

well acquainted with the plans adopted by the poachers to net the river. He was appointed additional guardian, and, I understand, devoted a portion of one summer to protecting the river. Are there any outstanding claims of his against the department, or has the department settled with him, as there was a good deal of talk about this before the Fish and Game Society?

Mr. TUPPER. I will take a note of the question and find out.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Fish and Game Protection Society of the Island some time ago entered into correspondence with the hon. gentleman's department, and, with the laudable object of preserving that river, offered to pay the salary of a proper inspector if the Government would make the appointment, the society to name the man to be appointed. The department, however, refused. I do not understand why they refused. It may not be consistent with the policy of the department to make an appointment and allow a private game society to pay the salary; but so anxious were the society to have a proper man appointed, who would actually and not nominally alone protect the river, that they were perfectly willing to pay the salary if the department would make the appointment. The consequence of the refusal of the department is, that the river is being netted year after year, for want of proper guardians. That is a crying pity, because most excellent sport can be had there and magnificent fish. Some very stern measures will have to be taken to teach the poachers that their offence is not a slight one. They have the idea that netting the river and taking out baskets full of the finest fish is not an offence at all, and if an officer goes to arrest them they look upon him as an intruder, and call upon their neighbours to assist them and protect them when they are violating the law. There is a very strong effort going to be made by the Fish and Game Society to protect that as well as other rivers, and I hope my hon. friend will lend them his official aid in that. I would like to know whether it is true, as is stated, that the department has refused to nominate a man there, though the Fish and Game Society offered to pay his salary.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). The Morel is one of the most important rivers in Prince Edward Island, especially for trout fishing, and I think it is important that the department should protect that river. The fishery wardens in the past have, perhaps, not been properly situated, but I hope the new departure which is being taken by the Minister will have a good effect, and that this fishery, which is a very important one, will be better looked after. There is no doubt that the river is being fished and netted year after year, and to some extent the law is being set at defiance. I understand that the Minister is now going to place wardens on these rivers, and pay them for the time they are actually employed in looking after the stream. If those wardens are judiciously placed I think that will have a very good effect in preventing the netting which has been going on for years past, and I hope the Minister will give it his serious attention next year when the fishing season sets in, and will see that this river, which is the most valuable river we have in the province for trout fishing, will be properly protected.

Mr. TUPPER. I am in thorough accord with the hon. gentlemen who have spoken, as to the importance of giving better protection to the important streams in the different provinces. My difficulty in connection with the Fish and Game Club, who communicated with me, was that at the time I was not in the position which I am now, in regard to the re-organization of the fishery service. The hon. gentlemen very well know that in Prince Edward Island and in Nova Scotia we had a very large number of exceedingly useless officers, who had grown up under the old system prior to Confederation, where a man got a two-penny half-penny salary of \$10, \$20 and \$30 a year. These officers increased in number, and the result was, that while we spent a considerable sum of money on that system, none of these men would take any trouble to enforce the Act, for the simple reason that their salary was nominal and the dangers they ran were exceedingly great, incurring the enmity of neighbours and troubles of all kinds in enforcing what were often unpopular regulations. Now, in such a scheme as is proposed we can co-operate very cordially with the clubs—that is, we can, under proper provisions, resort to the system which the clubs have adopted in regard to the rivers in New Brunswick, where they have their guardians and pay them a fair day's wage for a fair day's work, and they have the opportunity of watching them themselves, and of dispensing with them when they do not perform their duty. During the important seasons, when the fish are running, and so on, it is proposed to adopt that system, and we have been proceeding in that direction gradually in the different districts in Nova Scotia, and now we have reached the Island and intend to do away with the warden system, and appoint from time to time temporary officers, who will be guardians under the overseers, all being under the general supervision of the inspector. I do not remember exactly the issue of the correspondence to which the hon. gentleman refers. It has not been the universal rule to refuse the nomination of a club regularly made, and especially when they pay the salary. On the contrary, we have often clothed the officers of private lessees with the powers of fishery officers, but I suppose the chief difficulty here was that we had no appropriation to meet the cost of the officer, though that hardly meets the case the hon. gentleman refers to, because he says the club offered to pay the salary. I do not know what the objection was. We did to a certain extent co-operate with these people last year, and this year we have to some extent met their wishes. Our chief difficulty was that we were cramped under the old system. We have now taken a different line and the subject has been touched upon in the two last reports of the department.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would point out the needlessness of appointing a local man to do this work. He cannot do it. If his neighbour's sons are netting trout, and he attempts to arrest them, he makes a life-long enemy of his next door neighbour. He will not do that, and therefore the necessities require the appointment of a good, energetic, active man, not living in the locality, who could protect the whole river easily enough. I know the appointment of Mr. Dowse a year ago would have been satisfactory if he had been clothed with the proper authority. If you appoint local