

That is what we are saying. That is the gist of our resolution, justifications for taking strong action to protect the straddling stocks are evidently abundant.

The Conservative government has ignored these possibilities. It has offered us oceans of Crosbie-like rhetoric. But has it set a deadline by which it will abandon the diplomatic route if it proves ineffective? The answer sadly to say is no.

Has the government announced its plan of action if diplomatic action fails, as it did last year, the year before, and the year before that? The answer again is no. Can Canadians believe the government's stated commitment to resolving this crisis? Unfortunately, from what the minister said this morning, the answer is no.

The issue therefore is what should we do? First, legislation should be prepared to establish a provisional custodial management for the cod fishery outside of the 200-mile limit. This legislation would be defended on the grounds of expert scientific advice which has been received, the principle of sustainable development which is clear, and the legal regime established under the Law of the Sea convention.

Second, Canada should announce conservation measures with full enforcement now, including arrest and prosecution for vessels both within and outside of the 200-mile limit.

Some may well respond to this recommendation for strong unilateral action by saying that force to protect straddling stocks are not optimal courses of action. To that I would respond by saying that passivity, that doing nothing when an important, irreplaceable Canadian and global resource is being depleted is even less than the optimum.

There is only one other alternative to this form of action, retaliatory trade measures and everyone in this House knows that they themselves carry their own consequences. The government option of simply watching the world go by is one that is no longer acceptable.

Third, our intention to enforce fisheries conservation measures outside the 200-mile limit must be heavily publicized both within and outside the country.

Four, the Law of the Sea convention, as my colleague from Alberta so articulately said earlier, should be

Supply

immediately ratified. How can the world community take our complaints in Canada about ocean management seriously when we have not even ratified the very convention which establishes the ocean management regime? It is the product of nine years of international negotiation, the world's most ambitious and advanced environmental convention—

Mr. Caccia: Which Canada pioneered.

Mr. Martin: —which Canada pioneered, of which my colleague from Davenport was a member of the government which lead it forth. It is simply unacceptable given our current circumstances that Canada has not ratified the Law of the Sea convention.

Five, we should go to the World Court in The Hague to seek a ruling that supports our enforcement of conservation measures on straddling stocks based on our necessity and obligation to preserve these stocks within the 200-mile limit.

It is clear in international law that given the right to enforce conservation within the 200-mile limit we have the right to enforce conservation outside if it is necessary to affect our jurisdiction within.

Six, we should serve notice that we will introduce a proposal in the context of the GATT that countervail trade measures, sanctions, be applied to countries which defy internationally-accepted environmental conventions, including those respecting living marine resources.

Seven, an agreement on the conservation of marine living resources should be the highest priority for Canada at the UNCED conference in Rio de Janeiro. The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans this morning said that that is his intention. We are tempted to applaud, but unfortunately, his words ring hollow.

The Prime Minister has yet to commit to attending the earth summit. If this government really places the highest priority on resolving the fisheries crisis, the Prime Minister should announce today in this House that he will be personally bringing this message to the other heads of state at UNCED.

Let us be very clear, he must achieve more than a mere reiteration of declaration of principles, principles which are already set out in declarations by the G-7 and other international bodies. There must be teeth arising out of the Rio convention.