

are unique in regard to the fact that they are wholly within protected waters, and that they can be operated with more safety and less loss of life than is experienced in connection with the fisheries on the Atlantic coast. That shows, Sir, that these fisheries are an asset which it is well worth our while protecting. I venture to say that the cost of properly protecting these fisheries will be more than amply repaid by the saving to the country in the fish which would otherwise be poached. I am glad to see that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has provided in the estimates for this year for the building of two or more cruisers. I would like to impress on him the absolute necessity there is for getting these cruisers into commission as soon as possible. I would also suggest to him that these cruisers be built in the province of British Columbia, if that can be done. I do not see any reason why they should not be built in that province. We find that the Canadian Pacific railway, and other large concerns are building vessels in British Columbia, and there can be no reason why the Dominion government should not also do so. It may be said that it would cost a little more to build a vessel on the Pacific coast than in this part of Canada. I would point out that the late administration did not find that an objection, for they were committed to the principle of encouraging shipbuilding in Canada even though they had to pay more than if the ships were built in the old country. In connection with their naval policy, when they called for tenders for the ships it was provided that they should be built in Canada, although they would probably cost thirty per cent more than if built in England. If it is a good thing for Canada that we should pay this increased cost for the benefit of having ships built on the Atlantic coast, it would be equally good for the country to have these ships built on the Pacific coast, so as to establish the industry there, even though they should cost fifty per cent more. I trust the minister will at a very early date give out the contracts for these fishery protection cruisers, and that when he does so he will endeavour to have them built in British Columbia.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver). Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for Comox-Atlin (Mr. Clements), for bringing this question before the House. It is a very important and burning question on the Pacific coast. We have felt very keenly the inattention and negligence of the former administration in regard to our deep-sea fisheries, and wish to take advantage of this opportunity to place ourselves on record, as supporters of the government, in favour of adequate protection for those fisheries. The natural physical features of the Pacific coast lend them-

selves to the abuse of this great industry, particularly to poaching. At the present time poaching is carried on to such an extent that we might almost as well have our fisheries under the control of our American friends in Puget Sound. Between two and three hundred American boats leave Puget Sound constantly to fish in our waters, whereas our own fishermen have only six or seven. This could not be, but for the fact that, by our policy, we permit American fishermen to receive shelter, to purchase bait, to clean their fish, and to do other things necessary to the life of the industry. Were we to enforce the law as it should be enforced, very few of these boats could fish in our waters, because they would be too far from their ports to carry on the business successfully. As you know, it is necessary for the fishing boats, especially those engaged in the halibut industry, to go into harbour to put their fish in shape, owing to the stormy nature of the sea. This great fishing industry of the Pacific coast belongs peculiarly to the Canadian people, and I believe our laws should be enforced in such a way as to protect the interests of our own people in that industry. Reference has already been made to the kind of protection we have at present. We have two old boats, the 'Quadra' and the 'Kestrel,' which are the laughing stock of the fishing people of the Pacific coast. They never were adequate, they never had any speed, they have never been able to catch up to the average fishing boat on the coast. Consequently, as years went by, the American fishermen came to ignore entirely the presence of these fishery cruisers, or protectors, as they are falsely called. What we require on the Pacific coast is at least three fairly large fishery cruisers of a type similar to that of the American fishing boats, of 100 tons burden, and of a speed of at least 15 knots an hour. If we had boats of that type it would not be long before the poachers would find their business to be so unprofitable that they would leave our fisheries alone. We should also have stationed at all the harbours along the coast, where these American boats are wont to come, a number of officials who could advise the cruisers what boats had been illegally in any of these harbours. It would cost very little to have these officials, and I recommend it to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. There are men living at these harbours who have other means of support, and who would be willing, for \$12 or \$15 a month, to watch these American poachers, and give information concerning them. This fishery protection service should be placed under the control of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the fishery superintendent. I understand that at the present time it is under