

Mr. BROWNE (*Vancouver-Kingsway*): I think, Mr. Chairman, there has been a very important question raised here, the implications of a high seas fishery. If I might ask a question with relation to the Pacific ocean.

We have a problem out there which seems to be a difference of opinion between the Department of Fisheries, the international commission and the fishermens' union out there.

I think it is recognized that there must be conservation and the whole basis of a high seas fishery is a completely unscientific way of fishing. If we are to catch fish in the ocean, the way the Japanese are doing, we do not know where these fish are going to spawn and which streams they will take.

I realize this has to be done by international agreement, we might not be able to do anything about it here, but I do not see why there should be any difference in principle, any difference of opinion on the principle on the matter involved, whether the high seas fishing is an unscientific way of going about fishing. We do not seem to know where the fish the Japanese are catching in the ocean are spawning. We say we do not think, or there is no evidence, they are coming from Canadian waters; it might also be said that we do not know for sure that they are not coming from Canadian waters.

Aside from that it would not make any difference whether they come from Canadian waters or American waters, or any other waters; the fact is the appropriate conservation measures have to be taken.

As long as these fish are caught in the middle of the ocean I do not see any way of taking proper conservation measures.

Mr. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, this is the whole point of the international north Pacific fisheries convention. I think it is an arguable point, as to whether it is scientific or non-scientific to take salmon, for example, on the high seas.

This subject was touched upon at the first meeting of the committee and I attempted at that time to explain in a very brief and general way some of the provisions of the convention concerning the fisheries of the north Pacific.

The Japanese have agreed under the convention to abstain from fishing east of the 175th meridian. This was felt, at the time of the negotiation of the convention, to be about the dividing line between stocks of salmon from the North American coast and stocks of salmon from the Asiatic side.

The evidence up to the present time, and there has been a very comprehensive scientific investigation under the commission participated in very extensively by the three countries concerned, shows that there is an intermingling area somewhere about the 175th meridian.

At certain times of the year and in certain seasons there is no doubt, because, again, of oceanographic conditions, that some of the salmon spawned, let us say, on the North American coast do travel farther west than the 175th meridian. But, in so far as salmon originating in Canadian waters is concerned we have found no evidence to date that salmon from Canadian streams do travel that far west. This may change, of course, as further studies are made but, as I pointed out at one of the early meetings of this committee, we have had no evidence to date that that is so.

There are some stocks, beyond any question of doubt, particularly from Bristol bay, again apparently because of oceanographic conditions, which travel farther west than the 175th meridian.

I would like to make this point, also, Mr. Chairman, as to whether it is scientific or non-scientific to fish on the high seas: these are high seas water and it must be by agreement on an international level that there can be any recognition as to whether to fish on the high seas or not to fish; there is no control by any one country.