

*S. O. 21*

until this matter is resolved satisfactorily the mediation process. These are the steps we have taken.

**Ms. Copps:** That's disgusting.

**Mr. Crosbie:** We know that the Liberal Members are not interested in the facts. They are not interested in trying to help the fishermen of eastern Canada or of Newfoundland. They are only here to try to score cheap political points and to holler and call out and interject when someone else has the floor.

**Ms. Copps:** Methinks he doth protest too much.

**Mr. Crosbie:** I would like to put on the record the following facts so that there is no false feeling of sympathy on the part of any person in Canada in connection with the fishermen of St. Pierre and Miquelon. I would like to remind Hon. Members that there are 28,000 commercial fishermen in Newfoundland. There are only 176 fishermen in St. Pierre and Miquelon. In the period 1972 to 1985, the average groundfish landings in St. Pierre and Miquelon from within and without the disputed zone including the part not in dispute, 3PS, only approximated 6,250 metric tons per year. Yet they are looking now for something in the order of 50,000 metric tonnes per year and they have taken in excess of 26,000 tonnes in the disputed zone in the last several years.

We should note that in St. Pierre and Miquelon, cod landings in 1987, per fisherman, totalled 99 tonnes while, per fisherman on the South Coast of Newfoundland, the catch averaged only 10 tonnes. On a province-wide basis, each Newfoundland fishermen catches about 18 tonnes of fish of various species a year. The St. Pierre and Miquelon fishermen catch about 122 tonnes a year.

Let us not have anyone here in Canada feeling sorry for the poor fishermen of St. Pierre and Miquelon. We should feel sorry for them because they are represented by a Government that apparently does not consider their interest to be of the first priority as we do.

The fishermen we need to be concerned about are our own Canadian fishermen whose catches on average are much lower than the catches of the fishermen of St. Pierre and Miquelon. That is worth remembering when there are theatrical events such as the sending of a trawler with French politicians on board.

I suppose the next thing I would imagine the Liberal Caucus might do is send John Turner out in a 65-foot dragger off St. Pierre and Miquelon and challenge the French authority. That might solve their leadership problem right there.

We have here a motion that is completely misconceived. It is only designed to give the mover a chance to speak in the House in a theatrical manner. It is completely misplaced in trying to condemn the Government for the failure to protect the Canadian fishing industry while the record of the last four years shows the Government putting the Canadian fishing industry first, defending it, advancing its cause, hampered and

with our hands tied behind our backs, handcuffed by arrangements entered into by the previous Liberal Government and confirmed by the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) when he was the Prime Minister of Canada for those few brief weeks in the summer of 1984. There was an exchange of notes in July of 1984 dealing with the question of mutual restraint by both parties when their fishermen are fishing in the disputed area of 3PS.

We do not have to vote on this motion. It is a pity that we do not, because it is one of the most ill-conceived, weakest, most jejune of motions that has ever been put before the House. If there was ever a case of the pot calling the kettle black, it is this motion moved by the very people who, for the years from 1972 onward, did nothing to protect the Canadian fishing industry. They gave away our rights to the French, to the European Economic Community, to Germany, to Spain, to Portugal and to every other nation. They failed to take steps to adequately enforce the 200-mile limit, the various steps we have taken since which have improved the situation immeasurably.

**Mr. Tobin:** Why don't you read the dictionary for the next minute? You're afraid of a question.

**Mr. Crosbie:** I do not need to read the dictionary. Here are some of the steps we have taken. This is a tremendous document. The measures we have initiated include increased fines and the arming of patrol vessels. The Hon. Liberals opposite were afraid to do that. They did not arm patrol vessels.

There has been the placing of fishery observers on all foreign fishing vessels and greater aerial observation including the addition of a twin-engine helicopter to our surveillance capability. Yet we have this ridiculous, silly and in fact misleading and damaging resolution which should be changed so that the Secretary of State for External Affairs is congratulated by the House for the swift action he has taken.

● (1100)

I would urge all Hon. Members, if we have a vote, to throw this motion completely out of the House.

---

## STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[English]

### FISHERIES

#### CANADA-FRANCE DISPUTE—ARREST OF CANADIAN VESSEL BY FRENCH AUTHORITIES

**Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe):** Mr. Speaker, in my short time in Parliament I have never seen such a pathetic, weak, and spineless response to yet another insult not just to the people of Newfoundland, not just to the small boat fishermen in Newfoundland, Canada's poorest province, with the highest unemployment rate, but an insult to the