

*By Mr. Neill:*

Q. Did not that all arise in connection with the Fraser river treaty?—A. The Fraser river treaty does not specify the methods of fishing.

Q. That however applies to the negotiations; no doubt that was all taken into consideration when the treaty was in the course of negotiation?—A. Quite so, but the treaty does not provide what method of fishing shall be allowed on either side of the river. It provides for control of the amount of fishing that shall be done on either side.

*By Mr. Reid:*

Q. So that we do not have to heed very seriously the thought to which you gave expression a moment ago to the effect that there was a bare possibility of the Americans bringing back their traps, because of the fact that when the Fraser river sockeye treaty is signed it will provide for an equal distribution of the catch?—A. Yes, no matter how the catch is made.

Q. So there is the possibility of the traps being put back on the American side?—A. I see what you mean there, that the treaty would provide for the total amount of fishing that might be allowed, and a proper division of that amount between the two countries.

Q. Yes?—A. That is right.

Hon. Mr. MICHAUD: And that would be irrespective of traps or methods employed.

*By the Chairman:*

Q. Just before you leave that question, for the benefit of the committee I would like to ask, was there any undertaking given or implied to the American government that if they withheld or abolished the use of traps on their side we would do the same?—A. So far as I am aware there has been no discussion whatever of the subject.

*By Mr. Reid:*

Q. The point I desired to emphasize was about these traps; I take it that you are still of the opinion that if we take out the four traps now operating on our side the Americans may bring back the use of traps on their side. There is no telling what they may actually do, I take it?—A. Some one asked me that question, I think it was Mr. Neill: as to whether or not it would be "good ball," I think that was the term he used, for us to operate these few traps if it is going to result in bringing back the use of traps on the United States' side.

Mr. NEILL: Pardon me; I asked, would it not be good ball for us to abandon the use of these four traps in use when the Americans have discontinued the use of their some 219 traps. That has already taken place?—A. That has already taken place, it took place two years ago. The question is at the moment before the legislature of the State of Washington, and the issue is whether or not that legislation will be amended.

Mr. REID: Would it be a fair statement for me to say, Dr. Found, that the same agitation is going on across the line as to Canadians using traps where the Americans are not as was going on on this side of the line for so many years when we were not allowed to use traps and when the Americans were using about 220?—A. All I can say is that I do not know of any agitation in the United States against the use of traps on our side.

Mr. REID: I can only give you my impressions as to what I encountered during my visit to fishing centres down there, and I can assure you that there are very many representations being made by the Americans along the same lines and using the same arguments that we in Canada used.