

prepared to make any arrangement with him to replace the present one. I did not feel that I was in a position to make any arrangement with Reuters.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not suggest that, but when the government is paying out \$60,000 in five years, is it not interested in finding out whether we could not have an improved service? The service is not satisfactory at present although it is better than the old United States associated service. But it is not as good as we ought to have now.

Mr. FIELDING. In these things, it seems to me, the interests of the newspapers are much greater than those of the government. Of course, as representing the public, we are interested, to the extent of the subsidy, in having a good service. But the newspapers have even a deeper interest; and besides they know the best kind of news and they know the best way to get it. If Reuters was the best source of supply, we could trust the newspapers, in their desire to get the best service, to make whatever arrangement might be most advisable. I thought I was doing right in saying to the representative of Reuters: See these newspaper gentlemen; we are anxious only to subsidize the best service, and the newspapers are the best judges of what is the best service. That is why it seems to me I was right in referring the matter to them.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PROHIBITION OF OPIUM.

Bill (No. 205) to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of opium for other than medical purposes, read the second time, considered in committee, read the third time and passed.

THE CANADA SHIPPING ACT.

Bill (No. 183) to amend the Canada Shipping Act read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. BRODEUR. This section is to take the place of section 4 of the Canadian Shipping Act. By section 4 it was provided that nothing in that section concerning the registration of ships should apply to ships belonging to His Majesty. In 1906 the imperial parliament passed an Act by which ships belonging to His Majesty should be registered. It did not make provision with regard to ships belonging to His Majesty

Mr. FIELDING.

in the colonies, but it reserved that power for the colonies themselves to exercise.

On section 2,

Mr. BRODEUR. The object of this amendment is to prevent the multiplication of the same name for ships. There was no provision in the law to the effect that when a ship was registered the name should be submitted to the department to find out whether it should be used. The result has been that a good many ships are bearing the same name. We find now, especially in sailing vessels, that there are not less than fifteen or twenty ships in one case bearing the same name. The imperial parliament passed a law last year by which the duplication of names should be avoided, by compelling people seeking for registration to send the name of their ship to the government. We are adopting absolutely the same legislation as was adopted by the English parliament.

On section 3,

Mr. BRODEUR. Sections 74 and 75 of the Shipping Act provide that in order to be admitted to examination a man must be a British subject, or domiciled in Canada for three years. It amounts to about the same thing, because when a man has been previously domiciled in Canada it is supposed that he takes out his naturalization papers. But it has been found that no such provision exists in the United States, and they simply confine the application to pass an examination to persons who are American citizens. This Bill is for the purpose of giving to the Governor in Council or to parliament the right to prohibit any citizen of a country which does not give us the same privilege as we are giving to it, the right to refuse such citizen to be admitted to pass the examination. My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) wanted to make some remarks on this clause and we might therefore let it stand.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 4—certified officers.

Mr. DANIEL. What does that mean?

Mr. BRODEUR. The sections which are mentioned before section 98 have reference to British ships which, not being registered in Canada, were not obliged to take certified officers when they left our ports. A Bill was introduced by my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean) some time ago dealing with the same question. The matter was dealt with by a special committee and as a result of the work of that committee a report has been made at variance with the section which is now proposed. In view of that I do not want to press this section, but I am willing to accept the report of the committee which has given the matter full consideration. We will strike out this section, and propose later