

1883, up to the 31st December, the total value of exported fish, fish oils, &c., including the consumption by the European population throughout the Province, was \$1,603,145.42, and the consumption by the Indian population throughout the Province, by computation previously made and published, \$4,885,000; making a total of no less than \$6,488,145.42. There is sufficient in that to show that there must be as much work devolving on the Inspector of Fisheries in British Columbia as on the inspectors in any of the other Provinces. I do not wish to detract from any other Province, but I do think that the inspector in British Columbia should receive, not only as much as the inspectors of the other Provinces, but should receive a larger amount, in view of the increased cost of living in that country. The comparative value of the yield of the years 1882 and 1883, exclusive of computed Indian consumption, was: in 1883, \$1,603,145.42, and in 1882, \$1,842,675.05—which shows a deficiency in the year 1883, of \$239,529.63, arising from shortness of salmon pack and deficient fur seal hunt. The pack of canned salmon in 1883 from Fraser river amounted to 12 canneries 105,701 cases, and from the northern rivers and inlets, to 11 canneries 90,501 cases, or a total of 196,292 cases. The pack of 1882 was 265,610, which shows a deficiency of 1883, compared with 1882, of 58,769 cases. The value of vessels employed, together with boats, nets and ordinary equipment, was \$253,245.00, and the computed value of stationary plant \$515,000, or a total value of \$768,245.00. The number of men employed during the season was 70 sailors, 2,934 fishermen and seal hunters, and 2,136 shoremen, making a total of 5,070 persons engaged in the trade. These statistics give a very fair idea of the importance of our fishing industry, and show the necessity of increasing the inspector's salary. Mr. Anderson is a gentleman of very high culture, a man of intelligence and ability, and I think the Department would be very sorry indeed to lose his services. If the Department desires to retain him in his position, it is necessary he should be paid commensurate with his services; and I hope the hon. gentleman will give the attention to this case which it is fairly entitled to.

Mr. PAINT. I wish to say one word in reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Prince County, Prince Edward Island. He protested against the use of fish traps, and I wish to say a word on behalf of the fishermen of Nova Scotia. He objects to fish traps; I protest against the use of purse or tuck-seines. The hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island, referred to the sixty-three American vessels that were in the Gulf of St. Lawrence last year; but he did not say that they had loaded with the aid of seines. The vessels throw the bait overboard, and the fish rise to the surface, and they run the seines round the shoal of mackerel and load their vessels this way, destroying immense numbers, the small ones being thrown away. In dealing with a Reciprocity Treaty or anything like that, care should be taken to treat with the Americans in regard to the destruction by them of the fish in our waters. Our Nova Scotia vessels have not yet taken that method of catching fish, but the Americans have done so, and they loaded twice last year; this is a more destructive method than the trap.

Mr. DAWSON. The constituency which I represent extends for 600 miles along the great lakes, and fishing is very extensively carried on there. I will not detain the House more than a few minutes, but I desire to refer to a matter which I think of very great importance to the country at large. I suppose that fish traps on the sea coast correspond with our pound nets on the great lakes, and there is no doubt that those pound nets are most destructive to the fish. They are set all over the lakes now, and are coming more and more into use every day, and some restrictions should be put upon their use. The pound nets are very un-

Mr. BAKER (Victoria.)

fair to a large class of the population up there, the Indian population. In some places the fish are actually swept out of the lake. The Minister has very well said that these nets would clean out a lake, however large or small it was, and there is no doubt that they have cleaned out the Georgian Bay a great deal. I think there should be some restrictions upon them. I must say, with regard to the fish hatcheries, that, so far as I have observed and heard, and the general opinion as far as I have heard it expressed is, that they are eminently successful. There can be no doubt that, but for these fish hatcheries, the fish would be very soon exterminated in some parts of the Great Lakes. They have been successful on Lake Ontario, and at Detroit, on the American side, they have been exceedingly successful, and wherever they have been tried. It is contrary to reason to suppose that, if you throw millions of fry into the water, perfectly alive and well, it will not increase the quantity of fish. It is absurd to imagine that it would not, and it has been proved that these hatcheries have been eminently successful.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. member who has just sat down expresses a strong opinion which, if it were correct, would justify the voting of this money or a larger amount; but I am not satisfied that his opinion is a correct one. I would not give my opinion as strongly as he has done his, but I would recall to his recollection and to that of hon. members that the gentleman who was for twenty years the head of the Fishery Department, Commissioner of Fisheries, published an open letter which I read in the newspaper last year, in which he stated that, notwithstanding the enormous sums we had expended in this Dominion for the last twenty years, ranging up to I do not know how many thousand dollars, in his mind the system was a failure. It seemed to me that this would have been an appropriate time for the hon. Minister, if that letter or the conclusions which Mr. Whitche submitted to the public as his conclusions after twenty years experience were incorrect, or if the data upon which he formed them were incorrect, to explain to the House and the country, who are called upon to vote \$30,000 or \$40,000 for this purpose, wherein he was incorrect—was it in his data, or in his conclusions, or in his reasoning? Certainly the country have a right to suppose that a gentleman occupying the position he did for so long, a gentleman supposed to know so much and credited with knowing so much, would, in giving such an opinion, do so with more than ordinary knowledge and with a right to be believed and to have his statements accepted. Perhaps he may have overdrawn it, or he may not; but I think the Minister should have given us not a simple opinion as he did to-night, but some reasons for it. As to the question of protecting the fisheries with the overseers; I am inclined to think, and there is no disguising the fact, that, to a very large extent, these men do not do their duty, that the rivers are not protected as they ought to be, that the wardens are afraid to discharge their duty in some instances, and in other instances do not discharge it from other causes, but, as a matter of fact, they do not do it. I would refer the Minister to the fact that, in Prince Edward Island, last year, one man, while discharging his duty, who caught three or four parties in *flagrante delicto* and tried to arrest them, was so brutally maltreated that he has been a cripple ever since. I believe he has put in some sort of claim to the Minister, and I hope that in order to show the wardens throughout the country that they will be protected in the performance of their duty, his case will be considered. In regard to the hatcheries, my opinion has been very much shaken by Mr. Whitche's statement, and before Concurrence I would like the Minister to give us some further information upon this subject. Another year, at all events, I will not let the vote go by without making a thorough personal investigation into the