

*Oral Questions*

be filled by Canadians, foreign workers will not be given work visas or permits to come into the country.

\* \* \*

**FISHERIES****ENFORCEMENT OF 200-MILE LIMIT**

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment and is supplementary to the question asked by my colleague, the hon. member for South Shore. Given the fact that by international treaty we already have mineral rights to the continental shelf, and that the continental shelf—and hence the Grand Banks—exceeds the 200-mile limit by certainly over 300 miles in places, is the minister prepared to use the substantial clout he has by virtue of his licensing authority within the 200-mile limit and the port facilities which we are now prepared to make available to foreign fleets to enforce quotas on our continental shelf? Failing this, is the government prepared to consider imposing the same jurisdiction on our continental shelf that we now have on the 200-mile limit?

**Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries and the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I am not an international lawyer but I think that the two issues, the question of mineral rights and the question of living resources, are quite separate. It is obvious—I think this is recognized by serious fishing countries—that there should be a regime of international co-operation in which stocks which move in and out of the 200-mile zone are managed as a unit and not fought over as they move in or out of the zone.

That would be a preferable system, and there is broad acceptance of the principle that Canada has a special interest outside the 200-mile zone. This is reflected in some bilateral agreements we have with at least five nations which have traditionally fished off Canadian shores. There is one difficulty: the European Economic Community finds it difficult to agree with that clause, but that will be the subject of further negotiation. I will certainly tie permits to access to the Canadian zone to behaviour outside the Canadian zone, because I think that is one of the strongest cards we have to play.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. There are two outstanding questions of privilege. One was raised by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield) yesterday, and I indicated I would hear argument today. However, before doing that, the hon. member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) has given me notice of a question of privilege and also indicated that he may want to reserve argument to another day.

[Mr. Cullen.]

**PRIVILEGE****MR. HUNTINGTON—LEGAL PROCEEDINGS LAUNCHED BY VANCOUVER BRANCH OF CUPW**

**Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano):** Mr. Speaker, I just returned from my riding last evening, so this is the first opportunity I have had to raise in this House what I believe to be a serious matter. In my opinion this matter involves an attempt to intimidate a member and to inflict pecuniary loss on a member through the use of the judicial process.

It involves a dispute which Mr. Whitaker, the president of the Vancouver local of CUPW, believes he has with me as a result of statements I made on May 5, 1977, before the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. There was an interview subsequent to those statements on May 6. On April 17 of this year I received a statement of claim from the solicitors for CUPW. I have been in my riding for almost a week. The writ was issued back in July of 1977, on the original statement made in May of 1977.

I have discussed this with research personnel here, and I am told that the matter is serious enough to deserve serious research on the part of the research branch of the Library of Parliament. Therefore, I seek Your Honour's permission to guard my question of privilege by raising the matter after it has been properly researched, on Monday or Tuesday of next week.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member has given notice, and requests time to research the matter before delivering argument. I see no problem.

**MR. STANFIELD—SURVEILLANCE OF CANDIDATES SEEKING PUBLIC OFFICE**

**Hon. J.-J. Blais (Solicitor General):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the motion introduced yesterday in this House by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield) on a question of privilege.

I have given serious attention to the hon. member's concerns because, in my view, they express the feelings of hon. members on all sides of the House not only as they relate to privileges of members but also as they relate to the cherished democratic process which brings them here. In a democratic society such as ours, where freedom prevails and where freedom is dependent upon the electoral process, we should not suffer from any interference which would either enhance or hamper the efforts of candidates seeking office.

Following the publication of the article which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* on Wednesday, April 26, some hon. members of this House may have been led to believe that there could be surveillance of candidates, which might be construed as interference, or that the RCMP may have been involved in surveillance activities in the past and again more recently, contrary to guidelines issued by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in 1975, and contrary to assurances given by the Prime Minister to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) to the effect that no member of this House has been the subject