

sional instructions, and endeavours have been made to have these laws placed under jurisdiction of the Dominion Government. There was no additional cost, although some extra trouble, attending this arrangement, and it proved advantageous to both the fishery and public interests, as the persons who usually frequent the shooting places for water-fowl are the very persons who fish illegally, and also shoot fish in the bays and marshes; and when they have no 'lawful excuse' for being about these bays and other localities where fish and game abound, the expense and trouble of keeping them away is very much lessened. The Provincial authorities have always materially assisted Dominion officers in enforcing the Fishery Laws, so that we are every way gainers by the exchange. In fact the two services are so peculiarly related that the public interest in both of them would be greatly promoted by their combination under uniform authority. However, if the Minister, in view of the Hon. Mr. Cockburn's exception to the system, thinks it advisable to instruct the fishery officers in future to abstain from enforcing the game laws and other Provincial Acts, it will spare me considerable personal trouble and expense, and relieve all and singular of us from unremunerative and apparently thankless duty.

"Respectfully,

"W. F. WHITCHER,

"Commissioner of Fisheries."

The result of the correspondence was that a circular was issued to the Fishery Overseers of the Dominion, and this having been sent to me led me to enquire into the causes which induced the Department to issue this circular; and I find in the course of my enquiries that the Fishery Overseers have been the only parties acting in the preservation of game. Their services in that respect have been very great. I came into possession of the correspondence read to this House, in the course of my enquiries. It is to be regretted that there is a divided authority and that the game laws are not under the control of one Department, instead of being under dissimilar Provincial regulations, so that there could be a due enforcement of the game laws. In moving my amendment, I desire to establish some facts, but before they can be established the circular will need to be read; however, as the motion will call for the production of the circular I will not now trouble the House by reading it. It will be among the papers to be brought down under this motion, and it will be satisfactory evidence of the manner in which the Fishery Overseers have performed their duties. I therefore move the following amendment:—

MR. PATTERSON.

That the following words be added at the end of the said motion:—"including also reports and accounts of Dominion Policemen, or other officers, employed by the said Department in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec during the same period, explaining what proportion, if any, of the expenses incurred by them in the service of protecting the Fisheries relates to the enforcement of any of the Provincial Statutes affecting hunting and fishing; together with a statement showing in what manner the Provincial authorities may have co-operated with Dominion officers in enforcing the Fishery Laws."

MR. MACKENZIE: I wish to call attention to the point I raised just now. The ground I took was that the hon. member for Essex could not read from official papers unless they were laid upon the Table of the House. The hon. gentleman disputed that. I am certain I was correct in my contention. I find it laid down in *May*, page 320, as follows:—

"A Minister is not permitted to read or quote from any despatch or other state paper unless he is prepared to lay it on the Table * * * The principle is so reasonable that it has not been contested, and, when the objection is made in time, it has been generally acquiesced in."

Then cases were cited in the British Parliament in 1865, in which this principle was maintained. A public document obtained from one of the Departments has been cited, and it must, therefore, according to the rule of Parliament, be laid on the Table of the House. Early in the Session, I complained that the hon. member who moved the Address was supplied with documents which he used in the debate and which were not laid upon the Table as I demanded. This practice ought to be put a stop to. It places every member at a disadvantage, except the hon. Minister or the hon. member to whom he gives documents of this kind. I, therefore, claim that this document should be at once laid on the Table, and ask your ruling.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman is quite right in claiming that the document should be laid on the Table for the use of hon. members. The rule is very properly laid down in *May*, when he says that no second-hand evidence can be given, but that the documents should be produced at once. But what I object to is that my hon. friend (Mr. Patterson) should be interrupted in the course of the discussion, on the ground that he was quoting an official document