

\$1,800,000, and that harbor requires about as much more money to be expended upon it. On account of these burdens imposed upon its trade it becomes difficult for the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal to go on and expend any more money. I would call the attention of the House to the fact that while this is a resolution to assist the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal, it is a resolution to assist them in improving the navigation of the River St. Lawrence, not to improve the harbor of Montreal, a thing that is not at all asked for. We have been told in the newspapers that the harbor of Glasgow has been made from the mouth of the Clyde in order to make a great port at that city. When we consider that the city of Glasgow is only twelve miles from the mouth of that river, the parallel scarcely holds, and there is really nothing in it upon which a comparison can be made. The same thing applies to any port or river that exists in Great Britain. The fact is, there is no parallel we know of to this work in the St. Lawrence, and no other parallel upon which it could be maintained that Montreal should pay for deepening the channel of Lake St. Peter for a distance of forty miles. I have drawn attention to this fact because I think the Minister of Finance is amenable to reason. I will not say the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal, acting in this instance in the interest of the Dominion of Canada, have asked him for bread and that he offers them a stone. I believe he offers them a crust, and it is only a crust. Now, we have undertaken some great expenditures in this country in order to put ourselves in a position to be our own carriers for all times. I think that is a matter of great importance to us, one that will give us great importance if we maintain it. We have undertaken lately to spend \$25,000,000, beside some land, of which we do not compute the value just now, to build the Pacific Railway. It was an act of faith. I do not ask any member of this House to withdraw the confidence with which they voted that money. We have expended about \$46,000,000, on the Intercolonial Railway, and I think we certainly have a brace of elephants on our hands in those two railways. We have been munching away at a camel as we went along for some years past until we have spent about \$31,000,000 in the improvement of our canal system, and we have something to show for it. We have a well-established trade now by the route of the St. Lawrence. Having liberally put our hand to this work and having expended a large amount of money, I really think my hon. friend might consider and get himself well up to the mark, and not allow himself to be checked by this small gnat of \$1,500,000, to keep a trade we have actually got and which our American neighbors are trying to take away from us. I find in this memorandum, passed by a resolution of the Board of Trade of New York, that a fear is expressed that the competition of the Welland Canal and the Canadian route may take away a portion of their western trade. We are now, I believe, carrying about one-seventh of the grain exported from the city of Chicago by the Canadian route; but we are not carrying it by favor of the Americans, but because our merchants have gone there and bought it, and if there is anything beyond that, it is the stuff that has been bought by British merchants and their agents in Chicago, and sent over this route. What our friends on the other side are afraid of is, that we shall keep this small portion of the trade, and they are proposing to reduce the last vestige of charge on their canals, for fear that we may take away more of their trade. I ask the hon. Minister of Finance to reconsider this resolution, and see whether he cannot get up his courage to undertake this \$1,500,000, in order that we may maintain something that by our own energy and enterprise we have actually got, and that is in some danger of being taken away from us by the greater power and resources of the Americans. If the hon. Minister could see his way to do that it would leave the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal free to prosecute the improve-

Mr. McLennan.

ments that are necessary in order to make the harbor of Montreal complete, and to afford facilities for that trade which they fully expect will grow in the future, I have no more to say except to thank the House, and to express my confidence that the men of Ontario, who have so large a stake in this trade, will agree with me that this is a national question.

House resolved itself into Committee on the resolution.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Has any sinking fund been created?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No.

Resolution reported, read the first time and the second time, and concurred in.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY introduced a Bill founded on the resolution.

Bill read the first time.

NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS.

Bill (No. 87) respecting Naturalization of Aliens (from the Senate)—(Mr. Langevin)—was again considered in Committee.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

INSPECTION OF STEAMBOATS.

Mr. POPE (Queen's) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 84) to amend the Acts relating to the Inspection of Steamboats.

Mr. McCALLUM. I trust the Government will not insist on going on with this Bill, introduced at this late stage of the Session, when steamboat owners have not had sufficient notice of it to enable them to show to the Government what effect it will have on their property. The Steamboat Inspection Act has had one or two amendments already, and several Orders in Council have been passed bearing on it. I hope the hon. Minister will let the matter rest as it stands, as no accidents have taken place under the law, and next Session a Committee or Commission could be appointed to draw up a new Act altogether. On the 28th March last, an Order in Council was passed, which changed the whole law, and the people knew nothing about the change, although Parliament was in session at the time. This Order in Council provided that all small pipes that are screwed into the boiler shall have a flange attached to them. For thirty years nothing of this kind was insisted on, and no accident, except in one case, when the fireman was scalded through carelessness in screwing in the pipe. I do not like this country to be governed by Orders in Council. This one was passed without the steamboat owners knowing anything about it, and the result was that when their steamboats were inspected they had to stop working two or three days, in order to get this flange or run their boats, as was done in many instances, without having them inspected. The object of steamboat inspection is to protect life, yet there is a certain class that does not come under the law—what are called steam yachts. The reason given is that they are not used for hire, but in many instances they carry a large number of people. Were those lives to be exposed to danger because they did not pay fare? Those yachts were not required to have a qualified engineer to run them, while a small tug with only three men on board, each of whom knows how to run an engine, must bear the expense of an inspection. There is now \$28,000 to the credit of this fund. Are yachts to be excepted because their owners are rich? Under the law, a second-class engineer can take