

S.O. 29

responsibility to the people of Newfoundland for that resource. What have we done with it? We bargained it away. We frittered it away. We turned our back whenever there has been any kind of assault upon it. Newfoundland brought that resource into Canada and into Confederation and we have let it slip away.

One of the most amazing things I heard today was from the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans who said this decision was a unanimous decision by Cabinet. If it was unanimous, we have to ask where the people were who would speak up for Newfoundland? Who was speaking up for the Atlantic fishery? The Minister of Transport (Mr. Crosbie) is perhaps a bit unhappy about that statement, but it was made in this House and we will listen very closely to see what the Minister of Transport has to say about it. I suspect he missed the boat.

We want to emphasize the importance of law in solving problems. We all want to see this matter resolved in some international tribunal. But how do we get France to come to the table? The Minister believes the best way to kill a cat is to choke it with cream. He tried to bribe France.

Mr. Siddon: You would rather shoot them.

Mr. Manly: I do not think we need to shoot people but surely we can demand that other nations show us a little respect. We have done absolutely nothing since this Government has been in power to make other nations respect us; not the United States, not France, nor any other nation.

In conclusion, I would simply like to read some words of Douglas Johnston from his book entitled *Canada and the New International Law of the Sea*:

Canada is governed from the centre. The ocean is, literally, peripheral to the perceptions and concerns of Government. Most Canadian decision makers, indeed most Canadians, may view the ocean as a regional matter in the affairs of the state. Yet ocean policy is no less national in significance than agriculture or manufacturing.

Sadly, there is no guarantee that Canadians are ready to give the ocean a high priority on the national agenda. Our sentiments turn inward to the national centre.

The ocean should have high priority, and if it is going to have that high priority, it has to have some leadership from the Government. We have not received that from the Minister, nor from the Government. The people of Newfoundland and Atlantic Canada have had enough of this Government. They want to see some leadership. They want to see their resource protected and some future for themselves and for their families.

● (2130)

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, this is a most important topic to be discussed. Rather than deal with the half-truths and the specious comments that have been made to date, I want first to set the background. We are prisoners of our past.

What is the past that now governs what actions we can or cannot take in the matter of France, St. Pierre and Miquelon

and their claims of a 200-mile economic zone around St. Pierre and Miquelon territorial boundaries and the right—

Mr. Riis: Is it really a unanimous cabinet choice?

Mr. Crosbie: I do not want to be interrupted, Mr. Speaker, if you do not mind. I am speaking through you, Mr. Speaker, to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

On January 1, 1977, a 200-mile economic zone was declared by Canada, and accepted by most of the international community.

On March 27, 1972, a treaty was entered into between Canada and France to govern fishing relations between Canada and France in the waters of Canada. France has historic rights that date back to 1763, I think it is, and the Treaty of Paris. There was a Liberal administration in office at that time. As a matter of fact, when this treaty was entered into the Secretary of State for External Affairs was the Hon. Mitchell Sharp. Believe me, it is this treaty that is at the nub of the problem that Canada has today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: It was only at the end of 1986 that, finally, the French metropolitan fleet no longer had the right to send trawlers into the Gulf of St. Lawrence, our own internal waters, to catch fish under the terms of that treaty. France, today, or St. Pierre and Miquelon, still have the right to send in 10 trawlers to fish in the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

As a result of the ending of the rights of the metropolitan fleet of France, some 17,000 tonnes of fish will come back to Canada this year, fish which can be caught by our own fishermen. This treaty says nothing about quotas. It sets no quotas. But if Canada and France do not agree on the amount of fish to be caught under the treaty, then the French have the right to go to compulsory arbitration if they disagree with the amount allotted by Canada. That is their right under this treaty.

In addition, under the terms of this treaty the metropolitan fleet of France has unquantified rights—unquantified rights—in the Canadian 200-mile zone, in perpetuity, to take fish. If Canada does not allot France a quota then it has the right to go to compulsory arbitration under the terms of this 1972 treaty to have a quota assigned to it. This is a treaty which has no termination date. It is a treaty which was entered into by the Liberal administration of the Government of Canada in 1972, a treaty that will bind us forever, unless the two parties can agree together to terminate it. Under Article 10 of the treaty there is a dispute settlement procedure.

In addition to the agreement of 1972 which governs our situation, there is a long-term agreement with the European Economic Community entered into when? It was entered into in 1982, again under a Liberal administration of the Government of Canada. This agreement is in effect from 1982 until 1987. Under the terms of it the Liberal Government gave a quota to the European Economic Community of 9,500 tonnes