

*Adjournment Debate*

and if there was going to be any kind of balance or equity in the agreement he was going to sign with the U.S.

I am afraid the minister gave me the same kind of run-around he gave the hon. member for Richmond-South Delta. I can understand why the minister is so anxious to have the fishermen use the barbless hook. He has long practice in getting off the hook. Regardless of how important a question is, he always manages to get off the hook by talking around the question.

The situation along the Fraser is catastrophic. The U.S. fishermen around Point Roberts are catching, in a ratio of nine to one, the Chinook salmon that ought to be coming into the Fraser River and that ought to be the rightful catch of the Canadian fishermen.

I cannot understand the contradictory position taken by the Canadian government when the minister's own officials go to the Law of the Sea Conference and agree to a treaty—it has not been signed yet—whereby anadromous fish like salmon belong to the country in which they originate. That is the agreement of the Law of the Sea Conference. But when it comes to the west coast fishery, then the minister wants to agree to a 50-50 package with the U.S. fishermen. That is an incredible contradiction.

Why does the minister insist on being a long-distance minister for the fishermen on the west coast? I can understand that he would go quite frequently to New Brunswick where his home is. In the past year, however, he has been in British Columbia once. He spent one day there and even then did not meet with the fishermen. I am asking him whether he is content to be the minister of east coast fisheries or whether he plans to be the minister for west coast and inland fisheries as well?

The fact is, that as far as his responsibilities are concerned, he has written off the west coast. He gave me a high-flown answer about what he and his department and his officials have done for the west coast with the salmon enhancement program. Mr. Speaker, that was funded something like seven years ago, at \$150 million. That was 1975 or 1976 dollars.

● (2205)

That is not worth \$80 million or \$90 million. When the Secretary of State (Mr. Fox) looks for funding for the CBC, it is always in current dollars. This minister did not have the fortitude to work for the fishermen in such a way that that salmon enhancement program would be funded with current dollars, yet he had the audacity to boast about it in the House today.

I received a letter today from the Liberal Party of Canada. I received it in my office. It was a request for funds. The only truthful thing in the letter was that the Liberal Party is hard-pressed for money. Mr. McLeod had the audacity to say that the Liberal Party is a grassroots party. If it is so grassroots, why was there a delegation of 22 fishermen here today and yesterday knocking on the doors of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans? If the Liberal Party and this Liberal government are so grassroots, why does the minister not go to

British Columbia and meet the fishermen there? I challenge him to go to the next fisheries convention and spend two days at that convention. Dollars to doughnuts, he will not take the fishermen up on that. If he spends one day there, they will be happy. If he spends two days there, he would need a leave of absence from the House of Commons.

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** I received a letter from them too.

**Mr. Friesen:** The hon. member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker) says he received a letter from the Liberal Party too. That is terrific. We can tell they are hard-pressed, but this minister, who wants to be part of a grassroots government, will not have the courtesy and sense of commitment and responsibility to go out and meet with the fishermen there.

Last Sunday there was an audacious situation. The fishermen were meeting in a hall with one set of government officials who were telling the fishermen one thing; another set of officials were meeting with the sports fishermen and telling them another thing; and the minister was somewhere else. The minister makes long distance regulations. He is not meeting with his advisory board; he is going among them. Officials out on the west coast apparently have no contact with the industry or the fishermen involved, and they are making regulations which are totally out of touch with the needs of the community.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him has expired.

**Mr. Robert Bockstael (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, as you know, Canada and the United States have had several rounds of discussions centring on interception fisheries. The next round of talks is scheduled for April 26 to May 5. In addition, we have also been discussing with the State of Washington the immediate need for co-operative Chinook conservation measures, particularly as they relate to U.S. fisheries in the Point Roberts-San Juan Islands area—Washington commercial areas 7 and 7A—where a large number of Fraser run Chinooks are taken in the U.S. seine and gillnet fisheries.

The State of Washington formally advised us in writing on April 2, 1981 that unless there are significant changes in the problem from mid-April through late October the State of Washington is prepared to close the commercial net fisheries directed at Chinook salmon and, during any commercial net fisheries for other salmon species, require purse seines and reef nets to release chinook and a 5 $\frac{7}{8}$  inch maximum mesh size for gillnets.

In addition, the northwest Indian councils have agreed to the restrictions and will be formally advising the Department of Fisheries and Oceans accordingly in writing.

The above arrangement should result in savings of up to 45,000 Chinook from purse seines and 5,000 by gill nets, many of which will return to the Fraser and other river systems. As