

*North Pacific Fishery*

coast of this continent and to the intermingling of fishing operations, no abstention from fishing on the high seas off the Pacific coast of North America would be asked by the Canadians or the Americans against each other. Let no one try to tell me that by making that agreement we gave the Americans more than we got. You know, on a rough measurement the Pacific coast of the United States of America and the Pacific coast of Alaska, which is included, are four and one-quarter times the length of the Pacific coast of British Columbia. In mentioning that figure I am ignoring entirely the coast of the Aleutian peninsula, and the Aleutian islands, on the east side of which we have the right to fish under this treaty.

The prime reason of course was that it is almost impossible to segregate on the fishing banks, whether they be north or south of the international boundary line, salmon which may have been born in the Fraser river or in the Columbia river or in an Alaskan river, or halibut which may have been spawned in Canadian or United States waters. But by obtaining that commitment on the part of the United States of America we have brought to the fishermen of the Pacific coast a security of asset which it is hard to over-emphasize. In so far as territorial waters are concerned, the subject is not irrelevant because territoriality is specifically protected in the treaty. We put in a clause that nothing in the treaty shall affect any claim any of us may choose to make, but the question of territoriality was not one for negotiation at all. We do not have to go to Tokyo to keep the Japanese out of our territorial waters. We have always had the legal right to keep them out. Therefore I say, with due respect to contrary opinion, that I think it is unfortunate that the very important subject of the protection of the high seas fisheries should be mixed up and clouded with the equally important subject of the definition of our territorial waters.

In that connection I might mention that "territorial waters" as such is a term that usually has reference to matters of navigation and originally concerned navigation by foreign warships. I think we may yet reach the stage where we may be able to extend our legally recognized interests in fishing much farther from our coast than we are able to extend our territorial waters, our control over the use of the seas as a highway by the people of other countries.

There is a third point which has been entirely ignored and overlooked in all discussions of the treaty, both by its supporters and by its opponents. The treaty sets up an international commission representing the

three countries. That international commission is a permanent body and its job will be not only to carry out the punitive clauses of the treaty but to investigate—the instructions are there—and report on the conservation and the building up of all stocks of fish which come within the convention area, which is the whole north Pacific ocean from Japan to Canada.

A great deal has been said, and rightly so, about the terrific economic pressure upon the Japanese for food, and that fish is one of their main foods. If the commission, as set up under the treaty, gets operating and gets to work, and is even fractionally as successful as have been the international commissions set up by Canada and the United States on the Pacific coast, it will have the effect of building up and increasing the perpetual yields which the Japanese can take from the fisheries which are normally tributary to Japan, and to that extent will have no small effect in relieving the economic pressure on Japan, and therefore relieving the incentive to her to go to other waters, including our own, for fish. That is a matter of no small importance.

I should like to refer to one or two specific points that have been brought up in the debate. With reference to Canadian fishing in Bristol bay, the protocol to the treaty makes provision for Canadians to fish salmon in Bristol bay if it is established that there are any fish of Canadian origin there. I quote one sentence from the protocol:

The commission to be established under the convention shall, as expeditiously as practicable, investigate the waters of the convention area to determine if there are areas in which salmon originating in the rivers of Canada and of the United States of America intermingle with salmon originating in the rivers of Asia.

That was with reference to the northern part, the Bering sea and so forth. So we have a treaty which is undoubtedly of general benefit. The question is: Why hurry? We are not in a hurry. We are the laggards. We are the ones who are dragging our feet. The Japanese and the Americans ratified this convention months ago. We are faced now with two alternatives. As a matter of fact we are right back where we started from. There was a demand over a great many years for a treaty with Japan to keep them out of our preserved fisheries. That treaty we have got. Then what logical objection can there possibly be against ratifying it? As to the necessity of referring the matter to the standing committee on marine and fisheries, the treaty was referred to that committee last year. It was gone over there clause by clause. We had the advantage of the evidence of such people as Stewart Bates, the deputy minister,