

In a paper prepared for the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization for the Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment to be held next month under the sponsorship of the United Nations, Dr. Henry Regier of the University of Toronto and Dr. Don W. Kelley, who was formerly associated with FAO, came out flatly and said that world fisheries face total destruction unless techniques already available for saving them are properly used. The FAO recommended a number of ways to cope with the situation, including a recommendation which states that fish stocks should be managed rationally through controls, including monitoring and periodic assessments of fish catches and limits on waste disposal. The paper contains this warning:

Time is not on our side. In spite of growing environmental and economic awareness, we have grave concern about the future ecological state of the fresh water and inshore marine communities from the viewpoint of fisheries.

• (1420)

I submit that it is to this problem that ICNAF must address itself, otherwise it will be leaving open to question the justification for its very existence.

The minister makes reference in his statement to a formula which Canada will be putting forward allocating quotas on a total sustainable yield of each species. However, it is not clear from his statement whether these species include Atlantic salmon or whether the estimate of the over-all sustainable yield would be an adequate basis for the establishment of an over-all quota even if reduced by 10 per cent for those species of fish, including salmon, which have already declined as a consequence of overfishing. It does appear, however, that Canada will have two separate proposals: one for allocating quotas on all species except salmon, and a resubmission of our proposal of 1969 for a total ban on salmon fishing on the high seas.

In the ICNAF conference of 1969 Canada's proposal was rejected by a vote of eleven to two with one abstention. What hope do we now have of our proposal being accepted? Our chances are no better now than they were three years ago; if anything they are worse. Under the provisions of the ICNAF agreement, the proposal must be accepted unanimously. Since the 1969 conference, the Danish government has taken a hard line toward Canada's proposal and, in an effort to undermine our position within ICNAF, they have entered into a bilateral agreement with the United States to phase out the Greenland salmon fishery within five years. This proposal is untenable and unacceptable to Canadians and it is unacceptable to Canadian fishermen. The Americans were responding at that time to the pressures of very influential and wealthy sports fishermen when they entered into this agreement with the Danes. I submit that the agreement fails to recognize the urgency of the situation.

Statistics indicate that there has been a sharp increase in the total catch coincidental with the discovery of the Greenland feeding grounds by the Danes. The Danes keep saying that they cannot agree to Canada's proposal for a ban on high seas fishing because they say there has been no evidence provided to them that high seas fishing is depleting the salmon stocks. If this statement is true, it is an indictment of the Secretary of State for External

Northwest Atlantic Fisheries

Affairs and of the Minister of Fisheries for not presenting in clear and simple language our case to the Danish government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crouse: I say this because statistics indicate that there has been a sharp increase in the total catch coincidental with the Greenland fishery. The Danish catch has risen from 50 metric tons in 1965 to 2,654 metric tons in 1971. This figure, of course, corresponds with the decline in the Canadian commercial catch as well as the virtual disappearance of salmon from rivers in New Brunswick and Quebec.

I ask the minister, in view of the very serious economic impact that this situation has on Atlantic Canada, whether these figures were made available to the Danish government, and if they were not, why they were not made available?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I have to interrupt the hon. member to remind him of the terms of the Standing Order which allow him to comment briefly on a ministerial statement. There should not be a debate at this time. The hon. member was given the floor for the purpose of commenting briefly on the statement made by the minister. I hope that the hon. member will bear that in mind in continuing his remarks.

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for that admonition but I wish to point out to you, Sir, that this is the same thing that happens when fisheries are talked about at international conferences—there is always an urgency to get on to something else. With all deference to your ruling, I must take a little time to explain the situation because I live in Atlantic Canada and I see what is happening in that area. The decline of our fisheries is having a tremendous impact on our people.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I appreciate the point made by the hon. member for South Shore, but at the same time the rules are there. It seems to me, if the matter is as important as the hon. member says it is, and of course I know and all hon. members know it is, that perhaps there might be an opportunity under the rules for a more extended debate to be had in which the hon. member might ask the searching questions he has been asking, but certainly under the terms of the Standing Order this is not the occasion to do it. In any event, I thought it was my duty to bring this to the attention of the hon. member.

Mr. Crouse: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will try to conclude very briefly. I would point out to the minister and the House that Canada imports almost 35 million dollars worth of goods annually from Denmark. According to a press dispatch from Copenhagen in the *Globe and Mail* of May 25, Danish officials claim that they are exporting about \$12 million worth of salmon to Canada. If one were to give credence to this figure, the appropriate government action should be obvious. Unlike the minister, we believe that a case can be made for a restriction to be placed on all Danish goods coming into Canada. I am sure we would find the Danes not nearly so inflexible in their approach to this matter if the Canadian government were to take this action.