

*Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act*

**Mr. Comeau:** We supported it.

would be part of the bill at this point, but it is not. Despite that fact I want to make it clear that we are giving full support to the bill as far as it goes. We hope it will further the cause of protecting and enhancing the fisheries of Canada.

The hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) has just said that the present act is operative. In my previous remarks I pointed to some of the deficiencies in the 1964 act. I said that the jurisdiction which it asserts has been respected and has in fact been enforced. I am more familiar with the situation on the Pacific coast than that on the Atlantic coast. I can recall various reports made to the House by Ministers of Fisheries in answer to questions about excursions by other nations into our declared fishing zones. They said they had respected our laws and in fact had been prosecuted on a few occasions for infractions.

I remind the House, and in particular the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Whelan), who is the only representative of that department here tonight, that when asked a question as to when the closing lines proposed in the bill would come into force if this legislation is passed, authorizing them to be proclaimed by the Governor in Council, the Minister of Fisheries said "within days." I hope that once this bill has received royal assent the commitment of the minister will be borne out.

I wish to make one or two comments on the remarks of spokesmen of the official opposition. I have always been ready and willing to give full marks to the efforts that were made on the international convention on the Law of the Sea by the then Conservative administration, and to the imagination and initiative displayed by Hon. Howard Green when he was Secretary of State for External Affairs. When talking about international negotiations, some of the problems outlined by the hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse) resulted from the failure of international negotiations in certain respects, particularly those related to fishing zones at the international convention on the Law of the Sea in 1960. Members of the official opposition outlined the sad state of affairs. What they say is true. However, I have listened in vain for them to come forward with any concrete proposal as an alternative. A short time ago I put an amendment before the House. For their own reasons, the official opposition did not see fit to support it.

**Mr. Barnett:** I did not hear any yeas from that part of the House, Mr. Speaker. If I am mistaken, I withdraw those remarks. My impression was that my amendment did not have the support of the official opposition. However, if knowledgeable members say it had, I am very happy to know that. In listening to the remarks of the hon. member for South Shore it did not appear that he supported the concepts I was putting forward as to the necessity of the Canadian Parliament taking declaratory action. Be that as it may, I hope the time is not far off when there will be another international conference on the Law of the Sea. Perhaps some of the ideas discussed at the various stages of this bill will receive international blessing at such a conference.

I notice that Your Honour is eyeing the clock. I have concluded my remarks. I wish to say we support the bill at third reading stage.

**Mr. McGrath:** Mr. Speaker, if the House will give unanimous consent to a few minutes' overtime, I wish to make a few remarks on the bill.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is not clear to the Chair whether there is agreement.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Mr. Speaker, when the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) introduced this bill he had quite a lot to say about the treaties and traditional rights of certain countries that were involved in fishing activities off the east coast of Canada. He referred to these countries by name. They have already been referred to by my two colleagues who spoke earlier in the debate. They are Britain, Norway, Denmark, France, Spain and Italy.

I was interested in the comment of the minister with respect to the treaty rights of the United States and France. The minister said, as reported at page 6017 of *Hansard* for April 17:

Apart from traditional fishing practices, the United States and France also have certain treaty rights off Canada's east coast, and these rights will of course be respected.

Why should Canada respect a treaty that was negotiated by a foreign power—in this case Great Britain—in 1713, before Canada