betrayal of federal-provincial relations. Third, it is a betrayal of the Atlantic fishing industry. Finally, and most important, it is a betrayal of the fishermen themselves, their families and their communities.

I want to speak just a bit about each of those. First, sovereignty. Ten years ago, in January, 1977, Canada established a 200-mile exclusive economic zone and began to patrol and enforce it. Establishing that zone took international negotiations, and a measure of determination and gumption on Canada's part. About 12 or 13 miles off the south shore of Newfoundland we have the two small islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon.

Mr. Forrestall: You are sure of that?

Mr. Manly: That is according to everything I have read. I have never been there.

Mr. Forrestall: Who wrote your speech for you?

Mr. Manly: You can check and see that the notes are written by hand.

Mr. Crosbie: Go back to sleep.

Mr. Manly: By my own hand. I do my own research on these things, thank you very much. I do not need to have a government flack prepare my speeches for me.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member may continue.

Mr. Manly: Those islands have passed back and forth between Great Britain and France. Finally, with the Treaty of Ghent in 1814, they passed into French ownership. They are one of France's last remaining colonies. They are being treated as a colony and the people of those two islands are not very happy about it.

However, with the establishment of Canada's 200-mile EEZ, France decided it was going to use these islands to establish certain claims. They claimed an area as large as the Province of Nova Scotia. They have attempted to back up their claim with some force. In August of 1983 the French sent a gunboat into that area to establish their claim. They were involved in seismic exploration and of course in blatant overfishing of that entire area. No one in Canada recognizes the claim France has made and no one in the international scene, apart from France, would recognize it has any real validity. Yet what has Canada done? We sent diplomatic notes of protest. The gunboat incident was kind of smoothed over.

 $Mr.\ Crosbie:$ Should we send a gunboat? What would you do?

 $\ensuremath{\mathbf{Mr.}}$ Manly: France had indicated it was prepared to push the issue.

Mr. Crosbie: Would you send a submarine or aircraft carrier or what?

Mr. Manly: Overfishing was a constant practice.

Mr. Crosbie: What is your answer?

Mr. Manly: The Conservative critic at the time was very concerned about the question of overfishing. He pointed out that the French had taken two and a half times their quota. He suggested that perhaps the Government should deduct what they had overfished in the past two years from their quota, in succeeding years. That was in 1983. Since then the Tories have come to power and instead of two and a half times the quota and they have been allowed to go up to eight times the quota and the Government does nothing about it.

Last June the Minister decided he had to do something, so he issued a warning. He said there were not going to be any more allocations unless foreign nations followed good conservation practices. He said that means good behaviour, not only inside the Canadian zone but also in the North Atlantic Fisheries Organization management area outside the zone. He said we are sending a very clear message to foreign nations. In return for a licence to fish in our waters and permission to use our ports they must co-operate with our conservation efforts and observe the fishing limits that we and NAFO have established. He said he was sending a very clear message. The very clear message given by this agreement is that Canada's interests can be ignored with impunity. That is what France has done and I expect other nations who want to establish their rights in this area will do the same.

Under this agreement the French will continue to overfish. There are absolutely no guarantees that the agreement is going to put an end to overfishing. We licensed nine factory freezer trawlers when it is obvious that one could have taken the total allocation. Why license nine when we knew there was going to be overfishing?

Mr. Broadbent: They asked for nine.

Mr. Manly: We are lucky they did not ask for 20.

What did we get in this deal with the French? We got a vague commitment to submit this to some future arbitration. I think it is very clear from everything said this evening, including what the Minister said, that this is a fundamental betrayal of Canadian sovereignty.

Then we have the betrayal of federal-provincial relations. That is an area into which the Government came with so much hope and so much promise. For a time it even appeared as though the Government was going to deliver better federalprovincial relations. There appeared to be a better climate, a new and better era of consultation. That seems to have gone out the window in the last few months in a number of cases and this is perhaps one of the more blatant ones. When the going got tough, the federal Government jettisoned any consultation with the provincial Government.

Mr. Forrestall: Not so.