

Game Export Act

resolution requesting the present amendment in order that this confusion might be removed.

Mr. MacNicol: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister if it is the purpose of the department to appoint its own officers outside of those just mentioned?

Mr. MacKinnon: No.

Mr. MacNicol: The government does not intend to set up a staff of its own, but will confine enforcement activities to the provincial game officers, the provincial police and members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police?

Mr. MacKinnon: That is right.

Mr. MacNicol: Are those officers to be paid extra for any activities in connection with this act?

Mr. MacKinnon: No, they are doing it as a public service. These people are not paid specially for their services.

Mr. Hodgson: Has not the minister's department had game administration officers up until now?

Mr. MacKinnon: We have not had officers for the purpose of this bill.

Mr. Pearkes: In recent years the ravages of wolves have made very considerable inroads in the herds of big game in the southern Yukon, Northwest Territories and northern British Columbia. Will the changes now contemplated by this amendment in any way reduce the protection which is now given? Will the numbers of individuals who are responsible for safeguarding game in the more remote parts of Canada be in any way decreased?

The damage being done in recent years has had a very serious effect upon those people who make their living by guiding hunting parties. These parties spend great sums of money in these northern parts. Statistics show that in the last few years there has been a serious depletion of the herds of big game in these areas. I think it is most important that nothing be done that will in any way diminish the inadequate protection which is now being given.

Mr. MacKinnon: This bill, Mr. Chairman, will not diminish the protection in any way. The problem mentioned by the member for Nanaimo (Mr. Pearkes) is a matter that is very much before the appropriate branch of my department at the present time. At the moment we are in consultation with the provincial authorities looking to the eradication of this menace.

[Mr. MacKinnon.]

Mr. Smith (Calgary West): May I ask the minister the reason why we cannot export feathered game without removing the feathers?

Mr. MacKinnon: I am sure I do not know, Mr. Chairman. Possibly the member for Calgary West can tell me.

Mr. Smith (Calgary West): I think the answer is that the authorities are afraid the feathers might carry some disease.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CULLERS ACT

REPEAL OF CHAPTER 39 OF REVISED STATUTES

Hon. Alphonse Fournier (Minister of Public Works, for the Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved the second reading of Bill No. 15, to repeal the Cullers Act.

Mr. Graydon: Mr. Speaker, before you continue with this motion, this legislation was not mentioned in our agenda.

Mr. Fournier (Hull): Yes, it was.

Mr. Graydon: It was not mentioned at first.

Mr. Fournier (Hull): At first it was not mentioned, but I did mention it later.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Golding in the chair.

On section 1—*Act repealed.*

Mr. Graydon: Will the parliamentary assistant to the minister explain the reason for repealing this act?

Mr. McIlraith: The Cullers Act is an act of the parliament of Canada passed in 1842. It was carried forward into the consolidated statutes in 1859 and now appears as chapter 39 of the 1927 revision of the Statutes of Canada. It is only applicable to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

Section 4 of the act provided that exporters of square and waney timber must have the timber measured and culled by a dominion culler appointed under that act. The last dominion culler was superannuated in 1921 at the age of sixty-seven. We have a situation now where many exporters of timber in this country are technically committing an offence under this old act. There is no way for them to avoid it. I might add that the provinces of Ontario and Quebec have statutes on the subject which provide for the culling of timber cut from crown land, but not covering the point in this old statute.

Mr. Graydon: Would the hon. member indicate why, when the revision took place in 1927, the act was not dropped at that time?