

coaster, as she is now built, and bear in mind that one of the requirements of the coasting trade is that the vessel shall be shallow; bear in mind that the physical feature of the whole coast of North and South America is that we have shoal water harbors to encounter, and the American coastwise fleet are largely built with a very great beam, little depth, and considerable length. These vessels will carry, if necessary, their full load on deck and sail safely. A narrow and deep vessel on the coasting trade is almost utterly useless, that is a vessel shaped similar to a sea going vessel, giving the same proportions, and which would have to carry ballast. The coaster carrying ballast is entirely useless. If you load an ordinary coaster full of grain, and it will be found almost impossible to throw her on her beam ends, no matter what storm she may encounter. We must bear in mind that in these short voyages of a few hours, if the vessel is thrown down a little on her beam ends, she would still worry into a place of safety, while when the deep sea vessel, perhaps a few miles from land, falls into that position, it is impossible for her to recover; so that what would apply very aptly to deep water vessels does not apply with the same aptness to coasting vessels, and would become a very great burden. Ship-owners will tell you that preparing for a grain cargo in the harbor of New York is a large item of expense; fitting the vessels to receive the grain, fitting the shifting boards and all the necessary requirements is a large item, and unless the vessel is continued in that trade, it is considered unprofitable to fit her out for the grain trade of a single voyage. All gentlemen engaged in that trade will agree that taking a load of grain and then throwing away these preparations in order to take a cargo of another character is considered a great waste. A coasting vessel rarely takes her second cargo of grain. She delivers her cargo of grain, and her next load is coal or lumber or any other cargo she can get, and perhaps in a year's trade she will not have more than one or two little loads of grain. After careful investigation of this subject, I think it would almost be found impossible in the Atlantic coastwise trade to find a single case where a coastwise vessel came to grief in carrying a cargo of grain. I have had experience in carrying cargoes of corn from the port of New York to St. John and Halifax, and I never knew of a single instance where any precaution has been taken or considered necessary because of loading the vessel in bulk.

Mr. WALDIE. The inland trade of this country upon the lakes is largely with the United States, either in regard to cargoes going from Canada to United States ports, or cargoes coming from United States ports to Canadian ports. The Montreal trade, carried by way of Kingston to Collingwood or other ports on the lakes, is carried in vessels with centre boards. None of them have shifting boards. If this provision is passed, the Canadian vessel will be at a disadvantage in comparison with the American vessel, because it provides that the Canadian vessel is to be subject to inspection by a Customs officer at the port of arrival. My experience in regard to unloading vessels before the regular hours has been that we had to pay a fee to the Customs officer to allow us to unload, and I am certain that, whatever might be the intention in this Bill, we would have to pay a fee.

Mr. TUPPER. There is no authority for it.

Mr. WALDIE. I know that, but the fee is paid all the same. If this examination was made at the port of loading, before the vessel had departed, it would be reasonable and just, because it would afford a means of preventing an accident and of seeing that the vessel was in a seaworthy state before she sailed; but, when the examination is to be made at the port of arrival, I think it is unreasonable and unnecessary, and the effect of it will be to drive our Canadian schooners entirely out of the grain trade from Chicago

Mr. BAIRD.

to Collingwood, Midland and Kingston, and will leave that trade entirely in the hands of the Americans. I think such an act in regard to the large propellers that have mixed cargoes is much more needed than it is in regard to the schooners with centre-boards. The smaller vessels with centre-boards do not need this provision, and it would affect not only the through trade but the Lake Ontario trade, where there are short runs of a few hours, such as that from Toronto to Oswego. In those cases the vessels are filled with grain. They suit their cargo to the size of the vessel, and no shifting boards are required in these centre-board vessels. This Act, being made applicable to all kinds of vessels, is not the legislation which is required, and I do not think it should be passed. If it were passed, I am sure it would remain a dead letter.

Mr. CHARLTON. The necessity for shifting boards on the inland waters does not exist. All sailing vessels on the inland waters have centre-boards, and they are generally vessels of light draft and wide beam. Even without a centre-board, it would not be necessary to make this provision.

Mr. GILLMOR. Does not the centre-board extend the whole length of the keel.

Mr. CHARLTON. No. I would suggest to the Minister to amend sub-section 2 of section 4 by adding after the word "used" in the first line, "except on vessels having centre-boards."

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman's argument is that there is no danger of the cargo shifting when there is a centre-board. I am otherwise informed by the nautical officers of my department, but, if the hon. gentleman is right no amendment is needed, because there is a provision for other proper precautions to be taken.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is very indefinite. It is a fact that, in all the vessels sailing under the American flag on the lakes, this regulation in regard to shifting boards has never been made. They carry grain in bulk, and, as far as I know, no accident has ever occurred in consequence of that. It is entirely unnecessary to make any requirement that shifting boards should be used on inland waters. It puts our vessels at a disadvantage in competing with the American vessels for business.

Mr. WELSH. I object to one clause in this Bill. I have been engaged in the shipping trade for the last forty years, and I know that the original Act met with the approval of the English Board of Trade. For the last fifteen years, I think, we have been shipping our grain under the present Act, and there have been no accidents reported, as far as I know. Now, we are to bring our ships under the notice of the port warden, and to put shifting boards in, and to go to considerable expense, as the hon. member for Queen's Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) has stated, and I quite agree with his remarks all through. I object to this provision unless the Minister can show that there has been a loss of ships or a loss of life or a loss of property through the want of this provision, because this clause will entail great cost on our coasting vessels. It will cost them \$40 or \$50 or \$60 to carry a cargo of grain a distance of 50 miles. You might as well compel the boats on the canal here to have shifting boards to carry a cargo across the river. If the hon. gentleman makes a provision that every ship clearing out of our ports to sea shall be seaworthy and fit to carry its cargo, I have no objection, but this is a tax imposed on the coasting trade, and is working for boodle on the part of the port wardens, and I for one will move that that clause shall be struck out.

Mr. TUPPER. Is not the hon. gentleman aware that vessels engaged in the coasting trade do use these shifting boards?