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you and to express the wish that some real and lasting fruits will result from your gathering together. Indeed, the very nature of the conference is such that good results should follow.

We have come to realize in the Dominion—late, it is true, because, as a nation, like all other nations, we have only recognized very late the importance of great truths—that the conservation of our game is as vital a subject for consideration and attention as is the conservation of any other of our resources. The Dominion of Canada is so situated that wild game is a larger factor in the estimate of our national resources than it is, perhaps, in many great countries. A large section of this Dominion is valuable for its game and its fur-bearing resources more than for anything else—indeed, to the utter exclusion of anything else. That great stretch between the eastern coast of the Hudson Bay and the Atlantic, on the one hand, and the Mackenzie basin, on the other, is valuable for its fur-bearing: in fact, as yet, it is valuable for little else. Canada is known as the great breeding place of the wild fowl on this continent. The Interior Department administers, as you know, the Northwest Game Act, which has been on our statute book for many years, and also the recent statute ratifying the convention with regard to migratory birds entered into between the British Empire and the United States.

A glimpse of the value of your work can be had by considering the loss that we annually sustain as an agricultural community through the depredation of our insectivorous birds. In Western Canada, as in Ontario and, no doubt, in Eastern Canada, the loss in respect of this is very great indeed. The figures are so great that I hesitate to quote them; and a great service, from a purely commercial standpoint, can be rendered by a study of the best means of preserving our wild birds.

Our fur-bearing resources are also very extensive in what are known as the 'barren lands' of northern Canada—but which are not in any real sense barren lands. I do not know whether Senator Edwards will agree with me in this, because he and I are at opposite poles on this question of Canadian resources. But they are not barren lands, because no barren land can sustain the animal and plant life that these lands sustain. In that district, therefore, there are tremendous possibilities of greater fur-bearing and, indeed, meat-bearing development. I think it was Seton Thompson who fixed the number of caribou of that country at very many millions, and that it was Mr. J. B. Tyrrell who referred to them as being like the sands of the sea, not capable of being numbered, but only to be estimated numerically on a square-mile basis. It is impossible to conceive that we are not going to do something to extend the geography of Canada, so far as civilization and utilization are concerned, nearer to the Arctic, and make use of these vast domains which, while not comparable with the rest of the Dominion, will, if properly administered, become an exceedingly valuable asset among the natural resources of Canada.

I am glad indeed to find that such a distinguished gentleman as Dr. Hornaday, the Director of the New York Zoological Park, is to be among the contributors to the value of this conference, and also the gentleman who, on behalf of the United States, is responsible for the administration of the Migratory Bird Convention to which I have referred, Mr. Nelson. I earnestly hope that I shall be able to be present to hear what they have to say.

There is another reason why I am interested in this conference. Not as Minister of the Interior, but because I am Minister of the Interior. I happen also to be Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. To the Indian, wild life is almost all of life. Possibly for many generations yet the Indian will not be able to subsist, to fight against the inroads of disease, and to maintain himself as a healthy and real Indian, except by access to sufficient wild life to enable him to so do. By reason of the depletion of deer and other game in the Ungava district—which depletion took place most pronouncedly some thirty-five years ago, at the time of the great fire—it is becoming increasingly difficult to sustain the life of the Eskimo and Indians of that territory. It is not that the Department of Indian Affairs is negligent of them, because direct assistance to the Eskimos and Indians has been on the increase during all these years. But such assistance can never take the place of that ability to help themselves which Indians alone can exercise if they are in the environment of wild life; consequently we are making an effort to re-establish the conditions under which the Indian and the Eskimo can survive by their own resources and their own energies. Help them as we will, the more we help them the faster they die. Tuberculosis invades their huts: they do not get out as much as they did: if we help them more they get out less, and we are steering towards the extinction of the Indian and the Eskimo in that territory unless some successful change of policy can be made. It is not an easy matter in a country of such vast extent as ours to bring game into a territory of that kind and to preserve it through its earlier stages and enable it to become sufficiently numerous to be of real utility to the people. We are making arrangements that, we trust, in the course of time will take care of this condition, by co-operating with a concern which hopes very shortly to
I wish to express my appreciation of the calling of this conference, and to hope that the exchange of opinions and experiences and the deliberations generally of you who are assembled here will result in advancing the knowledge of every section of the matters you are called upon to consider, as well as what may be described as a really practical outcome—greater uniformity in wild life administration and in the laws relating to wild life, and tangible progress in furthering the preservation of wild life itself.

Senator Edwards: It is always interesting to hear Hon. Mr. Meighen, and I am sure you have listened to him with a great deal of pleasure. His tribute to Sir Wilfrid Laurier must be appreciated by every one, and particularly by his close friends. As one of Sir Wilfrid's intimate close friends, I thank Mr. Meighen very much for the remarks which he has made.

I was very much interested in Mr. Meighen's remarks with regard to Ungava. I know that country, not personally, but by proxy: our firm has explored it. I may say that a good deal of the burning that is going on—at least, this was the case a few years ago, and I imagine the condition still exists—is done by the parties whom our friend Dr. Grenfell is helping to maintain there. His friends in that district are misguided, and he is making a great mistake—unintentionally, of course.

I shall now call upon Dr. Hewitt, Dominion Entomologist, Dept. of Agriculture, and Consulting Zoologist to the Commission of Conservation. Dr. Hewitt will address us on the Need of Nationwide Effort in Wild Life Conservation.

Dr. C. Gordon Hewitt: Before reading the few remarks which I have to make I should like to add a word of tribute to the words that were spoken at the Annual Meeting of the Commission of Conservation yesterday and to those that have been so well spoken by Hon. Mr. Meighen this morning, to the memory of Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier was the chief man who was responsible for the creation of this Commission. But we are gathered here to consider a certain aspect of the Commission's work, namely, the conservation of wild life. It may not be known to most of you that Sir Wilfrid took a very keen interest in wild life. It was my privilege to be on terms of friendship with Sir Wilfrid, consequently I had many opportunities of learning of his great interest in wild life. Of course, public men in his position are generally regarded as politicians only; few trouble to think that there may be another side to their lives. As a matter of fact, Sir Wilfrid had a very great love of nature, particularly of birds and trees. I never met him without the conversation turning to the subject of birds, or to the work that was being done by the various provinces and by the Dominion for the protection of birds. He took a great interest in our work here in Ottawa. The last communication I had with Sir Wilfrid was a letter from him, stating that he had written Sir Lomer Gouin asking his interest in the work that this Commission and the Advisory Board had undertaken to secure the reservation of the Bird rocks and Bonaventure island in the gulf of St. Lawrence as bird sanctuaries. During all the ten years that it was my privilege to know him, Sir Wilfrid evidenced a very real interest in wild life conservation, and it is fitting that this should be pointed out at a time when we are all thinking of what the nation owes him and the loss it has suffered at his death.
The Need of Nation-wide Effort in Wild Life Conservation

by

C. Gordon Hewitt

Consulting Zoologist

This National Conference marks an epoch in the history of the movement for the conservation of wild life in the Dominion. Convoked, as it has been, by the Commission of Conservation, with the co-operation of the Advisory Board on Wild Life Protection, it represents the first occasion on which an endeavour has been made officially to bring together those who, through their official duties or public or private interests, are concerned in the protection of our game and fur-bearing animals and wild life generally. All to whom our wild life has any significance have been invited: officials of Dominion and Provincial Governments, representatives of sportsmen's and game protective associations, of the fur-trading companies and of the railways. And the international significance of the problem that we are to discuss is evidenced by the presence of those of our friends and co-workers from the United States who have accepted our invitation.

During the last decade there has been in Canada an awakening to the fact that, of all our natural resources, the wild life was the most sensitive to human interference. and there has been a realization of the responsibility that rests upon our shoulders as trustees of the greater portion of what remains of the big game animals, of the breeding grounds of the wild fowl and of the most valuable fur-bearers of this continent. The manner in which the wild life over most of the United States has suffered through lack of adequate protection has furnished an object lesson that Canadians have not been slow to learn: and, while wanton destruction and excessive and unwise killing have taken place throughout Canada, our comparatively small population has not depleted our wild life so well favoured in haunts by Nature, and we are still fortunate in possessing a fair proportion of our original stock of game and fur-bearing animals, well distributed over the country. We have convened for the purpose of determining the best methods by which we can conserve our wild life for the use and enjoyment of the people of to-day and of the future.

Before we commence our discussions, I should like to emphasize two points, which are vitally important in their bearing on this subject, namely, the desirability of the greatest degree of co-operation, and the necessity of foresight.

