

she allowed these obstructions to be placed on the Columbia river without protest. Canada has a considerable interest in that river. It will take me only a moment to quote from the treaty which was signed in 1846. Article II reads:

From the point at which the 49th parallel of north latitude shall be found to intersect the great northern branch of the Columbia river, the navigation of the said branch shall be free and open to the Hudson's Bay Company, and to all British subjects trading with the same, to the point where the said branch meets the main stream of the Columbia, and thence down the said main stream to the ocean, with free access into and through the said river or rivers; it being understood, that all the usual portages along the line thus described shall in like manner be free and open.

In navigating the said river or rivers, British subjects, with their goods and produce, shall be treated on the same footing as citizens of the United States; it being, however, always understood, that nothing in this article shall be construed as preventing, or intended to prevent, the government of the United States from making any regulations respecting the navigation of the said river or rivers, not consistent with the present treaty.

By that treaty British subjects, that is Canadian citizens, were to be allowed free approach and access from the interior of Canada right to the Pacific ocean through United States territory. During the last few years quite a number of dams have been built for power purposes on the Columbia river. These dams have taken away from us the right granted in the treaty of 1846, and we are now beginning to feel the effects of the construction of these dams. Since these dams have been completed, fishing on the Columbia river has practically passed out of existence. Besides the one dam to which I have referred, another dam is nearing completion located about thirty miles from Spokane. This dam will back up the waters of the Columbia river across the boundary line into Canada. This whole matter should be taken up by the International Joint Commission and a claim made by Canada for adequate compensation for the losses sustained through the violation of the treaty of 1846. I need not point out that if Canada had violated such a treaty, the United States would have made immediate representations in protest.

I should like to refer to the third understanding. The Prime Minister has pointed out that while the representation is not compulsory, it is intended that various branches of the industry will be represented upon this commission. I cannot see any reason at the moment why sport fishing should be represented. As is well known, the sockeye salmon

[Mr. Reid.]

is not a sport fish. I think the representation on this commission should be confined to commercial and actual workers in the industry. Representations were made only last year by sports clubs in my district to eliminate the commercial fishermen from two rivers. It was pointed out that a six or seven inch mesh net would not stop the sport fish, but these clubs wanted the rivers for themselves. The attitude of the sport fishermen in many parts of Canada does not take into account the men who gain their livelihood from fishing. These sports fishermen are concerned only with having a little pastime generally after their week's work is over.

I should like to add one word in answer to some statements made by the leader of the opposition. Perhaps I can do this best by asking a question. What further can be done by Canada if the United States will not sign the treaty? The treaty passed this house in 1930 and since that time representations have been made at various times to have it approved by the United States. But they would not do it. I do not agree with the leader of the opposition when he says that nothing can now be done for eight years. During the past two years, since the traps have been prohibited by the Americans, Canada has been getting a greater percentage of the sockeye catch. Last year Canada got 78 per cent of the catch as against 22 per cent caught by the Americans.

The treaty can be summed up as having at least two desirable points. The first is the attempt to equalize the catches as between the United States and Canada, and the second is the preservation of the fish. An attempt is being made to preserve the fish and if possible increase the catch in the Fraser river. As to the preservation of fish, this work has been carried on for some time by the Canadian fisheries department. If one looks over the records of the catches for the past years, he will see that the remarks made by the leader of the opposition are not exactly correct. The catch last year of sockeye salmon on the runs to the Fraser river amounted to 226,393 cases. If the catches had been going down every year to the point of depletion, they would not have caught as much as they did in 1932 or 1933.

Mr. BENNETT: That indicates the undesirability of the treaty.

Mr. REID: We have no guarantee that traps will not come back. Having no guarantee, then I say that a treaty is desirable. It is desirable and we are at least assured that for at least two years we shall be able to

get a greater proportion of the catch than the Americans because they have agreed to prohibit the use of traps for two years. So that for the next two years there is no doubt that Canada will get the greater proportion of the fish coming through Puget sound waters. But as I say, what further can be done to make the Americans sign a treaty? It would be unthinkable for Canada to go out and destroy the sockeye on the Fraser river just because the Americans will not sign a treaty or because they are getting a greater percentage of the catch. I know the suggestion has been made here and there, but to me it is unthinkable. To my mind we have everything to gain even if nothing is done for eight years, although that contingency is greatly in doubt, and it may well be that, as in the case of the halibut treaty, something will be done after the commission starts to function.

I shall reserve further remarks until the committee considers the various clauses, but I thought it incumbent upon me to suggest to the committee the important questions that arise affecting the high seas and territorial waters, point out the possibilities of international complications, and to urge that it is far better for Canada to face the issue at once.

Mr. J. S. TAYLOR (Nanaimo): In view of what has been said, including the interpretation placed upon some of these regulations by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett), I should like to place before the committee some information. Reading from fisheries document 1092 of the bureau of fisheries, United States Department of Commerce, I find:

Chinook, quinnat, or king salmon. The largest of the Pacific salmon is the chinook or king salmon. It is found throughout the region from the Ventura river, California, to Norton Sound, Alaska, and on the Asiatic coast as far south as northern China. As knowledge extends, it will probably be recorded in the Arctic.

In the spring the body is silvery, the back, dorsal fin, and caudal fin having more or less of round black spots, and the sides of the head having a peculiar tin-coloured metallic lustre. In the fall the colour is, in some places, black or dirty red. The fish has an average weight of about twenty-two pounds, but—

This is the point I want to stress.—individuals weighing 70 to over 100 pounds are occasionally taken.

Dealing with the sockeye, that name being an anglicizing of the apparently Russian word sukkegh—the sockeye, blueback, or red salmon:

The red or sockeye salmon, when it first comes in from the sea is a clear bright blue above in colour, silvery below. Soon after entering the river for the purpose of spawning,

51—1937—21

the colour of the head changes to a rich olive, the back and sides to crimson, and finally to a dark blood red, and the belly to a dirty white. The maximum weight is about 12 pounds, and length 3 feet, with the average weight about 5 pounds, varying greatly, however, in different localities.

That throws some light on the question of the nets and the meshes of the nets. The plain object of a net is to catch not a few but every fish of a particular type which it is spread to catch, and if the mesh is too large, so that the small fish of that type pass through, it will not be very long before the fish of diminished size will be reproducing themselves in the spawning ground. But in this case, where chinook and sockeye salmon are running together, evidently these regulations are intended to permit the sockeye spawning fish to pass through the net, which is otherwise gauged to catch all the chinook, king or spring salmon.

I thought that that information should be brought out, in view of what has already been said.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Chairman, I would like first to thank the government, and more particularly the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe), who I think was leading the house when he agreed to bring this matter into the house at the request of myself and the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett). It is no lack of modesty that leads me to put my name before him, but simply because I brought it up first by a question in the house and then on the orders of the day, and I suffer no least illusion as to what my fate would have been if it had not been for the powerful intervention of the leader of the opposition. I have only to look at the answer that I got to the question which I asked on March 3, when I was told that the reservations or understandings simply constitute clarifications or interpretations upon administrative aspects and therefore it was not necessary to bring them into the house. That, Mr. Chairman, is another illustration of the ever-growing custom in this house, not under this government alone, but under preceding governments as well, of proceeding to eliminate almost all the power and influence of the ordinary common member and giving us government by cabinet rather than by parliament. We hear a lot about the common man, the man in the street, the forgotten man. I think there should be a movement in this house to preserve the rights and jurisdiction of the man who represents the common man—that is, the ordinary member of parliament. Otherwise the day will come when we may get ourselves elected by what methods we can,