

shall support it if the Island of Prince Edward is excepted from its operation.

HON. MR. POWER—I informed the hon. gentleman at the second reading of the Bill that I had no objection to adding a rider to meet his views. I should like to do anything in my power to meet the views of my hon. friend from Lunenburg, but I am afraid I could not by any possibility so amend the Bill as to satisfy him. I shall only try to indicate that there is no very great substance in his objections, and then leave the Bill to the committee. The hon. gentleman tells us that he had information from persons interested in the fishery in his own county last year to the effect that the Bill could do no harm. Then why does the hon. gentleman oppose a Bill which can do no harm? He tells us further that the fishermen of his county actually do the things that this Bill requires. It cannot therefore injure anybody in his county. His argument is very like that of a man who should say that because here, in the Senate, we do not commit murder, therefore the commandment which says "Thou shalt do no murder" should be done away with. It does not follow because vessel owners in Lunenburg do their duty that it should not be done everywhere else. This Bill is intended to compel fishermen in other parts of the Dominion to do what the fishermen of Lunenburg already do. I am informed by a gentleman who fits out a great many of these fishing vessels in Lunenburg county that he does supply a compass for each boat, and I hope his example will be followed all over the country. The hon. member from Lunenburg went so far as to say that this Bill was not only useless but injurious, involving unnecessary expense. Are the fishermen of Lunenburg in the habit of going to unnecessary expense in the fitting out of their vessels? I think they are too shrewd for that; and the hon. gentleman does not give the people of his county credit for their sagacity and intelligence when he makes a statement of that sort. Another of his objections to the Bill is that it would apply to a boat going out to set a net in a bay. Now, this Bill does not apply at all to nets. The hon. gentleman is a lawyer, and has been sufficiently engaged in construing statutes to know that the language of the clause clearly applies only to line fishing. This Bill is not intended and does not apply

to net fishing at all. The hon. gentleman made one suggestion which I think was a sound one, and I propose to amend the clause in the direction he desires. He said that perhaps fishermen might prefer to take some other liquid with them instead of water, and to meet that objection I move that the words "drinking water" be stricken out and that the words "liquor suitable for drinking purposes" be substituted.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I regret that I did not manage to make myself understood. I declare as a lawyer that the words of this clause do not make it apply exclusively to deep-sea fishing, but that it applies to any boat that is launched for the purpose of fishing. The words are as plain as anything could be. When I said that this legislation was useless I meant as far as the county of Lunenburg was concerned, and the hon. gentleman has not shown that the fishermen of other parts of Nova Scotia are less careful and intelligent than those with whom I am acquainted. This Bill applies to all kinds of fishing.

HON. MR. POWER—The language of the clause shows that it does not.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Then why object to stating that it applies to deep-sea fishing?

HON. MR. POIRIER—I should like to support this Bill, and I will, to a certain extent, because I believe there is some merit in it, or at least in the intention of the hon. gentleman who promotes it; but I don't care to see our criminal statutes loaded with a Bill drafted as this one is. I should like to have it made clear that the Bill applies only to deep-sea fishing. As it stands now, it might apply to boats engaged in catching mackerel along the coast. If it is not intended to include such boats it is certainly open to that interpretation. There are two distinct clauses, and I say the words "other appliances" may mean nets. Certainly, there is no lawyer that would not take that point, and there are many judges and magistrates who would interpret the phrase as including nets. I would request the hon. gentleman to amend the Bill so as to make it clearly apply only to deep-sea fishing. As it stands now, it would lead to a good deal of petty per-