Taking the last point first, why should we not now resolve to use that faculty which distinguishes us from our fellow creatures and exercise our reason, which should make us provident? In the past it has been almost an irrefutable rule to wait until serious depletion of game animals had taken place before instituting protective measures which, had they been in effect earlier, would have prevented such depletion. Why should we continue to be so lacking in foresight, and of those attributes that make a nation progressive, as to be unwilling to provide against contingencies that we know from experience will occur? Conservation is practical foresight. No natural resource needs the application of greater foresight for its conservation than our wild life, for it cannot be replaced once it is destroyed, and its destruction can only be avoided by wise provision. Let us, therefore, resolve to look ahead of the present requirements, and plan with our eyes on the future.

But the chief object of this conference is to secure as great a degree of co-operation as possible, in order to further the objects we all have in view. A significant change has taken place in our attitude towards wild life. Formerly, game laws were framed more with an eye to human advantage than for the benefit of the wild life. Our wild life resources were regarded as a convenient and easy source of revenue, and the issuing of game licenses was the principal function of the game officer; the same attitude of mind existed in regard to our forest resources, which were regarded as a valuable source of public revenue, in the shape of licenses and stumpage fees, and not as an economic asset requiring wise conservation. But, when the limits of the, so-called, ' inexhaustible' come within the range of our perception, then the instinct of self-preservation comes into play, and we hasten to make such amends as may be possible by endeavouring to save what remains. The true game officer to-day is more concerned in protecting such game as remains than in issuing licenses for its destruction, and, if we are to retain our game resources, their conservation must necessarily constitute the main function of the game officer: he must be truly a game guardian or warden.
This broader conception of the significance of our wild life and of our attitude towards it has, in turn, brought about a greater sense of our responsibility with regard to the future, and a realization of the fact that the conservation of wild life is not a matter which any one province, state or territory can undertake alone, but that its successful prosecution demands neighbourhood co-operation and mutual assistance. The extent of our success in protecting our wild life will depend upon the degree of our co-operation.

In every sphere of activity the spirit of co-operation is growing; in industrial labour, agricultural production or international conduct, co-operation is replacing separate effort. Similarly, in conserving our wild life we are appreciating the necessity of co-operation. So long as our migratory birds were subject to excessive destruction during their winter sojourn in the south and their spring migration northward, our effort to protect them in their breeding grounds was likely to prove unsuccessful altruism; the conservation of these birds demanded international action, and now we are endeavouring by mutual co-operation to protect them. This conference will afford an opportunity of discussing the means whereby we may cooperate in this problem to the best advantage.

Indeed, there are few phases of wild life conservation which cannot be promoted with a much greater degree of success by mutual co-operation between governments than by individual effort. In the regulation of the fur trade, which we propose to discuss, the enforcement of the best laws that a government can devise may be seriously hampered by the limitations that provincial or national boundaries place upon the jurisdiction of such governments. The same difficulty is met where contiguous governments have different policies; for example, where a provincial government, such as that of Saskatchewan or New Brunswick, prohibits the sale of game, and an adjacent province permits it; the absence of uniformity in policy leads to infractions of the law and trouble in enforcing it. While it is too much to expect uniformity in all cases, it cannot be denied that a much greater degree of co-operation than exists at present can be secured, and we believe that the best mode of obtaining such co-operation is by such a conference as this.

The migratory tendencies of most forms of wild life usually affect the effect of provincial or national boundaries, and the results may be for good or for evil; a territory carrying on a wise protective policy with regard to its game or fur-bearing animals will bring about an overflow into the more depleted contiguous areas; or an area in which an ineffectual policy for the control of predatory animals will serve as a source of supply to neighbouring territory. For good or for evil, contiguity has an effect on the wild life. In the control of predatory animals it is now obvious that complete success can only be obtained by co-operative effort.

There is abroad in Canada an impression that the Dominion Government concerns itself little, if at all, with the actual protection of wild life. This impression may have been justified by apparent inactivity in former years; it is not justified to-day, and the proceedings of this conference afford confirmation of the fact. While the Dominion Government has left to the provinces the protection of the game, fur-bearing animals, and other wild life within their respective territories, it is nevertheless responsible for the protection of the wild life over an enormous portion of Canada, namely, the Northwest Territories, Yukon Territory, and in the Dominion parks. In order to carry out our national obligations with respect to the treaty with the United States for the protection of migratory birds, it has also assumed the guardianship of our migratory birds; this is being undertaken with the practical co-operation of the Provincial governments. The legislation governing these matters is administered by the Minister of the Interior. In order to supervise the enforcement of this legislation, and to advise on such matters affecting the conservation of wild life as might be referred to the Government, there was appointed, two years ago, on the recommendation of the Minister of the Interior, an Advisory Board on Wild Life Protection, which is composed of a representative from each of the departments concerned in wild life conservation, namely, the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, Mines (Geological Survey), and Indian Affairs, and the Commission of Conservation. The chief activities of this Advisory Board, up to the present, have been the drafting of the legislation under the Migratory Birds Treaty and the revision of the Northwest Game Act.

The policy adopted in respect to the protection of migratory birds serves to illustrate two points that I should like to bring out: First, the possibilities in the way of co-operation between the Dominion and Provincial governments; and, second, the useful functions of our Advisory Board as an instrument for bringing about or facilitating co-operation between the Dominion and Provincial governments, inter-provincial or international co-operation, all of which, as we cannot insist too often, are
essential to any policy for conserving our Canadian wild life. In regard to the first of these points, the government's policy in the administration of the legislation carrying out the Migratory Birds treaty is to rely on the provincial governments, so far as may be possible, for the enforcement of the provisions of the treaty within their respective territories. With this in mind most of the Provincial governments have already amended their game laws to conform with the provisions of the treaty. Where assistance is necessary to secure the adequate enforcement of the regulations, it is intended to furnish such assistance; and where it may be necessary for the Dominion Government to enforce the regulations under the Migratory Birds Convention Act, owing to the failure of a Provincial government to do so, the Dominion Government will live up to its obligations under the treaty, which is by no means a "scrap of paper", but the most far-reaching measure that has been yet put into operation for the preservation of our valuable bird life. A great responsibility rests upon the Dominion Government in this matter, inasmuch as it is solely responsible for the enforcement of the regulations in the Northwest Territories, which now constitute, perhaps, the chief breeding grounds of the greatest number of the migratory birds of this continent.

Revision of Northwest Game Act

It may not be out of place to discuss as briefly as possible the conservation of the game, fur-bearing animals and wild life of the Northwest Territories, on which subject I have addressed the Commission of Conservation at previous annual meetings. The Commission recommended the revision of the Northwest Game Act in 1916, and that revision was subsequently undertaken by the Advisory Board on Wild Life Protection, a new Act being passed in 1917. The new Northwest Game Act, and the Regulations passed thereunder, have two main features: First, the needs of the wild life in the Northwest Territories are more adequately satisfied; and, second, the fur resources receive a greater degree of protection by the institution of a licensing system for trappers and traders, thus providing a safeguard against exploitation by unscrupulous individuals or companies. The Canadian people generally fail to realize, chiefly because they lack the information upon which to form an opinion or do not give the subject a thought, what an immense economic asset the wild life, and particularly the fur-bearing animals, of the Northwest Territories constitute. Reliable statistics of the fur production of these vast territories are unavailable, and, in passing, may I say that we hope that one of the results of this conference will be the development of a scheme for securing reliable statistics of one of the country's chief natural resources, the resource that first attracted the outside world to our shores. But it is safe to say, that millions of dollars worth of furs of the finest quality obtainable are exported annually from our Northwest Territories. Furs constitute the main available resource, and capturing fur-bearing animals is the occupation of practically the entire population of those territories at the present time.

In an address which I gave before the Commission of Conservation two years ago on the "Conservation of our Northern Fur Resources," I pointed out that the Danish Government administers the fur trade of Greenland as a government monopoly, and has thus been able to exercise a great degree of control, with a view to ensuring the conservation of the fur resources, and, what is of still more vital importance, the conservation of the health of the natives by protection from foreign traders. So far as I have been able to ascertain, this policy has met with success. Why should not a similar policy succeed when applied to our Northwest Territories? The policy of state ownership of public utilities has its adherents and opponents, but the state ownership of natural resources is not in the same category, and the state ownership of certain resources, such as forests, has undoubtedly proved successful, from both the point of view of conservation and of revenue. A discussion of this subject in these introductory remarks would be out of place and I have enlarged upon it elsewhere. It is desirable, however, that all who are interested in the conservation of our wild life, and particularly the fur-bearing and game animals, should consider the suggestion that these wild life resources in the Northwest Territories might be administered as a government monopoly, and for three reasons: First, as a means of securing adequate protection for these resources; second, as a source of revenue; and third, in order to safeguard the native population, which is dependent upon and is the chief means of harvesting the crop.

