

Supply

• (1240)

Eight, the government should seek a commitment to a follow-up conference to UNCED specifically committed to overfishing.

Let me be very clear. Some of the recommendations that I have made are for provisional and limited extension of functional jurisdiction until an appropriate arrangement is developed. Others are more permanent. One thing is clear. We can delay no longer.

Let me quote from the Brundtland commission.

Traditional forms of national sovereignty are increasingly challenged by the realities of ecological and economic interdependence. Nowhere is this more true than in shared ecosystems and in the global commons—those parts of a planet that fall outside of national jurisdictions—the commission is convinced that sustainable development, if not survival itself, depends on significant advances in the management of the oceans. The underlying unity of the oceans requires effective global management regimes. An international ecosystem approach is required for the management of these resources for sustained use.

These words ring painfully true today to the people of the Atlantic provinces. That is why we recommend unilateral action now. That is why we have brought forth this resolution today. It is the first step on the road to a global solution.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 26(1), I move:

That the House continue to sit between one and two o'clock this day, for the purpose of consideration of the motion now before the House moved by my hon. colleague for Burin—St. George's.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Will those members who object to the motion please rise in their place.

And fewer than 15 members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Fewer than 15 members having risen, pursuant to Standing Order 26(2), the motion is adopted.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Ross Belsher (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member for LaSalle—Émard about the so-called steps to be taken for this functional jurisdiction, whatever functional jurisdiction really means.

The member has heard what the minister said earlier today about what is taking place in the international marketplace and the various things we are already doing.

The minister was in New York this week. Also, a strong representation is being made to the conference which will take place later on this year in Rio.

I am wondering what action the hon. member feels the government is not already taking with regard to the possible outcome of this additional jurisdiction.

He will know that it took years in order to finally get agreement among the countries on the 200-mile limit. There has been a real success about the 200-mile limit. But I am certainly not aware of any precedent of additional jurisdiction outside of the 200-mile limit. How would he propose that we get that support? You cannot do it by yourself in an international marketplace.

Mr. Martin: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the hon. parliamentary secretary's question.

I believe the minister answered it by the contradiction in response to some of the questions of the member for Burin—St. George's in saying that what he was trying to do was to sort of build up enough support around the world for taking the very kinds of actions that we are recommending that he take today. If he thinks he can take those actions in three to six months, why in heaven's name can he not take them now? The damage has been done and these stocks are being winnowed away so quickly that we must take action now. In international law we have the authority.

The member asks what we can do. First of all, let us ratify the Law of the Sea convention. It is the strongest body of international law that we have with us. Article 63 of the convention talks about stocks occurring within the exclusive economic zones of two or more coastal states. Article 63 talks about straddling stocks, it talks about the right of a state to protect for ecological and for economic reasons its own coastal interests. The Law of the Sea convention gives us the authority.

For heaven's sake, why will the government not ratify it?

It is a clearly established convention of international law. The Oceans Institute at Dalhousie has written extensively on it. It says that where you have the authority to preserve a stock within a 200-mile limit, you have the right to go beyond the 200-mile limit if that is