

tive of the United States to secure action by their Congress. We learn to-day, for the first time, that a third attempt is to be made by President Taft to get Congress to consider these regulations. I think the history of this transaction shows the folly of the Canadian government continuing in the course upon which it has embarked of making one treaty after another with the United States without any guarantee, or any attempt to exact a guarantee from the United States, that this treaty will be enforced, that the same code of honour should be applied on the American side as is applied on the Canadian side in connection with matters of this kind.

I may say that there is a very urgent reason, with respect to the fisheries of the Fraser river and of Puget Sound, why this treaty should be put into effect, and it is that under the arrangement existing at the present time, American trap fishermen are taking in wholesale quantities, the salmon on their way to the Fraser river, without any regulations at all such as prevail on the Canadian side for the preservation of this fishery, in regard to a close season, to prevent the taking of fish by destructive methods. So much is the case that the American commissioner, Professor David Starr Jordan, has sent to Secretary Knox a statement with regard to the operations going on in the state of Washington from which I will read a short extract. Professor Starr Jordan says:

With upwards of 2,500 square miles of fishing territory, the State of Washington has no patrol vessels, and so far as I know but a single gasoline launch. The present statutes are fairly well enforced in most of the eastern boundary States, notably so in Ohio and Pennsylvania. In Washington they are not adequately enforced. It is claimed that in the current season the fishermen of Washington caught by encroachment on the close season, salmon to the value of upward of \$600,000, to which they were not entitled. Part of these should have been taken in British Columbia waters. The others should have escaped up Fraser river to the spawning grounds. In Canada, throughout the boundary waters, the statutes now in effect are rigidly enforced. It does not even occur to any one to violate them. The real need of the boundary situation is less that of stringent legislation than of equal enforcement of law on either side. I see no way to accomplish this except by a federal patrol, corresponding to the Dominion patrol of Canada.

It is such a federal patrol that Congress has been asked to establish, and so far has refused to establish, so that for two seasons after this recommendation has been made we still find our fish being taken without any restriction whatever by trap fishermen in Puget Sound waters. The matter is particularly worthy of discussion at the present moment from the fact that by a subsequent arrangement it is proposed

to allow free into Canada the whole catch of these traps if our canners desire to import the fish. It makes it all the more exasperating that the fishermen of the Fraser river should see the fish bound to their river being illegally caught in the United States, being caught without any restriction whatever, and this government making it easier to bring these fish into competition with our Canadian caught fish by a proposal to remove the duty and make them as free in Canada as are the fish caught under strict regulation in Canada at the present time. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the conditions this government might very well lay before the government at Washington the idea that it is well to take one international arrangement at a time, particularly where there are two under discussion affecting the same subject, as the two now under discussion affect this subject of fisheries, that it is due to our Canadian fishing interests to insist that this Fisheries Treaty should be honourably observed by the government of the United States, that it should be put into force and that they should observe the agreed-upon regulations for the preservation of the fisheries in international waters on the Pacific before we agree to any other arrangement affecting the product of those fisheries.

I understand the reason that the Senate of the United States hesitates to give effect to this treaty is that hearings have been given to the fishery interests of the United States affected by the proposals. That is a privilege which the United States commissioner distinctly agreed with the Canadian commissioner should not be given. It was distinctly arranged that the regulations as agreed upon by these two commissioners should go into effect without any change whatever for a fixed period and that if the experience of their operation showed that a change should be necessary it should be made by agreement between the two commissioners. The regulations are in many respects very unsatisfactory to the Canadian fishery interests. It is unnecessary now to go into detail as to the matters of dissatisfaction. They were discussed in this House on a previous occasion, but, since the American interests are being heard by the Senate at Washington with a view to a modification of the regulations in their interest, it seems to be more than ever incumbent that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should arrange with Washington that a similar privilege on this side of the line should be allowed and that the proposal made in this House two sessions ago to refer this matter to our Committee on Fisheries, as it has been referred at Washington to their Committee on Fisheries, should be adopted so that we could hear our interests and learn from them what we