

light of the importance of this department and the fact that it has existed as a department of government since 1868. As a matter of fact, the department of marine and fisheries, as it was then known, was established on May 22, 1868. It has continued to exist as a vital and important part of government ever since.

• (3:20 p.m.)

It is interesting to reflect that if there had not been a department of marine and fisheries, confederation would probably not have taken place: New Brunswick and Nova Scotia would have been reluctant to join the new federation without grounds for believing that this important industry would be protected by an established department.

There have been a number of occasions on which the department has been changed as a result of organizational bills put forward by governments. Changes were made in the thirties, and during the fifties under the distinguished government of my right hon. friend from Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker). Changes were made under the government of Mr. Lester Pearson. But none of these changes affected the basic structure of the department, which had as its primary responsibility jurisdiction over the fishing industry in Canada. This has always been implied in the name of the department.

Therefore we feel a sound argument can be put forward in favour of the government accepting the proposition that the deputy minister of the environment should be known as the deputy minister of fisheries, just as hon. members opposite accepted the argument that the Minister of the Environment should also be designated by statute as the Minister of Fisheries. For these reasons I intend to move the following amendment:

That all the words after "That" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Bill C-207 be not now read a third time but be referred back to committee of the whole with an instruction to amend clause 4 thereof by adding thereto, next after line 3 on page 2 thereof, the following:

"(2) Upon appointment, the deputy minister of the Environment shall be the deputy minister of fisheries."

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the amendment moved by my hon. friend from St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) in the firm belief that the substance of the amendment should be accepted by those on the government side if they wish to be consistent in their thinking. They have already accepted an amendment that the Minister of the Environment shall also be the Minister of Fisheries, and it seems obvious to me that the deputy minister of the environment should also be the deputy minister of fisheries.

According to a memorandum which was submitted to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry, the fishing industry will now come under the authority of an assistant deputy minister—one of six assistant deputy ministers responsible to a senior assistant deputy minister and a deputy minister. My hon. friend from St. John's East gave a complete resumé of the way in which authority is divided. It is evident to those of us who have studied this memorandum that fisheries problems are

Government Organization Act, 1970

way down the ladder. We are too low on the totem pole. We think the rating now contemplated is not good enough. I submit that the present rating of importance attached to the fishing industry by the government is not in keeping with the importance of the industry to Atlantic Canada and to the nation as a whole.

Some may wonder why we who represent constituencies in Atlantic Canada have taken such a strong position on this matter. The answer is, of course, that our Atlantic and, for that matter, our Pacific coastal areas contain some of the world's most prolific fishing grounds. A significant part of our national development has been associated with fisheries and as a result fisheries considerations have always been important in the formulation of Canada's international and domestic policies. Canada is a party to nine international fisheries conventions aimed at the study and management of various fisheries on both our coasts and in the Great Lakes. In addition, we have signed bilateral agreements with the United States and the U.S.S.R. concerning the fishing activities of those nations off our shores.

Unfortunately, the development of international law has failed to keep pace with the realities of the operations of modern fishing fleets. The prolific fishing grounds which first attracted European settlers to our shores have since proved a magnet for the modern fishing fleets of the world to a point at which some species have been fished beyond their maximum sustainable yield and others are, unfortunately, past the point of recovery. This is the situation on the extensive fishing grounds off our east coast.

Our experience in multinational fisheries management has shown that the fewer nations involved in the management of a fishery, the better are the chances of good management. We also know that the fewer nations involved, the better are our chances of meeting the needs of our fishermen and of our fishing industry. It is for these reasons we have advocated that the coastal state should possess jurisdiction over the living resources of the continental shelf. We can support this claim because most of the commercially valuable species are associated with the continental shelf, and because the ownership of resources on and under the seabed of the continental shelf is accepted by international law as residing in the coastal state. So what I propose would be a logical extension of international law.

I realize that jurisdiction over these living resources would carry with it responsibility for management. Whenever these resources were under exploited or not exploited at all by the coastal state, other nations could be permitted to exploit them; but they would always be subject to the conservation regulations of the coastal state. A policy of this type would serve the interests of Canada's fishing industry, with one important exception. This exception involves the anadromous species—those which spend part of their life at sea and part in fresh water. In respect of this species, especially Atlantic and Pacific salmon, we must secure universal agreement on the proposition that salmon, for instance, belong to the nation in whose territory they spend their freshwater