

EVIDENCE

May 31, 1954
2.30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we have a quorum. It has been customary to print so many copies in English and French of the evidence. Would somebody like to move the number of copies to be printed?

Mr. LANGLOIS (*Gaspe*): I move that 500 copies in English and 200 copies in French be printed.

Mr. GREEN: I second that.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed?

Carried.

Gentlemen, when we adjourned at the last meeting we were still considering clause 1 of Bill 421. Shall the clause carry?

Mr. WINCH: I understood that there was going to be an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: On clause 8.

Mr. WINCH: On clause 1 there was to be an amendment, which I understood the parliamentary assistant was going to accept, that is, in subsection (*ea*) after the word "charterer", on the second line, that the words "by demise" be added.

Mr. LANGLOIS (*Gaspe*): That "charterer by demise" be substituted for "charterer".

Mr. WINCH: I would so move.

Mr. GREEN: I think that perhaps we might make better progress if we left some of these sections which are contentious stand and dealt with the others. Over the week-end I have had an opportunity to go over the brief submitted by Mr. Brisset, and I do not know how many other members have done so, but I think it makes the situation clear beyond the shadow of a doubt with regard to this proposed extension of power to seize a vessel.

Coming from one of the great ports of Canada, I cannot overemphasize the concern with which we see an attempt being made here to extend the power of the National Harbours Board to seize vessels. That right of actually seizing a vessel is going very far. They already have the right to seize for damage that is done to a dock by the vessel, but they are attempting in these amendments to get the power to seize a vessel for damage done by an agent living in Vancouver or any other port or by a charterer, in addition to a charterer by demise. I do not believe that there could be a more objectionable provision going into this Act.

You have ships coming in from all countries of the world. A government agency will have an arbitrary power to seize a vessel, not for something the vessel itself does or that its master does, which right they already have, but they go further and ask for the right to seize for things done by a local agent. I think it is preposterous. You will notice that this submission is made on behalf of the Shipping Federation of Canada and also on behalf of the Vancouver Chamber of Shipping. I cannot see why the National Harbours Board would ask for such a power.

The CHAIRMAN: What clause is that under?