

Supply

I think the Speaker is indicating that I have to come to an end. It is amazing how fast time goes. I did not even get to my notes here that were so carefully prepared for me. We are all agreed in this House on what the problem is, that our fish stocks are being endangered and so is the way of life.

I have not got the time now to go on with the economic steps we have taken or outline some of the things we have done, say, in Gaultois or wherever it might be, the Atlantic AFAP program, the PWAP program and how we are attempting to deal with the economic consequences. That will be for another day.

I thank the member who introduced the motion for his interest. I know of his concern. I ask him and the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and eastern Canada to exhibit patience. If we are to be successful in this cause, we have to exhibit some patience, go at this, and I think the way we are going at it is the right way.

Hon. Roger C. Simmons (Burin—St. George's): Mr. Speaker, first on a serious note, I thank the minister for his speech. I found it disappointing in some respects, but I will come back to that in a moment.

On a less serious note, may I ask the man of a thousand faces a question? I was thinking when he was talking about being Sylvester Stallone that the chest is slightly lower.

The minister has done something again today that I have seen him do fairly often. Maybe today, since we just a few feet across the aisle from each other, we can sort this one out. I get confused about many things, I admit that, but this one, I think, is a matter that he might be able to clear up fairly quickly. He says in one mouthful—and this is not the first time he has done this either—"now this is foolhardy and this can't be done, and if you did it you would have the whole world on your door with their gunboats", and so on. Then, in the next mouthful, he says; "Now, by the way, if we have to do something down the road, we want to be able to demonstrate that we have taken all the preliminary steps".

Which is it? If it is foolhardy today, March 12, 1992, is there something I am missing that would make it less foolhardy if he has to do it later on? Either it is a plausible course of action or it is not a plausible course of action.

In the one mouthful he condemns it as being irresponsible, that only people not in a position to have to make

the decision would advocate. He might be sparring politically but he should bear in mind that one of his dearest friends on this earth, one Vic Young, advocates this position and I do not think he is running for any office. National Sea advocates the position, and many other people who do not have any political points to score are making this argument.

So I ask him: which is it; is it as foolhardy as he pretends, or is it something that maybe he has up his sleeve when the time comes? Because he has said both today, and I would submit to him that it really ought to be one or the other.

Mr. Crosbie: Mr. Speaker, as is true so often in life, it is certainly true in international affairs, that it is usually not one or the other. I am not suggesting in this situation that it is one or the other.

I am suggesting this. If and when Canada has to take some kind of unilateral action in connection with this situation, such as the kind of unilateral action the hon. member is advocating in his resolution, that we have to be able to show the world, hopefully, at that stage we would want to have as many nations as we could supporting our actions and saying that, "Yes, this is sensible, you've been driven to it, your stocks obviously are endangered."

Environmental groups, ecological movements support the fact that our fish stocks are in danger. We have spent several years now trying to persuade the European Community, Spain, Portugal, South Korea, Panama to cease fishing and to observe the requirements of this international body NAFO.

We have had resolutions passed. The Prime Minister had a resolution passed at the economic summit last year by all the leaders of these countries which said that nations should observe the quotas established by regional international fisheries authorities. We have done all these kinds of things, we have brought this to the United Nations, we have brought it to the United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development, we have put before them this resolution proposal on coastal stocks.

There are five major points here and I cannot refer to them all. But if it were accepted, the nations of the world would be agreeing that with respect to a stock occurring both within the exclusive economic zone of the coastal state and in an area of the high seas adjacent to it, the management regime applied to the stock must provide for consistency of the measures applied on the high seas