

should do to make these regulations effective for the protection of Canadian interests as well as the protection of American interests. When I discussed this question before with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, he told me that this was a matter altogether impossible, because it was an affair of honour between him and the government at Washington that these regulations should be adopted precisely as they stood. Now, it seems to me that as this pledge of honour has not been fulfilled at Washington, we are absolved from being any more strict with regard to our share of this matter than they are with respect to their share, and I would ask the minister whether he will not take into consideration a representation to Washington under which, without any charge of breach of faith, we might submit this matter to our Committee on Fisheries, so that we may discuss there the amendments which I think should be made to these regulations.

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Speaker, I have already spoken on this question, but I suppose I will be permitted to offer a few remarks in answer to what has been said by my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor). This Boundary Waters Treaty, as my hon. friend has stated, has been under consideration for some time. Some two years ago it was agreed that a joint commission should be appointed by the United States and by the British authorities, for the purpose of framing fishery regulations to apply to the boundary waters. Dr. Starr Jordan was appointed on the American side, and Professor Prince was appointed on our side. Both set to work and framed a set of regulations, which were to be submitted to both governments. It was necessary on our part to pass legislation for the purpose of putting in force those regulations after the issuance of the proclamation contemplated by the treaty. This was done last year. In the United States it is contended that those regulations must be submitted to the Senate. It is contended in the United States that the treaty-making power is vested, not as in Great Britain, with the King, with the advice and consent of his counsellors, but the treaty-making power in the United States is vested in the President and the Senate of the United States. Therefore, in order that a treaty may come into force it is necessary not only that the President should sign it, but that it should be approved by the Senate, since the treaty-making power is vested in the President, on the advice and consent of the Senate. The regulations in question were submitted to the United States Senate, but so far they have not thought fit to approve of them. That is the way the matter stands at the present. When I was in Washington, in

Mr TAYLOR (New Westminster).

the month of January, in connection with the settlement of the objections made by the United States to our legislation concerning the treaty coasts under the treaty of 1818, I took the opportunity of discussing with the Counsellor at Law of the Secretary of State this whole matter. There was one objection made by some members of Congress which strongly appealed to me. It seemed that a mistake had been made in framing the regulations concerning one of the boundary waters. Different provision was made as to the size of the mesh for pound-nets and the size of the mesh in seine-nets. It was stated that so far as we were concerned there was no objection to this difference being adjusted, and on my assurance that the matter would be remedied, I was promised that the President would send a message to the United States Senate, recommending the adoption of the regulations which were based on the treaty. The message has been sent, I had the pleasure of reading it a few days ago, and I find that the President urged strongly the Senate to pass the necessary legislation. The Senate, however, adjourned without taking the final steps; but it is expected, as I have already informed my hon. friend, that during the session that is to open to-morrow the question will again be taken up by the Senate. We must recognize that there are difficulties in the United States with regard to making treaties that do not exist in Canada. I admit that the regulations that were concurred in by the two commissioners, and that we have adopted, are not up to the standard of the regulations I would like to see introduced. They are not as severe as they should be, they do not go so far as our own regulations go in respect to the preservation of the fisheries. At the same time, they do not affect the preservation of our fisheries, because we have taken power to maintain the regulations which exist to-day with regard to the preservation of our fisheries. But these regulations were a step in the right direction. They tended to concentrate power in the federal authorities of the United States, which was formerly exercised by the different states of the union. For instance, my hon. friend knows that the various border states, like Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, New York, Michigan, Wisconsin and Minnesota, have been in the habit of framing their own regulations, and a good deal of divergence exists between them. In most of those states the regulations are not up to the standard of those we have put upon our own statute-book. I think we ought at least to be satisfied with the fact that the treaty has been made. Now, I would like for my part to see them expedite their legislation and to approve of the regulations, but we must all realize that