

*Private Members' Business*

instituted landing requirements in order to meet the GATT ruling and still maintain some conservation of its resource stock.

However, that was not good enough for the United States, so it brought the issue again before the Canada-U.S. free trade panel. Of course we are all familiar with the result of that panel. Essentially Canada was forced to abandon its landing requirements and to allow the United States virtually free access to our west coast salmon and herring without having to land them in Canadian ports. Certainly the 20 per cent requirement, although it is not 100 per cent, is a significant portion of our fish production.

Now government members, after having lost this dispute with the United States, are quite happy to engage in justifying the decision after the fact and using the arguments that they really have pride in our fishing industry and in our ability to compete on the west coast. It is really an unwillingness to accept what happened, that they lost through that free trade panel.

This year the shoe was on the other foot. This time it was the Atlantic lobster. This time it was the United States through an amendment to the Magnussen Act, which regulates, among other things, the size of U.S. lobster U.S. fishermen are allowed to catch, increased the minimum size of Atlantic lobsters that could be allowed in the United States. At the same time it blocked Canadian exports of lobsters that were below that minimum size.

The trade minister and the Prime Minister protested loudly in the House of Commons that this was a trade restriction and not a conservation measure as the American fishing industry tried to proclaim. They instituted a free trade panel. We had the free trade panel with three U.S. panellists versus two Canadian panellists. Of course the decision favoured the Americans, even though we were arguing that the American restrictions under the Mitchell bill were GATT inconsistent and were a violation of GATT rules. We brought the issue to the free trade panel where we were outnumbered by the Americans and where we lost the dispute.

What did Canada do? Rather than admit that once again we had been snookered, once again the government had failed to defend the Atlantic as well as the Pacific fisheries industry, they tried to put the best

possible face on this defeat. They tried to gloss over the fact that really the Canadian government had capitulated once again and, in this case, had allowed the American lawmakers to argue that they were protecting their resource and that their rules were not trade distorting restrictions. However, on the west coast they were quite prepared to concede that our landing requirements, which were instituted for conservation reasons, were trade distorting reasons.

What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. This government cannot have it both ways. We are either acting to conserve our resource, to protect our fishing industries, or we are not. We cannot allow the U.S. legislators through the free trade agreement to bully us, whether it be by arguing conservation when it suits them or arguing trade restrictions when it suits them. We have to start defending our fishing industry, which this government has consistently refused to do, whether it be through the free trade agreement or by appealing GATT rulings as my colleague has mentioned.

I think it is an eminently sensible motion. It is a timely one at this time, given that the Uruguay Round is reaching its final stages.

One of the issues that has not been prominent in this discussion of the world trading system, since we are discussing the world trading system, is what I believe will be an emerging concern in international trade, that is the whole conflict between free trade and environmental protection, between free trade and the management of non-renewable resources such as our fish. This is an area in which the rules and the international code of ethics are still very vague.

If the recent behaviour of this government is any indication, it is prepared to allow the preponderant force of our neighbours to the south to determine in what instances they will defend their resource conservation measures and in what instances they will simply tell us: "No, you cannot defend yours. That is against free trade and we will block you on that".

The initial reaction of the government to both of these disputes is not a very good indicator of how the government is going to defend our interests in resource conservation, which is going to be one of the key issues in environmental protection in the future.