

Mr. FOUND: I think it submitted its report in 1923.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: It apparently was acted upon in 1927.

Mr. FOUND: The big fall in revenue in 1927 was due to the Privy Council case. We had a \$500 licence fee for traps and purse seines at that time.

Hon. Mr. KING: And that was reduced to what?

Mr. FOUND: \$20.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we might take up the proposed treaty now. Have any members of the Committee questions to ask? Perhaps Senator Taylor has some?

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: My interest here is almost solely in the treaty. As I know the administration of the fisheries in British Columbia, I have nothing but admiration and praise for it. I have no desire to discuss that at all. I have had my eye on it for forty years, and the fisheries have been well administered. They are administered, though, under direction from Ottawa, and particularly under the direction of instruments like this proposed sockeye fisheries convention. I am quite sure that this was never made in British Columbia, possibly not even made in Canada. It has all the earmarks of having been made in the United States of America, to join our sockeye salmon fisheries to the other branches of the fishery which we have given over to American control. When this convention first came before Parliament it was not received at all with the acclaim which we have heard greeted it when it was passed through both branches of Parliament and through the Congress of the United States. On the contrary, it met with a rebuff that I think was never before experienced by any diplomatic document. That is, when it was first introduced, about 1925, the provisions were found to be so extraordinary, so damaging to the prospects of Canadian interests, that a strong government, which had a big majority in the House of Commons and was able to pass anything it desired, voluntarily withdrew it, and the thing did not come back again until a couple of years afterwards and then in a very much amended form.

As I see it, this treaty is based on absolutely wrong premises and on the promise of something that it is impossible to do. The wrong premises are these, as stated in Article VII:—

Inasmuch as the purpose of this Convention is to establish for the High Contracting Parties, by their joint effort and expense, a fishery that is now largely non-existent . . . .

That is the part which I say is absolutely contrary to the fact, for the fishery is not largely non-existent, and is not threatened with any such fate. As I see it, the promoters of this treaty took advantage of the occurrence at Hell's Gate in 1913. There is no question that that was an interference with the part of the sockeye fishery having its origin above 150 miles up the Fraser river, that is above Hell's Gate, but I have never been satisfied that that was the sole reason for the disappearance of the sockeye. I have always felt that there was some entirely different reason, unknown to the Department of Fisheries but which I did feel it should have been at some pains to ascertain. Instead of that, we have had it rubbed into us year after year that the paucity of our fishery was due solely to the occurrence at Hell's Gate. If that were so, it would not likely be possible to remedy the conditions there and we would have to say good-bye to the sockeye. But while we still laboured under that misapprehension, Providence in its wisdom restored to us a couple of years ago the largest sockeye run that we had had for nearly twenty years. The bluebooks that I have here congratulate the people of British Columbia on the operation of the salmon fishery and the advent of the finest year that we had had. But that very year, when we were being complimented on the restoration of our fishery, this proposed treaty comes before the Parliament of Canada and the Congress of