

or three remarks which I will make if I am permitted. One blot upon the award at the Hague, in my mind and indeed, I think, in the minds of Canadians generally, was the extremely unsatisfactory position in which the matter of the fishery regulations of Canada and Newfoundland was left and the extremely costly and far-away tribunal, or double tribunal, which was arranged for the final disposition of these disputes if disputes should occur. I, for my part, after listening to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) in his very clear exposition of the matter this afternoon, am very glad indeed that at the present time it seems we are likely to escape from both of these great inconveniences. There is no reason in the wide world why two countries lying side by side with similar interests in a great many respects and similar ideals should not get very close together and arrange on business methods and on a business basis such details of a great question as arise out of the reasonableness of the regulations framed by Canada and Newfoundland.

The result of such a meeting seems to prove that there was nothing inherently difficult in having it brought about. To take into consideration whatever might have occurred in the future in the making of fishery regulations by Canada and Newfoundland, and to feel that to every one of these regulations the United States had a right to object, and that in order to get a final determination of it there must be an appeal to a mixed tribunal and afterwards to the main tribunal itself, opened up a vista of confusion, trouble, and vexation. If by this method of agreement that has been avoided for the present, that is so much gained. As the minister pointed out, the United States retains for itself the right to object even with reference to present regulations, and, of course, retains the right to object as to future regulations. But, if once we have come together and reached an understanding upon what exists, I think a very large part of the difficulty is removed. What can be done in one case and which is shown to be both convenient and inexpensive will very likely be followed in all cases which may come thereafter. I do not think there was anything inherently wrong in the position taken on these four points by Canada. I could not help but admire, however, the perspicacity of our representatives in Washington on one of these points, namely, with reference to the Sunday fishing. Now, a bluff, common man, you know, would have said to these people down there: The Lord's day must be held in honour and your fishermen ought to be at their prayers on Sunday instead of fishing. But, perspicacious and far-seeing gentlemen such as we had there

Mr. FOSTER.

preferred to put the argument on different ground; a broad humanitarian principle applied to fisheries, a sort of piscatorial humanitarian basis. Instead of asking a day of rest, and often much needed, I think, for consideration and contemplation by those who pursue the fisheries, on the means of grace and of making their lives better, it was thought best in this case to base the appeal on the ground of humanity to the fishes. It may be that in the long course of evolution the cod and herring which abound on these coasts will come to understand what the seventh day means, and maybe they will show an appreciation of it which sometimes their more highly developed pursuers lack. However, the main thing is that, however, the argument was approached the result was obtained, and the fishes will have the advantage of that one day in seven of rest, in which they can recreate themselves and get up more vigour for the six days' fight with the nets which are their common and deadly menace. As far as the purse seine fishing is concerned, that, I think, has been properly settled, and I do not see how objection could be taken to a regulation of that kind. Boarding and searching has been also settled, which, I think, was perfectly proper, for I do not see how the law could have been carried out without that power. With reference to licenses, I am afraid I did not altogether catch the meaning of it. Do I understand that licenses are not required for either Canadians or Americans with reference to (a) and (b). Distances seem to have been set within which these nets should not come, and do I understand that regulation does away with the license in regard to the first and second of the three changes that were made? Under the third agreement the United States fisherman asks for a license and receives it on the same ground, other things being equal, as the Canadians. That leads me to think that in the other two cases the license is done away with entirely.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. I am afraid I do not understand the question which the hon. gentleman has propounded well enough to answer it categorically, but possibly I can strike the difficulty by explaining exactly the position of the existing regulations. In our unamended regulation, as it stood last week, it was provided that fishing by means of herring trap nets without a license from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is prohibited in the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. The same regulation exactly existed in regard to cod trap nets. The effect, therefore, was that no one could fish in the Gulf of St. Lawrence for either herring or cod by trap nets unless he had obtained a license from the minister. Now, the change that has been