

Bretton Woods Agreements Act

of Premier Bennett in British Columbia. There we see a philosophical rigidity, a fixation on a restraint program. I fear for British Columbia when this federal Government and the effects of its philosophical fixation on restraint are joined with those of Bennett in British Columbia. We will rue the day that either one of these Governments was elected.

This is not just a question of the Conservatives and Socreds making a horrendous mess of the country. We are allowing them to sell out the independence of this nation, and that cannot continue. The one encouraging thing is that the Committee for an Independent Canada is beginning to form again. This time it will have strength, and the Conservative Party and its attempts to sell out Canada's sovereignty in a political and economic sense will be the direct target of that agency. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I was just indicating the number of minutes the Hon. member has left. The Hon. Member still has the floor.

Mr. Skelly: Mr. Speaker, I always appreciate the assistance of the Chair and recognize what a magnificent job is being done.

Some Hon. Members: More.

Mr. Skelly: It is a great help to all Members in here.

The salmon treaty, Mr. Speaker, was an interesting example of how this Government was in an incredible rush to sell the country out. In the old days we allowed American jurisdiction over about one third of the coast of British Columbia. We sat on a joint committee with them. For the privilege of doing so, and a few other minor things, they could take half of a certain species of fish which went into the Fraser River. This meant millions of dollars a year free. They could also help in the management of our fishing territories and we would have to go along with them. That was an erosion of sovereignty which took place years ago. In fact, it may have been done under a Conservative Government, I would have to check my book.

What the Conservatives propose now is that instead of controlling a third of the coast of British Columbia the Americans now shall have jurisdiction over the whole coast of British Columbia; the whole fishing plan, and that is an enormous erosion of sovereignty. Canadians were hung out to dry by that treaty because, in the haste to get something together to give to President Reagan when the Prime Minister meets with him in Quebec City this weekend, the Prime Minister insisted this treaty go ahead, no matter what shape it was in. As time went by we found out that this important treaty, this complete erosion of the sovereignty over an important Canadian resource on the West Coast, went through Cabinet in 30 minutes. I wonder if the Minister of Transport even bothered to read the document or became informed on it. Can he confirm today that it went through Cabinet in 30 minutes and that the Prime Minister never even read the document?

It was indicated in the media that the Government knew there were very serious problems with the treaty, but the

Prime Minister wanted it very, very badly. What kind of a Government is this? It is one that does not care about Canadian sovereignty. It is prepared to take the welcome mat, roll it over and turn Canada into a door mat. I suggest that this Bill is another example of that attitude, and we should examine it very clearly for its Canadian sovereignty implications. The Conservative Party's contempt for Parliament is such that I do not think that we can defend against these continued erosions of sovereignty.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Are there questions or comments on the Hon. Member's speech?

Mr. Crosby: Mr. Speaker, in offering a comment on the speech of the Member for Comox-Powell River (Mr. Skelly) I won't complain that he failed to deal with the matter of the—

Mr. Skelly: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Do I have to accept a comment from a person who is politically biased?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Halifax West (Mr. Crosby).

Mr. Crosby: I don't admit to political bias ordinarily, but in the case of the Member for Comox-Powell River I'm only too pleased to say that I'm biased, not so much against him but what he and his Party stand for, and that's why I'll begin by offering not to complain about the fact he didn't deal with the International Monetary Fund and its threat to its stability caused by national debts across the world, but particularly in Canada, and the need for deficit reduction, I won't complain that he didn't deal with those things. But I will complain that the thrust of his speech was to complain about the Member for Cochrane-Superior (Mr. Penner) who made one of the better speeches I've heard in the House of Commons. He complained that he was sounding like a Tory. How is that for political bias? The Members of the New Democratic Party, those armchair socialists who purport to represent a political element in Canada, cannot get it through their heads that there is no philosophy of politics that demands debt reduction. There is a will on the part of the Canadian people to demand financial responsibility of the Government. That is what the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada is responding to. My colleague from Cochrane-Superior was responding to the need and desire of the Canadian people for financial responsibility in government. I would like to tell the Member for Cochrane-Superior and the Members of the New Democratic Party, those armchair socialists of which I speak—

● (1710)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order please. I think the Hon. Member is addressing his comments to the speech of the Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River (Mr. Skelly). I would hope the Hon. Member would address his remarks to that particular speech.

Mr. Crosby: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I really was addressing my remarks to you. I want you to tell that armchair socialist from Cochrane-Superior that we can best aid the