

*Commercial Fisheries Development*

intrude into the exploration of new fishery resources. It seeks to introduce new fishing vessels and techniques, to assist in the fuller exploitation of the fisheries themselves and also seeks to go into the area of new fisheries products, and new handling, processing, and distribution techniques. That, I think might cover the field, as it were.

Whatever good may come from this legislation, whatever good may have come from the programs similar to these contemplated by this bill which were dealt with by way of appropriation earlier, could very easily be offset by other activities. In fact, sometimes in the past the good contemplated by conservation measures, by the development and increase in exploitation of certain fisheries in order that we could exploit them to the full within the bounds of conservation itself, has been offset and will be offset in the future if the government does not take cognizance of and do something about the fact that other nations in the world are interested in catching fish.

The government must recognize that other nations in the world engage in fishing the same sort of fisheries products that we fish. Sometimes they engage in this fishing right on our back doorstep.

We have had long discussions in this house about the North Pacific Fisheries Treaty, the treaty to which Canada, the United States and Japan are signatories. If the abstention principle some time in the future is removed from the treaty, and that incidentally is the intention and desire of the government and the people of Japan, then one of the countries on the other side of the Pacific will be able without compulsion or without any prohibition to fish for the very fisheries products which have been our lifeblood in British Columbia. That country's vessels will be able to fish within 12 miles of our shores.

It is imperative, if any good is to come from the legislation now being passed, that we move fully into the international field and have discussion not only with nations in NORPAC, but that we include within that treaty other nations the vessels of which fish in the Pacific Ocean for the fisheries products we fish for.

Within the last year we have seen Russian fishing vessels on our back doorstep, just off the northern tip of Vancouver Island. The Russians are under no prohibition whatever to abstain from fishing for the fish which we normally consider ours because they are

spawned in our areas. If the massive fishing fleet of the Soviet Union concentrates on the salmon, halibut or herring fishery, that could mean the destruction of those fisheries for British Columbia. If that were to happen all the beneficial things contemplated by the bill before us will come to naught.

Korea is another nation which is expanding its fishing fleet. The People's Republic of China, which is another of the great and developing nations on the horizon, will be embarking on the ocean eventually in order to catch fish. We on this side of the Pacific must recognize these possibilities, and these trends, and these dangers. We must take concrete steps to draw these countries into a conservation pact with us, knowing that only by conservation practices engaged in by all nations with fishing industries shall we be able to exploit these fisheries to the full. Without conservation practices destruction will come to the fisheries. That destruction can be just as devastating as that brought about by the building of hydroelectric dams on rivers containing fish.

Another matter of concern is the degree to which United States fishermen off and around Alaska catch what we classify as our homecoming salmon, which is salmon that comes into the spawning streams in that part of the country which I have the honour to represent. Those salmon come into the Nass and Skeena Rivers and their tributaries. United States fishermen wait on the other side of the international boundary to catch these fish as they follow that route down the Alaska Panhandle as they come to spawn.

We have had conversations in the last couple of weeks with United States authorities about their surf line, as it is called. I have read statements attributed to the deputy minister of fisheries before the Fisheries committee to the effect that there was no agreement about altering that surf line in Alaska, and that some other course of action may have to be followed. I say that it is imperative that we deal strongly and firmly with the United States to see that it desist in wrecking our conservation practices. The United States must enter into a conservation pact to establish surf lines, in the good will and spirit of co-operation necessary to preserve and develop our fisheries.

We must concern ourselves with the 12-mile territorial fishing zone, which was passed in law by parliament some two years ago. That law contemplated the establishment