

good enough to be admitted as masters of ships in Canada, and I would make our coasting laws quite as strict as the coasting laws of the United States with regard to interchange with their people. There are other reasons why this legislation should be passed, in my judgment—national reasons. There may be times when it would be wise in the interests of Canada that this discretion should be vested in the minister to prevent foreign subjects from becoming masters of Canadian or British vessels.

Hon. Mr. ELLIS—I concur with the hon. gentleman from Halifax. I think it is a ridiculous and foolish thing for any country to shut itself out from using the services of any man who can render it service, and I do not agree with the protectionist doctrine my hon. friend from Hastings enunciates. Because the United States or any other country does a foolish thing is no reason why we should follow a bad example. It very often happens—along the coast at any rate—I do not know how it may be on the great lakes—but I observe from the observations of the hon. gentleman from Hastings, that there is on these lakes a sort of union or trades alliance as against outsiders that we require to get anybody we can; and to shut ourselves out from having our coasting vessels properly manned and properly managed, simply because of the fact that a man is a Norwegian or a United States citizen, and that we do not get the same privileges in his country, is a piece of great foolishness.

Hon. Mr. MCGREGOR—We have, in sailing our ships, very often officers who are foreigners. We may have a Norwegian who is mate of a ship, who has never had an opportunity to become domiciled. If the captain dies, the mate takes his place. The owner of the ship should be permitted to decide who is to be the master.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—If he becomes naturalized, he is qualified. The order in council, which doubtless would be passed, would make some provision for that. The latitude given in the proposed legislation is sufficiently wide to permit of a proper

adjustment of conditions in regard to that question.

Hon. Mr. DOMVILLE—England is a free country. When a man goes to England, does he have to take the oath of allegiance before he can command a ship? Did any hon. gentleman ever hear of such a thing? Never. Men may be offered to fill the positions on the ship, and the owner may not want them; he may know a good man, residing in Boston, who would suit him, and yet he would be told that he could not employ that man.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The hon. minister has agreed to let this clause stand.

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—I would prefer to go through the Bill, and if there are clauses to which the hon. gentleman objects, I am prepared to allow them to stand until I can confer with my colleague.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Before we leave this clause, can the hon. gentleman say how many nations refuse to permit British subjects to become masters of vessels within their waters?

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—That I am not able to say off-hand. But I think probably, in all likelihood, that the parties that are aimed at are the inhabitants of the United States. I have no doubt about that, and that very few of the others would be affected. I think, for instance, the Norwegians would not be affected by this, or any of the Scandinavian nations.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The hon. gentleman might find out about that.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Is this clause sufficiently wide to meet the cases mentioned by the hon. members from Pictou and St. John? It leaves it optional with the minister of the day to exercise discretion in matters of that kind, and if there were cases similar to that to which the hon. gentleman has called the attention of the committee, the minister would, in the interest of those interested, the ship-owners, grant the permission. It does not go as far as I indicated a few moments ago. I should like it to go. It is not left suffi-