

### *Fishing Industry*

**Mr. Skelly:** I thank hon. members for giving me the opportunity to sum up. The licensing scheme has been a disaster, but I would like to move to the question of allocation, which was dealt with by the hon. member for Richmond-South Delta (Mr. Siddon), by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Alberni and the hon. member for Skeena. The allocation situation appears to be far more complicated. What will happen is this: we will reach a situation in which there will be allocating between sports fishermen, commercial fishermen and Indian communities. Many coastal Indian communities are absolutely dependent upon that resource. A commitment has to be made to the Indian people which will assure them of access to that resource so that they can support their communities at a financial or economic level which will allow them to lead what we consider to be a decent life. If we are to resolve unemployment and some of these financial problems and give a certain independence to those Indian communities, they must be considered in that allocation program. So when we are speaking of allocation we are not just talking about sports fishing or commercial fishing, we are not just talking about gear-type, we are talking as well about providing an allocation to a group in British Columbia whose only option, in many cases, because of the geographic location in which they find themselves is to resort to that resource.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I thank hon. members and resume my seat.

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the opportunity to participate in this debate although I note it is an opposition day. In my opening remarks I would like to refer to the first part of the motion which says:

That this House condemns the government for its failure to support the Canadian fishing industry, as demonstrated

(a) by betraying the interests of Canadian fishermen in its international fisheries negotiations with the United States;

Before I deal with that particular topic I would like to clarify a few inconsistencies which I believe have become evident here today. I believe it was the hon. member for Malpeque (Mr. Gass) who made some comments in relation to the Atlantic Salmon Advisory Board. He indicated that the minister was not involved in the process, nor in the past was he in the habit of using this particular board. It is my understanding that this is incorrect. I am told that the minister has met with the chairman and vice-chairman of this board on numerous occasions and that he has asked several members of the board to undertake specific consultations regarding the possibility of reopening the fisheries in the areas where a ban was imposed—I believe this took place some time in 1972.

I understand that these consultations have now been completed and that the minister will soon be meeting with those concerned to hear their advice. Dealing with the wider aspect, I believe the minister is prepared to listen to these officials, as well as others, on all aspects of the Atlantic salmon management.

There were also a few comments made by the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay) with regard to the policy

affecting freezer-trawlers and factory freezer-trawlers. The present government has not altered the previous government's policy of licensing vessels to fish underutilized species but otherwise of issuing no further groundfish licenses. And none have been issued. It is my understanding that only one holder of an underutilized species licence has acquired a vessel. Some have suggested that given the economics of fishing such species, the previous government may have given some people a licence to go bankrupt.

I think it would be useful to review the steps and events in our relationship with the United States over the past four years as they relate to fisheries. This review will indicate the efforts which have been made to protect the interests of fishermen on both our coasts. Canada and the United States each extended their fisheries jurisdiction to 200 miles in 1977—Canada on January 1, 1977, for both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, and the U.S.A. on March 1, 1977. In the period preceding these extensions, negotiations had been initiated between the two countries to try to develop an agreement which would protect the interests of the fishermen of both countries when extensions of jurisdiction came into effect. These negotiations were under way when the Canadian extension came into force and Canada acted, at that time, to protect the negotiating process by passing an order in council to allow United States vessels to continue fishing in Canadian waters until a reciprocal fisheries agreement was completed. The assumption of the Canadian government at that time was that if negotiations for a reciprocal agreement were not completed by March 1, the date on which the U.S. extension would come into force, Canada would expect interim treatment of the same kind for Canadian fishermen until the negotiations were concluded.

As things worked out, an interim reciprocal fisheries agreement applicable to both east and west coasts was worked out. It was effective from February 14, 1977, to the end of the year. The first reciprocal agreement in the period following extensions of jurisdiction had two primary objectives. The first was to allow fishermen of both countries to continue their existing fishing patterns. The second objective was to avoid conflict or prejudice to legal claims in the boundary regions by ensuring that neither party would licence third countries to fish within the area of overlapping claims and providing for flag state enforcement by Canada and the United States, that is, within the area of overlapping claims Canadian laws would apply to, and be enforced against, only Canadian fishermen and the United States would take similar action with respect to United States vessels. This interim agreement was amended in 1978, subject to ratification by both countries. The amendments were designed to deal with problems which had developed under the fisheries agreement of 1977, particularly those involving troll fishing for salmon on the west coast. However, problems continued over the salmon troll fishery on the west coast while the 1978 agreement was being provisionally applied pending ratification.

● (1750)

Because of these difficulties, the Canadian government suspended provisional implementation of the agreement in June,