

*Fisheries and Sealing Agreement*

Canada and Norway may be similar to the amounts of the catch in recent years or may be zero. The numbers remain to be seen. But Canadians are now guaranteed two things. One is the perpetual protection of the seal herd in the North Atlantic. The other is a fair division of the commercial catch. This will depend on the recommendations made by this group of international experts.

The hon. member says that Norwegian fishermen will be, in his words, "invited in to within three miles of our shores." He says this as if it is something new. Foreign nationals, including Norwegians and Russians, for many, many years have been coming close to our shores to take seals. The only difference now is that Norwegians will come only when there is a proven surplus of seals and the take will have to be shared in any case with Canadians.

I should mention the special position, the privileged position in a sense, of our small inshore fishermen. They are in a special category. They have first claim on any quota which may be declared as surplus to the basic seal stock in the whole of the North Atlantic. The number of longliners operated by inshore fishermen off the northeast coast of Newfoundland has been increasing. Presumably the take of these small inshore fishermen will be guaranteed under the new agreement with Norway.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, hon. members opposite claim that our new agreement with Norway, like the other agreements with other European countries being phased out of our fishing waters, should be debated in this House before it is ratified by the government. Presumably they realize, also, that to follow this procedure would be to depart from normal Canadian and British parliamentary practice. It would be to adopt United States practice. It would be to adopt a procedure which is characteristic of the U.S. presidential system. I doubt very much whether hon. members opposite would want that to happen.

**Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate):** Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed the minister did not see fit to provide an advance copy of his statement until two or three minutes ago. First of all, in respect of his concluding remarks about having the matter debated in the House of Commons may I say that the fact the government is not willing to place this matter before us does not surprise me. They never would have placed the present arrangement before the Canadian people except for moves by a number of members in the House of Commons in the last couple of days.

As far back as 1963 the Canadian government started talking about imposing a 12-mile limit, called a territorial sea, and baselines drawn from headland to headland on the Atlantic coast. Recently we have had the application of the 12-mile limit and more recently have had the Gulf of St. Lawrence closed off as a completely exclusive Canadian fishing zone.

Hon. members have heard from day to day for the past year from the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp), every time we have raised questions about conservation problems on the Atlantic coast, about the great achievement of having made the gulf an exclusive, Canadian fishing zone a body of water that is completely Canadian. Now we have received the treaty between Canada and Norway which trades off the rights of the sealers on the northeast coast of Newfoundland in an

effort, the minister tells us, to phase Norway out of the Gulf of St. Lawrence in the next three years. I believe, if I read the exchange of notes correctly, it says that Norway must be out of there by 1975.

In order to do that we are establishing a principle which has never been agreed to by any nation since the seven years war when the defeated nation was forced to give up certain territorial rights. In order to do that we are permitting Norway to violate our territorial seas by nine miles on the northeastern coast of Newfoundland and to actually come within three miles of Canadian territory on the southern part of the northeastern coast of Newfoundland in Notre Dame Bay. This will mean that the Norwegian sealing fleet or any kind of vessel in part of Notre Dame Bay can actually be nine miles inside Canada's nearest land, Fogo Island, which is 12 miles off the coast. It means that the 5,000 people there who have engaged in the seal fishery will have to compete with the great Norwegian sealing fleet nine miles inward from their island.

The minister mentions that traditionally the seals are out to sea in international waters. We have asked the government of Canada if they would enforce the 12-mile limit which would prevent Norway from being encouraged to take the gamble of sending their fleet across the Atlantic because the minister knows well, if he knows anything about the sealing industry, that for many years the seals—this is why a special treaty was arranged—have come within the 12-mile limit and frequently right up to the shores of Canada. If the government of Canada were to enforce the 12-mile limit on Norway in regard to sealing it would make it impossible for Norway to take the gamble. They would have to stay home with their ships. In the last decade they have taken in excess of 100,000 seals a year. They are the biggest harvesters of seals in the world. This agreement would permit Canada to continue its harvest at the present quota and allow the herd to flourish and grow. This move is an anti-conservation move and a treacherous move toward the people on the Atlantic coast.

The fundamental question which has to be raised is what will we trade off to other nations that we are trying to get out of the Gulf of St. Lawrence? What are we going to trade off to these other nations that have no fishing rights in the gulf? What will we do with France in the matter of St. Pierre and Miquelon? What are we prepared to trade there? The government might revert to the time before the seven years war when it comes to that particular trading.

We have been encouraging the government for purposes of conservation to push our territorial sea beyond the 12-mile limit and to follow the lead of Iceland and other countries by extending our jurisdiction over marine resources. If we accept this agreement it will mean that no other move will be made by the government to extend our territorial seas to protect marine resources. This is a devastating precedent. The principle is fundamental for all Canadians and I feel that this action cannot be agreed to by Canada. The matter should be referred to Parliament and referred immediately to the Standing Committees on Fisheries and Forestry and External Affairs and National Defence. If the Canadian government has any interest in