

limiting the operations of our vessels and you are curtailing, to a certain extent, trade which they are now able to carry on, at various periods of the year.

**Mr. TUPPER.** If the hon. gentleman means that we should drop this sub-section 2 of course the argument is in order, but the hon. gentleman's argument is just as strong and he urges it with as great earnestness against the word "West Indies" in the present Act. If a vessel is not allowed to go to the West Indies but as he claims, is allowed to go to South America, it seems an extraordinary argument that while he approves of a certain cargo at a certain time of the year being carried to South America he argues against vessels being allowed to go to the West Indies. That argument is something very hard for one not in the coasting trade to understand.

**Mr. McKAY.** It seems to me there is something peculiar about this. The Dominion Government have had an agent in South America trying to build up a trade between the Dominion and that country, and now we are by this legislation trying to restrict that trade. I think that there is a good deal in what the member for Queen's (Mr. Baird) says in reference to this special trade in lumber between the port of St. John and South America, and it would be well worthy of consideration by the Minister.

**Mr. TUPPER.** We do not propose to restrict the trade at all. The hon. gentleman will see that it is deemed by nautical experts unsafe to take a cargo loaded in a certain way—the manner of the loading is specified in section 5 of the Act. The hon. gentleman does not suppose that for the purpose of making a trade with South America that we should repeal all these laws that have been framed with a view of preserving the safety of the ships and the cargo and the lives of the crew, and change it all because there is an opportunity to send more ships and more lumber to South America.

**Mr. BAIRD.** It is my impression that South America is not now restricted and as the hon. Minister put it, at certain seasons in the year these restrictions come into force. That season of the year is the very season when the whole business of South America is done and to adopt this provision, as I said before, will be simply to change our vessels from the port of St. John, N.B., to the ports of Portland and Boston. You can do that most successfully under the provisions of this Act if they are adopted. I say that a vessel will not load at the port of St. John, N.B., if 20 per cent. of her carrying capacity is taken away from her. You may talk about the safety of those vessels and you may say that the laws apply in Great Britain, but you will find that our ships engaged in this trade are of different construction. Their vessels are narrow and deep and the law that would apply to them would not apply here at all. When you go to the ports in South America you will find that every river is guarded by a sand bar which is thrown up by the action of the ocean and you have to have shallow vessel to get over that. You will find that in the United States six millions of the tonnage coastwise is of vessels that have been specially built for this particular trade and you will find that the shallow vessel is worth three times what the deep water vessel is worth. In the United States, with their experience—having built up that great trade while they let their ocean carrying trade go altogether—they have guarded with jealous care their coastwise business and they have built it up to be the greatest home trade that can be found in the world, three times greater than the home carrying trade of the United Kingdom, and Canada comes and places herself under a set of laws which prevent her competing in that trade. It is more profitable than any deep-water trade. The coaster spends her money among our own people; the foreign trade vessel spends it abroad, and she may not return for two or three years. There is a

vast difference between the two classes of vessels in their profitableness to the country to which they belong; and if we expect to be able to do the carrying trade alongside of such neighbors as those we have to-day, if we expect to carry the 100,000,000 feet of lumber that goes out of Canada in bond to the United States and is shipped from American ports, if we expect that the Short Line Railway is going to amount to anything, we have to carry on as good terms, or even on more favorable terms, than it is carried from Portland and Boston. Not one vessel owner in Canada will be found willing to load his vessel at St. John when he can go to Portland and be able to carry 20 per cent. more cargo, and do it with comparative safety. The idea of losing a vessel from these deck loads is all a matter of moonshine. Everyone who knows vessels knows that they are not lost from such causes. If Mr. Plimsoil could see an American built vessel he would condemn her at once, because he would say she had too small a draft of water; but we find that these vessels outrival us in age and in every way; we find that after they are twenty years old they are still doing their work well. Nothing has been said to show that the trade is not safely done, and it is growing to a wonderful extent; and unless we are prepared to do it on as favorable terms as our neighbors we shall have to leave it alone altogether.

**Mr. TUPPER.** I have to remind the Committee, as from the remarks of the hon. gentleman they would not imagine, that under the Bill and the amendments, ships are allowed during this particular period to go even to the West Indies and South America with their cargoes of lumber. But all that is said is that when sailing after the 15th of November or before the 16th of March in any year, a ship, if an open decked vessel, shall not permit any cargo to be above the deck rail more than six inches or above the deck more than four feet six inches. If that is a good and proper law, which Parliament in its wisdom has seen fit to place on the Statute-book, the provision I mention is equally necessary and proper.

**Mr. ELLIS.** But it is not wise.

**Mr. TUPPER.** I said I was not particularly in love with this section. It was suggested that it was necessary to make the Act on our Statute-book proper and sufficient, and if the navigation to the West Indies at that time of year is such as to require certain loading of lumber, surely the vessel should not be permitted to sail during the same season to South American ports. But I will not press that if the Committee does not favor it.

**Mr. FREEMAN.** I think the difference lies here, that the vessels for South American ports are of a different build altogether from other vessels; they are constructed to carry a cargo on deck, while others are deep in the hold, and cannot carry a cargo on deck. In former days American vessels carried more than half their cargo on deck, and there are American vessels still doing that, and they are insured as cheaply by the insurance companies as deep vessels are, and perform their voyages quite as successfully. In the United States as well as in our own country ships are now being built to suit particular trades; freights have become so low that that must be done; and vessels which have to go up the shallow rivers in South America require to be built with very little draft of water. If you send a cargo there in a deep vessel, it has to be carried up the rivers in steamers or in flat-bottomed vessels. The whole matter lies in the fact that vessels are built specially for carrying deck loads, and others for carrying cargoes under the deck, and one class is as safe as the other.

**Mr. RIOPEL.** These last remarks go to show that for the purpose of protecting trade it would be necessary to do away with the latter part of the clause. I do not see that we could remove that part of the clause and do justice to