

plished in this direction by allowing them a full season's fishing of lobsters until the fall.

Mr. HAZEN: I am afraid that if we allowed the lobster fishing to go on without provision for a close season, the result would be prejudicial to lobster fishing in future years. To be honest with my hon. friend, I do not think that his suggestion can be complied with.

Mr. KYTE: In what respect would it have a bad effect?

Mr. HAZEN: For one thing, it would reduce the market price. The quantity of lobsters obtained would be so great that they would be a drug on the market. I do not think that it is in anybody's interest that my hon. friend's suggestion should be carried out.

Mr. COPP: One of the fishery overseers in my county, Mr. Prescott, died about a year ago. Who was appointed in his place?

Mr. HAZEN: My recollection is that, as about 18 miles intervened between the different points which had to be especially watched by the guardian, the district was considered too large. Accordingly, the district was divided and one guardian appointed for each district, the salary being divided between them. I do not recollect the names; I shall be glad to send them to my hon. friend later.

Mr. COPP: Mr. Prescott's salary was only \$100, and the dividing of the district would result in the men getting \$50 each, which is a very small salary. My impression is that the chief duty of an officer of this kind is to see that no refuse from the mills gets into the fishing streams. It is a fact that the sawmills dump sawdust and other refuse into the streams which flow into fishing waters. This is not prevented by a visit from the fishery officer or by the writing of a letter. If in the opinion of my hon. friend's officials, the dumping of refuse into these waters is detrimental to fishing interests, I would suggest that he pay the officers who attend to that matter a sufficient salary and clothe them with sufficient power to enable them to prevent the practice, which has not been prevented up to the present time.

Mr. KYTE: I am surprised to observe the difference in the salaries paid to various fishery officers in Nova Scotia. For instance, Mr. Aylmer, of Meteghan, gets a salary of \$500, in addition to travelling allowance. Mr. Burke, of Albert Bridge,

gets \$155. Mr. J. M. Campbell, of Halifax, gets only \$15. I see in the Auditor General's Report the name of another officer whose salary is \$500, and another who receives as small an amount as \$60.

Mr. HAZEN: The man who gets \$500 is allowed \$150 for horse hire, but he gets no mileage, as some other inspectors do. His hotel bills also are paid.

Mr. KYTE: His travelling allowance is larger than a good many others, and he receives also a salary of \$500.

Mr. HAZEN: Perhaps he has a larger district.

Mr. KYTE: Edward Chute gets \$500, in addition to travel and outlay, \$278.91. J. A. Donovan, of Ingonish, receives the princely salary of \$60, but he has the consolation of having drawn \$389.32 for travel and outlay, making altogether \$449.32. It seems to me that the system is antiquated, and that the salaries ought to be revised. The fact that a man draws a salary of \$60 a year and receives an amount by way of travel and outlay of \$389.32, indicates either that he is not getting a sufficient salary, or that he is drawing too much for travel and outlay, having regard to the work that he is doing. A few years ago all fishery officers throughout Nova Scotia were getting practically the same salary. In the last few years, however, I find that the salaries of some of these officials have advanced in a very marked degree. I do not understand that that is altogether because of any special difference in the character of the work they are doing. If the work of Mr. Donovan, for instance, of Ingonish, is such that the necessary travel and outlay should amount to \$389.32, then he is entitled to a salary of more than \$60 per year. The whole thing appears to be wrong; there ought to be a scale of salaries prevailing throughout Nova Scotia for all officers of that particular class. I cannot see why one fishery overseer should receive a salary of \$500 and travelling expenses of \$248.58, whereas another gentleman occupying the same position and doing the same work receives a salary of only \$60. I do not know whether this inequality is due to influence that certain officers may have with the department as against others, but it is almost scandalous to have it appear in the public records of this country that men occupying the same positions and discharging the same duties should be compensated so unfairly and with such a great inequality.