

North Pacific Fishery

Furthermore, the second limitation is that only three species of fish on the Pacific coast are protected at the present time, namely salmon, halibut and herring. Other species of fish are not now protected, and can be protected only until such time as the three powers signing the convention will accept the fact that any other species of fish which it is Canada's desire to preserve can be proved to have been scientifically conserved and fully utilized.

The third limitation to which objection is taken is the limited period of time this convention is in force, because after a period of eleven years and one day any of the contracting parties may discontinue the convention at will.

The reappearance of Japan as a great fishing power on the Pacific ocean is already causing many repercussions. I pointed out some of the activities Japan was entering into when we were discussing this measure at the resolution stage. I pointed out the number of expeditions Japan was planning for 1953. I showed the expansion that had taken place in Japanese fishing during 1952. Already objection is being taken to the extension of the Japanese fishing interests into the Bering sea by the fishermen of the United States. Also under the peace treaty—and I am not now referring to the convention—Japan is bound to accept any proposal from Australia for the opening of negotiations for another fishing pact, dealing with the activities of the Japanese fishing industry around Australian waters. It is inevitable that such a pact would be based upon this one, which we are now asked to ratify.

All these limitations and reasons would suggest that perhaps the government is in somewhat of a hurry to give ratification to this treaty. I feel that this convention will serve as a pattern for many other fishing treaties and conventions the world over. A thorough examination of it would seem fully justified.

However, we must recognize the fact that a limited degree of security is given to the fish of the Pacific ocean off the coast of British Columbia, and that without this convention there would not be even that measure of security. So I can only hope that the convention will not be considered by any means the last word in fisheries agreements, conventions or treaties, and that further consideration should be given. I hope the minister will refer the bill to the standing committee on marine and fisheries.

Mr. Angus MacInnis (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of bill with which the average layman like myself does not feel competent to deal at a time like this. I would hope that the parliamentary assistant to the

Minister of Fisheries would consent to sending the bill to the committee on marine and fisheries, so that experts on the fishing industry in Canada might appear before that committee and explain to it those sections of the convention which may not be quite clear to us.

I think people throughout the country will have to realize, as I do, that Japan, with its expanding population of now pretty close to 90 million people, must have access to the fisheries of the Pacific ocean, and that we cannot take the attitude that we must preserve special privileges for Canada. On the other hand we should be careful not to give away something without getting something in return. I am informed that if the treaty were passed in its present form it would limit the expansion of Canadian fisheries into Bristol bay and the Bering sea, and would in no way limit American operations off our Canadian shores. The only advantage that could be shown for this three-way deal is that it would provide a more lenient base for Canadians fishing in the waters of the gulf of Alaska. But here again the advantage is not very clear.

So I would hope that, even if it would require a little time, the minister would refer this treaty to the standing committee on marine and fisheries, where we could give it closer study.

Mr. E. T. Applewhaite (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I feel myself in considerable sympathy with the opening remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) when he referred to the difficulty of one who is more or less a layman, in the matter of foreign treaties, endeavouring to discuss this subject.

At the same time, as one who took a small part in the negotiation of this treaty, I consider it my duty to express my views to the house on the subject. Further, I flatter myself that perhaps to some slight degree I may be of some help in explaining those sections of the bill and those portions of the treaty which may be causing some worry.

Before going into the subject matter of the treaty I should like to trespass for a few moments upon the indulgence of the house to refer to those Canadians who were responsible for bringing these negotiations to their present stage. I am sure the present Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Sinclair) would be in full agreement with me, if he were here to hear me say that the fact that the Hon. R. W. Mayhew was at the head of the Canadian delegation, and to a large extent set the tone of the negotiations in Japan, contributes in no small measure to the fact that we did come out of these negotiations with a treaty.