

justified in extending a system which, though it has been tried on a small scale and in a few places, has fully justified the expenditure and the attention given to it. There is another question of a personal nature to which the hon. gentleman has alluded. He referred to the neglect on the part of some of the fishery officers. I have taken stern measures with many of them, and sometimes they have seemed almost too stern. But every one knows that there are cases where officers receiving a mere nominal sum do not deem it worth while to incur all the risks that an officer must incur in carrying out the fishery laws. The hon. gentleman mentioned one of the fishery officers. Well, the department learned that that officer had been disregarding the responsibilities of his office and had broken the law himself, and had been fined: as soon as those facts were officially reported and substantiated, the services of the officer were immediately dispensed with. With regard to the proprietor himself, Mr. Gauthier, all that I can say is, that the matter is not closed. As soon as the facts were represented to me that this gentleman, having a license to fish in our waters, had so utterly disregarded the rules and regulations of the department as to set his pound-nets across the Spanish River, for which no authority had been given whatever, we took the regular steps to ascertain immediately whether the representations were true, with the intention of cancelling at once all his rights; and hon. gentlemen do not desire that any other course should be adopted in such a case. At present, the defence alleged is that Mr. Chamberlin, formerly the foreman, and perhaps now foreman of Mr. Gauthier, had done this without his sanction and without his knowledge, and an enquiry is now being proceeded with to ascertain the correctness of the statement as to whether this man did or did not have the sanction of his employer. I can assure the hon. gentleman that we shall insist that the officers do their duty, and I will be only too glad to receive from him any information he has in such cases, and will act upon it. I may say that lately we have found, in dealing with this question to which reference has been made, that it is a very useful thing to take one official out of his district, altogether, and send him suddenly into another district, and *vice versa*. The same reasons that would induce one official not to act would not exist in a case of another official. On several occasions I have tried that plan with success, although we keep each officer in his own district, as a rule, and give him power as a justice of the peace over a large extent of territory, his own particular district being defined in the departmental instructions. Cases have occurred in Georgian Bay where this plan has stopped effectively, for a time, that species of abuse to which allusion was made, where fishermen have concealed certain fish in boxes and have sold them under other names. The hon. gentleman will pardon me if I mention, before sitting down, another difficulty which concerns the Fishery Department to-day. As everyone knows, in order to protect our waters, which are of such an enormous extent, we require, not merely the staff that we have, but a staff and an expenditure that this country could not afford. Indeed, no country, apparently, has yet found itself able to patrol and guard thoroughly its own waters in the right season, so as to prevent violations of the fishery

Mr. TUPPER.

regulations. However, I will take note of the suggestions made by the hon. gentleman to-day, and the spirit that has prompted him to make them, and I hope that we will be able to carry out his suggestions, so as to render these fishing apparatus as little harmful as possible, consistent with the public interest, and that great vigilance will be shown in the districts referred to for the protection of the fisheries.

ADJOURNMENT FOR DOMINION DAY.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to refer briefly to a matter which is causing considerable anxiety, not only in the House, but out of it—that is, as to whether this House should sit to-morrow or not. I have just received the following telegram from Belleville:—

“Will the House be in session to-morrow? Please answer Belleville station immediately.

“H. CORBY.”

I find there are some members present who, in case the House does not sit to-morrow, wish to leave by the 10.45 train this evening. On Thursday last, when the Minister of Public Works moved that when the House adjourned it should stand adjourned until Tuesday at three o'clock, there was more than one suggestion that the House should stand adjourned until Thursday. Several objected to that, and I made a few remarks, stating that I thought it was due to the people of the Maritime Provinces and the North-West that the House should sit on Tuesday, and if necessary on Wednesday. But to-day many members are representing that as to-morrow is private members' day, and but little business of importance can be done, the House had better not sit to-morrow, and I know there is a general feeling to that effect on this side of the House; and I have also heard the same opinion expressed by some hon. gentlemen opposite. I think the matter had better be finally settled now, so that if the House does not sit to-morrow those who wish to leave on the 10.45 train this evening may do so.

Mr. KAULBACH. It was very kind on the part of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), on Thursday last, to take the interest he did in his friends from the Maritime Provinces and British Columbia, or those representing constituencies by the sea, to propose that this House sit for the dispatch of business to-morrow (Dominion Day), feeling, as was very true, that they had a desire to dispatch the work of the session, and get to their respective homes as early as possible. It having been acknowledged and concurred in at the time by an hon. member from British Columbia, caused me to be silent, although I did not approve of it, and was not in accord. Hearing considerable dissatisfaction expressed since, by various members of this House, I felt that this matter ought to be brought up for reconsideration, and I am very glad indeed that my hon. friend has done so. There are many reasons why we should observe Dominion Day, when we consider the many benefits, since 1867, the British North America Act conferred upon this fair Dominion of ours. The most potent is for the respect and high esteem in which we held our grand old chieftain, who was the father of Confederation, and whose death we all so deeply deplore, and who, were he with us, would recognize