

inspect vessels in course of construction is a very good one, because very frequently they are constructed without possessing the strength necessary to contend against the storms they have to encounter. There should be some provision compelling the collector of Customs at every port to see that every vessel that leaves the port is properly equipped, not only with men, but with life-saving apparatus, and this is the more necessary, because many people know nothing about the requirements of equipment, or in regard to life-saving apparatus. There should be some authority to look after steamers leaving the port.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I have no objection to any measure in any degree tending to provide for greater security for our shipping interests, and it is just possible that some of the clauses may be in the direction of improvement. The only objection that I raise to the Bill on its face is that it will be attended with very considerable expense to the owners of small vessels on account of providing, first, for shifting boards, and secondly for the inspection of vessels either leaving port or arriving at their destination. Any charge of that kind, no matter how small it may be, will be objected to by all who are interested in the coasting trade.

Mr. TUPPER. There is no provision for any cost for inspection.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Precisely so, but the Act relating to port wardens is continued in force. I see by one of the clauses it is provided that when a vessel arrives at a port of destination with a grain cargo any Customs house officer may proceed on board and examine into the mode in which their cargo is stowed.

Mr. TUPPER. But there is no charge.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman will observe that an ordinary Customs house officer would be a very incompetent man to see whether a cargo is properly stowed or not. It would be rendering the Bill a complete farce because any Customs house officer would know but little about the stowing of the cargo. The 9th clause provides that the Act relating to port wardens is to continue in force, therefore it will be necessary to provide that the port warden would be the proper person to inspect that vessel either before she leaves or at the port of arrival. The hon. gentleman will have to provide for that without any expense to the owner of the craft. When we go into committee I have some further matters which I will draw the hon. Minister's attention to and which we will consider more thoroughly.

Mr. TUPPER. I would remind the hon. gentleman that the port wardens are only at certain ports. I understand that inland, farther west than Montreal, there are no port wardens.

Mr. LOVITT. As I understand this Bill will apply more particularly to the inland waters than to the foreign trade, and I do not see any objection to this.

Mr. TUPPER. It does not affect our trade in any radical way, as we have the clause in the British Act relating to this in force.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The objection which I intend to make on section 5 will arise on this interpretation clause to some extent, and I, therefore, take the opportunity of stating my objections now. The idea of the hon. gentleman is, no doubt, a good one, and I suppose that this clause is a

Mr. SPROULE.

transcript of that known as the Plimsoll clause in the English Act. As the law now stands under the Port Warden's Act, any vessel loaded with grain that leaves any port in Canada, for any port outside the limits of Canada not on inland navigation, is obliged either to have shifting boards or that her cargo will be stowed in such a manner as to satisfy the port warden that she is properly loaded. The 12th, 13th, 14th and 15th clauses of the Port Warden's Act provide for this—one of these sections reads:

"That no vessel shall leave any port in Canada for a port outside of Canada, not including inland waters, unless she has obtained a certificate from the port warden that the grain cargo is properly loaded in every respect."

There is ample provision at present to prevent the improper loading of any ships sailing from Canada to foreign ports. The Bill now before the House, so far as it extends to the Maritime Provinces, is intended to apply to schooners or vessels leaving ports in New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, or Nova Scotia, for some other port in Canada. We must bear in mind that this is intended to apply to the coasting trade, because anything outside of that is already provided for in the Port Warden's Act. The hon. gentleman knows that from the Province from which I come, we ship each year immense quantities of oats on small schooners, for ports in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and he knows that all these cargoes were shipped in bulk. The practice has existed ever since I can remember, and I am sure ever since the coasting trade has existed in these Provinces, of shipping those grain cargoes in bulk. I do not recollect and I have never heard of any accident arising from that, even although they had no shifting boards. As a matter of fact, when a vessel leaves Prince Edward Island for Pictou or Shediac, or any port along the north coast of New Brunswick, she is only a few hours going over, and this provision will entail no doubt a good deal of expense on the owners of these vessels. They are not vessels which constantly carry a grain cargo and if they are obliged to put in shifting boards or any similar provision it will be very expensive. I do not think the experience in the past will justify the hon. Minister in stating to the House that this is a necessity. I would suggest to him that in this interpretation clause the word "oats" be omitted, and if so that would cover nine-tenths of the cases I refer to and would remove the objection that at present I have to the Bill.

Mr. TUPPER. The argument of the hon. gentleman goes to the extent that this legislation is inapplicable to a special class of shipping and particularly to ships engaged in carrying oats. I must candidly admit that if the legislation is improper and unjustifiable in regard to vessels carrying oats, then that section relating to the grain cargoes should not be pressed at all in any form, because it is impossible to distinguish between barley and other grains and oats. If I am unable to press upon the House the necessity of applying this law to ships engaged in carrying oats between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, I think the clause should go altogether. But, if the hon. gentleman will look at the legislation to which he referred, he will see that the distinction he made with regard to cargoes of oats is not well taken. The hon. gentleman argues that port wardens have compulsory powers in the maritime ports, and these vessels are under their supervision and control.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I said so far as vessels carrying grain from the Maritime Provinces to foreign ports are concerned.

Mr. TUPPER. Then I will grant that part of his case. But even in the case of vessels engaged in carrying grain cargoes from our ports, he will see that the law does not go so far as this Bill, because the port wardens can go to ships leaving port; the law is inapplicable to ships arriving. The Bill before the House, like English legislation, deals