

that if one is from France, one need only register the boat in St. Pierre and Miquelon and it is a St. Pierre and Miquelon boat. The Secretary of State stated in his announcement that the level of cod allocation is an exception as it is greater than what Canada's legal obligations require under the 1972 agreement which, by the way, ran out last May. He went on to say:

This exception has been made in order to facilitate resolution of the boundary dispute.

The Government is giving away this fish when Quebecers have been cut back in the Gulf this year, and New Brunswickers, Nova Scotians and Prince Edward Islanders have been cut back. Yet the Minister says that in order to facilitate the resolution of a boundary dispute he has given some to St. Pierre and Miquelon.

I enjoyed listening to the Member for St. John's West in Newfoundland this morning because he was speaking his mind. I am sure he will do so in the House today and deal with the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

The point is that the Government is saying that a few years ago the Liberals gave it away and created the problem. The Minister was referring to 1983 and 1984 when there was no overfishing by the French. The fish plants in France opened in 1985. While the document containing the official figures is marked "confidential" by the Department of External Affairs, one can see from these exact figures that the French fleet started overfishing in 1985 and 1986, fishing four times over their quota on the south coast of Newfoundland. Their quota was 6,400 tonnes and the Minister admitted tonight that the French took 20,000 tonnes more than 6,400 tonnes. In other words, they took as much as the Canadian fleet last year. The total allowable catch for the entire south coast of Newfoundland and to the east of Nova Scotia was surpassed by 6,000 tonnes.

The truth can be seen in the first page of the press release today, which I will put on the record to show what a flippant and flip-flop kind of government it is. The press release states:

The two countries have agreed to a meeting of Canadian and French scientists as soon as possible—

That sounds rather impressive. It goes on:

—to undertake a joint assessment of the state of the cod stock off the south coast of Newfoundland—

And then states:

—now being overfished by French vessels: and joint projections of what will happen to the stock if the current overfishing continues.

They will appoint scientists to determine the state of the stock when the Minister says that it is drastically overfished. The only thing that should happen to this agreement is that it be put in the ash can of history where it belongs. The Government should do away with this agreement because it will not be tolerated in Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island or Quebec.

Today, fish companies are barely surviving. According to the recent unemployment insurance report, it is suggested that

perhaps fishermen in Atlantic Canada should not receive unemployment insurance because it actually amounts to more than what the average fisherman earns from fishing. It suggests that perhaps another way should be found to support fishermen. That suggests to me and everyone in the Official Opposition that fishermen are not catching enough fish.

It is unacceptable for the Government to pass those fish stocks over to other nations, not only the French, but the Americans as well, without objection. Yet the Government wonders why petitions are beginning to come from Newfoundland and there are suggestions that people will come to Ottawa to tell the Government exactly what they think.

In conclusion, I want to refer to a phone call that I received this morning. It was from a gentleman who asked me if it was true that he will not receive his unemployment insurance cheque on Friday. I asked him if he was a logger who worked at Abitibi-Price. When he replied that he was, I told him that he was correct that he would not get his unemployment insurance cheque on Friday. He indicated that he had heard that the federal Government would deduct all of the vacation pay he received the first week in January but that he received it last year and it did not affect his unemployment insurance. He closed the door, then told me that last week he gave \$300 from that cheque to his son who is in university. He will have to ask him how much he has left because his family will need it since they cannot get welfare as a result of the 90-day rule. It is an example of the type of phone calls we receive from our primary producers in Newfoundland.

• (2110)

Some 219 loggers got hit on Friday. Unemployment insurance benefits were removed for a month because of some mistake by the Unemployment Insurance Commission. Fishermen are being discriminated against by government policy. When you contact the Government and ask it to do something about it, it just turns the other way and says what a magnificent deal it has made with some foreign country.

Newfoundlanders are not going to accept this. The fishermen are not going to accept this. We say this House of Commons should not accept this.

**Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to express a word of appreciation to my Leader, the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent), for initiating this debate and to the Speaker for granting it.

**Mr. Crosbie:** He is leaving now. He is going early.

**Mr. Manly:** It is a very important issue. We wanted to bring it before the House, and we look forward to hearing what some of the government Members are going to say, particularly those from Newfoundland and other Atlantic provinces.

There is a great deal of outrage in Atlantic Canada over the agreement signed with France. The outrage is fully justified because this deal represents a betrayal in four different ways. First, it is a betrayal of Canadian sovereignty. Second, it is a