of protecting themselves. If they had had information when they applied for licenses that the limit had to be placed on the amount of fish to be taken they could have used their own judgment with regard to the matter. My information is that the people were given to understand, by reason of the action during the previous year, that they had an unrestricted right to take fish as there was no restriction on the number of licenses and it was not until every preparation was made that they were notified of this limitation and then apparently they were notified as to an amount below the mark that has finally been conceded by the department. They were notified that the amount was 240,000 pounds which was a very severe blow to their expectations. These expectations were justified in view of the policy of the department with regard to lac la Biche last year. If a change was going to be made they should have had due notice. They did not have notice. That is exactly what occurred with regard to Slave lake a year ago. I am consuming the time of the House now for the purpose of impressing upon the minister the absolute injustice of withholding this notice until such a late date, and whatever decision the department arrives at as to the amount of fish that may be taken ought to be made known from year to year before the licenses are issued, if the department does not see fit to restrict the number of licenses.

Mr. HAZEN: I recognize my hon. friend's desire to put this before the committee properly. I am informed that when the application for licenses were made a limit had not been fixed, but that before they were issued the limit had been fixed and that the department had no knowledge of the applications until a few days before the limitation was adopted. That is the information I get from the Superintendent of Fisheries. However, a limit has been adopted now and in future years it will be known what the limit is. If a change takes place, if it is found that the taking out of 400,000 pounds is more than the lake can stand, we will endeavour to see that notice is given so that people, before they take out their licenses will know what the limit is.

Mr. OLIVER: There are other lakes that will come in and I am anxious that the minister should be aware of the hardship that might occur in such cases so that he will take the proper measures in the future.

Mr. KYTE: I intended to make some remarks on this item and perhaps, Mr. chairman, you would call it six o'clock.

Mr. HAZEN: The item is No. 249.

Mr. KYTE: I was under a misapprehension as to the item; I thought we were discussing No. 248, and I have some observations to make on that item.

Mr. HAZEN: Well, we will wait at eight o'clock.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill No. 48, respecting The British Columbia and White River Railway Company.—Mr. Clements.

SECOND READING OF SENATE BILLS.

Bill No. 60, respecting The Essex Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. Wilcox.

Bill No. 61, for the relief of Charles Frederick Reuben Jones.—Mr. Kay.

Bill No. 62, for the relief of Florence Amelia Kennedy.—Mr. Edwards.

Bill No. 63, for the relief of John Bassnett Parker.—Mr. Clarke (Essex).

Bill No. 64, for the relief of Amy Beatrice Mathews Hilton.—Sir Herbert Ames.

SUPPLY.

House resumed in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Fisheries—Legal and incidental expenses, $4,000.

Mr. KYTE: Since the House rose at six o'clock, I have been making some further investigations as to the differences in salaries of fishery overseers in the province of Nova Scotia, and these investigations confirm me in the belief that the increases that have been accorded to certain fishery overseers must have more relation to the activities of certain hon. members in this House who have the ear of the minister, than to the circumstances in which these overseers are situated or the amount of work they do. Take the salary of William Aymar, of Meteghan, in the constituency of Digby, who receives $500 a year; while Sylvester Boudrot, of Petit de Grat, in the constituency of Richmond, has to be content with a salary of $100. Edward Chute,