Reservations and Sanctuaries

In addition to the protection of wild life in the Northwest Territories and Yukon and of migratory birds under the international treaty, the Dominion Government is actively conserving the wild life in another direction, namely, by the establishment of natural reservations under the Dominion Parks Act. The wild life in all the national parks is protected, and these parks comprise an area of nearly 9,000 square miles. But certain parks, such as the Wainwright Buffalo park, the Foremost Antelope reserve and Elk Island park, are maintained solely for the conservation of native mammals that would otherwise
have been exterminated. The Commissioner of Dominion Parks, who is also charged with the enforcement of the Northwest Game Act and Migratory Birds Convention Act, will, no doubt, give further details regarding these Dominion game and wild life reserves. When he opens the discussion on game sanctuaries, which is one of the subjects that it is desirable to consider at this conference.

In the establishment and maintenance of wild life or game reserves in Canada there are unlimited opportunities for co-operative action between the Dominion and Provincial governments. In fact, the reserves in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta are co-operative in character, inasmuch as such reserves are chiefly established by the Provincial governments in Dominion forest reserves. We feel, however, that closer co-operation is both desirable and possible, particularly in the matter of the appointment of wardens for such reserves. A wild life reserve fails in its object to a very large extent unless it is adequately patrolled; there are law-breakers everywhere, both white and Indian, and, if a reserve lacks sufficient protection, it will be a reserve in little more than name. The wild life inhabitants of a reserve must receive protection, both from human enemies and from the predatory animals that will be attracted to such a district providing more abundant food.

The effect of Conservation on Natives. In the conservation of our wild life one of the chief factors we have to consider is the native, whether he be Indian or Eskimo. His attitude towards the subject is naturally different from ours, and he affords a problem that demands sympathetic treatment and careful consideration. The Deputy Minister of the Department of Indian Affairs is a member of our Advisory Board on Wild Life Protection, and, in consequence, it is possible for us to give the fullest consideration to questions arising out of the relations of natives to our wild life and to take such action as may be deemed necessary and advisable. As this question will be discussed during the present session of the conference it is unnecessary to say more in this introductory statement than to point out that it affords, perhaps more than any other question, opportunities for co-operation between the Dominion and Provincial governments, and one of our desires is that this meeting and our free discussion will result in a greater degree of mutual understanding and co-operation in dealing with the problem of the Indian in the future.

In the foregoing remarks, government activities in the conservation of wild life have been chiefly considered. But, unfortunately, governments are more apt to follow than to lead public opinion in questions of this nature. Consequently, the creation of a strong public opinion on the necessity of conserving our wild life is essential. It is essential, not only from the point of view of promoting the ends we have in view, but also in order to carry out effectively the measures as may be established.

The Commission of Conservation has taken the lead in educating public opinion in Canada as to the importance of conserving our wild life resources and in promoting measures to effect such conservation. The work that has already been accomplished has only served to indicate how much greater an effort is necessary. The assistance of all organizations concerned in the protection of wild life is essential. In a country so rich in game animals, it is surprising how few organizations there are of those interested in the protection of such animals. There are a few associations of sportsmen scattered through the Dominion, but how many of these ever endeavour actively to promote wild life conservation or exert themselves except when their immediate interests are involved? Such associations of sportsmen should become active centres of propaganda for wild life conservation, not confining themselves to merely selfish interests, but dealing with the subject in a broad, public-spirited manner. Further, we should like to see associations of persons interested in wild life conservation, both sportsmen and nature-lovers, organized throughout the country. The effect of such organizations would be inestimable. Not only would they serve to educate the public, but they would be able to assist the governments in the effective enforcement of the game laws. Where we now have one game-protective or sportsmen's association, there should be at least ten. The possibilities of mutual co-operation between such associations and the governments are indefinite. In no way could an endeavour to promote nation-wide effort in the conservation of wild life meet with greater success than through the assistance of such organizations of sportsmen, of guides and of nature-lovers—in a word, of all who are directly interested in the adoption and carrying out of all measures that have for their object the preservation of our wild life resources.

Need of Nation-wide Effort. Time will not permit a further review of the various directions in which our fur-bearing and game animals and wild life generally may be more successfully conserved by co-operative effort, not only between governments but between organizations and governments. The need of such nation-wide effort was never so pressing as it is today. We shall never again have such an excellent opportunity of attaining, by mutual
effort, the ends for which we are individually striving, as we have now. Everywhere ideas are in a state of flux, and the extent to which they crystallize out in forms that will promote the welfare of the country as a whole will depend upon the justice of the cause, the weight of public opinion behind it, and the prescience of our governments. A great responsibility rests upon those of us who are endeavouring to form and guide public opinion, and, at the same time, are called upon to advise on the conservation of this and other resources, but we can discharge our obligations with a greater degree of success if we work together with the same ends in view, and, instead of limiting our vision by regarding our problems as local, make our cause a national one.

**DISCUSSION**

Dr. Hewitt: May I suggest that this paper is really not meant for discussion; it is intended as a general introduction to the work of the conference. Our programme has been purposely made brief, as we felt that the objects of the conference would be better attained if we had plenty of time for discussion of the subjects with which they deal rather than a large programme which would leave practically no time for discussion. You will see, therefore, that we have endeavoured to select subjects that seemed to us to need discussion by such a conference as this and, possibly, action by resolution.

On the other hand, delegates to the conference may wish to discuss subjects that are not on the programme. We had that also in view, and we welcome the discussion of any further questions which delegates to the conference desire to bring up during the course of the meeting.

Dr. A. R. Baker (Chairman, Provincial Game Conservation Board, Vancouver): Dr. Hewitt remarked that game wardens, instead of being sellers of game licenses should be game conservers. British Columbia has taken a forward step in the conservation of game by appointing a Game Conservation Board, whose sole duty it is to see that the game of that vast country is conserved as far as possible. It has always been the object of governments to derive as much revenue as possible from the sale of licenses and from the exportation of the skins of our fur-bearing animals. For many years I worked to get the British Columbia Government to bring about a system whereby we would have an opportunity of conserving our game and our fur-bearing animals.
Dr. Hewitt spoke about the fur-bearing districts of the Northwest. British Columbia produces about one-third of the fur produced in Canada. We have established a system under which we can give you exact figures of all the fur that is taken in the province and exported at any time. Mr. Host, who is with me, will be pleased to explain the system and to give an idea of the amount of fur taken out yearly.

One year ago, the Game Conservation Board of British Columbia was created, of which I am proud to be chairman. During the short time that we have been in existence, we have accomplished wonderful results. I should like to see Conservation Boards and Game Protective Societies established in all the other provinces. In British Columbia two game protective associations have been established—one in the interior and one on the Pacific slope—comprised of representative sportsmen of the province. These associations have entered into the spirit of conservation and are doing a great deal of valuable work in preserving, protecting, and conserving game.

Mr. E. A. Smith (Minister of Lands and Mines, New Brunswick): At the last session of our Legislature we passed what is known as the Forest Act. Formerly we employed a number of men, at a certain time of the year, to scale our logs. Then, a certain number of men were employed, during portions of the year, to protect our forest lands from fire, and we had another set of men temporarily employed for the conservation of our game, and known as game wardens. I do not think that any of these branches of work was carried on in the best interests of the province. The Forest Act, as passed last year, was coupled with the Forest Fires Act. Under the Forest Act we consolidated or combined those three outside services, and made the employees permanent instead of temporary. I do not think there was any saving of money; I did not take that into consideration. What I did take into consideration was chiefly the conservation of our game and our forests. In placing the Bill before the Legislature I contended that we did not get efficient service from our temporary employees, and that the appointment of permanent employees would give better results. Examinations of candidates were held, and no man was given a position who did not possess qualifications for the line of work in which he was to be employed; and, when selected for appointment, the first six months of his service was to be a probationary period. Lumbermen and others in the province are objecting to the new Act, but I feel that it was a forward step, and we are getting the results.
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It would take a good deal of time to deal fully with all branches of the subject which you have allotted to me; therefore, I will only say something of what the Department of Indian Affairs is actually doing to conserve wild life by endeavouring to induce the Indians to obey the laws.

