase them. We have seen in the past that we do not really have that much capacity.

Government Orders

We do not enforce it in the same way against the foreigners who may get over. This morning, we heard my colleague from Gander—Grand Falls talking about the foreigners having overcaught their resources, but they are not penalized in the same way that an inshore dragger fisherman is when caught overfishing, and not on purpose, but in the abundance of the sea. Then, the vessel will be penalized if it has either to dump it or to bring it in.

We do not talk about the fact that it is that inshore fisherman who goes out every day. He is his own operator of the boat. He owns the boat, operates it, and is the one who is going to be affected.

We do not talk about the few big companies that are going to pay the penalties in the offshore for those fishermen who may have overfished. I find it quite offensive that the act will not differentiate between a violation within the inshore where it is owner operated for the most part, a violation in the offshore which is company operated, and a violation by the foreign fleet which is country operated for the most part. The heaviest burden is going to be on the inshore sector.

The minister hopes that bringing in stiffer penalties is going to provide for better conservation and restoring of the stocks. He does not talk about the dumping that has had to be done because of the poor conservation policy that the government has had in the past in the inshore fishery.

He does not talk about poor biological data that allows a place like the Bay of Fundy to have an abundance of fish and yet the department does not have the willingness to recognize this and allow the fishermen to fish there in a greater number this year.

The minister does not talk about having caught people who perhaps were transferring fish at sea, or dumping by the foreign fleet. He does not talk about providing better biological data.

Certainly, the fishermen would have a lot to tell him if this Minister of Fisheries and Oceans would listen. One of the reasons that this bill is so bad is that he has not consulted the various fishing groups or the various associations. Again, it is as the government always does: "Do it our way or no way". It is either "do it" or "suffer the consequences". We have seen this all summer. We have seen it in the fishery in the past. Once again, with this bill, we are seeing that it will be their way or no way.