

S.O. 29

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 29

CANADA-FRANCE AGREEMENT—FISHING RIGHTS

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Leave has been granted to the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent) to move the adjournment of the House pursuant to Standing Order 29 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, an interim agreement with the Government of France concerning additional fishing rights for the French fleet off the northern coast of Newfoundland.

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa) moved:

That this House do now adjourn.

He said: Mr. Speaker, those most affected by the agreement that was announced yesterday by the Government of Canada are clearly the fishermen, the people in the industry and the Government of Newfoundland. At the same time, those completely ignored in shaping the content of the agreement were the fishermen, the people in the industry and the Government of Newfoundland.

Very clearly, this agreement was designed by the Government of Canada, not to please the people of Atlantic Canada but to please the people of France. The clear intention of the Government was to prepare a document that would serve as the centre-piece for a photo opportunity for the visit to Canada by the President of France in a few weeks from now. That is what it was all about. I say that it is time the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mulroney) recognized that he was elected in Manicouagan not Marseille, that he is responsible to the people of Canada and not to the people of France. That is what he should understand.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (2010)

Mr. Broadbent: Given the nature of this agreement which gives French fishermen access to some 15,000 tonnes of cod that they did not have before, remarkably enough, in precisely the same area as the curtailment to Canadian fishermen of some 10,000 tonnes, perhaps it is legitimate for Atlantic Canadians to ask what type of Government could reach this agreement and make it seriously as a proposal? What could have led to this?

[Translation]

According to the Government, Mr. Speaker, we have this proposal because of a dispute about the boundaries of Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon. The Government wanted to use this proposal to settle the dispute. The Government of Canada says, and in my view it is right, that Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon's boundary extends to the 12-mile limit. However, the Government of France wants a zone that is almost as big as Nova Scotia. According to us and according to the Government, international law is on Canada's side. That is our

opinion. The French take a different view. We on the Canadian side and at any rate Members in our party are saying we should seek a ruling by an international body, by a third party.

[English]

It seems to us that when there is a dispute over conflicting claims about fishing rights off the coast of St. Pierre and Miquelon, which presumably had been made in good faith by the two governments, that the rational, sensible approach would be to have it resolved by some third party intervention.

I see the Minister smiling over there, and I will come to what I think he is smiling about.

We think that under the circumstances the correct approach would be to try to persuade our French friends that we are right. Obviously, they tried to do the same thing with us. Then we would say, "Well, if you don't agree with our view, which clearly you do not, and we do not accept yours, then if you are good friends and traditional allies, the appropriate thing to do is to have some third party pass judgment on this which is acceptable to both sides." I suspect that the Government will say that is exactly what it tried to do. Our Government will say, "Yes, we wanted to do that, but the French Government refused". Under those circumstances, what does a rational, fair-minded Government with some sense of obligation to its people, and some sense of self-respect do? One of the reasons there are frigates and a naval presence on the coast is to enforce our sovereignty. Not that long ago we chased—

Mr. Crosbie: You are advocating war now. This is something new.

Mr. Broadbent: —we chased a Spanish vessel half way across the Atlantic Ocean in order to legitimize our claim to sovereignty. That is what we did.

Mr. Crosbie: They had no right to be there.

Mr. Broadbent: The Minister who is participating in a Government that has sold out Newfoundlanders is now joking about this. I say to him that a sovereign nation with a sense of respect—

Mr. Crosbie: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

An Hon. Member: Sit down.

An Hon. Member: It is not a point of order.

Mr. Crosbie: The rules of this House do not permit an Hon. Member to make false characterizations as to whether a Member is smiling or not smiling, or what he is doing. There has not been a smile on my face. The Hon. Leader of the New Democratic Party should stop that kind of low and detestable tactic and stick to his speech. I have not a smile, not a grimace, not a grin, because I am listening to him with disbelief.

An Hon. Member: I think he listened to his Government with disbelief.