We should have a good deal of sympathy for the Indian. He is the original fur-hunter of the country, and, when he was alone in that industry, he had everything his own way. When the fur-traders came, everything was changed, and, looking back over the old days, and reading the records of that time, one cannot help wondering that any Indians now remain to hunt or to be subject to restrictive regulations, considering the stormy period they went through in their first relations with the white man. The Indians were then debauched by liquor supplied to them by government employees, military officers, and fur-traders, until the middle of the last century—1850 or thereabouts, when laws were enacted, providing that no more liquor should be given to Indians. Then a halcyon period for the Indian set in, when he could not get whiskey in trade, and when the fur-trade was in the hands of one or two great companies. The fur-bearing animals were carefully conserved by the companies and by the Indians themselves in their own interests. The number of skins to be taken was limited, and the trade was very carefully regulated. These conditions prevailed until the independent fur-trader made his appearance upon the scene. Now the trade is so divided and parcelled out between hunters, who are not Indians, and many companies and individuals who are engaged in buying furs, that the Indian finds it year by year, increasingly difficult to support himself and make way amidst competition and the restrictive regulations which he is expected to recognize and obey.
The Provincial governments are attempting to deal with the fur-trade by enacting restrictive legislation, and the Department of Indian Affairs endeavours to induce the Indians to obey the Provincial laws. That is the fixed policy of the Department. As you are all well aware, we have what we call "treaties" with the Indians. These treaties are really concessions of land, surrenders of large areas of Indian lands over which the Indians had usufructuary title. It has been British policy, ever since the year 1763, to require a surrender of these titles before the country was thrown open for settlement. In most of the treaties the question of hunting and fishing was mentioned. I will read the clause which is inserted in these treaties:

"His Majesty further agrees with his said Indians, that they, the said Indians, shall have right to pursue their avocations of hunting and fishing throughout the tract surrendered as hereinbefore described, subject to such regulations as may from time to time be made by His Government of His Dominion of Canada, and saving and excepting such tracts as may from time to time be required or taken up for settlement, mining, lumbering, or other purposes, by His said Government of the Dominion of Canada, or by any of the subjects thereof fully authorized therefor by the said Government."

While allowing the Indians this privilege, these treaties, for the most part, contain the general provision that the Indians shall be loyal subjects of His Majesty and obey the laws passed from time to time by His Majesty's Government.

Indians under Provincial Law

The Indian Act contains no specific legislation on the subject of hunting and fishing, but contains the following clause, which controls his application to Indians of Provincial laws in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Northwest Territories:

"The Superintendent General may, from time to time, by public notice, declare that on and after a day therein named the laws respecting game in force in the Province of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, or Alberta, or the Territories, or respecting such game as is specified in such notice, shall apply to Indians within the said Province or Territories, as the case may be, or to Indians in such parts thereof as to him seems expedient."

From time to time, by proclamation, we have brought Indians under the provisions of the provincial game laws, and, through correspondence with our agents, and, through the exercise of all the influence we can bring to bear on the Indians themselves, we are endeavouring to get them consistently to obey these laws.

We have not had much trouble with the Provincial governments on the question of Indian hunting. Of course, we sometimes get exaggerated reports that the Indians are killing all the moose in certain districts, but, when we investigate them, we usually find that there is little foundation for the reports.

Indians Kill for Food

On the whole, it may be said that the Indian obeys the hunting and fishing regulations equally as well as the white man. The Indian, who has to maintain himself on his hunting grounds by killing animals for food, is entitled to a measure of sympathy, and we have found that the Provincial governments are willing to recognize his exceptional position in this regard. The Indians who are difficult to deal with are those who are remote from civilization, living in aboriginal conditions and not open to the influences of civilization: but this class is fast disappearing.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that, so far as the Department of Indian Affairs is concerned, our fixed policy is to endeavour to induce the Indians to obey the laws passed by the Provincial authorities for the conservation of wild life and the preservation of game, and to endeavour also to mitigate the laws to meet any special conditions that surround the present mode of life of the natives.

Discussion.

Mr. F. Bradshaw (Provincial Game Guardian, Saskatchewan): We have listened with interest to Mr. Scott's remarks, but I, for one, do not think that everything possible is being done to control the Indian. One of the most difficult problems we have to contend with in Saskatchewan is the non-observance of the game laws by Indians.

The Indian does little or no big game hunting during the lawful open season, but it is an established fact that, during August, September and October, when the moose and elk are easily lured within range by the use of a call, he kills far more big game than he is legally or morally entitled to. In the early days, when there was an abundance of wild life, no reasonable objection could be taken to the killing of big game for legitimate requirements, but, in these days, when the annual toll taken seriously endangers the very existence of some of the magnificent species of our North American fauna, I think we would be very remiss in our duties as wild life conservationists if we closed our eyes to the unwarranted violations that are being perpetrated by the Indians at this time.
I do not know whether this problem affects the whole of the Dominion or not, but I think I may safely say that it applies with equal significance to all the western provinces, and, for this reason, I presume the subject to be of sufficient importance to warrant my bringing it to the attention of this conference.

Each year our department receives an increased number of complaints of wanton slaughter of big game by Indians. These are usually received from settlers who reside in the vicinity of where the Indians are operating, or from sportsmen who go to considerable expense and trouble in preparing for their annual big game hunting trip, only to find, on arriving at their camp, unquestionable evidence that the Indians have preceded them. I suppose, in some cases, the complaints received are prompted by selfish motives; in others, the motive is purely a desire to secure a square deal both for the game and for the law-abiding sportsman. Whatever the reason, the fact remains that, for the most part, the complaints are justified, and, in nearly all cases, they are fully substantiated upon investigation.

Perhaps the best way to open up this subject for discussion would be to quote from a few of the many letters recently received by the department on this subject. But first of all, I will read a news clipping from the North Baffalo News, dealing with the situation as it obtains north of that city:

"The slaughter of moose in the north country goes steadily and craftily on. This autumn has actually been the worst, positively the worst, in years. According to reports from those who know, and with whom The News is in close touch, fully two hundred moose were killed this year by the Indians in the country to the north of us during the season just closed. Hunters who have lately returned from the moose-hunting grounds of the north emphatically state that this year's hunt was the dullest yet experienced. Few traces of moose could be found. For days the forests could be secured for these monarchs of the woods without success. Indian encampments could, however, be seen in plenty, profusely decked for raids around with moose heads, hair, and hides, proving beyond any doubt that, throughout the summer and early autumn, the country was stripped clean by these marauders of the animals that should be only killed off sparingly by legitimate hunters annually. This wanton slaughter, the work of Indians from across the border to a large extent, is the talk of the whole country, and much resentment is felt at the condition of affairs existing.

"The Provincial Government should investigate the affair at once, and, if necessary, appoint a game warden to preserve the game of this last great moose rendezvous of this portion of the West."

The reference to Indians from across the border would indicate that natives from the south are now making an annual excursion to our big game hunting grounds, and we are informed from another source that a large band of half-breeds from Montana visited our northern woods last summer and feasted on moose meat during their sojourn, and then returned with what they considered enough dried meat to carry them through the winter. So pleased were they with the success of their trip, that it is stated, they contemplate a return visit next summer.

While the accuracy of the figures contained in the below letter might be questioned, it will suffice to show the views of a sportsman whom, I would judge, from my own personal knowledge of him, can at least be credited with sincerity of purpose and an enthusiastic desire to further any project that has for its object the conservation of wild life. This is part of his letter:

"While I had almost decided never again to say much with regard to the big game conditions, I again feel that it is my duty to tell you of the conditions which exist there, and how imperative it is that thorough and drastic measures be taken immediately in order to preserve the game of our big game fields, not from licensed hunters, but from Indians and those who kill for commercial purposes.

"Two years ago I was over very much the same ground as I was this year. That year I saw 137 head. Each and every member of our party saw a large number of animals, these being principally elk. This year, with cows and calves only eight was put in a week extra over what I did the previous year. I am reliably informed that one party of Indians alone killed 127 head of elk during the month of September. While it is hard to prove these things, there is not the slightest doubt in my mind but what this is done. This, as you know, is the rutting season, or calling season, and it is no trouble whatever for any one to go in and kill and kill and kill without effort, and the evidence of this slaughter can be found in many places. Some of the finest heads, that would be considered almost priceless, are slaughtered and left to rot. That these Indians may, in a sense, use this meat for food. I do not doubt, but, in view of your intending to close the season on elk for three years, I might say that, under the conditions which exist at present, you may as well throw the season wide open and let the white get his share of the game with the Indian, for, if you close this season for three years, you only close it against a few of your licensed hunters who have to go over a railway. The Indian and be who wishes to commercialize in game are not affected in the least, and I daresay, under the present conditions, that, although you may close the season, within three years from now there will be no elk on the big game fields of the north to be secured by any one.

