

Colonial and Indian Exhibition to be held in London in the year 1886.

Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has the hon. Minister any further information to furnish in respect of the preparations made?

Mr. POPE. Space has been obtained, and the exhibits at Antwerp will soon be brought over. We find that people are much more willing to send their exhibits to the London exhibition than they were to Antwerp, and many who declined to send to the latter have signified their intention of sending goods to London. The space acquired is 54,000 square feet in a very prominent position. As I stated before, the work done for the Antwerp exhibition was also done for the London exhibition, so far as sending exhibits is concerned. That is all that has been done up to this time with respect to the London exhibition. As I explained to the hon. gentleman, that exhibition is going on very well, as I am informed by those attending it, and the number of exhibits far exceeded what we thought we would be able to get in the short space of time at our disposal, considering also that some exhibitors seemed indisposed to exhibit at that place.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is gratifying to know that the Antwerp exhibition is likely to prove a greater success than was hoped for, especially as the work was undertaken on short notice, and there were grave fears for its success. I think it is important that these exhibitions should be made a great success, and as there is ample time to supplement the Antwerp exhibition, and as I am sure Parliament will be glad to vote the money, I trust the Minister will see that every effort is made to make the other exhibition a success. I would not like to say that I have any doubt that the Minister will exercise his full powers in that direction, and I think a little extra effort to bring our country as prominently before the country as possible, is well worth being made.

Mr. POPE. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, and I think it is important that we should have a first rate exhibition in London and I think we shall have one. I think perhaps we can be a little more economical than we sometimes have been, and still have a good exhibition. Experience ought to teach us something, and without complaining at what was done at former exhibitions, I hope that these two exhibitions will not perhaps cost us more than the one at Paris.

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

NAVIGATION OF CANADIAN WATERS.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the Order for the second reading of Bill (No. 132) to amend the Act 43 Vic., chap. 29, respecting the navigation of Canadian waters and to enable the Governor in Council to suspend from time to time certain provisions of the said Act, be discharged. He said: I find that a previous Act gives the powers necessary, without passing this Act.

Mr. BLAKE. When the hon. gentleman did not know what authority he had with reference to his own Department before now, how in the world is he going to know his authority when he assumes the duties of Acting Minister of the Interior?

Mr. McLELAN. I have acquired that knowledge before becoming Acting Minister. I might say that after examin-

ing into the matter with my deputy and the Law Clerk it was ascertained that an Act passed by the late Sir Albert Smith was sufficient for all we required.

Order discharged and Bill withdrawn.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION.

Mr. McLELAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 133) further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882. He said: This Act is simply to provide for another class of engineers, called fourth-class engineers, to those already provided for. We find that there are a number of men needed who have not the qualification of the third-class, and that it is important that they should be included. I may say that prior to the Act of 1882, a fourth-class was provided for, but in the latter Act they were omitted.

Mr. BLAKE. Then this simply restores the law to its former condition?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. The amendment was in the wrong direction?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes, the steamboat inspectors considered that only three classes were necessary, but it has since been found that the fourth class are required.

Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. BLAKE. Is the provision now inserted substantially the same as the law prior to 1882?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes. I wish to add some words to the first clause in the fifth sub-section of the present Act. After the word "steamboat," in the 14th line, the words, "requiring under such Act a certificated engineer." Under the Inspection Act, freight vessels of less than 150 tons, not carrying passengers, are not compelled to have a certificated engineer, and this might shut the fourth-class out.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not suppose it could be construed that a fourth-class engineer should be prevented from acting on a steamboat on which any other person might act as engineer. There can be no harm done, I suppose.

Mr. EDGAR. Would that exclude a fourth-class engineer from acting on the smallest description of vessels.

Mr. McLELAN. I want to provide that it shall be so construed as not to prevent them from acting on such vessels.

Mr. EDGAR. On what classes of vessels will they act?

Mr. McLELAN. Tug-boats, pleasure yachts, and boats carrying freight under 150 tons are not compelled to have certificated engineers.

Mr. EDGAR. Then the only difference between a fourth-class engineer and one who is not an engineer at all is that he is permitted to act as second engineer on these large vessels.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 2,

Mr. McLELAN. I wish to amend this by striking the word "marine" out of the 20th line. That is, to make the service in any steam engine shop sufficient. There are not many marine engine shops in this country, and it is considered sufficient if the engineer serves the required length of time in any steam engine shop.

Amendment agreed to.