

There are others however. South Korea is not a member of the European Community or NAFO. Neither is the United States. There are vessels registered under Panamanian registry or registered in other countries that are not bound by any of the agreements of which the member for Fraser Valley East spoke.

Unless we are prepared to really do something about this situation the problem will not be solved. I suggest that the thing to do is to set a time and say that by a certain date, and it cannot be too far off, in the very near future in the interest of preserving the little that is left of the north Atlantic cod Canada will unilaterally insist on taking over the management of the cod stocks off the nose and tail of the Grand Banks. We must make it very clear. Give the world some time to react to that.

Let us talk and reach an agreement as to how long this will take, what will happen afterwards if it works and how we can work together in measuring the situation and seeing what we can learn about it. Is it the environment? Is it the seals? Is it overfishing? Is it a lack of food? Is it everything? We do not know. Let us get the world to co-operate with us but at the same time say that come June 1993, or 1994, Canada will take over management of the nose and tail of the Grand Banks area and make sure that we do preserve what is left of the cod stock.

Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate my colleague from Bonavista—Trinity—Conception for having the foresight to present this private member's motion before the House in order that we can discuss it at greater length.

I, my colleague and others in this House are fully aware of the importance of this situation but I do not think there are many members in this House who appreciate the severity of what the fishing industry is going through as much as the hon. member. He knows about this situation only too well from his own personal experience and his involvement on the seas, particularly the Grand Banks.

This is not subject matter that has just come to the attention of the House. In fact on March 12, 1992 my colleague from Burin—St. George's put forward a motion that reads as follows:

Private Members' Business

That, in the opinion of this House, in order to prevent further ecological disaster through the pillage of transboundary fish stocks off Canada's east coast, and in order to save an essential national industry and valued way of life for many rural citizens, Canada should take immediate steps to extend its functional jurisdiction to the nose and tail of the Grand Banks.

The government of the day voted against that motion. The minister responsible for fisheries said, and I quote from page 8085 of *Hansard*:

• (1740)

The government and I will be asking my colleagues to vote against it because it is premature and it is certainly inexplicit as to what Canada has been asked to do.

That is what the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans said. I found that to be rather alarming in view of the fact that the motion was presented by our party to solicit the support to begin the process. No member on this side has said or intimated that the extension of this jurisdiction would somehow be the panacea for all the ills that the fishing industry faces at the present time. We are not that naive. The people we represent are not so naive as to think it will be the panacea. However, why does the government of the day refuse to begin that process?

I can only suggest to this House and to the members who have been in it here for quite some time that although it may be a priority for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans—and I underline the word may and I do so with great respect—I know it is not a priority of the government opposite.

In what jurisdiction, in what parliamentary democracy would we see such avoidance of the issue as demonstrated time and time again by the Secretary of State for External Affairs? The present Secretary of State for External Affairs is following the track record of her predecessor, the right hon. member for Yellowhead. They have not dealt with this issue as a government issue, as a national issue of great importance. They have fluffed it off. It is a fisheries thing. We will give it to Crosbie the old windbag. He will do his thing. He will get up and tell a few jokes. He will tell everybody: "Ah we cannot do this. It is not going to be this and it is not going to be that".

The credence and the significance of the forethought of my colleague is that he has presented the motion not to defeat the government but to solicit its support. Members of the New Democratic Party would love to criticize those of us in the Official Opposition and have done so repeatedly, not very wisely I might add, but in