

little good, I believe, results from hatcheries. In that respect I have to differ from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. In doing so, I may refer to a discussion which took place in the other Chamber some weeks ago, when an hon. gentleman, who represents there the county of Lunenburg—a county more remarkable for its fisheries than any other county in the whole Dominion—contradicted entirely the statement made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries just now. He did not condemn the hatcheries on principle, but the manner in which they are conducted; and he declared that he could prove that they are an entire failure. Last year I had occasion to complain to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that a large portion of the expenditure on fisheries, and in paying the salaries of officers, was money thrown away. As a case in point, I referred to a fish-way and dam on the St. Mary's River—that branch of the river which runs out of Lochabar. The Minister was kind enough to refer the complaint to Mr. Rogers, the inspector, who communicated it to the overseer of the district. The overseer visited the place and made his report, and I have no hesitation in saying that his report is absolutely false. I do not blame the authorities at Ottawa, for they are misled by many of their subordinates, and that is one of the reasons why the protection of our fisheries is in so many cases a farce. I will read the report of the overseer, which is addressed to Mr. Rogers:

“SHERBROOKE, 3rd July, 1883.

“DEAR SIR.—I was on the ground this spring, the very first day the alewives made their appearance, and can testify that I saw them ascend the fish-way to the very top in quantities; and there are men at Lochabar who caught barrels of them. For salmon, Lochabar has never been a resort, and I do not believe that any try to go up. They can if they wish.

“I am, yours truly,

“ALLAN McQUARRIE, Overseer.

“W. H. ROGERS, Esq., Fishery Inspector.”

Mr. Rogers publishes this letter in the *Halifax Herald*, introducing it by a letter of his own, endorsing every word of it. Shortly after its appearance, I was spoken to by persons living in the locality about it; and since my arrival here I have taken the trouble to write to the owner of the mill that is operated by this dam; and if any person would have an interest in suppressing the truth with regard to the fishway, it would be the mill owner. Yet he was frank enough, though not to his own interest to make this statement, which is dated the 5th March, in reply to my enquiry whether he remembered the day the overseer examined the ladder:

“I did not hear that any fish were caught above the fishway the time McQuarrie was here. I doubt if he saw any going up, for the flood in the spring partly broke the fishway, and it was not repaired until a few days after he was here.”

The fishway was out of repair, and was not repaired until some days after McQuarrie left; and yet he says in his report to Rogers that he himself saw the fish ascend the ladder. Now this state of things should not be allowed to exist any longer, and I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to send some reliable person there as soon as possible to make a correct report, because neither McQuarrie nor Rogers is to be relied upon. This Mr. Rogers has a hobby of his own, a ladder, which he is always putting forward. This will be seen in the letter which he sent to the *Halifax Herald* on the 5th of July, 1883, in introducing McQuarrie's report. It is as follows:—

“To the Editor of the *Herald*:

“SIR.—The following from the Overseer of Fisheries at Sherbrooke, as to the workable qualities of a ladder of the old pattern built by myself some years ago below the dam, will be of interest just now. Isaac Gault, overseer, informs me about the same is the case with a ladder of the same sort on the dam at Sheet Harbour, in east Halifax. The difficulty with most people is, they do not know that fish only ascend fishways at certain times of the day, and they visit the ladders at improper times, see no fish, and report accordingly. This Lochabar fishway has been condemned over and over again by the knowing ones.”

It is well known that Mr. Rogers is an inventor of ladders. The first ladder to which he refers here he claims to be perfect; if it is, there is no reason for improvement; yet in his letter he says: “This has been condemned over and over again by the knowing ones.” This, I think, is simply a rebuke to those who venture to condemn his ladder. Therefore, I ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, again, as the season is approaching when the fish will ascend the river, to send some reliable person down to examine the place. Mr. Rogers gets \$1,400 for travelling expenses, and what does he show for it? Everybody knows that there is no river more celebrated in Nova Scotia than the river St. Mary's for its fisheries, and particularly its salmon fisheries, and since the erection of this dam the salmon and other fish have deserted altogether the portion above the dam. A few allowives make the exception. Every statement in this letter of Mr. McQuarrie is false. That is bold language to use, but it is the truth, and every resident along the river for 20 or 30 miles will corroborate what I say.

Mr. McLELAN. Will the hon. gentleman send me a copy of the letter; it is a serious matter if an officer has made a false return. There must be some convenience, a ladder of some kind to enable the fish to pass over the dam.

Mr. McISAAC. There is a kind of a ladder.

Mr. McLELAN. Of all the ladders I have seen, Mr. Rogers's is the best and on the right principle, and if the ladder in question is one of Rogers's and is properly constructed, it ought to be able to effect the purpose. I have instructed Mr. Roberts to see that the fish have facilities to ascend to their breeding grounds. The hon. gentleman referred to the remarks of the hon. member for Lunenburg. Lunenburg is one of the greatest fishing counties in the Dominion, and we have placed fry in some of the rivers of that county. There is no hatchery yet on that coast, but some fry has been taken there, and the overseer reports that during last year there was a considerable increase in the catch of salmon.

Mr. McISAAC. The request is made in this letter that a warden be appointed near this dam. There is one within five or six miles of the mill who is a relative of the mill owners, and naturally does not take the same interest in looking after the fisheries as he otherwise would, and it is necessary to appoint a warden who is not a relative of the mill owner.

Mr. McLELAN. If he were too near the mill, he might get his grist there.

Mr. McISAAC. I do not recommend any one in particular, so that I have no personal interest in the matter in any special appointee.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria, B.C.) I want to take this occasion to advocate, as I did last year, the payment of an adequate salary to the Inspector of Fisheries in British Columbia. Mr. Alex. Caulfield Anderson, the inspector, receives but \$1,200 a year, and why he should receive less than any other Provincial Inspector of Fisheries I cannot imagine. I must do the hon. Minister of Marine the justice to state that last year he did increase Mr. Anderson's salary, but still it is not equal to that of the Inspectors of Fisheries in the other Provinces. Of course, when one is advocating an increase in expenditure, or anything which entails the expenditure of public money, the question is asked: Will it pay? What is the return? If a Custom House or Post Office is asked for, the Government will ask, what are the receipts? Is there sufficient revenue to yield a sufficient return for the money expended? Possibly hon. gentlemen in this House are not fully alive to the value of the fishery interests of British Columbia; but, perhaps, I can enlighten them on that subject. I have a memorandum, showing that for the year