

It was announced that Canada and France have agreed that the dispute be submitted for binding settlement by an international judicial tribunal subject to the negotiation of a treaty before the end of 1987. What is this negotiation of a treaty before the end of 1987? It is negotiation on the composition of the tribunal and its terms of reference. If they can get that settled, the negotiations will possibly start by March 15, 1987. Canada and France have also undertaken to negotiate before 1987 interim fisheries arrangements for French vessels in Canadian waters for the years 1988-91. It is not only this they are giving away, but they are starting to negotiate an agreement on something from 1988 to 1991, if they can get an agreement to negotiate. It is very confusing, extremely confusing. There is a paragraph at the very bottom of page 1 of this fancy news release from the Government of Canada and the two Ministers. They are the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Siddon). It states:

● (2300)

The two Ministers noted that solid scientific information is the first step toward resolving the overfishing problem.

I ask Hon. Members if they have ever heard anything as silly as that? They have already said that the French have been overfishing by something in the order of 20,000 tonnes. They have been overfishing the quota that was set by the scientists.

On page 2 of this document it states:

The rights of vessels from Metropolitan France to fish in the Gulf of St. Lawrence expired in May 1986 under the provisions of the 1972 Canada/France Fisheries Treaty.

This is the treaty that was signed by the Liberal Government. But it expired in 1986. So what are they talking about? Up until 1985 there had been no overfishing. We know the reason why there was no overfishing. It is because we used to board the vessels. We used to protect our fishery.

On this very subject I would like to quote a question to the then Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Hon. Mark MacGuigan, as reported in *Hansard* for March 23, 1982, at page 15719. This was a question asked by the Hon. Member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse) who is still a Member here, at least for the time being. He asked:

Madam Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I would like to ask the Minister what transpired between Canada and France while two French trawlers were hiding out in St. Pierre following orders from Canadian fisheries authorities to report to St. John's, Newfoundland, for alleged violations of our Canadian Fisheries Protection Act. Will the Minister table copies of the diplomatic exchange which took place between our two countries?

The Minister replied:

Madam Speaker, on Sunday, March 14, Canadian fisheries officers boarded two French fishing vessels in Canadian waters off the coast of Newfoundland and found that their log books had underreported their catches. The vessels initially refused to comply with orders to report to a Canadian port for inspection. Instead, they went to St. Pierre.

Following representations to the French authorities, the vessels proceeded to Halifax where charges are in the process of being laid.

S.O. 29

In other words, this was a Government which knew how to negotiate.

Mr. Crosbie: You turkeys, you were the ones who got us into this problem.

Mr. Henderson: Do you know why it knew how to negotiate, Mr. Speaker? Because it negotiated from a position of strength. It was not a weak-kneed Government like this Government.

Mr. Crosbie: You turkeys got us into this.

Mr. Henderson: Yet this Government says that we should give the nose of Grand Banks to the Americans. My colleague, the Hon. Member for Gander—Twillingate (Mr. Baker), so eloquently spelled that out earlier this evening.

Mr. Crosbie: That is the first time that he has ever spoken up. Where was he in 1984? Where was he in 1972?

Mr. Henderson: The Government says give everything else to the French, or to the Americans. With respect to the softwood lumber it has said: "Give it to them. Give it to them". With respect to excise tax and codfish, I remember asking the present Minister of Transport (Mr. Crosbie) when he was the acting Minister of Fisheries if he would intervene and have the Prime Minister intervene in the great Shamrock Summit so that the United States would start to listen and not impose a duty. Oh yes, they would do everything at that Shamrock Summit. He said: "You can depend on the Prime Minister". What happened? On salt cod an 18 per cent duty was levied. That is the type of nonsense that is going on with the Government. Those are the kinds of negotiations it is entering into. It is no wonder that any country can come in and take our fish because the Government will not stand up to them. It immediately puts up the white flag.

A little bit further on in the press release from which I have been reading it states:

The French will also receive in 1987 fishing allocations in Canadian waters outside the Gulf in accordance with obligations under the 1972 Canada/France Treaty and under a separate fisheries treaty between Canada and the European Economic Community.

That is the treaty which expired in May, 1986. The press release goes on:

These allocations are included in the 1987 Atlantic Groundfish Management Plan and total approximately 15,600 tonnes of various species, the same as in 1986.

Let us take a look at what those species are. Let us take a look at what this quota entails. This is the quota that was given to the EEC and taken by the Germans up until last year. That is the same quota that was supposed to come back to our Canadian fisheries. In fact, it was supposed to come back to the fishermen of Newfoundland and Nova Scotia. That is what was given to France. Of course, 6,400 tonnes of cod was also included in the zone 3PS which Canada has established as a French quota for this stock. Mr. Speaker, did you ever hear the likes of it?