

every few hours if necessary. The business of the fair shipper would be little affected by the bill, whose limit constituted a fair average load. Forty-two vessels laden with timber were lost last fall on their way to Europe from Quebec, and the attention of the British Government had been called to the subject in the most earnest manner with a view to such legislation as this bill contemplated. In the face of the facts and statistics recited, no one could doubt a great evil existed, and that a remedy was needed. He trusted therefore this amendment would be withdrawn. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. KAULBACK said he fully agreed with the Postmaster General that we should consider whether there was a sufficient case of recklessness made out for legislation on the question of deck loads. He would ask whether the hon. gentleman had founded his case upon the elaborate report got up by the Minister of Marine and fisheries, which was the strongest possible document on all the cases therein mentioned that could have been prepared. Could he find an instance of the loss of a vessel from Nova Scotia? Well, if such a thing could not be proved, why should the vessels of that Province be restricted in the manner proposed? The United States offered us an example in this respect. They had shown a due sensitiveness to the value of life and property, but had not acted as we were asked to do. He thought, as regards the principle involved, that private parties were the best judges. They would not improperly expose their vessels to loss, involving hull, cargo and insurance—would not despatch risky or over-laden vessels. He argued that we should confine ourselves, therefore, to provisions in the interest of life. But even as regards New Brunswick, the loss of life was small, considering the number of men in the trade. There were but one or two vessels set down by the report as lost through overloading. The thirty-one or thirty-two casualties mentioned might extend over several, say ten years. The Minister might as well have given the period; but at any rate, there was loss of life in only a few instances. He contended that deck-loads afforded protection to seamen; and that more were washed off and drowned from vessels that did not carry them, over whose decks the waves had free play. There had not been a sufficient case made out for this legislation, which would bear hardly against New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. The present agitation and trouble were due mainly to the shipwrecks of last year in the Quebec and British timber

trade. Old vessels of twenty years' average, unfit for anything else, were sent to Quebec to bring home timber, and the consequence was, they fell a prey to the elements when a storm arose—deck loads not being the chief cause at all. The British Parliament, at the instance of Mr. Pimmsoll, who had taken great interest in this matter, had appointed a commission to report, and had we waited for it, we should have been in a better position to legislate. He held that all the Canadian Government should have asked for at present was legislation as respects the trade between Canada and Britain. The proposed legislation, affecting but the south shores of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, on the Bay of Fundy, would be not fair, but partial and invidious. After the 15th of November, no vessel left the Gulf of St. Lawrence. The largest vessels, with the heaviest deck loads, went to Brazil, which was not thought of in the bill. He pointed out the privileges enjoyed by British Columbia in the coasting trade, in order to enable her to compete with the Americans. The Minister of Marine had not told us there was a large sacrifice of life in its trade with places along the southern coast and round the Horn. He appealed to the Government in forcible language to consider the case of the Maritime Provinces as favorably as that of British Columbia, and in the interest of the Canadian trade to strike out the objectionable clause. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON said it must be very gratifying to know that there is no life lost in this trade between Nova Scotia and the West Indies. Might not that be due to the fact which the hon. gentleman (Mr. K.) stated when the bill was last before the House, namely, that the average deck load carried by the Nova Scotia vessels did not exceed much, if any, the height of the deck load prescribed by this Act, four and a half feet? He thought that hon. gentleman in saying so, gave a very strong reason in favor of the limit fixed by the bill, that the advantage of observing this rule was demonstrated by the fact that very few losses had occurred, and according to the hon. member, no loss of life. He understood that a large portion of the opposition to this bill in another place, came principally from St. John people; but that before it reached its final stage, the opposition was almost, if not altogether withdrawn, and that its prominent opponents took pains, before it passed, to undo their previous work. He had heard that letters were received