

warden whose compensation is \$1,200 a year, and is paid by the state. It permits the appointment of not more than three deputy wardens in each county by the chief warden, and their compensation is fixed by the Board of Supervisors. The result has been that we have absolutely no enforcement of the law, because the supervisors will fix no compensation, and therefore the wardens are simply figure heads. What the state should do, in my opinion, is to pass a law which should make these wardens paid by the state—should pay their expenses by a warrant drawn on the State Treasurer, and countersigned by the Game Warden-in-Chief. I may have something further to say upon it, but it seems to me this evil may be remedied in that way.

The subject is now open for your discussion. In the first place I think this subject ought to be anticipated by the discussion of the question, should we agree upon a uniform warden law? I will take the liberty of calling upon one or two gentlemen whom I know are familiar with the enforcement of the laws in their localities. I will ask Mr. Wilmot to give us the workings of the warden law, so far as he is informed in his jurisdiction, and to talk upon the matter before us as in his judgment he should.

Mr. Wilmot: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen—I feel a good deal of deference in appearing before you. In the first place, we do not come here to represent the Province of Ontario or any of the provinces of Canada. We come here on behalf of the Dominion Government, to listen to what may be said, with a view, if possible, to learn something and to give as much information as we can, but over this question of wardenship we have no jurisdiction whatever. The Dominion of Canada has had laws controlling these matters since the federation, but at present there is a dispute arising between the local governments of the provinces and the dominion on that question. In the meantime, the Federal Government is making what are termed the fisheries laws. They have

for several years appointed what are termed the fisheries officers. The Dominion Government has nothing whatever to do with the game laws. They are wholly under the jurisdiction of the ~~fisheries~~ ^{Provinces}. The local governments of Canada have control of the game laws. Therefore, the proceedings we are entering upon are quite beyond my jurisdiction to give you any light upon. If the question comes up with regard to the appointment of the fisheries officers I will be glad to give you what information I can. But it is beyond my power to give you any knowledge upon this subject of game wardens, because we have nothing to do with it. If we have any representative here from Ontario, perhaps he can do so. In the mean time, I must decline to discuss that subject.

I might also state, while I am on my feet, that I notice the meeting has been called the International Fisheries Conference. At first I was under the impression that it wasn't my sphere to be here at all, because it is not our province to deal with international questions. International questions can be dealt with only by the federal officers of the United States on the one hand, and Great Britain on the other. This could hardly be called an international meeting. With all due deference to the International Fisheries Conference, I think it more appropriate to call it an Inter-state State Fisheries Commission, in which the states proper would have an opportunity of expressing themselves, but international action, I think, is beyond the jurisdiction of any of us. We in Canada have to leave all those questions to a higher power—Great Britain. The Province of Ontario had given information to you previously that they were desirous of having a meeting of this description. The Province of Ontario never communicated that wish to the Dominion Government. We never had any knowledge of it. Consequently the Dominion Government had no communication, and received no invitation from the previous meetings you held, which