

S.O. 29

right to harvest and manage the fishing resource of Canada for the betterment of all Canadians.

**Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton—Charlotte):** Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that Members of the House should have a careless disregard for the truth as they speak and present their cases to a national television audience, they hope, and certainly to all Atlantic fishermen in the area. I do not believe that a Party should suggest that a debate go beyond midnight and then evacuate the House. I think that is a fair statement to make and I hope someone in the fishing community of Atlantic Canada is aware that that is what has happened. It is a farcical motion to move if one is not prepared to support it. Obviously the Liberal Party was not prepared to support its suggestion for an all-night debate. Where are they?

I listened to the Hon. Member for Egmont (Mr. Henderson) and I must say that in all the speeches I have heard in the House since I came here in 1972, I have never heard a more careless disregard for facts as I did while he presented his case to Canada and the Canadian fishing industry. I wish to address that.

The Hon. Member mentioned surveillance. It was a Liberal Government that made a deal with France that in the disputed area, we would not have surveillance over their boats for the amount of catch they took and they in turn would not have surveillance over ours. That was the Liberal deal with France. The difference was that the Canadian boats that fished within that territory landed at Canadian points and were subject to Canadian quotas. They could not catch beyond that limit. There was no such condition imposed upon the French fleet. They could catch to their heart's content and we had no rights or privileges to surveillance, examination or to board them because we surrendered those rights under a Liberal Government.

If the fishery policy of the former Government was so good, why was the Minister not re-elected to the House of Commons? He was defeated in a fishing community. Following the political map throughout the Gaspé, the Gulf, down the East Coast of New Brunswick, into Nova Scotia and over to Newfoundland, how did it happen that the Liberals lost so many seats to the Conservative Party. If the Liberal policy was so good, why did this happen? Not one former Liberal Fisheries Minister now sits in this House. Two of them had to seek haven in the other place and the third was defeated. One cannot speak very well for one's Party when that is the history of its Ministers.

Hon. Members spoke about surveillance. The Fisheries Committee, including the Hon. Member for Gander—Twillingate (Mr. Baker) and later the Hon. Member for Egmont, heard Conservative Members emphasize surveillance meeting after meeting. When we pointed out that the herring quota within our own waters had probably been exceeded threefold because of a lack of surveillance, we were mocked. The fact is that those on the coast of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, P.E.I. or the Gulf knew that the quota of herring was

being caught threefold and surveillance was not part of the program.

A member of the crew of one of the boats that was supposed to be on surveillance duty in the North Atlantic came before members of our committee and said: "I have been afloat all summer in a fisheries boat which is supposed to be surveilling the catch of the foreign fleets. We have never seen a foreign boat pull its gear from the water so that we could examine what was in that catch. We have never seen a foreign boat come to the mother ship and unload its catch. We have never been permitted to go into a hold of a Russian factory ship to see what was in it". That is the surveillance to which the Hon. Member for Egmont referred. That was a mockery of surveillance.

When surveillance was discussed in committees, I can remember the Hon. Member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse) saying repeatedly that within our 200-mile limit, it looked like a city at sea because there were so many lights from the factory boats and their suppliers. Yet, as we were told, we never saw a boat haul in its gear or unload onto the factory ship and we never got into the hold of a boat. The Hon. Member for Egmont says we were doing the surveillance. Then, on top of that, they abandoned surveillance in the disputed territory except for Canadian boats.

• (0120)

The Hon. Member also mentioned the duty on fish. I believe the Hon. Member for Gander—Twillingate and the Hon. Member for Egmont were on that committee. We had to deal with a very difficult situation in our trade with the U.S. It was pointed out repeatedly that if we established a government-supported company in the fish processing industry we would unavoidably be subject to duty by the U.S. There was no way we could get the Liberal Government of the day to do anything but establish a subsidized company. Yes, duty was applied and the Hon. Member for Egmont says that is all the fault of this Government. That is just another one of the deceptive statements made in this House and we and the people of Canada deserve an apology.

I am sure that viewers did not get a different impression of the statement of the Hon. Member for Egmont than I did. He said the nose and tail of the bank were surrendered by this Government. The facts are that in the negotiations at the Law of the Sea Conference and in the establishment of the 200-mile limit, Canada dropped its right to the ownership of the resource in the coastal waters and under the sea bed. That treaty was approved by coastal states about 30 years ago. The only nation which supported Canada on the 200-mile limit issue was India. They were mad at us because they have a 600-mile coastal shelf and they could not afford, they felt, to surrender any of their rights in that shelf in view of the Coastal Nations Treaty. However, we put it on the table and that is where the fishing privileges on the nose and tail of the bank went down the tube before we even negotiated anything.