

Fishing Industry

Friday. The negotiation teams came up with a proposal which they intend to recommend to their respective governments. In view of some of the answers which I received on Friday regarding a commitment from the government to delay any official ratification of that treaty until certain stipulations are met by the United States, I think it is an appropriate discussion for today.

I share the same skepticism as many Canadians when it comes to negotiating treaties with our neighbours to the south. We only need to look at some of the current outstanding issues of concern to Canada to make us a little bit cautious about entering another agreement which may turn out as sour as the east coast fisheries treaty. I would like to refer to several of those outstanding issues, including the issue of acid rain.

This issue has been given a great deal of attention both in the House and the public sector in Canada and the United States. Certainly, environmentalists are concerned about the increase in the use of coal in the United States to generate energy because it is expected that it will increase acid rain in that country and, therefore, because of air currents flowing toward Canada, increase the incidence of acid rain in our country by 25 per cent. Because of this concern it is felt that we should talk with the United States to see if they will not reconsider and give us some assurances that that increase in coal usage will be reduced.

We are also having difficulties with the auto pact and the refusal of the United States to renegotiate that pact. As a result, it has given us a deficit position of \$3 billion for last year and very little return for research and development. We need research and development in Canada to employ our technical people and our young people who are hoping to find meaningful jobs in this country.

There is also the Garrison diversion. Many of my colleagues from the prairies are still advocating and lobbying the government to see if the Americans will not curtail that project, which continues to go ahead irrespective of the very dire consequences to our Canadian fishing industry in the prairies.

Last week a delegation from British Columbia expressed its concern about the Skagit Valley. Two successive provincial governments have failed to convince the United States to curtail the flooding of that valley in B.C., which is a very important recreational facility and wildlife area for the residents of the lower mainland of Vancouver.

The east coast fisheries treaty is still in limbo. The United States negotiators and Canadian negotiators signed a treaty which took them two years to negotiate, which would give protection to the fishermen of both countries, provide some stability in the east coast industry, and a joint management program in the disputed areas around Georges Bank. The treaty took two years to negotiate and one month for Canada to approve. Canada approved the agreement in March, 1979, and, as I am sure many hon. members are aware, the U.S. Senate foreign relations committee still has not ratified that treaty. In fact that committee has told Canada bluntly that it will not be ratified without some amendments.

Canada has already made considerable sacrifices in that treaty. It is not too well known that Canadian fishermen on both the east coast and the west coast are in competition for the same fish stocks as the American fishermen. In negotiating the east coast treaty, Canada gave up a considerable amount of the scallop stocks in order to get agreement. At one time the United States caught only 10 per cent of the scallops on the east coast. After negotiations, they were able to catch up to 26 per cent of the scallop stock.

The United States has increased that quota on their own accord by increasing their fleet by 50 per cent and they are now taking 40 per cent of the scallops despite the negotiated allocation of 26 per cent. Canada agreed that we would not negotiate a boundary and that we would take the boundary dispute to arbitration and accept the award. We agreed that we would take no concessions on cod and haddock which also caused our Canadian fishermen to suffer.

We agreed not to fish herring for three years in order to allow stocks to build up. Canada wanted a permanent deal to protect its fishermen and so that they would know what kind of investment they could make in the industry and what stocks they would be able to fish. The United States agreed to a period of ten years, and Canada compromised again. We now have a situation where not even that agreement is good enough. The U.S. again wants to open negotiations after Canada has backed down in at least five very critical areas.

We relayed the attitude of a number of members in this House to the United States through an interparliamentary committee which went to Washington on July 23. At that time we were told in no uncertain terms, as we were told again last week by the Rhode Island Senator Claiborne Pell, that the Americans would not be negotiating on the issue. The representations made by all parties in this House were as equally firm for a treaty ratification by the U.S. Senate foreign relations committee.

In British Columbia we now have what could be a very important treaty for managing the stocks on the west coast to allow Canada to embark on an enhancement program on a very threatened Fraser River chinook and sockeye salmon stock. However, the New Democratic Party would like to make some comments, and caution the government before that treaty is ratified. We would like to make some suggestions which were made to the House last Friday in the form of questions.

Before the government ratifies the west coast treaty, we would like the opportunity to debate this subject in the House to determine if the treaty is indeed in the interests of Canadian west coast salmon fishermen. If one considers that in ratifying the east coast treaty it took the government only one month and that we have been waiting since March, 1979, for ratification by the U.S. Senate, we should seek the assurance, before ratification, that the U.S. Senate foreign relations committee and the U.S. Senate have indeed ratified the west coast treaty so that we are on the same ground. We did not have that on the east coast and, as a result, the fishermen there are suffering a loss of income through a loss of fish. And probably just