

and the nature of the coast, and so there may be physical difficulties in the way there which do not exist anywhere else. It is certainly not in consequence of the great abundance of seal on the coast of Norway.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** How does the hon. gentleman know that?

**Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).** Because I find from writers in natural history the statement that they are not.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** The recent legislation in Norway is surely on account of the abundance and destructiveness of the seals. They are paying money for their extinction in order to assist their fisheries, and they are not doing this because the seal are not abundant.

**Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).** The hon. gentleman knows that public money has been offered for the extinction of wolves in this country, not because they are very numerous, but because of their bad habits. The hon. gentleman will see, from the statement I have made, that if there is any danger to be apprehended, that danger is one which could be easily surmounted.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** After we had spent money in introducing the enemy.

**Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).** The hon. gentleman has agreed to spend a great deal of money for the purpose of its preservation. He is a party to regulations which have made a preserve of a band of over 60 miles in width all around those islands, so that at all seasons in the year the life of the animals should be protected, and which, over an immense area of the Pacific Ocean, forbids the killing of a seal with the gun or the hunting of it in a particular way for a large portion of the year. The hon. gentleman will have a great deal of difficulty in reconciling what he did at Paris with the contention he has put forward to-day.

**Mr. STAIRS.** I have not had time to study up the question, I am sorry to say, and therefore do not profess to be able to reply to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), but there are one or two considerations which have come to my mind while listening to this discussion. As regards the position of seal life in the Pacific Ocean, the hon. member for Bothwell forgets the balance which always exists in nature. I think that it is a mistake to assume that the extermination of the fur seal in the Pacific Ocean would be desirable. To my mind, it would be as great a mistake to exterminate the fur seal in the Pacific Ocean as it might be to introduce that seal into Hudson's Bay. The fur seal and the fish have existed in the Pacific Ocean for any number of years, and the numbers of both had not decreased. As has been pointed out by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the quantity of fish in

**Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).**

the Pacific Ocean is enormous, and has kept so in spite of the destructive efforts of the seal. Therefore I think we may naturally assume that there has been in nature in the Pacific Ocean a productiveness on the part of the fish which counterbalances the destructive efforts of the seal. If the seals in the Pacific were exterminated, some injurious effects of which we have no conception now, might ensue, and which naturalists have not perceived, so that it would be a mistake to exterminate them. I think, therefore, that the hon. member for Bothwell, in his reference to the old saying about the woman telling her son not to go into the water until he learned how to swim, overlooked the fact that the boy, in learning how to swim, was doing a very desirable thing. But it may be possible that in the introduction of the fur seal into Hudson's Bay an undesirable thing would be done, therefore his reference does not apply. Now, if the effort to introduce the fur seal into the Hudson's Bay were successful, I believe it might, as pointed out by the hon. Minister, have a very injurious effect upon the fish-life of the Atlantic coast. There is on the Atlantic coast, as there has been on the Pacific coast, a certain balance of the destructive elements on one side and the productive elements on the other, which maintains the proper supply of fish in the sea. But I wish to point out to the hon. gentleman that if he were successful in introducing the fur seal into Hudson's Bay, that balance would be destroyed; and for this reason the House ought to hesitate to approve of the proposition made by the hon. gentleman. I may refer to well known cases showing the harmful effects of the introduction of animals into countries in which they are not indigenous. The hon. gentleman will remember the experience of Australia. The Australian colonies would to-day, no doubt, give untold millions if they could destroy the rabbits in those colonies. They are already paying large sums for the destruction of these animals, but without much success, and it seems as though they never could exterminate the rabbits which have now become such a pest. Then there is the case of the mongoose in Jamaica. This animal was introduced into Jamaica some years ago. I have forgotten exactly for what purpose, but no doubt the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will remember.

**Mr. MULOCK.** To destroy the rats.

**Mr. STAIRS.** I have heard from friends who have lately been in Jamaica that the mongoose has become itself a great pest.

**Mr. MULOCK.** And the rats changed their habits and took to the trees.

**Mr. STAIRS.** The mongoose, I believe, has begun to prey upon something which the people do not want to exterminate. I am reminded by my hon. friend beside me of the case of the English sparrow in America.