

four years. You have seen it passed by the Senate and the House of Commons of Canada, but you have declined to accept it. Conditions certainly have changed. The sockeye salmon have returned in larger force than they ever did before, the menace which perhaps did exist at one time no longer confronts us. Therefore we should like to have this treaty withdrawn. If it is found in the public interest a revised treaty will be submitted at a later time."

That, honourable gentlemen, is my idea of the matter. I do not think it is necessary to labour it in any way. It was upon those premises and with that idea in mind that I asked to have the proposed treaty referred to this Committee for reconsideration.

I see present Mr. Tom Reid, of the House of Commons. He has a very strong interest in this matter on account of his constituents, and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee should hear him.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall be very glad to hear him.

Hon. Mr. TANNER: Senator Taylor, does not this treaty provide any machinery for making the distribution that you spoke of?

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: Not the slightest.

Mr. FOUND: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if you will allow me—

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: Before Mr. Found speaks, Mr. Chairman, I have something to say. I am becoming a little bit restive of having every effort on my part for the fishery interests of British Columbia officially opposed by the representative of the Department. I do not think that is fair. The duty of the Department is to administer the will of Parliament, not to impose its will upon Parliament. At a meeting in New Westminster attended by eighty or one hundred men whose homes are menaced, when I asked Mr. Found how he proposed to administer this section he answered, "I would hate indeed to have the responsibility of administering a section like that."

Hon. Mr. McRAE: Mr. Chairman, I may be able to throw a little light on this treaty, for I was the one who led the fight in the House of Commons in 1929.

My principal objection was to that part of the treaty which gave the Commission the right to own hatchery sites. I took the ground that this would prejudice our sovereign rights. In the revised treaty, which was submitted the following year, that clause was withdrawn, and I voted for the treaty.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: General McRae, will you say this: Are you satisfied that the cultural operations in British Columbia are well conducted?

Hon. Mr. McRAE: No, I am not.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: I am.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: I am not sure that they have yet solved the question. There is still some doubt as to what are the best cultural methods.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: Our authorities are very familiar with the American theories and practices in cultural operations, particularly in Alaska where they are making their great success. What benefit would we get by handing over half of the control of our cultural operations to the Americans when we already have the advantage of knowing everything they are doing along that line?

Hon. Mr. McRAE: The 1930 treaty extended the jurisdiction of the Commission over the shore beds west of Vancouver Island, the idea being, as Senator Taylor said, to control the seiners. The seiners had become such an important factor that any treaty which did not control seining could not have the situation in hand. That was the viewpoint of the Americans.

Answering Senator Taylor, I think the real object of the treaty is this. Some kind of joint agreement with respect to allowing a proper amount of seining. The Americans had been catching two-thirds of the fish. Under this agreement there is to be a fifty-fifty division, left to the Commission to regulate.