

umbia, it has gone so far, according to reports that come from there, that even the Indians on the coast, who see these poachers coming ashore and breaking the game laws, want to know why the Dominion government cannot protect the fisheries which belong to them.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the reports mentioned by the hon. gentleman are somewhat exaggerated. That question does not come up under this item, but I may deal with it. We have been doing our best to protect the fisheries. My hon. friend complains, and other complaints have been brought before the House, that some of those poachers who come ashore, were stealing game from the province. It is not our duty to protect the game of British Columbia, that is a work which pertains to the provincial authorities. If there is any lack of protection or enforcement of the game laws of the province of British Columbia, certainly my hon. friend is not justified in charging this government with it. We are looking after the protection of the fisheries, and we are doing it so well that I think nobody can seriously complain. We had some fishery protection vessels there, but they were not found numerous enough, and at the request of some members of this House, I do not know whether my hon. friend is one of them, we chartered a vessel to look after the protection of the fisheries, with very good results. Immediately after the 'Rainbow' arrived in this country we gave her instructions to look after the fisheries. The 'Rainbow' has done so, and the other day she seized an American vessel which was fishing within the three-mile limit on the north shore of the island of Vancouver, off Cape Scott. The matter is now before the courts, and will soon be adjudicated. I hope we will succeed in proving that this vessel was within the three-mile limit, and that the seizure was valid. My hon. friend will admit that there has been a good deal of exaggeration in the reports in regard to poaching. People think that a vessel is fishing within the limit, when, as a matter of fact, she may be outside of it. Three miles is a short distance from the shore, and people imagine that the fishing is going on within the three-mile limit when it is outside.

Mr. BARNARD. With regard to exaggerated reports, I think the minister has very much underestimated the situation in which they are exaggerated. It is a matter of common knowledge all along the Pacific coast cities that that poaching goes on practically unchecked, and has gone on for years; and I am much mistaken if a great many representations have not been made to the minister by boards of trade and other official bodies to that effect. With regard to his suggestion that I am

complaining that the game laws of the province of British Columbia are not enforced by the Dominion government, he is either very dense or is trying to misinterpret what I said. That is not my complaint at all. What I am trying to point out is that the fishermen are actually so bold that they come into the harbours along that coast, anchor their vessels and go ashore, and commit breaches of the game laws. They leave their vessels and go ashore and there is no one to check them.

Mr. BRODEUR. What can we do in a case like that?

Mr. BARNARD. I am not asking this government to enforce the game laws, but to stop these men from fishing. If you stop them from fishing they won't come ashore. That is the situation. I am not asking the minister to enforce the British Columbia game laws; as has been shown frequently, the provincial government are well able to take care of their own game laws. But I say the minister and his department have so far neglected to stop this poaching, they have brought the administration in that particular into contempt, and not only into the contempt of the business people of the province, but into contempt even of the aborigines who are not supposed to know very much about it.

River St. Lawrence ship channel, \$900,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is to make provision for ship channel dredging, for the maintenance and improvement of the shipyards, as well as renewal of machinery and plant. We have now in the service six elevator dredges, and we are building a new steel elevator dredge, which will be completed during the next season of navigation. We have also one hydraulic dredge and two suction dredges. I may say that the department is contemplating increasing very materially the expenditure on this work. For some years there has been an agitation among the shipping interests and in the country generally in favour of deepening the St. Lawrence to 35 feet. To-day we have a 30 foot channel at high tide from Montreal to the sea. When we remember that at one time we had only a 10 foot channel in some parts of the river, we are able to appreciate the extent of the work which has been done. Our purpose is to deepen this channel to 35 feet. We will require some new dredges for that purpose, and this vote is to cover that expenditure. So far the cost of dredging the St. Lawrence has been \$3,549,460.78 and the cost of the plant \$2,696,741.16. This work consisted in dredging the 27½ foot channel between Montreal and Quebec to 30 feet. This was decided on in 1897. It included