

*Supply—Fisheries*

hope upon the establishment of the 12 mile fishing zone in so far as the protection of our fisheries is concerned. In fact I might say that the declaration by the parliament of Canada regarding a 12 mile fishing zone has in reality done more to protect the fishing interests of United States fishermen than it has to protect the fishing interests of Canadians; because within that 12 mile zone we are going to continue forever, as I interpret the attitude of the government as expressed by the minister, to permit United States fishermen, on the west coast particularly, to continue to fish within not only the nine mile fishing zone but even, in some instances presumably, within the three miles of the territorial sea which we will be declaring shortly, I hope.

I use these remarks to lead to the meetings which currently are taking place here in Ottawa between Canadians, Japanese and Americans. I believe this is the third series of meetings in recent years of the north Pacific fisheries commission. This is a meeting that is seeking to re-establish or continue in operation a tripartite treaty which was signed some 11 years ago involving Japan, Canada and the United States. This treaty concerns the salmon, halibut and herring fisheries in the Pacific ocean. We all know from public declarations that the Japanese government is demanding a relaxation of the abstention principle, or in other words an increase in the access of Japanese fishermen to the fishery stocks of halibut, salmon and herring in the Pacific when those stocks may be propagated in what we call our waters. In other words, Mr. Chairman, it is a demand of the Japanese fishing industry to fish our fish, as the saying goes.

They have made no bones about stating that; there has been no hesitancy on the part of the Japanese government to indicate that this is its desire. This is its sole purpose at the moment in entering into these discussions, namely to seek a relaxation of that abstention principle so the Japanese fishing fleet will be able to range further into the mid-Pacific and closer to our shores in order to fish the halibut, salmon and herring stocks which are propagated within what we consider to be our territorial limits.

Unfortunately the Canadian people do not know what has been taking place at these meetings, because the minister has been reluctant, unable, or has thought it unwise to communicate to parliament and the Canadian people what is taking place and what is Canada's position in respect of these meetings. I think we can assume that the

United States and Japan are virtually deadlocked in respect of fishing for the so-called red or sockeye salmon in the Bristol bay area of Alaska.

Statistically and biologically I am sure the Japanese, by fishing for sockeye salmon in the mid-Pacific, have had a very detrimental effect on the conservation practices of Alaskan or United States authorities in respect of the sockeye salmon which propagate in Alaskan waters. I suggest there is perhaps even greater concern in this regard at this time than will be the case after the election is over, because this is a presidential election year in the United States. In fact, that may be one of the reasons why we may not be able to reach an agreement during this round of meetings in Ottawa. If there is any result from these meetings that is adverse to the United States, President Johnson will not publicize that adversity until after the election because it might damage his chances of re-election. If there is any result which is adverse to the United States it will be adverse as well to Canada, although to a different extent, because we have salmon stocks which propagate in our waters and intermingle in the mid-Pacific.

An article in this regard appeared in the *Globe and Mail* on September 30, 1963. It was a Canadian Press association dispatch from Tokyo, and in part states:

The United States has proposed a substitute section to the international north Pacific fishery treaty to replace the so-called abstention principle that has had Japan at loggerheads with Canada and the United States over renewal of the fishing act.

Perhaps there has been a mistake made here, and it should say "fishing acts" rather than "act". The article then states:

Japan had demanded that the abstention principle be removed from any new agreement and when the three nations failed to reach agreement at meetings in Washington in June new private talks were held here.

Japan has argued here that the original convention was drawn up while she was an occupied country and that it was, in effect, an unequal treaty.

Another paragraph of this article reads:

U.S. negotiators here have seen the merits of this argument and have agreed to drop all mention of Japan abstaining from fishing for salmon and halibut.

That article outlines a result which could very easily develop at the discussions now taking place. Uppermost in the minds of Canadians and the members of the commission, as well I presume as in the minds of the minister and the officials of his depart-