

is adopted as it stands, it would be right to reduce the amount which those who pass examinations for pilots or mates have to pass. I have no further observations to make in reference to the Bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). One of the objections which I have to this Bill, relates to the fee of \$5, which it is proposed to place on the certificates, which these men are to receive, if they have been captains before the 1st of January, 1883. I think that this fee should be merely nominal, not more than \$1, as I see no reason why they should be taxed for their certificates. Again, the hon. Minister may be aware, that as far as the Province of Nova Scotia is concerned, an effort is now being made to invest a large amount of capital in the fishing industry; and some vessels of a large size are to be employed in it; an effort is also being made to secure the services of Nova Scotians, who for years past have been engaged, as the hon. gentleman knows, most successfully on the Nova Scotian coast and on the banks of Newfoundland, but as masters of American fishing vessels. I wish, if possible, to have added a clause providing that men who are Nova Scotians or Canadians and the masters of American fishing vessels prior to this date, shall be included in the exceptions. I think that this would be an inducement to them perhaps to take command of our vessels; and many of these men are well qualified, although not able to pass the somewhat rigid examination which the hon. gentleman proposes.

Mr. MITCHELL. When this Bill was introduced and the explanations were made by the hon. Minister, I pointed out the difficulty which would arise if my hon. friend did not add an amendment by which a class of persons who had been in the service for some time, and were not the masters and mates of vessels of the class to which the Bill referred, and who could not undergo examination owing, perhaps, to the want of scientific information, should be excepted; and I am glad to say that the hon. gentleman has adopted my suggestion and provided for this class. To my mind, that was the only real difficulty in connection with the Bill. The hon. gentleman from St. John has spoken of another, the limitation of size; but I think that if the hon. gentleman relaxes it to 150 instead of 200 tons—which would not quite come to what the hon. gentleman wishes—this would fully cover what the hon. Minister aims at by introducing this measure, which is a good one; there is no question about that, and the moment that the hon. member adopted the suggestions of myself and of other members of the House, he added very much to the popularity which the Bill will create, and to the justice which it will impart to a class of men who otherwise would not be benefitted by it. As regards the fees, I must say, I think that the objection taken as to the extent of the fees has some foundation. The class of people who would be covered by these certificates appears to me one which, particularly, ought not to pay the amount of fees provided. I would suggest whether it would not be well to consider these two points, first the limitation of tonnage to the extent of 150 instead of 100 tons, and the reducing of the fees to such an extent as might relieve that class of people. They are a class who suffer a great deal, work hard, generally have large families and are not specially protected by the National Policy; and I think, that taking all these circumstances into consideration, and looking at the way in which this Bill has been received by the House, and the general feeling of satisfaction shown on account of the remedy which is proposed by it to protect this country, and the greater security which it is going to extend to that class of people, the hon. gentleman would do well to accept the suggestions made with the view of trying to give this Bill greater popularity even than it will possess, if it be

passed, as it is. I have nothing further to say, save that I hope that the hon. Minister will accept the suggestions made by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and I will be pleased to see the measure pass, as I trust it will, with those amendments.

Mr. DAWSON. I agree with the remarks of preceding speakers with regard to this Bill, and more especially with those of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken on the other side of the House, that it is a step in the right direction, and I shall have great pleasure in supporting it. There is no part of the country where such a Bill as this is more needed than in the very extensive district which I represent, where there is such a large extent of inland navigation. My purpose in rising was to ask the Minister whether it is his intention to bring down a supplementary measure to this with reference to the navigation of our inland waters?

Mr. GILLMOR. From my experience of the coasting trade I am inclined to believe that many of the vessels which suffer from these casualties are less than 100 tons. I am well acquainted with the masters, mates and crews of such vessels, and I have never heard any expression of opinion from them that such a Bill was necessary; but, of course, if it is going to have the effect of protecting life and property it would be for the public benefit, and I should be sorry to oppose its passage. It will, however, be attended with a good deal of expense, because, although the fee is fixed at \$5, the real expense will be in many cases \$20 and more. This board of examiners, I presume, will sit in St. John, and those who apply for certificates will have to lose their time, and pay travelling and other expenses. I am somewhat surprised at the number of casualties which the hon. Minister of Marine reported; but I am sure he has looked into the matter, and he feels it to be in the public interest that the Bill should be passed. I had thought that the owners of vessels and the commanders and crews were pretty good judges of these things, and I cannot see that this Bill is going to be much of an improvement. The board of examiners will require, of course, to be as well acquainted with the qualifications necessary as those who are to be examined, and I am not quite satisfied that the public interests will be very much served in this matter or that the Bill will be received with very much favor. The owners of vessels are usually well acquainted with the qualifications of the master and the men, while the men are equally familiar with the qualifications of the master and the mate, and as passengers rarely go by these boats this would seem to be a sufficient guarantee of safety, because the crews will not venture their lives unless they are satisfied with the qualifications of the officers. However, it is possible that the examinations will result in making the men more particular in the discharge of their duties. I would, however, call the hon. Minister's attention to the size of the vessel, because I do not believe that there are 10 per cent. of the coasting vessels which are as large as 125 tons. I hope that he will also make the fee as moderate as possible, as it seems to be a pretty large one.

Mr. LISTER. Representing as I do a county in which there are a great many seafaring men, I take the liberty of expressing my views on the Bill. My hon. friend from Shelburne (Mr. Robertson) must remember that there are other places in which sailors live, besides the coast of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia; and my own opinion is that the Bill, with the amendment which has just been proposed, will meet with a very hearty approval by late captains and sailors. I would, however, repeat what has already been stated by others, that I think that the fee exacted for these certificates is far too large. The men who will be affected by this Bill are not, as a rule, too well paid. They are subject to a great many exposures; they usually have large families to keep, and they are only employed during portions of the year. I think the fee that this Bill proposed to exact from those