

*Coastal Fisheries Protection Act*

at lower cost than if the fleets had to send their fishing vessels and their supply vessels back home for these goods and services.

● (5:10 p.m.)

As I said, on the east coast we are vulnerable because they can drop into St. Pierre and Miquelon and obtain the same services they are now obtaining in Halifax and St. John's. However, I doubt very much if our inshore fishermen or our commercial fishermen are very interested or sympathetic so far as this trade is concerned.

**Mr. McGrath:** The minister doesn't know what he is talking about.

**Mr. Davis:** The position of some representatives of the Official Opposition is inconsistent in another way. They talk about driving the big Russian, Polish and East German fishing fleets away from our own fishing grounds, away from the grounds immediately off our coasts, away from our Canadian continental shelf. But at the same time they are pleading that we serve these fleets; that the costs of these fleets would be cut if they could be looked after at our east coast ports. They are inconsistent to this extent.

On the west coast the situation is clear. There are no alternative ports in the main body of United States or in Alaska, which will serve the large Russian fishing fleets. They have to send their vessels back home for repairs, servicing and supplies and therefore the additional power we are asking for in the amendment, that of being able to limit their access to Canadian ports for supplies, is useful. It will be useful in our bargaining with the U.S.S.R. and when we confront them with our problem of fisheries conservation on the west coast, as well as when we try to eliminate a tendency of theirs to raid our waters and wipe out whole fish stocks in important fishing areas. On the east coast, as I say, we have a problem because of the existence of St. Pierre and Miquelon.

**Mr. McGrath:** Why does the minister try to defend his policies in terms of conservation and conservation measures?

**Mr. Davis:** This has something to do with conservation in that by introducing this amendment we shall be able to bargain, and thereby conserve our fish stocks. In conclusion perhaps I should say a word about the proposed amendment. First of all, it is out of order because it does not deal with any clause of Bill C-134. Second, I think if passed it

[Mr. Davis.]

would be a retrograde step because it would tend to balkanize Canada. Many are critical of Quebec because it has wanted to talk exclusively on some occasions to other nations about a matter that comes under provincial jurisdiction in our constitution, that of education.

Yet here we have members of the Official Opposition who are prepared to turn over to the provinces the national power over fisheries.

They want to turn over to the provinces a power that under the British North America Act clearly and exclusively is a federal power. This is balkanization. This is a national power and not a provincial power, like education. Since I am opposed, as a matter of national interest, to a province's right to talk to other nations even on matters that come under provincial powers, I am doubly opposed to turning over to the provinces even broader powers that are within the federal realm.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davis:** The power over fisheries is exclusively a national power and it would be ridiculous in my view to turn it over to the provinces. Can you imagine what would happen? The Premier of Nova Scotia, or his minister of fisheries or external affairs would be talking to the Russians, the Poles or East Germans about whether he would allow their vessels to enter Halifax or other harbours in Nova Scotia and pick up supplies. That minister's policy might be different from that of the minister of external affairs—if you even made such a provincial minister—of an adjoining province, who might have a different policy with respect to foreign fishing fleets.

I think this is ridiculous. We are a nation because we stand together and because by standing together we win more influence in international affairs through having a common policy and following a common course of action. I say therefore, that the amendment is out of order, and second, that it is ridiculous from a Canadian point of view.

**Mr. McGrath:** It is the minister who is out of order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Before putting the question, which I intend to do, I would say a