

Canada-U.S. Fishing Agreement

do not believe a precedent should be established for the consideration of an amendment of this kind. I am saying this *ex post facto*. I realize that if there had been real objection, and I had wanted to hear arguments for or against the bill from a procedural aspect, the matter should have been raised before. I do think the objections should be mentioned now, however, so that this form of amendment will not be used as a precedent should a similar situation arise later.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**EXTERNAL AFFAIRS****CANADA-U.S.—TABLING OF AGREEMENT ON
RECIPROCAL FISHING PRIVILEGES**

Mr. Speaker: I understand the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) would

like the unanimous consent of the House to return to Motions for the purpose of tabling a document. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the other day I promised I would table a copy of the agreement between the government of Canada and the government of the United States of America on reciprocal fishing privileges in certain areas off the coasts of the two countries. This agreement was signed this afternoon, and since a public announcement is to be made I thought it would be only courteous to seek the first opportunity to table it in the House.

On motion of Mr. Cadieux (Labelle) the House adjourned at 3.40 p.m.
