

sure that sound conservation practice is extended to the whole of our shelf and its slope. We are prepared to fish our shelf along with other nations on a co-operative basis, but with Canada being on the inside track; and, in so far as the exploitation of new species is concerned, we would have the total fishery. That has been our policy. That is our policy today.

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Speaker, may I ask one further question. I hesitate to interrupt the minister. Has the government indicated to the Icelandic government, for example, that we as Canadians will support their resolution which, if I read it correctly, states that their continental shelf fisheries resources will be managed by them in the area between 50 and 70 miles off the shore. That area is to include their natural continental shelf which, in one area, extends out for 70 miles. Will we, as a nation, take the public stand that we are endorsing that type of action in the hope that Iceland, in turn, will support our action when we go before the 1973 Law of the Sea Conference?

Mr. Davis: There is common ground here. We have worked closely with the Icelandic fishing industry in respect of getting the price of fish up, and in respect of the optimum management of the continental shelf. We are interested in the fishery out beyond 50 miles. We are not interested in a 50 mile only policy. What I have referred to is a total shelf policy. We may cheer them on, but I do not think we should follow their policy in detail, Mr. Speaker.

There are one or two other points I should like to touch on, Mr. Speaker. I would not like to leave the impression that our commercial fishery off the east coast is in the process of being wiped out. It is in difficulties, in that the resource itself is under heavy pressure offshore from very large fleets owned by a number of countries. Indeed, the number of countries is increasing. Japan has recently entered the fishery off the east coast as well. Yet the total catch in quantity this year, in 1971, will be in the same order of magnitude as the highest catch ever taken in the North Atlantic. And because of the higher prices which we now obtain for our fisheries products in the markets of the world, the total income to the fishery will be very much higher this year, 1971, than it has ever been. So, in terms of income, we are making progress. It is in terms of fish stocks that we have a problem, and this is the area in which we must work closely with other nations.

As for the other points which have been raised are concerned, I was asked how many of the 14 nations have already indicated their willingness for reciprocal policing of their vessels by our own officers, and vice versa, in the North Atlantic. I am sorry that I cannot answer that precisely. I think about ten nations have already taken the necessary steps, either by regulation or by passing legislation. All are expected to do so before the convention meets again next year in June. The principal nations about which we are really concerned, the USSR and the United States, have signed and we are anxious to start operating reciprocally with them now.

Perhaps a few statistics could be of interest. I think anyone listening to this debate would have the impression that over the years other offshore nations have been taking the bulk of the fish from our shores and continental shelf. This is true with respect to cod. The offshore nations collectively took two-thirds, and we took about a

third of the cod. However, Canadians took more than half of all the other species, including herring which may be in jeopardy, and haddock. The average figure is 50 per cent. Canadians currently take 85 per cent of the total catch of scallops off the east coast. Canadian commercial fishermen take 80 per cent of the pollock. They take 60 per cent of the herring, 50 per cent of the haddock, 50 per cent of the red fish and 50 per cent of the flounders. So, good conservation practices will depend in considerable measure on our own good practice as well as the practice of other nations.

I am glad to note that hon. members in all corners of the House support this legislation. I am convinced that it will help us eventually to develop a policy to bring about orderly production and better remuneration for the commercial fishery in the North Atlantic.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE ON STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council) moved:

That Standing Order 65(3) be amended by adding thereto the following:

"(c) On Regulations and other Statutory Instruments, to act as members on the part of this House on the Joint Committee of both Houses established for the purpose of reviewing and scrutinizing statutory instruments standing permanently referred thereto by section 26 of the Statutory Instruments Act, to consist of 12 members;"

And that a message be sent to the Senate requesting that House to unite with this House for the above purpose, and to select, if the Senate deems it advisable, some of its Members to act on the proposed joint committee.

• (4:40 p.m.)

He said: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a very few remarks in connection with this motion to establish an additional standing committee, a standing committee that is intended to be a joint committee of both Houses of Parliament. Hon. members will be aware of the history of this process in establishing parliamentary machinery for reviewing regulations and other forms of administrative legislation. The setting up of this scrutiny committee is really the final step in that process.

As hon. members will recall, in the first session of this Parliament, a thorough review of this question was undertaken by a special committee under the chairmanship of the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan). On the basis of the committee report, the government prepared the Statutory Instruments Act which was passed earlier in the present session.

I believe that consultations have been held with members of the opposition with regard to this particular motion and that it has the general acceptance of the House. As has been pointed out in previous speeches that have been made in discussion on the bill, it is intended that the committee will operate in a non-partisan man-