

Mr. TUPPER. The engines and the boilers as well, as the hon. gentleman will see if he reads the Act. He will find that Parliament made careful provision as to what style of boiler and what style of engine Parliament deemed it proper to permit a steamer to carry, and that Parliament appointed a regular staff, paid not by fees but by a fixed salary to inspect and deal with those subjects. Under those circumstances I beg to move:

That this Bill be not now read a second time, but that it be read a second time this day six months.

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil). Mr. Speaker, this is a question which I think the hon. gentleman who has introduced the Bill (Mr. Cook) has not much knowledge of and I hope the hon. gentleman will excuse me if I as a manufacturer and as a man who has been connected with steam boilers for many years express my views on the subject. Had the hon. member been thoroughly acquainted with the facts he would never have stated in the preamble of the Bill that the danger lay in stationary engines or in those devices worked by steam power. The danger does not lie in the steam engine nor in the want of proper qualification by stationary engineers or those who work steam engines, but the danger lies in the manner of producing the steam and in the steam boiler itself. In all our municipalities in the different Provinces there are inspectors appointed who are called "boiler inspectors" and who especially look after the safety of those boilers. I know that in the municipalities of Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, Quebec and other large cities in which a number of steam boilers are worked there are efficient officers to look after the examination of boilers and to see that they are sound and in good order before the owners are granted licenses to work them. If the hon. member who introduced this Bill (Mr. Cook) meant in any way to guard against the destruction of life and property he should have introduced a bill referring only to steam boilers and not to steam engines. But the hon. gentleman proposes to deal with steam engines which are as harmless as the babe unborn; if you leave the steam out of them. The steam engine without the steam boiler is not in the least dangerous to life, and there is no reason for legislation in regard to it. If the hon. gentleman intended to protect life he should have framed his Bill so as to prevent the licensing of men who are ignorant of the strength of a boiler and of its capability for bearing steam pressure. There are few engineers engaged in our workshops who will undertake to have anything to do with steam boilers, for that matter is left entirely to the fireman. I admit that in some places we have engineers acting as firemen, but the employer can always secure that the engineer so engaged is a thoroughly competent fireman and that his training is such as to warrant him being so employed with safety. In my opinion this Bill is *ultra vires* of the Dominion Legislature. I think the powers which it assumes to take belongs entirely to the Provinces or to the municipalities where those boilers may be situated, and I do not believe that this House should be asked to waste time in considering it. It is very true as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has said that the Dominion Government has power to deal with marine engines, for they are operated upon the waters of the Dominion and in different places, but I think that the regulations as regards stationary engines should be left to the provincial or municipal authorities or to the discretion of the manufacturers, who employ men to take charge of these engines. I think that the figures that the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook) gave us with reference to the destruction of life in Canada from the explosion of steam boilers are a little wild. I am satisfied that not 260 persons have been killed from this cause, and I believe that the hon. gentleman would not save one-third or one-tenth or any part of the number from any protection that might be afforded by this Bill. I hope that the time will not be wasted in dis-

cussing this Bill which would be of no practical advantage and which would only throw more labor on those who have in charge the conduct of manufacturing concerns in this Dominion.

Mr. IVES. There is one feature of this question which has not been referred to by hon. gentlemen who have opposed the second reading of the Bill. I noticed that the hon. member who moved the second reading has shown that nearly all the petitions in its favor come from unions of stationary engineers or labor organisations. I was not surprised at that because if the title of this Bill had been "An Act to render it possible for all stationary engineers to obtain employment at high prices from the manufacturers of the country" the title would have been appropriate to the effect that the passage of this Act would have. I consider this Bill to be a very mischievous and a very meddling piece of legislation. There are a vast number of small manufacturing industries all over the Dominion using engines of from 25 to 100 horse power which would be seriously affected by the passage of this Act. The result would be that they would be unable any longer to employ the competent men they have been in the habit of employing at a moderate rate of wages, and they would be obliged to employ a class of men with far higher qualifications, to whom they would have to pay a much higher rate of wages than their business would enable them to pay. The passage of this Bill would simply mean the stoppage of the business of a man with a small engine engaged in manufacturing in a small way. Although he might have had a man in his employ for three or four years who had worked satisfactorily and well without any accident, he would be liable to a penalty if he any longer continued to employ him. The hon. gentleman has not shown any need of this measure. He has read statistics of a number of deaths which have occurred from explosions of boilers in 1866, 1887 and 1888. He would not tell us to what an extent of territory those statistics referred; but they unquestionably refer to the whole world. So far as Canada is concerned, I follow the newspapers with considerable regularity, and we are not often shocked by accounts of boiler explosions. I am not aware that we have had any loss of life at all through explosions of stationary boilers. As an hon. member has said, the danger is not with the engineer who runs the engine, but it is in the boiler itself; and if the boiler is a good boiler, there is practically no danger at all. I am strongly opposed to this measure, because I think it is mischievous and meddling, and would interfere with the business of a large number of small manufacturers who could not afford to pay the wages required to employ the class of engineers prescribed by this Bill.

Mr. WATSON. I believe some good might be done by the passage of a Bill of this description. I would be in favor of some slight amendments to it, but I entirely differ from the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and from the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) with regard to the cause of the explosions of boilers. They seem to think that explosions are altogether due to the defective condition of the boilers. I have a practical knowledge of these matters, and I say that in almost every instance the cause of a boiler explosion is the incompetency of the man handling the boiler. I have had some considerable experience for years in the construction and repairing of boilers, and there has hardly been an instance within my knowledge of an accident occurring through the defective construction of a boiler. The explosion is always caused by the water being too low in the boiler, and by the fireman not being competent to handle it. With regard to small manufacturers being injured by the passing of this Bill, any person who could not undergo the examination required by sub-section 4 of section 9, and get a certificate which would only cost him \$2 a year, would not be a fit and competent