

British sealers for damages sustained after being warned against killing seals on the high sea last year?

Hon. Mr. ABBOTT—This matter has been under discussion between the two Governments, more or less, since the date at which the order was made for the restriction of the killing of seals last year. The correspondence is not in a shape to be brought down, and I am not myself in a position to explain exactly the state of the negotiations, but I dare say my hon. friend will understand or divine for himself the position which the Canadian Government has taken on that question.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE SEA FISHERIES BILL.

SECOND READING.

Hon. Mr. ABBOTT moved the second reading of Bill (5) "An Act further to amend chapter 96 of the Revised Statutes, intituled: 'An Act to encourage the development of the sea fisheries, and the building of fishing vessels.'" He said: This is a short Bill to repeal a clause in the Fisheries Act which had been found impracticable, and has fallen into disuetude, and it ought not to remain on the statute book. The provision of the statute as it stands is, that a statement should be laid before both Houses of Parliament, showing the mode in which it is proposed to distribute the fisheries bounty the following year. It is found to be impossible to discover the mode in which the bounty is to be distributed until we know the mode of fishing that is to be adopted, and the purpose of exercising a proper check upon the disposition of this money it is thought will be attained by the next clause of the Act, which requires that a statement shall be submitted to Parliament the following session.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I do not propose to oppose the second reading of the Bill, but I presume that as this Bill is going through at a very early stage of the session, the hon. gentleman will let the committee stage stand over until next week.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES BILL.

SECOND READING.

Hon. Mr. ABBOTT moved the second reading of Bill (12) "An Act respecting the De-

partment of Marine and Fisheries." He said: This is a Bill in reality to restore the Department of Marine and Fisheries to its former condition. It has practically been two departments, and it is proposed to constitute it one department again, having, of course, jurisdiction over the two subjects, marine and fisheries. That is really the only change which is effected by this Bill.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I do not suppose there is to be any opposition to the second reading of this Bill, but it is an instance of a peculiar kind of legislation. The legislation is apparently general in its character, but anyone who looks beneath the surface will see that this measure and the Act which it proposes to repeal are both of a personal character.

Hon. Mr. ABBOTT—Personal?

Hon. Mr. POWER—Yes. The gentleman who was at one time Minister of Marine and Fisheries had the department subdivided into two branches, Marine and Fisheries. It was understood amongst the Civil Service, and amongst members of both Houses, that the object of that division was to give to a gentleman to whom that Minister of Marine and Fisheries was rather partial, an important office. That gentleman was made Deputy Minister of one of the branches, and continued to be Deputy Minister of that branch for some years; but now, not a new Pharaoh, who did not know Joseph, but a new Minister who is not so much attached to the particular Deputy in question, has arisen, and he thinks it is desirable to eliminate the Deputy Minister whom his predecessor had looked upon with eyes of favour; and this Bill is introduced for the purpose of eliminating the obnoxious deputy, the deputy in question having a retiring allowance made to him which will be a very considerable charge on the public revenue at the same time. I admit that I see no reason why there should be two departments, as it was found that one department could do the work satisfactorily; and as the present Minister is an energetic, painstaking and capable Minister, the work of the Department is not likely to suffer. However, I think it is just as well that we should understand the character of the legislation.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—I cannot understand the hon. gentleman's remarks.