

out another sell-out of Canadian fishing interests. The Canada-U.S. salmon treaty for the Pacific coast was rushed through so that the Prime Minister and Ronald Reagan could sign it at the Shamrock Summit. The Prime Minister's boys were very concerned that they not be outdone by this second-rate show business President from the United States, so they went to great, elaborate lengths to present this grand finale where the Prime Minister and the President sang *When Irish Eyes Were Smiling*. We paid a tremendous price for that PR coup they were able to engineer.

We can look at the latest Summit where the Prime Minister went to Washington and spoke to a joint session of Congress. He got absolutely nothing in terms of the important agenda items concerning Canadians. He got nothing in terms of acid rain but he did get his photo op.

In our relationship with France, we saw that the Prime Minister's refusal to stand up to France on the boundary dispute with St. Pierre and Miquelon was directly related to his desire to have good relations with France for the August meeting of *la francophonie* last year. While it is desirable to have good relations with France and it is a desirable goal to even have photo opportunities, surely there are other goals and issues that are more basic in terms of foreign policy, including standing up for Canadian interests, for the rights of Canadian fishermen and standing up for a decent environment that would not be polluted by acid rain. Those interests have been sacrificed to the photo op.

Last spring we saw the Newfoundland Government dealt out of the talks with France over the disputed zone because the Prime Minister wanted to have a deal with France that would look advantageous to him even though it sacrificed the interests of the Newfoundland fishery.

If the Prime Minister is that interested in a photo opportunity, perhaps it could have been helpful if he was in St. Pierre yesterday afternoon to be on the dock when the French naval tug came in, towing the *Maritimer*. He could have seen where his policies have lead and could have had his picture taken, greeting these Canadian fishermen who were only doing their job. He could have been greeting them, after they had been arrested in violation of an agreement because Canada does not have the gumption to stand up to France.

Unfortunately, there will soon be another economic summit at which there will be more photo opportunities. One can presume that this will probably inhibit the Prime Minister from speaking out on this and a number of other issues. I suggest that the Prime Minister may want to see a doctor to help him get rid of some of these inhibitions. He is very inhibited when it comes to speaking out.

We must take seriously the fact that the 65-foot Canadian fishing vessel, the *Maritimer*, was arrested by the French Government. This action should be condemned by the Canadian Government but rather than condemning it, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) is quoted as saying in a CP story: "It is a very strange incident and we

Supply

want to get more details before we take any further dramatic action". The story goes on to say: "Clark said the French insist the privately owned *Maritimer* out of Fortune, Newfoundland was not arrested but was invited to port".

Mr. Speaker, if someone invited you that way, would you go? What would have happened if the invitation was declined? What would have happened to those fishermen if they did not want to go? Perhaps if there had been a Canadian presence there the invitation could have been turned down successfully. However, as it was, the strength of the invitation was such that a tow line was attached and they were towed into port. Yet the Government seems to accept the fact that it was an invitation.

Rather than condemning it, the Secretary of State says that it is a very strange kind of incident. The only action we have taken is to temporarily suspend the talks that were to take place later this month between Canadian and French negotiators on some kind of non-binding mediation process to provide the French with a secure quota of fish. We have stopped the give-away process of the negotiations. That is all that has happened.

The *Croix de Lorraine* was seized by Canadian authorities for fishing not in the disputed 3PS zone but in Canadian waters. There was a direct violation of Canadian sovereignty in Canadian territorial waters. In 1987 we banned French fishing efforts in Canadian waters. The *Croix de Lorraine* incident was a deliberate act of provocation and one that was designed as a media event by the French. That is why there were French politicians on board.

Indeed, there is no relation between the arrest of the *Croix de Lorraine* and its crew and the accompanying celebrities with the arrest of this working fishing vessel, the *Maritimer*. The only relation is the exigencies of French politics. I suppose the Government is hoping that once the French run-off Presidential election takes place in three days this whole situation can die down and the Chirac attack will be over. I hope that it will be over also. But the point is, why do we stand for these insults? Why do we allow Canadian interests to become tools in French presidential politics? Why do we not have the gumption to stand up for our own interests at a time like this?

• (1230)

Incredibly, only 13 days after the arrest of the *Croix de Lorraine* on April 28, 1988, the Canadian Government reached an agreement with the French "on a non-binding mediation procedure to assist in resolving the Canada-France fishing quota dispute". It is a quota dispute, according to this agreement. It is not a boundary dispute. The agreement does not mention anything about how the boundary dispute is going to be resolved. It is a quota dispute. It is something that is going to give the French a quota to fish in Canadian waters. It is not something that is going to solve the boundary dispute between Newfoundland and St. Pierre and Miquelon. Providing the French, whether they are from St. Pierre and Miquelon