"I never in all my life saw such a slaughter in game in two years as has taken place in the elk fields north of Prince Albert; and, on the other hand, I feel that, if the Government does owe a just debt to her returned soldiers (of whom many are our most loyal
sportsmen), it is to the preservation of these game-fields that they may be again able to enjoy a little hunting after their return, as these men are surely entitled to every consideration. I am absolutely convinced that the licensed, legitimate hunters are not, to-day, depleting your game-fields of the north. . . . I again state that, if you wish to preserve the big-game fields of the north, it is necessary to put on more patrolmen, enforce the law more rigidly, and stop the illegal killing in September and October, as it is the marksmen-hunter and the Indian who are depleting the game of the north."

The two letters I will now read give a very clear insight into the methods pursued by the Indians. The first is from a man at Unity, Sask., and is as follows:

"I do not wish to make a complaint against any one responsible for the enforcing of the game laws, as, with the great area of the province, it would require a force large in number and of the right stamp to strictly enforce the laws. But, if we are to have big game in the years to come, we must have three or four resident game wardens right in amongst the game to watch Charley Grey-eyes and Johnny Rain-in-the-face.

"It does seem pretty hard, when everything is so high in price, to think the Indian has a source of revenue right at his door and we will try to deny him. But he is preparing himself for a period of game scarcity if his present methods are not stopped. During my four trips to the big game country we found only one spot which lacked the marks of the Indians' visit. That was Tp. 57, Rge. 15, and in the season of 1915. We went in on an old surveyor's trail, and cleared out windfalls, etc., for several miles, and there was game to repay us for our labour. The next season, we took the same trail, but the Indian appreciated our efforts at road-making, for he spent a good part of the summer of 1916 right on our old camp grounds and left his drying-racks and piles of moose hair as evidence that the game was plentiful in the summer at least. We had to hunt hard that autumn to get a moose, and decided to try a new spot in 1917. This lay by way of the Green Lake trail, and we got into a nice run of game, despite the fact that Indian signs were plentiful. During 1918, we went to the same grounds, and I was sorry to see the destruction which the Indians had wrought during the previous summer. The drying-racks still had the leaves on them, showing that they were cut when poplar was in full leaf, and we judged the date to be not later than August. We made careful examination of the many camps, and found skulls of cows, calves, and bull moose, as well as does, fawns, and bucks of the jumping deer. I venture to say the Indians killed more game illegally in 1918 than all the licensed hunters saw during the big game season."

Here is another one:

"I hunted moose this fall in Tp. 56, Rge. 16, W. 3rd Mer., and I am sorry to say, found no moose, although they were very plentiful last autumn. But I did not have to look very far to find the reason. The Indians had been there before us. While up there I saw several hunters, and all were complaining of the same thing. I saw six Indian camps in Tp. 56, one in Tp. 55, and one in Tp. 57, and pack trails and wagon roads were in evidence everywhere. Some of the camps had eight stretching racks, and moose hair four inches deep lying around them, also several cow moose heads. They must have been there in the summer, as the trees they had used for shading their camps had dried leaves on them, and were mostly alder and poplar. I heard one report of an Indian saying they killed 200 between Meeting and Witchekan lakes, and I should not be surprised if evidence to that effect could not be found in the way of buckskin in either of the Witchekan Lake stores."

In that connection, we made an investigation, found that such was the case, and the storekeepers were heavily fined. The letter continues:

"I think it is up to the game department to go after the Indians and put a stop to the killing of moose for their hides. I am afraid if the Indians had been there when we were, they would have had a rough time."

Here are two letters from settlers whose chief grievance seems to be that the Indian is obtaining undue advantage over the white man:

"I would ask a few questions regarding the killing of big game in the province of Saskatchewan. Is it lawful for the Indians to come in from their reserves and kill moose out of season?"

"For the last two years they have just about scalped all of the big game, some of the farmers are asking: Is there one law for Indians and another for the white man?

"Not that we want to see the Indians go hungry, but we do not like to see parts of moose and jumping deer lying in the bush, which has occurred. And not only this, but they have the presumption to come around on Sunday selling this meat from door to door."

"If the Government sees fit to allow these Indians to obtain food in this way, all well and good; but some of the residents and farmers are under the impression they are doing more than the Indians towards opening up the country and advancing civilization. This may not be a democratic spirit towards the red man, but, if the deer are to be wasted, we would like a small share to help lessen the high cost of living; but we dare not."

"Sir, we are not hunting trouble for the poor Indian, far from it. But is it justice?"

"I would be very much pleased to hear from you on this matter, as a moose has just been slaughtered not half a mile from here."

This is the other letter:

"All last winter and most of the summer of 1918 a lot of Indians in this settlement were killing moose and deer and selling as much of it
as they could; then, about October, 1918, about fifty Indians came in to hunt before the season opened; while, if we, who are doing something for the upbuilding of the country, should kill game out of season for our own use, we are liable to a heavy fine. The Indians seem to have a special privilege to kill and sell as much as they wish.

At present a lot of Indians are camped here, are killing moose and deer and selling same.

"I ask that you use your influence and, if possible, have the Indians removed from here at once, and not permit them a privilege that we do not enjoy."

The next one is from an old-timer, whose opinion on these matters is highly respected. It gives some idea of the destruction that it is possible for a single Indian to execute, and, when we consider there are hundreds; yes, I think it would be no exaggeration to say thousands, of such Indians engaged in similar destruction throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion, we may form some idea of the tremendous slaughter that takes place annually as a result of this unlawful practice. Here is the letter:

"One of our business men was hunting north of Fort a-la-Corne this autumn, and had no luck; a large party of half-breeds were camped close to him. He joined them often at the camp fire, and, naturally, game was discussed. The remark was made that if the game were protected from Indians it would be more to the point, and an instance was quoted where an a-la-Corne Indian named Britain had killed 30 moose that autumn before the season opened. It might be difficult to verify this, but I have no doubt of its truth myself, as the British (or Poonaman) family are noted hunters.

"I was at St. Bréceux for a week since the New Year, and was then credibly informed that Indians from Batoche and Duck Lake make a point of coming down just before the season opens and cleaning up the game in the Basin Lake country, where I do not think any of the parties I issued licenses to secured any last autumn.

"I knew you would be interested in this matter; it is an old fight, and I have had correspondence with both Dominion and Provincial Governments over it in the past. There is no doubt in my mind that Indians should only be allowed to kill game in season. Talk about them being hungry, they always are; what would keep a family of white people all winter in the way of venison would not last them a week, as they eat steadily until the supply is finished."

I might cite innumerable instances of similar charges against the Indian, but I think enough has been said to establish the fact that he is a real menace to the big game, and that the operations of the Big Chief Company are contrary to the most elementary principles of economy and conservation. As a matter of justice to law-abiding citizens; as a matter of protection to the game; and as a matter of insurance for the future welfare of the Indian himself, this unlawful practice must be checked, or there can be but one result, the annihilation of the big game in all the districts affected.

"From time to time, we have sought the assistance of the Indian Department in our endeavours to curtail this wanton slaughter. Our correspondence has always been courteously acknowledged, and promises of co-operation were repeatedly given. I regret to say, however, that there is little or no evidence of any improvement. I may be wrong, but the attitude of the Indian Department seems to be, that, while they are extremely sorry that such things are happening—the poor Indian must be fed, and, presumably, in the cheapest possible manner. I venture to say, that the average Indian agent encourages, rather than discourages, the illegal killing of big game. He feels it incumbent upon himself to keep expenses down to a minimum; in fact, I have reason to believe that this is expected of him, that he may present a report that is favourable to the Administration in regard to its avowed policy of making the Indian self-sustaining, so far as it is possible to do so. Consequently, the more moose meat the Indian secures the less beef the agent will have to provide. We do not deny the Indian's right to be fed, but he has the opportunity of securing an ample supply of meat during the lawful open season, if he fails to avail himself of this opportunity, the Federal Government, as guardian of the Indian, should assume the responsibility of providing the necessary food supply.

Notwithstanding the many complaints we receive of the Indian's depredations, there is still displayed an unmistakable trace of sympathy for the Indian by most complainers, a sympathy, I think, which in a greater or less degree is found in every person who recognizes the red man's former privileges, and his present day improvidence. Nevertheless, none of these things should be allowed to blind us to the inevitable results of slaughter-house methods when applied to the killing of big game. If the Indian Department has no control over the Indians in this respect—a condition of affairs which I am not prepared to accept—there seems to be but one other solution of this problem, and that is the vigorous enforcement of the game laws, a policy which we would be reluctant to adopt, if we could find any way of avoiding it. However, I am firmly convinced that, under present conditions, it is absolutely necessary that stringent measures be taken if we intend to stamp out this evil. No doubt there are many representatives of the other provinces here who have a similar problem on their hands, and a full discussion on this important question would doubtless be the means of formulating some practical
plan that would help to bring about a solution of this perplexing problem.

