

Private Members' Business

being caught, and without being able to count or determine how many of each run of salmon are going up the river at any one time, we cannot properly manage the resource.

I am indebted to the former minister of fisheries for telling me on one occasion, in an aside across the floor, that there were 2,400 different runs of salmon. It is not a case of managing one species, one run, or whatever. It is a matter of trying to manage 2,400 different families over a period of time. To do that, we are maximizing the potential of the resource. By letting the fish go out of the province before they are landed and counted, before we know what is happening, and before we know what species there are, we were losing the opportunity to properly manage the resource. So, there were good reasons for having those landing regulations.

However, the Americans objected. They took it to GATT and GATT agreed with them, initially. Whether it would have in the long run, we do not know. The Canadian government neglected or decided not to appeal. It had the opportunity to appeal, as provided for in GATT, but Canada decided it would not appeal and that it would accept the ruling of GATT.

We had another opportunity, and this was an opportunity that was pressed by both the processing industry and by all of the people working in the processing industry: the fishing industry, the fishermen themselves, their organizations, people working in the plants, and the fishermen who were not organized in unions. All of them pressed the government to appeal the GATT ruling, or, if not, there was an alternative and that was to accept the penalty.

At that time the penalty was calculated to be an annual penalty of \$5 million. But we are dealing with an industry that on the west coast of British Columbia is worth in excess of \$1 billion. There was plenty of opportunity and good reason for all those people, everybody involved in the industry, to press for us accepting the penalty and preserving the industry, preserving the right to maintain employment in Canada and preserving the right to husband that resource and to manage the resource properly. However, we gave that up.

I can only suspect—and it is not just my idea, but certainly I agree with the conclusion—that we gave it up because the federal government wanted to show how good the free trade deal was for Canada. It knew there would be an opportunity to test this before a free trade panel. Indeed, there was. Under the free trade deal, the Americans again protested what we were doing before we had time to make changes. We did make changes in the regulations that they did not like, and it was all protested to the free trade adjudication process and a free trade panel was set up.

The free trade panel initially said that requiring landing of 100 per cent of these species of salmon and herring was restraintive trade. They made that decision and they said that if it was not 100 per cent, for example, if it was only 18 per cent, that might not be considered to be restraintive trade and might be acceptable. They did not say it would be.

People have said the free trade panel recommended 18 per cent. That was not the case, Mr. Speaker, not as I read it. What they said was: "If you come back and try us with 18, we just might accept it." Well, we did not do that. We appealed this time. We could have appealed to GATT and likely won, but we did not. We did appeal the free trade ruling, and, of course, we lost. Not only did we lose, we lost some ground that we might have made had we negotiated the first free trade panel agreement, because the second time we went to the free trade appeal, the appeal came against us. It said that 20 per cent of the volume two of these species of salmon and 20 per cent of the herring could leave without being landed in British Columbia. Eighty per cent had to be landed here. It could then be shipped out of the province without any processing. It is not all that practical to ship it out with processing, although it is done to some extent. The free trade panel said 20 per cent for the first year. It is to go up to 25 per cent over a period of four years.

The American trade negotiator made it very clear that the Americans wanted access to the total resource. The 25 per cent was an interim measure, as they were not going to accept 25 per cent in the long run. They were going to let us get away with 20, 21, 22 and 23 per cent until it became 25 per cent, knowing by that time, unless there was a change of government, Canadians would be so locked into the free trade deal there would be no way