

*North Pacific Fishery*

the Pacific coast, and the things which he says are presumed to be based upon knowledge and upon facts. Things which perhaps I might say, or some lesser light unknown on the coast, would have very little effect. But when people reach that stage in the esteem of their province which the hon. member for Nanaimo has reached, they should exercise more than the usual care. I find in the *Argus*, published in Courtenay, B.C., of June 11, 1952 under the heading "Fishery treaty grave danger to Province. Leader of B.C. Conservatives so views it", the following:

The potential danger to the B.C. fishery industry of the Japanese fishery treaty was not appreciated, said General George Pearkes, V.C., in his speech at Campbell River on Thursday night in support of the Conservative candidate, Dr. Bruce Gordon.

The article goes on quoting the hon. member as saying:

For many years Canada had been spending millions of dollars to conserve their halibut and their salmon and after five years if the Japanese did not choose to sign the treaty again they could fish for these species of salmon, halibut and herring right up to the three-mile line.

That statement was made, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the hon. member was at the time a member of the committee on marine and fisheries. The same meeting is reported in the *British Columbian*, published at New Westminster, in the issue of Friday, June 6, 1952, under the heading "Pearkes Raps Fish Treaty" and I quote:

Campbell River, June 6 (BUP): Concern about a serious threat to British Columbia's fishing industry posed by the recently-signed Canadian-American-Japanese fishing treaty was voiced in Campbell River last night by Major-Gen. George Pearkes, Progressive Conservative M.P. for Nanaimo.

Pearkes explained that under terms of the treaty the Japanese could fish B.C. waters at the end of a five-year period.

"We've spent millions of dollars on fisheries research to benefit our own fishing industry. And now it appears the Japanese are to reap the benefit of this expenditure," he said.

He charged that the House of Commons committee investigating the treaty had been composed mostly of eastern Canadian Liberals who had no real grasp of the situation on the west coast.

"They gave scant attention to my protests and to the representations of the united fishermen and allied workers' union", he declared.

I have the verbatim report of the standing committee on marine and fisheries for last year. I should mention at this stage that on or about May 30 the committee chairman received from the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Pearkes) a very reasonably worded letter suggesting that the matter of territorial waters be referred to the Department of External Affairs. I have the minutes of the proceedings of the committee here and I will be glad to take time out of my forty minutes

[Mr. Applewhaite.]

to read into the record any protests against this treaty to which the hon. member referred and to which the eastern Liberals who packed that committee paid no attention. I would quote from page 134 of the proceedings of June 5, where the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Catherwood) is reported as having asked the following question:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this committee could recommend to the external affairs department the suggestion that Mr. Pearkes has made in regard to the definition of Canadian territorial waters. I think this matter is one of extreme importance and it would be in order to suggest to the Department of External Affairs that they re-examine and go into this matter very thoroughly so we will have a more precise definition of territorial waters, which I think will be of some help to us all.

The Chairman: In that regard, I might point out that there is an interdepartmental committee studying that matter at the present time. Do you not think that would cover it sufficiently?

Mr. Catherwood: Yes, perhaps it will.

The hon. member for Nanaimo charged that the House of Commons committee investigating the treaty had been composed mainly of eastern Canadian Liberals who had paid scant attention to his protests. So far as I know that was the only protest, if it can be regarded as a protest, which the hon. member made, and a reply was given at that time to the hon. member for Haldimand. I point out that the meeting in British Columbia to which I have referred was that of June 5. The committee continued to sit until June 10; its report had not been given consideration on June 5, and I query the desirability of discussing the sittings of a committee on the hustings when the same people could not discuss it on the floor of this house, which was also sitting. If one can learn anything from the *Ottawa Journal* of Monday, March 23, 1953, I assume that discussing committee proceedings outside the house while the house is in session is still a practice that is engaged in.

Let us look at the accusations which undoubtedly did cause, and should have caused, considerable misunderstanding on the Pacific coast, and I quote:

We've spent millions of dollars on fisheries research to benefit our own fishing industry. And now it appears the Japanese are to reap the benefit of this expenditure.

We have been spending those millions of dollars for a good many years and up until the meeting in Tokyo in December, 1951, there was nothing on earth to stop the Japanese reaping the full benefit of that expenditure other than the armed might of Canada and the United States if they chose to go to war over it. By introducing this treaty we have worked out by agreement with the Japanese a situation whereby they cannot