Mr. D. C. Scott: I think the speaker should describe what Saskatchewan is doing by way of having her responsible game wardens look after this matter. The responsibility for the enforcement of the law rests upon the province: the Indian Department can do nothing about that.

Mr. Bradshaw: I am pleased to answer that question. At present we have four salaried game guardians, and provision has been made in our estimates for the appointment of five or six additional game guardians to enforce the game laws in connection with the Indians. I should like to ask Mr. Scott a question. Is the Indian Department in sympathy with the enforcement of our Provincial laws?

Mr. Scott: Yes, decidedly; and it always has been.

Mr. Bradshaw: Well, I have never seen any effect of it.

Mr. Scott: We took the necessary action under the Act to apply the game laws to the Indians. But our men cannot enforce the game laws. The Indians of Witchegan lake, for example, are 'wild': they have not signed a treaty; we have, as yet, no official connection with them. As for the bands of roving half-breeds from the south, it seems extraordinary that Saskatchewan can not stop them from coming in. You should know when they come over; they should be stopped at the border.

Mr. Bradshaw: We have only just received the information.

Mr. Scott: This subject should not be discussed in a controversial way. We wish to preserve the game; at the same time, we wish to have our Indians well fed, but we do not want the hunters to feed themselves entirely on the game of the country. It is difficult for us to control Indians that we do not come in contact with officially, such as the Witchegan Lake band, but they will, no doubt, settle down before long. Of course, they ought to be brought to time.

Mr. Jack Miner: We are met here to discuss these matters in a friendly way, and to bring about better game protection. If I know of something that I believe is wrong, it is my duty to stand up here and say so. The Kingville, Ont., hunting party has hunted in the country 50 to 75 miles west of Sudbury. The members of our hunting party all took out licenses and some of them started trapping a few beavers. They just took the old ones—some of us knew how to catch the old beaver and let the younger ones go, and we showed the others how to do it. They got a few beaver, but I do not think one of the party ever thought of selling a beaver skin. But this year, when we went up there, the Indians had come in and were camping right where I had camped for twelve or thirteen years—two brothers and a son—and they had three dogs. And of all the destruction! What is the result? Our party has to go to a new hunting ground. I will give the Indians their due: if we had a trap set they did not let that dam out. But they let the other dams out and they destroyed the beaver. I was writing a letter for an old Indian to his son in France, and among other things he said: "Tell him one hundred and fifty:" "I think the Speaker should describe what Saskatchewan is doing by way of having her responsible game wardens look after this matter. The responsibility for the enforcement of the law rests upon the province: the Indian Department can do nothing about that.

Mr. Bradshaw: I am pleased to answer that question. At present we have four salaried game guardians, and provision has been made in our estimates for the appointment of five or six additional game guardians to enforce the game laws in connection with the Indians. I should like to ask Mr. Scott a question. Is the Indian Department in sympathy with the enforcement of our Provincial laws?

Mr. Scott: Yes, decidedly; and it always has been.

Mr. Bradshaw: Well, I have never seen any effect of it.

Mr. Scott: We took the necessary action under the Act to apply the game laws to the Indians. But our men cannot enforce the game laws. The Indians of Witchegan lake, for example, are 'wild': they have not signed a treaty; we have, as yet, no official connection with them. As for the bands of roving half-breeds from the south, it seems extraordinary that Saskatchewan can not stop them from coming in. You should know when they come over; they should be stopped at the border.

Mr. Bradshaw: We have only just received the information.

Mr. Scott: This subject should not be discussed in a controversial way. We wish to preserve the game; at the same time, we wish to have our Indians well fed, but we do not want the hunters to feed themselves entirely on the game of the country. It is difficult for us to control Indians that we do not come in contact with officially, such as the Witchegan Lake band, but they will, no doubt, settle down before long. Of course, they ought to be brought to time.

Mr. Jack Miner: We are met here to discuss these matters in a friendly way, and to bring about better game protection. If I know of something that I believe is wrong, it is my duty to stand up here and say so. The Kingville, Ont., hunting party has hunted in the country 50 to 75 miles west of Sudbury. The members of our hunting party all took out licenses and some of them started trapping a few beavers. They just took the old ones—some of us knew how to catch the old beaver and let the younger ones go, and we showed the others how to do it. They got a few beaver, but I do not think...
in the province of Quebec, especially in the Abitibi country, a little to the south of Lake Abitibi, and in the Gaspé district. I assisted in a prosecution a few years ago of some of these Indians in the Gaspé district, on the shores of the Bonaventure river. There, the slaughter was simply dreadful. The Indians were slaughtering the animals, taking away the meat for food, and leaving the heads to rot in the bush—in other localities taking away only the heads. There is no doubt that the destruction by Indians of wild game in portions of our province is terrible, and, in that respect, I endorse some of the things that have been said by representatives from the other provinces.

Dr. A. R. Baker (British Columbia): I am sure it was with a great deal of interest that we listened to the remarks of Mr. Bradshaw, from Saskatchewan. Everything that he said with regard to the Indians is absolutely correct, and it applies equally to British Columbia. We have more difficulty with Indians than with anybody else. In the northern country, Atlin and Cassiar, we have experienced a great deal of trouble with the Indians in the slaughtering of moose. When they go on a trip they slaughter one every day for their dogs; they never think of carrying any. We have proof positive that, on a four-day trip through that district, two Indians slaughtered thirty-two moose. In the Chilcotin country, where there is a tribe of Indians on the Fraser river, they have slaughtered the Rocky Mountain sheep. They gather together at certain times of the year and have potlatches. They organize what is known as a 'drive'—they surround a mountain, drive all the game to the top, and simply slaughter it and let it lie there; they do not even take the hides away. They kill them just for the love of killing. The only way we have been able to do anything with the Indians is to segregate the areas where the game is plentiful into organized districts. Once we form an organized district the Indian must take out a gun license, same as anybody else; then we have some control over him. In the unorganized districts they are allowed to shoot under the Game Act, or allowed to kill for meat; but it is a well-known fact that the Indian on the Pacific coast and through the valley of the Fraser kills the animals simply for the love of killing—not even for their hides.

Destruction of beaver dams is another thing we have to contend with. The Indians take the beaver in the northern country by destroying the dams. Fortunately, streams are plentiful, and where the dams are destroyed the few beaver that escape migrate to other streams.

I am not criticising the Indian Department, more than to say this: When a district is organized, an Indian must take out a license or must get a permit to hunt, and the Indian agents apply for too many permits for the Indians. At the last meeting of the Conservation Board we decided that we simply would not give the Indians permits; they will have to take out licenses. We made recommendations to the Government for the organization of certain game districts, that we may put our own game wardens in and control the Indians.

We have a great deal of sympathy for the Indians and have no objection to their killing all the animals they need for their own use; but we do object to absolutely wanting destruction. Four years ago I went into a section of the Lillooet district for bighorn, or what are known as Rocky Mountain sheep, and on that trip I counted 50 rams. I went in there over a year ago, and could find only eight sheep left in that district. We are putting that area into a reservation. These animals were destroyed by the Chilcotin Indians. The year before I went they organized a deer drive in the Lillooet district. When a district is organized a deer drive is held in the Lillooet district. We did not have a Game Commission at that time, but I made it my business to go into that country to get some information about the deer drive. I found that the Indians killed on that occasion some 150 deer. If this thing goes on it will be only a question of time when the big game of British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Alberta will be a thing of the past.

Senator Edwards: We have now heard a good deal about the Indian as a destructive agency; perhaps we might have an expression of opinion on the constructive end of it. I think I am correct in saying that, some years ago, New Brunswick was almost denuded of its moose, but that, through the enforcement of proper regulations for some years, moose are again numerous in that province. Perhaps we might hear from some gentleman from New Brunswick on that question. Further, the beaver had almost disappeared from Algoma in Ontario; now they are very numerous, the Government having prohibited the taking of beaver. So we have evidence in two provinces of what conservation can do; we should like to hear from other provinces on that point.

Dr. Hewitt: It is, of course, quite to be expected that the various delegates will have complaints to make, and the object of this conference is to hear those complaints. But we are not going to get ahead if we do nothing more than hear complaints. What we really want is, not only accounts of destruction, but suggestions regarding conservation. I have no doubt that Mr. Baker, Mr. Bradshaw, and others, who complain of the great destruction caused by
Mr. D. C. Scott: Dr. Hewitt's suggestion is certainly very much to the point. While the Indian has been blamed, as well as the Indian Department, I wish to say that our policy is to support the provincial authorities in the conservation of game, and anything we can do through your agents to assist, we shall do energetically. If the provincial delegates can make any suggestions at any time as to action that might be taken by the Indian Department we shall be delighted to co-operate. Of course, the law-making power is in the hands of the provinces, as well as the enforcement of the law. But the Indian Department will do what it can, through its officials, by way of advice or otherwise, to put a stop to these illegal practices, which, of course, we deplore as much as anybody.

