

American may use to catch fish; that is left to his discretion. The protection we would have is that he is only to take half; we get the other half.

Mr. REID: Yes. We seem to be operating in an entirely opposite way from the United States. They do allow gill nets to operate at the mouth of the Columbia River and they prohibit seining and trapping there. But when it comes up to the international boundary close to Canadian waters, they prohibit the gill nets, even though they can be operated in the shallow waters, but they allow seines and traps. I think that is a very important factor to bear in mind. As I say, we are doing exactly the opposite.

Hon. Mr. KING: That is a recent development on the Columbia River?

Mr. REID: I am not sure. This information I obtained on May 3rd of this year. I think I should read this paragraph from the communication I received:

Northern Puget Sound does not permit gill netting, with few exceptions, because of the nature of the area, hence the fishermen are forced to use a gear which is suitable for that district. The Fraser River permits extensive gill netting as does our Columbia River. We have ruled purse seines out of the latter district and off the coast of Washington within our jurisdiction to prevent the hatching of immature fish.

That point also should be noted. It backs up the statements I made previously, that if you allow the seines to operate it will not only deplete, it will lead to the catching of immature fish, and ultimately will completely ruin the fisheries, especially in the mouth of the Fraser River. My own view would be to entirely curtail, if not abolish, seines from that section.

General McRae brought up the question of state ownership. I think there has been far too much interference with our fishermen. We are perhaps suffering from too much regulations. There have been times, even during the past year, when a higher price was offered for our raw fish across the line than could be obtained on the Canadian side. But our fishermen were prohibited from taking advantage of that better market.

The CHAIRMAN: Could not the raw fish be sold to the highest bidder?

Mr. REID: Not for export. Our fishermen were and still are prohibited from taking sockeye salmon across the line, although during the past four or five years they would have obtained anywhere from 10 to 25 cents more for each fish.

Hon. Mr. KING: Is that a Dominion prohibition?

Mr. REID: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: How long has that been in force?

Mr. FOUND: Since 1894.

Mr. REID: I do not know, gentlemen, whether I have gone into matters as fully as you would like, but I was not prepared to deal with them exhaustively.

The CHAIRMAN: You are quite clear, Mr. Reid, that if this convention could be arranged it would bring about a great improvement in present conditions?

Mr. REID: I think that would be so, although it seems to me the provisions for our propagating fish in this country should be gone into much more fully and arranged to the better advantage of this country. There are other clauses with which, of course, one might find a little fault; but I still believe—and perhaps in this I differ with Senator Taylor—I still believe the principle could be embodied under which our Canadian fishermen would have 50 per cent of the catch. It would be a great advantage to them.

Hon. Mr. KING: Senator Taylor does not seem to think that that is practicable. It would have to be done by control.

Mr. REID: Our fishermen naturally feel very much incensed that while they are not operating their competitors across the line are still busy.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: That is an argument in favour of the treaty.