

But that is not the worst reservation. Another one is that when regulations do come to be made, any having to do with the type of fishing net to be used cannot become effective if they conflict with the law of either the State of Washington or of the appropriate jurisdiction in Canada. What does that mean? If I understand English, here is what it means. Suppose that after eight years have passed the commissioners decide that a certain size of net is required so that young sockeye salmon may escape and propagate and this industry may be preserved. Then if it is found that that type of net is not in conformity with the law of the State of Washington, that state's law must prevail. What kind of treaty is that? It just means that after eight years have elapsed, after a study has been completed and the commissioners are in a position to promulgate regulations, any regulations in respect of this very vital matter of providing for escapement of sockeye salmon from nets will in reality be subject to approval by the State of Washington.

Hon. Mr. HARDY: And the Dominion of Canada.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Hon. Mr. HARDY: The regulations have to be in conformity with the laws of Canada as well as of the State of Washington.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, but that does not help a bit. It is really just the same as if only the State of Washington were mentioned, because regulations will have to comply with the law of that state.

Hon. Mr. HARDY: Quite right.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The third provision is one which I cannot regard so seriously, although I know that in some quarters it is seriously regarded. Nothing can be done except after consultation with an advisory committee of five members from each country. I do not think their approval is specified as necessary, but they must be consulted. Well, honourable members can feel sure that this consultation will mean further delay, if nothing worse. However, I set that third qualification or modification or reservation or understanding, or whatever you like to call it, to one side. These first two reservations simply mean the United States Senate has ratified on condition that the treaty is to have no effect. That is where we have arrived.

I do not know of any objection to approving this. Perhaps it is worth trying. The honourable leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) says that it is at least a

step forward. But it is a step so molecular that you would need a high-powered instrument to see it.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STANTON: Are we not rather silly to pass the resolution at all?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know. I would not be opposed to the passing of it.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: To one who is not familiar with conditions on the Pacific coast there is a fact which appears very extraordinary. Under the convention a great asset, a natural resource, is to be shared in equally by the United States and Canada—

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Although the source of the salmon is Canadian.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: —although the source of the salmon is the Fraser river. But when the salmon go to sea, not only do they fall prey to United States fishermen, but they may also fall prey to fishermen from Japan. I cannot understand why the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada should not do their level best to maintain and preserve for both countries that great asset—

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STANTON: But they do not.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: —of which, under the convention, they are joint beneficiaries. While I recognize the force of my right honourable friend's statement, I would point out that perhaps after a commission has surveyed the ground it may be able so to stir up public opinion in both countries as to bring about better conditions. I move the adoption of the resolution.

Hon. G. H. BARNARD: Honourable senators, in view of the remarks of the right honourable leader on this side of the House (Right Hon. Mr. Meighen), I do not propose, as I had intended, to suggest adjournment of the debate to give the honourable senator from New Westminster (Hon. Mr. Taylor) an opportunity of discussing the matter. We have been given to understand that for some reason the Government is anxious that the treaty should be ratified at once.

It is a little difficult to see the need for such hurry. The original treaty was ratified by this Parliament some seven or eight years ago, and it was only after some years of discussion that the United States Government decided to make any overtures at all in connection with the matter.

In my judgment the people of British Columbia are not likely to receive this treaty