

experience had shown never developed into full, mature salmon. There was also a program to build more hatcheries. He concluded his remarks by saying that if the two countries co-operated in planning their catch it could be expanded substantially in the next 10 to 15 years but, if they did not, there would be major problems with all species.

The U.S. co-chairman said that he appreciated receiving new information on Canadian efforts to manage the fishery. He said that the U.S., like Canada, now had no east coast commercial salmon fishery but was very concerned about high seas interception. There were persistent allegations by U.S. fishermen of a large Russian take but no evidence. The Canadian co-chairman said that while he had no proof either, he was convinced that the Russians were taking substantial numbers of salmon because of two serious weaknesses in salmon interception control: *first*, the observers did not observe everything on factory ships and *second*, there was no supervision beyond 200 miles even though Canada's continental shelf extends well beyond that limit. "It was a serious mistake not to have retained the entire shelf in the Law of the Sea". He recommended that Canada and the U.S. co-operate in pushing for international supervision beyond 200 miles.

West Coast Fishery

The discussion was begun by a Senator from Alaska who described the magnitude of high seas catch of salmon. There were now 19 countries with high-water fleets which took some 3 billion pounds of fish a year. "They catch more halibut incidentally than we do intentionally. They are vacuum cleaning the whole area of the North Pacific." The largest of the fleets—the Japanese—can take a whole salmon run at one time though he noted that the Japanese had recently shown some interest in limiting the take because Taiwan had "gotten into the act in a big way". He suggested that the Japanese might offer a cutback in salmon take in return for a "more understanding" policy on whaling. He went on to say that the Russians were also very disturbed by high seas interception of salmon and wanted international talks on the matter.

A Canadian M.P. from British Columbia assured the U.S. delegates that Canada strongly supported controls on high-seas interception of salmon. Turning to the salmon treaty, he suggested that it boded well for the west coast fishery. "The principle that the country which promotes enhancement benefits from it should greatly strengthen enhancement efforts." He reported that Canada had strict quotas on *chinook* and that, as a result, five years from now there should be far more fish. He then asked whether sports fishing, which played a large part in the B.C. fishery, was of major importance in Alaska.

The U.S. Senator replied that commercial fishing was "a major Alaskan industry" and far more important than sports fishing. He added that there were some hand trawlers in southwest Alaska taking daily catch and many Indians exporting to Seattle. He went on to say that the U.S. was generally satisfied with the salmon treaty and convinced that it would increase enhancement. The one remaining problem on the U.S. side was

a jurisdictional dispute between fisheries officials and the U.S. Parks Service which had denied access to streams for enhancement programs. He concluded his remarks by suggesting that Canada and the United States should explore the possibility of transplanting some Alaskan salmon to the East Coast because Alaska had achieved excellent results with the direct implanting of fish rather than the building of hatcheries.

Fishing Issues Between Ontario and Minnesota

A Congressman from Minnesota opened the discussion by describing the "tremendous frustration" felt by Minnesota and particularly its tourist industry at the actions of the Ontario Government. It had reached the point, he said, where the issue had been raised by the Secretary of State and the President at the recent Quebec City Summit. He warned: "There are storm clouds on the horizon and rain is about to fall". The Congressman went on to say that Minnesota is convinced that destruction of its sports fishing industry is the purpose behind the various actions of the Ontario Government. "Everything is being done in pursuit of that policy. We are afraid that Ontario wants a tourist desert on the U.S. side of the border." He reported that there had been a meeting in Washington to discuss these matters and that the U.S. side wanted another meeting, but warned that the \$3.00 daily user fee—which applied only to U.S. fishermen and was therefore obviously not a conservation measure—made it impossible to sit down and discuss things rationally. He then remarked: "I've worked hard for Canada on other issues, for example, Buy America legislation. I am now calling in some chips." He said that he had proposed a Border Commission which would serve as a permanent forum for the discussion and resolution of conflicts in the border waters of Minnesota-Ontario.

Another Congressman from Minnesota fully supported these remarks and specifically repeated the point that his colleague and he had been friends of Canada over the years, most recently in resisting a Buy America campaign on cement products. The first U.S. spokesman resumed his remarks by saying that Minnesota had also proved its concern for the fishing stock by buying out its commercial fishing and by taking a number of other steps to protect the fishery. He added that conservation and enhancement efforts had to be done cooperatively with Ontario but that current hard times and hard feelings made that impossible.

A Canadian Member of Parliament from northern Ontario said that the Congressman was right: Ontario policy was motivated by a desire to benefit the tourist industry and, specifically, the outfitters. He went on to say that the proposal for a border commission "makes a lot of sense" because it would enable the two sides to deal on an ongoing basis with issues as they arose. He warned, however, that the results of the recent Ontario election made it unlikely that any government would risk offending people in Northern Ontario. He reported that Minnesota and Canadian outfitters were beginning to talk to each other about a joint package to increase the tourist pie rather than fighting over shares. The U.S. side said that such an approach was precisely what was needed. He pointed out