

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—Is that changing the law in that respect?

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—No, this appears to be new.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I wish to say a few words with respect to this clause. The section which it is proposed to repeal practically—

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—No, it adds to it.

Hon. Mr. POWER—It comes very near repealing it. Section 75 reads as follows:

75. Examinations may be instituted in Canada for British subjects or for persons domiciled in Canada for at least three years who intend to become masters or mates of ships trading on the inland waters of Canada, or on the minor waters of Canada, or on coasting voyages, or who wish to procure certificates of competency or service.

2. Foreign subjects serving in ships registered in Canada and trading on the inland waters of Canada, or in the minor waters in Canada while so serving. 57-58 Victoria, 42, section 4.

76. Subject to the provisions of this part, the minister shall provide for such examinations at such places as he sees fit.

The amendment proposes to say that the minister may refuse to admit to examination any person domiciled in Canada who is a subject of a country which does not grant the same privilege to British subjects. I must say that I do not think that clause ought to commend itself to the committee. The present law provides for persons domiciled in Canada for at least three years. Now when you say a man is domiciled anywhere it means that he is in that place with the intention of remaining there. If a man comes into this country, say from the United States, with the intention of returning to the United States, he is not domiciled in Canada. I contend that any man who has been domiciled in Canada for three years should not be refused a certificate. I say that on general grounds. It is an inhuman sort of proceeding I think, position who advocated good-fellowship and good feeling amongst people of different opinions a little while ago, will concur with me with respect to this matter. That is one point. I think it is improper, and that it is legislation which belongs to a darker age than this altogether. Then there is this other point: unless I am misinformed, the number of qualified masters and mates at the present time is not

sufficient to carry on the business of the country, and if the law is put in force the effect will be to make the present condition of things still worse. The business of the country must be carried on, and if you get men to come from, no matter where, from Norway, or the United States or Germany, to live here—because to be domiciled they must be here with the intention of remaining—I think it is a most foolish as well as an improper line of policy to say to these men, 'You shall not have certificates of this kind. We shall not admit you to examination. You shall have no opportunity to fill the vacant places on our ships, unless the country to which you belong has made the same concession to British subjects.' I am somewhat surprised that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce should be prepared to act as godfather, even to a Bill of that kind.

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—I may remark that this is permissive. It simply allows the minister, in his discussion, to refuse. However, if the hon. gentleman wants to discuss this matter, I have no objection to allow the clause, or similar clauses, to stand till I confer with my colleague. I would not be disposed to accept an amendment striking that out until I confer with him.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—This is a question that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce knows very well has been agitating the sailors and masters of ships in Ontario for a great many years, and while the interpretation is given by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken as to what constitutes a domicile, that three years' residence in a country is to be considered a domicile, what would you do with a man who was in the country about six months? Would he be domiciled under the interpretation the hon. gentleman gives to the clause?

Hon. Mr. POWER—I should not say that a man who resided in the country six months should have a right; but if a man is domiciled, I do not care if it were only for three months, when he is domiciled here it means he is here with the intention of remaining.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Whatever may be the practice in the mari-