

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that two gentlemen were employed only nine months, and others for a shorter period. But the Minister does not say where the new inspectors will be placed.

Mr. McLELAN. One is appointed for Manitoba; an additional one has been appointed in Ontario, and one is to be appointed in British Columbia. The additional Inspector in Ontario is Mr. Taylor, who only served a portion of the year. Another one has also been appointed for the St. Catharines district. There are fifteen inspectors with a salary of \$1,000 and travelling expenses.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria, B.C.) Is this sum of \$25,000 to include the inspection of hulls?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. BAKER. What will be the remuneration to the inspector of hulls in British Columbia? Also the salary of the Inspector of Steamboats in British Columbia?

Mr. McLELAN. The inspector of boilers and machinery is to have \$1,200. The inspector of hulls has not yet been appointed.

Mr. BAKER. I wish to impress on the Minister the desirability of having the inspector of hulls distinct from the Inspector of Steamboats. The former should be a man who is a shipwright by trade. The person whom it is intended to appoint as steamboat inspector at the present time, I think I can confidently state, is not a man to be the inspector of hulls. He will make a good inspector of machinery and boilers, but will not do for the inspection of hulls.

Mr. DAVIES. Why is the hon. gentleman asking so large a vote as \$25,000, when the expenditure was only \$16,000 last year? I see the expenditure has been increasing \$1,000 a year for a number of years.

Mr. McLELAN. The inspectors appointed last year were not paid for the full year, and additional inspectors have been appointed for the coming year. It may even be found necessary to appoint one or two more to overtake all the work and prevent delay in making inspections. We have fifteen officers now.

Mr. COCKBURN. I think the salary of a hull inspector is too low at \$1,000.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to a grievance which has arisen in connection with the operation of the inspection laws. The tug *Michigan*, belonging to the International Wrecking Company, received extensive repairs to her boilers last winter. Inspector Risley was requested by the parties having charge of the repairs to visit the vessel and see if they were being made in accordance with the law. He failed to do so. He came to inspect the vessel in September, and refused to do so because the boilers had not been raised so that he could see beneath them. The repairs had cost several thousands of dollars, and the boilers were in excellent condition. As it was then about the commencement of the wrecking season, it was a matter of great importance to the owners that the vessel should be allowed to proceed to work. The inspector was requested, at all events, to grant permission for the vessel to run until the end of the season, when the inspection could be made, as several weeks would be required to raise the boilers. His refusal to apply the test, although the boilers were in excellent condition, led to the vessel being tied up during the latter part of the wrecking season, which caused great loss to the owners. I wish to ask the Minister whether Inspector Risley's action in this matter was strictly in accordance with the law; whether it was necessary to insist that the vessel's boilers should be raised so as to bring into view the bottom as well as the sides and top; and whether, if the boilers had been proved to be in good condition, he should

Mr. McLELAN.

not have given a permit for the vessel to run, on condition that the boilers would be raised and an inspection made at the end of the season?

Mr. McLELAN. Without having the papers before me I am not prepared to say that Mr. Risley acted strictly according to the law or not. I suppose, in the hon. gentleman's opinion, he acted too strictly according to the letter of the law, and not in the spirit of it. I dare say the hon. gentleman thinks that the inspector should have not so strictly followed the letter of the law; and perhaps that may be a proper view to take. In the working of a new Act, no doubt there is friction, and occasionally shipowners make complaints; but we are getting the Act gradually to run smoothly, and I hope it will be so worked that, while the law will be fully carried out, the people will have no cause of complaint.

Mr. CHARLTON. This is a case of very great hardship. The loss that resulted to the owners probably amounted to several thousands of dollars. No doubt the vessel's boilers were in excellent condition, and I have reason to suppose that Inspector Risley was fully aware of the fact. Mr. Risley was not without blame, he having declined to visit the vessel when repairs were being made, though he was at a point adjacent at the time. I certainly think this is a case where, if the inspector acted according to the letter of the law, he did not act according to its spirit. It seems to be absurd to refuse to make a test of the boilers when, having been repaired, they were in a better condition than they were years before, and in consequence of the Inspector's action, the vessel lost the best half of the season.

COLLECTION OF REVENUES.

RAILWAYS AND CANALS

196. Repairs and working expenses—Intercolonial Railway \$2,500,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We shall be glad to hear the hon. gentleman's explanation as to the present condition of the Intercolonial Railway. I may make one remark, and it is this: I observe always, in addition to the \$2,500,000, several hundreds of thousands figure in the capital account for rolling stock for the line. I think, as I have always said, it is high time the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway should be wiped out.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman, during his absence from this House, which we all deplored, has forgotten the explanations that have been given. I did flatter myself that I had convinced the hon. gentleman that it was quite proper to add to the capital expenditure for rolling stock so long as you had a correspondingly increased business to provide for. That subject has been very fully discussed in the Committee on various occasions, and I think I succeeded in satisfying hon. gentlemen that the Intercolonial Railway forms no exception to the other railways in the country in that respect; that it is necessary and incumbent on the manager of every railway to keep the rolling stock furnished from capital account in a state of thorough repair and efficiency, not to allow it to run down, but to maintain it in good order; that whenever there is a large increase in the traffic of a road, it is necessary that the increased provision for that traffic should be made from capital account. I proved by evidence, on various occasions—by the Manager of the Grand Trunk, whom the hon. member for Northumberland will accept as a very high authority, the then Manager of the Great Western, and the Manager of the Northern—that rolling stock required for increased business was provided from and charged to capital account; and that all that was incumbent on the management of any railway was to maintain the road in a thorough state of efficiency, and that the rolling stock provided from capital account should not be allowed to run down. That will have to be accepted, I think, as the correct procedure in this matter. Such has always been the case. The