Mr. G. H. Ramsay (Superintendent of Game and Fisheries, Ontario): On behalf of Ontario, I wish to thank Mr. Scott for the co-operation of his Department with the Department of Game and Fisheries of my province. I have no adverse criticism to offer, so far as Ontario is concerned: the Department of Indian Affairs gives us every assistance.

Mr. Scott: I thank you very much—but we have not assisted you more than we have the other provinces.

Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my thanks for the kind invitation I received to attend this conference. I only regret that Mr. McDonald, the Deputy Minister, who, until the last moment, had intended to come, found it impossible to get away, and asked me to attend in his stead. I am not prepared, therefore, to give you an address; in fact, I hardly knew what was to come before the meeting until I received the programme this morning. I am greatly interested, however, in hearing from the other provinces and being informed somewhat fully of their difficulties. I realize that the Indian problem is a great one, and that the Indians are causing a great deal of destruction. But the Indians are not alone to blame. In Ontario a great deal of destruction is due to the white man, particularly in the northern part of the province, where lumbering operations are being carried on. There, a common practice is to engage men by the month to go out and shoot big game for the camp table.

Hon. F. A. Smith: I think that in New Brunswick the big game has been really on the increase; there is no particular scarcity in the
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province today. We have no Indians to speak of, and the few we have are too lazy to hunt. I have never heard of any depredation or violations of the law by the Indians of New Brunswick. We have increased not only the big game of our province, but also the beaver. For years, we prohibited the killing of beaver, and the results have been so effective that, during the last three or four years, we have allowed killing under permit from the Department of Lands and Mines. We receive quite a revenue from our beaver permits; those who take them out have to pay two dollars per beaver killed. I would be very much in favour of the fur business being handled by the Provincial Government. Instead of selling permits, we should do the killing ourselves, thus doing away with the violations of the law which now take place.

Some two years ago we received a letter from the Dominion Food Controller, asking if we would allow the killing of some 2,000 deer. My answer was that we had not the deer to spare. I believe that to have consented to do so would have amounted to the extermination of our moose and deer. I am sure that you would like to hear from our Chief Game Warden, who will be able to give you a good deal of information.

Mr. L. A. GAGNON (Chief Game Warden, New Brunswick): Under the energetic direction of our Minister of Lands and Mines, we have now on our statute book a very good game law. We have about 45 temporary game wardens on duty, who are doing good work, in cooperation with the forest rangers, who are also charged with the protection of game. I think I am safe in saying that, during the past year, the game in our province has been better protected than for many years. As evidence of that, it has been observed that lumbermen are taking much more domestic meat to their camps this winter than formerly.

I am not quite satisfied with the regulations respecting beaver that we have now, but we will improve them before long. Under those regulations some abuse is made of the use of permits granted by the Department. However, our beaver have increased considerably during the last few years. With respect to our big game, the deer are certainly on the increase. From the information at hand, the moose is also on the increase; if not, it is undoubtedly holding its own. I do not know that we ever had any trouble with respect to the Indians. They are few in numbers, and they are subject to the game laws the same as white men; so far as I know, they have observed the game laws even better than the white men. Our trouble there is entirely with white men. I am absolutely in sym-
from Saskatchewan, who stated his troubles in connection with the Indians in so able a manner. While people sympathize with the Indians to some extent, it is not right to give them a monopoly of the big game, and it is my opinion that something should be done to straighten out that matter.

Mr. J. A. Knight (Chief Game Commissioner, Nova Scotia): The Indian is not a great issue with us; some of them are engaged in a small way in agricultural pursuits and work in the lumber woods during the winter season. Few of them depend to any extent upon hunting for a livelihood. We sometimes have trouble with them, particularly with regard to beaver. They kill the beaver, and it is not easy to discover the offenders. But the Indians do not market the furs outside the province; and so would not kill them off if they did not have the assistance of white men. Let me give you an illustration. For several years we have had a close season for beaver in Nova Scotia, with a view to restoring them. A fur-buyer in Nova Scotia shipped some beaver skins to St. Louis, Mo., a month or so ago, but the St. Louis fur-buyer refused to handle them. That is an illustration of the benefit of co-operation in game protection. The St. Louis fur-buyer telegraphed the Nova Scotia man that he would not handle the skins, and the latter, realizing that he was caught, went to our game inspector and made a clean breast of the matter.

The Indians are hard to deal with in the matter of trapping beaver, because it would take an army of game wardens to watch them. It is easier, perhaps, to put a stronger check on the fur-buyer, and, in that way, prevent the killing of the beaver.

Game protection is not a new thing in Nova Scotia. It must be nearly 150 years since we passed our first migratory bird law. Dr. Hewitt referred to the importance of game societies as agents for game protection. In Nova Scotia we have what I think is, with one exception, the oldest game society in North America, the Nova Scotia Inland Game and Fishery Protection Association. The first one established in America still exists. I believe, in the state of New York. For many years the Nova Scotia Game Society were the chief agency of game protection in our province. They received a government grant and administered and enforced the laws. They received the license revenue, or the greater part of it, and used it for the purposes of their society. Recently, we organized a game commission. Dr. Baker spoke of the newly-organized Game Conservation Board of British Columbia; I am not sure that Nova Scotia was not the first province to introduce that method of game protec-

tion. I do not know that we spend as much on game protection as most of the other provinces, but there is one thing about game protection in Nova Scotia: it has never been in politics. When the management of game protection was taken out of the hands of that society, in order to bring it up to date and introduce more modern methods, it was placed under the operation, not of a department of the Government, but of a commission appointed for the purpose.

Some kinds of game are, of course, more difficult to protect than others. Migratory birds are among the most difficult, because, whatever we may do within our own province, we cannot protect them outside. Fur-bearing animals are also difficult to protect, as they are an important article of commerce. But some of our game, at all events, has increased in recent years. I am sure we have more moose in Nova Scotia to-day than we had ten years ago, and probably as many as we have had at any time during the last fifty years. We have more deer than we ever had. We have a few caribou on the mainland of the province, but they are of a migratory nature, and I think they must have left the province and gone north to New Brunswick and Quebec. There are a few traces of caribou on the mainland. Although we have protected them for a good many years, they have not increased there. But on Cape Breton island there is a tableland similar to the caribou barrens of Newfoundland. It is suitable for caribou, and, if they are not increasing in that district, at all events, they are holding their own. They are not hunted a great deal. The place is not very accessible to outsiders, and the natives, who live chiefly in the fishing settlements around the coast, are busy in the autumn with their farming and fishing. The chief killing is done in the winter by trappers—out of season, of course. But they are not being destroyed, owing to their peculiar situation. They are on the extreme northern end of the province, and cannot migrate without coming down through the more settled parts of the island and crossing the strait of Camp. The probability is, therefore, that, with a reasonable amount of protection, we shall have caribou there indefinitely.

Our position in Nova Scotia in respect to migratory birds is also a peculiar one. I am not sure that the wild geese winter anywhere else in Canada than on the southern shore of Nova Scotia. The wild geese that winter there are said to be somewhat different from and of a larger size than the wild geese from the south. We have set apart a section there as a refuge or feeding ground, and the wild geese are not decreasing. The people on the coast where the geese winter think there should be some change in the regulations to suit the
peculiar conditions prevailing there. If some change were made, of course, it could be confined to the particular counties where the wild goose winter.

Mr. J. M. Macoun: I should like to make a suggestion with regard to dealing with the Indians, and that is, that the law be enforced with regard to the Indian as well as to the white man. The Indian likes as little as the white man to go to jail, and anyone who has been in northern Saskatchewan knows that a small party could detect the Indians who are killing deer or moose in contravention of the game laws, as the routes are well known by water and trail. A volunteer party might go after them. My experience has been that sympathy is generally with the game killer, whether he be Indian or white man. I know British Columbia well, but nowhere have I seen any attempt to enforce the game laws. I have spent the last five summers in British Columbia, and, while I do not mean that the law is not enforced anywhere, I have seen it violated in every part of the province that I have been in during that period.

