

produce such memorandum in like manner as if it were the certificate of registry, or, in the case of a foreign ship, the document equivalent to a certificate of registry, and, in default, shall be liable to the same penalty as if he had failed to produce the said certificate or document."

Now, to held, in relation to this matter that, while it was desirable to assimilate the legislation with that of the Imperial Government in relation to the tonnage and shipping of Canada, this Parliament should not be without control. He had never disputed for one moment that proposition; he believed in this House legislating for itself whenever it could do so without any serious interference with the interests of the Empire; and they should confine those interests to as small a space as possible, particularly when they affected their tonnage and shipping. But he held that it was the duty of his hon. friend, when he propounded a measure such as this, to tell the House how far it affected the revenue, and he should like to have an approximate statement showing to what extent it would diminish the revenue or sick seamen's fund, river police fund, and the several dock trusts throughout Canada.

Mr. SMITH (Westmoreland) said he had told his hon. friend it would not diminish the revenue a single cent. He had assumed his hon. friend was acquainted with the provisions of the Act of 1876, but now he could only infer that the hon. gentleman was not aware of that law. He talked about what an owner could do after getting the original register. This Bill had nothing to do with the register, except for the necessary dues. His hon. friend had charged him with being recreant to his duties, but that was not a question for him to decide. He had no other object than to serve the public interest. He had never taken any course inconsistent with his present one, and when the hon. member for Northumberland had introduced a Bill in 1872 relating to deckloads, he had given that Bill his entire support. That law had worked admirably and had been copied in England to a very considerable extent. He was quite prepared at all times to give all information in his power, but he thought, in

this case, the House had all the information necessary.

Mr. MITCHELL said he understood the Act of 1876. The hon. gentleman had stated this Bill only affected the dues and did not affect the revenue. Did the hon. gentleman pretend that it could affect the dues without affecting the revenue derived from those dues to support those trusts? The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had challenged his (Mr. Mitchell's) action in relation to the Act he carried with respect to deckloads in which he received that hon. gentleman's cordial support, and which the British Government had copied as being useful legislation. The hon. Minister had challenged a comparison of his administration of the Department and that during the seven years he (Mr. Mitchell) was in charge—a comparison which he had not provoked, for he never attempted to decry the administration of the hon. gentleman and never cast a slur upon any officer in the Department.

Mr. MACKENZIE rose to a question of order. The hon. member, during five minutes over which his speech had extended, had not discussed the resolution before the Committee, and it was not proper to permit that extraordinary diversion into topics having no connection with the subject under discussion.

Mr. TUPPER said it was the first time he had heard of such a position being taken by the First Minister. On two or three occasions, when the hon. member for North York (Mr. Dymond) had improperly raised questions of order, the Chairman had ruled that the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) was strictly in order, and that he had not dealt with a single question which the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had not opened up, and having opened up it was right he should receive his reply in as extended a form as the hon. member desired to give it. It would become a tyranny if hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial benches were permitted to raise questions outside of that under discussion and hon. members of the Opposition were not allowed to reply.