

department to find out the reason of the omission and they have not been able to do so. I surmise, however, that the reason was perhaps, due to the fact that St. John is treated differently from the other harbours. There was special legislation passed in the 80's concerning it.

Mr. DANIEL. That has nothing to do with the pilotage authorities.

Mr. BRODEUR. I know. It was with regard to the administration of the harbour itself, but it is probably due to that fact that St. John has not been treated in the same way as the other ports mentioned in section 478. I intend looking into the matter, and if there be no reason found why St. John should not be on the same footing as the other ports, we shall have to amend the law. I am under the impression, however, but speak subject to correction, that there has been some protest on the part of the Board of Trade on the ground that if St. John were put on the same footing as the other harbours, the result would probably be an increase in the rates for tolls which the vessel owners would have to pay.

Mr. DANIEL. Not necessarily. It all depends upon the action of the pilotage commissioners. I do not know whether they are all appointed by the common council or a portion by the common council and a portion by the government, but the effect of placing the authority in the hands of the pilot commissioners would not necessarily result in any increase of the pilotage dues.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, it might, because the harbour of St. John would then be included in clause 477, under which all vessels plying between Nova Scotia or any part of the Bay of Fundy and St. John would not be obliged to pay any pilotage dues, whereas under section 478 the pilot authorities would have the right to impose such dues. I think that was the objection made by the board of trade.

Mr. DANIEL. This would give the commissioners probably the authority to impose pilotage dues on some vessels that are not now affected, but the point is whether it would not be fair and right to do so under the circumstances.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is considered that St. John is too big a port for that. Mr. Finlayson moved to add the following subsection to section 10:

Subsection 1 of section 477 is amended by adding the following paragraph:

Ships making or entering the harbour for refuge shall not pay pilotage dues.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have no objection to incorporate this amendment which has met the approval of the subcommittee to which the Bill to amend the Canada Shipping Act was referred.

On subsection 11,

11. Paragraphs (i) and (j) of section 565 of the said Act are repealed and the following are substituted therefor:

(i) 'passenger' means any person carried on a steamboat other than the master and crew, the owner, his family and the servants connected with his household, and other than the guests of the owner of any steamboat used exclusively for pleasure, if such guests are carried on such steamboat without remuneration or any object of profit; and

(j) 'passenger steamer' means any steamboat carrying passengers.

Mr. BRODEUR. The object is to make clear what constitutes a passenger. Application was made the department to allow freight vessel owners to bring guests in their boats. It was feared that if such permission were given, it would perhaps cause those freight vessels to have a passenger service and so we thought it advisable to make it very clear that this would not be allowed.

On section 14—to amend section 591.

Mr. BRODEUR. The old section 591 provided simply that the report should be made to the inspector. We want it made very clear that it shall be made to the inspector who issued the certificate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The expression is a little unusual—'shall report such occurrence to the office of the inspector.' Why 'the office'?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is what we proposed. But the Senate thought that, as the inspector might be dead, or might have disappeared or been replaced, it would be better that the report be made to the office. I think this was suggested by the leader of the opposition in the Senate. It was accepted by us, as we wish to have the provision very definite.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The form of words is unusual. I should have supposed that some such expression as 'to the inspector who issued the certificate or his successor in office' would be better.

Mr. J. D. REID. The inspector is often away from his office. Go to the office of the inspector in Kingston while he is off inspecting, and you will find his office locked up.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is always somebody to attend to this work. It is supposed that they will have somebody to attend to it.

Mr. J. D. REID. They have no clerks.

Mr. BRODEUR. They do some other work generally, and they have somebody to attend to these matters.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have gone many times to the inspector's office in Kingston.