

fishermen and American fishermen at Fortune Bay arose altogether out of the fact that that the American fishermen were not bound to obey the local laws with regard to fishing. I hope the Government will see that in whatever arrangement is come to, provision will be made on this point, because our experience has been in the past that American fishermen come in close to the shore and tear up and destroy the nets and other fishing appliances of our shore fishermen; and I may venture to suggest also—although it is not my duty to recommend things to the Government—that in the interest of the inshore fishermen it is desirable that the Government should make regulations to protect them against the interference of our own fishermen who fish from schooners and large boats. It is not an uncommon thing for a fishing schooner to improperly interfere with the nets and fishing gear of the shore fishermen, and it is the duty of the Government to prevent it. I hope the hon. gentleman who represents the Government in this House will take some interest in this matter and see that the Government make the necessary regulations, and if legislation is necessary that that legislation shall take place.

The latter part of that paragraph says the necessary provision has been made for the protection of our inshore fisheries. I think that up to the present time, that is since the beginning of last year, the protection afforded to our waters has been fairly satisfactory, and I hope that the Government will continue to protect our rights in the way that they have done. I may say, although it is repeating what I have said before, that there probably would have been less difficulty with the American fishermen last year, and less dissatisfaction amongst the American people, if the Government had not, with the best intentions, made the mistake of giving our neighbors one season of free fishing. There is just one other point as to which I humbly suggest a mistake has been made. I think that in some two or three instances our officers have perhaps rather exceeded their instructions. There was the case which occurred very recently: that of the schooner "Scylla," of the county of Lunenburg—a case with which my hon. friend on the left

(Mr. Kaulbach) is doubtless familiar, in which the offence of the "Scylla" was that she supplied provisions to an American schooner in need of them, at a distance of fourteen miles from land. The "Scylla" was seized, and only recently released. I think that there was an excess of zeal on the part of the officer to seize a vessel for an proceeding of that kind. I fail to see how it can be an offence under any law. On the whole, however, the Government have done their duty fairly well in connection with this protective service, and I am glad to notice that they have fitted out additional cruisers this year, and that the protective service will probably be more complete than it has been.

We are told in the fifth paragraph that we are to have a Department of Trade and Commerce, under the supervision of a responsible Minister. That is a proposition which I think does not deserve the approval of this House. We have too many departments. We have, I think, thirteen departments. You may go over the whole civilized world, and you will hardly find a country, no matter how populous or how large or how rich it may be, where there are so many departments to do the same work as we have here. The only country that I have been able to find where there are more departments than there are in Canada is Great Britain and Ireland. In that country there are sixteen ministers; and when we take out of those sixteen the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, the Secretary for the Colonies, the Secretary for India and the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, there are practically less by one or two than we have here. In Belgium, where the revenue is nearly double as large as ours, and where there is a population considerably larger than ours, they have only seven ministers. In the Netherlands, where the population is about the same as ours, and the revenue once and a half as large, they have only eight ministers. In Portugal, where the revenue and population are pretty much the same as ours, they have only seven. Coming to this continent, we find that in Brazil, where the revenue and population are double what ours are, they have only seven ministers. In the United