

he should be released from the penitentiary had been previously made, and an officer of the Immigration Department was in readiness to escort him across the boundary. The warden says that upon receiving the order for the release of the prisoner he stated that fact to the prisoner, and told him that if he wished he might remain longer in the penitentiary until he could communicate with his friends in the United States or elsewhere if he had any hope that he would receive money from them. It was the prisoner's own wish that he should not wait for any such communication, but should be released at the earliest moment possible. He was accordingly allowed to go. But before leaving the penitentiary he was furnished with the clothing which he had when he came into the institution, and also with a complete new suit, boots, cap and underwear, and he was also furnished with five dollars in money. Instructions were given to the immigration officer who was to accompany him to Ogdensburg that no part of this five dollars was to be expended within Canada. The prisoner was, therefore, when he arrived at Ogdensburg, not penniless, or in the condition which has been represented, and the regulations of the penitentiary, as well as the interests of ordinary humanity, have, in this case, I think, been fully complied with.

COMBINES INVESTIGATION ACT.

Mr. MADDIN. I would like to ask the Minister of Labour when he will have ready for the House the report under the Combines Investigation Act, also whether regulations have been passed pursuant to the provisions of section 45 of the Act, and when we may expect the report of all such investigations as may have taken place under that statute, or whether any investigations at all have taken place.

Mr. KING. Such report as there is to present has been presented to the House already in connection with the report of the Department of Labour. The hon. member will find in the annual report of the department the information he has asked for.

Mr. MADDIN. Section 46 of the Act says that the minister shall lay before parliament within the first 15 days of the next session the annual report of proceedings under this Act. I submit that a mere reference to it in the report of the Department of Labour is not a report such as was contemplated by this section of the Act. One would look in vain for a report of the proceedings under this Act if he were to search for it in the annual report of the Department of Labour. I submit that the minister should lay before this parliament the report required under section 46 of the Act.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH.

THE HAGUE TRIBUNAL—FISHERIES REGULATIONS.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to take this opportunity to refer to the negotiations which took place last week in Washington with reference to the differences still at that time existing between the government of the United States and this country in regard to the regulations and laws governing the operation of Canadian fisheries in Atlantic waters. It will be remembered that one of the principal questions in dispute referred to the arbitrament of the tribunal at The Hague was the question whether the legislation of Canada or of Newfoundland could be considered binding upon citizens of the United States while exercising their treaty privileges within British waters; so long as such legislation had not been assented to by the government or Congress of the United States. If the decision of that question had upheld the contention of the United States that such legislation was not binding upon fishermen coming from that country into Canadian or Newfoundland waters it is plain, of course, that there would have been no further question in relation to any of our future or existing legislation. Such legislation would have been the enactment of regulations with which the inhabitants of the United States would have no concern, and it would have been indifferent to them what regulations we or Newfoundland might see fit to pass. The decision of that question, however, was in favour of the British contention, maintaining the sovereign right of Britain and her colonies to legislate with regard to these territorial waters, and maintaining equally that such legislation, so long as it did not transgress the provisions of the treaty under which the United States fishermen claim their right of access to our waters, would be equally binding upon such fishermen as upon our own people. That decision having been pronounced, it at once became a practical question what disposition should be made of the existing legislation and regulations on the part of Canada and Newfoundland.

The United States had taken formal objection before the tribunal to practically the whole of both Canadian and Newfoundland fisheries legislation, taking the position that, for one reason or another, all of this legislation contravened the true intent and meaning of the Treaty of 1818 and therefore, ought to be pronounced as of no effect so far as the fishermen from the United States was concerned. The disposition of that question, which had been agreed to by the parties in coming to their arrangement for arbitration, was that it should be pronounced upon by the tribunal itself. It was for that we had stipulated, it was that which we expected; but