

## SHOOTING RESERVES.

The Montreal *Star* of the 8th instant, would make us believe that there are shooting reserves in Canada. That the Government should offer facilities for letting out certain rights to sportsmen. What rights? Where are these shooting rights or reserves? We have never heard of them and do not believe they have an existence. We know that the Government claim all the rivers, and offer to lease them every season? In regard to inducing Europeans to come to Canada for sport, we have one instance this year of how gentlemen from England are treated when they lease a Canadian river.

If the Government has shooting reserves, we would be pleased to know where they are? It is a new thing for us to learn that the lovers of the rifle and the fowling piece are not to enjoy the sport in season without asking permission from Government. When that pleasure is taken from the Canadian Sportsman, farewell to his rural liberty. It is quite sufficient that the Fishery Department lease the Salmon rivers without taking from the subject his rights in the marsh or forest.—C.

## THE MONTREAL "STAR" ON FISH AND GAME.

The above paper in its issue of the 27th ult., speaks editorially on our Fish and Game. He says "out of five thousand eggs hatched by fish in a natural way, only about one egg will hatch out; out of five thousand eggs hatched in an artificial way, four thousand on an average are hatched out."

We ask the *Star* where he obtained this information? and furthermore what species of fishes are referred to?

The artificial breeding of fish, especially *Salmonidae*,—is certainly good, and doubtless may be productive when carried on in rivers connected with salt water; but to cast young fishes of the above order into an inland lake, is the most unscientific and expensive mode of fish propagation we have ever heard of.

The *Star* thus tells us that nature has lost a force, which is now supplied by artificial means. Nonsense; the disparity is too glaring, and has no facts to sustain it.

He says: "Take for instance, whitefish;" What whitefish? Why not name the species? Whitefish of various forms occur in almost every Province of the Dominion, and it may be possible that their isolation is the cause of enmity between them. Be this as it may, we have no proof that the parent whitefish devours its own eggs. It is, however a fact, that the sea trout will follow *Salmo salar* to its spawning grounds, where it devours the eggs of the salmon.

The most absurd statement made by the above paper is that ducks known as "widgeon redheads, canvas-back and bluebill devour fish spawn in immense quantities." This information is altogether new in an ornithological view, and the writer should certainly be awarded a leather medal for the discovery. Again, speaking of shad, it is useless to experiment on that fish; if they are allowed to propagate in their old natural way, the markets of the United States and Canada will always be well stocked with this fish in season. We contend that the artificial breeding in inland waters of fishes that frequent the sea, is both a waste of money and time, and the sooner it is abandoned the better. Protection during the close season for each species, is what we wish to see carried out, and if that is properly performed, the fish will do what the Creator commanded they should. It is nonsense to say that "our fish would go just as the buffalo and the moose are going." No living man can make a comparison between the forces acting on terrestrial and aquatic animals, more especially in regard to their abundance or scarcity; and if the writer in the *Star* had lately passed through the forests frequented by moose and caribou, he must have done so with closed eyes, as these animals have never been known to be so abundant as at present. We could inform the writer what has produced this, but that is not necessary at present. We