

ing vessels coasting from one part of the Province to another, are exempt from the payment of these dues, or contribute very little; and in any case they do not participate in the benefits of it unless they go beyond the Province in which they pay the dues which entitle them to that advantage. Our own vessels which fish one part of the year, and the other portions make voyages beyond the limits of one Province, will therefore be called upon to pay those dues and will be entitled to the benefits of the fund. But foreign fishing vessels seldom enter our ports and pay any dues unless they have a sick mariner on board, in which case they enter the port, pay a few cents or dollars, and leave a sick seaman on our hands causing large expense. In one or two cases when that has not happened, but when they have entered our ports for this purpose, and been called upon to pay the sick mariner's dues, their Government has represented to this Government that it was an infringement of the spirit of the fishing treaty. It is thought, therefore, that it would be simpler and better to abolish the dues for vessels exclusively engaged in fishing, or when upon a fishing voyage."

That closes my objection, as far as I am concerned, if the Government of the United States will be benefited by leaving the Act as it is now on the Statute Books. I would rather see the broader ground taken, however, that our hospitals should be open to the fishermen of all nations; but if the Government of the United States has represented to the Canadian Government through the Imperial authorities that this law is an infraction of the Fishery Treaty, I withdraw my objection to the Bill.

HON. MR. POWER—I call the attention of the hon. gentleman from Alberton to the fact that the objection of the American Government that this tax is contrary to the spirit of the Fishery Treaty, which was in existence at the time the representations of the American Government were made, does not apply now, because the Fishery Treaty is not in existence.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Did I understand you to say that this is a repealing Bill?

HON. MR. ABBOTT—No, it simply corrects a mistake and leaves the law as it was.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—As our trade with the United States is so large, it would seem to be a more humane thing to allow the fishermen of that country the advantage and the benefits of our hospitals.

HON. MR. CARVELL—They do not give that advantage to our fishermen.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Well, we should set them a pattern in that respect. Many of our fishermen are employed in the United States, and considering the close relations existing between the two countries, I think it would be very much better to set them a good example and allow their fishermen to have the benefit of our hospitals. I do not think they are overcrowded, and fishermen are not a class who are very often seen in hospitals. Sometimes they have a sore finger from the prick of a fish hook, or something like that to be attended to, but seldom anything serious.

HON. MR. CARVELL—When I read this Bill a few days ago, I must confess that my feelings were similar to those expressed by the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg. I thought it hard that a sick sailor landing anywhere in Canada, should be refused the privilege of the hospital. I thought then that it was a new matter; but the explanation of the leader of the Government puts it in an entirely different light. If the law in the United States is similar to ours, and our fishermen have no privileges in the hospitals there, we must remember that the United States Government is represented in the seaports of Canada by consuls or consular agents, and no real hardship can occur to unfortunate or invalid fishermen. They have only to apply to their consul or his agent as coming from an American vessel and they are taken charge of by the consul and cared for, so that the hospital privileges are not so necessary for the United States fisherman as it would seem. This Bill relieves him of the privileges, and of the tax at the same time, and my objection to the Bill is removed.

HON. MR. MILLER—I would sug-