I know a case where, at a general boarding house in a lumber camp, near La Tuque, Que., moose meat was served at every meal. Everybody knew that; the resident game warden must have known that. I was in Mr. Bradshaw's province, ten years ago this autumn, a month before the moose season opened. My work took me to the lumber camps, and I was told that the lumbermen were living on moose meat. I know the sectionmen were, because my work kept me along the line of the Canadian Northern Ry., and I have eaten moose meat myself at the section-houses at practically every meal. Just when I was leaving that district, two days before the season opened, a young man who was with me wanted a moose head. I knew the game warden, and I asked him if he could get a moose-head for my friend after the opening of the season and ship it down to me. He said that he could, and when I asked him how much he wanted for it, he said "Fifty dollars." I said, "If you send the moose-head to me I will send you the money." He said: "Have you the money with you?" When I replied that I had, he said "I will give you the moose-head right now." That was two days before the moose season opened. I do not mean to say that the chief game wardens are not doing their duty. But, in the Lillooet country, three years ago, I was within fifty yards of the place where a deer was killed—not by an Indian—and, if I had come along the next day with the game warden, he would have said: "Oh, those damn Indians again."

I was on one of the islands in the strait of Georgia the summer before last. Two bands of fishermen were there, one a large Indian family and the other a band of four or five white men and a woman. The Indians lived on seal meat and fish; the white people lived on deer meat. I went to the camp of the Indian, who was observing the law, and asked him why he did not kill deer meat, and he said, "Oh, I like seal meat better." This was an island with a game warden on it; everybody knew these people; there was no attempt to seize the meat.

I do not say that the chief game officials and some of the game wardens are not trying to enforce the law. But, if there are not enough game wardens to cope with the situation, the province or the Dominion Government should contribute money so that the law can be properly enforced. No game warden or chief game warden need tell me that he cannot find the people who are doing these things. If some one 18 miles up the Gatineau is killing deer or moose out of season, give me a man or two, and we certainly can locate him—any one can do that. My suggestion, then, is: Enforce the law against both white man and Indian.

Mr. Jack Miner: I have hunted in Northern Ontario for thirty-four successive autumns. The last three seasons, 1913, 1914 and 1915, in the country where I hunted, the beaver doubled each year. I do not think we could obtain better results than that. Another point: A fur-buyer came into my tent, and offered an Indian $12 each for the beaver he had, provided he could get the tags off, but for those he could not get the tags off he would only give him $7 each.

Mr. E. E. Lemieux: The Petawawa Camp Fish and Game Club, for the last nine years, has worked steadily in the interests of the conservation of game. Game has been increasing very rapidly, simply because we did everything possible to prevent people from shooting during the close season. I think, however, that, especially in that district, the wolves have a great deal to do with the diminution of deer. Three or four years ago I was in that district, and I found as many as thirty-six wolf tracks on a 12-mile tramp. We made several attempts to get rid of the wolves. We found the best way was to kill a rabbit, put strychnine into little pieces of the meat about an inch square, and stick these on the alders near lakes and creeks, or at projecting points. By these means we have got as many as twelve wolves. One was a she-wolf with from four to six young; so it will be seen that very good results are accomplished in that way. Many died somewhere else, we do not know how many; but it is safe to say that at least twenty-five wolves were destroyed. We see our game wardens on this work every winter, and results are very satisfactory. We supply them with $10 worth of the purest strychnine, and have put out about 150 baits. Occasionally we get a
fox, but no other animals. There is no doubt that the deer are much depleted by the wolves. I myself on a short trip came upon seven or eight deer that had been killed by them. I have the picture of a deer that had been freshly killed by wolves: you can almost see the freshly-made wounds.

Dr. Bryce: I have been asked by a gentleman from the Dun-
vegan country, Peace River district, where they propose to set aside
large areas for the returned soldiers, to mention to the Commission
the difficulty of raising sheep in that part of the country, on account
of coyotes, which are becoming very numerous and very dangerous.
I do not personally know the facts, but I assume that this gentleman
knew what he was talking about, and perhaps we should take some
steps towards the destruction of the coyotes in that district. They
are doing great damage, and if that is to be a sheep-raising country,
and to be settled by returned soldiers, it is very important that this
matter should be kept in view by the Commission.

Mr. W. F. Tye (Montreal): We have heard a number of
remarks about the destruction of game by the Indians, and one would
imagine they were the people principally at fault. But does anyone
say that the Indian is the man who has destroyed the game of this
continent? Surely we are big enough to put the blame where it
belongs—that is, on the white man. In the early days, when I was
in the western country, there were just as many Indians and there
was plenty of game—buffalo, deer, antelope, small game of all kinds.
The Indians were there, and the white men were not. It was then
in the days of the Sioux troubles—I am speaking now more of the
country to the south of the border—and the only way the United
States Government could get rid of the Indian trouble was to kill
off the buffalo. Men were hired at $75 a month and furnished with
guns, horses, and an unlimited amount of ammunition: the result
was that the buffalo departed from that country like the snow before
a chinook wind. That was not the Indians, was it? We taught the
Indians bad habits right there and then.

Later on, I was connected with the construction of the Canadian
Pacific railway—I was out there before the construction of that
railway was commenced, for that matter. The country was then
filled with little lakes, and I am sure you could go to one of these
small lakes and see 1,000,000 ducks, geese, swans, and birds of that
kind. And there were more Indians in that country than there are
now, and the game was there. The Indian killed because he
required the food. He killed the buffalo because he required the
skins to make tepees, but the white man came in, with his insatiable
desire for furs, and not only taught his own people to kill off the

game, but taught the Indian as well. The Indian has learned bad
habits; now he kills the game not only for food, but, in imitation of
the white man, also by way of useless slaughter. If you are going
to preserve the game the first thing to do is to make the white man
obey the law. The white man makes the laws. The Indian does not:
the white man is used to obeying laws, the Indian is not. First
make the white man obey the laws, and the Indian will, in the course
of time, follow. It is to supply the demands of the white man that
the Indian does this killing.

Mr. W. C. J. Hall: In the far north, where the Indian has
the territory all to himself, have you ever known him to kill the game
in such a way as to exterminate it?

Mr. Tye: No, I never did. I was not far north; I was in
Dakota, Montana, and what is now Saskatchewan and Alberta, far
in advance of civilization, and I am sure that—

Mr. Hall: How about the Arctic Circle, where the Indian is
not molested by the white man? Have you ever heard anything of
the Indian exterminating the game there?

Mr. Tye: No, and the same applies to the country which is
now Saskatchewan and Alberta: before the white man went there
there was no extermination whatever. There was a superabundance
of game; therefore we are the people who are responsible—let us
accept the blame.

Dr. Hewitt: If the discussion on this subject is now concluded,
I should like to make a suggestion with a view to carrying out the
idea I put forward a short time ago, namely, that, together
with the complaints that have been made, we should have some
really constructive suggestions. I would move, therefore, that a
small committee be formed, consisting of Hon. Dr. Smith, of New
Brunswick, Hon. Mr. Daniels, of Nova Scotia, Mr. J. E. Hellble, of
Quebec, and Dr. Baker, of British Columbia, to consider this
question, and, at a later session of the conference, to bring in any
recommendations that it may see fit to make with regard to this
question of Indians.

The motion was adopted.
Committee on Indians

DR. BAKER: The Committee appointed to consider the question of destruction of wildlife by Indians begs to submit the following resolution:

"Be it resolved that, in view of the destruction of game illegally by Indians of the various western provinces, the Dominion Government be urged to cooperate in the enforcement of the game laws in the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, and British Columbia, by means of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police or other special officers, in districts where damage to game by Indians most frequently occurs."

In moving this resolution on behalf of the Committee, I may say that, recently, the Dominion Government has established various districts in which are stationed Northwest Mounted Police. If the Commission of Conservation will recommend that these Northwest Mounted Police help us in the enforcement of our laws throughout the west, I think we can handle this Indian question very effectually.

DR. BRAZIER: Any one who has known the Mounted Police and is familiar with the great service they have rendered in the years gone by, would be glad to see that done. I have much pleasure in seconding the resolution. It is a very proper one.

The resolution was accorded. The recommendation of Grant to Mr. Miner

DR. BARBER: I have another resolution which was recommended by the Committee on Resolutions. It is as follows:

"Resolved that the convention recommend for the consideration of the Provincial Legislature of Ontario the granting of a sum to Mr. Jack Miner for the purpose of defending his expenses in connection with the feeding of migratory wild fowl on his bird sanctuary."

The sum of course to be fixed by the Legislature of Ontario.

Mr. McKernan: I have much pleasure in seconding that motion. In view of the statement made to me by Mr. Jack Miner in this respect, the Convention takes up with the Dominion authorities and sees that he is provided for. It is without doubt a crime and a disgrace that a man who has done a great deal for Ontario and the Dominion should pass without receiving any aid from the game departments of this great Dominion.

Mr. James Wintle: I hope that nothing I have said would indicate that I was not as much in favour of the resolution as Dr. Baker, or as any one.
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