

nated for the whole term of its existence because Canada has had no real working representation on that Commission.

The recent history of this convention is another illustration of the futility and weakness of the administration of fishery affairs on the part of the Government of Canada—a matter to which I referred in the Halibut Treaty discussion here a few days ago. Last year, although this matter had been before the two Governments, as we have just now been informed, for twenty or twenty-five years, this Government approached Washington with a treaty so clumsily drawn, so amateur in all its provisions, that after a few weeks' consideration it was withdrawn both at Washington and Ottawa because of its manifest imperfections and the impossibility of carrying out the conditions suggested, and also because of the inadequacy of the convention, which showed a lack of appreciation on the part of those who negotiated, particularly for Canada, as to the needs of the situation.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Why not apply this judgment which my honourable friend pronounces on the qualifications of the Canadian delegates to the American delegates as well, inasmuch as the convention was the child of both?

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: There is a very simple answer to that question. In the convention of last year the advantage on every article was plainly on the side of the American delegates, who, in drawing up the convention, imposed their will upon the Canadians in every respect. It was because the American delegates had imposed their will in this way that objection was taken to it last year by persons in British Columbia interested in the convention.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: But it was not accepted by the American authorities either.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: No, but that was for another and very different reason. The reason why it was not accepted by the American authorities appeals to Canada also; but the Government who negotiated it should have realized that before they pressed upon this Parliament the creation of a bargain with the United States which was to last for sixteen years without any revision of any kind, and under which it was proposed to appoint commissioners for the whole of that term without any possibility of their removal, no matter what their actions might be.

I mention this, not because I want to involve this Chamber in discussions that have taken place elsewhere, but because I am aware that in another place it has been represented that this treaty was withdrawn from the Parliament

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR.

of Canada last year because of objections raised for political purposes. I have only to state the nature of some of the objections to make it plain to the House that politics had no part whatever in the matter, and this becomes evident now when this Government, without any political urging whatever, comes back to Parliament with a treaty that in every section is entirely different from the treaty proposed last year. For instance, the treaty of last year took no cognizance of the fact that the fishery operations of both countries have been menaced during the past two or three seasons by something not hitherto in existence, namely, the bootlegging operations of fish pirates who have gone out from Puget Sound and intercepted the salmon on the high seas before either the State of Washington or the Dominion of Canada could get the fish under their control inside the Strait of Juan de Fuca. That has been recognized in the treaty of this year by the jurisdiction of the Commission being extended westward into the Pacific Ocean between parallels 48 and 49 degrees north latitude—a most important provision, without which the treaty would have been futile in attempting to protect fish that would have been destroyed on the high seas by the intensive seining operations of those bootleggers, but as to which, apparently, the Government and Department were oblivious.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: The objection raised in the other House last year was that the Government had bowed to the decrees of the United States Government.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: I am not discussing the debate that took place in the other House last year, although I could discuss it with very great satisfaction to myself.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: There would perhaps be no recrimination if we confined ourselves to the present convention. I have not before me the convention of last year and cannot follow my honourable friend in that regard.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: It is typical of the unfortunate position of the fishery administration in Canada that there is no responsible member of the Government conversant with the fishery situation; that these negotiations have been left to subordinates of comparatively humble degree, who have shown very little acquaintance with anything but the minute details of their office duties, and no appreciation at all of the larger interests upon which these treaties should be founded. I say this with no disrespect for the honourable gentleman. I realize that it is absolutely im-