geographic arrangement, which has some ations and the state of the negotiations surpretty important resources potentially available to us. By and large, however, these resources are receiving very little attention from the Canadian government.

Mr. Chairman, not very long ago a delegation visited us here representing some of the fishermen of my own province of British Columbia. They presented, distributed and discussed with many members of this house a brief entitled "Crisis in the British Columbia Fishing Industry". They outlined at considerable length, using a considerable number of statistics, the situation in respect of fishing on the Pacific coast. Fishermen's Union of British Columbia is not the only organization in Canada which takes some interest in where we are heading with regard to our fisheries; there is another organization. I have one or two documents here from this organization, which is called the Fisheries Council of Canada. The views of this council and those of the Fishermen's Union do not always coincide in all respects, but there are some important areas in which there is pretty close agreement and outlook.

I am going to confine myself, so far as my remarks today are concerned, to the context of our fisheries in relation to the dealings of the government particularly with regard to our outside waters and what is being done to protect and conserve Canada's position as a fishing nation in the world. In its bulletin of January 1966, the Fisheries Council of Canada says in part:

What this industry had hoped to read, some-where in the Speech from the Throne, which was where in the Speech from the Throne, which was read on January 18 on the opening of Canada's 27th Parliament, was something of this order: "My government will recommend to parliament further measures calculated to give effect to Bill S-17 "An Act respecting the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones of Canada", which parliament passed in 1964. Our object must be, without undue delay, to protect Canada's fisheries for Canadian fisher-men. men.

Then, a little later on in their review of what should be in the Speech from the Throne, they have this to say:

Among other measures, my government will propose a comprehensive program for the greater development of the salmon resources of our Pacific coast.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the Fishermen's Union brief had quite a lot to say about what is happening to the fisheries resources on the another aspect of our international relations Pacific coast, in particular with reference to the situation arising out of the international out, in connection with the 12 mile fishing

Supply—Fisheries

acres of land we are a nation, because of our North Pacific Fisheries Commission, its operrounding that treaty. They point out that this salmon fishery, which is a high seas fishery, did not exist until 1952 and began following the signing of the Norpac Treaty between Canada, Japan and the United States of America. They point out further that from that time this fishery increased from 11.1 million pounds in 1951 to a peak of 438.4 million pounds in 1958. That is the amount taken by the Japanese in the mid-Pacific salmon fishery. Since then, it has tapered off due to a general decline in both Asian and North American salmon resources.

> The brief points out that Dr. W. Royce, director of the Fisheries Research Institute of the University of Washington College of Fisheries, speaking in Seattle on March 17, 1964, described this rape of North Pacific salmon resources as "intense, continuing, wasteful fishing by methods which largely prevent any special protection of weak runs".

> Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a brief reference to the situation in which we find ourselves at the moment. I am going to quote from the statement that was issued following the twelfth annual meeting of the commission in Seattle last November 12:

> The matter of the high seas salmon fishery in the area of intermingling of Asian and North American stocks west of 175 degrees west longi-tude was discussed. No agreement was reached concerning this problem.

> Mr. Chairman, this is a situation in respect of which there appears to be very little action and very little interest on the part of the Canadian government. We have a Secretary of State for External Affairs in this country. He concerns himself, of course, with a broad variety of questions. He makes fairly lengthy statements from time to time on such questions as Viet Nam and our future relations with the United Nations.

> Just before the minister leaves the house for a very important appointment, I am sure, I should like to suggest to him that if he cannot find the time and the energy to deal with some of these other very important national problems involving the economic future of this country and its welfare, perhaps he should suggest to the Prime Minister that he needs an associate minister such as there is in the Department of National Defence. Then, perhaps we can get greater attention paid to some of these problems. There is with which I intend to deal. I wish to point