

Q. You agree, Mr. Found, to this: it takes two of each country to change the regulations in Articles 4 and 5, but in Article 3, which does not provide the same safeguard, the usual practice of the majority will govern?—A. That is true. It is dealing with an entirely different thing.

Q. Now, let us stop there. That being the case three American commissioners on the Commission and one Canadian will create a majority which can decide what that Commission is going to do—under Article III?—A. Yes.

*By Mr. Brady:*

Q. Would it not be a reasonable thing to include Article III with IV and V and cover it by the same vote?—A. My answer would be only an opinion. I can scarcely conceive that a Commission which is seeking to build up a fishery would finally, after canvassing the situation, have very much division of opinion on it, as to what would be best to do.

*By Mr. McRae:*

Q. Why should that apply to one side of the line and not to the other?—A. It applies to one set of waters; it applies to reproductive waters; the other waters are fishing waters.

Q. Then I take it that these fishing waters which are, roughly, 50 per cent American and 50 per cent Canadian, and which we would all like to see with uniform fishing regulations, require a vote of two from each country to change regulations which we would very much like to change, while the propagation area, the Fraser River watershed, into which we invite these three American commissioners, lays itself open to these Americans exercising their will on territory entirely in our own country.

*By Mr. McLaren:*

Q. Mr. Found, if your reasoning is correct it would be safe to call for an unanimous vote. That would show that your reasoning is open to question on that point. Do you think that Article III would be improved by calling for a vote of two and two?—A. As a direct question, I cannot conceive in practice that it would. If the Commissioners are earnestly seeking to do that which will give the best result, what would likely happen would be that necessarily some experimentations would be required with different methods before the method was adopted which would be largely applied. However, I can only give you my opinion on that.

Q. We must assume that they are earnestly seeking to do what is right under that section?—A. Quite so.

Q. And under all sections?—A. Yes.

Q. Therefore why apply it to only one section and not refer to these individuals on the other side? In one case it is safeguarded; in the other it is all attributing a great deal more of this "earnest seeking after truth." Would not a serious difficulty arise by calling for a vote of two and two, under Article III?—A. I am not aware of any.

Q. Do you think it would be a prudent course to pursue to ask for two and two, from our standpoint, to insure that there should be at least two Canadians siding with one point of view?—A. Again I say that I do not think it would be any improvement. You are not dealing in any one interest, a matter of self-interest or country interest, but in the interest of the fisheries, and when you come to build up this matter, and do a reproductive job in the way it can best be done, there is not much room for a division there.

*By Mr. Brady:*

Q. I would like to ask with reference to bringing Article III in with IV and V. "The Commission shall have the right to stock the waters with sockeye

[Mr. W. A. Found.]