

Mr. Stanfield: I should think the Italians would be very happy with these safeguards, as they allow them to do virtually anything they like.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): No, Mr. Speaker, that is not correct.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SALE OF CANDU REACTOR TO ARGENTINA—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF CONTRACT CONTAINING PROVISION FOR SUBSEQUENT NEGOTIATION OF SAFEGUARDS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, is the Secretary of State for External Affairs now prepared to table those parts of the agreement entered into between Canada and Argentina relating to the sale of the CANDU reactor in 1973 which provide for the subsequent negotiation between the two countries, Canada and Argentina, of adequate safeguards? Now that the minister has returned from South Korea is he, after asking all those questions in that country, sufficiently refreshed to be able to answer this question?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his consideration. I think the main document the hon. gentleman wants is the commercial contract, which is a matter for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. I think the Leader of the Opposition will have to try his hand again with my colleague on that point.

Mr. Hees: Use a new shuttlecock for passing the buck. The old one is worn out.

Mr. MacEachen: There are two exchanges of notes, which will be made available to the hon. gentleman, on the safeguards. With respect to the commercial contract, I think the hon. gentleman understands that, normally, these commercial contracts are not tabled, but for the final word, he ought to address his question to my colleague.

TELEGRAM FROM NEWFOUNDLAND GOVERNMENT REQUESTING PROTECTION OF FISHERIES RESOURCES— MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has the minister received a telegram from the minister of fisheries of Newfoundland expressing doubt that the inshore fishery of eastern Canada can survive one more year without the federal government's full support and, if so, has the minister replied to the telegram, and what was the nature of the reply?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think I received two telegrams from the minister of fisheries of Newfoundland. He is suggesting a meeting and, if my second reply has not gone out, it will be going out shortly, setting the date for the meeting which will discuss the question, in which both

Oral Questions

he and I are interested, relating to the law of the sea and the development of the east coast fisheries.

● (1440)

PROPOSED UNILATERAL ACTION TO PROTECT FISHERIES RESOURCES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, I will direct my supplementary question to the Prime Minister. In view of the widespread doubt and fears that have been expressed, particularly in eastern Canada, by groups of fishermen, unions and people connected with the industry as to whether the industry can survive unless the government takes firm and, if necessary, unilateral action to protect the resource, is it the government's intention to take that kind of action? On the basis of reports from eastern Canada, it is obvious that the industry cannot survive without that kind of firm action on the part of this government.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is asking a question which has been replied to time and again. As the Minister of State (Fisheries) and the Secretary of State for External Affairs have indicated, the unilateral action which the hon. member is advocating, and I am not sure if it is the position of his whole party, is one of the options the government has rejected. Two points should be made. First, that is not the way to establish international law. Second, it would be misleading the Canadian people, particularly the fishermen, to have them believe that unilateral action by Canada would solve their problem. It would not solve the problem of the salmon fishery, for example. The origin of that problem is well beyond our 200 miles. It would not solve the problem of how to get nations which have historic fishing rights in these waters to stop exercising these rights. Unilateral action would not achieve that. I remind the House that when this government drew fisheries closing lines a few years ago to increase immensely the rights of the Canadian fishermen, we did become involved in a series of bilateral discussions with nations which had historic rights, for example, in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. The question is much more complex than the solution seems to indicate. I do not think the hon. member would want to mislead the fishermen into believing that unilateral action is an immediate solution.

* * *

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Maurice Dupras (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Postmaster General. Is the minister aware of the fact that the Mayor of Montreal, Jean Drapeau, came to Ottawa today in a last minute attempt to convince the hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley and the hon. member for York-Simcoe to stop their filibuster on Bill C-63?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!