

and found him away on duty and his office closed up.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think that this clause could be improved. What would the leader of the opposition think of using the expression 'make a report of such occurrence to the office of the inspector'?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister's suggestion would still leave the matter open to the objection on the ground I have mentioned. But it may work out; I am not very critical of the language.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the inspector of hulls also the inspector of machinery?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is the inspector of hulls and also the inspector of boilers and machinery. The report is to be made to this inspector who gave the certificate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I might suggest what I think will meet the point, and that is to provide that the report shall be in writing. If the party making the report found the office locked he might fulfil the letter of the law as here proposed by standing there and making the report to the office.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have no objection in accepting the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 15—changes in certificated officers to be reported.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I think subsection 2 of this section is objectionable. It imposes a new duty on the captain and owner of the ship of reporting to the inspector whenever he changes an officer. It is customary for steamboats crossing the Atlantic to change their officers every trip, and it would be a good deal of trouble to the captain to report every change of officers to the inspector, who I suppose, is some officer in Ottawa, who would simply file it away in a pigeon-hole, so that, while a good deal of trouble for the captain, it would be of no advantage to anybody. We now require the custom-house officer to see that the captain and mate have certificates as required under the law. If you choose to impose the same duty upon the customs officer with regard to engineers, I have no objection. I think subsection 2 should be cut out.

Mr. PARDEE. I endorse the remarks of my hon. friend from Nova Scotia (Mr. Sinclair). So far as the inland waters are concerned, if this duty is imposed upon masters I feel sure it is a law which will not be adhered to to any great degree. For on inland waters officers are changed very often in the season. Besides, this seems rather impracticable. I cannot see what is to be safeguarded by having this section passed, as, under the law, these

Mr. J. D. REID.

men must have certificates in order to be employed.

Mr. BRODEUR. In the spring, for example, on the inland waters, the inspector is obliged to see that all the requirements of the law has been complied with before he gives his certificate. It was supposed that this legislation would be a very wise move, because it would ensure that those in charge of the vessel are certificated officers. When a change takes place we have nothing before us to show whether this vessel is properly manned afterwards; no report has been made showing whether she has on board an officer possessing a proper certificate. If we find that it is necessary, when a vessel is inspected in the spring, to have the names of the certificated officers on that vessel, and that the certificate shown to the inspector bears those names, I think it is a wise suggestion that when a change takes place it should be at least communicated to the department. Then we will know whether the new appointment on the vessel is a certificated officer or not. We have not in the service a sufficient number of men to inspect every vessel plying on the ocean or inland waters; that is why I think we should require that when a change takes place in the officers of a vessel that change should be communicated to the department.

Mr. DANIEL. If the statement of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) is correct that the vessel cannot clear unless she has the proper certificated officers, what is the necessity for this?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are places where we are not obliged to clear, places in the inland waters.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The inspector has the duty imposed upon him in the spring, or at the time of inspection, to see that the men have a proper certificate. It is the duty of the engineer to hang the certificate up in the cabin, and the engineer is fined \$20 if that certificate is not found hanging there. I do not believe, however, that a case has ever occurred where a ship has been sailed in Canadian waters requiring a certificate by an engineer that did not have a certificate. The owner of the vessel is under a heavy penalty if he employs a man without a certificate. Then there is this other safeguard, that he can be called upon at any moment to produce his certificate. I think those provisions are sufficient, and we are imposing another duty upon the ship owner and the shipping master that, to my mind, is altogether unnecessary. If we keep on piling new duties on these people we will drive away ships from our waters altogether. I do not believe there has been a single Act passed in the Canadian parliament during the last ten years that has