First of all, I was delighted to hear the hon. member for Kent speak. Quite often we forget the situation in the freshwater fishery.

Twice during the month of November I was in Europe. It sounds glorious and marvellous, but I made eight or nine presentations a day, Madam Speaker,—I had a few days off, I recognize—with one whole day in French, and for me that can be a bit of a challenge, particularly in Paris, both in the National Assembly and at the *Palais du Luxembourg* where the Senate is, and at the Brussels meeting with European parliamentarians and a number of other people. I will not go into it, but it included media and groups from all over.

I led a group of members of Parliament from the Liberals. Unfortunately, our New Democrat colleagues could not join us. I know they would have if they could.

The message that I brought on behalf of my colleagues and supported by my colleagues was that Europe and the European community should meet its commitments under the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization. The management system was set up by the users of the resources of the Northwest Atlantic following the imposition of the 200-mile economic zone by the Law of the Sea Conference.

That organization should be the basis for managing that resource along the principles of sustainable development.

In 1977, the Law of the Sea put the 200-mile limit in place. We, as a coastal state, made a commitment that in recognition that we manage what is inside as part of our obligation, we will allow countries to come and fish for fish we do not take.

For instance, cod in 2G and 2H. I hope I can find it. Unfortunately, I do not have it here. The cod that we heard about from my hon. friend opposite, Canadians have not caught.

Government Orders

One example I can give is the quota for turbot in 1989 in 2G and 2H, 11,000 tonnes. Do you know what we caught, Madam Speaker? Turbot, by the way is Greenland halibut. Canadians caught 18 tonnes of it either by choice or incapacity and capability of doing it.

Yes, we allow foreigners to come in, but the key there also is that we have NAFO, which I will not go into. We are short of time, and I want to get on.

The message that we had to all of them was that the European community should recognize its responsibility, manage the resource properly and get back in and comply with NAFO.

When my friend opposite from Gander—Grand Falls stands up and talks about 12,965 tonnes distributed off the Flemish Cap to a variety of European countries, then goes to Europe with me and our colleagues, tells the Europeans to comply with NAFO, then comes back here and complains about the quota given to the Europeans under NAFO, what am I to think?

It sounds great as we stand here and shake and shift. All his colleagues stand up and congratulate him, but if we are going to get the Europeans to deal with it, we have to be reasonable, responsible and insistent in the message that we send.

WE cannot stand on their home turf and tell them to comply with NAFO and then come back here and stand in front of a television and complain about NAFO.

Madam Speaker, I will sit down because I think you will find that we may be able to have the opportunity to have the vote on this question.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

[Translation]

Madam Deputy Speaker: It being 6.10 p.m., the House stands adjourned until 11 a.m. tomorrow, pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 6.10 p.m.