

Oral Questions

matter of days. I might tell the hon. member that in some cases a decrease will take place for conservation reasons and in other cases there will be an increase.

May I say in relation to the comment from the hon. member for St. John's East, that we have traded away nothing.

Mr. McGrath: You have given it away.

Mr. Crouse: I have one brief supplementary question for the minister. In view of the fact that in the near future representatives of the fishing industry will be meeting in Ottawa with the minister and with a panel of cabinet ministers to discuss a food strategy for Canada, at which time there will most likely be a discussion on the underutilized species and stocks presently being caught by foreign fleets within our 200 mile zone, will the minister indicate whether he has any plan for the Canadian industry to harvest these stocks, thereby providing employment opportunities for Canadians at sea and in processing plants offshore?

Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent): Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have plans. Not only do we have plans but we have realized them. This year we supported industry ventures into this area. In fact, we were associated with the most successful, the one that has discovered shrimp stocks in northern Newfoundland waters, and we are assessing the size of this stock. We also went into a joint arrangement with Canadian and foreign companies' vessels to take and to market some of the squid products off our shore. But I might remind the hon. member that if we want to have access to some of the markets to which we presently do not have access, surely we should not completely close the zone to foreign fishing fleets.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS**URANIUM EXPORTS—POSSIBILITY OF AGREEMENT ON SAFEGUARDS**

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs in relation to the answer he gave a few moments ago. I am sure the minister is aware that he worries some members of the House when he talks about some provisions of Canada's safeguards being eliminated in respect of these discussions with ECC which have not yet been finalized. I am not asking him now about the proposals still under negotiation. I am asking him to indicate to the House as briefly as he can which items have been eliminated in respect of Canada's safeguards.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Perhaps I used the word "eliminated" inadvertently. What I meant was that they had been resolved satisfactorily between the two parties. We had come to an agreement with regard to such questions as technological transfers and some others of an immensely complex technical nature which I would not be able to articulate meaningfully—I do not know

[Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent).]

about the hon. member—without the paper in front of me. Those were the matters which, when I used the word "eliminated" I meant we narrowed down to areas of continuing discussions while others have been agreed upon. I can tell the hon. member that the fundamental question which still remains to be resolved regards the conditions under which we would resume shipments for an interim period while INFCEP studies are going into full fuel cycle evaluation.

● (1502)

This is the issue. As I think the hon. member knows, the Europeans are asking for an interim arrangement of limited duration, and we are seeking to find a means through which we might be able to do that without closing the door to the outcome of the INFCEP negotiations or indeed backing off from the fundamental principles of our nuclear export policy.

ISRAEL—POSSIBLE CHANGE OF POSITION ON RIGHT TO OCCUPIED TERRITORY

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the honourable and lucid Secretary of State for External Affairs. Noting that at the United Nations General Assembly last week Canada voted with Israel, the United States, El Salvador and no one else against a motion condemning continued Israeli occupation of the territory of other sovereign states and considering that we voted with the vast majority on October 28 opposing Israeli settlements in occupied lands, can the minister advise if this latest vote represents a change in Canadian policy and, if so, why such a change occurred and if it is now the view of the Canadian government that we should legitimize the right of military conquest?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker, there is no change of policy. In so far as the vote against the resolution was concerned it was done basically on two premises, the first being that the resolution called for withdrawal from all occupied territories. We have always taken the position that the English text referring to occupied territory was the appropriate one in this case. Second, of course, it called for recognition in a certain context of the Palestine Liberation Organization which, once again, we have not as Canadian policy designated or acknowledged as being the so-called rightful spokesman for the Palestinians. There has been no change of policy, but there has been a growing irritation, quite frankly, on my part at what I regard as these rather senseless United Nations resolutions at this time which are doing nothing to advance the goal and the main objective which is, of course, to get the parties to Geneva.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!