

think they are too happy about that. I did not have the opportunity to go to all the hearings, but any that I went to were interesting and informative.

This is an important issue. We are waiting for Senator MacDonald's report. I know with his heart in Nova Scotia and his feet in Nova Scotia—in fact, he comes from Nova Scotia—that he will be thinking of Nova Scotia when he brings in that report. If he needs me to go and help him make a motion, and support it, to ensure that the CNR stays there and operates that rail, I will. As far as I know it is still profitable and they are simply trying to make some kind of excuse so that it appears not to be profitable.

**Senator Frith:** No, they admit that it is profitable. It is marginally profitable.

**Senator Bonnell:** "Marginally" means that it is profitable. There are a lot of margins right now and a lot of people going bankrupt because they have no margin of profit. But that rail spur is still marginally profitable. But if they can make it unprofitable so that they can get out of it gracefully they are likely to try to do so.

**Senator Frith:** Senator MacDonald will not let them get away with it.

**Senator Bonnell:** With those few remarks, honourable senators, I should like to wait until the full report comes in. Perhaps I will have a chance to debate this again when the report enters this chamber. Thank you very much.

On motion of Senator Corbin, debate adjourned.

## FISHERIES

### FOREIGN OVERFISHING—DEPLETION OF NORTHERN COD STOCKS—DEBATE ADJOURNED

**Hon. Jack Marshall** rose pursuant to notice of February 18, 1992:

That he will call the attention of the Senate to the report of the Standing Senate Committee on Fisheries: The Marketing of Fish in Canada "East Coast Fisheries", dated December 1989; and specifically as it relates to the recommendations applicable to the present state of the fish stocks due to foreign overfishing.

He said: Honourable senators, I rise to speak to this Inquiry because it will serve to emphasize the warnings the committee heard back in 1987. We heard then from witnesses who gave evidence of the very issue which is so unsettling and critical today. I refer to foreign overfishing and the action of the government, which was forced to reduce the quotas for Canadian fishermen by 35 per cent. They are down from 185,000 tonnes to 120,000 tonnes.

Certainly, honourable senators, the state of the fisheries should be no more alarming today than it has been for the past many years. Indeed, the gradual and continuing reduction of stocks by foreign overfishing and the serious state of the fisheries in the seventies and even before prompted Canada to

extend its jurisdiction to 200 miles back in 1977, some 15 years ago.

I think it should be noted that the declaration of extended jurisdictions, which everyone was lead to believe would solve all the problems of fisheries, created other problems; namely, two boundary disputes—one with the United States in the Georges Bank-Gulf of Maine area which was resolved by reference to the International Court of Justice in The Hague in 1984 and one with France which claims a 200-mile economic zone around the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon off the southern coast of Newfoundland. This last issue is one that seems to have been largely unforeseen in 1977, but one which has since become an ongoing irritant for all concerned and as yet is unsettled.

• (1630)

A study in 1988-89 showed the need for a reduction in fishing in area 3PS in order to rebuild and stabilize cod stocks because of uncontrolled harvesting by the St. Pierre and French metropolitan dragger fleets. The committee was told that France may have exceeded by four times its assigned quota in the zone 3PS, a particularly critical area to Newfoundland inshore fishermen which has not been mentioned since. I intend to deal with the St. Pierre and Miquelon issue separately at a later date. At that time, I will describe my visit to that area in 1976, and relate some very revealing stories as a result of that visit.

Dealing with the northern cod issue, on March 5, 1987, Mr. Ron Bulmer gave evidence before the committee. He was then president of the Fisheries Council of Canada, which represents some 182 corporate entities in the fisheries with a membership that includes seven provincial organizations. Certainly, it is one of the most responsible fisheries groups in Canada. Mr. Bulmer said this while giving evidence before the committee:

This problem of overfishing has reached that kind of priority level where the government and other ministers must support the Minister of Fisheries. Let's get this problem broadly aired, let us make the senior members of government external affairs, finance and the Prime Minister himself absolutely aware of it, and let us get it on the list of objectives so that every time they are meeting with France, Brussels, South Korea or even Washington, fish is not a nonissue in those discussions.

I repeat, that was five years ago. On May 24, 1988, another witness, a hard-working and industrious fisherman, offered these words to the committee:

We fishermen are not too familiar with all this foreign policy stuff, but I am sure that we could rattle some cages if Canada had the political will to do so.

Honourable senators, I do not restrict those remarks to any particular government.

The President of the Fisheries Council, Mr. Ron Bulmer, told us—not only the committee but certainly the Government of Canada and everybody that would listen in North America—more about the state of the fisheries as reflected in a paper they produced entitled, "Foreign Overfishing: A Strate-