

person to fire any boiler. So far from that provision being a hardship on the owners of small steam appliances, I say it would be a great benefit to them. If their firemen had to undergo some such examination, they would devote themselves to preparing for it. A great many people innocently have property destroyed in consequence of employing incompetent men. I know no instances in which men are more deceived, and in which greater loss of property takes place, than in having incompetent firemen and engineers. In the case of threshing machine boilers, in nearly all instances in which they are injured or damaged and made practically worthless after running two or three seasons, this is in consequence of incompetent men being in charge of them. The hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Wilson) has stated that the steam engine is as harmless as the unborn child. He must know, in speaking of an engineer, that in a great many cases the man who runs the engine is also the fireman. I had hoped that the principle of this Bill would have been adopted, and I should have been prepared to suggest two or three amendments; but apparently the intention of the House is to defeat the Bill entirely. I think the fact of gentlemen objecting to a Bill of this description because it is advocated by trades and labor unions should not defeat it. As a rule, these men are working not only for their own interests, but for the interests of the general public. I know of no measure which would be of greater benefit to the owners of steam appliances than in requiring the men who take charge of those appliances to undergo an examination.

Mr. MACDOWALL. As the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has spoken in favor of this Bill, and as I believe it is directly contrary to the interest of the North-West, I feel bound to congratulate my hon. friend the Minister of Marine for the action he has taken in moving the amendment. The hon. member for Marquette says that anybody should be able to pass the examination which is stipulated in sub-section 4 of section 9, but I will call attention to sub-section 2 of section 9, where you will find that a second-class engineer is required to have a very thorough knowledge of his duties; in fact, he has to pass a very severe examination. A great many men in the North-West who are thoroughly capable of running such an engine would not be able to pass such an examination.

Mr. WATSON. 200 horse power?

Mr. MACDOWALL. Yes, I believe they would not only run a 200-horse power engine, but when difficulties arise, though perhaps not men of very high education, they are men of practical training which they can be put to use. I do not underrate the importance of imposing proper restrictions upon engineers in large factories or large centres, where a large number of people are employed, but in out-of-the-way places, like many in the North-West—and this Bill applies to the whole of Canada—it would be very detrimental to the interest of the people to do so. If the Bill were to apply to the whole country it would be very detrimental to the interests of our people. We know that the first thing it is necessary to have in a newly-formed settlement is a grist mill, and these mills are very often started by men of small means and without technical knowledge. These men are perfectly capable of running such a mill, and I think deserve every encouragement; but, if this Bill should become law, it would take away from them the right to run such a mill, and throw the whole thing into the hands of trade unionists. In centres such as Winnipeg, or Prince Albert, or Calgary, in the North-West, there would be very few certified engineers, and the public works there might be shut down at any time from the sheer impossibility of getting such engineers. Another objection is clause 2, which provides for the appointment of an inspector, and the inspector must have a certain knowledge. Now, there are

Mr. WATSON.

some settlements in the North-West, and, I believe, in British Columbia, where it would be impossible to find men with the knowledge requisite to be an inspector who could grant certificates, and, in that case, the engineers there would have to come down to some large centre in order to pass an examination, and if there should be any difficulty between the employer and the engineer necessitating the employment of another engineer, the latter would have to be brought from eastern Canada, since none could be found in the west.

Mr. COOK. I was somewhat surprised at the assertion of the hon. the Minister of Marine respecting the provisions covered by this Bill; but he is a young man who has not been very long in the Government, and of whom, therefore, too much must not be expected. He stated this was different from the Steamboat Inspection Act, because these boilers could not be made perfect. Is he not aware that there is no inspection of boilers for steamboats when manufactured. Is he not aware that there is no Act by which steamboat boilers must be inspected when manufactured. In Germany and some other countries no steamboat boiler can be manufactured without its being subject to the inspection of the Government inspector, but we have no such inspection here. Last Session a deputation waited on the Government in reference to this matter. The hon. gentleman then was an independent member of the House, and the Minister of Finance occupied the position then that the hon. gentleman does now. This deputation declared that they had the assurance of the then Minister that they had proved their case and that legislation would be introduced. He did not say when, but he gave them to understand that they should have legislation this year. But the present Minister of Marine declares we are not to have legislation at all. He, also, in speaking about inspectors, asks where they are to come from? Well, they will come, perhaps, just as the Minister of Marine came, from father to son; an inspector might be made just as the Minister of Marine has been made. The hon. gentleman spoke also of the differences existing between the Bill I am promoting and the Inspection Act for steamboats. Why, the hon. gentleman must know that I, as an independent member of this House, have no right to introduce a Bill such as the Steamboat Inspection Act, by which I would ask the expenditure of money by the Government. He ought to know that it is the duty of the Government to take matters of this sort off the hands of private members and make them Government legislation. I expected that was what the hon. member would do. I did not expect him to defy the members who are supporting this measure by saying that it would never pass. I did not suppose he was going to fly in the face of all the labor organisations in this country, and I believe a large number of manufacturers are in favor of it. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) is of course a large manufacturer. He has large steam mills, and, perhaps, he would have to pay \$5 a month more to an engineer if this Bill became law. I am also a manufacturer, and I have a number of men employed and an engineer, and I conceived the idea a few years ago that it would be to my advantage to have a capable man to manage the steam department of my mills. But I am perhaps not so extensively engaged in the manufacturing business as the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Wilson). I believe he runs about a fifteen horse power machine making tissue paper. I believe he has about as much horse power as you would find generally in a threshing mill on a farm. I propose to exempt him. Everything up to the extent of twenty-five horse power shall be exempted, so that he will not come within the provisions of the Act. He need not feel so very much alarmed. We know that at the explosion of the Ammonia Works at Toronto, a few weeks ago, a man was killed. That