

North Pacific Fishery

Of the others who were there, Mr. Stewart Bates, the deputy minister of fisheries—and this is no reflection on the then minister at all—was undoubtedly the leading member, irrespective of which nation you refer to, in these negotiations. Mr. Bates proved to me to be, first, a bonnie fighter when the interests of Canada were concerned, and second, an expert diplomat when, and there were such occasions, it looked as though negotiations might perhaps break down. The job that he has done for us, for the fishermen of the Pacific coast, is outstanding. Mr. Arthur R. Menzies, who was at the time chargé d'affaires for Canada in Tokyo, took an active part throughout the negotiations, and this was just one of many arduous jobs that he has performed and performed well for Canada. We had with us Mr. Samuel Ozere, legal adviser of the Department of Fisheries, who has been described to me, and not by a member of the Department of Fisheries, as the outstanding lawyer on territorial waters on the North American continent. We had as advisers, Dr. Hart, our scientific director of the Pacific biological station, and Mr. John M. Buchanan, president of B. C. Packers. Dr. John Hart, as biologist, and Mr. Buchanan as speaking for the industry both added considerably to the weight of the Canadian delegation. And so I think you will find, Mr. Speaker, that with one exception you had out there a group of men who have done a very fine job for the fishing industry of the Pacific coast and whose work was a credit to themselves and to the country which they represented.

I should like to put myself on record now as saying with all the modesty of which I am capable—

Mr. Macdonnell (Greenwood): Oh!

Mr. Applewhaite: —and I note the interruption of the hon. member for Greenwood—that if my parliamentary career were to be cut short at five o'clock tonight I would feel that I had some ground for pride and satisfaction in that I had been able to contribute in a small way to the production of this treaty.

The subject matter of the treaty itself and the whole treaty clause by clause were referred to the standing committee of this house on marine and fisheries at the last session, and that committee considered the treaty and reported entirely with unanimity and almost non-politically. I have not a very long parliamentary career, and I do not know whether it is usual or very unusual that when a report is being submitted on a bill some private member of a committee should move that the word “unanimously” be inserted. That was done in this case and

the committee's report came in reading “unanimously”. Of course, that could not have happened had any one member of the committee raised his voice against it.

The committee in its deliberations, I think, discussed this matter and looked at it entirely from a non-political point of view. The treaty's main—no, it would not be fair to say only—result is that we have protected for the lifetime of the treaty the halibut, the herring and the salmon of the Pacific coast of Canada. That is only three species out of all the species of fish that we fish for on that coast, but in the calendar year 1951, the last for which I have complete figures, the landed value of these three species on the Pacific coast was \$37,821,945. The landed value of all the other species combined was \$3,075,000. Therefore we have given protection during the lifetime of the treaty to these three species, which represent well over ninety per cent of the dollar value of our Pacific catch at the present time.

Why do I say, the “lifetime of the treaty”? I say that because in the treaty there is a fixed period of five years only. But the treaty does say that that protection for these three varieties of fish shall remain in force after the expiry of the five-year period until such time as all three governments, through their representatives on the commission, decide that halibut, herring or salmon no longer qualifies for or no longer requires that protection. In other words, the protection is there until Canada voluntarily relinquishes it, because protection is there until Canada's representatives on the commission state that it is no longer required.

I made reference, Mr. Speaker, to the unanimity and to the non-political aspect of the committee which considered this treaty. And at the time I was sitting on the committee I considered that that was a statement of fact. The hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Pearkes), when speaking on the resolution stage of this bill, at page 3379 of *Hansard* spoke of—

—a certain amount of misunderstanding which existed on the west coast, and a good deal of controversy which took place, . . .

I would say, and I think not unkindly, that the hon. member for Nanaimo has contributed in no small way to that measure of misunderstanding which may have existed on the coast and to the measure of controversy which has been raised on the coast in connection with this treaty, because the hon. member for Nanaimo, in my opinion, did not introduce politics into the committee on marine and fisheries, but did take the committee on marine and fisheries into politics. And it is regrettable, because the hon. member for Nanaimo carries a lot of weight on