

Fisheries and Sealing Agreement

Newfoundland and its role in Confederation it will have to revise its present position.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker—

An hon. Member: Take off your parka.

An hon. Member: Don't flounder.

Mr. Brewin:—this subject is of such vital importance to the people of the Maritimes and particularly to our fishing industry that I regret that the members of our party who are particularly expert in this matter are not available to answer the minister's statement. However, as one who has been interested in some aspects of this matter, namely, those that affect the development of international law, I do make bold to make a few brief comments on the matter.

• (11:20 a.m.)

We in this party have all been in favour of the extension of the territorial waters of Canada. We think this is essential in this modern age not only to conserve fishing resources but in order to preserve the rights of Canadian fishermen but also to deal with the very grave problems of the pollution of our waters. In so far as this agreement recognizes our right to extend control beyond three miles from our shores, we welcome it.

There is great concern across Canada with respect to the problem of seals. It has aroused the consciences of many people. We are concerned that sealing practices should be humane, but over and above that we are more particularly concerned that in the conservation of wildlife there be no extinction of these species.

It appears to us that the agreement the minister has announced in his statement on the setting up a joint commission on sealing is a forward step. We hope this joint commission on sealing will make its major responsibility the conservation of seals and the enactment of humane practices in regard to sealing.

I admire, as I think all members of our party do, the energy with which the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Lundrigan) has expressed his concern about the right of Norwegian fishermen, conceded in this agreement, to come within three miles of our shores. But we do take some comfort from the fact that, as the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis) said, this is not a new development but something that has been happening in the past. We believe that if this was necessary in order to secure adequate international control of sealing, then perhaps it was a necessary concession.

We will observe developments in regard to this commission with a great deal of interest. We note the statement that eminent conservationists are to be members of the commission. We hope they will be in fact a majority of the commission, and that there will be no special interests represented on it but that those who are truly concerned with the conservation of this great national resource will be the effective majority on the commission.

[Translation]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, my situation is similar to that of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). At the Noranda mine at Lake Dufault,

in my area, there is no problem like the one raised this morning by the minister.

I understand however that experts who advise the government, who are conversant with the matter of Canadian territorial waters, have this important problem under active consideration. The hon. members from the Maritimes are deeply concerned about this problem, as much as the hon. members from the Prairies are concerned about the wheat problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I leave it to the better judgment of the experts who advise the government and of the minister responsible to find solutions to protect the resources of this country for the benefit of Canadians. I cannot be more concerned about that matter because I am not familiar with it, but I believe that with the advice of experts advising the government our resources will be protected for the benefit of all the citizens of Canada.

[English]

AGREEMENT WITH NORWAY ON SEALING—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to move a motion under Standing Order 43 not only because of the urgency of the particular matter before the House but especially after having noted the lack of concern on the part of members of two other parties in the House, or perhaps a lack of understanding on their part that is not their fault. Because of the implications of the treaty between Canada and Norway, which permits the latter to violate our territorial seas, and because of its long-term implications I would like to move, seconded by my colleagues from the Atlantic region, if that can be collectively done, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. member please put the motion in proper form?

Mr. Lundrigan:—seconded by my colleague the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall):

That this whole matter be referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and External Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: The motion proposed by the hon. member under the terms of Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent and the motion cannot be put at this time.

An hon. Member: Who said no?

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

U.S.-CANADA PRODUCTION SHARING—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): I rise under Standing Order 43 to ask the unanimous consent of