

## FUR TRADE

From enquiries made from different fur dealers in the Province it is proved that in the year 1905 the fur trade was dead and did not produce more than \$50,000, to \$70,000, per annum. It is now worth at least Two Million Dollars per annum to the Province and about \$500,000, of that to the city of Vancouver. The fur dealers say that the increase of trade is entirely due to the protection of fur-bearing animals received, and all agree that the commencement of improvement began after protection came into force. In 1917 the trade had improved so much that representatives from every fur trading firm on the Continent; came to Vancouver to attend the monthly sales. These sales, though only lately organized, averaged some \$20,000, a month.

The improvement in the fur trade was so marked in B. C. that a succession of articles appeared on the subject in the U. S. magazines.

### INDIRECT PROFIT TO THE PROVINCE FROM ITS GAME

The indirect profit to this Province is not less than \$3,000,000. This is only a small amount to what it would be in a few years if game and fur-bearing animals continued to receive the protection they were getting prior to 1918. To prove this you have only to see what the States are making out of it. From the Washington Game and Fish Association Report for the year 1903, we find that in 1902 the State of Maine realized \$6,000,000, out of its fish and game privileges. That is to say, that amount of money went into the treasury of the State on account of hunting licences and other privileges granted by the State. This takes no account of the amount spent on equipment, travel and other incidentals of outing trips.

According to the report of the U. S. National Association of Fish and Game Commissioners, Mr. Carleton, Chairman of the Commission, estimated that \$15,000,000, is left in Maine every season by non-resident sportsmen who visit the State in quest of sport.

If this is true of a State like Maine, what might be the results in this Province, with all its splendid variety of game, in future years. Is it not an asset which should receive every attention and not be allowed to run the slightest risk of depletion?

### RETROGRADE LEGISLATION

From the time of the introduction of the gun licence until the year 1918, throughout the whole of the North American Continent, as well as in many other parts of the world, the British Columbia Game Department was regarded as the most up-to-date and properly administered Game Department on the Continent, and was often the subject of most favorable comment both in sporting and commercial papers. The game laws were well enforced by a competent staff of game wardens; game birds and animals were steadily increasing, and there was every reason to expect that the Province would retain its reputation of being the best hunting country on the Continent if not of the world.

At this time the Game Department, in spite of the war and all the depression, was financially in a flourishing condition, in fact there was a profit that year of some \$14,000.

Then came the legislation of 1918 which completely undid the work of years, the Provincial Game Warden and his staff were dismissed, the Superintendent of Provincial Police appointed nominally Provincial Game Warden and the policy of the Department put in the hands of a number of honorary Game Commissioners, none of whom had the slightest knowledge of big game or fur bearing animals, and very little knowledge even of game birds.

The plea for this, what may almost be called suicidal folly, was economy, and this in spite of the fact that the Department could show a profit of over \$100,000 since the introduction of the gun licence.