

people on the steamer cut her adrift to save themselves, and down she went with all these poor people on board, of whom not one was saved. These navvies, who were going to their work, knew nothing of navigation, knew nothing of the danger they were incurring, and they were all lost. That is not a solitary instance. Now, something should be done whereby it would be impossible for vessels of this kind to go out. The Customs officer at the port from which she sailed should have authority to say: You shall not go out in that miserable plight at this season of the year; you shall not go out improperly manned. No less than twelve cases involving great loss have occurred within a few years, and 300 lives were lost in the waters of Algoma; so it is a subject upon which my constituents feel very keenly, and to which I am bound to draw the attention of the Government. There are a great many vessels on the lakes nearly worn out. The present system is to build vessels of a larger class than have hitherto been used, because they are more profitable. The consequence is that the large fleet of schooners and other sailing vessels, with some steamers, has not been renewed for several years, and consequently the vessels now afloat are becoming very unseaworthy. During the ensuing summer, and for some time to come, a careful watch should be kept over these vessels to prevent loss of life and property. I draw the attention of the Minister to this matter, so that some means may be devised whereby these vessels will not be allowed to go out when they are overloaded. A very important point is to have them properly provided with anchors and chains, and with all the appliances which would enable the sailors to save them if they were cut adrift. I have a letter from a gentleman of St. Catharines, a Mr. Carey, who is the chairman of the Seamen's Committee of Workingmen for looking after the safety of sailors. I will not trouble you by reading his letter, but Mr. Carey tells me that vessels have come into port there without a single sailor on board. In one case, a vessel in tow of a steamer was left to two landmen who knew so little of what they had to do that people had to go on board from the shore and tie the vessel to the wharf. Now, this is a state of things that should be guarded against in the future. Another point to which I wish to call attention, is the construction of vessels. Anybody is allowed to build a vessel and to put it afloat. There was a case occurred in the Georgian Bay, of a vessel built at Little Current on the Manitoulin Island. The vessel was called the *Jane Miller*, and she was put afloat top heavy, a small vessel with an enormous upper deck arrangement. I have here a few remarks made by an experienced mariner, a man who has been on the ocean, as well as on the great lakes, and who knows all about ships in every possible way. I will read what he says:

"The duties of the Inspector of Hulls should be expanded, or a special officer should be appointed to see that new vessels on the lakes are built with the necessary stability, that the centre of gravity bears its proper relation to the centre of flotation. At present there seems to be no legal limit to the height and weight of top hamper in the shape of cabins above the main deck. The fierce and sudden gales on the lakes require as good a model of vessel as on the sea coast. A vessel may perhaps be seaworthy under section 6, and yet, if of a bad model, turn over directly she is outside the harbor. In regard to the last portion of clause 2 of section 6, I fail to see that the action of a vessel leaving port in an unseaworthy state can under any circumstances be deemed reasonable or justifiable. A summer and fall "Plimsoll load mark" should be established. The system of towing barges on the open lakes in the fall of the year is bad. In my opinion no vessel should be towed after the 1st of September, unless she is a *bona fide* sailing vessel officered, manned and equipped in every particular under the Canadian Merchant Shipping Act, so that in the event of the hawser parting she may be able to keep herself off the shore, which at present many cannot do."

I need not add a word. That is the case as I have been asked to lay it before the Government by the Boards of Trade and people of Algoma who are largely engaged in shipping, and when this Act is amended as proposed it will be sufficient to prevent lives being sacrificed, providing means be devised whereby the law will be enforced.

Mr. WALDIE. This Act is intended to apply to centre board vessels sailing on the lakes. They do not require the same shifting boards as ocean vessels do, and planks passing from the keel to the deck make a shifting board in the vessel itself; in the case of a number of small vessels employed on the lakes. Does the Act provide for these cases?

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see that it applies to all vessels, but it is not necessary that every ship should have shifting boards. In the case referred to by the hon. gentleman, such would not be required. The words are, shifting boards or some other precaution; in fact, some means of preventing the cargo from shifting, but not necessarily shifting boards.

Mr. SPROULE. I gladly endorse every word said regarding the necessity of further amending the law so as to provide greater means for the safety of life and property in shipping. The hon. gentleman has spoken the sentiments of a great many people who, in the past, have suffered from defective laws and defects in the vessels themselves, and in the loading of cargoes, which causes have brought about most serious disasters. One case, that of the *Jane Ward*, was caused by, or thought to have been caused by, the cargo being placed on the deck, there not being sufficient ballast below. I believe it was clearly understood that that was the cause of the loss of that vessel. Another defect that will be provided for, by the amendment proposed, is cargoes being carried without shifting boards. A schooner carrying corn from Chicago began rolling in the trough of the sea, from the cargo shifting from side to side, and ultimately foundered. In that case, had there been a provision in the law providing for shifting boards, the loss of the vessel, and of lives, would have been prevented. Another important matter to which the hon. gentleman for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) called attention, and which I think a very important one, is that some person should have the authority to retain a vessel going out of port, either without the cargo properly arranged or being overloaded. Many vessels go out with large excursion parties without possessing life boats and life-saving apparatus needed on board for the safety of so large a number of people. Moreover, vessels go out with a very much larger number of passengers than the law allows; but if you appeal to the collector of Customs he says: While I have the authority, I only get into trouble if I stop the practice; while I have the authority I am not instructed to invariably exercise it. Accordingly what is everyone's business is no one's business, and vessels are therefore allowed to go without possessing proper life-saving apparatus, or overloaded. The objection taken by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), I do not think is a valid one, namely, that a vessel going on a trip of four or five hours should not be expected to bear the expense that would be necessary to provide shifting boards for the cargo and so on. But the hon. gentleman forgets that grain is generally not taken a short distance in bulk in vessels.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, always.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that it was usually put in sacks or something of that sort. If it is as stated by the hon. gentleman, I think the present provision should apply as much in that case as if the vessel was going 2,000 miles. I can take my own county facing on Georgian Bay, and while the distance from Owen Sound to Collingwood is only 50 miles, vessels frequently meet very disastrous storms and serious losses have occurred in that short distance, and the provisions of the law should apply as much to those vessels as to vessels going from Owen Sound to Port Arthur or Duluth. The principle involved is as good in one case as in the other. The suggestion of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), that some competent person should