

Mr. Whitcher or others may write on the question—that it is of the greatest importance that we should not only restock the depleted fisheries of the inland waters, but that some measures should be adopted for the purpose of improving the coast fisheries of the country. Most of the American fishing is carried on outside of the three-mile limit, and the United States fishermen, under the Treaty of 1818, have the right to fish outside of that limit. If, therefore, the strongest measures were adopted towards the purse seine fishermen, they would still come and seine in the Gulf. The most destructive mode of fishing in the Maritime Provinces is that known as trap fishing. I want to make this distinction: The people round the coast resort to brush weir fishing. They construct weirs along the coast, and these are altogether different from traps, which are machines constructed to gather in and destroy fish, and they are only used at times when the fish resort to the coast to spawn. When you prevent the fish coming to the coast to deposit their eggs, you at once destroy the fisheries. These fisheries have for a number of years given employment to our people and afforded subsistence to our fishermen and their families. Now, however, these men who resort to legitimate modes of fishing, the gill net and the hook and line, find that capitalists who are able to purchase trap nets are destroying their very means of subsistence. In the very next item of these Estimates, we are asked to grant a subsidy of \$150,000 as a bounty to our fishermen. What for? To provide them with boats and gill nets for the purpose of prosecuting the fisheries outside of the coast and round the coast; and while you grant that money as a means of encouraging them, you at the same time allow capitalists from abroad, and especially from the United States, to set trap nets and destroy the valuable fisheries which you vote a subsidy to encourage our people to prosecute. Such course of action is inconsistent. If we wish that our people be encouraged to prosecute the fisheries, which led our people first to settle by the sea, which led Champlain to cross the ocean to this country, we must prevent the prosecution of trap fishing around the coasts of the Dominion. I feel strongly on this point. I know how it is in regard to Prince Edward Island. The Acadian French, who were the first settlers and who have prosecuted the fisheries for 100 years, found that when they made their valuable fisheries known, United States capitalists came in and set nets round the coast in the coves and bays which are the spawning grounds and are thus depriving the people of the means of prosecuting the fisheries by which they have provided for themselves during 100 years. I represent these people, and if it is the desire of the Government, and I know it is their desire, to preserve these fisheries for the people to whom they legitimately and properly belong, they will prevent such apparatus from coming into competition with gill nets and hand line fishing. One of the hon. members for British Columbia (Mr. Baker) has said that the inspector of that Province only received \$1,200 a year. I have a complaint to make. We have in Prince Edward Island one of the most able fish inspectors in this country, a gentleman who is not only thoroughly qualified practically, but is also well read in the matter theoretically. This gentleman receives a salary of \$800. I think I have a perfect right to make complaint that the Island inspector only receives \$300, especially when the hon. gentleman from British Columbia declared that the inspector of that Province received the smallest salary of any inspector in the Dominion. The hon. gentleman made a great mistake. I trust the Minister will see that the inspector of Prince Edward Island is paid a fair salary in compensation for the services he so very ably performs.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). This is a very important question, and I am very glad indeed, the hon. gentleman

Mr. HACKETT.

man has spoken so strongly and warmly on the subject. The protection of the river fisheries is a very important duty which the Government should look carefully after. In the county which I represent there happens to exist the best river fishery in our Province. I was exceedingly astonished that the hon. member for Halifax, who is a sportsman, did not refer to the Margaree. He should know that the Margaree is an excellent fishing river, particularly for salmon, and excels any other river in Nova Scotia; and I regret to say that river is hardly as well protected as it should be. It is not only necessary to protect the rivers, but it is also necessary to restock them, and I believe the fish-breeding establishment in Nova Scotia has done good service. But besides the inland fisheries, there is another important fishery which requires protection—that is the deep sea fishery. The trap nets, to which the hon. member for Prince Edward Island has referred, are very destructive to fish, and I hope that some means will be employed by which the destruction of the fish will be lessened. The fish rise to the surface and are trapped. The fishermen use only a portion of them, and allow the rest to be thrown overboard and thus poison the fishing grounds. There is another unfortunate method which should be discontinued, and that is trawling along the coast. There is one section of my own county in which the people take the law into their own hands. The district of Cheticamp never allowed either their own fishermen or foreign fishermen to set trawls in that section of the country, and the result is that the fisheries there are more productive than in any other part of the Province of Nova Scotia. Wherever they use trawls, or trap nets, or other infernal machines, it is noticed that the fish are going to destruction fast. I have no hesitation in saying that means should be used to protect the fisheries against these appliances.

Mr. McLELAN. I wish to say a few words in reply to remarks which have been made by hon. gentlemen. I am glad to hear the hon. member for Prince County bear testimony to the efficiency of the fish inspector there, and I am equally sorry to hear the hon. member for Lunenburg speak of the inspector for Nova Scotia, and I would suggest that if he has a complaint to make he should make specific charges, and a complete investigation will be made. The hon. member for Restigouche speaks of the manner in which the parent salmon are treated. There may have been such cases from the want of skill on the part of the person manipulating them, but I think that injury done in that way must be exceptional. I know of cases in which the fish of some of the hatcheries have been marked, and the same fish have been taken there for three or four years, so that little injury must have been done. The hon. member from Queen's, Prince Edward Island, referred to a late officer of the Department, Mr. Whitcher, and to his opinions respecting the results of fish culture. I believe there is not a man in the Dominion of Canada who is a firmer believer in the advantages and benefits of fish culture than Mr. Whitcher. He was for a long time an officer of the Department, and faithfully served the Government. I do not want to enter into the particulars of the reasons why he published the letter which he did publish, or for what purpose it was published. But as an evidence upon which I found my views as to his opinions of fish culture, I may say that almost the first paper which came to me, after my return from the Fishery Exhibition, was an elaborate report from Mr. Whitcher, urging the purchase of a fish hatchery, which was in the hands of a private gentleman named Mr. Price, since deceased. I shall not say anything more about his motives, which were acknowledged to me at the time.

Mr. McINTYRE. I wish to say a few words with regard to the distribution of the fishery bounty. There has been a good deal of dissatisfaction expressed by those re-