

Supply

tists?" Then we overcame that because we brought all the scientists together. The NAFO or the EC scientists do not disagree with our scientists. Then they have other objections. The Portuguese say: "We have fished there for hundreds of years and now you are not letting us fish there." The industry seems to take the attitude that: "Look, Canada has this huge zone out there. You are greedy-guts Canadians. You have this huge area of millions of square miles or kilometres or whatever you want to call it out there, and now you want to control the fishery of the whole northwest Atlantic and chase us out of there. We have been chased out of other parts of the world. Now are we no longer to be allowed to fish as we like? You are trying to save all the fish for yourselves."

• (1130)

So they are very suspicious of us and the Spaniards are the same. They get driven out of Namibia. Namibia extended a 200-mile limit down there and stopped them fishing there. The next thing we had six or seven boats formerly fishing Namibia now off the northwest Atlantic, 147 of them last year.

Our problem, by the way, and I want to appeal to the member for Gander—Grand Falls to straighten up his thinking on this, is not foreign fishing within the 200-mile limit because that is under absolute control. We know exactly what they are doing when they are in there. We have fees that we charge them so we know exactly what they are catching. It is outside.

These are the kinds of answers we have received from them. The latest rumour I heard that had been planted down in the UN was a suggestion by the EC that we were not listening to our scientists, that the problem was caused by our not listening to our own scientists. They are seizing on the Cabot Martin theory or whatever.

In other words, it is my fault, I should have eliminated the whole TAC for northern cod, but I am not doing that or I did not do what the scientists said we should do two or three years ago. So this whole crisis is our fault and not their fault for catching fish when they have no quota. It is ours for not listening to the scientists. So they have all kinds of excuses that they give.

Now maybe we need somebody with the flair of the hon. gentleman. In fact, we have to pursue more

involvement of the opposition, but somebody with the hon. gentleman's flair to take hold of this issue and propel it in non-governmental ranks for us.

Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast): Mr. Speaker, I thought it was amusing the comparison of the minister with Sylvester Stallone. I think that one of the points in common is that neither one will ever be accused of overestimating the intelligence of their listeners.

Will the minister tell us why the government has not ratified the convention on the Law of the Sea? When he was going on about highly unusual two questions ago, does he not think the situation is highly unusual? Does he not think it deserves some special measures, some other than weak-wristed government? Does he not think that it deserves a bit of vigour in the backbone of the minister of fisheries of this country?

Mr. Crosbie: Mr. Speaker, I can say that in one particular case I have overestimated the intelligence of an hon. member, the hon. member who just spoke. What do these questions add to this discussion at all? The weak-wristed action of the government. Where is the weak-wristed action?

All kinds of actions have been taken by the government. Is the hon. member advocating some kind of war-like action or bellicosity of that nature?

Is it weak-wristed to try to use diplomacy in all its forms or the UN or UN conferences or non-governmental bodies to try to achieve our objectives? What a silly, jejune, imbecilic statement by the hon. crosser of the floor. I would not doubt that he would even double-cross the floor if he had a chance.

Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls): Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister, a couple of moments ago, referred to me and he said that I had to get my thinking straight, on these licences inside to foreign nations. I heard the minister on the speaker system in there a few moments ago as I was coming into the hall. The speaker system certainly does bring up the volume of the hon. gentleman's voice, but it certainly does not do anything for the idea behind what he is saying.