

I do not know how else you could do it. I am quite content to accept that as a working out of the distribution, we applying our regulations, whatever they may be, and the Americans theirs. One year you would have a short season and the next year a long season. This would be no more agreeable to the fishermen of one country than to those of the other. I think if this is worked out properly the river could be put back to something resembling the conditions of years ago.

I am in favour of the treaty. There is something in what Senator Taylor said about withdrawing the treaty, it having been before the United States for four years. But I should like to see it passed. I do not think the situation has changed materially enough to warrant the opening of new negotiations. I think the terms of the proposed treaty are the best that could be worked out.

Hon. Mr. TANNER: Why do not the United States approve of it?

Hon. Mr. McRAE: This treaty was framed to include this territory, and the understanding was that it would first be passed by the Senate at Washington, because then the seiners would wake up too late. But in the throes of an election the treaty was passed here first, and the seiners had ample time to raise such a row in Washington that the treaty could not get through; and it never has gone through owing to the hostility of the seiners.

Hon. Mr. KING: Senator Taylor complains of Article VII. We must first realize that this is an international agreement, and that while there may be things in it we do not like, there are other things that undoubtedly the Americans do not like, because they have refused to accept it. It is an agreement drawn on the advice of those who are conversant with the interests of the two countries and is regarded by them as a fair document to submit to the legislative bodies of those two countries.

The senator voices opposition to the Treaty of 1929. It would not be wise, and it is not necessary to go into any controversy in regard to that. It is past. There were two changes made in the Treaty of 1929. The first was one whereby the facilities on the Fraser river, previously owned by the Commission, became the property of the Canadian Government to be used by the Commission. In 1929 the Justice Department advised that there was no loss of sovereignty; that at the expiration of the treaty this would return to the people of Canada.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: That is just a lawyer's opinion.

Hon. Mr. KING: That is a lawyer's opinion.

The important feature, as I see it, is the extension of the boundary. That came about when it was found that the seiners were going outside the usual area, and the American people, as well as our own people, realized that the boundary should be extended, and it was extended.

We have been dealing with two treaties heretofore, the Pelagic Sealing Treaty—which we discussed very thoroughly, and which we know from experience and the evidence given here has resulted in restoring a valuable fishery. Whether we get the percentage from it that we should get or not is not a matter for us to consider now. From our inquiry into the Halibut Treaty it would seem that it had brought about an improvement over the conditions that prevailed before. I understand the senator's difficulty in regard to the fishermen on the Fraser. But it would not be correct to say that the trap fishermen would be allowed to catch all the fish before they come to the Fraser. Both parties have their responsibilities, and it would be the duty of the Commission to arrive at some formula whereby the fish would be distributed equally as far as possible.

The CHAIRMAN: Are they not using traps at present?

Hon. Mr. KING: We do not use them. The Americans do. I know very little about the fishing, but I think it can be said in reference to conservation that the use of the trap could be controlled better than that of any other device, because the trap can be closed when you do not want to fish. But as far as